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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Monosodium titanate (MST) for use in the Actinide Removal Process (ARP) must be qualified and verified in advance. A single qualification sample for each batch of material is sent to SRNL for analysis, as well as a statistical sampling of verification samples. The Harrell Industries Lot #46000824120 qualification and the 16 verification samples failed to meet the specification for weight percent solids. All of the pails sampled and tested contained less than 15 wt % MST solids.
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1.0 Introduction

Harrell Industries is under contract with Savannah River Remediation (SRR) to provide MST for use in the Actinide Removal Process (ARP). A 1-L qualification sample from Lot #46000824120 was sent to the Savannah River National Laboratory (SRNL) to confirm the material meets certain requirements specified in the purchase specification.¹

The vendor is also obligated to send verification samples from ~10% or more of the pails of MST product for each lot. The verification samples are selected from the entire inventory of pails so that the set of verification samples represents pails filled from the beginning to the end of the pail-filling operation for the entire lot of MST. For the verification of this lot, Harrell Industries sent 16 samples, one each from pails #10, 20, 30, 40, 50, 60, 70, 80, 90, 100, 110, 120, 130, 140, 150, and 155 of 155 total pails.

SRR requested analysis of the qualification sample for weight percent MST, density, pH, volatile organics, and particle size. They also requested analysis of the verification samples for weight percent solids, density, and pH.² The work was controlled by a Task Technical and Quality Assurance Plan (TTQAP).³

2.0 Experimental Procedure

SRNL analyzed the qualification and verification samples for density, pH, and weight percent solids. Density was measured using an electronic pipette in triplicate. The pH was measured by colorimetric pH strips, and the weight percent solids were measured in triplicate using a Mettler-Toledo Halogen Moisture Analyzer HG63 instrument.

Weight percent solids measurements performed on the samples at SRNL were lower than the value reported by Harrell Industries for this lot. Therefore, the weight percent solids measurements were confirmed for the qualification sample using the method provided by Harrell Industries. This procedure is provided in Appendix A.

Aliquots of the qualification sample were removed under well mixed conditions to provide sub-samples for each of the analyses. SRNL performed the following analyses: volatile organic analysis (VOA) and particle size using a Microtrac® S3500 analyzer.

3.0 Results and Discussion

The results of the weight percent, pH, and density measurements are reported in Table 3-1, while the results of the additional qualification sample analyses are reported in Table 3-2.

As seen in Table 3-1, all of the samples tested contained less than 15 wt % MST solids and, therefore, failed to meet the purchase specification. Pail #s 1 – 150 were marginally below the lower weight percent limit, while Pail #155 was significantly below the limit, containing only ~14 wt % solids. The measured density of Pail #155 was also lower than the remainder of the lot. There has been a declining trend in the most recent batches of MST received from Harrell.
Industries, with respect to the weight percent MST in the slurries. The three previous lots (#46000706120, 46000722120, and 46000808120) were very near the 15 wt % lower limit, but were accepted.4

Harrell reported a weight percent solids of 15.7 wt % for this lot of material. Using the method provided by Harrell (Appendix A), SRNL obtained a value of 14.53 wt % solids, consistent with the low values obtained using the normal SRNL method (Mettler-Toledo Halogen Moisture Analyzer). During performance of the Harrell method, it was found that it required approximately 3 hours of drying to reach a constant weight. This is a possible source of the discrepancy between the SRNL and Harrell reported values. If the samples are not completely dry the weight percent solids will be reported high.

Table 3-1. Weight Percent, pH, and Density Results for All Samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample ID</th>
<th>Weight % Solids (Standard Deviation)</th>
<th>pH</th>
<th>Densityb (g/mL) (%RSD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualification</td>
<td>14.92 (±0.112) %</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>1.116 (0.10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pail #10</td>
<td>14.82 (±0.137) %</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>1.116 (0.04%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pail #20</td>
<td>14.75 (±0.076) %</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>1.115 (0.04%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pail #30</td>
<td>14.63 (±0.178) %</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>1.115 (0.06%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pail #40</td>
<td>14.61 (±0.159) %</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>1.117 (0.36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pail #50</td>
<td>14.80 (±0.106) %</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>1.111 (0.15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pail #60</td>
<td>14.67 (±0.056) %</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>1.119 (0.12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pail #70</td>
<td>14.81 (±0.273) %</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>1.114 (0.26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pail #80</td>
<td>14.85 (±0.082) %</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>1.115 (0.02%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pail #90</td>
<td>14.73 (±0.122) %</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>1.116 (0.02%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pail #100</td>
<td>14.82 (±0.191) %</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>1.116 (0.07%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pail #110</td>
<td>14.81 (±0.047) %</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>1.113 (0.05%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pail #120</td>
<td>14.81 (±0.068) %</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>1.115 (0.05%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pail #130</td>
<td>14.80 (±0.026) %</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>1.115 (0.16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pail #140</td>
<td>14.64 (±0.104) %</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>1.115 (0.04%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pail #150</td>
<td>14.70 (±0.329) %</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>1.113 (0.23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pail #155</td>
<td>14.95 (±0.050) %</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>1.108 (0.09%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>14.72 (±0.192) %</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>1.115 (0.23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable Range5</td>
<td>15-17 %</td>
<td>&gt; 10</td>
<td>no requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrell Methodc</td>
<td>14.53%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) The uncertainty of the pH measurement is 0.5 pH units.
b) Density measurements taken at 23 °C.
c) Performed at SRNL using the qualification sample from this lot and the method provided by Harrell. Note total drying time to reach the constant weight was approximately 3 hours.
Table 3-2. Results of the Qualification Sample Analyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Specification</th>
<th>Pass ?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volatile Organics</td>
<td>VOA</td>
<td>17 ppm(^1)</td>
<td>n/a(^2)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particle Size, &lt; 0.8 μm</td>
<td>Microtrac(^\circledast)</td>
<td>4.60 vol %</td>
<td>&lt;10 vol %</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particle Size, &gt; 37 μm</td>
<td>Microtrac(^\circledast)</td>
<td>0 vol %</td>
<td>&lt;1 vol %</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particle Size, geometric standard deviation (absorbance mode)</td>
<td>Microtrac(^\circledast)</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>≤3.5</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The “Particle Size, geometric standard deviation” is defined as the 50th percentile result divided by the 16th percentile result. Microtrac\(^\circledast\) results have a 10% analytical uncertainty. VOA results have a 20% analytical uncertainty.

4.0 Conclusions

Analyses of the Harrell Lot #46000824120 MST material indicate the material meets the specifications, with the exception of weight percent solids. The pails all contain less than 15 wt % solids (the lower limit of the specification).

---

\(^1\) Isopropanol = 17 ppm, all other analytes = < 0.25 ppm

\(^2\) Purchase specification does not include a specification for volatile organics, only total alcohol content of < 500 ppm.
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Appendix A. Harrell Weight Percent Solids Procedure
PROCEDURE: WEIGHT PERCENT

PURPOSE: To determine the weight percent of monosodium titanate in an aqueous slurry

EQUIPMENT: Oven
Analytical balance
Porcelain crucible

METHOD:

1. Thoroughly clean a porcelain crucible and dry in a 105 °C oven. Cool to room temperature in a desiccator. Weigh crucible and record weight to 0.0001 g.

2. Thoroughly suspend the MST slurry by shaking the sample bottle. Open the bottle and stir with a glass rod to make sure no chunks of MST remain unsuspended. Add approximately 1 g monosodium titanate slurry to crucible and record weight to 0.0001g.

3. Place crucible in 105 °C oven for one hour. Remove from oven and cool to room temperature in desiccator.

4. Weigh dish and record weight to 0.0001g.

5. Place crucible back in oven for 30 minutes, remove to desiccator, cool, and reweigh. Continue until weight percent does not change from one measurement to the next.

CALCULATION:

\[
\text{Weight \%} = \left( \frac{\text{weight dried slurry} - \text{weight dish}}{\text{weight wet slurry} - \text{weight dish}} \right) \times 100
\]

SPECIFICATION: 15 – 17 wt %
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