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:

Extraction, Scrub, and Strip Test Results for the Salt Waste Processing Facility Caustic Side Solvent Extraction Solvent Sample

T. B. Peters

July 2020

SRNL-STI-2020-00236, Revision 0

DISCLAIMER

Printed in the United States of America

Prepared for
U.S. Department of Energy

SRNL-STI-2020-00236
Revision 0

Keywords: *SWPF, Solvent, Qualification*

Retention: *Permanent*

Extraction, Scrub, and Strip Test Results for the Salt Waste Processing Facility Caustic Side Solvent Extraction Solvent Sample

T. B. Peters

July 2020

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

Savannah River National Laboratory®
OPERATED BY SAVANNAH RIVER NUCLEAR SOLUTIONS

REVIEWS AND APPROVALS

AUTHORS:

T. B. Peters, Environmental, Materials and Energy Sciences

TECHNICAL REVIEW:

K. M. Taylor-Pashow, Environmental, Materials and Energy Sciences, Reviewed per E7 2.60

APPROVAL:

B. J. Wiedenman, Manager, Environmental, Materials and Energy Sciences

S. D. Fink, Director, Chemical Processing Sciences

C. Conner, Manager, Process Engineering Manager/CSE Lead, Parsons

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

An Extraction, Scrub, and Strip (ESS) test was performed on a sample of Salt Waste Processing Facility (SWPF) Caustic-Side Solvent Extraction (CSSX) solvent and salt simulant to determine cesium distribution ratios ($D_{(Cs)}$), and cesium concentration in the strip effluent (SE) and decontaminated salt solution (DSS) streams; this data will be used by Parsons to help determine if the solvent is qualified for use at the SWPF.

The ESS test showed acceptable performance of the solvent for extraction, scrub, and strip operations. The extraction $D_{(Cs)}$ measured 13.2, exceeding the required value of 8. This value is consistent with results from previous ESS tests using similar solvent formulations. Similarly, scrub and strip cesium distribution ratios fell within acceptable ranges.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

$D_{(Cs)}$	Distribution Ratio for Cesium
DF	Decontamination Factor
DSS	Decontaminated Salt Solution
ESS	Extraction, Scrub, Strip
SE	Strip Effluent
SRNL	Savannah River National Laboratory
SWPF	Salt Waste Processing Facility
TOA	Trioctylamine
TTQAP	Task Technical and Quality Assurance Plan

1.0 Introduction

This report provides the distribution ratio for cesium ($D_{(Cs)}$) and the cesium concentration in the SE and DSS streams obtained from performance of an Extraction, Scrub, Strip (ESS) test using CSSX solvent and salt simulant provided by Parsons. This type of work was specified in a Technical Task Request[i] and in a Task Technical and Quality Assurance Plan (TTQAP).[ii] Details of the work are contained in controlled laboratory notebooks.[iii]

2.0 Experimental Procedure

For the ESS test, Parsons provided the salt simulant (SIM_20200218_01) which was prepared in the same manner as the previously used salt simulant (LABCS-SSFS-002aRW09).[iv] SRNL added a de minimis volume of ^{137}Cs source to make the radioactivity in the parent solution ~5E+05 dpm/mL (a goal activity to provide enough activity for easy radiocounting, but to provide minimal dose to personnel). See Table 1 for the composition as provided by the customer.

Table 1. Composition of the Parsons Salt Simulant (LABCS-SSFS-002a_LS_CR_C28_020)

Analyte	Molarity (M)	Analyte	Molarity (M)
Na^+	6.29	AlO_2^-	0.245
K^+	0.0150	$C_2O_4^{2-}$	7.97E-03
Cs^+ (cold)	4.28E-04	PO_4^{3-}	7.03E-03
Zn^{2+}	1.18E-04	MoO_4^{2-}	8.37E-05
Sr^{2+}	9.95E-05	NO_3^-	2.21
Cu^{2+}	2.56E-05	NO_2^-	0.600
Sn^{2+}	1.95E-05	Cl^-	2.94E-02
Free OH	2.46	SO_4^{2-}	0.164
CO_3^{2-}	0.180	F^-	3.37E-02
Density	1.2734 g/mL	^{137}Cs (nominal)	5E+05 dpm/mL

The analytical uncertainty for the cation and anions are 10%. The analytical uncertainty for the ^{137}Cs is 5%.

The test used SRNL's protocol for analyzing macrobatch salt waste as formalized in a Savannah River National Laboratory (SRNL) manual.[v] The test used a nominal starting volume of 90 mL of salt simulant feed and 30 mL (3:1 aqueous-to-organic volume ratio) of freshly prepared CSSX solvent.[1] This solvent was supplied by Marshallton Research Laboratories under contract to Parsons. It is identified as CSSX-2020-1 and was used without further alteration or analysis. The

[1] The CSSX solvent has a composition as follows: 0.007 M BOBCalixC6 [calix[4]arene-bis(*tert*-octylbenzo-crown-6)], 0.75M Cs-7SB Modifier [1-(2,2,3,3-tetrafluoropropoxy)-3-(4-sec-butylphenoxy)-2-propanol], 0.003 M trioctylamine (TOA), and the balance Isopar ™ L.

density of this solvent was measured as 0.8393 g/mL @ 21.6 ˚C which is close to the nominal value of 0.852 g/mL.[vi] The scrub and strip solutions were 0.05 M nitric acid and 0.001 M nitric acid, respectively, and used an organic to aqueous volume ratio of 5:1.

2.1 Quality Assurance

The customer requested QA classification for this work is Production Support. Requirements for performing reviews of technical reports and the extent of review are established in Manual E7, Procedure 2.60.[vii] SRNL documents the extent and type of review using the SRNL Technical Report Design Checklist contained in WSRC-IM-2002-00011, Rev. 2.[viii] All work, analysis, and documentation were completed commensurate with the QA classification specified by the customer.

3.0 Results and Discussion

Table 2 shows the results from the ESS test, corrected to the normal process operating temperatures (i.e., 23 ºC for extraction and scrub and 33 ºC for strip). For these tests, the temperature correction factors for the CSSX solvent were used (see Appendix). For comparison, the acceptable range of values are provided.[vi]

The temperature in the shaker oven during the ESS test ranged from 23.3 ºC to 25.7 ºC for the extraction and scrub steps and 33.8 to 34.0 ºC for the strip steps. The temperature controller/probe combination had an uncertainty of ±1.7 ºC

Table 2. Cesium Distribution Ratios ($D_{(Cs)}$) for the ESS Tests

Material	Extraction	Scrub#1	Scrub#2	Strip#1	Strip#2	Strip#3
Acceptable Range	>8	>0.6, <2	>0.6, <2	<0.2	<0.16	<0.16
This Test	13.2	1.28	1.40	0.0585	0.0338	0.0289

The current test shows the expected behaviors, with good overall performance. The measured strip distribution values are ~4-5X better than the maximum threshold values suggesting good stripping behavior.

SRNL has an extraction stage $D_{(Cs)}$ predictor model which allows SWPF to get an early indication of possible extraction problems. This model predicts an extraction $D_{(Cs)}$ value of 17.6 for the submitted salt solution.[ix] The model predicts a wide range of distribution values (i.e., shows a high variance) at the composition range covered by this salt solution and tends to provide a positive bias.[Δ] Hence, the larger predicted distribution value does not pose a concern about the current measured result.

[Δ] A range of salt solution compositions with similar sodium concentrations (6.25 to 6.5 M) were modeled. See Table B-1 in reference ix for the compositions. The predicted $D_{(Cs)}$ values for these solutions ranged from 1.72 to 21.4.

3.1.1 Aqueous and Organic Phase Results

At the end of the ESS test, the gamma activities of each phase, and the pH of the aqueous phases were measured (Table 3).

Table 3. Aqueous and Organic Phase ^{137}Cs Results

Sample	AQ ^{137}Cs (dpm/mL)	ORG ^{137}Cs (dpm/mL)	AQ pH
Salt Simulant Feed	3.38E+05	0	14
Extraction	7.45E+04	8.28E+05	14
Scrub#1	7.24E+05	6.73E+05	7
Scrub#2	4.96E+05	5.58E+05	2
Strip#1	2.20E+06	1.17E+05	4
Strip#2	5.10E+05	1.58E+04	3
Strip#3	7.71E+04	2.00E+03	2.5

The 1-σ analytical uncertainty on the ^{137}Cs activity is 5%. The analytical uncertainty is ±1 pH unit for the pH measurement performed with colorimetric strips. The pH results from the test are similar to values from prior testing.[x] The pH values for the salt simulant and extraction stages were not measured but known to be 14 due to the free hydroxide of > 1.0M.

4.0 Conclusions

Results of the ESS test for this qualification sample meets the performance expectations. There is no unexpected behavior and there are no anticipated issues for cesium removal.

Appendix. Temperature Correction Factors for the ESS Tests

The SWPF facility uses active temperature control to keep the extraction and scrub steps at 23 °C, and the strip steps at 33 °C. The temperature during the ESS tests varied slightly over the course of the experiment within the control bands of the system used. During each step of an ESS test, the calculated distribution values must be corrected for temperature. The general formula for temperature correction is as follows:

correction factor = EXP((**COEF**/0.0083144)*((1/**TEMP**)-(1/(**STEP**)))) (Eqn. 1)

where "COEF" is the particular temperature coefficient (i.e., apparent enthalpy change) for the step in question, the "TEMP" is the ambient temperature, in Kelvin, and "STEP" is 296.15 for extraction and scrub and 306.15 for strip steps.

Table 4 lists the temperature coefficients for each step in an ESS test, as well as the actual temperature range measured during the test.

Table 4. Temperature Coefficients

Step	BOBCalixC6 [vi]	Temperature Range
Extraction	-47.95	23.3-25.7
Scrub#1	-86.82	25.7-25.7
Scrub#2	-74.24	25.7-25.2
Strip#1	-79.36	33.9-33.8
Strip#2	-82.94	33.8-34.0
Strip#3	-82.49	34.0-34.0

5.0 References

[i] C. Conner, "SWPF Solvent Preparation, Qualification, Packaging and Delivery Tasks A and B", X-TTR-J-00001, Rev. 0, May 30, 2017.

[ii] T. B. Peters, "Task Technical and Quality Assurance Plan for Salt Waste Processing (SWPF) Solvent Qualification", SRNL-RP-2017-00296, June 2017.

[iii] T. B. Peters, "Parsons Solvent Work", ELN, A4571-00084-33.

[iv] PTC-LAB-036, *Simulant Preparation Log Book*

[v] "Extraction, Scrub, and Strip Testing of Solvent Extraction Systems", Manual L29 Procedure ITS-0205, Rev. 1, January 2020.

[vi] L. H. Delmau, J.F. Birdwell, P. V. Bonnesen, L. J. Foote, T. J. Haverlock, L. N. Klatt, D. D. Lee, R. A. Leonard, T. G. Levitslaia, M. P. Maskarinec, B. A. Moyer, F. V. Sloop Jr., B. A. Tomkins, "Caustic-Side Solvent Extraction: Chemical and Physical Properties of the Optimized Solvent", ORNL/TM-2002/190, October 2002.

[vii] "Technical Reviews", Manual E7, 2.60, Rev. 17, August 25, 2016.

[viii] "Technical Report Design Checklist", August 2004, WSRC-IM-2002-00011, Rev. 2.

[ix] K. Adu-Wusu, D. D. Walker, T. B. Edwards, "Waste and Solvent Composition Limits for Modular Caustic-Side Solvent Extraction Unit (MCU)", WSRC-TR-2005-00258, May 26, 2005.

[x] T. B. Peters, "Extraction, Scrub, and Strip Test Results for the Salt Waste Processing Facility Caustic Side Solvent Extraction Solvent Sample", SRNL-STI-2017-00431, rev.1, September 2017.

Distribution:

cj.bannochie@srnl.doe.gov
alex.cozzi@srnl.doe.gov
david.crowley@srnl.doe.gov
a.fellinger@srnl.doe.gov
samuel.fink@srnl.doe.gov
Brenda.Garcia-Diaz@srnl.doe.gov
connie.herman@srnl.doe.gov
dennis.jackson@srnl.doe.gov
brady.lee@srnl.doe.gov
Joseph.Manna@srnl.doe.gov
daniel.mccabe@srnl.doe.gov
Gregg.Morgan@srnl.doe.gov
frank.pennebaker@srnl.doe.gov
Amy.Ramsey@srnl.doe.gov
William.Ramsey@SRNL.DOE.gov
eric.skidmore@srnl.doe.gov
michael.stone@srnl.doe.gov
Boyd.Wiedenman@srnl.doe.gov
Records Administration (EDWS)
bill.clark@srs.gov
jeffrey.crenshaw@srs.gov
james.folk@srs.gov
Curtis.Gardner@srs.gov
Pauline.hang@srs.gov
Anna.Murphy@srs.gov
tony.polk@srs.gov
Anthony.Robinson@srs.gov
mark-a.smith@srs.gov
patricia.suggs@srs.gov
thomas.temple@srs.gov
Bill.Brasel@parsons.com
Kevin.Brotherton@srs.gov
cliff.conner@parsons.com
Vijay.Jain@srs.gov
Ryan.Lentsch@gat.com
Tom.Burns@parsons.com
Skip.Singer@parsons.com
Patricia.suggs@srs.gov
Brad.Swanson@parsons.com
earl.brass@srs.gov
Kevin.Brotherton@srs.gov
Richard.Edwards@srs.gov
Kenneth.Fernadez@srs.gov
Phoebe.Fogelman@srs.gov
brent.gifford@srs.gov
Thomas.Huff@srs.gov
Vijay.Jain@srs.gov
ryan.mcnew@srs.gov