



CA0000264

AECL-11978

**Reducing Tube Bundle Deposition Using
Alternative Amines**

**Réduction du dépôt des faisceaux de tubes en
utilisant des amines alternatives**

C.W. Turner, S.J. Klimas, P.L. Frattini

July 1999 juillet

AECL

REDUCING TUBE BUNDLE DEPOSITION USING ALTERNATIVE AMINES

by

C.W. Turner^{*}, S.J. Klimas^{*} and P.L. Frattini[#]

^{*}Atomic Energy of Canada Limited
Chalk River Laboratories
Chalk River, ON K0J 1J0
[#]Electric Power Research Institute
3412 Hillview Avenue
Palo Alto, CA USA 94304-1395

AECL-11978

1999 July

AECL

RÉDUCTION DU DÉPÔT DES FAISCEAUX DE TUBES EN UTILISANT DES AMINES ALTERNATIVES

par

C.W. Turner*, S.J. Klimas* et P.L. Frattini#

RÉSUMÉ

On a mesuré dans une boucle à haute température, les vitesses de dépôt des particules de magnétite et d'hématite sur l'Inconel 600 dans des conditions d'ébullition en écoulement avec pH contrôlé, en utilisant une des amines suivantes : morpholine, ammoniac, éthanolamine ou diméthylamine. Les particules d'hématite se sont déposées à des vitesses 10 fois supérieures à celles mesurées pour la magnétite, bien que la vitesse de dépôt de l'hématite ait chuté quand la boucle a été mise en oeuvre dans des conditions réductrices. La vitesse de dépôt de la magnétite a été influencée par l'amine utilisée pour réguler le pH, la vitesse relative décroissant dans l'ordre suivant : morpholine (1), éthanolamine (0,72), ammoniac (0,51), diméthylamine (0,25). On étudie ces tendances dans la vitesse de dépôt au point de vue de la chimie de surface des produits de corrosion. Les vitesses de dépôt de la magnétite et de l'hématite ont augmenté de façon considérable une fois que la qualité du mélange a dépassé environ 0,3, ce qui peut être lié à un changement dans le mécanisme de transfert de chaleur de l'ébullition nucléée à la convection forcée diphasique à travers une pellicule mince.

*Énergie atomique du Canada limitée
Laboratoires de Chalk River
Chalk River (Ontario)
K0J 1J0

#Electric Power Research Institute
3412 Hillview Avenue
Palo Alto, CA USA 94304-1395

1999 juillet

AECL-11978

AECL

REDUCING TUBE BUNDLE DEPOSITION USING ALTERNATIVE AMINES

by

C.W. Turner^{*}, S.J. Klimas^{*} and P.L. Frattini[#]

ABSTRACT

Particle deposition rates were measured in a high-temperature loop for magnetite and hematite depositing onto Inconel-600 under flow-boiling conditions with pH controlled, using one of the following amines: morpholine, ammonia, ethanolamine, or dimethylamine. Hematite particles deposited at rates 10 times greater than those measured for magnetite although the hematite deposition rate dropped when the loop was operated under reducing conditions. The magnetite deposition rate was influenced by the amine used to control the pH, with the relative rate decreasing in the following series: morpholine (1) : ethanolamine (0.72) : ammonia (0.51) : dimethylamine (0.25). These trends in deposition rate are discussed in terms of the surface chemistry of the corrosion products. Deposition rates for both magnetite and hematite increased significantly once the mixture quality exceeded about 0.3, which may be related to a change in the heat-transfer mechanism from nucleate boiling to 2-phase forced-convection through a thin film.

*Atomic Energy of Canada Limited
Chalk River Laboratories
Chalk River, ON K0J 1J0
#Electric Power Research Institute
3412 Hillview Avenue
Palo Alto, CA USA 94304-1395

AECL-11978

1999 July

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
2.	EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURES AND ANALYSIS.....	1
	2.1 Procedures.....	1
	2.2 Data Analysis.....	3
3.	RESULTS.....	4
	3.1 Magnetite Deposition onto Inconel-600.....	4
	3.2 Hematite Deposition onto Inconel-600.....	7
	3.3 Deposition at High Steam Quality.....	8
4.	DISCUSSION.....	8
5.	ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	11
6.	NOMENCLATURE.....	11
7.	REFERENCES.....	11

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1:	Nominal test conditions used for the deposition experiments.....	3
Table 2:	Conditions used to achieve a high-temperature pH of 6.2 in the test section at zero steam quality.....	3

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1:	Schematic of the loop used for the deposition experiments.....	2
Figure 2:	Example of the buildup of activity on the test section during the typical experiment, as measured by the on-line γ -detector (experiment D35).....	5
Figure 3:	Typical examples of the normalized deposition rate constant and wall superheat versus mixture quality for magnetite deposition onto Inconel-600 for pH controlled using morpholine, ammonia, ethanolamine, and dimethylamine.....	6
Figure 4:	Effect of amine used for pH control on the normalized deposition rate constants, $\rho_{2\phi} K_{2\phi}$, averaged for $X = 0 - 0.25$ for magnetite and hematite deposition under flow-boiling conditions.....	7
Figure 5:	Normalized deposition rate constant and wall superheat versus mixture quality for hematite deposition onto Inconel-600 for pH-controlled using morpholine, ammonia, ethanolamine, and dimethylamine.....	8

1. INTRODUCTION

Corrosion products that are produced in the balance-of-plant are transported to the steam generator (SG) where they deposit on the tube bundle, tube sheet, and the tube support structure. The adverse effects of the accumulation of deposits on the performance of once-through and recirculating SGs is well documented [1,2]. For example, deposition on the tube bundle can reduce the thermal efficiency of the SG. The buildup of deposit on the tube support structure tends to restrict the flow paths, which can lead to excessive pressure drop across the tube support structure and, ultimately, to operational problems. Finally, deposits that form on the tubes and within the tube–tube-support and tube–tube-sheet crevices can become sites for localized corrosion and subsequent tube failure.

Although much work has been done to optimize the selection of pH-control reagents—that is, amines, to minimize the generation and transport of corrosion products from the balance-of-plant to the SG [3,4]—very little was known about how different amines might influence the deposition rates of corrosion products once they have reached the steam generator. Thus Atomic Energy of Canada Limited and the Electric Power Research Institute co-funded a program to determine the effect of the choice of pH-control reagent on the deposition rates of corrosion products under typical SG operating conditions [5]. We report here the effect of the choice of pH-control reagent on the deposition rates of magnetite and hematite under flow-boiling conditions.

2. EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURES AND ANALYSIS

2.1 Procedures

Details of the experimental methods and analyses are reported elsewhere [5]. The deposition experiments reported here were performed under flow-boiling conditions in the H-3 high-temperature loop located at the Chalk River Laboratories (CRL). Figure 1 shows a schematic of the loop. The main components of the loop are chemical addition tanks and sampling lines, to control loop chemistry; a positive displacement pump and flow control valve, to regulate the flow rate and loop pressure, respectively; an interchanger to preheat the water upstream of the test section; and a heated test section where deposition rates are measured under the thermalhydraulic conditions of interest. Table 1 lists the nominal test conditions used for the deposition experiments.

All tests were performed using Inconel 600 for the heated test section. Each test section was rinsed sequentially with hexane and methanol, and then pre-conditioned in the loop under experimental conditions for 48 h. The experiments were performed using one of the following 5 pH-control reagents: morpholine, ammonia, ethanolamine, dimethylamine, and potassium hydroxide. Table 2 lists the high- and low-temperature pH and calculated concentrations of free base. The high-temperature pH was calculated for conditions in the test section at a steam quality of zero.




Figure 1: Schematic of the loop used for the deposition experiments.

During each experiment, a suspension of radioactive corrosion product—i.e., magnetite or hematite—was continuously injected from the suspension tank into the loop at a location approximately 2 m upstream of the heated test section. A positive displacement chemical addition pump was used for this purpose, and the injected stream was diluted in the main loop circuit by a factor of approximately 200. The deposition of the colloidal particles onto the test section was monitored by a high-efficiency on-line γ -ray detector (high-purity germanium). Particles that did not deposit were removed by a system of filters downstream of the test section before the water was returned to the loop main tank. The magnetite used in this investigation was prepared by aging a fresh precipitate of $\text{Fe}(\text{OH})_2$ for 2 h under mildly oxidizing conditions at 90°C and $\text{pH} \approx 9$ [6]. The phase purity of the final product was confirmed by X-ray diffraction. A commercial reagent-grade product was used for the hematite deposition tests. For each test, a portion of the corrosion product was activated in the NRU reactor at CRL, to produce the radioisotope ^{59}Fe , which then served as a radiotracer to monitor deposition on the test section. The activated corrosion product was dispersed in water in an ultrasonic bath and was equilibrated with base in the suspension tank at the target pH before injection into the loop.

The concentration of corrosion product in the loop was determined by hot filtration, using a silver membrane filter with $0.2\text{-}\mu\text{m}$ pore size. Sampling either the inlet or outlet of the test section gave essentially identical results, which is consistent with the magnitude of the deposition rates reported below. The filtrate was analysed for pH, dissolved oxygen, and hydrazine. Samples of the activated suspension were taken from the suspension tank and were dissolved to determine the specific activity of the corrosion product.

After the completion of each experiment, the test section was cut into 30-mm sections so that the radioactivity on selected sections could be measured using an off-line γ -ray detector.

Table 1: Nominal test conditions used for the deposition experiments.

Thermalhydraulic Conditions	
Pressure	5.6 MPa (absolute)
Mass Flux	300 kg/m ² s
Heat Flux	250 kW/m ²
Steam Quality	-0.15 to 0.25*
Chemistry Conditions	
pH _T	6.2
Dissolved oxygen	<10 µg/kg
hydrazine	10 - 100 µg/kg
corrosion product (loop)	1 mg/kg

*: Steam quality extended to 0.52 towards the end of the test program.

Deposit activity was converted to deposit loading using the specific activity of the corrosion product, and the deposition rate was calculated from deposit loading by assuming a linear rate of buildup on the test section. This assumption was confirmed for each test using the on-line γ -ray detector. Deposit morphology was determined using scanning electron microscopy (SEM).

Table 2: Conditions used to achieve a high-temperature pH of 6.2 in the test section at zero steam quality.

pH control reagent	pH_{270 °C}	pH_{25 °C}	Concentration (mg/kg)
Morpholine	6.2	9.28	11.8
Ethanolamine	6.2	9.57	5.0
Ammonia	6.2	9.67	3.0
Dimethylamine	6.2	9.18	0.70
Potassium hydroxide	6.2	9.02	0.50

2.2 Data Analysis

The deposition rate determined by the simultaneous deposition and re-entrainment of particles is given by the following equation:

$$\frac{dm}{dt} = K_{2\phi} \rho_{2\phi} C(t) - \lambda m(t). \quad (1)$$

The re-entrainment rate, $\lambda m(t)$, was negligible under the experimental conditions of this investigation and, therefore, it could be omitted from Equation (1). Thus the deposition rate was normalized with respect to concentration of corrosion product to calculate the normalized deposition rate constant:

$$K_{2\phi} \rho_{2\phi} = \frac{dm}{dt} \frac{1}{C(t)}. \quad (2)$$

The rate constant, $K_{2\phi}\rho_{2\phi}$, does not change significantly with steam quality; hence it is more practical to use than $K_{2\phi}$ (m/s).

The deposition rate constant under fully developed nucleate boiling conditions, $K_{2\phi}$, consists of 2 components: the forced-convective and the boiling deposition rate constants:

$$K_{2\phi} = K_{FC} + K_b. \quad (3)$$

At zero steam quality, it has been shown [7,8] that, to a very good approximation

$$K_{2\phi} \cong K_b. \quad (4)$$

The boiling component, K_b , has been postulated to be proportional to the rate of vaporization of the liquid [9]. Consequently, the proportionality constant—known as the boiling deposition coefficient, a_b —can be evaluated using the following equation:

$$a_b = K_b \rho_{2\phi} \frac{H_{f-g}(1-X)}{q''}. \quad (5)$$

This value is permissible for X close to zero because the value of the forced-convective deposition rate constant, K_{FC} , is very low in comparison with the boiling deposition rate constant, K_b , at both subcooled conditions and at low mixture qualities. The deposition coefficient a_b is, in effect, a deposition rate constant normalized with respect to heat flux and pressure (the value of the heat of vaporization, H_{fg} , is pressure-dependent). Its magnitude represents the fraction of suspended crud deposited per kilogram of liquid evaporated.

The local thermodynamic steam quality in Equation (5) is calculated from the expression

$$X(l) = \frac{H_{in} + \frac{q}{F} \frac{l}{L} - H_{SAT}}{H_{f-g}}. \quad (6)$$

3. RESULTS

3.1 Magnetite Deposition onto Inconel-600

Figure 2 shows an example of the buildup of the decay-corrected activity of ^{59}Fe on the heated test section during the course of an experiment, as recorded by the on-line γ -ray detector for $X \approx 0$. The data in Figure 2 are for the deposition of magnetite onto Inconel 600 under morpholine pH control (experiment D35), but the results are typical of the other experiments in this investigation. There is a stepwise increase in activity upon commencement of the injection

of active suspension into the loop at $t = 0$. Thereafter, the activity measured by the on-line γ -ray detector increases linearly with time, signifying a constant rate of buildup of deposit on the test section. After the injection pump is switched off at $t = 10$ h, the deposit activity slowly decreases as particles are “scrubbed” from the surface by the flowing steam–water mixture. It is clear from Figure 2 that the rate of removal is significantly lower than the rate of deposition, thus justifying the use of Equation (2) for the calculation of the deposition rate constant.




Figure 2: Example of the buildup of activity on the test section during the typical experiment, as measured by the on-line γ -detector (experiment D35).

Figure 3 shows typical examples of the trend in wall superheat and normalized deposition rate constant, $\rho_{2\phi}K_{2\phi}$, as a function of mixture quality along the length of the test section for magnetite depositing onto Inconel 600, with pH controlled by morpholine (a), ethanolamine (b), ammonia (c), and dimethylamine (d). The wall superheat averaged 7.4°C in the tests. A local maximum in the deposition rate was normally observed between $X = -0.1$ and 0.0 , in the vicinity of the transition from sub-cooled to saturated nucleate boiling heat transfer. In some cases, the deposition rate dropped significantly with increasing mixture quality, as illustrated in Figure 3 (b), whereas in other cases the deposition rate was almost independent of mixture quality in the range $X = 0$ to $X = 0.25$, as shown in Figure 3 (a). Another trend, illustrated in Figure 3, is that the deposition rate of magnetite under flow-boiling conditions is dependent upon the volatile amine used for pH control, with the highest rates measured under morpholine pH control and the lowest rates observed when pH was adjusted using dimethylamine.




Figure 3: Typical examples of the normalized deposition rate constant and wall superheat versus mixture quality for magnetite deposition onto Inconel-600 for pH controlled using morpholine, ammonia, ethanolamine, and dimethylamine.

Figure 4 shows a comparison of the normalized deposition rate constants, averaged for mixture qualities from 0 to 0.25, for magnetite particles depositing under flow-boiling conditions with the four different amines used in this investigation. Each entry in the figure is itself an average of the results from at least two, and sometimes as many as seven, separate experiments. Reference 5 gives a complete list of the tests performed and results of the individual tests. Also shown in the figure are average results for the deposition of hematite particles under flow-boiling conditions, which are discussed in the next section.




Figure 4: Effect of amine used for pH control on the normalized deposition rate constants, $\rho_{2\phi} K_{2\phi}$, averaged for $X = 0 - 0.25$ for magnetite and hematite deposition under flow-boiling conditions.

3.2 Hematite Deposition onto Inconel-600

Examples of the trend in wall superheat and the normalized deposition rate constant, $\rho_{2\phi} K_{2\phi}$, with mixture quality for the deposition of hematite particles onto the surface of Inconel-600 under flow boiling conditions are shown in Figure 5. The wall superheats and the general features of the trend in deposition rate with mixture quality for hematite deposition are similar to those noted previously for magnetite deposition under the same conditions. One significant difference, however, is that the hematite deposition rates are about 10 times greater than the rates measured for magnetite depositing under similar operating conditions. The hematite results were less consistent, however, from one test to another with the same amine, and some rates were significantly lower than others. The differences were eventually traced to the concentration of dissolved oxygen in the loop water. All tests were done with hydrazine concentrations ranging from 50 to 150 $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$, while dissolved oxygen concentrations ranged from 0 to 25 $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$. In 4 out of 5 cases, the tests with low hematite deposition rates were the ones in which the dissolved oxygen concentration was zero. (See, for, example, Figure 5(d)). For this reason, the deposition rates for hematite, shown in Figure 4, are averaged over only those tests that had a residual oxygen concentration $\geq 5 \mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$. No result is shown for DMA because neither of the two DMA tests satisfied this criterion.




Figure 5: Normalized deposition rate constant and wall superheat versus mixture quality for hematite deposition onto Inconel-600 for pH-controlled using morpholine, ammonia, ethanolamine, and dimethylamine.

3.3 Deposition at High Steam Quality

Towards the end of this test program, modifications were made to extend the steam quality at the outlet of the test section from 0.25 to just over 0.60. Figure 5 (d) shows a typical example of the effect that operating at high steam quality has on the particle deposition rate. Although the results shown are for hematite depositing under dimethylamine pH control, similar results were observed for both magnetite and hematite, regardless of the amine used to control pH. The steam quality at which the deposition rate began to increase significantly varied somewhat from test to test. In 2 cases, elevated deposition rates were observed at mixture qualities as low as 0.15, but in general the behaviour was as shown in Figure 5 (d); a gradual increase in rate was observed between $X = 0.3$ and $X = 0.5$, followed by an abrupt increase in rate for $X > 0.5$.

4. DISCUSSION

The work presented here has demonstrated that

- the deposition rate of hematite is significantly higher than for magnetite under flow-boiling conditions;

- the deposition rate of magnetite is dependent upon the nature of the amine used for pH control;
- the deposition rate of hematite is sensitive to the dissolved oxygen concentration when the water contains 50 to 150 $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$ hydrazine; and
- the particle deposition rate under flow-boiling conditions increases significantly for mixture qualities in excess of 0.3.

The difference between the deposition rates of magnetite and hematite is most likely related to differences in the sign of the surface charges of these corrosion products at $\text{pH}_{270} = 6.2$. Earlier room-temperature loop deposition tests performed as a function of pH showed that the particle deposition rate is highest when the particle and substrate are oppositely charged and that the deposition rate is reduced significantly when the pH is adjusted to a region where the particle and substrate have the same sign of charge [10,11]. The reduction in the deposition rate in the latter case is attributed to the force of repulsion that develops between similarly charged surfaces [12,13].

The forces that affect the particle deposition rate are the same ones that determine whether a colloidal suspension of particles is stable against agglomeration. Factors that reduce the magnitude of the force of surface repulsion act to both decrease the stability of a colloidal suspension and to increase the rate of particle deposition. Conversely, increasing the magnitude of the repulsive force tends to increase the stability of a colloidal suspension and to decrease the rate of particle deposition. The fact that the deposition rate of magnetite particles onto Inconel 600 is lower than the rate for hematite suggests that the surfaces of magnetite and Inconel 600 are similarly charged at $\text{pH}_{270} = 6.2$, whereas the surfaces of hematite and Inconel 600 appear to be oppositely charged.

The sign of the charge on the surface of a metal oxide at any given pH is determined by the PZC, or point of zero charge, of the oxide. The surface will be negative when the pH is greater than the PZC and positive when the pH is less than the PZC. Shoonen [14] calculated the PZC for a number of metal oxides for temperatures up to 350°C and predicts that the PZCs for magnetite and hematite at 270°C are at pH 4.6 and 6.7, respectively. Thus, for the tests under flow boiling conditions— i.e., $\text{pH}_{270} = 6.2$ —the magnetite particles are predicted to be negatively charged and the hematite particles are predicted to be positive. From the relative deposition rates of magnetite and hematite, it would appear that the surface of Inconel 600 is also negatively charged under the experimental conditions. This hypothesis is corroborated by streaming current measurements performed at room temperature, which found a PZC of 4.2 for Inconel 600 that had been autoclaved for 24 h in water adjusted to pH 9 with morpholine [15].

The tests showed that the average particle deposition rate for magnetite under flow-boiling conditions is dependent upon the amine used for pH control and that it decreases in the following order (normalized to the rate with morpholine):

morpholine (1) : ethanolamine (0.72) : ammonia (0.51) : dimethylamine (0.25).

Additional tests showed that the lowest deposition rates were measured when a non-volatile, inorganic base, such as potassium hydroxide, was used to control the pH [5].

The equilibrium between a base and its conjugate acid is given by



It is postulated that adsorption of the conjugate acid, HA^+ , onto the surface of the negatively charged magnetite particle increases the particle deposition rate by making the surface of the magnetite particle less negative. The upper limiting case is given by deposition of a positively charged particle—i.e., hematite—which is observed to have a deposition rate that is 10 times greater than that of magnetite. The lower limiting case is given by deposition of magnetite where adsorption of the positively charged conjugate acid is zero. This value corresponds to the maximum negative charge possible on magnetite for a given pH_T , and it was likely achieved to a good approximation in the tests with pH controlled using potassium hydroxide.

The dependence of the deposition rate of hematite on trace concentrations of dissolved oxygen in the loop is consistent with other evidence that surface charge plays a strong role in determining the particle deposition rate under flow-boiling conditions. In those tests that had residual hydrazine and zero dissolved oxygen in the loop, the surface of the hematite particles would have been thermodynamically unstable with respect to reduction to magnetite. Because the deposition rate of magnetite is significantly lower than that of hematite, any tendency for the surface of the corrosion product to convert from hematite to magnetite would be expected to result in a reduction in the deposition rate, as observed. The kinetics for the reduction of hematite to magnetite is known to be slow, and it is not argued here that a significant fraction of the hematite particle has been reduced to magnetite. The measured deposition rates imply, however, that only the surface layer needs to be reduced to affect the particle deposition behaviour and that reduction of the surface layer is relatively fast.

It is not clear why the particle deposition rate increases significantly for mixture quality in excess of ≈ 0.3 . According to the Hewitt and Roberts flow pattern map for vertical flow [16], there is a transition from churn flow to annular flow at $X \approx 0.17$, but there is no apparent change in deposition behaviour at this mixture quality. It has been noted previously [5], however, that trends in the heat-transfer coefficient with thermodynamic quality are a good indicator of the trend in particle deposition rate; that is, both heat-transfer and particle deposition rates increase in a similar fashion as the mode of heat transfer changes from single-phase forced-convection to sub-cooled nucleate boiling to saturated nucleate boiling. There is a transition in the annular flow regime from saturated nucleate boiling to 2-phase forced-convection through a liquid film that is accompanied by a cessation of nucleate boiling and an increase in the heat-transfer coefficient. The effect of this change in the mode of heat transfer on the expected particle deposition rate is under investigation. The results of this investigation suggest that both high steam qualities and oxidizing conditions in the feedtrain may lead to higher deposition rates in the SG. In addition, the choice of amine used for pH control in the balance of plant may affect the deposition rate of magnetite in the SG, depending on the extent to which the amine adsorbs onto the surface of magnetite corrosion products.

5. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Funding for this work was provided by Atomic Energy of Canada Limited and by the Electric Power Research Institute. The authors are pleased to acknowledge the diligent efforts of Mr. M.G. Brideau who looked after all aspects of the loop deposition tests.

6. NOMENCLATURE

a = coefficient	-	λ = removal rate constant	(1/s)
l = distance along test section	(m)	ρ = density	(kg/m ³)
m = deposit mass	(kg/m ²)		
q _a = applied power	(kW)	<i>Subscripts</i>	
q = heat flux	(kW/m ²)	b = boiling	
t = time	(s)	fc = forced convection	
C = concentration	(kg/kg)	f-g = vaporization	
F = flow rate	(kg/s)	in = inlet	
H = enthalpy	(kJ/kg)	sat = saturation	
K = deposition rate constant	(m/s)	2 ϕ = two phase	
L = test section length	(m)		
X = mixture quality	-		

7. REFERENCES

1. Johnson, L.E., "Fouling in Once-Through Steam Generators". Paper 87-WA/NE-12 ASME Winter Annual Meeting, Boston, Mass. (1987).
2. Dyck, R., Spekkens, P., Verma, K. and Marchand, A., "Operational Experience with Steam Generators in Canadian Nuclear Plants", in Proceedings of the Steam Generator and Heat Exchanger Conference, Vol. I, Canadian Nuclear Society, April-May 1990, Toronto, Canada (1990).
3. Fellers B.D. and Shenberger D.S., "Dimethylamine Chemistry Demonstration. Nuclear Steam Cycle Application", 55th International Water Conference, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1994).
4. Trent R.L. and Fellers B.D., "Dimethylamine Technology to Remove Deposits and Reduce Fouling of Nuclear Steam Generators", EPRI Sludge Management Workshop, Myrtle Beach, SC. (1996).
5. C.W. Turner, S.J. Klimas and M.G. Brideau, "The Effect of Alternative Amines on the Rate of Boiler Tube Fouling". Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd. Report, AECL-11848. Also issued as Electric Power Research Institute Report, EPRI TR 108004 (1997).
6. T. Sugimoto and E. Matijevic, "Formation of Uniform Magnetite Particles by Crystallization from Ferrous Hydroxide Gels", *J. Colloid and Interface Sci.* **74** (1980) 227.

7. C.W. Turner and M.S. Godin, "Mechanisms of Particle Deposition in High Temperature Boiling and Non-boiling Water", 2nd International Steam Generator and Heat Exchanger Conference, 1994 June 13-15, Toronto, Canada.
8. D. Thomas and U. Grigull, "Experimental Investigation of the Deposition of Suspended Magnetite from the Fluid Flow in Steam Generating Tubes". *Brennst.-Warme-Kraft*, **26** (1974) 109.
9. Y. Asakura, M. Kikuchi, S. Uchida and H. Yusa, "Deposition of Iron Oxide on Heated Surfaces in Boiling Water", *Nuclear Science and Engineering*, **67** (1978).
10. C.W. Turner, D.H. Lister and D.W. Smith, "Deposition of Sub-micron Particles of Magnetite at the Surface of Alloy-800", Steam Generator and Heat Exchanger Conference Proceedings, Vol. II, Toronto (1990) 6B-64
11. R. Williamson, I. Newson and T.R. Bott, "The Deposition of Hematite Particles from Flowing Water". *Can. J. Chem. Eng.* **66** (1988) 51.
12. C.W. Turner, "Rates of Particle Deposition from Aqueous Suspensions in Turbulent Flow: A Comparison of Theory and Experiment", *Chem. Eng. Sci.* **48** (1993) 2189.
13. E. Ruckenstein and D.C. Prieve, "Rate of Deposition of Brownian Particles under the Action of London and Double-Layer Forces", *J. Chem. Soc. Faraday Trans. II* **69** (1973) 1522.
14. M.A.A. Schoonen, "Calculation of the Point of Zero Charge of Metal Oxides between 0 and 350°C", *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta* **58** (1994) 2845.
15. P.V. Balakrishnan and C.W. Turner, Chalk River Laboratories, unpublished results.
16. G.F. Hewitt and D.N. Roberts, "Studies of Two-Phase Flow Patterns by Simultaneous X-Ray and Flash Photography". Atomic Energy Research Establishment Report, AERE-M (1969).

ISSN 0067-0367

To identify individual documents in the series, we have assigned an AECL-number to each.

Please refer to the AECL-number when requesting additional copies of this document from:

Information Centre, Information Management Branch
AECL
Chalk River, Ontario
Canada K0J 1J0

Fax: (613) 584-8144 Tel.: (613) 584-3311 ext. 4623

Pour identifier les rapports individuels faisant partie de cette series, nous avons affecté un numéro AECL-à chacun d'eux.

Veuillex indiquer le numéro AECL-lorsque vous demandez d'autres exemplaires de ce rapport au:

Service de Distribution des Documents Officiels
EACL
Chalk River (Ontario)
Canada K0J 1J0

Fax: (613) 584-8144 Tel.: (613) 584-3311 poste 4623

