Florida International University [FIU Digital Commons](https://digitalcommons.fiu.edu/?utm_source=digitalcommons.fiu.edu%2Fetd%2F2390&utm_medium=PDF&utm_campaign=PDFCoverPages)

[FIU Electronic Theses and Dissertations](https://digitalcommons.fiu.edu/etd?utm_source=digitalcommons.fiu.edu%2Fetd%2F2390&utm_medium=PDF&utm_campaign=PDFCoverPages) [University Graduate School](https://digitalcommons.fiu.edu/ugs?utm_source=digitalcommons.fiu.edu%2Fetd%2F2390&utm_medium=PDF&utm_campaign=PDFCoverPages)

8-20-1991

Chemical and evaporative behaviors of synthetic liquid nuclear waste

Donna MacGrath Cline *Florida International University*

DOI: 10.25148/etd.FI14060860 Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.fiu.edu/etd](https://digitalcommons.fiu.edu/etd?utm_source=digitalcommons.fiu.edu%2Fetd%2F2390&utm_medium=PDF&utm_campaign=PDFCoverPages) Part of the [Mechanical Engineering Commons](http://network.bepress.com/hgg/discipline/293?utm_source=digitalcommons.fiu.edu%2Fetd%2F2390&utm_medium=PDF&utm_campaign=PDFCoverPages)

Recommended Citation

Cline, Donna MacGrath, "Chemical and evaporative behaviors of synthetic liquid nuclear waste" (1991). *FIU Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 2390. [https://digitalcommons.fiu.edu/etd/2390](https://digitalcommons.fiu.edu/etd/2390?utm_source=digitalcommons.fiu.edu%2Fetd%2F2390&utm_medium=PDF&utm_campaign=PDFCoverPages)

This work is brought to you for free and open access by the University Graduate School at FIU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in FIU Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of FIU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact dcc@fiu.edu.

ABSTRACT OF THE **THESIS**

Chemical and Evaporative Behaviors of Synthetic Liquid Nuclear Waste

by

DonnaMacGrath Cline Florida International University, **1991** Miami, Florida Dr. M. Ali Ebadian, Major Professor

In the 1960's the Department of Energy at Oak Ridge National Laboratory designed eight 50,000 gallon storage tanks for the liquid nuclear waste. Each tank was designed with its own ventilation system to purge radiolytic hydrogen and oxygen from the tank. This design induced water removal and necessitated the additional requirement ofentraining radioactivity from the exiting system **by** the use of demisters and **HEPA** filters.

Up until the 1980's this was a sufficient method, via the hydrofracture process, of disposing the liquid nuclear waste. However since then, this method has been terminated and the tanks are nearing capacity. In the transfer of the liquid waste to the holding tanks, large amounts of water are used to prevent line clogging and solid build up in the pipes. Utilizing the existing system, this thesis proposes the idea of sparging air into the liquid waste and increasing the tank temperature in order to eliminate excess water. Parameters such as increasing the sparging air temperature, and dehumidifying and eliminating carbon dioxide from the sparging air, are investigated theoretically and experimentally in small scale experiments. In addition, the effects of vapor pressure lowering and its simultaneous effect on the evaporation rate are investigated through the activity coefficient of sodium nitrate, the major component of the liquid waste. Precipitate blockage formations in the sparging tube have also been addressed.

FLORIDA **INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY** Miami, Florida

Chemical and Evaporative Behaviors of Synthetic Liquid Nuclear Waste

A thesis submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science in Mechanical Engineering

by

Donna MacGrath Cline

1991

To Professors Dr. M. Ali Ebadian, Dr. E. Bigzadeh, Dr. W. Kinzy Jones and Dr. T. C. Yih:

This thesis, having been approved in respect to form and mechanical execution, is referred to you for judgement upon its substantial merit.

> Dean Gordon R. Hopkins College of Engineering

The thesis of Donna MacGrath Cline **is** approved.

Dr. M. Ali Ebadian, Major Professor

Dr. E. Bigzadeh

Dr. W. Kinzy Jones

Dr. T. C. Yih

Date of Examination: August 20, 1991

Dean Richard Campbell Division of Graduate Studies

Florida International University, 1991

DEDICATION PAGE

This work is dedicated to my husband, who is my inspiration.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A very special thank you to my parents who allowed me to choose my own paths and who provided never-ending support in all my decisions. I would also like to express my gratitude to my advisor and professor Dr. Ebadian of Mechanical Engineering; whose perseverance and belief in me was more than I had ever dreamed possible. I also want him to know that he has not lost a graduate student, but has guided yet another devoted person into the fulfilling world of engineering. A warm hug goes out to Joi Phelps, my sister-inlaw, who cheered me on and guided me in the organizational process of writing this thesis.

I would also like to take this time to express my respect for Dr. Bigzadeh and thank him for his continual assistance in the experimental work and Dr. Yang whose clarity and expertise helped me visualize the fundamental aspects of my work. Thankyou Mr. Zhang, for your willingness to offer assistance regardless of the situation.

I am also grateful for the caring assistance offered by Helen, Marianne and Ester; who all helped in revising my manuscripts and maintained a smiled at the same time. Thanks Marianne for assisting me in the paperwork necessary to complete this Thesis. And, thank you Helen for sharing your experiences in art and photography with me; your warmth and your philosophies heightened the long working days. Keep up the good work Ester, your energy amazes me.

Finally, I want Grandma to know that her prayers are answered, thank you.

PUBLICATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

TECHNICAL REPORTS

Ebadian, M. A., Bigzadeh, E., Yang, **G.** and MacGrath, **D.** L., "Evaporating Water From the MVSTs for the Purpose of Producing Liquid Concentrate Storage Capacity, Progress Report No. 7," Martin Marietta, Department of Energy, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tennessee (August, **1990)**

Ebadian, M. A., Bigzadeh, E., Yang, **G.** and MacGrath, **D.** L., "Evaporating Water From the MVSTs for the Purpose of Producing Liquid Concentrate Storage Capacity, Progress Report No. 9," Martin Marietta, Department of Energy, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tennessee (January, 1991)

Ebadian, M. A., Bigzadeh, E., Yang, **G.** and MacGrath, **D.** L., "Evaporating Water From the MVSTs for the Purpose of Producing Liquid Concentrate Storage Capacity, Progress Report No. 11," Martin Marietta, Department of Energy, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tennessee (April, 1991)

Ebadian, M. A., Bigzadeh, E., Yang, **G.** and MacGrath, **D.** L., "Evaporating Water From the MVSTs for the Purpose of Producing Liquid Concentrate Storage Capacity," Martin Marietta, Department of Energy, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tennessee (July, 1991)

REFEREED **CONFERENCE AND JOURNALS**

MacGrath, D., Yang, **G.** and M.A. **Ebadian,** "Conjugated **Heat** Transfer **in a Concentric** Annular Pipe" **27th** National Heat *Transfer* Conference and Exposition, *Same* **paper** was **accepted for** publication **by** the **InternationalJournal** of Nuclear Engineering **and** Design.

MacGrath, D., **Yang, G. and** M. **A. Ebadian,** "The **Effects of** Mixed Boundary **Conditions on the** Conjugated **Heat** Transfer **in a Concentric** Annulus," **ASME** Winter Annual **Meeting Atlanta, GE,** December, **1991.** (Accepted **for presentation)** Also submitted **to ASME** Journal **of Heat** Transfer.

Cline, **D., Ebadian,** M. **A., Bigzadeh, E., and G. Yang, "The Effects of the Activity Coefficient on the** Evaporation **of Liquid** Nuclear Waste," *Int.* **Journal of Nuclear Engineering** andDesign **(submitted).**

Ebadian, M. **A, Bigzadeh,** E., **Yang, G. and D. L. Cline,** "Chemical **and** Evaporative **Changes of Synthetic Liquid** Nuclear Waste," *Int.* **Journal of** Nuclear **Engineering andDesign** (submitted).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF **FIGURES**

LIST OF **TABLES**

NOMENCLATURE

Greek Symbols

Subscripts

Chapter **1 INTRODUCTION**

Safe storage of **nuclear** waste **is of** major concern worldwide. **In** the past, hazardous waste has **been** discarded **with** inadequate precautions. This tragic miscalculation carries **over to** today **where** the problems of radioactive waste disposal have **yet to** be **solved.** This **thesis identifies one resourceful** method **of** controlling the liquid nuclear waste dilemma. Nuclear waste **in the** liquid state poses a great threat **due to its** potential **of** seeping **into ground** water supplies.

In **the late 1960's, the** Department **of** Energy **at** Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL) designed **eight 50,000** gallon storage tanks **for low level** radioactive waste. These tanks, the Melton **Valley** Storage Tanks (MVSTs), **were** designed such that **four** tanks **were placed in** two **specially** made **ventilated vaults.** Each tank was **initially** designed with **its own ventilation** system **to** purge radiolytic hydrogen **and** oxygen from **the** tank. The design **induced** water removal from **the** tanks **and** thus imposed **the** additional requirement **of** entraining radioactivity from exiting **by the use of** demisters and HEPA filters.

Up until 1984, the tanks **were** prevented from reaching capacity **by** utilizing the **hydrofracture** process. However, **since** 1984, this process has been terminated and no alternative long-term disposal method **for** liquid radioactive waste has been developed. **Thus, the** problem **at hand is severe.** Oak Ridge National Laboratory produces **26,000** gallons **of** waste per **year and** the tanks are **near** capacity. The idea **of** building additional storage tanks **is** associated **with** geological barriers **and** political harassment. The ideal **solution** would be **to** optimize **the** existing tanks, until **a** permanent disposal method **is** operative.

In **the** transfer **of** the liquid **nuclear** waste to the holding tanks, large amounts of **water are** used **to rinse** out the **solid** build up **and** prevent line clogging. Consequently, the

concentrationof the various nuclear waste constituents are not near their saturation limits. It has been proposed by the principal investigator, Dr. Ebadian, that sparging air be utilized to evaporate the excess water from the holding tanks. As a result, the liquid waste would be minimized and could potentially be stored as conventional solid nuclear waste. Furthermore, the storage capacity of the existing tanks would be increased and fully utilized.

Evaporation of liquid waste from the MVSTs is one method that will be implemented to reduce the volume of the liquid waste stored until a permanent disposal site is in operation. In-tank evaporation of liquid waste will be accomplished by introducing **100** scfm of air into the existing sparged system. The air is sparged into the tank, absorbed by the liquid and is discharged at the top of the tank through a 0.6-in. diameter off-gas pipe. The saturated effluent air is passed through roughing filters, HEPA filters, demisters, and finally discharged from a 12-ft exhaust stack. The desired rate of evaporation from the tanks is a minimum of **26,000** gallons per year of liquid waste **by** means of five sparger pipes located in each tank.

Before implementing this proposed evaporation process, bench scale tests must be performed to foresee any problems that may occur and to characterize the evaporative and chemical behavior of this surrogate waste. A non-radioactive surrogate solution, Table I, has been provided **by** the Chemical and Technology Division of Oak Ridge National Laboratory based on the analysis of one of the holding tanks.

2

TABLE 1

Composition of the Liquid Synthetic Nuclear Waste

The focus of this thesis is to design, evaluate and optimize the bench **top** models. Factors such as activity coefficient, solution pH, temperature, crystallization and sparging air humidity will be used to characterize the evaporation rate in the total analysis.

The final phase of this thesis report **is to test** the mathematical modeling results developed by **Dr.** Bigzadeh **and** Dr. Yang **with** the large scale similitude model. The similitude model has been constructed based **on** the dimensions **of** the actual existing tanks **at** Oak Ridge National Laboratory. However, there **is one** discrepancy, the mathematical modeling **is** based on the properties of pure **water.** Thus, **an** additional purpose of this study is to identify which parameters require modification **in** the mathematical modeling.

Chapter 2 EXPERIMENTAL **APPARATUS AND** PROCEDURE

A. Introduction

The Chemical and Technology Division of Oak Ridge National Laboratory provided the composition of the liquid synthetic nuclear waste, **(SNW),** as presented in Table I of Chapter 1. The chemical and evaporative behavior of **SNW** is characterized **by** running, simultaneously, three experimental samples: (i.) **SNW** unfiltered, (ii.) Deionized H₂O and (iii.) SNW supernatant. Three controlling parameters are investigated: sparging air temperature, T_3 , liquid temperature, T_5 , and sparging air humidity, ϕ . The subscript 3 deontes sparging air and the subscript 5 denotes the liquid temperature. This notation will be demontrated in the figures and throughout this report .

The deionized water, as an experimental sample, serves as a "control" since it has known properties. In addition, the water sample provides a direct observation of the effects of increasing salt concentration on the evaporation rate. The choice of filtering, **(SNW** supernatant), or not filtering, (SNW unfiltered), the solution was chosen out of curiosity. Vapor pressure lowering, a major controlling parameter on the evaporation rate, is dependent only on the concentration of that which is in solution. Thus, an initial assumption was drawn that the insolubles had no effect on the evaporation rate.

Two series of experiments will be described in the following paragraphs. Essentially the procedures are the same for both experiments; however, experience improved the experimental setup for the second series of experiments. The first series of experiments consisted of comparing the evaporative behaviors between the liquid temperatures of **50** and 90'F. These temperatures reflect the MVSTs temperature ranges. Fifty degree fahreneit is the minimum temperature of the soil in the winter months wheras 90'F is the maximum allowed temperature of the liquid nuclear waste as set by the Department of Energy. In addition, the sparging air humidity was varied in the first series of experiments. The second experiment varied both the liquid temperature and the sparging air temperature. The liquid temperature was varied between *70* and **90F** and the sparging air temperature was varied between ambient condition and *125'F.* These two experiments will be referred to as the 50-90'F Experiment and the 70-90'F Experiment, respectively.

B. Experimental Setup

$i.50-90$ F Experiment

Each of the experimental samples in the 50-9O'F Experiment had an individual pump which provided a flow rate of **0.0375** scfm at ambient condition. This sparging air is carried through Teflon tubing to the Boriscillicate glass sparging tube. The sparging tube is un-supported, i.e., it is simply placed inside the graduated cylinder. A procedure improved in the second experiment. The initial volume of each experimental sample was 50 ml's in a **100** ml graduated cylinder. The solution sparging containers were not completely immersed in the water bath, therefore, they did not have a uniform wall temperature. This effects the temperature of the air above the solution which has a direct effect on the evaporation rate. Again, this has been corrected in the succeeding experiment.

Two sparging air humidities were observed, ambient condition, ϕ_1 = 70%, and bone dry sparging air, $\phi_3 = 9\%$. The bone dry sparging air condition was obtained by sparging the air through sodium hydroxide pellets prior to entering the liquid. As a result, this experimental sample exhibited a lower volume flow rate of **0.0205** scfm and a lower relative humidity ratio of **9%.**

ii. 70-90°F Experiment

Figure 1 illustrates the set-up of the 70-90'F Experiment. The sparging air is generated **by** a small compressor, after which, the temperature of the air is regulated. The higher sparging air temperature is obtained **by** wrapping Thermolyne heating tape around a 2 inch steel pipe. This temperature-controlled air is then divided into three separate flows. Each flow is individually controlled **by** flow meters meters providing flow rates of **9** scfh, or **0.150** scfm. The air is then directed towards the three graduated cylinders containing the experimental liquid samples. These cylinders are completely immersed in a recirculating water bath to provide a constant wall temperature throughout the cylinder. The air is sparged through the liquid with the aid of a long Boroscilllicate sparging tube **held** by **a** rubber stopper **and placed** 1 **in.** above the bottom surface. The effluent air **is** released through **a** smaller tube **located just** above the surface of the **water** bath. **The initial** volume **for** each **of** the experimental samples **is 70 ml's.**

Figure 1. Test apparatus with sparging system.

C. Experimental Procedure

The system, **a 100** ml graduated cylinder and **its** solution, **is** weighed before and **after** adding **the** solution. Thus, the initial weight **of** the solution **is** known prior **to the** sparging procedure. The temperature **of** the water bath **and** the sparging air are **preset.** Once **the** experimental samples **are** brought **to the** temperature of the water bath, the sparging procedure begins.

The duration **of the** experiment **is approximiately** eight hours. Measurements **of pH,** weight **and** volume **loss of solution,** temperature **of** the solution, and **the** temperature **of the sparging and** effluent **air are** recorded **every hour.** The weight **loss of** the **solution is** obtained **by** weighing **the** system **on a** Mettler **balance.** The rubber stopper **and** sparging **tube are** removed, **the cylinder is** quickly dried, **placed on the** balance, and weighed. At **this** same time, the volume **of** the **solution is** recorded. This procedure takes **less** than **one minute to** perform. **All of the** controlling temperatures **are automatically recorded** with thermocouples attached **to** a strip **controller.**

An unexpected complication **of** the **sparging** procedure was the clogging **of** the **sparging** tube. **The solution** appeared **to** flux **into the outlet of** the **sparging** tube, **collect,** and ultimately **halt the sparging** process. These precipitate blockages were removed from **the sparging** tube **and** saved **for** compositional analysis **on** the X-ray diffractometer and scanning **electron** microscope, **(SEM).**

8

Chapter **3 RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS**

A. LIQUID TEMPERATURE

I. Introduction

Increasing the liquid temperature undoubtedly increases the rate of evaporation. In addition, a higher liquid temperature increases the solubility of electrolytes which also enhances the evaporation rate. However, an inverse effect occurs when both the liquid temperature is at **50F** and the sparging air is at ambient condition. In this case, there is a net condensation of liquid.

One of the factors which prevents the achievement of a high evaporation rate is the process of the sparging air and effluent air condensating back into the solution. One means of preventing the condensation process is to heat the liquid temperature in the tank. The increased temperature of the liquid simultaneously increases the temperature of the air above the liquid in the tank and of the effluent air.

II. Discussion of Results

i. 50-90°F Experiment

There exists extremely different evaporative behaviors between the liquid temperatures of 50'F, Table II, and 90'F, Table III. In general, ambient condition air sparged into a liquid at a temperature of 50° F undergoes a condensation process, shown in Table II as a negative number. However, at a liquid temperature of 90'F there is a net evaporation for all three liquids.

TABLE II

Evaporative/Condensation Behavior at T $_5 = 50$ °F

TABLE III

Evaporative Behavior at $T_5 = 90$ °F

Ambient condition air, $T_3 = 73.5$ °F and $\phi_3 = 70\%$, sparged into a liquid at a temperature of 50"F undergoes condensation. **This** condensation effect was observed for the deionized water and both SNW unfiltered and supernatant. A net weight gain of approximately **1** gram was measured during the 9 hours of sparging for all three liquids, as

demonstrated **in Table II.** The condensation behavior **is** predicted **for water** upon analyzing the thermodynamic tables. **According to** the psychometric chart, Appendix **B,** the moisture in the sparging air with a humidity ratio, $\phi_3 = 70\%$, and at a temperature, $T_3 = 73.5$ °F, condenses at temperatures lower than 61.7'F. During **the** introduction of the sparging air into **the** liquid **its** temperature drops below 61.7F because of the lower temperature of the liquid, 5OF. However, by changing the temperature **of** the liquid to 90F, there **is** a net evaporation **for all three liquids,** as demonstrated in **Table II.** A comparison **of** the evaporation rates **at** these two temperatures **for the** three liquids are demonstrated **in** Figs. 2, 3 and 4.

Figure 2. Cumulative evaporation/condensation(-) of SNW supernatant as a function of T₅.

Figure 3. Cumulative evaporation/condensation(-) of deionized H_2O as a function of T_5 .

Figure 4. Cumulative evaporation/condensation(-) of SNW unfiltered as a function of T_5 .

An interesting observation is the linear tendencies of the evaporation with sparging time at T_5 = 90°F for deionized water as expressed in Fig. 3. Whereas, in Figs. 2 and 4, for the **SNW** supernatant and unfiltered, the evaporation initially appears linear but levels out after several hours. This tendency of the **SNW** is dependent on the concentration of the solution. As the solution becomes more concentrated the vapor pressure is simultaneously lowered and the rate of evaporation is decreased.

Figure 5 demonstrates a comparison of the evaporation rate of the three liquids at temperatures of 50 and 90°F. Figure 5.A. establishes that at a liquid temperature of $T₅$ = 5OF there is no evaporation, only condensation occurs. However, as shown in Fig. 5.B., at T_5 = 90°F evaporation occurs. In Fig. 5.B., deionized water exhibits the highest rate of evaporation.

A. Liquid temperature, $T_5 = 50$ °F

Figure 5. Effects of liquid temperature on the evaporation rate.

ii. 70-90°F Experiment

Tables IV and V illustrate the cumulative evaporation of the three different liquids versus air sparging time when the sparging air temperature is at ambient condition, T_3 = 73.5'F. Table IV shows the evaporation behavior at a liquid temperature of **70'F** and in Table V, **90F.**

TABLE IV

Evaporation Behavior at $T_5 = 70$ °F

TABLE V

Evaporative Behavior at $T_5 = 90$ °F

An immediate observation is the great influence the liquid temperature has on the evaporation **rate.** The sample **deionized** water has the greatest rate **of** evaporation **in** comparison **to the** other liquids regardless of the liquid temperature, T,. A liquid temperature increase of 20'F, from 70 to 90'F, increases the amount of evaporation by two orders **of** magnitude **for all** the liquids. **In** addition, **note** the **linear** rate **of** evaporation of **the deionized** water sample. These same **results,** although **at a** much lower volume flow rate, were observed **in** the 50-90'F Experiment. Figures 6.A and 6.B. illustrate the results of Tables IV and V, respectively.

Figure 6. Effects of liquid temperature on the evaporation rate.

B. SPARGING AIR TEMPERATURE

I. Introduction

The effect **of the sparging** air temperature on the evaporation process was peculiar. **Initially it** was thought **that** the higher sparging **air** temperature would inhibit **the** effect of the effluent **air condensating** and thus provide a greater evaporation rate. **However, it** appears **that a** liquid temperature **lower** than the **initial sparging air** temperature created an inverse **effect. Infact,** the **sparging** pipe, which **is at** the temperature **of** the liquid, **acts** much like aheat exchanger.

II. Discussion of Results

Theoretically, evaporation **should** increase as **the sparging air** temperature increases. However, the **results for the** samples **deionized** water, SNW supernatant, and SNW unfiltered, **show that sparging air** temperature has **a** negligible **effect on** the evaporation rate. **Tables VI and VII** demonstrate **the effects** between sparging **air** temperatures of $T_3 = 73.5$ °F and $T_3 = 125$ °F at a liquid temperature of $T_5 = 70$ °F on the evaporation rate. **Table VIII and** IX illustrate the respective sparging **air** temperatures **at** the liquid temperature, $T_5 = 90^\circ F$. An immediate observation is the negligible effect the **sparging air** temperature has **on the** evaporation rate.
TABLE VI

Evaporation Behavior at $T_3 = 73.5$ °F and $T_5 = 70$ °F

TABLE VII

Evaporation Behavior at $T_3 = 125$ °F and $T_5 = 70$ °F

Figure 7. Effects of sparging air temperature on the evaporation rate at $T_s = 70$ °F.

TABLE VIII

Evaporation Behavior at $T_3 = 73.5$ °F and $T_5 = 90$ °F

TABLE IX

Evaporation Behavior at $T_3 = 125$ °F and $T_5 = 90$ °F

Figure 8. Effects of sparging air temperature on the evaporation rate at $T_5 = 90$ °F.

The negligible **effect of sparging air** temperature on the evaporation rate may be observed **by** examining the **path of** the **sparging** air as **it** enters **and** travels through the sparging pipe. The **sparging** pipe **is** immersed **in the** liquid and has the same temperature **of** the liquid, **15.** Thus, the pipe has a lower temperature than the sparging **air.** The pipe may be described as acting as **a heat** exchanger **for** the sparging air. **By** the time the sparging **air** has traveled the length **of** the sparging pipe and **is** released into the solution, **it** has reached **the** same temperature as the liquid. To summarize, regardless **of the initial** temperature chosen **for the sparging air, by** the time **the air** enters the solution, **it** has the same temperature as **the** liquid. This **is one** explanation **for the** negligible **effect of** sparging **air** temperature **on** the evaporation.

Figures 9 **through 11** sum up the **difference** between the liquid temperatures **of 70** and 900F **and sparging air** temperatures **of 73.5** and **125'F for** the three different liquids. These figures **also** demonstrate that the **lower sparging air** temperature of **73.5 results in a slightly** higher evaporation rate **than** that **of** 90'F. **In** addition **to** the pipe acting as **a** heat exchanger, the **lower** evaporation rate with **the** higher sparging **air** temperature **is also** attributed **to the** decreasing mass flow rate **with** increasing **air** temperature. When the sparging **air** has **a** higher temperature, the volume flow rate must be increased such that the mass flow rate **is** invariant **with** temperature. The increased temperature lowers the density of **the air.** Calculations were performed, and based **on** the temperature **of** the sparging air, the volume flow rate was adjusted.

Additional experimental **error can** be attributed **to the fact** that each experimental procedure was performed on different days; thus, the ambient temperature and **relative** humidity were fluctuating **with** each experiment.

23

Figure 9. Cumulative evaporation of SNW supernatant as a function of T_3 and T_5 .

Figure 10. Cumulative evaporation of deionized H_2^0 as a function of T_3 and T_5 .

Figure 11. Cumulative evaporation of SNW unfiltered as a function of T_3 and T_5 .

 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$ ϵ

C. SOLUTION PH

I. Introduction

The acidity or basicity of water is expressed as the concentration of free hydrogen or hydroxyl ions in solution. The equilibrium concentrations of hydrogen ions $[H^+]$ in aqueous solutions are expressed in terms of pH. The pH is defined as the negative log of the hydrogen ion activity:

$$
pH = -\log\left[a_{H^+}\right] \tag{1}
$$

The presence of $CO₂$ in the sparging air causes a very basic solution to become neutral in pH. This lowering of the pH occurs with $CO₂$ acting as the catalyst and causing NaCO₂'s to precipitate out of solution. Thus, as will be presented in this chapter, by eliminating $CO₂$ from the sparging line prior to entering the solution caused the solution pH to remain invariant with time.

I. Discussion of Results

As presented in Table X, solution pH dropped approximately 2 points in **9** hours for all the experimental samples, except when the sparging air was bone-dry, $\phi_3 = 9\%$. The solution **pH** was monitored with a Hanna portable pH meter. This pH meter features a digitized readout and has automatic temperature compensation.

TABLE X

Solution pH Behavior at $T_5 = 50$ ^tF

During the sparging procedure, crystallization occurred along the edges of the glass beaker and on the sparging tube above the surface of the solution. The pH of this formed crystal, when diluted with a drop of deionized water, was found to be basic at a pH of 12.0. Figures 12 indicates that when ϕ_3 = 70% the pH decreases as the sparging time increases. The decreasing pH of the chemical solution can be partially explained by the precipitates occurring above the surface of the solution and along the edges of the glass. However, even though the crystallization that was appearing along the edges of the glass were the same color as the solution, it was a grainy, opaque, white crystal that persisted to clog the sparging tube.

Unfiltered SNW, sparged with bone dry air, ϕ_3 = 9%, exhibited a relatively constant pH. The means of obtaining this bone-dry air condition needs explanation in order to understand this constant pH behavior. The bone-dry air was obtained by sparging the air through NaGH pellets prior to entering the solution. Sparging the air through sodium hydroxide pellets not only removes moisture from the sparging air; it also

Figure 12. Changing pH with sparging time.

precipitates out CO₂, in the form of NaCO₂, from the sparging air. Eliminating CO₂ from the sparging **air** prohibited **the** change **in** pH **of** the SNW unfiltered.

In the case of the other experimental samples, sparged with ambient air, $\phi_3 = 70\%$, the presence of **CO2** in the **sparging line caused** the pH of the **solution to** decrease. Carbon dioxide is **a** Lewis acid that **reacts with any** Lewis base, which **in** this case **is** a hydroxyl **ion** (OH⁻), (Brown and LeMay, 1981). By definition, Lewis acids accept an electron pairs **whereas** Lewis bases donate **electron** pairs.

The prescence of CO₂ in the sparging line creates a simultaneous two step process:

(i.) Hydroxyls, 0H~, **are** removed from the solution,

$$
CO_{2(g)} + OH_{(aq)} \rightarrow CO_3{}_{(aq)}^{2} + HCO_3{}_{(aq)} \tag{2}
$$

producing excess CO_3^2 $_{(aq)}^2$ and HCO_3 $_{(aq)}^2$.

(ii.) These forms of carbonate react with Na to precipitate Na₂CO₃ and NaHCO₃ out of solution

(a.)
$$
CO_3^{-2}_{(aq)} + 2Na_{(aq)}^{+} \rightarrow Na_2CO_{3(s)}
$$
 (3)

(b.)
$$
\text{HCO}_{3 \text{ (aq)}} + \text{Na}^+_{\text{ (aq)}} \rightarrow \text{NaHCO}_{3 \text{(s)}}
$$
. (4)

To summarize, the **bone** dry **sparging air** was obtained **by sparging** the **air** through soddium hydroxide pellets. Thus, **this bone** dry **air** has **two** characteristics, a sparging **air relative humidity of** $\phi_3 = 9$ **% and no** CO_2 **in the sparging air. The elimination of** CO_2 **from** the sparging air, prior to entering the solution, prevented the precipitation of the NaCO₂'s. This was observed by **the invariance of** the solution pH with **sparging** time. However, sparging the liquid **with** ambient condition sparging **air caused** a decrease **in the solution pH.**

D. SPARGING AIR HUMIDITY

I. Introduction

The water-vapor content **of** the **sparging and** effluent air **is an** important parameter in **the** evaporation **process.** Attention should be drawn to the terms used **to describe the** water-vapor mixture. The changes **in** enthalpy **of** the **water** vapor **are** found from the steam tables **whereas** the ideal-gas **relations are** applied to the air.

The relative humidity, ϕ , is defined as the ratio of the actual mass of vapor to the mass of vapor required **to** produce **a** saturated mixture at the same temperature. If the **vapor** is at the saturation pressure and temperature, $\phi = 100\%$, the mixture is refered to as a saturated mixture. **The** two **relative** humidities observed **in** this experiment **are** ambient condition sparging air, $\phi_3 = 70\%$, and "bone-dry" sparging air, $\phi_3 = 9\%$. An OMEGA **HX-550 relative** humidity transmitter was **used to** monitor **the relative** humidity. This **instrument,using a thin** film **plymer** capacitor, provided linearized and temperature compensated **relative** humidity **output.**

Assuming the vapor behaves like an ideal gas, ϕ reduces to the ratio of the partial **pressure of the existing vapor,** P_v **, to the saturation pressure of the vapor at the same** temperature, P_g,

$$
\phi = \frac{m_{v}}{m_{sat}} = \frac{\frac{P_{v}V}{R_{v}T}}{\frac{P_{g}V}{R_{v}T}} = \frac{P_{v}}{P_{g}} \quad .
$$
\n(5)

The specific humidity, or humidity ratio, ω , of an air-water vapor mixture is defined as the ratio of the mass **of water** vapor, **m.,** to the mass of dry **air, ma,**

$$
\omega = \frac{m_v}{m_a} \tag{6}
$$

which for and ideal air-water **vapor** mixture reduces **to,**

$$
\omega = \frac{m_{\upsilon}}{m_{a}} = \frac{P_{\upsilon}V}{\frac{P_{a}V}{R_{a}T}} = \frac{P_{\upsilon}R_{a}}{R_{\upsilon}P_{a}} = \frac{M_{\upsilon}P_{\upsilon}}{M_{a}P_{a}} = 0.622 \frac{P_{\upsilon}}{P_{a}}
$$
(7)

where the subscript **a refers to the** gas, **exclusive** of the vapor.

For an air-water vapor mixture, **the** relation between the relative humidity, **I,** and the humidity ratio, ω , can be found by combing Eqs. (5) and (7):

$$
\phi = \frac{\omega P_a}{0.622 P_g} \tag{8}
$$

I. Discussion of Results

Tables **XI and XII** demonstrate **the effects of two** sparging **air relative** humidities, **4** = 70% and *9%,* **on the evaporation** process. **In Table XI** the liquid temperature **is at** *50'F* and **Table** XII demonstrates **a** liquid temperature **of** 90'F. An interesting observation was **the net** increase **in** mass, **i.e.** condensation, **of** the SNW **unfiltered solution at a** liquid temperature, $T_s = 50$ °F, sparged with ambient condition air. This condensation effect is denoted **by the** negative number as shown **in** Table **X.** The sparging **air** experiences **a** decrease **in** temperature as **it enters a liquid** temperature **of** 5O'. Moisture **in** the sparging **air,** with a **relative** humidity of 70% **and a** temperature of *73.5'F,* condenses **for all** temperatures lower than its corresponding dew point of 64.0°F, with $P_g = 0.4280$ lbf/in². It **is our** assumption **that the** lowering temperature change **of** the sparging **air** as **it** enters **into** the lower temperature **solution induces** condensation **to** occur along the inside the sparging tube. This would **also explain the nonclogging effects** of the sparging tube **for** the lower liquid temperature of 50°F. However, for bone-dry sparging air, ϕ_3 = 9%, the inverse condition occurs, whereby **6.2** grams are evaporated **in** the 9 hours **of sparging** time.

TABLE XI

The Effects of Sparging Air Humidity on SNW Unfiltered at $T_5 = 50$ ^oF

TABLE XII

The Effects of Sparging Air Humidity on SNW Unfiltered at $T_5 = 90$ °F

Irrespective of the sparging air humidity, evaporation occurs with a liquid temperature, $T_5 = 90$ °F. In addition, a relative humidity, $\phi_3 = 9\%$, demonstrates the

greatest evaporation holding liquid temperature constant. Recall in the last chapter that the bone-dry sparging air was obtained by sparging the air through sodium hydroxide pellets. Thus, this sparging air has not only been dried but is also void of $CO₂$. The elimination of $CO₂$ in the sparging line, prevented the pH of the solution from decreasing. Figure 13 demonstrates the results of Tables XI and XII.

Figure 13. Effects of sparging air humidity on the evaporation rate.

E. ACTIVITY **COEFFICIENT**

I. Introduction

The composition of the liquid synthetic nuclear waste, **SNW,** is presented in Table 1 of Chapter 1. The thermodynamic properties of mixed electrolytes at various concentrations and their effect on the evaporation rate are the concerns of this section. The activity coefficient is introduced to characterize these thermodynamic behaviors. The activity is an "effective concentration" of the ions in an electrolyte solution.

Thus, in order to explain the behavior of electrolyte solutions it is necessary to know the thermodynamic activity, a_i , rather than the total concentration or molality of the ionic components. Activity and concentration of an ionic component are related **by** the introduction of the activity coefficient, y_i , where,

$$
a_i = \gamma_i \ m_i \tag{9}
$$

and m_i is the molality of the ionic component i. The activity coefficient, γ_i , may be described as a type of correction factor for the ions in order to express their thermodynamic effects, such as vapor pressure lowering, **by** the familiar laws of perfect solutes. This is attributed to the non-ideal behavior of the solute due to the ionic interactions of the solution.

When ionic crystals dissolve, the solution consists of a distribution of positive and negative ions. This charged environment has many effects on the anions and cations in an electrolyte solution. A particular ion, in its desire to form an ionic atmosphere, attracts ions of opposite charge. This charged atmosphere makes it less probable for the ions to take part in reactions. In such a solution, there is a greater degree of dissociation prevalent, and as a result, a greater degree of solubility. That is, their activities become less than their molarities, corresponding to a fractional value of γ_i or a negative value of ln γ_i . Thus, instead of speaking in terms of the concentration of the ions it is more significant to speak in terms of their activities.

To summarize, the activity coefficient can be thought of as a quantitative measure of the effectiveness of an ion in influencing its equilibrium environment. For a very dilute solution, this effectiveness becomes a constant, $\gamma_i = 1.0$, and a_i and m_i are equivalent. As the ionic strength increases, the ion becomes less effective and γ_i decreases.

The earliest model used to estimate the activity coefficients of ions were based on the Debye-Hiickel model. The activity coefficient for an ion i is given by (Millero, **1978):**

$$
\ln \gamma_{i} = A I^{0.5} / (1 + F \alpha_{i} I^{0.5}) + G_{i} \quad , \tag{10}
$$

where A and F are Debye-Hückel constants, α is the ion size parameter, G_i is a specific interaction coefficient related to cation-anion interactions and a strong function of ionic strength, I where,

$$
I = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i} m_i Z_i^2
$$
 (11)

and Z_i is the charge of the ion.

The magnitude of the activity coefficient is strongly dependent upon the ionic strength of a solution. It is apparent that the ionic strength of an electrolyte solution, made up of singly charged ions, is simply the sum of the molarities of the salts present. However, for multiply charged ions, the ionic strength is much greater than the formal concentration. The limitation of the Debye-Hiickel approach is its inability to calculate activity coefficients of ionic strength greater than 0.3 molal.

In the next sections, two very different models will be presented to describe the activity coefficient. One model uses the methods ofMeissner and Tester **(1972)** and Kusik and Meissner (1973) to determine the thermodynamic properties of the surrogate solution. This method assumes a pure solution of $NaNO₃$ and ignores the effects of any other electrolytes. Another model is based on the method of Pitzer(1974), commonly referred to as the Pitzer equations. **The** Pitzer equations are significant **for** determining the activity of an electrolyte in a *mixed* electrolyte solution.

I. Development of Equations According to Meissner and Tester **(1972)**

Meissner and Tester (1972) presented a simple graphical method for representing **the** activity **coefficient of pure,** strong electrolytes **in** an aqueous solution, applicable from low concentrations to saturated solutions. To use this method a value for y_i must be known **at a** concentration above the application **of** the Debye-Hickel equation, **i.e.** above **0.03** molal.

In the following methodology, **extensive use is** made **of** the term **F, where**

$$
\Gamma = \gamma_i^{-1/2 + Z} \tag{12}
$$

Here, **Z+** and Z.. **are the** charges **on** the **cations** and **anions.** Notice **that for a 1-1** electrolyte such as NaNO₃ $Z_+ = Z_- = 1$ and $\Gamma = \gamma_i$. Thus, in the remaining paragraphs of this section **yj will** replace F. Concentrations **are** expressed as **p,** the **ionic** strength, **where for a** pure electrolyte **solution, is defined** as

$$
\mu = 0.5 \text{ m } (\nu_{+}z_{+}^{2} + \nu_{-}z_{-}^{2}), \tag{13}
$$

where m is the molality and v_+ and v_+ are the moles of the cations and anion, respectively, formed upon complete dissociation **of 1** mole **of** electrolyte. Again, **for a 1-1** electrolyte **p** is equivalent to m **and** will therefore be represented as such **in** the succeeding paragraphs **of** this section.

As presented **in** Figs. **14** and *15,* the **ionic** strength, **p, or** in this case m, **is** the abscissa and $\log \Gamma$, or $\log \gamma_i$, is the ordinate. All the curves converge at low molality and terminate at **avalue** of **yi ,** equal to unity when m **is** zero. Figure **14 is** best utilized **for** ionic strengths greater than 2; while Fig. *15* **is** implemented **for** ionic strengths ranging from **0.1**

to 2.0. In order to use these curves, a value of y_i at a molality, m, value greater than the Debye-Hückel approximationmust be known. The values of log y_i and m intersect on a curve; **after** which one extrapolates to the molality in question.

Following this methodology, the activity coefficients for sodium nitrate at various concentrations **are** obtained **in Table** XIII.

TABLE XIII

Activity Coefficients of NaNO₃ Derived From Mesissner and Tester(1972)

Molality, m moles ⁷ kg	$log_{10}\gamma_i$	Y_i
	-0.26	0.550
2	-0.32	0.479
3	-0.36	0.432
4	-0.40	0.398
٢	-0.42	0.380
6	-0.44	0.363
	-0.47	0.339
8	-0.49	0.324

Figure 14. Activities of water for aqueous solutions of pure electrolytes at ionic trengths of 2.0 to 20.0 molal.

Figure 15. Plot of Γ versus μ over an ionic strength range of 0.1 to 2.0 molal.

Il. Development of Equations According to Pitzer and Kim (1974)

The unique characteristic of the Pitzer equation's are that they determine the mean activity coefficients of both individual ions and the electrolytes in a mixed aqueous solution. The Pitzer method is unlike that of Meissner and Tester since their method is only valid for pure solutions of one electrolyte.

Pitzer and Kim (1974) improved the Debye-Hiickel ion distribution function **by** observing the dependence of short range forces between ion pairs, i.e, the second viral coefficients dependence on the ionic strength. The Pitzer and Kim equations, an extension of the Debye-Hückel method, accurately calculates γ_i to ionic strengths greater than four molal (Millero, 1982):

$$
\ln \gamma_{i} = D.H. + \sum_{j} B_{ij} m_{j} + \sum_{jk} C_{ijk} m_{jk}
$$
 (14)

This equation has the unique ability of estimating the activity coefficients of specific ions: a) in mixed electrolyte solution and b) for ionic strengths greater than 4 molal.

The following equations pertain to *mixed* electrolyte solutions of *high* ionic strengths. In the simplest form, the activity coefficient of a cation N and anion X are given by:

$$
\ln \gamma_{N} = Z_{N}^{2} f^{\gamma} \sum_{a} m_{a} (B_{Na} + E C_{Na}) + Z_{N}^{2} \sum_{a} \sum_{m_{c}} m_{a} B'_{ca}
$$

+ $Z_{N} \sum_{a} \sum_{m_{c}} m_{a} C_{ca}$ (15)

$$
\ln \gamma_{X} = Z_{X}^{2} f^{\gamma} \sum_{a} m_{a} (B_{Xa} + E C_{Xa}) + Z_{X}^{2} \sum_{a} \sum_{a} m_{c} m_{a} B'_{ca}
$$

+ $Z_{X} \sum_{c} \sum_{a} m_{c} m_{a} C_{ca}$ (16)

where Z_i is the charge of the ion, m_i is the molality of the cation(c) and anion(a) in the mixed solution. The equivalent molality, E, is given by:

$$
E = \sum_{c} |Z_c| m_c = \sum_{a} |Z_a| m_a = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i} |Z_i| m
$$
 (17)

The function, f^{γ} , depends on the ionic strength, I, and represents the long-range effects of Coulomb forces, where (Pitzer and Kim, 1974):

$$
f^{\gamma} = -0.392 \left[\frac{I^{0.5}}{1 + 1.2 I^{0.5}} + \frac{2}{1.2} \ln \left(1 + 1.2 I^{0.5} \right) \right] \tag{18}
$$

The second and third viral coefficients are given **by:**

$$
B_{NX} = \beta_{NX}^{o} + \frac{\beta_{NX}^{1}}{2I} \left\{ 1 - (1 + 2I^{-0.5}) \exp(-2I^{0.5}) \right\}
$$
 (19)

$$
B'_{NX} = \frac{\beta_{NX}^1}{2I^2} \left\{ -1 + \left(1 + 2I^{-0.5} + 2I \right) \exp(-2I^{0.5}) \right\}
$$
 (20)

$$
C_{\text{NX}} = \zeta_{\text{NX}}^{\phi} \left(2 \left| Z_{\text{N}} \, Z_{\text{X}} \right|^{-0.5} \right) \tag{21}
$$

Tabulations of β_{NX}^o , β_{NX}^1 , and ζ_{NX}^{ϕ} are presented below in Tables XIV, XV, and XVI

(Pitzer,1973 and Pitzer,1979) for the ions of interest in this system.

TABLE XIV

Values of β (0)

TABLE XV

Values of β ⁽¹⁾

TABLE XVI

Values of ζ (ϕ)

The complexity of the Pitzer equation's in determining the activity coefficient is presented below for cesium:

$$
\ln \gamma_{Cs} = Z_{Cs}^2 f'' + 2 \left\{ m_{Cl} (B_{CSCl} + E_{CSCl}) + m_{NO_3} (B_{CsNO_3} + E_{CSNO_3}) \right\} \n+ m_{OH} (B_{CSOH} + E_{CSOH}) + Z_{Cs}^2 \left\{ m_{Cs} m_{Cl} B_{CSCl}^1 + \n+ m_{Cs} m_{NO_3} B_{CSNO_3}^1 + m_{Cs} m_{OH} B_{CSOH}^1 + m_{K} m_{Cl} B_{KCl}^1 \n+ m_{K} m_{NO_3} B_{KNO_3}^1 + m_{K} m_{OH} B_{KOH}^1 + m_{Na} m_{Cl} B_{NaCl}^1 \n+ m_{Na} m_{NO_3} B_{NaNO_3}^1 + m_{Na} m_{OH} B_{NaOH}^1 \n+ m_{Sr} m_{Cl} B_{SrCl_2}^1 + m_{Sr} m_{NO_3} B_{Sr[NO_3]_2}^1 + m_{Sr} m_{OH} B_{Sr[OH]_2}^1 \right\} (22) \n+ Z_{Cs} \left\{ m_{Cs} m_{Cl} C_{CSCl} + m_{Cs} m_{NO_3} C_{CsNO_3} \n+ m_{Cs} m_{OH} C_{CSOH} + m_{K} m_{Cl} C_{KCl} + m_{K} m_{NO_3} C_{KNO_3} \n+ m_{K} m_{OH} C_{KOH} + m_{Na} m_{Cl} C_{NaCl} + m_{Na} m_{NO_3} C_{NaNO_3} \n+ m_{Na} m_{OH} C_{NaOH} + m_{Sr} m_{Cl} C_{SrCl_2} + m_{Sr} m_{NO_3} C_{Si[NO_3]_2} \n+ m_{Sr} m_{OH} C_{Si[OH]_2} \right\}
$$

For activity coefficients in the mixed electrolyte solution, additional terms related to the short range interaction of ions of like charge and triplet interactions are included. The equations in ionic form are:

$$
\ln \gamma_{N} = Z_{N}^{2} f^{\gamma} \sum_{a} m_{a} (B_{Na} + E C_{Na}) + Z_{N}^{2} \sum_{a} \sum_{m_{c}} m_{a} m_{a} B_{ca} + Z_{N} \sum_{a} \sum_{a} m_{c} m_{a} C_{ca} + \sum_{a} m_{c} (2\theta_{Nc} + \sum_{a} m_{a} \Psi_{Nac}) + \sum_{c} \sum_{a} m_{a} m_{a'} \Psi_{aa'M}
$$
\n(23)

$$
\ln \gamma_{X} = Z_{X}^{2} f^{\gamma} \sum_{a} m_{a} (B_{Xa} + E C_{Xa}) + Z_{X}^{2} \sum_{a} \sum_{m_{c}} m_{c} m_{a} B'_{ca}
$$

+ $Z_{X} \sum_{c} \sum_{a} m_{c} m_{a} C_{ca} + \sum_{a} m_{a} (2\theta_{Xa} + \sum_{c} m_{c} \Psi_{Xac})$
+ $\sum_{c} \sum_{c} m_{c} m_{c'} \Psi_{cc'X}$ (24)

The term, θ_{ij} is related to the interaction of ions and is dependent on the ionic strength. Whereas, Ψ_{ijk} is related to the triple ionic interaction of two similarly charged ions with an ion of opposite charge. Values of θ_{ij} and Ψ_{ijk} for the components of interest in this system **are presented** in Table XVII, (Pitzer,K. S. and J.J Kim, 1974)

TABLE XVII

		k	θ	Ψ_{ijk}
Na	K	C1	-0.012	-0.002
Na	$\bf K$	NO ₃	-0.012	-0.001
Na	Cs	C1	-0.033	-0.003
$\bf K$	Cs	C1	0.000	-0.001
C1	OH	Na	-0.050	-0.006
C1	OH	$\bf K$	-0.050	-0.008
C1	NO ₃	Na	0.016	-0.006
\mathbf{C}	NO ₃	K	0.016	-0.006

Higher Order Interaction Terms, θ_{ij} and Ψ_{ijk}

A computer program has been developed based **on** the Pitzer Equations and the surrogate solution, **and can** be found **in** Appendix C. The values obtained for the activity coefficient of the ions are presented **in Table** XVIII. Under the assumption that only the soluble components **are in** solutions, only the soluble components have been considered **in** the solution.

TABLE XVIII

Activity Coefficients Derived From the Pitzer (1974) Equations

The mean activity coefficient for an electrolyte, **NX,** as a function of ion activity coefficients is determined from:

$$
\gamma_{\text{(NX)}} = [\gamma_N \gamma_X] \frac{1}{v_N + v_X} \tag{25}
$$

where v_i is the number of cations or anions.

IV. Comparison of Models

Table XIX shows the predicted results of the activity coefficient by both the Pitzer method and the Meissner and Tester method. An additional column is provided, (Dobos, D.,1975) which was obtained experimentally for a pure $NaNO₃$ solution at the concentrations listed.

TABLE XIX

Comparison of Models for the Activity Coefficients of NaNO₃

Pitzer's estimation for the activity coefficient is less than the other two approximations. This is expected since the Pitzer's equations take into account the other electrolytes in solution.

V. Vapor Pressure Lowering as Predicted by the Activity Coefficient

Adding a nonvolatile solute to a solvent, lowers the vapor pressure of the solvent. Experiments have shown that vapor pressure lowering depends not only on the concentration of the solute particles, but also on the charge of the electrolytes cation and ion and the temperature of the solution. Quantitatively, the vapor pressure of *ideal* solutions is given by Raoult's Law:

$$
P_A = X_A P_A^{\dagger}, \tag{26}
$$

where P_A is the vapor pressure of the solution, X_A is the mole fraction of the solvent, and P_A^{\dagger} , is the vapor pressure of the pure solvent. The vapor pressure lowering, ΔP_A , is P_A^{\dagger} . P_A . The activity of water, a_w , over a solution of a single electrolyte is expressed as:

$$
a_w = \frac{P_w}{P_w^{\circ}}\tag{27}
$$

namely, the **ratio of** vapor pressure **of a** single electrolyte **solution,Pw,** over that of pure water, P_W[°]. Thus, considering the non-ideal behavior of electrolyte solutions, the vapor pressure of an aqueous solution is:

$$
P_w = a_w P_w^{\circ},\tag{28}
$$

For a single **1-1** electrolyte, NX, the Gibbs-Duhem equation **presents an** isothermal relationship between a_w , γ_{NX} and concentration, (Kusik, C.L and H. P. Meissner, 1973):

$$
V_{\rm NX} = -0.0156 \mu_{\rm NX} - (0.036) \int_{0}^{Y_{\rm NX}} m \, \text{dlog} \, \gamma_{\rm NX}.
$$
 (29)

The results **of** this equation have been evaluated and **are** shown **in** Fig. 19 as curves **of** constant values of $log (a_w)_{NX}$.

Kusik and **Meissner** (1973) **also** suggested using these curves **in** Figs. **19** and 20 for any solution temperature between 0 and 150°C. To determine the value of γ_{NX} at a higher temperature, the value of γ_{NX} at an ionic strength of $\mu = 10$, or for our case m = 10, and 25'C, must be known. The following equation **is used to find** the representative curve **at the** prescribed temperature:

$$
\log(\gamma_{T})_{\mu=10} = [1. - 0.0050 (T - 25)] \log(\gamma_{T=25} C)_{\mu=10}
$$
 (30)

Thus, once the value of $log(\gamma_T)_{\mu=10}$ at the prescribed temperature is located, the electrolytes activity **and activity** coefficient **at** this temperature is defined for all concentrations.

Table XX presents the activity of water over a NaNO₃ solution at concentrations from 1 **to** 8 **molal** as a function **of** temperature and simultaneously **its** effect on the vapor pressure.

TABLE XX

Activity of Water over a NaNO₃ Solution as a Function of Molality and Temperature

and Their Effect on Vapor Pressure

It is sometimes more convenient to express concentration as molarity, M, $\left[\frac{\text{moles}}{\text{liter}}\right]$, instead of molality, m, $\left[\frac{\text{moles}}{\text{kg}}\right]$. For a sodium nitrate solution this may be easily accomplished with the use of two equations, (CRC Handbook of Chemistry and Physics, **1991)**

$$
m = \frac{1000 M}{1000 \rho - 85 M} \qquad \left[\frac{\text{moles}}{\text{kg}} \right]
$$
 (31)

where **the** density, **p, is**

$$
\rho = 1 + 0.054 M - 0.00405 M^2 \tag{32}
$$

From Eqs. (32) and (33), **Table** XXI **and Table** XXII **are** obtained:

TABLE XXI

Molarity Versus Molality of NaNO **³**

TABLE XXII

Activity of Water over a NaNO₃ Solution as a Function of Molarity

and Temperature and Their Effect on Vapor Pressure

The activity of water versus sodium nitrate concentration with liquid temperature as a parameter is presented in Fig. 16. For pure water, $m_{\text{NaNO}_3} = 0$, the activity of water is unity. As NaNO₃ concentration is increased the activity of water deviates from ideality and becomes less than one. At an 8 molal solution of NaNO_3 , the a_w falls in the range of 0.733 to 0.750 for a temperature between 50 and 90 F. The effects of increasing solubility of $NaNO₃$ by increasing the temperature of the solution is also shown in Fig. 16. At low

concentrations less than 2 molal, the activities of water are approximately equal regardless of the solution temperature. However, at concentrations above 2 molal the activity begins to deviate with solution temperature. The activity of the water at 90'F is greater than that at 50°F since the solubility of NaNO₃ is increased with temperature.

The corresponding vapor pressure of the water as a function of solution temperature is presented in Fig. **17.**

The vapor pressure of the water is calculated as

$$
P_w = a_w P_w^{\bullet} \tag{33}
$$

where a_w is the activity of water and P_w^* is the vapor pressure of saturated water at the temperature in question. Thus, the activity of water can be seen as a type of correction factor describing the non-ideal behavior of the electrolyte solution.

For pure water, $m_{NaNO3} = 0$, the vapor pressure of water is the saturated water pressure at the prescribed temperature. As expected, with increasing $NaNO₃$ concentration the vapor pressure of the water deviates from that of pure water and decreases. The effect of the solution temperature is also demonstrated in Fig. 17, where at 90'F the vapor pressure is much higher than that at 50F.

Figure 16. Activity of water versus sodium nitrate concentration as a function of liquid temperature.

Figure 17. Saturated vapor pressure lowering of water versus NaNO₃ concentration as a function of liquid temperature.

F. PRECIPITATION AND CRYSTALLIZATION

I. Introduction

One of the complications **in** the sparging procedure was the clogging of the sparging tube. The solution appeared **to** flux **back** into the inlet of the sparging tube, **where it** collected and ultimately **halted** the sparging **process.** These precipitate blockages were removed from the sparging tube and saved for compositional analysis **on** the X-ray diffractometer and Scanning Electron Microscope.

I. Observations

The rate **at** which the **color** changes **in** the **solution is** an observation dependent **on** the temperature **of the** liquid. At **a solution** temperature of SOF, the SNW supernatant changed from **a clear,** transparent **color to a** turbid, opaque **color** within minutes **of** sparging. Whereas, **at a solution** temperature of 90'F, the **solution** did **not** change from this **initial color until** several hours **of** sparging time had progressed. This effect **is** partially explained by **the** increase **in solubility** of the sodium nitrate **with** temperature. The solubility **of** sodium nitrate **at** 50F is 80% (80 **gr per** 100 **gr of** water), **whereas at** 90 F **it** is 97.8%. This color change of the supernatant indicates **that** something **is** precipitating **out** of **the solution.** This precipitate **not only** was visible **in** the **solution,** but **also along** the sides **of the** graduated **clyinder in** small **patches.** Another observation should be **noted that** was **not** demonstrated in the figures. Crystal formations were most predominant **on** the surface of the graduated cylinder of the unfiltered SNW in comparison **to** the supernatant. This observation was independent of the solution temperature and sparging **air** temperature.

At a solution temperature greater than 70'F and regardless of the sparging air temperature, the SNW supernant had the beginnings **of** precipitate formations **in** the sparging tube within one hour of sparging. These formations were noticeable **in** the sparging tube of the unfiltered SNW solution, however, their occurrence was not as frequent as **in** the supernatant. Although the blockages **of** both samples seemed **to** occur at

the same rate, the unfiltered SNW precipitate blockages were easily disrupted by the agitation of the sparging air. This was observed as the volume flow rate on the flow meter decreased slightly and then in the next moment returned to its original volume flow rate; indicating that the precipitates were being dislodged by the agitation of the sparging air.

As each experiment progressed during the day, the crystal precipitates in the sparging tubes occurred more frequently and persistently. The decrease in evaporation of the **SNW** supernatant and unfiltered is partially attributed to the clogging of the sparging tube. The formation of precipitates in the sparging tube results in a reduction of the crosssection of the inlet sparging tube, and simultaneously, a decrease in the volume flow rate of the sparging air. Ultimately, if the blockages are not eliminated, the sparging tube becomes completely clogged and the sparging process comes to a complete stop.

Precipitation blockages in the sparging line occurred most frequently with the liquid temperature at 90F. Yet, at a liquid temperature of 50'F, the sparging line never clogged, with the exception of bone-dry sparging air. Similarly, at a liquid temperature of 90°F, precipitate blockages in the sparging tube occurred more frequently in comparison to the solution temperature of 70'F. The solution reaches a more concentrated state with total sparging time at a liquid temperature of 90°F rather than 70°F. A greater rate of evaporation corresponds to a more concentrated solution. Thus, the solubilites of the components are reached at a quicker rate at the higher liquid temperature corresponding to an increased rate of clogging in the sparging tube.

At a liquid temperature of 5O or **90'F,** with relatively bone-dry sparging air, the precipitate blockages formed in the sparging tube with the greatest frequency. This is probably a combination of the smaller flow rate of **0.0205** scfm and the bone-dry surface inside the sparging tube, allowing crystal formations.

54
III. Analysis

It **is** one of the purposes **of** this section to identify the precipitation that formed **in** the sparging tube and **in** the solution. The crystallization that occurred in the sparging tube of the two samples **of** the **SNW,** supernatant and unfiltered, differed **in** sodium nitrate concentration, as will be demonstrated **in** this section. **However,** both samples identify sodium nitrate as the major constituent.

The crystallization process **consists of** three stages (Mullin, **1972):**

- **(1)** achievement **of** supersaturation,
- **(2)** formation **of** crystal **nuclei, and**
- **(3)** growth **of** the crystal.

In most cases, **all** three **of** these stages **are** occurring simultaneously **in** the system.

The condition **of** supersaturation **is not sufficient cause for** the system **to** begin crystallization. There must **exist centers of** crystallization, **or** seeds, **upon with** nucleation may begin. The formation **of** crystal **nuclei is a** complicated process. The constituent molecules must **not only** be able **to** coagulate, they must **also** orientate themselves **in** fixed **lattices.**

The first signs of nucleation occur **where there is a** local high degree **of** supersaturation. It **is also** not uncommon **to find** crystallization occurring **at** the point **of** most **activity,** the very explanation **for** the precipitation blockage formations inside the **sparging** tube. Glass surfaces **and** metals may **also** act as a catalyst **for** nucleation. Thus, a future suggestion may be to replace the current boroscillicate glass sparging tubes with stainless **steel or** teflon tubing.

The presence **of** impurities **in** a system have a considerable effect on the nucleation behavior. Ions, such as **Fe 3+, A13+,** Na² +, and **Ca² +,** all present **in** the **SNW** unfiltered, have strong inhibiting **effects. It is** explained (Mullin, **1972)** that the **effects** of these impurities on the growth of the crystal **is** a phenomenon **not** completely explainable; however, a few patterns of behavior stand **out.** For one, the higher **the** charge of the cation, the more powerful **is its** inhibiting **effect. In** addition, these large molecular weight substances are known **to** deposit themselves **on** the **heteronuclei,** and as a **result,they** disrupt the formation of growth layers **across** the surfaces. Furthermore, these impurities change the properties of the solution and the equilibrium saturation concentration. Thus, **one is** provided **with an** explanation for the frequent clogging **of** the sparging tube **of** the supernatant **of** SNW, **where the** majority of these impurities have been **filtered out, in** comparison to the unfiltered SNW.

One method **of** obtaining detailed pictures **of** the crystal **lattice is** through X-ray **diffractometry. The** Bragg condition **is the basic** equation **of** X-ray **diffractometry** (Atkins, P. **W.,1982):**

$$
n \lambda = 2 d \sin \theta , \qquad (34)
$$

where **n** is an integer, λ , is the wavelength, θ , is the angle of incidence and d is the layer spacing between **a set of planes.** The Bragg equation determines the spacing, d, between layers in the lattice of the crystal. By finding the angle θ at which maximum intensity is observed, the **unique** d-spacing **of** the crystal structure **may be** calculated.

X-ray **diffractometer results** indicate that sodium nitrate **is** the major **cause of** the precipitation blockages. Table **XXIII** exhibits the d-spacing and **relative intensities** of a **pure** Aldrich sodium nitrate sample. The sample serves as **the 'control'.** An additional column **is presented to** demonstrate **the** identical match **of** the experimental sample **of** sodium nitrate **d-spacings with** the JCPDS powder diffraction file 7-271 of sodium nitrate.

TABLE XIII

X-Ray Diffraction Results of Pure Aldrich Sodium Nitrate

The X-ray diffraction results of the precipitate blockages formed **in** the sparging tube of a *pure* 4.35 M sodium nitrate solution **is** shown **in** Table XXIV. An additional column exhibits the matching of d-spacing with $NaNO₃$, JCPDS diffraction powder file 7-271.

TABLE XXIV

X-Ray Diffraction Results of the Precipitated Blockages in the Sparging Tube of a 4.35 M NaNO 3 Solution

Notice the similarity of the relative intensities of each of these diffraction patterns. There **is** a major peak of 100% intensity and the remaining peaks have an intensity of 25% and **less.** Also notice the experimental **d-spacings** that have no match, **i.e.,** 1.5170, 3.3643, 1.9735, and 1.7959. These unmatched **d-spacings** are noticeable **in** the succeeding diffraction patterns. Tables XXV and XXVI present **the** diffraction patterns of the precipitate blockages **in** the **sparging** tube of the SNW, supernatant **and** unfiltered, respectively. An immediate observation **is** the small intensities of the **d-spacings for** the unfiltered synthetic **nuclear** waste. With the X-ray **diffractometer,** the **intensities of** the diffracted beams **are** dependent on the arrangement of the atoms **in** the unit **cell.** As **a result,** from **these** tables **it can** be concluded that the crystalline structures **of** the precipitate differ for **the** two samples, SNW unfiltered **and** supernatant. In the unfiltered SNW, heavy molecular weight cations **are present (in the** supernatant, they have been **filtered** out), which disrupt the formation **of** the growth **layers** and as **a** result, **affect** the position **of the** atoms **in the unit cell.**

TABLE XXV

X-Ray Diffraction Results of the Precipitate Blockages in the

TABLE XXVI

X-Ray Diffraction Results of the Precipitate Blockages in the

Sparging Tube of **SNW** Unfiltered

TABLE XXVII

X-Ray Diffraction Results of the Precipitate Formations in

SNW Supernatant Solution After Eight Hours of Sparging

Again, the predominant component is sodium nitrate. Quantitative and qualitative results on the precipitate blockages from the scanning electron microscope are presented in Figs. **18** and 19. The blockages resulting from the supernatant of **SNW** are presented **if** Fig 18; the unfiltered SNW blockages are presented in Fig. 19; and Fig. 20 demonstrates the control, pure Aldrich NaNO₃.

Nitrogen was not picked up in the quantitative or qualitative analysis. Nitrogen would appear as a peak to the left of oxygen. Looking at the spectrum, it is assumed that the nitrogen peak was dominated **by** the oxygen peak. Furthermore, the control, pure Aldrich NaNO₃ of Fig. 20, did not pick up the nitrogen peak either; this further justifies this assumption.

In the control, 86.52% was found to be pure $Na₂O$. As explained in the previous paragraph, combining the results form the X-ray diffractometer, it is assumed to be NaNO₃. In addition, Al_2O_3 and K_2O are also picked up in the background of the control, **SNW** unfiltered and supernatant. Most importantly, sodium nitrate is the major percentage component in the analysis of the synthetic nuclear waste.

PEAK LISTING

 $\hat{\pmb{s}}$

Figure 18. Scanning electron microscope results on the SNW supernatant, $T_5 = 90$ °F, $T_3 = 125$ °F.

 $T_5 = 90$ °F, $T_3 = 125$ °F.

 \mathbb{R}^2

Figure 20. Scanning electron microscope results on pure Aldrich sodium nitrate.

é	$3-00$	$2 - 31$	3.50	3.39	NACL					
EK.	າເທ	25	16	€	SOON IN BITTALTE				(SOSA NOTEA)	
	and ζ and ζ A 1.5405 Prizes It. Dis. Cut edi LA DIFFACTORETER						u. ë.	has	4 A	1A
Suf. tein.	$4.5.0\%$ a 4.5 ø	Red MCS CIRCULES 3390 Fo 26 VOLLEY & Libet; Spa M FACSAN (ANONOSHIZZLAG) S.G. JAJ - RJC (167)	$0.16 - 32$	A	C 3.119 $24' + 10$ (3.26) 21 and $\overline{21}$	دیم : 4.قه هذء نا 111. غا 2.125 li . 547 84 - ، ا	:00 SA 10 25 XD. ٠ 36	012 1C4 CC6 110 313 23 ĈЭ C18	1.262 1.226a 1.1e:2 F 1.1698 $1 - 1368$ 1.1246 1.Lea 1.0120	۹£ 02 48 2 \bullet 4å \bullet 2
$4 -$ 22	Ð	0081.00 AND مستخففته فلطلط مستخف والمحمد فالمتنف	ð p		Suga - Color Cotonucss Bol loop. Lone's Seatte or Braddoccor The ED- Vol., 2 Scale, one took of the same appreciation of a RECORE % of 1.505 ALL SIEK GLOU S/8 BAL CRO FEO LIS BOL PATRON WARE AT	1.380 عدد. ا 1.429 1.560	\bullet ۵ 2 s. æ	116 211 122 214 2C3 119	1-0046 1-2540 $1 - 2279$ 1.0126 C.STSE -9733	峻 \bullet 48 \bullet $^{\circ}$ 98

Figure 21. JCPDS diffraction powder file on sodium nitrate.

÷

Chapter 4 LARGE SCALE SIMILITUDE MODEL

A. Introduction

The small-scale experiments were used **to** characterize the chemical and evaporative changes of the liquid waste. The next step **in** the **analysis** was **to test** the evaporative theories in the similitude model. In order **to** determine the **correct** size **of the** experimental setup of the similitude model, dimensional analysis was carried out. The dynamic and geometric similarities **to** the actual case are followed to obtain valid measurable data.

I. Dimensional Analysis:

The most important parameter affecting the in-tank evaporation project **is** the evaporation rate, which depends **on heat and** mass transfer coefficients between the bubble chain and **the** surrounding liquid **nuclear** waste. These coefficients in dimensionless form **are** given **through the Nusselt** and Sherwood numbers.

Nu = f(Re, **Pr,** Geometry)

Sh = **f(Re, Sc,** Geometry)

It should be apparent from the above **relations** that the Reynolds number and the geometric **relation of** the actual model **and** prototype must match **so that** the results obtained **in** the prototype **can** be transferred **to** the actual model. The Reynolds number **is** easily **calculated** by **the** sparging **air velocity, sparging air pipe** diameter, **and** the dynamic **viscosity of** the sparging **air at** ambient condition.

$$
\text{Re} = \frac{\text{vD}}{\text{v}} \tag{35}
$$

Thus, it is customary practice in the dimensional analysis procedure to calculate these significant parameters first from the actual MVSTs, and then build a prototype based on these parameters.

II. Actual Model of MVSTs:

The flow parameters and geometries are presented below:

The following equations are applied:

$$
v_3 = \frac{\dot{v}_3}{\frac{D_3^2}{\pi - 4}} = \text{velocity of the sparging air for one pipe} \tag{36}
$$

$$
\text{Re} = \frac{v_3 D_3}{v_3} = \text{Reynolds number of the sparging air} \tag{37}
$$

$$
D_b = (v_3)^{0.4} \left(\frac{7.3}{g}\right)^{0.2} = \text{bubble chain diameter}
$$
 (38)

$$
v_b = \frac{\dot{v}_3}{\frac{\pi}{4} D_b^2} = \text{bubble chain velocity}
$$
 (39)

$$
\frac{D_{\text{tank}}}{D_3} = \text{geometric relation} \tag{40}
$$

Applying equations **(36)** through (40) to the actual model, the following relations are obtained:

$$
\frac{\mathbf{D}_{\text{tank}}}{\mathbf{D}_3} = 140.4 \tag{41}
$$

$$
Re = 33418. \t(42)
$$

These two parameters, Re and D_{tank}/D_3 , must be kept constant and identical for both the actual and prototype models, i.e.:

$$
[Re]_{\text{Actual Model}} = [Re]_{\text{FIU}} \,.
$$

III. Experimental Model:

The prototype model has been designed and constructed with a height of $D_{\text{tank}} = 70$ in. and the sparging tube diameter, $D_3 = 0.5$ in. Thus, the relationship given by Eq. (42) is warranted. The sparging **air tube is** 67.3 in. **in** length at **3.73 in.** above the outlet, and consists of 48 staggered holes with a diameter of 5/32 in. each. A spacing of 5/16 in. between each center has been added. The sparging **air,** filtered by **an air** dryer/extractor, **is** driven by a 5HP compressor. The sparging **air** entering the tank **is bone** dry. The volume flow rate **of** the sparging **air is** adjusted by a **control** valve. Two thermometers **are** installed **in a** by-pass channel to measure the dry and **wet** bulb temperatures **of** the sparging **air and to** verify the **bone** dry condition **of** the sparging **air.** Two pressure probes **are** installed **in the** piping **to** measure: **a.)** the static pressure , **and** b.) **the** total pressure. An **air preheater,** equipped with a thermostat regulates the sparging **air** temperature. The sparging **air** temperature **is also** measured **at** the entrance **of** the **sparging** tube by **an** installed thermocouple. The humidity ratio and the temperature **of** the exhausted **air** are measured by **a** humidity transmitter **and an** additional thermocouple **is located on** the off-gas pipe. The liquid temperature **of** the tank **is** controlled with **an** internal **heater,** plus thermostat.

B. Experimental Procedure

Composition of the synthetic nuclear waste, (SNW), as provided by the Chemical and Technology Division of ORNL, **is presented in Table I.** The electrolyte solution was made up in deionized **water in** several seven **liter** containers. These containers were sealed and **the solid** components were allowed **to** dissolve into solution overnight. The following day, this solution was **filtered** and added **to the** tank. In approximately **one** week the tank was full.

The actual liquid nuclear waste Melton Valley Storage Tank, **with a** geometric size of length, L = 62 **ft,** and diameter, D **= 11.7 ft,** has **a** total volume of 50,000 gallons, **or** 6,684 ft3 . Assuming **an** optimum **scenario of** the **nuclear** waste occupying 90% of the tanks actual volume, **calculates to** a **total of** 45,000 gallons **of** nuclear waste per tank. According **to** the tank height **of 11.7** ft, a 90% capacity calculates **to** a liquid height **of 11.114 ft.** Thus, if a **total of** 26,0000 gallons **of** waste must be evaporated per **year, or 3,250** gallons from each **of** the eight tanks, the final volume **of** the tank **is** (45,000 **- 3,250) 41,750** gallons. **Thus** the height **of** the liquid **is only** reduced from **11.114 ft to 10.7 ft, or a** difference **in** height **of** 0.414 **in.** However, **it** should be mentioned that the **level of** the liquid waste will **never** be this low **since if** the liquid waste **is** always being added **to** the tanks.

The geometric scale **relation of the** experimental tank **to the real** tank **is 1:2.** Accordingly, **the initial level of** the liquid nuclear waste **in** the experimental tank **should** be **one-half that of the real tank.** As such, the initial waste level in the experimental tank was $\frac{1}{2}$ **of 11.114 ft or** 66.7 in.. As discussed **in** the previous paragraph, the greatest reduction **in** height of the liquid **in one** year period **is** approximately **5** in. **for** the **real** tank, **or 2.5 in. for** the experimental model.

Accordingly, the experiment was run **at an** initial **level of 66.7** in. **in** height and run for a duration of 120 hours. A bone-dry sparging air volume flow rate of $\dot{v}_3 = 12.064$ scfm was used based on the Reynolds number of 33418.

The sparging air remained saturated during the entire experimental time **of** 120 hours. This **100%** saturated air corresponds thermodynamically **to a** maximum evaporation **rate** and **is** function **of** the height of the waste solution **in** the tank. In **fact, even** when the **initial level of** the liquid **in** the tank was reduced **to the** lower **level of** (66.7 **-** 2.5) in., or a **level** of 64.2 in., the sparging **air** remained saturated. In conclusion, the sparging **air** always remained **satured in the** prototype model, **even at** the lower liquid **level,** which corresponds **to** 10.7 **ft in** the **real** model.

C. Results and Discussion

For both water **or** liquid **nuclear** waste, **the sparging air** at the exit **of** the tank was saturated. **This** saturated condition **of** the effluent **air** corresponds **to a** maximum rate **of** evaporation. Even under **the** worst **scenario of** no additional waste added **to the** tank **in one year,** the **sparging air** remained saturated.

Chapter 5 **CONCLUSION**

In the 1960's the Department of Energy at Oak Ridge National Laboratory designed eight 50,000 gallon storage tanks for the liquid nuclear waste. Each tank was designed with its own ventilation system to purge radiolytic hydrogen and oxygen from the tank. This design induced water removal and necessitated the additional requirement of entraining radioactivity from the exiting system by the use of demisters and HEPA filters.

In the transfer of the liquid waste to the holding tanks, large amounts of water is used to prevent line clogging and solid biuld up in the pipes. Utilizing the existing system, this thesis explores the posibilities of sparging the waste with air and heating the tank temperature in order to evaporate the excess water. This thesis has identified a method of optimizing the existing tanks by examining the following fundamental principles in bench scale experiments.

1.) **The determination of the evaporation rate as a function of sparging air temperature and liquid temperature.**

Results have shown that a solution temperature increase of 20 F, from 70'F to 90F, causes the rate of evaporation to double. However, sparging ambient condition air into a liquid temperature of 50°F created an inverse effect, whereby a condensation process dominated. In addition, a sparging air temperature increase of 50° F, from 73.5° F to 125F, has a negligible effect on the evaporation rate. Two difficulties occured when heating the sparging air: A) The process of heating the sparging air lowers its density and consequently lowers its mass flow rate. The evaporation rate is strongly dependent on the mass flow rate; thus, the volume flow rate must be increased accordingly with temperature in order to keep the mass flow rate invariant. B) The sparging pipe, immersed in the

solution, behaves as a heat exchanger; **by** the time the air had traveled the length of the sparging pipe and is released into the solution, the temperature of the sparging air had decreased to the temperature of the solution.

2.) The effect of the solution pH as the solution evaporates.

The initial solution pH is basic, at a **pH** between **11.0** and 12.0. Due to the fact that the sparging air contains CO_2 , as the solution evaporates, the pH decreases to a value of approximately pH 10.0. Carbon dioxide is a catalyst in the reaction causing the sodium carbonates to precipitate out of solution thereby lowevering the overall pH of the solution. As to be expected, when the $CO₂$ was removed from the sparging air, the solution pH remained invariant with air sparging time.

3.) The effect of changing salt concentration and solubilities on the evaporation rate.

As a solution becomes more concentrated, the vapor pressure of the solution is decreased. Thus, as would be expected, the evaporation rate decreases with increasing concentration. The difficulty in determining the effect of the salt concentration on the evaporation rate is reflected in parameter defined as the activity coefficient. Electrolyte solutions do not behave as an ideal solution. In fact, electrolyte solutions, due to their charged environment, have increased solubilities. This information is vital to the operators of the existing holding tanks in predicting the total evaporation of the liquid nuclear waste.

4.) Analysis of the precipitation blockages in the sparging tube, i.e. chemical analysis and crystal morphology, using the X-Ray Diffractometer and Scanning Electron Microscope.

Results have shown that sodium nitrate is the main cause of the formation of precipitate blockages in the sparging line.

BIBILIOGRAPHY

Atkins, P. W.: Physical Chemistry, 2nd ed., W. H. Freeman and Company, CA, **1982.**

Brown, T. L. and H. E. LeMay, Jr.: Chemistry, The Central Science, 2nd ed., Prentice-Hall, Inc., **N.J.,** 1948.

Ceo, R. **N., Mattus, A. J. and J.** T. **Shor, "A** Summary **of** Data **on** the Chemical, Physical, and Radiochemical Characterization of Melton **Valley** Storage Tank W-26," Correspondence **with** ORNL, **1989.**

Dobos, D.: ElectrochemicalData, A Handbook **for Electrochemistsin** Industry and Universities, Elsevier Scientific Publishing Company, NewYork, **1975.**

Ebadian, M. **A. etal.,** "Mathematical Modeling of Liquid Waste Evaporation From **the** Melton **Valley** storage Tanks **Using Heat** and Mass Transfer **in** a Bubble Chain," NuclearEngineeringandDesign, **to** be published **in 1991.**

Ebadian, M.A., **et al.,"Evaporation of** Water from the MVSTs **for** the Purpose **of** Producing Liquid Concentrate Storage Capacity, **Final** Report," Martin-Marietta, Deparment **of** Energy, Oak Ridge **Natinal** Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tennessee **(June, 1990),** 101 pages.

Ford, D.: **The** Cult of **the** Atom, The Secret Papers **of** the Atomic Energy Commision, Simon **and Schuster,** Inc, NewYork, 1984.

Glasstone S. and W. H. Jordan: Nuclear Power and its Environmental Effects, American Nuclear Society, **IL, 1980.**

Holman, **J.** P. and W. **J. Gajda, Jr.:** Experimental Methods **for** Engineers,, **5th** ed., McGraw-Hill Book Company, NewYork, 1989.

Horwitz, **E.** P.: New Radioactive **-** Waste Treatment Could Save Taxpayers Billions, **LOGOS** Argonne National Laboratory **-** Progress Through Science, **4:3, pp. 6-9.**

Incropera, F. P. and **D.** P. DeWitt: Introduction **to** Heat Transfer, **John** Wiley and Sons, Inc., NewYork, **1985.**

Kusik, C. L. **and** H. P. **Meissner:** "Vapor Pressure of **Water** Over Aqueous Solutions **of** Strong Electrolytes, " *Ind.* Eng. Chem. Process Des. Develop., 12:1, **pp. 112-115, 1973.**

Meissner, H. P. and **J.** W. Tester, "Activity Coefficients of Strong Electrolytes in Aqueous Solutions," *Ind.* Eng. Chem. Process **Des.** Develop., 12:1, **pp. 128-133, 1972.**

Miller, F. J., "Use **of** Models **to** Determine Ionic Interactions **in** Natural Water," ThalassiaJugosavica, 18:(1-4), **pp. 253-291, 1982.**

Pitzer, K. **S. and J. J.** Kim, "Thermodynamics **of** Electrolytes, IV: Activity and Osmotic Coefficients **for** Mixed Electrolytes," **Journal** of the American Chemical Society, **96:18,** 1974.

Pitzer, K.. **S.,** "Thermodynamics **of Electyrolytes,** I: Theoretical Basis and General Equations," JournalofPhysical Chemistry, **77:2, 1973.**

Pitzer, K. **S.,** "Theory: **Ion** Interaction Approach," Chapter **7 in** R.M. Pytkowicz (ed.), **ActivityCoefficients in Electrolyte Solutions, Vol. I,** CRC Press, Boca **Raton, FL, pp. 157-2089, 1979.**

Reid, R. **C.,** Prausnitz, **J.** M. and B. **E.** Poling: The **Properties of** Gases and Liquids 4th ed., McGraw Hill Book Company, **NewYork, 1987.**

Reina, P.: Concrete Vaults Clean **up a** Dump, Low-Level Nuclear Waste Repositories will be Covered with Vegetation, ENR, March 2, **1989, pp.** 26 **- 27.**

Schreiner, **F.,** "Research Shows Two Ways **to** Dispose **of** Nuclear Waste; Subseadbed Disposal," **LOGOS** Argonne National Laboratory **-** Progress Through Science, **1:3,** pp. **12-19.**

Seitz,M. **G.,** "Research Shows Two Ways **to** Dispose of Nuclear Waste; Geological Repository," LOGOS Argonne National Laboratory *-* Progress Through Science, 1:3, pp. 12-17.

Snider, J., Proposal for Evaporating Water from the MVSTs for the Purpose of Producing Liquid Concentrate Storage Capacity, Correspondence with ORNL, 1988.

Spalding, B.J., "A Process **to** Downsize **Nuclear** Wastes," Chemical Week, December 24, 1986, p. 30.

VanWylen, G.J. and R. **E.** Sonntag: Fundamentals of Classical Thermodynamics, 3d ed., John Wiley and Sons,Inc., NewYork, 1985.

Walker,Jr., J. F.: In Tank Evaporation Start-Up and Evaluation, **Correspondence** with ORNL, 1990.

Walker, J. F. and T. J. Abraham: Bench - Scale Testing in Support of the In-Tank Evaporation (ITE) Process, **Correspondence with** ORNL, 1989.

Appendix A

Instrumentation : Methods and Modes of Measurement . Small Scale Evaporative Model

A. AIR DRYER

50-70 Experiment: Sodium hydroxide pellets were placed in an erlenmeyer flask; the air was sparged into **an inlet** tube, through the pellets, and released **out** the **top of** the flask. The effluent **air** was monitored with a drying tube containing self-indicating silica gel desiccant.

B. BALANCE

In order **to** keep a constant recording **of** the rate of evaporation **with** sparging time, the system, (solution plus container) was weighed hourly on **a** Mettler balance.

C. FLOW RATE

0-90 **Experiment** Three Kobold flow meters were **used to control** the flow rates **from** the GAST compressor. These flow meters have the **special** function **of** operating **up** to temperatures of 250° F and up to pressure of 100 PSI.

D. PH METER

HANNA portable microprocessor pH meter consists of a double-junction, epoxy body **electrode and a** temperature **probe. This** pH meter features **a** digitized readout and has automatic temperature compensation.

E. SCANNING ELECTRON MICROSCOPE

JEOL JSM-35CF, scanning electron microscope provides many notable attachments : an Energy Dispersal **X-Ray** Spectrometer(EDS), capable **of** light element detection; a Wavelength Electron microprobe; and **Backscatter** Electron Imaging **(BEI).** The EDS allows microscope expansion **to on-line** data transfer to a computer **for** qualitative and quantitative elemental **analysis.** The BEI provides composition, or topographical image

display. Thus , the SEM provides elemental analysis of the crystal formations **in** question, along **with** high resolution of crystal morphology.

F. SOLUTION COOLING/HEATING METHOD:

i. 50-90 Experiment: A LANDAU recirculating water bath, with thermostat, **provided** an accurate control of the temperature of the liquid. The 100 ml graduated cylinders were not completely immersed **in** the solution.

ii. 70-90 Experiment: The 100 ml graduated cylinders were completely immersed **in** this thermostatically controlled recirculating **water bath;** this **is** important **for** uniform temperature distribution.

G. SOLUTION FILTERINGMETHOD

One **of** the experimental samples **is** the supernatant **of** synthetic **nuclear** waste. The supernatant was obtained by **vacuum** filtering the solution with a medium-fritted **scintered** glass filter.

H. SOLUTION SPARGING CONTAINERS

The liquid was **placed in a** one-hundred milliliter graduated cylinder.

1. 50-90 Experiment: The boroscillicate sparging tube simply rested at the bottom of **the** graduated cylinder **for** the first experiment.

ii._70-90 Experiment: However, for the second experiment the boroscillicate **sparging and outlet** tubes **are held in place with a** rubber stopper.

I. SPARGING AIR

1. 50-90 Experiment: Individual small air pumps provided 0.0375 cfm of sparging **air.** The sparging **air** was room condition with a temperature **of** 74.5F and with a **relative** humidity **of** approximately 70%. This **held** true **unless** the **air** was dryed, as discussed under air-dryer, which **had a relative** humidity of 9%.

ii.70-90 Experiment: A one-sixth horsepower GAST pressure/vacuum compressor provided the sparging *air,* The flow was divided into three separate lines that were monitored by KOBOLD flow meters.

J. TEMPERATURE MEASUREMENT AND RECORDING

70-9 Experiment: Thermocouples **are** placed at the inlet of the sparging tubes **to** measure the **sparging** air temperature. Thermocouples were also installed **in** the solution to measured **and** record **its** temperature. An OMEGA thermocouple strip recorder provided **a** continuous recording **of** the temperature along with a digitized read out.

K. VARIABLE TEMPERATURE OF THE SPARGING AIR

70-90 Experiment: In order to obtain a variable temperature of the sparging air, a 104 Watt silicone rubber extruded heating tape **(1** in. x 4 ft) **is** wrapped **around a steel** pipe, **(3.5 cm in** diameter), and insulated with 100% fiberglass **cloth** tape. The heating tape is connected **to a Thermolyne Stepless** Temperature Controller **in** order **to** maintain a constant sparging **air** temperature. This setup allows **a** temperature range from room temperature up to 300° F.

L. X-RAY **DIFFRACTOMETER**

10-90_Experiment SEIMENS D-500, provides information **on** compound **analysis. Used to determine that which was precipitating in the sparging process and halting the evaporation rate.**

II. Large Scale Similitude Model

A. AIR COMPRESSOR:

The 5HP SUNBURN air compressor provides an **air** volume flow rate of 12.7 scfm and 40 psig.

B. AIR DRYER/EXTRACTOR:

The LA-MAN air dryer consists **of** two-stage **filters.** The air passes through **the** first stage coalescing **filter** which causes moisture to form larger droplets. The air velocity slows down as **it** enters the dryer/extractor chamber, allowing moisture, oil, and contaminants to be removed through the drain **valve.** The second-stage **filter** cartridge removes any remaining moisture, **oil,** contaminants, and particles **in** the **air** lines. The exhaust air **is** clean and **free of** harmful oil and water.

c. PRESSURE TRANSDUCERS DP154 AND DP1033:

The Valdyne **DP15** pressure transducer **is** designed for low and medium pressure measurement with an accuracy of \pm 0.25% FS (including effects of linearity, hysteresis and repeatability). The standard ranges are \pm 0.08 psid FS to 3200 psid FS. In typical AC **excited** bridge **circuits, the** system delivers **a full scale** output **of 35 multivolts** per **volt at 3000** Hz. **This** transducer measures **the** total pressure **of** the sparging **air in** the pipe.

The **Valdyne** DP103 wet differential pressure transducer is designed for exceedingly low differential pressure measurement. With the full-scale range down to \pm 0.008 psid $(± 0.56 \text{ cm H}_2 0)$, this instrument is used in the measurement of very low flow rates of air. The standard ranges for the Valdyne DP103 is \pm 0.008 psid FS to \pm 12.5 psid FS. This transducer, **also** with an accuracy **of** 0.25% FS, measures the dynamic pressure of **the sparging air in the** pipe. Each transducer **is** connected **to** a Valdyne **CD233** digital transducer indicator. This transducer **indicator can** be switched **to a selected** input **of** zero **and** span **control for** each input. **In** addition, the output signal from this indicator **is** transferred **to** the HIP **-** 3852A model data acquisition system.

D. AIR PREHEATER

The **air preheater** was designed and built by the Florida International University research **team to** accommodate the requirements of the experiment. It consists of a **750W**

finned strip **heater** juxtaposed inside a steel pipe. In addition, an external thermostat **is** installed **to** control **the** air temperature.

E. LIQUID HEATER

The immersion liquid **heater is** installed directly into the tank. The temperature **is controlled by an integral thermostat, adjustable from 60 - 250F.** The **material of the** heating **coil is 800 Incoloy alloy** (stainless **steel); this** material **is** non-corrosive **to** caustic liquids.

F. HEWLE TPACKARD DATA ACQUISITION SYSTEM(HP **- 3852A):**

Electronic signals from the pressure transducers, thermocouples **and the** humidity **transmitterare** transmitted to a HP data acquisition system. **This** system, through **various** types **of electronic** conversions; measures, processes and analyzes data acquired from the experimental instruments. A personal computer, connected **to** the data acquisition system, **continuously** displays **the** data visually **on** the monitor and **stores it on** the hard **drive.**

G. RELATWE HUMIDITY TRANSMITTER:

An **OMEGA HX-550 relative** humidity transmitter **is** installed directly **at the** exit **of the** off-gas pipe. **It** provides linearized and temperature compensated **relative** humidity **output.** A **thin** film polymer capacitor **senses relative** humidity. A power supply **is** connected **to** the transmitter **to** provide **a** constant voltage **of 16** V. The output **of** the transmitter **is** attached **to** the data acquisition system.

Appendix B Psychometric Chart

Appendix C

Computer Program for the Calculation of the Activity Coefficient **^c**

 \mathcal{L}

 $\overline{}$

 $\ddot{}$

program activity coefficient

 \mathbf{c}

c cmx an array that stores the third viral coefficient
c cat summation procedure involved with the cations c anion summation procedure involved with the cations
c cs activity coefficients facework with the anions $\begin{array}{ccc}\nc & cs & \operatorname{activity coefficient of cesium} \\
c & k & \operatorname{activity coefficient of nearest}\n\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{ccc}\nc & k \\
c & na\n\end{array}$ activity coefficient of potassium $\begin{array}{ccc}\nc & na \\
c & cl\n\end{array}$ activity coefficient of sodium c cl $\begin{array}{cc} \text{c} & \text{c} \\ \text{c} & \text{no} \end{array}$ activity coefficient of chloride $\begin{array}{ccc}\nc & no3 \\
\hline\n\end{array}$ activity coefficient of nitrate c oh activity coefficient of hydroxide **^c** c integer i,j,row,col parameter (row=4,col=3)
real beta0(row.col) be beta0(row,col),beta1(row,col),cphi(row,col),
a(col),c(row),ion,eq,dh,sqion,step,f,ai,aii,z1,z2, & a(col),c(row),ion,eq,dh,sqion,step,f,ai,aii,z1,z2,
& stepp,bmx(row,col),bmxj(row,col),cmx(row,col),zz,
sum,sum2,cat,anion,cs,k,na,sr,cl,no3,oh
data ((betaO(i,j),j=1,col),i=1,row)/0.0300,-0.0758,0.150,
 $\&$ 0.04835,-0.08 0.0765,0.0068,0.0864, & 0.3810,0.134625,0.0/ data ((beta1(i,j),j=1,col),i=1,row)/0.0558,-0.0669,0.30, &. 02122,0.0494,0.320, & 0.2664,0.1783,0.253, &. 2.223,1.380,0.0/ data ((cphi(i,j),j=1,col),i=1,row)/0.00038,0.0,0.0, & -0.00084,0.00660,0.004 1, &. 0.00127,-0.00072,0.0044, -0.00246,-0.01992450,0.0/ **^c** c cations : Cs, K, Na, Sr
c anions : $Cl, NO(3)$ O **c** anions *:* CI,NO(3),O1 $write(6, 81)$ 81 format($2x$,'Input the molality of the cations: cesium, potassium, $*$ strontium and sodium') $read(5, *) c(1), c(2), c(3), c(4)$ write(6,88) 88 format(2x,'Input the molality of the anions: chloride, nitrate and hydroxide') read(5,*) a(1), a(2), a(3) c data $(c(i), i=1, row)/0.000101, 0.15, 5.2906, 0.0002/$
c data $(a(i), i=1, col)/0.133, 5.290301, 0.0276/$ data $(a(i), i = 1, col)/0.133, 5.270301, 0.0376/$ do 11 is1,row $ion = c(i) + ion$ I1 continue do 13 i= $1,$ col $ion = a(i) + ion$ 13 continue ion=0.5*ion write(6,*)ion eq=ion
dh=0.392 Itrue only at 25 degrees celcius

```
sqion = sqrt(ion)step= 1. + 1.2*sgion
          f = -dh^*( (sqion/step) + ((2./1.2)^*log(step)))a = 2.0aii= -ai*sqion
          z = 122 = 1step= 1. + 2.*sgion
          sstep= 1.0 - step*(exp(ai))stepp=-1. + (step + 2.*ion)*(exp(ai))do 99 j=1,col
                  do 99i=1, row
                 -bmx(i,j) = + beta0(i,j) +&
               ( betal(i,j) * sstep)/(2.*ion)
                 bmxj(i,j)= ( betal(i,j) * stepp ) / (2.*(ion**2))
                 if ((i.eq.4).and (j.eq.2)) z1=2.
                 2z = z1 * z2cmx(i,j)= (cphi(i,j) / (2.*sqrt(zz)) )
                 sum=c(i)^*a(j)^*bmxj(i,j) + sumsum2 = c(i)*a(j)*cmx(i,j) + sum299
         continue
         write(6,*)((cmx(i,j), i=1, row), j=1, col)
 \mathbf{c}write(6,*)((bmx(i,j), i=1, row), j=1, col)¢
         write(6,*)((bmxj(i,j),i=1,row),j=1,col)
 ¢
 c
         write(6,*) sum, sum2
 ¢
         CATION
 \mathbf cdo 87 i=1, row
                 do 89 j=1,col
         cat= cat + a(j)*(bmx(i,j) + eq*cmx(i,j)) .
 89
         continue
         if (i.eq.1) cs = f + 2.*cat + sum + sum2if (i.eq.2) k = f + 2.*cat + sum + sum2
        if (i.eq.3) na=f + 2.*cat + sum + sum2
        cat = 0.087
        continue
¢
        ANION
¢
        do 77 j=1,col
                do 79 i=1, rowanion= anion + c(i)^*(bmx(i,j) + eq^*cmx(i,j))79
        continue
        if (j.eq.1) cl=f + 2.*anion + sum + sum2
        if (i.eq.2) no3=f + 2.*anion + sum + sum2
        if (i.eq.3) oh=f \neq 2.* anion + sum + sum2
       anion=0
77
       continue
       cs=exp(cs)
       k = exp(k)na = exp(na)s = exp(sr)cl=exp(cl)
```
 $no3=exp(no3)$ $oh = exp(oh)$ write(6,67) cs,k,na,cl,no3,oh
format(2x,'The activity coefficients :',/,/,
 $\frac{2}{\sqrt{3}}$ 7x,' Cesium
compared :: (13.5,/,

67

 $\bar{}$

 \cdot

-
- $\begin{array}{c} 0.7 \overline{X_1} \\ 0.7 \overline{X_2} \\ 0.7 \overline{X_3} \end{array}$ Potassium \therefore f13.5,/,
 \therefore f13.5,/,
- Sodium
- \bullet 7x, Chloride $:$ f13.5,/,
- $2x$ Nitrate $:$ $,$ f 13.5,/,
- ¢ $7x,$ Hydroxide $:$ (13.5) end
-

 $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$

 \sim

 $\overline{}$

 $no3=exp(no3)$ $oh = exp(oh)$ write(6,67) cs, k, na, cl, no3, oh

format(2x, The activity coefficients :*,/,/,

* 7x,* Cesium :*,f13.5,/,

* 7x,* Potassium :*,f13.5,/,

* 7x,* Sodium :*,f13.5,/,

* 7x,* Sodium :*,f13.5,/, 67

- \therefore f13.5,/,
 \therefore f13.5,/,
-
- $2 \times 7x$ Chloride $:$ f13.5/,
- $27x$ Nitrate $:$ f13.5/,
- * 7x, Hydroxide $: \{13.5\}$

 $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$

end

i,