SECONDARY CLEANUP OF IDAHO CHEMICAL PROCESSING PLANT SOLVENT

J. C. Mailen

Chemical Technology Division
Oak Ridge National Laboratory*
Oak Ridge, Tennessee   37831

MASTER

CONF-851011--9

DE86 013252

DISCLAIMER

SECONDARY CLEANUP OF IDAHO CHEMICAL PROCESSING PLANT SOLVENT

J. C. Mailen

Chemical Technology Division
Oak Ridge National Laboratory
Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37831

ABSTRACT

Solvent from the Idaho Chemical Processing Plant (ICPP) (operated by Westinghouse Idaho Nuclear Company, Inc.) has been tested to determine the ability of activated alumina to remove secondary degradation products — those degradation products which are not removed by scrubbing with sodium carbonate.

INTRODUCTION

All existing reactor fuel reprocessing plants use the Purex solvent extraction process for recovery of the fi ionable materials from the spent fuel elements. The head-end of the Purex process involves dissolution of the oxide fuel in nitric acid to yield a solution containing ~200 g of heavy metals per liter, in 3 to 4 $\underline{M}$ HNO_3. This solution is then contacted with a 20 to 30 vol % solution of tri-n-butylphosphate (TBP) in a normal paraffin hydrocarbon (NPH) diluent. The uranium and plutonium are preferentially extracted into the organic phase, leaving the bulk of the fission products in the aqueous raffinate. The extract is then scrubbed with nitric acid to increase the separation from fission products, and the heavy metals are stripped from the solvent.

The TBP-NPH used in these processes is degraded by radiation damage and by hydrolytic and dealkylation reactions with the nitric acid. A variety of methods have been proposed to minimize the cleanup problems

encountered when the degradation products accumulate in the used Purex process solvent. In an earlier study, we found that scrubbing with sodium carbonate solutions (the current practice in Purex plants) was the preferred primary solvent cleanup treatment, unless sodium in the effluent must be restricted(1).

The secondary degradation products (i.e., those remaining after the primary cleanup) can cause problems with phase separation and retention of cations. Since the identities and chemical properties of the important contaminants are unknown, secondary cleanup studies must be conducted using actual recycle solvent. We have previously studied secondary cleanup of Savannah River Plant (SRP) solvent(2) and report here our latest studies, which involved secondary cleanup of Idaho Chemical Processing Plant solvent.

EXPERIMENTAL METHOD

The solvent (~10% TBP-NPH) received from ICPP was first treated with 0.2 volume of 0.2 $\underline{M}$ Na$_2$CO$_3$ to remove any dibutyl phosphate (DBP) or mono-butyl phosphate (MBP) formed during storage, filtered through #40 Whatman paper filters, acidified by contact with 0.04 $\underline{M}$ HNO$_3$, and dried by passage of one volume of dry air per min at 60°C for several hours. The solvent was then passed, at a rate of either 1 mL/min or 2 mL/min, through a small bed containing activated alumina (Alcoa F-1, 60-120 mesh). The initial plans were to use ~1.3 g of activated alumina in a bed, as was used in earlier studies of SRP·solvent(2). However, the small degree of degrada-tion of the ICPP solvent led to large treatable solvent volumes, and the bed size was decreased to 0.5 g to allow determination of approximate bed capacities for the available solvent. The alumina bed (~0.6 cm^3, with a length-to-diameter ratio of 3.3) was contained in an 8-mm-OD, 6-mm-ID glass tube with a jack-leg (See Fig. 1) and was immersed in a beaker of water heated to ~45°C for temperature control.

The solvent leaving the treatment bed was collected in 10 or 20 mL samples and subjected to quality checks. The primary measurements to determine column effectiveness were of the interfacial tension against and the phase-separation time of the solvent from 0.2 $\underline{M}$ Na$_2$CO$_3$. The ruthenium content of the solvent was not sufficient to allow determination of ruthe-nium removal by the column. Anionic surfactant concentrations were too low to be determined by the methylene blue method(3). The concentrations of acidic impurities were too small to be determined by the conductivity method and plutonium retention gave ambiguous results.

ORNL DWG 84-677R3

NEEDLE VALVE
ADJUSTED TO
GIVE 1 mL/min

8-mm-OD
6-mm-ID
GLASS TUBE

20-cm HEAD

0.5 g 250–125 μm
(60–120 MESH)
ACTIVATED ALUMINA
2-cm BED DEPTH

GLASS WOOL PLUG

Fig. 1. Typical column for secondary cleanup tests on ICPP solvent.

Standard Quality Tests

The following quality tests were done on the effluent solvent from the column tests.

Phase-separation time - The phase-separation time was determined by placing 2 mL of the organic solvent and 2 mL of 0.2 $\underline{M}$ Na$_2$CO$_3$ in a glass vial of ~1.2-cm diam and mixing by slow inversion several times. The separation time was taken to be the time for the emulsion to collapse to one layer of drops at the interface. All these determinations were done by one individual for maximum consistency in results. Even so, this must be considered an inexact method. It is a necessary measurement, however, since phase separation from sodium carbonate solutions is a problem area with degraded solvent.

Interfacial tension - The organic solvent sample to be tested was first equilibrated with the sodium carbonate solution. A small quantity of the separated aqueous phase was drawn into a 0.2-mL micrometer syringe (Gilmont Instruments, Inc., Great Neck, NY) equipped with a 0.0635-cm-OD flat-ended, stainless steel needle. The syringe was then mounted with the needle tip below the surface of the equilibrated organic phase. Drops of aqueous solvent were slowly dispensed, and the volume reading of the micrometer dial was recorded as each drop fell. The interfacial tension was calculated for each drop (Attachment A) and the average determined for several drops(4).

Plutonium retention - The organic samples were contacted with a plutonium standard that contained 37.5 g Pu/L in ~2 $\underline{M}$ HNO$_3$. The organic phase was shaken for 10 min three times with equal volumes of water and allowed

to stand overnight after the last contact. The plutonium retention is the gross alpha count on the final organic phase.

<div align="center">PROCEDURES AND RESULTS</div>

SRP Solvent Studies

The previously studied SRP solvent was treated with base as the last solvent cleanup step, as contrasted with this study's ICPP procedure which uses a final scrub with dilute acid. It was suspected that the acid or base might react with materials removed by activated alumina and could affect performance results for the sorbent bed. As a preliminary test, we acidified SRP solvent, dried it by passage of dry air at 60°C, and treated it by passage through 1.3 g of activated alumina at a rate of 1 mL/min. The degree of improvement in solvent quality and the column volumes of solvent treatable by this method were essentially identical to our results when the solvent was treated with base. This demonstrates that the chemical form of the secondary degradation products that are removed by treatment with activated alumina either is unaffected by base or acid treatment or that in each case any differing forms are equally well removed.

Determination of Acidic Impurities

German workers recently reported(5) that the levels of acidic impurities could be determined by converting these impurities to their sodium salts and determining the conductivity of the solvent after diluting 50% with absolute alcohol. They determined that various types of impurities can be classified by contacting the solvent with scrub solutions of various basicity. The long-chain acids are converted to their sodium salts by

treatment with 0.5 M NaHCO₃; the long-chain organophosphoric acids are con-
verted to their sodium salts by treatment with 0.25 $\underline{M}$ Na₂CO₃; and the β-
diketones are converted to sodium enolates by treatment with 0.5 $\underline{M}$ NaOH.
We have confirmed this report by measuring the conductivity of solutions of
the sodium salts formed from lauric acid, butyllauryl phosphate, and
2,4-pentanedione in 30% TBP-NPH diluted 50% with absolute alcohol. It was
found necessary to use the 50-50 dilution to make up standard solutions
that remain stable in the concentration range of 10^{-3} to 10^{-5} $\underline{M}$. The
sodium salt of lauric acid was available commercially, and this was
dissolved directly in the 50-50 solvent/alcohol solution to obtain a 10^{-3} $\underline{M}$
standard; the other concentrations of lauric acid tested were made by dilu-
tion of this standard. The butyllauryl phosphate and 2, 4-pentanedione
were dissolved in 30% TBP-NPH, scrubbed with 0.1 volume of 50% NaOH to form
the sodium salts, and immediately diluted with ethanol. The conductivities
were determined using a YSI Model 31 conductivity bridge. Results are
given in Table 1.

The data indicate similar conductivities of the sodium salts of any of
the model compounds. Therefore, all the data were fitted to yield the
linear least squares equation:

$$C = (1.2559 \pm 0.086) \times 10^{-6} + [(2.042 \pm 0.16) \times 10^{-3}][\underline{M}] , \qquad (1)$$

where C is the specific conductivity and [$\underline{M}$] is the molar concentration of
the sodium salt of the impurity. The standard error of the regression fit
is 2.82×10^{-7}, which indicates an ability to determine concentrations
within about $\pm 10^{-4}$ $\underline{M}$. The low degree of degradation of the ICPP solvent
gave conductances lower than the uncertainty of the method, but the method
might be useful for solvent with higher levels of degradation products.

Table 1. Specific conductance of acidic impurities in ICPP solvent tests

Test solution concentration[a] ($\underline{M}$)	Conductance of model acidic impurities		
	Lauric acid (mho)	Butyllauryl phosphate (mho)	2,4-pentanedione (mho)
0	1.22×10^{-6}		
0	1.16×10^{-6}		
10^{-5}	1.39×10^{-6}	1.43×10^{-6}	1.33×10^{-6}
10^{-5}		1.35×10^{-6}	1.43×10^{-6}
10^{-4}	1.39×10^{-6}	1.56×10^{-6}	1.47×10^{-6}
10^{-4}			1.53×10^{-6}
5×10^{-4}	1.92×10^{-6}	1.82×10^{-6}	1.75×10^{-6}
5×10^{-4}	2.22×10^{-6}		
1×10^{-3}	3.45×10^{-6}	4.0×10^{-6}	3.03×10^{-6}
1×10^{-3}		3.57×10^{-6}	3.1×10^{-6}

[a]Conductance of standard TBP diluted 50% with ethanol was 9.43×10^{-7} mho. Conductance of absolute ethanol used in making test solutions was 7.4×10^{-7} mho.

Cleanup of ICPP Solvent at 45°C

Dried ICPP solvent was passed through 0.504 g of dry activated alumina at a flow rate of 1 mL/min. Data on the phase-separation times and interfacial tensions of effluent samples are shown in Fig. 2. The interfacial tension and phase-separation time for untreated solvent vs 0.2 $\underline{M}$ Na_2CO_3 were 7.2 dyn/cm and 30 to 35 s, respectively. The interfacial tension was greatly increased (to ~23 dyn/cm), and the phase-separation time was decreased to ~15 to 20 s by passage through the activated alumina bed. The lowest phase-separation time observed by our method was ~15 s. The interfacial tension began to decrease and the phase-separation time to increase after ~800 mL (1300 column-volumes) of solvent had been treated. It appeared that the column had been completely loaded by ~1200 mL (1960 column-volumes) of the solvent. After ~1350 mL of solvent had been treated, the test was

Fig. 2. Results for ICPP solvent treated by passage through 0.504 g of activated alumina at 45°C with a flow rate of 1 mL/min.

stopped overnight and restarted the next day. The quality of the sub-
sequently treated solvent was then seen to improve, a phenomenon also noted
in other tests and discussed later. This may be the result of a slow reac-
tion between the adsorbed material and the alumina bed or it may result
from channeling in the small adsorption bed. This peculiar behavior makes
it difficult to define the column capacity. In these studies, the column
capacity will be defined as the volume treated at the middle of the first
increase in the phase-separation time (~1100 mL or 1800 column-volumes),
realizing that solvent passing through the column after that time was
significantly improved in quality. The shape of the curve after the mini-
mum interfacial tension indicates that the actual capacity of the column is
probably nearer to 1500 mL (2400 column-volumes). Additional loading of
the columns was not attempted because of the limited volumes of ICPP
solvent available.

The phase-separation time of treated solvent was observed to exceed
that of untreated solvent near the end of this and other tests. This is a
phenomenon called "rollover" which can occur during adsorption of multiple
impurities from a stream(6).

Figure 3 shows the correlation of interfacial tension with the phase-
separation time (both vs $0.2 \underline{M} Na_2CO_3$) for the effluent (treated) solvent.
The phase-separation time can be predicted from the interfacial tension by
the following least-squares-determined linear equation:

$$PST = (-7.95)(IT) + 197, \tag{2}$$

where IT is the interfacial tension (in dyn/cm) and PST is the phase-
separation time in seconds. Thus, either of these measurements can be

Fig. 3. Correlation of phase separation time with interfacial tension.

used to define the quality of treated solvent by this method. The inter-
facial tension data are probably more precise than those for phase-
separation time, but it takes slightly longer to make the tension
measurements. Note, however, that the characteristics of the untreated
solvent do not agree with the correlation of Eq.(2) for treated ICPP
solvent.

Steam Stripping

The column containing the activated alumina sorbent bed was drained
and steam stripped after treatment of the ICPP solvent. For this proce-
dure, the column tip was inserted into one hole of a two-hole rubber
stopper for a boiling flask. A tube inserted into the other hole of the
stopper was attached to a rubber hose that was then submerged in water;
this acted as a vent to prevent pressure buildup and expulsion of the
packed bed from the column. The steam passing through the column partially
condensed in the packed bed, then percolated to the top where it was
removed by suction. Thus, the steam stripping was accompanied by some
upward flushing of the bed with hot water. This flushing was observed to
remove much of the oily material from the activated alumina. Nearly 2.5 mL
of condensate was collected from the top of the bed during the 2.5-h steam
treatment. The bed was subsequently dried at 90°C and was then easily
removed from the column. The color of the bed changed from deep brownish-
yellow to pale tan early in the steam treatment process.

Reloading of Steam-Stripped Column

The steam-stripped column and sorbent bed were then dried at 325°C and used to treat additional solvent. Results (Fig. 4) of the experiments indicate a column capacity of ~600 mL (980 column-volumes) — about half of the capacity of the fresh activated alumina. This result, with the crude regeneration method used, makes it likely that a more efficient steam-stripping and/or hot-water wash method could give nearly complete regeneration.

Effect of Bed Residence Time

Dried ICPP solvent was passed through 0.500 g of dry activated alumina at a flow rate of 2 mL/min (twice the previous flow rate) to examine the influence of bed residence time on the effectiveness of solvent cleanup. The improvements in interfacial tension and phase-separation time were significantly poorer than improvements obtained with the 1 mL/min flow rate (Fig. 5). The volume of solvent processed before the first increase in phase-separation time was approximately the same as with the lower flow rate. However, our column was small with a short residence time, and any column used in a process operation would likely have a solvent residence time significantly longer than any we have examined.

Effect of Increasing TBP Content

For a single test, the TBP content of the solvent was increased to 30 vol %, followed by drying of the solvent. The quantity of solvent available at that time was too small to allow the use of even the 0.5-g beds used in the other tests. For this test only, the bed weight was

Fig. 4. Results for ICPP solvent treated by passage through regenerated alumina bed at 45°C with a flow rate of 1 mL/min.

Fig. 5. Results for ICPP solvent passed through 0.500 g activated alumina bed at 45°C with a flow rate of 2 mL/min.

decreased to 0.25 g, and the flow rate was decreased to 0.5 mL/min to maintain the same bed residence time. The untreated solvent fed to the column had a phase-separation time and interfacial tension vs 0.2 $\underline{M}$ Na CO$_3$ of 25 s and 8.1 dyn/cm, respectively. The results of the test are shown in Fig. 6. The increase in phase-separation time occurred at ~470 mL (1550 column-volumes), in good agreement with the 1100 mL (1800 column-volumes) found with the lower TBP content. Thus, it appears that the TBP content does not have a significant effect on the volume of solvent that can be treated with activated alumina.

Plutonium Retention

The plutonium retention results (Table 2) will be discussed as a group, due to their disappointing inconsistency. The standard test procedure used dried, as-received ICPP solvent passed through 0.504 g of activated alumina at 1 mL/min, while the high-flow test used a solvent flow rate of 2 mL/min. The 10% TBP sample was prepared from ORNL stock TBP and NPH. Obvious problems in reproducibility of the plutonium retentions are evident in results from the duplicate analyses on samples from the beginning and end of the standard run. The first set of samples was not filtered after plutonium stripping; the second set was. Filtration apparently removed significant plutonium from these two samples. It appears that the actual plutonium retention, based on filtered samples, is low even at the end of the test. The plutonium retention of the stock ICPP solvent was determined three times, giving two high-retention values and one low value (the highest result is for a filtered sample). The average plutonium retention of the ICPP solvent from the high-flow test is significantly higher than that found with the lower flow rate, especially for the filtered sample.

Fig. 6. Results for ICPP solvent with TBP increased to 30 vol%, passed through 0.25 g activated alumina bed at 45°C with a flow rate of 0.5 mL/min.

Table 2. Results of Plutonium retention tests for ICPP solvent[a]

Solvent flow rate	Sample identity	Pu retention (c/min·mL)
1 mL/min	Average	25
1 mL/min	Beginning	2840, <1[b]
1 mL/min	Middle	130, 200[b]
1 mL/min	End	400, <1[b]
2 mL/min	Average	1510, 4500[b]
Stock	ICPP[c]	65, 3050, 17100[b]
	10% TBP	473

[a]The standard test procedure was dried, as-received ICPP solvent passed through 0.504 g of activated alumina.
[b]Filtered sample.
[c]As-received ICPP solvent.

This may indicate that removal of the materials which retain plutonium requires longer contact time in the sorbent bed. The difficulty in obtaining reproducible results for plutonium retention makes these observations tentative. Improved plutonium retention data would require significant additional efforts which are not possible with our current funding levels for solvent recycle and fuel reprocessing. In earlier studies, completed when we had more complete capabilities in these areas, data obtained with SRP solvent indicated that ~90% of the materials that complex plutonium were removed by passage through the activated alumina column, and the fraction removed did not decline significantly during the time preceding the break in phase-separation time. The earlier data also cast significant doubt on the low plutonium retention numbers obtained with some of the current samples.

CONCLUSIONS

The interfacial tension and phase-separation time of ICPP solvent vs sodium carbonate solutions can be greatly improved by passing dried solvent through a bed of activated alumina. The number of bed volumes of solvent that can be treated with a given column was much greater than for similar treatment of SRP solvent(2). This results from the decreased degradation of the ICPP solvent. Steam stripping cn be used to remove most of the organic materials from the used sorption bed, resulting in a free-flowing bed that ca.i be easily handled and that has at least 50% of the original bed capacity regenerated. The conductivity method for determining the concentration of acidic impurities in reactor fuel reprocessing plant solvent(5) could not be used with the ICPP solvent because of the low levels of impurities present.

REFERENCES

1. Mailen, J. C., and O. K. Tallent, Assessment of Solvent Cleanup Methods Using a Mixer-Settler System, ORNL/TM-9118, 1984.

2. Mailen, J. C., and O. K. Tallent, Cleanup of Savannah River Solvent Using Solid Sorbents, ORNL/TM-9256, 1985.

3. Neace, J. C., Allied-General Nuclear Services, private communication to J. C. Mailen, ORNL, 1980.

4. Harkins, W. D., and F. E. Brown, "Determination of Surface Tension (Free Surface Energy) and the Weight of Falling Drops: Surface Tension of Water and Benzene by the Capillary-Height Method," J. Am. Chem. Soc. 41, 499 (1919).

5. Stieglitz, L., and R. Becker, "Chemical and Radiolytical Degradation in the Purex Process, paper presented at the ANS International Topical Meeting, Fuel Reprocessing and Waste Management, August 26-29, 1984, Jackson, Wyoming.

6. Perrich, J. R., Activated Carbon Adsorption for Wastewater Treatment, CRC Press, Inc., Boca Raton, Florida, 1981, p. 54.

```
10 CLS:IF IT<>0 THEN PRINT "IT = ";IT
20 PRINT:PRINT:V=0:N=0
30 INPUT "WHAT IS THE SYSTEM TESTED";I$
40 LPRINT I$:LPRINT:PRINT
50 INPUT "WHAT IS DROP VOLUME (HIT ENTER IF THERE ARE NO FURTHER DROPS)
";VN
60 LPRINT VN
70 IF VN=0 THEN 100
80 N=N+1:V=V+VN
90 GOTO 50
100 INPUT "WHAT IS THE DENSITY OF THE ORGANIC PHASE (HIT ENTER IF NO
CHANGE)";DO
102 IF DO = 0 THEN DO = D1
104 D1 = DO
110 V1=V/N/(.0635)^3
120 IF V1<=1.5 GOTO 160.
130 V1=LOG(V1)
140 F=.2754-.0157*V1-.0002357*V1^2
150 GOTO 180
160 V1=LOG(V1)
170 F=.26056+.021385*V1-.02267*V1^2
180 INPUT "WHAT IS THE AQUEOUS DENSITY (HIT ENTER IF NO CHANGE)";DA
182 IF DA = 0 THEN DA = D2
184 D2 = DA
190 IT=V/N*(DA-DO)*980.7*F/.0635
200 PRINT "IT= ";IT
210 LPRINT "THE AQ DENSITY IS ";DA; ".   THE ORIG DENSITY IS ";DO;"."
220 LPRINT:LPRINT "THE INTERFACIAL TENSION IS ";IT
230 LPRINT "----------------------------------------------":LPRINT:LPRINT
240 GOTO 10
250 END
```