

AECD-4194

CLINTON ENGINEER WORKS  
TENNESSEE EASTMAN CORPORATION

Contract No. W-7401-eng-23

CHEMICAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT DIVISION

Dr. C. E. Larson - Director

ANALYTICAL PROCEDURE FOR:

DETERMINATION OF TUBALLOY IN SOLID SALVAGE RESIDUES

This report was prepared as a scientific account of Government-sponsored work. Neither the United States, nor the Commission, nor any person acting on behalf of the Commission makes any warranty or representation, express or implied, with respect to the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of the information contained in this report, or that the use of any information, apparatus, method, or process disclosed in this report may not infringe privately-owned rights. The Commission assumes no liability with respect to the use of, or from damages resulting from the use of, any information, apparatus, method, or process disclosed in this report.

Photostat Price \$ 1.80  
Microfilm Price \$ 1.80  
Available from the  
Office of Technical Services  
Department of Commerce  
Washington 25, D. C.

T/5 Wm. R. Lasko  
Mr. C. D. Susano

Oak Ridge, Tennessee  
January 24, 1946

146-1

2

ANALYTICAL PROCEDURE FOR  
DETERMINATION OF TUBALLOY IN SOLID SALVAGE RESIDUES

ABSTRACT

Test results indicate that the hydrofluorination method for the analysis of tuballoy in solid salvage residues yields satisfactory results with a high degree of accuracy; while a modification of the procedure gives good results in approximately half the time.

Two other procedures for the determination of tuballoy in highly siliceous residues were used in these studies for comparing the results; however these are only briefly considered.

INTRODUCTION

While the determination of tuballoy in siliceous residues has been investigated by many workers, our attention was drawn to the possible use of hydrofluorination in tuballoy analyses by the report "Analysis For Tuballoy By Fluorination" by A. Ellich; in which hydrofluorination is followed by fluorination; however, after exhaustive tests on beta-residue samples, the procedure was found to be time consuming and inadequate for routine work.

After further investigation on Beta-residues, it was decided to continue using hydrofluorination but eliminating fluorination, and substituting instead a procedure which entailed subsequent reworking of the remaining residue. Since this procedure was found to work quite satisfactorily on all residue samples; five solid, salvage residue samples were obtained from Mr. D. P. Krause of Department 190 for the purpose of de-





termining the suitability of the hydrofluorination procedure, for possible adoption as a standard method in the Beta Analytical Department.

EXPERIMENTAL METHODS

HF Procedure

Determinations which were made by the complete hydrofluorination procedure (Monthly Progress Report, Department 195) on solid, salvage samples submitted by Department 190 gave the following test results.

<u>Lab. No.</u>	<u>Requisition No.</u>	<u>Material</u>	<u>% 1320</u>
9335	910847	L. S. Solid	3.5
9336	910875	Carbon	48.0
9337	910786	Process liquid waste	1.67
9338	910792	Salvage Wash	1.66
9339	910884	Baffle strippings	0.63

Modified HF Procedure

Depending on the accuracy required and the time delegated to each sample, it is believed that the time per analysis could be tremendously reduced if the residue remaining after the first leach with 6N HNO<sub>3</sub> is discarded. This will eliminate fusions and subsequent reworking of the residue (steps 13-18 of procedure listed on page 5). The following results were obtained and the comparisons noted:

<u>Lab. No.</u>	<u>% 1320 in Leach</u>	<u>% 1320 in Residue</u>	<u>Total 1320, %</u>	<u>% Error if Residue is discarded</u>
9335	3.42	0.08	3.50	2.3
9336	47.6	0.40	48.0	0.80
9337	1.61	0.06	1.67	3.5
9338	1.65	0.03	1.66	1.8
9339	0.47	0.16	0.63	25.4

In the above procedure, five samples were hydrofluorinated at one time; however, there is no necessity to restrict the reactor size to hold

only five samples. The size of the reactor will depend primarily on the influx of samples per day. To insure validity of the results, all residues before they are discarded should be checked by the count method.

Two more procedures were used as a basis of comparison; however, these will be covered only lightly as most of the emphasis was placed on the hydrofluorination method.

#### Prolonged Leach Procedure

The procedure, which was followed in the analysis of residue sample No. 9335 is: The residue is treated with HCl and HNO<sub>3</sub> acid and after prolonged digestion, all the solids went into solution. The usual R<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> precipitation and electrolytic purification, followed by precipitations with NH<sub>4</sub>OH are made, and the results obtained are as follows:

<u>Sample No.</u>	<u>Hydrofluorination Procedure</u>	<u>Prolonged Leach with HNO<sub>3</sub> and HCl</u>
9335	3.50	4.67

The result obtained by the prolonged leach procedure is incorrect, due to the incomplete removal of impurities. The residue was discarded before the purity of the precipitate had been ascertained.

#### Leach Fusion Procedure

The procedure used on residue sample No. 9336 is: The residue is leached with HNO<sub>3</sub> and HCl for 1/2 hour, filtered and washed, the residue is ignited and fused with Na<sub>2</sub>CO<sub>3</sub> and placed in solution with HCl. Both solutions are combined and dehydrated, digested with HCl, filtered and washed. The precipitate remaining is ignited, treated with HF and H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub>, fused with pyro-sulfate, and both solutions combined. A double ammonia precipitation followed by a double ammonium carbonate separation is made



on the solutions, followed by electrolysis for complete removal of impurities. The tuballoy is precipitated with  $\text{NH}_4\text{OH}$ , filtered, charred, ignited and weighed as  $\text{T}_2\text{O}_3$ . Comparative results are as follows:

<u>Sample No.</u>	<u>1. Complete HF Procedure</u>	<u>2. Modified HF Procedure</u>	<u>3. Leach Fusion Procedure</u>
	<u>§ 1320</u>	<u>§ 1320</u>	<u>§ 1320</u>
9336	48.0	47.6	48.2

#### RECOMMENDED PROCEDURE

The complete hydrofluorination procedure is as follows:

1. Weigh 2 gram of the dried sample in a nickel boat.
2. Place sample in monel reactor.
3. Bring temperature up to  $650^\circ\text{C}$  and turn on dry nitrogen.
4. Turn off nitrogen when temperature reaches  $650^\circ\text{C}$ .
5. Turn on HF.
6. Pass HF over sample for 3 hours holding the temperature at  $650^\circ\text{C}$ .
7. After 3 hours turn off HF.
8. Turn off rheostat.
9. Turn on nitrogen until system is free of HF.
10. Turn off nitrogen and remove sample when furnace is cool.
11. Brush sample carefully into a 250-ml beaker.
12. Leach for one-half hour with 6N  $\text{HNO}_3$ .
13. Filter and fuse remaining residue with carbonate combining both solutions. (The carbonate fusion may not place all the material in solution, nevertheless, every-

thing should be combined).

14. Evaporate solution and dehydrate residue with perchloric acid.
15. Filter and treat residue with HF, and make a pyro-sulfate fusion.
16. Take residue up in  $\text{HNO}_3$ , filter, and the residue remaining is volatilized by the addition of ammonia iodide at  $450^\circ\text{C}$ .
17. Make a pyro-sulfate fusion on the final remaining material and take-up in  $\text{HNO}_3$ .
18. Combine all solutions.
19. Make 2 ammonia precipitations.
20. Electrolyze for complete removal of impurities.
21. Make solution up to volume and run polarographically or gravimetrically depending on the amount of tuballoy present.

#### CONCLUSION

The modified hydrofluorination procedure is recommended as being the best in so far as time consumption per sample and the accuracy attainable with the least amount of difficulty. If this procedure is used on a routine basis, a provision should be made for checking all discarded residues by the count method to insure complete validity of the results.

The complete hydrofluorination procedure will require more time per analysis, but a higher degree of accuracy will be obtained.

The use of either procedure No. 1 or No. 2 will depend primarily on the laboratories using the method.



7

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Mr. G. A. Westerdahl for leach fusion procedure

Mr. J. M. Folk for polarographic work

REFERENCES

1. A. E. Milch, USA
2. Monthly Progress Report, Department 195, C-3.100-24

*Wm. R. Lasko*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
T/5 Wm. R. Lasko

*C. D. Susano*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
C. D. Susano

WRL:mpt

Date Submitted: 1-24-45  
Attachments: none