

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

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.

Full-Scale Testing of a Caustic Side Solvent Extraction System to Remove Cesium from Savannah River Site Radioactive Waste

**M. R. Poirier
T. B. Peters
E. A. Brass
S. J. Brown
M. W. Geeting
L. C. Johnson, Jr.
C. J. Coleman
S. L. Crump
M. J. Barnes
S. D. Fink**

October 15, 2007

**SAVANNAH RIVER NATIONAL LABORATORY
WASHINGTON SAVANNAH RIVER COMPANY**

Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC 29808



SRNL

SAVANNAH RIVER NATIONAL LABORATORY

SUMMARY

Savannah River Site (SRS) personnel have completed construction and assembly of the Modular Caustic Side Solvent Extraction Unit (MCU) facility. Following assembly, they conducted testing to evaluate the ability of the process to remove non-radioactive cesium and to separate the aqueous and organic phases. They conducted tests at salt solution flow rates of 3.5, 6.0, and 8.5 gpm.

During testing, the MCU Facility collected samples and submitted them to Savannah River National Laboratory (SRNL) personnel for analysis of cesium, Isopar[®] L, and Modifier [1-(2,2,3,3-tetrafluoropropoxy)-3-(4-*sec*-butylphenoxy)-2-propanol]. SRNL personnel analyzed the aqueous samples for cesium by Inductively-Coupled Plasma Mass Spectroscopy (ICP-MS) and the solvent samples for cesium using a Parr Bomb Digestion followed by ICP-MS. They analyzed aqueous samples for Isopar[®] L and Modifier by gas chromatography (GC).

The conclusions from the cesium analyses follow.

- The cesium in the feed samples measured 15.8 mg/L, in agreement with expectations.
- The decontamination factor measured 181 – 1580 at a salt solution flow rate of 3.5 gpm, 211 – 252 at a salt solution flow rate of 6.0 gpm, and 275 – 878 at a salt solution flow rate of 8.5 gpm.
- The concentration factor measured 11.0 – 11.1 at 3.5 gpm salt solution flow rate, 12.8 – 13.2 at 6.0 gpm salt solution flow rate, and 12.0 – 13.2 at 8.5 gpm salt solution flow rate

- The organic carryover from the final extraction contactor (#7) varied between 22 and 710 mg/L Isopar[®] L. The organic carryover was less at the lowest flow rate.
- The organic carryover from the final strip contactor (#7) varied between 80 and 180 mg/L Isopar[®] L.
- The organic carryover in the Decontaminated Salt Solution Hold Tank and the Strip Effluent Hold Tank was less than 10 mg/L Isopar[®] L, indicating good recovery of the solvent by the coalescers and decanters.

INTRODUCTION

The Department of Energy identified the Caustic Side Solvent Extraction (CSSX) process as the preferred technology for removing cesium from radioactive waste solutions at the Savannah River Site (SRS).^{1,2} As a result, the Washington Savannah River Company (WSRC) designed and built the MCU facility in the SRS Tank Farm to process liquid waste for an interim period until the Salt Waste Processing Facility (SWPF) begins operations.

In the CSSX process (see Figure 1), solvent contacts SRS liquid salt waste in centrifugal contactors. During contact, cesium transfers from the aqueous phase (i.e., salt solution) to the solvent and the aqueous and organic phases are separated. The solvent is stripped of cesium by dilute nitric acid in subsequent contactors. Following separation of the strip solution from the solvent, the strip effluent is transported to the Defense Waste Processing Facility. The decontaminated aqueous salt solution is transferred via a piping system for ultimate disposal through the Saltstone Production Facility. The stripped solvent is washed with 0.01 M NaOH to

prepare it for reuse in the process. The decontaminated salt solution and strip effluent solution will contain droplets of solvent that have not been separated in the centrifugal contactors. Because of the cost of the solvent and the adverse impacts on downstream facilities, SRS has installed coalescers and decanters downstream of the contactors to recover this solvent from these streams.

The solvent for this process contains four components. The extractant is a calixarene-crown ether, calix[4]arene-*bis*(tert-octylbenzo-crown-6), called BOBCalixC6. The solvent contains a Modifier, which is an alkyl aryl polyether, to keep the extractant dissolved in the solvent and increase its ability to extract cesium in the extraction section. The Modifier is 1-(2,2,3,3,-tetrafluoropropoxy)-3-(4-sec-butylphenoxy)-2-propanol, and is called Cs-7SB. The solvent contains a suppressant, trioctylamine, which suppresses the effects of anionic organic impurities and improves the back-extraction of cesium from the solvent in the stripping section. The diluent is Isopar[®] L, a mixture of branched hydrocarbons.^{3,4,5,6}

SRS personnel have completed construction and assembly of the MCU facility. Following assembly, they conducted testing to evaluate the ability of the process to remove non-radioactive cesium and to separate the aqueous and organic phases.

They conducted the tests as follows. A vendor (Blue Line Chemical) prepared simulated SRS salt solution (see Table 1). MCU personnel added nonradioactive cesium to the salt solution to achieve a cesium concentration of 14.9 mg/L (equivalent to 1.1 Ci/gal ¹³⁷Cs). They processed the salt solution through the MCU process at flow rates of 3.5, 6.0, and 8.5 gpm (referred to as

Tests A, B, and C, respectively). During the testing, they collected samples from the inlet and outlet of selected contactors to measure cesium removal from the salt solution, cesium transfer from the solvent to the strip acid, organic solvent carryover into the decontaminated salt solution and strip acid. They collected samples from the Decontaminated Salt Solution Hold Tank and Strip Effluent Hold Tank to measure the effectiveness of the coalescers in recovering solvent from the aqueous streams. Following the tests, they performed a solvent cleanup test in which they recycled decontaminated salt solution through the contactors to remove cesium from the solvent. Following that test, they stopped and restarted the MCU process to determine its ability to rapidly reestablish process efficiency after shutdown and restart.

ANALYSES

The authors performed the ^{133}Cs analysis by ICP-MS. The aqueous samples (decontaminated salt solution and strip effluent) were submitted directly to the ICP-MS. The solvent samples were digested using a Parr Bomb Digestion prior to analysis by ICP-MS. They analyzed salt and strip samples for Isopar[®] L and Modifier by gas chromatography with flame ionization detection (GC-FID) and gas chromatography-mass spectrometry (GC-MS).

The ICP-MS used for the analyses is a Thermo-Elemental Plasma Quad II. This instrument provides multi-element analyses of aqueous solutions, and the analytical results can be expressed as either elemental or isotopic concentrations. The instrument aerosolizes the sample and transports the aerosol to the argon plasma. In the high temperature plasma (~10,000 °K) metallic species are ionized. The ions generated by the plasma enter the mass spectrometer through a

sampling cone set near the end of the plasma. The ions are separated by a quadrupole mass filter and focused on a detector. The detector provides either an ion count or an analog signal. The signal from the detector is amplified, measured, and stored in a multi-channel analyzer, and these measurements are used to calibrate the instrument and determine the concentrations of the elements of concern.

The authors performed the solvent sample digestions as follows. Approximately 0.1-0.2 g of the well-mixed sample was transferred to the TeflonTM cup of a Parr Bomb dissolution container. A 3 mL aliquot of high-purity concentrated nitric acid was added and the dissolution container sealed. Typically eight containers were heated simultaneously in an oven pre-heated to 175 °C. Heating was continued for at least three hours after the oven temperature re-equilibrated to 175 °C. After cooling to room temperature, the containers were opened and the nitric acid solutions were diluted to 10 mL with de-ionized water. No immiscible organic fraction or solution cloudiness was evident after this treatment, indicating that the oxidation of the organic fraction in the samples was complete.

Personnel performed the GC-FID and GC-MS analyses as follows. They weighed the sample bottle. They either added hexane to the sample bottle (1/4 of sample volume) or transferred the sample to a larger bottle and rinsed the sample bottle with the hexane. They recorded the weight of the bottle, sample, and hexane. They removed the top layer of liquid and placed it in a vial with a TeflonTM cap. They recorded the empty bottle weight. They dried the hexane with sodium sulfate, collected aliquots, and analyzed them.

GC-MS analysis or GC-FID analysis was employed to identify organic compounds in the samples. Analytical separations were carried out on a Hewlett Packard 6890 gas chromatograph, equipped with a 30 m DB-XLB column, with 0.18 mm diameter and 0.20 μ film thickness for GC-MS. The GC-FID uses a 30 m DB-5ms column, with 0.2 mm diameter and 0.33 μ film thickness. Quantification was performed using a Hewlett Packard 5973 mass selective detector. The mass spectrometer tuning was confirmed within 24 hours prior to each measurement using perfluorotributylamine.

RESULTS

Cesium Removal

Table 2 shows the analysis of the feed solution along with the control submitted. The feed cesium concentration measured 15.8 mg/L in both samples versus a target of 14.9 mg/L. The 15 mg/L control sample measured 14.6 mg/L (3% difference), well within the standard analytical uncertainty of $\pm 10\%$. The analytical uncertainty on all measured values is $\pm 10\%$, unless otherwise stated.

Table 3 shows the cesium concentration in the samples from the test conducted with a salt solution flow rate of 3.5 gpm. The Decontamination Factor (DF) varied between 181 and 1580, with an average value of 348. The Concentration Factor (CF) varied between 11.0 and 11.1. The cesium concentration in the solvent entering the extraction contactors was less than 1.1 mg/L, confirming effective cesium removal from the solvent during the stripping process.

Table 4 shows the cesium concentration in the samples from the test conducted with a 6.0 gpm salt solution flow rate. The DF varied between 211 and 252, with an average value of 227. The CF varied between 12.8 and 13.2. The cesium concentration in the solvent entering the extraction contactors was less than 1 mg/L, confirming effective cesium removal from the solvent during stripping, again.

Table 5 shows the cesium concentration in the samples from the test conducted with a 8.5 gpm salt solution flow rate. The DF varied between 275 and 878, with an average value of 470. The CF varied between 12.0 and 13.2. The cesium concentration in the solvent entering the extraction contactors was less than 1 mg/L, confirming effective cesium removal from the solvent by stripping, again.

Tables 6 and 7 show the cesium concentration in the samples collected during the Solvent Cleanup Test. Table 6 shows the cesium in the decontaminated salt solution samples. The cesium concentration decreased with time during this test, and all samples contained less than 0.2 mg/L cesium.

Table 7 shows the cesium concentration in the SHT. The cesium concentration measured less than 0.3 mg/L. The solvent cesium concentration at the conclusion of the test with 8.5 gpm salt solution flow rate measured 0.21 ± 0.16 . The initial solvent hold tank sample, collected 50 minutes after the start of the solvent cleanup test, had a cesium concentration of 0.030 mg/L,

showing a large fraction of the cesium had been removed from the solvent. Subsequent samples showed similar cesium concentrations. The last sample collected showed a higher cesium concentration. We are unsure of the reason for this increase. Given that the Salt Solution (see Table 6) did not show a similar increase in cesium, this result is likely due to analytical uncertainty.

Table 8 shows the cesium concentration in the decontaminated salt solution, strip effluent, and Solvent Hold Tank during the System Shutdown/Restart Test. In this test, the MCU system was shut down and restarted. The DF was 268, and the CF was 11.8. These results are consistent with the results from the Mass Transfer Tests. During the Mass Transfer Tests, the cesium in the decontaminated salt solution averaged 0.048 ± 0.026 mg/L, the cesium in the strip effluent averaged 194 ± 15 mg/L, and the cesium in the solvent averaged 0.40 ± 0.31 mg/L. The DF averaged 491 ± 461 , and the CF averaged 12.2 ± 0.9 .

Table 9 shows the cesium concentration in the inlet to Extraction Contactor #1. The concentration is slightly higher than in the Salt Solution Receipt Tank (SSRT) and the Salt Solution Feed Tank (SSFT) (15.8 mg/L).

Organic Carryover

Table 10 shows the measured Isopar[®] L concentration in aqueous samples collected from the outlet of Extraction Contactor #7. The organic carryover varied between 22 and 709 mg/L Isopar[®] L. The carryover measured during the test at 3.5 gpm was much less than measured

during tests at higher salt solution flow rate (31 mg/L Isopar[®] L versus 444 – 524 mg/L Isopar[®] L). This result is consistent with the results from the Integrated Test conducted previously, where the organic carryover was ~ 80 mg/L Isopar[®] L at salt solution flow rates of 3.5 gpm, and 130 – 100 mg/L Isopar[®] L at flow rates of 4.5 – 8.5 gpm salt solution.

Table 11 shows the measured Isopar[®] L concentration in aqueous samples collected from the decontaminated salt solution hold tank (DSSHT). In all samples, the Isopar[®] L concentration is less than 10 mg/L. These results show that the coalescer and decanter effectively recovered solvent from the decontaminated salt solution.

Table 12 shows the measured Isopar[®] L concentration in aqueous samples collected from the outlet of Strip Contactor #7. The organic carryover varied between 80 and 182 mg/L Isopar[®] L. No significant difference in organic carryover was observed between the different tests. These results are consistent with the Integrated Test conducted previously, in which the organic carryover varied between 170 and 370 mg/L Isopar[®] L.

Table 13 shows the measured Isopar[®] L concentration in aqueous samples collected from the strip effluent hold tank (SEHT). In all samples, the Isopar[®] L concentration is less than 10 mg/L. The modifier concentration in SEHT was 18 – 29 mg/L. The modifier concentration is higher than the Isopar[®] L concentration due to the modifier's solubility in dilute nitric acid. Given that the average modifier concentration in the SEHT was 23.6 mg/L, we estimate the solubility of modifier in strip acid to be 23.6 mg/L. These results show that the coalescer and decanter effectively recovered solvent from the strip effluent stream.

Subtracting the soluble Modifier from the measured Modifier in the Strip Effluent Contactor outlet samples, we calculate an insoluble Modifier concentration (see Table 12). Using the insoluble Modifier concentration, we calculate a modified Isopar[®] L:Modifier ratio, which varies between 1.72 and 2.49 with an average of 2.1. This average agrees well with the calculated Isopar[®] L:Modifier ratio of 2.32.

CONCLUSIONS

The conclusions from the cesium analyses follow.

- The cesium in the feed samples measured 15.8 mg/L, in agreement with expectations.
- The decontamination factor measured 181 – 1580 at a salt solution flow rate of 3.5 gpm, 211 – 252 at a salt solution flow rate of 6.0 gpm, and 275 – 878 at a salt solution flow rate of 8.5 gpm.
- The concentration factor measured 11.0 – 11.1 at 3.5 gpm salt solution flow rate, 12.8 – 13.2 at 6.0 gpm salt solution flow rate, and 12.0 – 13.2 at 8.5 gpm salt solution flow rate
- The organic carryover from the final extraction contactor (#7) varied between 22 and 710 mg/L Isopar[®] L. The organic carryover was less at the lowest flow rate.
- The organic carryover from the final strip contactor (#7) varied between 80 and 180 mg/L Isopar[®] L
- The organic carryover in the Decontaminated Salt Solution Hold Tank and the Strip Effluent Hold Tank was less than 10 mg/L Isopar[®] L, indicating good recovery of the solvent by the coalescers and decanters.

REFERENCES

1. C. L. Huntoon to G. P. Rudy, memorandum titled "Preferred Alternative for the Savannah River Salt Processing Project", June 25, 2001.
2. R. A. Dimenna, H. H. Elder, J. R. Fowler, R. C. Fowler, M. V. Gregory, T. Hang, R. A. Jacobs, P. K. Paul, J. A. Pike, P. L. Rutland, F. G. Smith III, S. G. Subosits, G. A. Taylor, S. G. Campbell, and F. A. Washburn, "Bases, Assumptions, and Results of the Flowsheet Calculations for the Decision Phase Salt Disposition Alternatives", WSRC-RP-99-00006, Rev. 3, May 24, 2001.
3. R. A. Leonard, S. B. Aase, H. A. Arafat, C. Conner, D. B. Chamberlain, J. R. Falkenberg, M. C. Regalbutto, and G. F. Vandegrift, "Experimental Verification of Caustic-Side Solvent Extraction for Removal of Cesium from Tank Waste", *Solv Ext Ion Exchange*, vol. 21, No. 4, pp. 505-526, 2003.
4. W. R. Wilmarth, J. T. Mills, V. H. Dukes, M. C. Beasley, A. D. Coleman, C. C. DiPrete, and D. P. DiPrete, "Caustic-Side Solvent Extraction Batch Distribution Coefficient Measurements for Savannah River Site High-Level Wastes", *Sep. Sci. Tech.*, vol. 38, No. 12-13, pp. 2637-2645, 2003.
5. M. A. Norato, M. H. Beasley, S. G. Campbell, A. D. Coleman, M. W. Geeting, J. W. Guthrie, C. W. Kennel, R. A. Pierce, R. C. Ryberg, D. D. Walker, J. D. Law, and T. A. Todd, "Demonstration of the Caustic-Side Solvent Extraction Process for the Removal of ^{137}Cs from Savannah River Site High Level Waste", *Sep. Sci. Tech.*, vol. 38, No. 12-13, pp. 2647-2666, 2003.
6. P. V. Bonnesen, L. H. Delmau, and B. A. Moyer, "A Robust Alkaline-Side CSEX Solvent Suitable for Removing Cesium from Savannah River High Level Waste", *Solv. Ext. Ion Exch.*, vol. 18, No. 6, pp. 1079-1107, 2000.




Figure 1. Solvent Extraction Contactor Layout

Table 1. SRS Simulated Salt Solution Composition

<u>Species</u>	<u>Concentration (Molar)</u>
KNO ₃	0.015
NaOH	2.07
NaNO ₃	2.02
NaNO ₂	0.50
NaAlO ₂	0.28
Na ₂ CO ₃	0.15
Na ₂ SO ₄	0.14
NaCl	0.024
NaF	0.028
Na ₂ HPO ₄	0.007
Na ₂ C ₂ O ₄	0.008
Na ₂ SiO ₃	0.030
Na ₂ MoO ₄	0.00007

Table 2. Feed Solution Cesium Concentration

<u>Sample</u>	<u>Cesium (mg/L)</u>
MCU-CS-I-SSRT	15.8
MCU-CS-I-SSFT	15.8
15 mg/L Control	14.6

Table 3. Cesium Concentration (mg/L) during Test with 3.5 gpm Salt Solution Flow Rate

	<u>Feed</u>	<u>DSS</u>	<u>SE</u>	<u>Solvent</u>	<u>DF</u>	<u>CF</u>
MCU-CS-I-SSRT	15.8					
MCU-CS-I-SSFT	15.8					
MCU-CS-A-EC-A-O-1		< 0.010				
MCU-CS-A-EC-A-O-2		0.017				
MCU-CS-A-EC-A-O-3		0.069				
MCU-CS-A-EC-A-O-5		0.087				
MCU-CS-A-EC-A-O-6		0.044				
MCU-CS-A-SC-A-O-1			174			
MCU-CS-A-SC-A-O-3			176			
MCU-CS-A-SC-A-O-5			174			
MCU-CS-A-EC-O-I				1.062		
MCU-CS-A-EC-O-I-1				0.209		
MCU-CS-A-EC-O-I-3				0.849		
MCU-CS-A-EC-O-I-5				0.400		
MCU-CS-A-EC-O-I-6				0.588		
Minimum		< 0.010	174		181	11.0
Maximum		0.087	176		1580	11.1
Average		0.045	175		348	11.1
Standard Deviation		0.033	1.1			

Table 4. Cesium Concentration (mg/L) during Test with 6.0 gpm Salt Solution Flow Rate

	<u>Feed</u>	<u>DSS</u>	<u>SE</u>	<u>Solvent</u>	<u>DF</u>	<u>CF</u>
MCU-CS-I-SSRT	15.8					
MCU-CS-I-SSFT	15.8					
MCU-CS-B-EC-A-O-1		0.075				
MCU-CS-B-EC-A-O-3		0.071				
MCU-CS-B-EC-A-O-5		0.063				
MCU-CS-B-SC-A-O-1			204			
MCU-CS-B-SC-A-O-3			202			
MCU-CS-B-SC-A-O-5			209			
MCU-CS-B-SC-A-O-6			207			
MCU-CS-B-EC-O-I				0.749		
MCU-CS-B-EC-O-I-1				0.227		
MCU-CS-B-EC-O-I-3				0.214		
MCU-CS-B-EC-O-I-5				0.191		
Minimum		0.063	202		211	12.8
Maximum		0.075	209		252	13.2
Average		0.070	205.5		227	13.0
Standard Deviation		0.006	3.1			

Table 5. Cesium Concentration (mg/L) during Test with 8.5 gpm Salt Solution Flow Rate

	<u>Feed</u>	<u>DSS</u>	<u>SE</u>	<u>Solvent</u>	<u>DF</u>	<u>CF</u>
MCU-CS-I-SSRT	15.8					
MCU-CS-I-SSFT	15.8					
MCU-CS-C-EC-A-O-1		0.057				
MCU-CS-C-EC-A-O-3		0.032				
MCU-CS-C-EC-A-O-5		0.028				
MCU-CS-C-EC-A-O-6		0.018				
MCU-CS-C-SC-A-O-1			208			
MCU-CS-C-SC-A-O-3			190			
MCU-CS-C-SC-A-O-5			199			
MCU-CS-C-EC-O-I				0.29		
MCU-CS-C-EC-O-I-1				0.14		
MCU-CS-C-EC-O-I-3				0.46		
MCU-CS-C-EC-O-I-5				0.077		
MCU-CS-C-EC-O-I-6				0.099		
Minimum		0.018	190		275	12.0
Maximum		0.057	208		878	13.2
Average		0.034	199		470	12.6
Standard Deviation		0.017	9			

Table 6. Cesium Concentration (mg/L) in Salt Solution during the Solvent Cleanup Test

<u>Sample</u>	<u>Cesium (mg/L)</u>
MCU-CS-W-EC-A-I-1	0.129
MCU-CS-W-EC-A-I-3	0.078
MCU-CS-W-EC-A-I-5	0.038
MCU-CS-W-EC-A-I-7	0.046
MCU-CS-W-EC-A-I-9	0.043

Table 7. Cesium Concentration (mg/L) in Solvent Hold Tank during Solvent Cleanup Test

<u>Sample</u>	<u>Cesium (mg/L)</u>
MCU-CS-SHT-1	0.030
MCU-CS-SHT-3	0.025
MCU-CS-SHT-5	0.037
MCU-CS-SHT-7	0.051
MCU-CS-SHT-9	0.293
MCU-CS-SHT-11	0.851

Table 8. Cesium Concentration during System Shutdown Test

<u>Sample</u>	<u>Sample</u>	<u>Cesium (mg/L)</u>
MCU-CS-I-SSFT	Feed	15.8
MCU-CS-D-EC-A-O-1	DSS	0.059
MCU-CS-D-SC-A-O-1	SE	187
MCU-CS-SHT-11	SHT	0.851
	DF	268
	CF	11.8

Table 9. Cesium Concentration (mg/L) in Inlet to Extraction Contactor #1

<u>Sample</u>	<u>Salt Solution Flow Rate (gpm)</u>	<u>Cesium (mg/L)</u>
MCU-CS-A-EC-A-I	3.5 gpm	16.8
MCU-CS-B-EC-A-I	6.0 gpm	16.9
MCU-CS-C-EC-A-I	8.5 gpm	18.3
MCU-CS-I-SSRT		15.8
MCU-CS-I-SSFT		15.8

Table 10. Isopar[®] L concentration in Extraction Contactor #7 Outlet

<u>Sample ID</u>	<u>Test</u> <u>(gpm)</u>	<u>Isopar[®] L (mg/L)</u>	<u>Modifier (mg/L)</u>	<u>Isopar[®] L/Modifier</u>
MCU-ISO-A-EC-A-O-1	3.5	37.0	22.2	1.66
MCU-MS-1	3.5	33.2	14.2	2.34
MCU-ISO-A-EC-A-O-3	3.5	21.8	20.1	1.08
MCU-MS-3	3.5	33.6	19.7	1.71
MCU-ISO-A-EC-A-O-5	3.5	35.1	23.9	1.47
MCU-ISO-A-EC-A-O-6	3.5	31.7	23.6	1.34
MCU-MS-5	3.5	26.9	12.0	2.24
Average	3.5	31.3	19.4	1.61
Standard Deviation	3.5	5.3	4.6	
MCU-ISO-B-EC-A-O-1	6.0	487	233	2.09
MCU-MS-7	6.0	501.5	154.2	3.25
MCU-ISO-B-EC-A-O-3	6.0	366.8	174.6	2.10
MCU-ISO-B-EC-A-O-5	6.0	419.6	201.7	2.08
Average	6.0	443.7	190.9	2.32
Standard Deviation	6.0	62.5	34.2	
MCU-ISO-C-EC-A-O-1	8.5	709.1	315.0	2.25
MCU-ISO-C-EC-A-O-3	8.5	210.8	137.6	1.53
MCU-ISO-C-EC-A-O-5	8.5	651.0	286.9	2.27
Average	8.5	523.6	246.5	2.12
Standard Deviation	8.5	272.4	95.4	

Table 11. Isopar[®] L concentration in DSSHT

<u>Sample ID</u>	<u>Test (gpm)</u>	<u>Isopar[®] L (mg/L)</u>	<u>Modifier (mg/L)</u>
MCU-ISO-A-DT-A-1	3.5	< 3	< 3
MCU-ISO-A-DT-A-3	3.5	< 2	< 2
MCU-ISO-A-DT-A-5	3.5	< 2	< 2
MCU-ISO-A-DT-A-6	3.5	< 2	< 2
MCU-ISO-B-DT-A-1	6.0	< 2	< 2
MCU-ISO-B-DT-A-3	6.0	< 2	< 2
MCU-ISO-B-DT-A-5	6.0	< 3	< 3
MCU-ISO-B-DT-A-6	6.0	< 3	29.9
MCU-ISO-C-DT-A-1	8.5	< 2	14.2
MCU-ISO-C-DT-A-3	8.5	4.9	7.3
MCU-ISO-C-DT-A-5	8.5	7.7	9.5

Table 12. Isopar[®] L concentration in Strip Contactor #7 Outlet

Sample ID	Test (gpm)	Isopar [®] L (mg/L)	Modifier (mg/L)	Isopar [®] L/Modifier	Insoluble Modifier (mg/L)	Mod. Isopar [®] L/Modifier
MCU-ISO-A-SC-A-O-1	3.5	80.5	66.8	1.21	43.2	1.86
MCU-ISO-A-SC-A-O-3	3.5	145.7	108.2	1.35	84.6	1.72
MCU-ISO-A-SC-A-O-4	3.5	130.4	81.0	1.61	57.4	2.27
MCU-ISO-A-SC-A-O-5	3.5	181.8	96.7	1.88	73.1	2.49
Average	3.5	134.6	88.2	1.53	64.6	2.07
Standard Deviation	3.5	42.0	18.1			
MCU-ISO-B-SC-A-O-1	6.0	161.6	92.7	1.74	69.1	2.34
MCU-ISO-B-SC-A-O-3	6.0	158.3	89.9	1.76	66.3	2.39
MCU-ISO-B-SC-A-O-4	6.0	147.8	87.7	1.69	64.1	2.31
MCU-ISO-B-SC-A-O-5	6.0	167.8	112.0	1.50	88.4	1.90
Average	6.0	158.9	95.6	1.66	72.0	2.23
Standard Deviation	6.0	8.4	11.1			
MCU-ISO-C-SC-A-O-1	8.5	113.9	79.7	1.43	56.1	2.03
MCU-ISO-C-SC-A-O-3	8.5	98.4	74.9	1.31	51.3	1.92
MCU-ISO-C-SC-A-O-5	8.5	99.8	73.5	1.36	49.9	2.00
Average	8.5	104.0	76.0	1.37	52.4	1.98
Standard Deviation	8.5	8.6	3.3			

Table 13. Isopar[®] L concentration in SEHT

<u>Sample ID</u>	<u>Test (gpm)</u>	<u>Isopar[®] L (mg/L)</u>	<u>Modifier (mg/L)</u>
MCU-ISO-A-ST-A-1	3.5	< 3	22.3
MCU-ISO-A-ST-A-3	3.5	< 3	23.6
MCU-ISO-A-ST-A-5	3.5	< 3	26.5
MCU-ISO-B-ST-A-1	6.0	< 3	25.2
MCU-ISO-B-ST-A-2	6.0	< 3	21.3
MCU-ISO-B-ST-A-3	6.0	< 2	20.1
MCU-ISO-B-ST-A-5	6.0	< 3	24.5
MCU-ISO-C-ST-A-1	8.5	< 3	25.9
MCU-ISO-C-ST-A-3	8.5	< 3	17.9
MCU-ISO-C-ST-A-5	8.5	< 3	28.8
Average		< 3	23.6