

RICHLAND, WASHINGTON

HANFORD

ATOMIC PRODUCTS OPERATION

Classification Cancelled and Change

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

By Authority

~~CG-PR-12-92~~
~~James L. [unclear]~~
~~Veronica D. [unclear]~~

- 1 - F. W. Albaugh
- 2 - V. R. Cooper
- 3 - O. H. Greager
- 4 - M. K. Harmon
- 5 - O. F. Hill
- 6 - H. H. Hopkins
- 7 - L. W. Lang
- 8 - R. L. Moore
- 9 - A. M. Platt
- 10 - P. H. Reinker
- 11 - R. B. Richards

- 12 - G. Sege
- 13 - R. J. Sloat
- 14 - R. E. Smith
- 15 - R. E. Tomlinson
- 16 - J. W. Underwood
- 17 - F. W. Woodfield
- 18 - J. B. Work
- 19 - 23 - Extra
- 24 - 300 File
- 25 - Yellow File ←

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

April 1, 1954

This document contains restricted information as defined in [unclear] 1946. Its transmission in any manner to an unauthorized person is prohibited.

This document consists of 10 pages No. [unclear] Series A

DECLASSIFIED WITH DELETIONS

TO: L. W. Lang

FROM: A. M. Platt and R. J. Sloat

McGick 7-5-01
De Sauley 6-10-01

1st REVIEW-DATE	4-24-2001
AUTHORITY	AOC ADG (ADD)
NAME	Donald Brown
ORG	PNNL
2nd REVIEW-DATE	5-4-2001
NAME	R.M. Gorton
ORG	PNNL

CG-NMP-2 Sept. 2000

FEASIBILITY OF PROCESSING IRRADIATED THORIA

Reviewed and Approved for
Public Release by the NSAT
PNNL ADD
Date

INTRODUCTION

In compliance with your request, Chemical Development has investigated the technical feasibility and the economic impact on the separations process of using thorium oxide in fuel elements in lieu of thorium for the production of U^{233} . This memorandum summarizes the implications of such a substitution on the separations process to be employed for processing the irradiated fuel elements.

In addition to the thorium metal (Q) slug, two types of fuel elements have been considered. The first is composed of a sintered thorium core enclosed in a conventional aluminum alloy jacket. The second uses a heterogeneous mixture of "J" alloy (aluminum - U^{235}) and thorium pellets and is also jacketed with an aluminum alloy.

REVIEWED FOR DECLASSIFICATION
[unclear]
[unclear]
CLASSIFICATION IS UNCHANGED

DECLASSIFIED
WITH DELETIONS

300 AREA
CLASSIFIED FILES

DECLASSIFIED

HW-31261

-2-

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Since very little experimental data are available on the dissolution of thorium oxide, these conclusions are only tentative. Actual experiments which will be made in the next few months should provide a better basis for "firm" estimates.

- 1) Based upon an assumed thorium oxide dissolution rate approximately 10-fold slower than that of thorium metal in HNO_3 -aluminum-complexed fluoride ion solution, it appears that a 2 ton per day thorium processing capacity could be attained by building a third dissolver cell for the thoria plant, one more than required for a plant processing thorium metal slugs. Each of the three thoria dissolvers would be considerably larger than the dissolvers required in a thorium metal plant (20-ton total charge (slugs plus heel) instead of 8 tons). It is estimated that the additional dissolver cell and the larger dissolver vessels required for thoria dissolution would cost \$1,000,000 to \$1,500,000 more than the dissolver facilities for a thorium metal plant operating at the same thorium processing rate.
- 2) If the "J" alloy-thoria pellet slug is adopted as the fuel element for a Thorex Plant instead of a thorium metal or thoria slug, it would be economically feasible to build a "25" processing plant at Hanford either as a part of, or adjacent to, the Thorex Plant instead of transporting the dissolver solution produced from "J" metal to another site for "25" processing. Estimates developed in the discussion below indicate that the \$10,000,000 to \$15,000,000 annual cost of shipping the dissolver solution would pay for a \$40,000,000 "25" facility in approximately three years. In addition, the hazard of shipping large volumes of "hot" solution would be eliminated.

The above shipping cost could be appreciably reduced if the "J" alloy- ThO_2 pellet slugs were transported off-site for "J" metal dissolution. The ThO_2 pellets could then be shipped back to Hanford for Thorex processing. This approach is not considered attractive since the Thorex Plant would be dependant upon other sites for its feed stock. Strikes either at the other site or in the transport facility could seriously affect Hanford thorium production.
- 3) The dissolver facilities required for handling the "J" metal- ThO_2 pellet fuel elements would be more complicated and costly than the combined dissolver facilities required for separate dissolution of "J" slugs and thoria slugs. Estimates developed in the discussion below indicate that approximately 30 batch dissolvers would be required to attain a 2 ton/day thorium rate when processing "J" metal- ThO_2 pellet slugs. These dissolvers would require an estimated additional expenditure of \$3,000,000 to \$4,000,000 over the expenditure required for separate "J" metal slug and ThO_2 slug dissolution facilities. Operating costs for the "J" metal- ThO_2 pellet dissolution would be higher than for

DECLASSIFIED

CONFIDENTIAL

DECLASSIFIED

HW-31261

-3-

separate dissolution of "J" metal slugs and ThO_2 slugs. It is estimated that six additional men (1 crane operator, 3 dissolver operators, and 2 laboratory people) would be required at an annual cost of \$120,000 (4-shift coverage).

- 4) If the decision were made to build a "25" Plant at Hanford, it would be cheaper to build the plant as a part of the Thorex Building. If such a dual-purpose Thorex-"25" Plant were built, manpower and material could be utilized more efficiently during the construction program resulting in lower capital investment costs than required for separate "25" and Thorex Plants. Similarly, when the plant is operated, overhead costs would probably be reduced (e.g., I.M.E., Plant Protection; General Administration). Operating cost data presented on Table 2 indicate savings of approximately \$1,000,000 a year by operating a "25"-Thorex Plant in place of separate "25" and Thorex Plants.

DISCUSSION

Thoria Core Slugs

Processing of thoria-core fuel elements through separations would differ from a conventional Thorex operation using an aluminum-jacketed metallic thorium core for fuel only in the dissolution procedure employed to produce a liquid feed solution from the fuel elements. (However, any radical departure from the nitric acid-trace fluoride dissolution procedure discussed below could affect subsequent processing steps.) Once the thoria is dissolved in nitric acid, the solution may be processed in a manner identical with that used in processing conventional thorium (Q) slugs.

The meager data available indicate that thoria and aluminum mixtures can probably be dissolved in 60% HNO_3 spiked with mercuric and fluoride ion (0.05 to 0.1 M) to catalyze the acid-aluminum and acid-thoria reactions, respectively. These data⁽¹⁾ (on very small samples of 0.5 to 2 grams) indicate that the dissolution rates of thoria (sintering temperature unknown) in fluoride ion-60% HNO_3 solution are the same order of magnitude (± 3 fold) as for dissolving uranium metal in 60% HNO_3 . However, more recent data⁽²⁾ show that the rate of dissolution is markedly influenced by the sintering temperature of the thoria. Relative dissolution rates of thorium oxide which has been sintered at temperatures of 700, 1200, and 1630°C. are 1, 0.55, and 0.3 respectively. Although the central core temperature attained during pile irradiation of thoria slugs has not been experimentally verified, it has been postulated to be in the region of 500 to

(1) GE 3076
(2) ORNL-1431

DECLASSIFIED

DECLASSIFIED

WITH DELETIONS

-4-

HW-31261 DEL

700°C. It is not known whether dissolution rates of irradiated thorium slugs exposed to such core temperatures would be comparable to the dissolution rates of thorium slugs exposed to such temperatures in sintering operations prior to pile exposure. Also unknown, are any deleterious effects which might result from irradiation of thorium. However, O.R.N.L. experience reveals that a very insoluble, "blue" thorium is formed during the irradiation of thorium metal. This material has been tentatively identified as a thorium oxide and is thought to be soluble in large excesses of acid-fluoride mixtures.

In summary, it might be said that although irradiated thorium dissolution problems do not appear to be insurmountable, they do appear formidable. It is estimated that 15 to 30 man months of research and development work would be necessary to establish conceptual design criteria for the dissolution step in a new separations facility.

The attached Table I summarizes and compares the operating characteristics of uranium, thorium, and thorium dissolvers. (*) These data indicate that one dissolver (a standby spare would also probably be required) would be capable of handling a uranium production rate of 100 tons/month or a thorium production rate of 50 tons/month. Two dissolvers (plus a standby) would be necessary for a thorium production rate of 50 tons/month.

From the above discussion, it appears that an additional dissolver cell would be required if thorium oxide were processed at a 50 ton/month rate instead of thorium. Based upon an estimated canyon cost of \$30,000 per foot and the canyon space (approx. 35 ft.) required for a Purex dissolver cell, it appears that an additional capital investment of approximately \$1,000,000 would be required to provide the additional dissolver cell required for thorium oxide processing. Each of the dissolvers used for thorium oxide processing would be larger than the dissolvers used in a plant processing thorium metal. However, the additional cost for larger dissolvers would be expected to be relatively small (less than \$100,000) in comparison with the million dollar extra cost of the dissolver cell and the equipment in it.

"J" Alloy-Thorium Pellet Slugs

The use of "J" alloy-thorium pellet slugs in the piles would definitely affect the design of a separations plant to process these slugs. In addition, there would be many far reaching effects such as the involvement of "25" separations facilities at other A.E.C. sites. During the processing steps

(*) Concentrated HNO_3 is assumed used in the uranium dissolver while concentrated HNO_3 and a low fluoride ion concentration are used for the dissolution of thorium and thorium oxide.

DECLASSIFIED
WITH DELETIONS

COMPAN
DECLASSIFIED

-5-

HW-31261

which would be required to separate the thorium oxide pellets and U^{233} from the aluminum and U^{235} , a dissolver solution is formed which would be suitable for processing in a "25" plant. This solution could either be processed in a new facility built at Hanford or shipped as dissolver solution to other A.E.C. sites (presumably Arco) for processing.

Shipping problems for this dissolver solution would probably be considerably more complicated than those encountered in shipping slugs. For example, in case of a rail or truck accident, rupture of tanks containing this dissolver solution would be likely to spread gross contamination over a considerable area. In a congested area, such an accident would have serious and expensive consequences.

The cost of shipping the "25" dissolver solution to Arco would be extremely high. Calculations indicate that approximately 70 to 100 shielded "cask type" cars costing approximately \$100,000 each and weighing 120,000 lb. each would be required for shipping the dissolver solution resulting from the dissolution of 36 kg. of U^{235} per day. A required capital investment of \$7,000,000 to \$10,000,000 is estimated for these cars using the following bases.

- 1) Each car carries 3,000 lb. of dissolver solution in six 9-inch diameter tanks, each 20 ft. long.
- 2) Each car weighs approximately 12,000 lb. Most of this weight is contributed by the lead shielding required.
- 3) A one-week round trip is assumed for each car. Ten cars a day would be required to handle the 30,000 lb./day of "25" dissolver solution produced when processing thorium at a 2 ton/day rate.

Order-of-magnitude estimates indicate that shipping charges (amortization of tank cars not included) would be approximately \$1,000,000 per month or \$.03 per pound of material (lead and solution) transferred to Arco.

From the above discussion, it appears that the cost of shipping "25" dissolver solution to Arco would be \$10,000,000 to \$15,000,000 per year. Assuming a capital investment of \$40,000,000 is required for a new "25" plant here at Hanford, it appears that the plant could be amortized in a 3 year period. Building this plant in conjunction with the Thorex plant it may be possible to better the \$40,000,000 figure.

Operating costs for the combined Thorex-"25" Plant would be less than the sum of the operating costs of two separate plants. Table 2 lists estimated operating costs for separate Thorex and "25" plants and similar costs for the combined plant. As noted on Table 2, annual operating cost savings of greater than \$1,000,000 may be achieved in the combined Thorex-"25" plant. The major portion of this reduction occurs because of the more efficient utilization of manpower.

DECLASSIFIED

DECLASSIFIED

HW-31261

-6-

"J" Alloy-Thoria Pellet Dissolution Methods

No "J" alloy-thoria pellet slugs have been fabricated either for piles or laboratory testing. Consequently, the dissolution methods developed below are based upon fragmentary data and are subject to considerable modification as research and development studies are made in the near future. In developing the dissolution methods discussed below, the following assumptions have been made:

- 1) The composition of the "J" alloy-thoria pellet fuel element has not been specified. The slug is assumed to be a combination of irradiated "J" and thoria slugs having the following average composition:

<u>Compound</u>	<u>Weight %</u>
U ²³⁵	1.25
U ²³³	0.16
U ²³⁸	0.10
Fission Products	0.25
ThO ₂	73.75
Al	24.49

Processing rates of 2.33 ton/day and 36 kg./day have been assumed for thorium oxide and U²³⁵, respectively.

- 2) Some cross-contamination of the U²³³ and U²³⁵ is inevitable, depending upon the relative dissolution rates in nitric acid of "J" alloy and thorium oxide (which contains the Pa-233 and U-233). Studies are planned to determine the cross-contamination experimentally. For present purposes, it is assumed that less than 1% of the U²³³ formed will be found in the U²³⁵ product. Since thorium oxide is very insoluble in nitric acid alone, probably only the Pa²³³ and U²³³ molecules on the surface of the pellets will dissolve along with the J-metal. Calculations indicate that 1% of the volume of a sphere is contained in an outside shell with a thickness 0.33% of the sphere diameter.
- 3) It is assumed that the Thorex and "25" processing steps subsequent to the dissolution operation would be unaffected by the dissolution method employed.

Batch Dissolution. Batch dissolution, that is, HNO₃ dissolution of the "J" alloy followed by aluminum-complexed fluoride-HNO₃ dissolution of the thorium oxide in the same dissolver, would probably be the most costly method of dissolution both from a capital investment and operating cost standpoint. However, the research, development, and design effort required for this type dissolution would be considerably less than for other schemes discussed later, and hence initial design on the basis of batch dissolution may be dictated by the timing involved.

DECLASSIFIED

DECLASSIFIED

-7-

HW-31261

The thorium dissolution rates of the "J" alloy and thorium pellets will probably differ by a factor of at least ten. Therefore, in a batch-type dissolver, the criticality considerations of the "J" alloy will establish the volume of each dissolver and the slow thorium dissolution rate will determine the number of dissolvers required.

Critical mass data have not been obtained for the "J" alloy-pellet slugs. In calculating the number of dissolvers required, it has been assumed that a 9-in.-diameter dissolver would be safe from a slow neutron reaction (safe geometry*) standpoint when processing these slugs. If the dissolver is made 20 ft. long, 1300 lb. of slugs may be charged to each dissolver. Assuming a 5-day dissolver cycle, approximately 30 dissolvers are required for a thorium processing rate of 2 tons/day. Assuming that 8 ft. of canyon length (connector limiting) would be required for each of these dissolvers, its associated receiver-samplers and off-gas handling equipment, approximately 240 ft. of canyon would be required to house the batch dissolvers.

Comparison of this 240 ft. of canyon length with the sum of the 100 ft. of canyon length required for dissolving ThO_2 slugs in a Thorex Plant and the 30 ft. of canyon length required for dissolving the "25" slugs in a "25" Plant, shows approximately 110 to 130 ft. of additional canyon length required for the batch dissolvers in the dual-purpose "J" alloy-thorium pellet plant. The additional 110 to 130 ft. of canyon would necessitate an additional investment of approximately 3 to 4 million dollars.

This 3 to 4 million dollars additional construction cost would probably be saved by building a "25" plant at the same time the Thorex Plant is built. By combining the construction program of the \$50,000,000 Thorex Plant and the \$40,000,000 "25" Plant, it should be possible to reduce the total cost \$4,000,000; i.e., enough to pay for the additional dissolver facilities required for thorium-oxide pellet-"J" alloy dissolution. The amortization charge shown on Table 2 is based upon a dual-purpose "25" Thorium Pellet Plant cost of \$90,000,000.

Alternate Dissolution Techniques

As is indicated in the discussion above, approximately 30 batch dissolvers contained in a 240 ft. length of canyon space are required for processing thorium pellet-"J" alloy slugs at a 2 ton/day thorium processing rate. Appreciable savings (\$30,000/ft. of canyon) could be realized by a reduction in the space used for dissolution. A few of the schemes considered are discussed briefly below.

(*)Oak Ridge is currently designing a 9" diameter "25" dissolver. It is considered "safe" because of the dilution of the "25" with aluminum in the slugs and in the resulting solution.

DECLASSIFIED

DECLASSIFIED

-8-

HW-31261

Remote Dumper. The "J" metal is relatively easily dissolved away from the pellets with mercury catalyst and HNO_3 . Instead of dissolving the slow-dissolving thorium oxide in the same unit in HNO_3 -fluoride over a 5-day period, the thoria pellets might be dumped from the "J" dissolver by the crane into a large thoria pellet dissolver. Before the pellets could be dumped, an accountability check on the "25" would have to be made to prevent discharge of "J" metal into the thoria dissolver. If "J" metal were inadvertently dumped in the thoria dissolver, criticality problems could arise and gross cross-contamination could result.

Continuous or Semi-Continuous Mechanical Dissolver. With this type dissolver, undissolved slugs would be fed to the dissolver on a conveyor belt. After dissolution of the "J" metal, the thoria pellets would be carried from the dissolver by conveyor to a second dissolver. Although designed critically safe, this dissolver would be considerably larger than the "J" metal dissolvers.

Jet Pellet Removal Dissolver. The "J" metal would be dissolved in a critically safe dissolver. Both the "25" dissolver solution and the pellets would be jetted to a centrifuge, from which the "25" solution would be routed to the "25" Plant and the Pellets would be removed to a thoria dissolver.

DECLASSIFIED

DECLASSIFIED
WITH EXEMPTION

TABLS I

DISSOLVING SCHEDULE

Operation	Purex Dissolver		Thorex Dissolver		Thorex Dissolver	
	Material Processed	Time, Hr.	One Dissolver Operating at Total Processing Capacity of 4.16 Tons U/Day	One Dissolver Operating at Total Processing Capacity of 2.05 Tons Th/Day	Two Dissolvers Operating at Total Processing Capacity of 2.05 Tons Th/Day ss ThO ₂ Slugs	Material Processed
Slug Charging	4.10	4.5	4.10	10.25	13.5	
Equilibrium Heel	(9 buckets)					
Jacket Removal and Rinsing	4.10	0	4.10	10.25	10.25	
First Cut	2.05	14	2.05	10.25	240	
Second Cut	2.05	18	2.05	10.25	10.5	
Slack Time		11.5			264	
Total Time		48				
Avg. Dissolution Rate		1.8 %/hr.			0.21 %/hr.	

DECLASSIFIED
WITH DELETIONS

GENERAL ELECTRIC
COMPANY

-10-

DECLASSIFIED
WITH DELETIONS

TABLE II

ESTIMATED ANNUAL SEPARATIONS COSTS, THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS

Bases: 600 tons Th/yr.; 10,800 Kg. U²³⁵/yr.; 1,350 Kg. U²³³/yr.

	Facility		
	Thorex Plants (1)	"25" Plant (2)	Dual-Purpose "25"-Thorex Plant
Material, Direct	Thorium Metal	Thorium Oxide Fuel Element	"J" Metal-ThO ₂ Pellets
Water Storage	Fuel Element	"J" Slugs	Fuel Element
Labor, Direct			
Labor, Indirect			
Maintenance			
Rent, Light, Heat			
Process Steam			
Water, Steam, Air, Sewage			
Radiation Monitoring			
Plant Eng. Service			
Process Sub-Section			
Process			
Analytical			
Process Assistance			
Operating Unit, General			
Manufacturing, General			
Freight, HWRR			
Electricity			
Laundry			
Area Bus Service			
Other IME			
Plant Personnel & Protect			
Direct			
Indirect			
General Administration			
Total Operating Cost			
Amortization (16-2/3%/yr.)			
Total Operating and Amortization Cost			
Unit Cost, \$/ton Th			
	\$/gm. "23"		
	\$/gm. "25"		

NOTES

- 1) Direct material, waste storage, and process steam costs have been taken from the Tentative No. 6 Thorex Flowsheet shown in HW-31131. Labor and indirect costs are for an assumed plant force of 150 people and are therefore quite similar to Redox and Purex costs.
- 2) Direct material, waste storage, and process steam costs have been calculated from data presented in Reactor Science and Technology, December 1953 (TID-2011). Labor and indirect costs are estimated on the basis of Hanford experience for a plant force of 80 people.

DECLASSIFIED
WITH DELETIONS