



Analysis of Harrell Monosodium Titanate Lot # 46000908120

K. M. L. Taylor-Pashow

April 2014

SRNL-STI-2012-00659, 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: *MST, ISDP*

Retention: *Permanent*

Analysis of Harrell Monosodium Titanate Lot # 46000908120

K. M. L. Taylor-Pashow

April 2014

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



REVIEWS AND APPROVALS

AUTHORS:

| | |
|---|------|
| K. M. L. Taylor-Pashow, Separations and Actinide Science Programs | Date |
|---|------|

TECHNICAL REVIEW:

| | |
|--|------|
| D. J. McCabe, Advanced Characterization and Processing, Reviewed per E7 2.60 | Date |
|--|------|

APPROVAL:

| | |
|---|------|
| F. M. Pennebaker, Manager Advanced Characterization and Processing | Date |
|---|------|

| | |
|---|------|
| S. L. Marra, Manager Environmental & Chemical Process Technology Research Programs | Date |
|---|------|

| | |
|--|------|
| D. J. Martin, Manager H-Tank Farm Engineering | Date |
|--|------|

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Monosodium titanate (MST) for use in the Actinide Removal Process (ARP) must be qualified and verified in advance. A single qualification sample for each batch of material is sent to SRNL for analysis, as well as a statistical sampling of verification samples. The original Harrell Industries Lot #46000908120 qualification and 16 verification samples received in October 2012 failed to meet the specification for weight percent solids. All of the pails sampled and tested contained less than 15 wt % MST solids. The lot was returned to the vendor, and in February 2014 a new qualification sample and set of 16 verification samples were received from this lot. The new lot met each of the selected specification requirements that were tested and, consequently, the material is acceptable for use in the ARP process.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----|
| LIST OF TABLES | vii |
| LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS | vii |
| 1.0 Introduction | 1 |
| 2.0 Experimental Procedure | 1 |
| 2.1 Analyses | 1 |
| 2.2 Quality Assurance | 2 |
| 3.0 Results and Discussion | 2 |
| 4.0 Conclusions | 4 |
| 5.0 References | 6 |
| Appendix A . Harrell Weight Percent Solids Procedure | A-1 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | |
|--|---|
| Table 3-1. Weight Percent, pH, and Density Results for All Samples (October 2012)..... | 3 |
| Table 3-2. Results of the Qualification Sample Analyses (October 2012 sample)..... | 3 |
| Table 3-3. Weight Percent, pH, and Density Results for All Samples (February 2014) | 4 |
| Table 3-4. Results of the Qualification Sample Analyses (February 2014 sample) | 4 |

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

| | |
|-------|---|
| ARP | Actinide Removal Process |
| MST | monosodium titanate |
| SRNL | Savannah River National Laboratory |
| SRR | Savannah River Remediation |
| TTQAP | Technical Task and Quality Assurance Plan |
| VOA | volatile organic analysis |

1.0 Introduction

Harrell Industries is under contract with Savannah River Remediation (SRR) to provide MST for use in the Actinide Removal Process (ARP). In October 2012 a 1-L qualification sample from Lot #46000908120 was sent to the Savannah River National Laboratory (SRNL) to confirm the material meets certain requirements specified in the purchase specification.¹

The vendor is also obligated to send verification samples from ~10% or more of the pails of MST product for each lot. The verification samples are selected from the entire inventory of pails so that the set of verification samples represents pails filled from the beginning to the end of the pail-filling operation for the entire lot of MST. For the verification of this lot, Harrell Industries sent 16 samples in October 2012, one each from pails #1, 10, 20, 30, 40, 50, 60, 70, 80, 90, 100, 110, 120, 130, 140, and 150 of 152 total pails.

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

Original analysis of the samples received in October 2012 showed the material did not meet the weight percent solids specification. The lot was returned to Harrell Industries. In February 2014 a 1-L qualification sample and 16 verification samples, one each from pails #1, 10, 20, 30, 40, 50, 60, 70, 80, 90, 100, 110, 120, 130, 140, and 152 of 152 total pails, were received. These samples represent the reworked lot of material previously returned to Harrell.

2.0 Experimental Procedure

2.1 Analyses

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

Weight percent solids measurements performed on the samples received in October 2012 at SRNL were lower than the value reported by Harrell Industries for this lot. Therefore, the weight percent solids measurements were confirmed for the qualification sample using the method provided by Harrell Industries. This procedure is provided in Appendix A.

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

2.2 Quality Assurance

Requirements for performing reviews of technical reports and the extent of review are established in manual E7 2.60. SRNL documents the extent and type of review using the SRNL Technical Report Design Checklist contained in WSRC-IM-2002-00011, Rev. 2.

3.0 Results and Discussion

The results of the weight percent, pH, and density measurements for the October 2012 samples are reported in Table 3-1, while the results of the additional qualification sample analyses are reported in Table 3-2. The weight percent, pH, and density measurements for the February 2014 samples are reported in Table 3-3, while the results of the additional qualification sample analyses are reported in Table 3-4.

As seen in Table 3-1, all of the samples tested from the October 2012 set of samples contained less than 15 wt % MST solids and, therefore, failed to meet the purchase specification. The weight percent solids ranged from 14.62 – 14.98 wt %, with an average of 14.84 wt %. This is the second consecutive lot of material received from Harrell with less than 15 wt % MST. The previous lot (#46000824120) had an average weight percent solids value of 14.72 wt %.⁴

Harrell reported a weight percent solids of 15.4 wt % for this lot of material. Using the method provided by Harrell (Appendix A), SRNL obtained a value of 14.57 wt % solids, consistent with the low values obtained using the normal SRNL method (Mettler-Toledo Halogen Moisture Analyzer). During performance of the Harrell method, it was found that it required approximately 3 hours of drying to reach a constant weight. This is a possible source of the discrepancy between the SRNL and Harrell reported values. If the samples are not completely dry the weight percent solids will be reported high.

As seen in Table 3-3, the new lot of qualification and verification samples received in February 2014 had higher weight percent solids. All samples fell within the 15-17 wt % acceptable range. The results for the remaining analyses (pH, density, particles size, VOA) were similar to the October 2012 samples, and were within the acceptable range.

Table 3-1. Weight Percent, pH, and Density Results for All Samples (October 2012)

| Sample ID | Weight % Solids (Standard Deviation) | pH ^a | Density ^b (g/mL) (%RSD) |
|-------------------------------|---|-----------------|---------------------------------------|
| Qualification | 14.90 (±0.232) % | 12.5 | 1.123 (0.10%) |
| Pail #1 | 14.96 (±0.087) % | 12.0 | 1.121 (0.09%) |
| Pail #10 | 14.80 (±0.046) % | 12.0 | 1.122 (0.10%) |
| Pail #20 | 14.84 (±0.081) % | 12.0 | 1.119 (0.13%) |
| Pail #30 | 14.89 (±0.040) % | 12.0 | 1.118 (0.09%) |
| Pail #40 | 14.96 (±0.029) % | 12.0 | 1.119 (0.06%) |
| Pail #50 | 14.70 (±0.093) % | 12.0 | 1.119 (0.04%) |
| Pail #60 | 14.87 (±0.012) % | 12.0 | 1.116 (0.06%) |
| Pail #70 | 14.98 (±0.180) % | 12.0 | 1.117 (0.09%) |
| Pail #80 | 14.83 (±0.057) % | 12.0 | 1.116 (0.06%) |
| Pail #90 | 14.80 (±0.087) % | 12.0 | 1.117 (0.05%) |
| Pail #100 | 14.82 (±0.053) % | 12.0 | 1.116 (0.03%) |
| Pail #110 | 14.77 (±0.078) % | 12.0 | 1.117 (0.00%) |
| Pail #120 | 14.71 (±0.070) % | 12.0 | 1.118 (0.05%) |
| Pail #130 | 14.92 (±0.029) % | 12.0 | 1.120 (0.04%) |
| Pail #140 | 14.83 (±0.121) % | 12.0 | 1.112 (0.06%) |
| Pail #150 | 14.62 (±0.373) % | 12.0 | 1.115 (0.05%) |
| Average | 14.84 (±0.098) % | 12.0 | 1.118 (0.24%) |
| Acceptable Range ¹ | 15-17 % | > 10 | no requirement |
| Harrell Method ^c | 14.57% | n/a | n/a |

a) The uncertainty of the pH measurement is 0.5 pH units.

b) Density measurements taken at 23 °C.

c) Performed at SRNL using the qualification sample from this lot and the method provided by Harrell.

Note total drying time to reach the constant weight was approximately 3 hours.

Table 3-2. Results of the Qualification Sample Analyses (October 2012 sample)

| Property | Method | Result | Specification | Pass ? |
|---|------------------------|----------------------|------------------|--------|
| Volatile Organics | VOA | 1.9 ppm ¹ | n/a ² | n/a |
| Particle Size, < 0.8 µm | Microtrac [®] | 4.51 vol % | <10 vol % | YES |
| Particle Size, > 37 µm | Microtrac [®] | 0 vol % | <1 vol % | YES |
| Particle Size, geometric standard deviation (absorbance mode) | Microtrac [®] | 2.98 | ≤3.5 | YES |

The “Particle Size, geometric standard deviation” is defined as the 50th percentile result divided by the 16th percentile result. Microtrac[®] results have a 10% analytical uncertainty. VOA results have a 20% analytical uncertainty.

¹ Isopropanol = 1.9 ppm, all other analytes = < 0.25 ppm

² Purchase specification does not include a specification for volatile organics, only total alcohol content of < 500 ppm.

Table 3-3. Weight Percent, pH, and Density Results for All Samples (February 2014)

| Sample ID | Weight % Solids (Standard Deviation) | pH ^a | Density ^b (g/mL) (%RSD) |
|-------------------------------|---|-----------------|---------------------------------------|
| Qualification | 15.72 (±0.226) % | 12.0 | 1.126 (0.09%) |
| Pail #1 | 15.99 (±0.138) % | 12.0 | 1.124 (0.10%) |
| Pail #10 | 15.88 (±0.240) % | 12.0 | 1.127 (0.07%) |
| Pail #20 | 15.82 (±0.045) % | 12.0 | 1.122 (0.06%) |
| Pail #30 | 15.73 (±0.058) % | 12.0 | 1.123 (0.02%) |
| Pail #40 | 15.74 (±0.155) % | 12.0 | 1.120 (0.04%) |
| Pail #50 | 15.86 (±0.089) % | 12.0 | 1.119 (0.03%) |
| Pail #60 | 15.92 (±0.075) % | 12.0 | 1.125 (0.08%) |
| Pail #70 | 15.93 (±0.045) % | 12.0 | 1.124 (0.02%) |
| Pail #80 | 15.82 (±0.055) % | 12.0 | 1.123 (0.02%) |
| Pail #90 | 15.83 (±0.201) % | 12.0 | 1.122 (0.10%) |
| Pail #100 | 15.88 (±0.076) % | 12.0 | 1.121 (0.06%) |
| Pail #110 | 15.81 (±0.090) % | 12.0 | 1.119 (0.09%) |
| Pail #120 | 15.85 (±0.144) % | 12.0 | 1.120 (0.03%) |
| Pail #130 | 15.77 (±0.060) % | 12.0 | 1.119 (0.03%) |
| Pail #140 | 15.69 (±0.078) % | 12.0 | 1.120 (0.07%) |
| Pail #152 | 15.94 (±0.095) % | 12.0 | 1.119 (0.04%) |
| Average | 15.83 (±0.084) % | 12.0 | 1.122 (0.24%) |
| Acceptable Range ¹ | 15-17 % | > 10 | no requirement |

a) The uncertainty of the pH measurement is 0.5 pH units.

b) Density measurements taken at 25 °C.

Table 3-4. Results of the Qualification Sample Analyses (February 2014 sample)

| Property | Method | Result | Specification | Pass ? |
|---|------------------------|----------------------|------------------|--------|
| Volatile Organics | VOA | < 1 ppm ³ | n/a ⁴ | n/a |
| Particle Size, < 0.8 µm | Microtrac [®] | 5.00 vol % | <10 vol % | YES |
| Particle Size, > 37 µm | Microtrac [®] | 0 vol % | <1 vol % | YES |
| Particle Size, geometric standard deviation (absorbance mode) | Microtrac [®] | 3.22 | ≤3.5 | YES |

4.0 Conclusions

Initial analyses of the Harrell Lot #46000908120 MST material received in October 2012 indicated the material met the specifications, with the exception of weight percent solids. The pails all contained less than 15 wt % solids (the lower limit of the specification). The material from this lot was returned to

³ Isopropanol = < 1 ppm, all other analytes = < 0.25 ppm

⁴ Purchase specification does not include a specification for volatile organics, only total alcohol content of < 500 ppm.

Harrell, and a new set of qualification and verification samples were received in February 2014. Analyses of the new samples from this lot indicate the material falls within the specifications required for use at ARP.

5.0 References

1. Specification for Purchase of 15 wt % Monosodium Titanate (MST) for 96-H ARP, Specification No. X-SPP-H-00012, Rev. 6, November 2010.
2. C. Duffey, "MST Qualification and Verification", X-TTR-H-00017, Rev. 0, February 2012.
3. K. M. L. Taylor-Pashow, "Task Technical and Quality Assurance Plan for Monosodium Titanate (MST) Qualification and Verification", SRNL-RP-2012-00094, Rev. 0, March 2012.
4. K. M. L. Taylor-Pashow, "Analysis of Harrell Monosodium Titanate Lot #s 46000706120, 46000722120, and 46000808120", SRNL-STI-2012-00629, Rev. 0, October 2012.

Appendix A. Harrell Weight Percent Solids Procedure

PROCEDURE: WEIGHT PERCENT

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

EQUIPMENT: Oven
Analytical balance
Porcelain crucible

METHOD:

1. Thoroughly clean a porcelain crucible and dry in a 105 °C oven. Cool to room temperature in a desiccator. Weigh crucible and record weight to 0.0001 g.
2. Thoroughly suspend the MST slurry by shaking the sample bottle. Open the bottle and stir with a glass rod to make sure no chunks of MST remain unsuspended. Add approximately 1 g monosodium titanate slurry to crucible and record weight to 0.0001g.
3. Place crucible in 105 °C oven for one hour. Remove from oven and cool to room temperature in desiccator.
4. Weigh dish and record weight to 0.0001g.
5. Place crucible back in oven for 30 minutes, remove to desiccator, cool, and reweigh. Continue until weight percent does not change from one measurement to the next.

CALCULATION:

$$\text{Weight \%} = \frac{(\text{weight dried slurry} - \text{weight dish})}{(\text{weight wet slurry} - \text{weight dish})} \times 100$$

SPECIFICATION: 15 – 17 wt %

Distribution:

S. L. Marra, 773-A
T. B. Brown, 773-A
D. H. McGuire, 999-W
S. D. Fink, 773-A
C. C. Herman, 773-A
E. N. Hoffman, 999-W
F. M. Pennebaker, 773-42A
W. R. Wilmarth, 773-A
Records Administration (EDWS)

C. K. Chiu, 704-30S
B. A. Gifford, 704-56H
M. T. Keefer, 766-H
T. A. Le, 766-H
D. J. Martin, 241-152H
A. R. Shafer, 766-H

P. R. Jackson, DOE-SR, 703-46A
J. A. Crenshaw, DOE-SR, 703-46A

K. M. L. Taylor-Pashow, 773-A
T. C. Shehee, 773-A
T. B. Peters, 773-42A
M. R. Poirier, 773-42A
F. F. Fondeur, 773-A
D. T. Hobbs, 773-A
D. J. McCabe, 773-42A