Westinghouse
Savannah River Company
Aiken, SC 29808

JUL 15 2002

HLW-2002-00096
Retention: Permanent, offer
To NARA when no longer
Needed by the Department
Disposal Auth: DOE-ADM
18-11.1(g) (1)
Track # 10048

Mr. C. E. Anderson, Assistant Manager
High Level Waste Division
U. S. Department of Energy
Savannah River Operations Office
P. O. Box A
Aiken, SC 29808

Dear Mr. Anderson:

DNFSB 2001-01, COMMITMENT 3.5 DELIVERABLE

Reference 1: Letter, S. Abraham to J. T. Conway, "Department of Energy Revised Implementation Plan Concerning the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety WSAG's *Recommendation, High Level Waste Management at the Savannah River Site*", dated 9/14/01.
Reference 2: Letter, S. Piccolo to C. Anderson, DNFSB 2001-01, Commitment 3.5 Deliverable Expectations, HLW-2002-00073

As you are aware, deliverables for the Defense Facility Nuclear Safety WSAG (DNFSB) Recommendation 2001-0 (Reference 1), include "Assess the technical feasibility of dispositioning the current Tank 48 material and returning Tank 48 to HLW service." Originally the deliverable consisted of "This evaluation will focus on the technical options for dispositioning the material, discuss the confidence level of success based on technical and regulatory risks and identify any research and development work that must be accomplished. Lessons learned from returning Tank 49 to service will be incorporated into the future Tank 48 plans." Per our agreement, the expectation for the Tank 48 deliverable was clarified in reference 2. The attached report, HLW Tank 48H Disposition Alternatives Identification Phase 1 & 2, satisfies Reference 1 and 2 and completes the HLW deliverable. No additional Tank 48 scope is included in the contract baseline.

If you have any questions please contact Bob Adams (phone 7-5045, pager 12308).

Sincerely,

S. F. Piccolo
Vice President and General Manager
High Level Waste Division

JUL 15 2002

BA:cs

c:

N. R. Delaplane, DOE-SR, 704-S
C. A. Everatt, DOE-SR, 704-S
C. S. Martin, DOE-SR, 704-S
T. J. Spears, DOE-SR, 704-3N
V. G. Dickert, 703-H
T. J. Lex, 703-H
S. S. Cathey, 703-H
F. E. Wise, 703-H
D. L. Becker, 703-A
C. J. Boasso, 742-2G
Records Admin, 773-52A
ECATS, DOE, 703-A
M. A. Mikolanus, DOE-SR, 704-S
W. F. Spader, DOE-SR, 704-S
W. D. Clark, DOE-SR, 704-3N
M. D. Johnson, 703-H
W. R. Tucker, 703-H
P. S. Kennedy, 703-H
E. M. Foster, 703-H
R. A. Adams, 704-3N
HLW Files, 703-H, 116

WSRC-RP-2002-00154
Revision 1

HLW TANK 48H DISPOSITION ALTERNATIVES IDENTIFICATION PHASE 1 & 2 SUMMARY REPORT

UNCLASSIFIED
DOES NOT CONTAIN UNCLASSIFIED CONTROLLED NUCLEAR INFORMATION

ADC/RO R T Jones Date: 7/15/02

Westinghouse Savannah River Company
Savannah River Site
Aiken, South Carolina 29808

DISCLAIMER

This report was prepared by Westinghouse Savannah River Company (WSRC) for the United States Department of Energy under Contract No. DE-AC09-96SR18500 and is an account of work performed under that contract. Neither the United States Department of Energy, nor WSRC, nor any of their employees makes any warranty, expressed or implied, assumes any legal liability or responsibility for accuracy, completeness, or usefulness, of any information, apparatus, or product or process disclosed herein or represents that its use will not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trademark, name, manufacturer or otherwise does not necessary constitute or imply endorsement, recommendation, or favoring of same by WSRC or by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of the authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

HLW TANK 48H DISPOSITION ALTERNATIVES IDENTIFICATION PHASE 1 & 2 SUMMARY REPORT

WSRC-RP-2002-00154

APPROVAL PAGE

Bob Adams, Project Owner	7/15/02 Date
Dan Lambert, SRTC Engineering Member	7-15-02 Date
Rick Fowler, HLW Process Engineering	7/15/02 Date
Tom Peters, SRTC Science Member	7-15-02 Date
Gavin Winship, Systems Engineering Member	7/15/02 Date
Michael Norton, Design Authority Member	7/15/02 Date
Narinder Malik, Regulatory Authority Member	7/15/2002 Date
Bob Bentley, Safety Authority Member	7/15/02 Date

REVISION SUMMARY

Rev. No.	Rev. Date	Affected Sections	Description of Revision
0	2/28/02	N/A	Initial Issue, Phase 1
1	7/15/02	N/A	Initial Issue, Phase 1 & 2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 Executive Summary 1
2.0 Purpose 3
3.0 Introduction 3
4.0 Tank 48 Disposition Team 7
4.1 Critical Needs, Boundary Conditions and Constraints 7
5.0 Background 8
6.0 Phase 1 10
6.1 Alternative Identification Process Overview 10
6.2 Generation and Organization of Alternatives 12
6.3 Go/No Go Screening of Alternatives 12
6.4 Screening of Alternatives 13
6.5 Selected Alternatives 14
7.0 Phase 2 15
7.1 Organization of Alternatives 15
7.2 Selection Criteria 17
7.2.1 Criteria Development 17
7.2.2 Weighting of Criteria 19
7.3 Scoping Studies 21
7.3.1 Catalytic Options 22
7.3.2 Thermal Options 24
7.3.3 Oxidation Options 27
7.3.4 Acidic Hydrolysis Options 31
7.3.5 Distribution Among Other Tanks 33
7.3.6 Grout 34
7.3.7 In-Tank Bioremediation 34
7.3.8 Metathesize with Cold Cesium 34
7.3.9 Tetraphenylborate is Thermodynamically 36
7.3.10 Tank in Tank 36
7.4 Risk Identification 39
7.4.1 Environmental Risks 39
7.4.2 Safety 40
7.4.3 Process Safety 41
7.4.3.1 Salt Cell Process 42
7.4.3.2 Catalytic Process 42
7.4.3.3 Acid Only 43
7.4.3.4 Acid Plus Catalyst in a New Facility 43
7.4.3.5 Thermal Decomposition (Steam Reforming) 43
7.4.3.6 Oxidant Process 43
7.4.3.7 Oxidant Plus Acid Process 44
7.4.3.8 Fenton Process 44

7.4.3.9 Catalyst Plus Acid Process 45

7.5 Selection Process 45
7.5.1 Re-Screening..... 45
7.5.2 Methodology/Tool 48
7.6 Sensitivity Analysis 49
7.7 Selection Conclusions 50
8.0 References 50
9.0 List of Abbreviations 51

LIST OF TABLES

Table 7.1 Phase 2 Alternatives List 16
Table 7.2.1 Phase 2 Selection Criteria 18
Table 7.2.2 Criteria Weight 20
Table 7.3.4 Carbon Balance - % C based on HPLC Analysis of selected samples..... 32
Table 7.5.1 Options Carried Forward to Selection Process..... 46
Table 7.5.2-1 Process Rates 48
Table 7.5.2-2 Process Hazards 49

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 3.1 - HLW System Process 6
Figure 6.1 - Logic Diagram for Screening Process 11
Figure 7.3.1.1 – Comparison of Catalysts for TPB Destruction 23
Figure 7.3.2.1 – Comparison of Microwave for TPB Destruction 25
Figure 7.3.2.2 – Comparison of Microwave for TBP Destruction at 20%, 80% and 100% Power 27
Figure 7.3.3.1 - Comparison of Oxidants for TPB Destruction 28
Figure 7.3.3.2 – Foaming Produced During Peroxide Addition to Unwashed Precipitate 30
Figure 7.3.4.1 - Comparison of Acids for TPB Destruction 33
Figure 7.3.8.1 – Results of Metathesis Testing Using Cold Cesium 35
Figure 7.3.10.1 - Comparison of Fenton Reagents for TPB Destruction 37
Figure 7.3.10.2 - Comparison of Permanganate with and without added formic Acid for TPB Destruction 38

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Phase 1 Screening Tables
Table 1A – Alternatives Rejected 52
Table 1B – Alternatives That Failed To Meet Screening Criteria 53
Table 1C – Alternatives That Are Accepted In Part 55
Table 1D – Alternatives That Are Accepted 56

Attachment 2 – Alternative Information Sheets 57
Alternative #2 – Sodium Tetraphenylborate Strike and Filter 58
Alternative #2 – Feed KTPB Slurry to DWPF Melter Directly 59
Alternative #3 – Feed KTPB Slurry to DWPF Salt Cell for Decomposition 60
Alternative #4 – Feed KTPB Slurry to DWPF Salt Cell for Decomposition 61
Alternative #5 – Chemically Decompose TPB Directly in Tank Using a Catalyst 62
Alternative #6 – Chemically Decompose Directly in a New or Existing Facility Outside Tank 48 Using a Catalyst 63
Alternative #7 – Chemically Decompose Directly in Tank by Lowering pH (Acid Addition) 64

Alternative #8 – Photolytically Decompose Tetraphenylborate Compounds Using TiO_2 65
Alternative #9 – Decompose by Addition of Water Soluble Mild Oxidant 65
Alternative #10 – TPB Decomposition Using Permanganate 66
Alternative #11 – Thermal Decomposition in DWPF, Send Residue to Melter 67
Alternative #12 – Electrochemical Decomposition of TPB 68
Alternative #13 – Supercritical Solvent Oxidation 68
Alternative #14 – DuPont NaTPB Destruction Scheme to Decomposed TPB Outside Tk48 69
Alternative #15 – Remove Cs/K with Organic Solvent and Burn Residue at CIF .. 70
Alternative #16 – Burn Tank 48 Contents at CIF after Appropriate Dilution 70
Alternative #17 – Distribute Tank 48 Contents Among the other Waste Tanks 71
Alternative #18 – Direct Grout 71
Alternative #19 – Do Nothing 72
Alternative #20 – Partner with GrayStar for Cs-137 Sources 72
Alternative #21 – Add Waste to Tk 48 and Decompose Radiolytically 73
Alternative #22 - Transfer Tank 48 Material to another Waste Tank and Decompose Radiolytically 73
Alternative #23 – In-Tank Bioremediation 74
Alternative #24 – Add Tank 48 Material to another Tank Scheduled to be Decommissioned (Grouted) 74
Alternative #25 – Use an Outside Vendor for Disposal 75
Alternative #26 – Metathesize with Cold Cesium 76
Alternative #27 – Add Tank 48 Contents to Tank 49 77
Alternative #28 – Send to Containment Facility 78
Alternative #29 – Remove Supernate and React phenylborates heel in solvent 78
Alternative #30 – Evaporate to Dryness and Bury or Add to Grout 79
Alternative #31 – Develop Method to Stabilize Material and use Tank 48 "As-Is" 79
Alternative #32 – Pyrolytic Decomposition of Precipitate 80
Alternative #33 – Tank 49 as a Reaction Vessel 80
Alternative #34 – Use Solvent to Extract KTPB, Park Solvent/TPB in Unused Waste Tank 81
Alternative #35 – Actinide Removal Process (ARP) Using Permanganate 82
Alternative #36 – Tank In Tank 83
Alternative #37 – Microwave Destruction of Organics 84
Alternative #38 – Volume-Reduce by Filtration, sending Filtrate to Tank 49/50, Decompose Residual In-Tank 85
Alternative #39 – Steam Reforming / Fluidized Bed 86
Alternative #40 – MST/TPB Strike in the Flow Sheet for the HLW System 87

Attachment 3 – ECPro Outcomes 88-97

Attachment 4 – R&D, Schedule and Cost 104-113

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 – Charter 95
Appendix 2 – Team Members 96
Appendix 3 – Team Milestones 97