

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.



Results for the Fourth Quarter Calendar Year 2018 Tank 50 Salt Solution Sample

C. L. Crawford

January 2020

SRNL-STI-2019-00148, Revision 1



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: *Tank 50, Waste Acceptance
Criteria, Saltstone*

Retention: *Permanent*

Results for the Fourth Quarter Calendar Year 2018 Tank 50 Salt Solution Sample

C. L. Crawford

January 2020

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



REVIEWS AND APPROVALS

AUTHOR:

C. L. Crawford, Author, Advanced Characterization and Processing	Date
--	------

TECHNICAL REVIEW:

J. H. Christian, Advanced Characterization and Processing, Reviewed per E7 2.60	Date
---	------

APPROVAL:

B. J. Wiedenman, Manager Advanced Characterization and Processing	Date
--	------

F. M. Pennebaker, Program Manager, Liquid Waste Chemical Processing Technologies	Date
---	------

S. D. Fink, Director Chemical Processing Technologies	Date
--	------

T. H. Huff, Manager DWPF and Saltstone Facility Engineering	Date
--	------

R. E. Edwards, Manager Nuclear Safety and Engineering Integration	Date
--	------

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In this Technical Report, the chemical and radionuclide contaminant results from the Fourth Quarter Calendar Year 2018 (CY18) sample of Tank 50 salt solution are presented in tabulated form. The information from this characterization will be used by Savannah River Remediation (SRR) for the transfer of aqueous waste from Tank 50 to the Saltstone Production Facility (SPF), where the waste will be treated and disposed in the Saltstone Disposal Facility. This Technical Report compares results, where applicable, to SPF Waste Acceptance Criteria (WAC) Limits and Targets.¹ The chemical and radionuclide contaminant results from the characterization of the Fourth Quarter CY18 sampling of Tank 50 were requested by SRR personnel via a Task Technical Request (TTR)² and details of the testing are presented in the Savannah River National Laboratory (SRNL) Task Technical and Quality Assurance Plan (TTQAP).³ This Technical Report is part of Deliverable 2 relating to Task 1 from the SRR request.² Data pertaining to the regulatory limits for Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) metals will be documented at a later time per the TTQAP for the Tank 50 Saltstone task.³

The following facts pertaining to the WAC are drawn from the analytical results provided in this report.

- WAC Targets or Limits were met for all analyzed chemical and radioactive contaminants for which the detection limits are below the WAC Targets or Limits.
- Isopar L has a higher detection limit⁴ compared with the current SPF WAC Limit value of 11 ppm¹ associated with flammability that has been in effect since revision 12 of the WAC dating back to July of 2013.⁵
- Nitrosamines were not detected in the Tank 50 salt solution sample above the instrument detection limits of < 1 mg/L.
- The minimum detection limit (<3.14E-01 pCi/mL) is reported for ⁹⁴Nb as determined from the minimum detectable activity associated with the radiochemical method used for this radionuclide. The reported detection limit is above the requested SRR target minimum detection limit concentration.⁶ However, the minimum detection limit reported for the Fourth Quarter CY18 Tank 50 sample for ⁹⁴Nb is lower than the estimated detection limit initially established by SRNL in 2009.⁷ Thus per guidance from SRR,⁶ SRNL continues to achieve as low as practical detection limits for this radionuclide.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	vii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	viii
1.0 Introduction	1
2.0 Experimental	1
2.1 Technical	1
2.2 Quality Assurance	2
3.0 Results and Discussion	2
4.0 Conclusions	10
5.0 Reference	11

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3-1. Chemical Contaminants from Fourth Quarter CY18 Tank 50 Samples and SPF WAC, Revision 18, Attachment 8.1 Limits ¹	4
Table 3-2. Chemical Contaminants from Fourth Quarter CY18 Tank 50 Samples and SPF WAC, Revision 18, Attachment 8.2 Targets ¹	5
Table 3-3. Radionuclide Contaminants from Fourth Quarter CY18 Tank 50 Samples and SPF WAC, Revision 18, Attachment 8.3 Limits ¹	6
Table 3-4. Radionuclide Contaminants from Fourth Quarter CY18 Tank 50 Samples and SPF WAC, Revision 18, Attachment 8.4 Targets ¹	7
Table 3-5. Chemical Contaminants Impacting Saltstone Disposal Unit (SDU) Flammability from Fourth Quarter CY18 Tank 50 Samples and SPF WAC, Revision 18, Table 2 Limits and Targets ¹	8
Table 3-6. Other Organics Impacting SDU Flammability from Fourth Quarter CY18 Tank 50 Samples and SPF WAC, Revision 18, Table 3 Concentrations ¹	9
Table 3-7. Processing Constituents from Fourth Quarter CY18 Tank 50 Samples and SPF WAC, Revision 18, Table 4 Limits ¹	9
Table 3-8. Additional Measured Constituents ³	10

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AD	Analytical Development
CVAFS	Cold Vapor Atomic Fluorescence Spectroscopy
DMA	Direct Mercury Analyzer
DSA	Documented Safety Analysis
EDTA	ethylenediaminetetraacetate
HDPE	High-Density Polyethylene
HPLC	High Performance Liquid Chromatography
IC	Ion Chromatography
ICP-AES	Inductively Coupled Plasma Atomic Emission Spectroscopy
ICP-MS	Inductively Coupled Plasma Mass Spectrometry
MRL	Minimum Reporting Limit
PHA	Pulse Height Analysis (alpha PHA)
RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
SPF	Saltstone Production Facility
SRNL	Savannah River National Laboratory
SRR	Savannah River Remediation
SVOA	Semi-Volatile Organic Analysis
TIC/TOC	Total Inorganic Carbon/Total Organic Carbon
TPB	tetraphenylborate
TTQAP	Task Technical and Quality Assurance Plan
TTR	Technical Task Request
VDS	Variable Depth Sample
VOA	Volatile Organic Analysis
WAC	Waste Acceptance Criteria

1.0 Introduction

Tank 50 aqueous waste is analyzed on a quarterly basis and the results are compared to the Waste Acceptance Criteria (WAC) of the Z-Area Saltstone Production Facility (SPF).¹ The quarterly Regulatory Compliance samples pulled in Tank 50 should be characterized for both Limit and Target acceptance criteria in this WAC.¹ The information from this characterization will be used by Savannah River Remediation (SRR) for the transfer of aqueous waste from Tank 50 to SPF, where the waste will be treated and disposed in the Saltstone Disposal Facility. This Technical Report compares results, where applicable, to SPF WAC Limits and Targets.¹ A memorandum reporting the average Cs-137 value has been previously issued.⁸

2.0 Experimental

2.1 Technical

The Fourth Quarter CY18 Tank 50 samples [a 200-mL sample obtained 6" below the surface (HTF-50-18-88) and a 2-L variable depth sample (VDS) obtained 66" from the tank bottom (HTF-50-18-87)] were obtained on November 6, 2018 and received at Savannah River National Laboratory (SRNL) on November 6, 2018.⁹

The contents of the 2-L slurry in the steel variable depth sampler were transferred by pumping into two different high-density polyethylene (HDPE) 1-L bottles. The original 2-L slurry was not composited into a single container prior to distribution into the individual 1-L bottles since the Tank 50 sample contains very little suspended solids and pumping occurred immediately after handling and positioning of the 2-L sample within the variable depth sampler inside the SRNL Shielded Cells Facility. The transferred slurry was left to settle in the bottles. Visual inspection of the inside of the steel sampler indicated there were no visible solids remaining in the sampler, so no clear supernate was returned to the sampler for rinsing. The entire sample was transferred out of the Shielded Cells and located in a radiochemical hood. The bottles were agitated to thoroughly disperse the extremely limited suspended solids into the supernate. These suspended solids are typically only visible as trace solids at the bottom of the container upon prolonged storage of the material under static conditions. Aliquots of slurry samples were promptly collected with slurry pipettes to minimize settling effects and placed into HDPE bottles. Samples were removed from the 200-mL surface sample from within a radiochemical hood and were transferred using glass pipettes into clean glass sample vials with Teflon lined caps. Amber colored glass sample vials were used for the samples that were analyzed for nitrosamines to minimize exposure to light.

Unless otherwise stated, all concentrations presented in the tables (except upper limits) are averages based on triplicate analyses of the Fourth Quarter CY18 Tank 50 samples. The standard deviation of each average is also presented. Several of the contaminants were either not detected in the slurry samples or detected at values below the method reporting limit (MRL). For contaminants not detected or detected below the MRL, the result is preceded by a "<", which indicates the result is an upper limit based on the sensitivity of the method used to analyze the individual analyte. If only one value out of the triplicate analysis is above the detection limit, then that single value is reported and noted in the tables. Also, if only two values out of the triplicate analyses are above the detection limit, then the average of those two values is reported and noted in the tables. All volatile organic analysis (VOA) and semi-volatile organic analysis (SVOA) were performed on the surface sample and all other analyses were performed on the variable depth sample. Data reported for inductively coupled plasma atomic emission spectroscopy (ICP-AES) and inductively coupled plasma mass spectrometry (ICP-MS) are derived from the digested Tank 50 supernate by the aqua regia method.¹⁰ Anion and the ammonium cation analyses are determined from Ion Chromatography (IC). Total Inorganic Carbon/Total Organic Carbon (TIC/TOC) analysis was used to measure the TIC (carbonate) and TOC components. The tetraphenylborate (TPB) anion and ethylenediaminetetraacetate (EDTA) were analyzed using High Performance Liquid Chromatography (HPLC). All the above analyses, excluding

VOA and SVOA, used approximately 150 mL of the 1-L variable depth sample. A 3-mL sample of the slurry was used to determine the density of the slurry using an Anton-Paar DMA 35n portable density meter. Total and soluble weight percent solids were determined on portions of the Tank 50 sample using the “Weight Percent Solids Determination Using a Furnace or Oven” procedure from the Environmental & Chemical Process Technology research programs section.¹¹

Approximately 630 mL of the VDS were used to determine all the measured radionuclide concentrations in triplicate. Radionuclides reported using the ICP-MS method are converted from a reported mass per volume basis to activity per volume units using the specific activities (Ci/g) reported from the Department of Energy 1996 Integrated Data Base Report.¹²

Mercury analyses performed at SRNL included Total mercury using the Direct Mercury Analyzer (DMA) method and monomethyl mercury by Cold Vapor Atomic Fluorescence Spectroscopy (CVAFS). Other mercury (Hg) speciation data shown in Table 3-1, Table 3-2 and Table 3-5 are calculated from previous work as analyzed by Cold Vapor Atomic Fluorescence Spectroscopy (CVAFS) by the Eurofins Frontier Global Sciences, Inc. laboratory in Seattle, WA.¹³ The parent sample for all mercury analyses performed at either SRNL or at Eurofins was obtained from the original Tank 50 sample within 10 days of sample receipt. The parent sample was obtained in near zero-headspace containers that were immediately refrigerated after removal from the Shielded Cells Facility on the same day of preparation. The Hg species reported from Eurofins include elemental mercury (Hg (0)), ethyl mercury, and dimethyl mercury. Monomethyl, ethyl, and dimethyl mercury are organomercury species. The concentration values for the organomercury species, ethyl mercury and dimethyl mercury, are calculated from the Hg speciation data on a mg Hg/L basis.¹³ As a sample calculation for dimethyl mercury, information from Reference 13 shows that the reported average dimethyl mercury concentration on a mg Hg/L basis is 0.184 mg Hg/L. This value is then multiplied by the formula weight of dimethyl mercury from the WAC¹ (230.7 g dimethyl mercury/mole) divided by the molecular weight of Hg (200.6 g Hg/mole). Thus, the calculated concentration of the species dimethyl mercury is $0.184 \text{ mg Hg/L} \times (230.7 \text{ g dimethyl mercury/mole} / 200.6 \text{ g Hg/mole}) = 0.212 \text{ mg dimethyl mercury/L}$.

2.2 Quality Assurance

Quality Assurance requirements for performing reviews of technical reports and the extent of review are established in manual E7 2.60.¹⁴ SRNL documents the extent and type of review using the SRNL Technical Report Design Checklist contained in WSRC-IM-2002-00011, Rev. 2.¹⁵ The Customer requested that a Functional Classification of Safety Significant apply to this work.² As stated in the TTQAP, the data collection and analysis methods employed in this study comply with this requirement.³

3.0 Results and Discussion

Analyzed nonradionuclide chemical concentrations, their standard deviations and their corresponding WAC Limits¹ are shown in Table 3-1 that correspond to the Attachment 8.1 Limits in the WAC.¹ Per the WAC, the Limits shown shall not be exceeded accounting for the analytical uncertainty in each measured concentration.¹ Analyzed nonradionuclide chemical concentrations, their standard deviations and their corresponding WAC Targets¹ are shown in Table 3-2 that correspond to the Attachment 8.2 Targets in the WAC.¹ Per the WAC, the Targets shown shall not be exceeded accounting for the analytical uncertainty in each measured concentration.¹ The Limits refer to a type of acceptance criteria that, if not satisfied, will have an adverse impact on repository requirements, whereas the Targets refer to a type of acceptance criteria that is set as a guideline to protect a Limit.¹ For the chemical contaminants and the radionuclides given in tables below, an analytical uncertainty of 2 sigma (2σ) shall be accounted for in sample analyses used to determine the analytical uncertainty vs. either the Limit or Target. The standard deviations given in tables for this WAC report are taken as 1 sigma (1σ) values that are calculated from the normal ‘standard deviation’ function for either duplicate or triplicate values from within Excel® spreadsheets.

Comparison of the average analyzed detectable values shown in Table 3-1 to the WAC Limits indicates that free hydroxide and nitrate anions are the highest analytes relative to the WAC Limits at 21% and 23%, respectively. Comparison of the average analyzed values shown in Table 3-2 to the WAC Targets indicates that aluminum is the highest analyte relative to the WAC Target at 72%, with average TOC and dimethyl mercury at lower ratios to WAC Targets of 26% and 21%, respectively. Excellent agreement for both total Hg and monomethyl mercury was obtained between the two analytical laboratories. SRNL analysis indicates a total Hg average value of 61.9 mg/L compared to the Eurofins average value of 61.7 mg/L. Similarly, SRNL analysis of monomethyl mercury indicates a monomethyl mercury average value of 21.7 mg/L compared to the Eurofins average value of 20.2 mg monomethyl mercury/L that is calculated from the reported monomethyl mercury of 18.8 mg Hg/L.¹³

Analyzed radionuclide concentrations and the respective radiochemical analysis methods, their standard deviations and their corresponding WAC Limits and Targets are shown in Table 3-3 and Table 3-4, respectively. These tables correspond to Attachment 8.3 Limits and Attachment 8.4 Targets, respectively, from the WAC.¹ The minimum detection limit reported for ⁹⁴Nb of <3.14E-01 pCi/mL in Table 3-4 is above the requested SRR target minimum detection limit of 2.0E-03 pCi/mL⁶ but is lower than the estimated detection limit initially established by SRNL of 4.38E-01 pCi/mL in 2009.⁷

Comparison of the average analyzed detectable values shown in Table 3-3 to the WAC Limits indicates that I-129 is the highest analyte relative to the WAC Limit at 44%. Comparison of the average analyzed detectable values shown in Table 3-4 to the WAC Targets indicates that Pu-238 and total alpha are the highest analytes relative to the WAC Targets at 31% and 30%, respectively.

Table 3-1. Chemical Contaminants from Fourth Quarter CY18 Tank 50 Samples and SPF WAC, Revision 18, Attachment 8.1 Limits¹

Chemical Name (Formula)	Method	Average Concentration (mg/L)	Std. Dev.	WAC Limit (mg/L)
Aluminate (Al(OH) ₄ ⁻)	ICP-ES	1.76E+04 ^a	4.34E+01	4.08E+05
Ammonium (NH ₄ ⁺)	IC	<1.00E+02	NA	2.12E+02
Carbonate (CO ₃ ²⁻)	TIC	1.50E+04 ^b	2.29E+02	1.20E+05
Chloride (Cl ⁻)	IC	4.43E+02	1.00E+00	7.95E+03
Fluoride (F ⁻)	IC	<1.00E+02	NA	4.07E+03
Free Hydroxide (OH ⁻)	Total Base	3.25E+04 ^b	4.50E+02	1.58E+05
Nitrate (NO ₃ ⁻)	IC	1.02E+05	5.77E+02	4.37E+05
Nitrite (NO ₂ ⁻)	IC	2.28E+04	5.77E+01	2.14E+05
Oxalate (C ₂ O ₄ ²⁻)	IC	4.98E+02	3.46E+00	2.72E+04
Phosphate (PO ₄ ³⁻)	IC	3.10E+02	2.52E+00	3.14E+04
Sulfate (SO ₄ ²⁻)	IC	3.91E+03	4.73E+01	5.69E+04
Arsenic (As)	ICP-MS	<1.23E-01	NA	1.97E+02
Barium (Ba)	ICP-ES	<6.50E-01	NA	6.19E+02
Cadmium (Cd)	ICP-ES	<4.91E-01	NA	3.10E+02
Chromium (Cr)	ICP-ES	5.34E+01	7.44E-01	1.50E+03
Lead (Pb)	ICP-MS	4.57E-01	1.70E-01	7.50E+02
Total Mercury (Hg)	DMA	6.19E+01	1.73E-01	3.25E+02
Elemental Mercury (Hg(0))	CVAFS	3.55E-01 ^c	3.02E-01	3.25E+02
Monomethyl Mercury (CH ₃ Hg)	CVAFS	2.17E+01	1.81E+00	3.50E+02
Ethyl Mercury (C ₂ H ₅ Hg)	CVAFS w/ Distillation	<1.03E+00 ^c	NA	3.73E+02
Selenium (Se)	ICP-MS	<1.23E-01	NA	3.75E+02
Silver (Ag)	ICP-ES	<6.38E-01	NA	6.19E+02
Aluminum (Al)	ICP-ES	5.01E+03	1.23E+01	1.16E+05
Potassium (K)	ICP-ES	4.15E+02	3.56E+00	3.03E+04
Butanol (C ₄ H ₉ OH)	VOA	<5.00E-01 ^d	NA	7.73E+00
Propanol (C ₃ H ₇ OH)	VOA	<2.50E-01 ^d	NA	1.88E+00
Phenol (C ₆ H ₅ OH)	SVOA	<1.00E+01 ^d	NA	7.50E+02
Tetraphenylborate [TPB] (B(C ₆ H ₅) ₄ ⁻)	HPLC	<5.00E+00	NA	5.00E+00
Total Organic Carbon (----)	TOC	1.95E+02 ^b	5.03E+00	4.50E+03
Isopar L (----)	SVOA	<3.30E+01 ^d	NA	8.75E+01 ^e

a. Result is calculated from the measured Al concentration assuming all the Al is present as the OH compound.

b. Measurement performed on filtered supernate samples.

c. Mercury species calculated from data presented in Reference 13.

d. Measurement performed on duplicate samples rather than triplicate samples.

e. The WAC Limit shown in this table is based on bounding DSA concentrations for accident consequence analysis. A more restrictive limit for Isopar L is set to protect assumptions associated with flammability as shown in Table 3-5 below.¹

Table 3-2. Chemical Contaminants from Fourth Quarter CY18 Tank 50 Samples and SPF WAC, Revision 18, Attachment 8.2 Targets¹

<u>Chemical Name (Formula)</u>	<u>Method</u>	<u>Average Concentration (mg/L)</u>	<u>Std. Dev.</u>	<u>WAC Target (mg/L)</u>
Aluminum (Al)	ICP-ES	5.01E+03	1.23E+01	7.00E+03^c
Boron (B)	ICP-ES	3.98E+01	1.33E+00	7.43E+02
Cobalt (Co)	ICP-MS ^a	<1.23E-02	NA	1.45E+02
Copper (Cu)	ICP-ES	<1.19E+00	NA	7.43E+02
Iron (Fe)	ICP-ES	8.44E+00	9.63E-01	4.95E+03
Lithium (Li)	ICP-ES	6.06E+00	1.27E-01	7.43E+02
Manganese (Mn)	ICP-ES	<6.14E-02	NA	7.43E+02
Molybdenum (Mo)	ICP-ES	<2.58E+01	NA	7.43E+02
Nickel (Ni)	ICP-ES	<3.69E+00	NA	7.43E+02
Silicon (Si)	ICP-ES	<2.02E+01	NA	1.07E+04
Strontium (Sr)	ICP-ES	<5.08E-02	NA	7.43E+02
Zinc (Zn)	ICP-ES	6.90E+00	3.41E-01	8.03E+02
Dimethyl Mercury ((CH₃)₂Hg)	CVAFS	2.12E-01 ^b	7.19E-03	1.00E+00
Benzene (C₆H₆)	VOA	<1.50E-01 ^c	NA	3.10E+02
Methanol (CH₃OH)	VOA	d	NA	1.88E+00
Toluene (C₆H₅CH₃)	VOA	<1.50E-01 ^c	NA	3.10E+02
Dibutylphosphate [DBP] (C₈H₁₉O₄P)	IC	<2.50E+02	NA	3.47E+02
Tributylphosphate [TBP] ((C₄H₉O)₃PO)	SVOA	<7.50E-01 ^c	NA	7.50E+00
Total Organic Carbon (TOC)	TOC	1.95E+02	5.03E+00	7.50E+02^c
EDTA (C₁₀H₁₂N₂O₈⁴⁻)	HPLC	<1.00E+02	NA	3.10E+02
NORPAR 13 (C_nH_{2·n})	SVOA	<7.50E-01 ^c	NA	7.50E-01
Formate (CHOO⁻)	IC	1.74E+02	5.77E-01	6.38E+03

- Cobalt based on the stable Co-59 isotope.
- Mercury species calculated from data presented in Reference 13.
- Measurement performed on duplicate samples rather than triplicate samples.
- Currently, a routine method for detecting this species does not exist in Analytical Development (AD).
- The WAC Targets for Al and TOC shown in this table are more restrictive than the corresponding WAC Limits shown in Table 3-1 to protect assumptions associated with thermolytic hydrogen generation.¹

Table 3-3. Radionuclide Contaminants from Fourth Quarter CY18 Tank 50 Samples and SPF WAC, Revision 18, Attachment 8.3 Limits¹

<u>Radionuclide</u>	<u>Method</u>	<u>Average Concentration</u> (pCi/mL)	<u>Std. Dev.</u>	<u>WAC Limit</u> (pCi/mL)
Tritium (³H)	Tritium Counting	1.23E+03	5.51E+01	5.63E+05
Carbon-14 (¹⁴C)	C-14 Liquid Scintillation	6.13E+02	1.19E+01	1.13E+05
Nickel-63 (⁶³Ni)	Ni-59/63	<1.22E+01	NA	1.13E+05
Strontium-90 (⁹⁰Sr)	Sr-90 Liquid Scintillation	3.95E+04	8.23E+03	2.62E+06
Technetium-99 (⁹⁹Tc)	Tc-99 Liquid Scintillation	4.62E+04	1.13E+03	2.11E+05
Iodine-129 (¹²⁹I)	I-129 (w/ separation) Liquid Scintillation	2.77E+01	2.64E+00	6.30E+01
Cesium-137 (¹³⁷Cs)	Gamma Scan	6.95E+05	2.22E+04	3.96E+06
Uranium-233 (²³³U)	ICP-MS	<5.95E+01	NA	1.13E+04
Uranium-235 (²³⁵U)	ICP-MS	2.09E-01	3.55E-03	1.13E+02
Plutonium-241 (²⁴¹Pu)	Pu238/241 Liquid Scintillation	6.62E+03	5.46E+02	8.38E+05
Total Alpha^a	Liquid Scintillation Counting (Cs removed)	2.02E+04	1.18E+03	2.13E+05

a. Only two detectable values from the analyzed triplicate set.

Table 3-4. Radionuclide Contaminants from Fourth Quarter CY18 Tank 50 Samples and SPF WAC, Revision 18, Attachment 8.4 Targets¹

Radionuclide	Method	Average Concentration (pCi/mL)	Std. Dev.	WAC Target (pCi/mL)
Aluminum-26 (²⁶ Al)	Gamma Scan (Cs removed)	1.04E-01 ^a	NA	2.88E+03
Potassium-40 (⁴⁰ K)	Gamma Scan (Cs removed)	<1.26E+00	NA	1.00E+02
Cobalt-60 (⁶⁰ Co)	Gamma Scan (Cs removed)	8.02E-02 ^a	NA	9.75E+02
Nickel-59 (⁵⁹ Ni)	Ni-59/63	<1.17E+01	NA	1.13E+03
Selenium-79 (⁷⁹ Se)	Se-79	3.17E+01	1.70E+01	1.90E+04
Yttrium-90 (⁹⁰ Y)	Secular Equilibrium w/ 100% of Sr-90	3.95E+04	8.23E+03	2.62E+06
Zirconium-93 (⁹³ Zr)	ICP-MS	<1.81E+02	NA	1.00E+05
Niobium-94 (⁹⁴ Nb)	Nb-94	<3.14E-01	NA	1.53E+02
Rhodium-106 (¹⁰⁶ Rh)	Secular Equilibrium w/ 100% of Ru-106	<1.68E+00	NA	3.12E+05
Ruthenium-106 (¹⁰⁶ Ru)	Gamma Scan (Cs removed)	<1.68E+00	NA	3.12E+05
Antimony-125 (¹²⁵ Sb)	Gamma Scan (Cs removed)	7.54E+00	7.68E-01	7.99E+03
Tellurium-125m (^{125m} Te)	Secular Equilibrium w/ 100% of Sb-125	7.54E+00	7.68E-01	1.83E+03
Tin-126 (¹²⁶ Sn)	Gamma Scan (Cs removed)	4.44E+02	1.17E+01	1.80E+04
Cesium-134 (¹³⁴ Cs)	Gamma Scan	<8.51E+01	NA	1.82E+04
Cesium-135 (¹³⁵ Cs)	Cs-135	3.82E+00	1.99E-01	2.50E+02
Barium-137m (^{137m} Ba)	Calculation (Secular Equilibrium w/ 94.6% of Cs-137)	6.58E+05	2.10E+04	3.75E+06
Cerium-144 (¹⁴⁴ Ce)	Gamma Scan (Cs removed)	<2.80E+00	NA	3.12E+04
Praseodymium-144 (¹⁴⁴ Pr)	Secular Equilibrium w/ 100% of Ce-144	<2.80E+00	NA	3.12E+04
Promethium-147 (¹⁴⁷ Pm)	Pm-147/Sm-151 Liquid Scintillation	<3.76E+01	NA	1.57E+06
Samarium-151 (¹⁵¹ Sm)	Pm-147/Sm-151 Liquid Scintillation	<4.02E+01	NA	2.25E+04
Europium-154 (¹⁵⁴ Eu)	Gamma Scan (Cs removed)	<3.23E-01	NA	1.62E+03
Radium-226 (²²⁶ Ra)	Ra-226	<3.80E+00	NA	1.00E+03
Radium-228 (²²⁸ Ra)	Gamma Scan (Cs removed)	<6.04E-01	NA	1.00E+04
Actinium-227 (²²⁷ Ac)	Th-229/230	<4.73E-02	NA	1.00E+04
Thorium-229 (²²⁹ Th)	Th-229/230	<3.86E-02	NA	1.63E+05
Thorium-230 (²³⁰ Th)	Th-229/230	<2.55E-02	NA	6.26E+03
Thorium-232 (²³² Th)	ICP-MS	<6.75E-04	NA	2.88E+03
Protactinium-231 (²³¹ Pa)	Pa-231	<7.34E-01	NA	1.00E+03
Uranium-232 (²³² U)	U-232	2.37E+00	3.24E-01	2.27E+03
Uranium-233 (²³³ U)	ICP-MS	<5.95E+01	NA	3.12E+03
Uranium-234 (²³⁴ U)	ICP-MS	7.78E+01	2.84E+00	3.12E+03
Uranium-236 (²³⁶ U)	ICP-MS	1.10E+00	2.24E-02	3.12E+03
Uranium-238 (²³⁸ U)	ICP-MS	3.62E+00	5.03E-02	3.12E+03

Table 3-4. Radionuclide Contaminants from Fourth Quarter CY18 Tank 50 Samples and SPF WAC, Revision 18, Attachment 8.4 Targets¹, continued

<u>Radionuclide</u>	<u>Method</u>	<u>Average Concentration</u> (pCi/mL)	<u>Std. Dev.</u>	<u>WAC Target</u> (pCi/mL)
Neptunium-237 (²³⁷ Np)	ICP-MS	<4.34E+00	NA	1.00E+04
Plutonium-238 (²³⁸ Pu)	Pu238/241 Pu alpha PHA	2.05E+04	1.66E+03	6.67E+04
Plutonium-239 (²³⁹ Pu)	Pu238/241 Pu alpha PHA	5.06E+02	3.16E+01	6.67E+04
Plutonium-240 (²⁴⁰ Pu)	Pu238/241 Pu alpha PHA	5.06E+02	3.16E+01	6.67E+04
Plutonium-242 (²⁴² Pu)	ICP-MS	<2.35E+01	NA	6.67E+04
Plutonium-244 (²⁴⁴ Pu)	ICP-MS	<1.09E-01	NA	7.02E+04
Americium-241 (²⁴¹ Am)	Am/Cm	7.91E+00	1.89E+00	6.67E+04
Americium-242m (^{242m} Am)	Am/Cm	<7.61E-02	NA	4.50E+05
Americium-243 (²⁴³ Am)	Am/Cm	<3.31E-01	NA	6.67E+04
Curium-242 (²⁴² Cm)	Am/Cm	<6.26E-02	NA	1.13E+04
Curium-244 (²⁴⁴ Cm)	Am/Cm	2.05E+00	7.06E-01	6.67E+04
Curium-245 (²⁴⁵ Cm)	Am/Cm	<8.56E-01	NA	2.25E+05
Total Alpha	Liquid Scintillation Counting (Cs removed)	2.02E+04 ^b	1.18E+03	6.67E+04

a. Only one detectable value from the analyzed triplicate set.

b. Only two detectable values from the analyzed triplicate set.

The following tables show various chemical contaminants (Table 3-5), organic species (Table 3-6) and processing constituents (Table 3-7) related to the Saltstone Disposal Unit (SDU) that are referred to in the WAC per Tables 2, 3 and 4, respectively.¹

Table 3-5. Chemical Contaminants Impacting Saltstone Disposal Unit (SDU) Flammability from Fourth Quarter CY18 Tank 50 Samples and SPF WAC, Revision 18, Table 2 Limits and Targets¹

<u>Chemical Name (Formula)</u>	<u>Method</u>	<u>Average Concentration</u> (mg/L)	<u>Std. Dev.</u>	<u>WAC</u> <u>Limit/Target</u>
Isopar L (----)	SVOA	<2.68E+01 ppm ^{a,b}	NA	1.10E+01 ppm (Limit)
Tetraphenylborate [TPB] (B(C ₆ H ₅) ₄)	HPLC	<5.00E+00	NA	5.00E+00 mg/L (Limit)
Ammonium (NH ₄ ⁺)	IC	<1.00E+02	NA	2.12E+02 mg/L (Limit)
Total Mercury (Hg)	DMA	6.19E+01	1.73E-01	3.25E+02 mg/L (Limit)
Monomethyl Mercury (CH ₃ Hg)	CVAFS	2.17E+01	1.81E+00	3.50E+02 mg/L (Limit)
Dimethyl Mercury ((CH ₃) ₂ Hg)	CVAFS	2.12E-01 ^c	7.19E-03	1.00E+00 mg/L (Target)

a. Measurement performed on duplicate samples rather than triplicate samples.

b. Result is calculated from the reported concentration of < 33 mg/L and the density of the slurry sample listed in Table 3-8.

c. Mercury species calculated from data presented in Reference 13.

Table 3-6. Other Organics Impacting SDU Flammability from Fourth Quarter CY18 Tank 50 Samples and SPF WAC, Revision 18, Table 3 Concentrations¹

<u>Chemical Name (Formula)</u>	<u>Method</u>	<u>Average Concentration (mg/L)</u>	<u>Std. Dev.</u>	<u>WAC Concentrations (mg/L)</u>
Butanol (C ₄ H ₉ OH)	VOA	<5.00E-01	NA	0.75
Tributylphosphate[TBP] ((C ₄ H ₉ O) ₃ PO)	SVOA	<7.50E-01	NA	1.0
Propanol (C ₃ H ₇ OH)	VOA	<2.50E-01	NA	0.25
Methanol (CH ₃ OH)	a	NA	NA	0.05
NORPAR 13 (C _n H _{2.n})	SVOA	<7.50E-01	NA	0.75

a. Currently, a routine method for detecting this species does not exist in AD.

Table 3-7. Processing Constituents from Fourth Quarter CY18 Tank 50 Samples and SPF WAC, Revision 18, Table 4 Limits¹

<u>Processing Constituents</u>	<u>Method</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>Std. Dev.</u>	<u>WAC Limit</u>
pH	Calculated	>13	NA	> 10
Sodium Concentration	ICP-ES	5.47 M	5.37E-02	2.5 M < [Na ⁺] < 7.0 M
Total Insoluble Solids	Calculated	~0 wt %	NA	< 15 wt %

Table 3-8 contains additional measured constituents per the TTQAP.³

Table 3-8. Additional Measured Constituents³

<u>Constituent</u>	<u>Method</u>	<u>Average Value</u>	<u>Std. Dev.</u>
Density (slurry)	Measured (22.6°C)	1.2335 g/mL	0.0005
Specific Gravity	a	1.2364	0.0005
Total Solids	Measured	26.75 wt %	0.18
Total Beta	LSC	1.01E+06 pCi/mL	1.96E+04
Total Gamma	b	6.59E+05 pCi/mL	1.32E+04 ^c
Beryllium (Be)	ICP-ES	<3.68E-02	NA
N-Nitrosodimethylamine (C₂H₆N₂O)	SVOA	<1 mg/L	NA
N-Dioctylnitrosamine (C₁₆H₃₄N₂O)	SVOA	<1 mg/L	NA

a. Calculated from the measured density of slurry and density of water at 22.6 °C.¹⁶

b. Calculated from the sum of gamma emitters (Sb-126, Sn-126, Sb-125, Eu-154, Am-241, Co-60 and Ba-137m).

c. Value is the “standard error of the mean” rather than the standard deviation of the measurements since its calculation involves multiple radionuclides.

4.0 Conclusions

The following conclusions pertaining to the WAC are drawn from the analytical results provided in this report.

- WAC Targets or Limits were met for all analyzed chemical and radioactive contaminants for which the detection limits are below the WAC Targets or Limits.
- Isopar L has a higher detection limit⁴ compared with the current SPF WAC Limit value of 11 ppm¹ associated with flammability that has been in effect since revision 12 of the WAC dating back to July of 2013.⁵ .
- Nitrosamines were not detected in the Tank 50 salt solution sample above the instrument detection limits of < 1 mg/L.
- The minimum detection limit (<3.14E-01 pCi/mL) is reported for ⁹⁴Nb as determined from the minimum detectable activity associated with the radiochemical method used for this radionuclide. The reported detection limit is above the requested SRR target minimum detection limit concentration.⁶ However, the minimum detection limit reported for the Fourth Quarter CY18 Tank 50 sample for ⁹⁴Nb is lower than the estimated detection limit initially established by SRNL in 2009.⁷ Thus per guidance from SRR,⁶ SRNL continues to achieve as low as practical detection limits for this radionuclide.

5.0 Reference

- ¹ Ray, J. W., "Waste Acceptance Criteria for Aqueous Waste Sent to the Z-Area Saltstone Production Facility", Savannah River Remediation, X-SD-Z-00001, Rev. 18, November 2018.
- ² Ray, J. W., "Routine Saltstone Support for Salt Solution and Grout Analyses – FY2019", Savannah River Remediation, X-TTR-Z-00013, Rev. 1, November 2018.
- ³ Crawford, C. L., Hill, K. A., "Task Technical and Quality Assurance Plan for Salt Solution and Grout Sample Preparation and Analyses – FY2019", Savannah River National Laboratory, SRNL-RP-2018-01082, Rev. 0, December 2018.
- ⁴ Crump, S. L., "Determination of Method Reporting Limits for Select Analytes by GC/MS", Savannah River National Laboratory, SRNL-TR-2010-00206, Rev. 0, October 2010.
- ⁵ Potvin, M. M., "Waste Acceptance Criteria for Aqueous Waste Sent to the Z-Area Saltstone Production Facility", Savannah River Remediation, X-SD-Z-00001, Rev. 12, July 2013.
- ⁶ Dixon, D. B., "Minimum Detection Limits for Saltstone Quarterly WAC Analyses", Savannah River Remediation, SRR-WSE-2013-00005, Rev. 1, January 2013.
- ⁷ DiPrete, C. C., "Overview of Capability to Measure Radionuclides of Interest for Saltstone", Savannah River National Laboratory, SRNL-L4000-2009-00028, Rev. 0, June 2009.
- ⁸ Crawford, C. L., "Results for the Fourth Quarter Calendar Year 2018 Tank 50 Salt Solution Sample: Cs-137", Savannah River National Laboratory, SRNL-L3100-2019-00006, Rev. 0, February 2019.
- ⁹ Crawford, C. L., "4Q CY18 Tank 50 WAC Characterization", B9108-00026-49, SRNL E-Notebook (Production), Savannah River National Laboratory, November 2018.
- ¹⁰ "Aqua Regia Dissolution of Sludge for Elemental Analysis"; Savannah River National Laboratory, Manual L16.1, Procedure ADS-2226, Rev. 10, July 2013.
- ¹¹ "Weight Percent Solids Determination Using a Furnace or Oven", Savannah River National Laboratory, Manual L29, Procedure ITS-0078, Rev. 1, October 2012.
- ¹² "Integrated Data Base Report – 1996: U.S. Spent Nuclear Fuel and Radioactive Waste Inventories, Projections, and Characteristics", Oak Ridge National Laboratory, DOE/RW-0006, Rev. 13, December 1997. <https://www.nrc.gov/docs/ML1028/ML102850100.pdf> (accessed September 14, 2018).
- ¹³ Bannochie, C. J., "Results of Hg Speciation Testing on the 4Q18 Tank 50 Sample", Savannah River National Laboratory, SRNL-L3300-2019-00004, Rev. 0, February 2019.
- ¹⁴ "Technical Reviews", Savannah River Site, Manual E7, Procedure 2.60, Latest Revision.
- ¹⁵ "Savannah River National Laboratory Technical Report Design Check Guidelines", Westinghouse Savannah River Company, WSRC-IM-2002-00011, Rev. 2, August 2004.
- ¹⁶ *CRC Handbook of Chemistry and Physics*, 99th Print Edition, Internet Version 2018; Section 6: Fluid Properties. Edited by Rumble, J. R., CRC Press Taylor and Francis Group, Boca Raton, FL, Internet Version 2018. <http://hbcponline.com/faces/contents/ContentsSearch.xhtml> (accessed March 12, 2019).

Distribution:

Name:	
J. P. Arnold	K. R. Liner
M. J. Barnes	M. J. Mahoney
M. N. Borders	J. Manna
J. M. Bricker	K. B. Martin
K. M. Brotherton	J. J. Mayer
L. W. Brown	D. J. McCabe
T. B. Brown	G. A. Morgan
N. F. Chapman	P. W. Norris
J. H. Christian	J. E. Occhipinti
W. A. Condon	F. M. Pennebaker
A. D. Cozzi	R. C. Player
C. L. Crawford	M. M. Potvin
D. A. Crowley	A. A. Ramsey
K. D. Dixon	W. G. Ramsey
J. M. Duffey	J. W. Ray
R. E. Edwards	C. Ridgeway
A. P. Fellingner	L. B. Romanowski
S. D. Fink	K. H. Rosenberger
E. J. Freed	A. Samadi-Dezfouli
E. K. Hansen	D. C. Sherburne
S. J. Harrington	F. M. Smith
E. W. Harrison	A. V. Staub
C. C. Herman	J. Stevens
K. A. Hill	M. E. Stone
P. J. Hill	R. L. Wall
A. T. Hooker	B. J. Wiedenman
T. H. Huff	T. L. White
J. F. Iaukea	A. W. Wiggins
D. G. Jackson	W. R. Wilmarth
V. Jain	L. A. Wooten
C. A. Langton	R. H. Young
J. D. Ledbetter	Records Administration (EDWS)