

Examination of Uranium(VI) Leaching During Ligand Promoted Dissolution of Waste Tank Sludge Surrogates

Brian A. Powell^{*a,\$}, Linfeng Rao^a, Kenneth. L. Nash^b

^aLawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley, CA 94720 USA

^bWashington State University, Pullman, WA 99164 USA

*Corresponding author: email: bpowell@clemson.edu

^{\$}Current Address: Department of Environmental Engineering and Earth Sciences, Clemson University, Anderson, SC 29630

Summary. The dissolution of synthetic boehmite (γ -AlOOH) by 1-hydroxyethane-1,1-diphosphonic acid (HEDPA) was examined in a series of batch adsorption/dissolution experiments. Additionally, the leaching behavior of $^{233}\text{U(VI)}$ from boehmite was examined as a function of pH and HEDPA concentration. The results are discussed in terms of sludge washing procedures that may be utilized during underground tank waste remediation. In the pH range 4 to 10, complexation of Al(III) by HEDPA significantly enhanced dissolution of boehmite. This phenomenon was especially pronounced in the neutral pH region where the solubility of aluminum, in the absence of complexants, is limited by the formation of sparsely soluble aluminum hydroxides. At pH higher than 10, dissolution of synthetic boehmite was inhibited by HEDPA, likely due to sorption of Al(III):HEDPA complexes. Addition of HEDPA to equilibrated U(VI)-synthetic boehmite suspensions yielded an increase in the aqueous phase uranium concentration. Partitioning of uranium between the solid and aqueous phase is described in terms of U(VI):HEDPA speciation and dissolution of the boehmite solid phase.

1. Introduction

The underground storage tanks at the Hanford Site in Washington State, U.S.A. contain the byproducts from a number of spent nuclear fuel reprocessing processes including the bismuth phosphate (BiPO_4), Redox and PUREX processes (1). Over time the waste has stratified into a salt cake, a supernatant phase, and an underlying sludge phase. Insoluble aluminum oxides make up a significant fraction of the sludge phase (1). Most of the transuranics have partitioned into the sludge phase, making vitrification of the sludge phase for geologic disposal a plausible treatment process (1). However, vitrification will be

31 prohibitively expensive due to the large volume of the sludge phase. Therefore, reduction of the volume
32 of the sludge through dissolution of the aluminum oxides presents a favorable alternative.

33 Various strategies of sludge leaching have been proposed and tested with sludge stimulants,
34 including leaching with increasingly aggressive procedures (0.01M NaNO₂ + 0.01M NaOH, 3M NaOH,
35 0.05M glycolic acid + 0.10M NaOH, 0.10M HNO₃, 2.0M HNO₃, 0.5M HEDPA (1-hydroxyethane-1,1-
36 diphosphonic acid)) (1-3). It was found that the aluminosilicates cannot be removed using the baseline
37 washing procedure (0.01 M NaNO₂ + 0.01 M NaOH) and no single treatment achieved complete
38 dissolution (1-3). Data from these experiments suggest that HEDPA could be an effective leachant to
39 reduce the volume of waste sludge. In order to develop an efficient waste treatment process, further
40 studies are needed to understand the extent of sludge phase dissolution and the partitioning of actinides
41 (U, Np and Pu) during the leaching process.

42 As a diphosphonic acid, HEDPA is known to form strong complexes with metal ions including
43 actinides and aluminum across a wide pH range (4-6). In the absence of complexing ligands, aluminum
44 (hydro)oxides are only sparingly soluble. Therefore, formation of Al(III):HEDPA complexes will
45 promote sludge dissolution. However, partitioning of the actinides between the sludge and aqueous phase
46 must also be understood in order to evaluate the viability of HEDPA for sludge washing. Formation of
47 U(VI):HEDPA complexes affects the partitioning of uranium during the leaching of waste sludge with
48 HEDPA. Previous experiments demonstrated that greater than 95% of the total uranium was leached from
49 BiPO₄, Redox, and PUREX sludge waste simulants by washing the sludge with 0.5 M HEDPA (3).
50 Recently, a number of (UO₂)_mH_hL_l (where L stands for the fully deprotonated HEDPA anion) complexes,
51 ranging from cationic to anionic, were identified in the pH region from 2 to 12 using potentiometry,
52 calorimetry, and spectroscopic techniques (4). The thermodynamic data provided by Reed et al. (4) are
53 used below to describe observed behavior of uranium in synthetic boehmite suspensions amended with
54 HEDPA.

55 The objective of this study was to investigate the ability of HEDPA to accomplish dissolution of
56 synthetic boehmite and to examine the leaching of uranium during dissolution. A companion study was

57 also performed to examine the leaching of neptunium and plutonium under similar conditions (7). The
58 data are expected to assist in the development of remediation strategies to be used during waste tank
59 sludge washing.

60

61 **2. Materials and Methods**

62 **2.1 Solid Phase Characterization**

63 The alumina used in this work was obtained from SASOL (trade name CATAPAL® B). Powder X-ray
64 diffraction data, determined using a Seimens D-500 Diffractometer, indicate that the material has the
65 crystal structure of boehmite (γ -AlOOH) although a significant amorphous character was indicated
66 through broad peaks in the XRD spectra. A surface area of $354 \text{ m}^2 \text{ g}^{-1}$ was measured by $\text{N}_2(\text{g})$ adsorption
67 using a Micrometrics BET Surface Area Analyzer. Potentiometric titrations were conducted with 100 g L^{-1}
68 boehmite suspensions in 0.01, 0.1, and 1.0 M NaCl to determine the point-of-zero-salt-effect (pzse). The
69 titration results are shown in Figure 1. The boehmite surface has a net positive or negative charge due to
70 protonation or deprotonation of surface hydroxyl groups with changing pH. The intersection of the
71 curves for the three NaCl concentrations at pH 8.1 represents the point at which changes in the
72 concentration of the background electrolyte have no effect on the net surface charge density (8). This
73 value is consistent with the zero-point-of-charge measured for several synthetic aluminas (9-11). The
74 apparent proton surface charge density was calculated assuming a surface site density of 1.7 sites per nm^2 .

75

76 **2.2 Preparation of Uranium Working Solution**

77 A stock solution of $^{233}\text{U}(\text{VI})$ tracer was obtained from the inventory at Lawrence Berkeley National
78 Laboratory and purified by ion exchange. Analysis by α -spectroscopy indicated that the purified uranium
79 contains 96.6% ^{233}U and 3.3% ^{232}U . A $1.1 \times 10^{-4} \text{ M U}(\text{VI})$ working solution in 1M NaCl at pH 3 was
80 prepared from the stock solution and used for sorption experiments. The concentration of uranium was

81 determined by liquid scintillation counting (LSC) using EcoLume™ (MP Biomedicals Inc.) cocktail on
82 a Wallac 1415 liquid scintillation counter.

83

84 **2.3 Dissolution of boehmite using HEDPA**

85 Working suspensions spanning the pH range 4 to 11 were prepared by equilibrating boehmite with 1.0 M
86 NaCl then using these suspensions to prepare samples for batch experiments. The batch experiments were
87 performed in polypropylene centrifuge tubes shaken along their longitudinal axis on an orbital shaker at
88 150 rpm. Batch dissolution experiments to examine the dissolution of boehmite by HEDPA were
89 conducted in suspensions with a constant boehmite concentration of 600 mg L⁻¹ (10 mM as Al) containing
90 5 mM, 10 mM, and 50 mM HEDPA. At specified intervals, aliquots were removed and passed through
91 200 nm nylon filters (Gelman Acrodisc). The aluminum concentration in the filtrate was measured using
92 ICP-OES (Perkin Elmer, Optima 5300 DV). The pH of each suspension was adjusted towards an initial
93 pH during sampling intervals using 0.1 and 0.01 M HCl and NaOH. At a few intervals, the HEDPA
94 concentration in the filtrate was measured using a standard spectrophotometric method (12) employing a
95 Cary 5G Spectrophotometer.

96 A series of potentiometric titrations were attempted to examine Al(III):HEDPA complex
97 formation in 1 M NaCl. However the titrations were unsuccessful as a white precipitate was observed
98 across the pH range 4 to 9. To identify the precipitate, a series of solutions were prepared in 1 M NaCl
99 with total Al(III):HEDPA ratios varying from 1:1 to 1:5. The precipitates were isolated via centrifugation
100 and re-dissolved in ultra pure H₂O. The aluminum and HEDPA concentrations in the resulting solution
101 were used to calculate the Al(III):HEDPA molar ratio in the solids. Additionally, to examine the effect of
102 the background electrolyte and electrolyte concentrations, Al(III):HEPDA precipitates were formed in 0.1
103 and 1.0 M NaCl, KCl, NaNO₃, and (CH₃)₄NCl as well as ultra pure water. Aliquots of each solution were
104 passed through filters with nominal pore sizes ranging from 450 nm to 12 nm to determine the particle
105 size range of the precipitates.

106

107 **2.4 Sorption of uranium to boehmite**

108 The effect of HEDPA on uranium partitioning to synthetic boehmite was examined by amending
109 equilibrated U(VI)-boehmite suspensions with HEDPA as described below. The uranium-boehmite
110 suspensions were prepared by adding an aliquot of the U(VI) working solution to a boehmite suspension
111 previously adjusted to a desired pH. The initial solution conditions were 6.1 μM U(VI), 660 mg L^{-1}
112 boehmite, and 1.0 M NaCl. The samples were mixed at 150 rpm for 10 days. Preliminary kinetic tests (in
113 the absence of HEDPA) indicated steady state uranium partitioning was achieved after 7 days. At
114 specified intervals, the soluble uranium concentration was determined in the filtrate obtained by passing a
115 subsample through a centrifugal filter (30k molecular-weight-cut-off, Nanosep, Pall Life Sciences,
116 estimated 12 nm pore size). The U concentration was measured by LSC as described above.

117 After 10 days, half of the uranium-boehmite suspensions were amended with a small volume of a
118 0.05 M HEDPA stock solution (pH 7) to yield a suspension containing 5.4 mM HEDPA, 600 mg L^{-1}
119 boehmite, and 1M NaCl. The other half of the suspensions were amended with a 0.5 M HEDPA solution
120 (pH 7) to yield a 50 mM, 600 mg L^{-1} , 1 M NaCl suspension. The final U(VI) concentration was 5.8 μM in
121 all suspensions. Boehmite-free control solutions were also amended to 5.4 mM HEDPA as described
122 above. The soluble uranium concentration was determined via filtration followed by LSC as described
123 above.

124

125 **3. Results and Discussion**

126 **3.1 HEDPA Interactions with Boehmite: Sorption and Dissolution**

127 In the absence of complexants, the aqueous phase concentration of aluminum is limited by the formation
128 of sparsely soluble Al (hydr)oxide solids, especially at circum-neutral pH values. As shown in Figure 2,
129 addition of HEDPA clearly enhances the dissolution of boehmite. Across the pH range 5 to 9, samples
130 amended with HEDPA have aluminum concentrations significantly higher than the HEDPA-free control
131 system. The enhanced dissolution of boehmite in the presence of HEDPA is likely the results of formation

132 of $Al_mH_hL_l$ complexes (where L represents completely deprotonated HEDPA and m, h, and l are
133 stoichiometric coefficients). The exact identity of specific complexes is uncertain at this point as the data
134 available in the current literature are not in agreement (5,6) and our potentiometric experiments to obtain
135 such data were unsuccessful due to the formation of a white precipitate across the neutral pH range (see
136 Section 2.3). The nature and composition of the white precipitate was not fully determined, but analysis
137 of the precipitate isolated from 1.0 M NaCl solutions with various Al(III):HEDPA molar ratios (from 1:1
138 to 1:2.5) indicated that it always had a 1:1 Al(III):HEDPA molar ratio. The observation of a 1:1
139 Al(III):HEDPA precipitate suggests that the low aluminum concentration across the neutral pH range
140 (Figure 2) may be controlled by the solubility of an Al(III):HEDPA solid phase. It was worth noting that
141 the constitution and concentration of the background electrolyte significantly affected the physical
142 characteristics of the precipitate. Precipitates prepared in 1.0 M NaCl and 1.0 M NaNO₃ tended to form
143 clearly distinct particles while precipitates from 1.0 M (CH₃)₄NCl and 1.0 M KCl tended to have a gel-
144 like character, suggesting that sodium may cause significant aggregation of the Al(III):HEDPA particles.
145 In addition, the concentration of NaCl was also found to have a significant effect on the precipitate.
146 Solutions containing aluminum and HEDPA in a 2:5 molar ratio in ultra pure H₂O, 0.1 M NaCl, or 1.0 M
147 NaCl were passed through filters with pore sizes ranging from 450 nm to 12 nm. The fraction of soluble
148 aluminum was found to be inversely related to the ionic strength of the solution.

149 The concentrations of aluminum in more acidic (pH 4 to 5) and basic (pH > 10) regions were
150 higher than those in the neutral pH region (Figure 2). After 2 days at pH 4 to 5, the concentrations of
151 aluminum were comparable in systems with or without HEDPA. This is due to the formation of $Al(OH)^{2+}$
152 and $Al(OH)_2^+$ species yielding macromolar concentrations of aluminum in the absence of HEDPA. At pH
153 > 10, the dominant aqueous species is $Al(OH)_4^-$, yielding high aluminum concentrations in systems
154 without HEDPA. At pH 11, the presence of HEDPA resulted in a lower aluminum concentration than that
155 in the control system up to 16 days (Figure 2). This difference may be due to precipitation of an
156 Al(III):HEDPA solid as described above or slow kinetics of dissociation of Al(III):HEDPA complexes
157 from the mineral surface. Data in the literature indicate that phosphate may form multi-nuclear surface

158 complexes which could inhibit detachment of the metal-ligand complex from the surface or even inhibit
159 dissolution (13). Therefore, as HEDPA surface complexation would be expected to occur through the
160 phosphate group, the inhibition of boehmite dissolution may be due to formation of a multi-dentate
161 surface complex.

162

163 **3.2 Sorption of U(VI) to synthetic boehmite in the absence of HEDPA**

164 Data describing the sorption of uranium in the absence of HEDPA are shown in Figure 3. In the absence
165 of HEDPA, approximately 15% of the uranium was sorbed at pH 4. As the pH increased, the fraction of
166 uranium sorbed increased until relatively steady partitioning was reached at pH > 5. Above pH 5,
167 approximately 90% of the total uranium was sorbed. The sorption edge occurring between pH 4 and 5 has
168 been previously observed by a number of researchers examining uranium sorption to aluminum
169 (hydr)oxides (10, 14-15) This behavior is consistent with electrostatic attraction/repulsion between
170 uranium and the boehmite surface. As shown in Figure 1, the boehmite surface charge transitions from a
171 net positive to a net negative charge as the pH increases. This is due to the protonation and deprotonation
172 of aluminol surface sites. At low pH values the positively charged uranyl dioxycation is repelled by the
173 positively charged boehmite surface. As the pH was increased, both the net positive surface charge and
174 the positive charge on the U(VI) species decreased (the latter due to hydrolysis), resulting in stronger
175 sorption of U(VI) onto boehmite. The slight decrease in the fraction of uranium sorbed observed at higher
176 pH values is presumed to be due to formation of soluble uranyl-carbonates. Although experiments were
177 run in sealed centrifuge tubes, no effort was made to exclude carbonate from these experiments.

178

179 **3.3 Effect of HEDPA Concentration on U(VI) sorption to Boehmite**

180 Significant leaching of uranium from boehmite occurred rapidly following the amendment of the
181 equilibrated uranium-boehmite suspensions to either 5 mM HEDPA or 50 mM HEDPA (Figure 4a and
182 4b). At all pH values above 4.5, the addition of HEDPA resulted in rapid leaching of uranium from
183 boehmite. Four hours after amendment of the uranyl-boehmite suspensions with 5 mM HEDPA, the

184 fraction of uranium sorbed within the neutral pH region dropped from approximately 90% to
185 approximately 50% (Figure 4a). Over the next 181 days, the concentration of uranium in the aqueous
186 phase continued to increase. This slow step could be due to a rate limitation of the dissociation of a
187 U(VI):HEDPA complex from the boehmite surface or due to continued dissolution of the boehmite phase.
188 A similar effect was observed for the 50 mM HEDPA system although a larger fraction of the total
189 uranium was leached into the aqueous phase within the first 4 hours (Figure 4b). Furthermore, the
190 concentration of uranium in the aqueous phase after 181 days was significantly greater in the 50 mM
191 HEDPA suspension relative to the 5 mM HEDPA suspension. The increased partitioning of uranium to
192 the aqueous phase in the 50 mM HEDPA system is presumably due to enhanced dissolution of the
193 boehmite solid phase, saturation of the remaining boehmite surface sites with HEDPA, and/or formation
194 of U(VI):HEDPA complexes. As shown in Figure 2, after 135 days, at least 10% of the aluminum in
195 boehmite suspensions with 50 mM HEDPA is soluble at all pH values examined (Al concentration greater
196 than 1.0×10^{-3} M). At pH values less than 5, the boehmite was almost completely dissolved. Therefore the
197 total boehmite surface available for sorption of uranium or U(VI):HEDPA complexes was significantly
198 diminished in the 50 mM HEDPA system.

199 Data in Figure 4a (for the 5 mM HEDPA system) indicate a loss of uranium from the aqueous
200 phase at low pH values following the addition of HEDPA. Such loss appears to be consistent with the
201 precipitation of U(VI):HEDPA complexes that was observed at low pH and low HEDPA:U(VI) ratios
202 (<2) by Reed et al. (4). However, precipitation of a U(VI):HEDPA complex in these sorption experiments
203 is not expected, because the HEDPA concentration is between 3 and 4 orders of magnitude higher than
204 the uranium concentration and uranium was found to remain in the aqueous phase in all control (with
205 HEDPA but without boehmite) solutions spanning the pH range 4 to 11 for the duration of these
206 experiments. Possible reasons for the observed loss of U(VI) in the low pH regions of the 5 mM HEDPA
207 system are discussed in Section 3.4.

208

209 **3.4 Effect of pH and HEDPA on U(VI) sorption to Boehmite**

210 *3.4.1 Uranium partitioning in the acidic pH region:* Unless specified, the effects of pH on uranium
211 partitioning will be discussed below in terms of the 5.4 mM HEDPA system (Figure 4a). At pH 4, the
212 addition of HEDPA increased the fraction of uranium sorbed from 15% to 47% within 4 hours (the
213 fraction remained unchanged for the remainder of the experiment up to 181 days). This is the only sample
214 in which the addition of HEDPA caused an increase in the sorption of uranium. The uranium partitioning
215 at low pH observed in this system is similar to the observations of Cheng et al. (16) who found that
216 phosphate caused increased uranium sorption to goethite-coated sands at low pH values, relative to
217 phosphate free suspensions. A similar pH effect was also observed by Guo et al. (17) and Guo et al., (18)
218 when examining thorium and uranium sorption in alumina suspensions amended with phosphate. Guo et
219 al., (18) proposed that the enhanced sorption of uranium was due to formation of ternary surface
220 complexes with U(VI) and phosphate.

221 Assuming that the behavior of the phosphate groups of HEDPA may be similar to that of
222 phosphate, the increased uranium sorption observed in this work was also likely caused by the formation
223 of a ternary U-HEDPA-AlOH surface complex. As the speciation plot of U(VI) in a 5.4 mM HEDPA
224 solution shows, a number of anionic U(VI):HEDPA species exist in low pH regions (Figure 5). On the
225 other hand, the boehmite surface carries a net positive charge at low pH values. Therefore the observed
226 increase in sorption could be due to sorption of anionic species such as $\text{UO}_2\text{L}_2\text{H}_4^{2-}$ or $\text{UO}_2\text{L}_2\text{H}_3^{3-}$. Similar
227 ternary surface complexes have been proposed to explain increased metal sorption at low pH values in the
228 presence of anionic metal-ligand complexes (19-21). In this case, sorption of the metal is proposed to be
229 due to the formation of a ternary complex where the ligand bridges the mineral surface and the metal.
230 Such a geometry could be conceptualized utilizing the two phosphate groups of HEDPA. Within this pH
231 region (pH ~4), HEDPA will be present as H_2L^{2-} (based upon the pK_a values reported by Reed et al., (4))
232 and will be attracted to the positively charged boehmite surface. Nowack and Stone (22) examined
233 HEDPA sorption to goethite and found that at low pH values, deprotonated anionic HEDPA species were
234 attracted to the positively charged goethite surface. As the pH increased, and the surface developed a net

235 negative charge, the sorption of HEDPA decreased (22). He et al., (23) observed similar pH effects when
236 examining phosphate sorption to alumina.

237 *3.4.2 Uranium partitioning at circumneutral pH* : Across the pH region from 5 to 8, the fraction
238 of sorbed uranium decreased significantly following the addition of HEDPA (Figure 4a). After 1 and 6
239 days, the fraction of uranium sorbed increased as the pH was increased from approximately 5 to 6.5.
240 Across the pH range 6.5 to 9, a relatively steady partitioning of uranium was observed for the sampling
241 intervals at 0.2, 1, and 6 days. After 6 days, a more general trend appeared in the data where the fraction
242 of uranium sorbed was found to increase as the pH increased from pH 5. It is noteworthy that
243 coprecipitation of uranium with an Al(III):HEDPA complex as discussed above is also a possibility.
244 However, the increase in uranium sorption with increasing pH is not consistent with coprecipitation as the
245 primary mechanism for loss of uranium from the aqueous phase. Across this circumneutral pH region (5
246 to 9), the anionic U(VI):HEDPA species $\text{UO}_2\text{L}_2\text{H}_2^{4-}$, $\text{UO}_2\text{L}_2\text{H}^{5-}$, and $\text{UO}_2\text{L}_2^{6-}$ are predominant (Figure 5)
247 and the boehmite surface maintains a net positive surface charge (Figure 1). This will allow for an
248 attractive force between the anionic U(VI):HEDPA complexes and the positively charged sites on the
249 boehmite surface. Since both free HEDPA and free U(VI) are known to sorb within this pH region, a
250 ternary surface complex could form through either uranium or HEDPA.

251 *3.4.3 Uranium partitioning above pH 9*: Above pH 9, the fraction of sorbed uranium decreased
252 significantly following the addition of HEDPA (Figure 4a). There was a slight decrease in the fraction of
253 uranium sorbed over the first 59 days followed by a significant decrease after 180 days. The rate at which
254 uranium was leached into the aqueous phase was similar to the rate of boehmite dissolution (Figure 2),
255 indicating that dissolution was a primary factor controlling uranium partitioning within this pH region. At
256 earlier time intervals, the fraction of uranium sorbed across the pH region 9 to 11 was higher relative to
257 the circumneutral pH region. This difference is proposed to be due to a change in the partitioning of
258 HEDPA within this pH region. Nowack and Stone (22) observed a significant decrease in the fraction of
259 HEDPA sorbed to goethite above pH 9. This is consistent with the full deprotonation of HEDPA in 1.0 M
260 NaCl ($\text{pK}_{\text{a}4} = 9.5$, measured in this work, data not shown). Therefore, boehmite sorption sites which are

261 occupied by HEDPA at neutral and acidic pH regions may be available for sorption of uranyl either as a
262 uranyl hydroxide or as a U(VI):HEDPA complex. In the absence of a complexing ligand, uranium
263 strongly sorbs to aluminum (oxy)hydroxides at high pH values (Figure 3 and references 10, 14, 15).
264 Therefore formation of a U(VI):hydroxide or U(VI):HEDPA (whereby surface complexation would occur
265 through uranium rather than through the phosphate groups of HEDPA) surface complex is feasible.
266 However, verification of such complexes through spectroscopy would be desirable, if not necessary, prior
267 to incorporation of such species into modeling efforts.

268

269 **4. Conclusions**

270 Results from this work show that HEDPA is capable of significantly enhancing the solubility of
271 aluminum hydroxides. The degree of enhancement is dependent upon the bulk solution pH and the
272 concentration of HEDPA. HEDPA is capable of leaching uranium from synthetic boehmite through solid
273 phase dissolution and/or the formation of U(VI):HEDPA complexes. Across the pH range examined, the
274 speciation of U(VI):HEDPA complexes affects the partitioning of uranium between the solid and aqueous
275 phase. Partitioning of uranium was observed to vary with pH and correlated with the partitioning of
276 HEDPA and HEDPA-promoted boehmite dissolution. The sorption of uranium to boehmite in the
277 presence of HEDPA is proposed to be through ternary U(VI):HEDPA surface complexes. However, no
278 spectroscopic evidence is provided to indicate formation of such complexes. These results indicate that
279 HEDPA could be used to reduce the volume of the aluminum component of sludge within the Hanford
280 waste tanks. However, because a significant fraction of uranium (and presumably other actinides) could
281 also be leached from boehmite by the addition of HEDPA, careful consideration of the partitioning of the
282 actinides must be made if a strong complexant such as HEDPA is selected for sludge washing.

283

284 *Acknowledgements.* This work was supported by the Director, Office of Science, Office of
285 Biological and Environmental Research of the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract No. DE-AC02-
286 05CH11231 at the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory.


287

288 **References**


- 289 1. Bond, A. H., Nash, K. L., Gelis, A. V., Sullivan, J. C., Jensen, M. P., Rao, L.: Plutonium
290 mobilization and matrix dissolution during experimental sludge washing of bismuth phosphate,
291 redox, and purex waste simulants. *Sep. Sci. Tech.* 36(5&6), 1231-1256 (2001)
- 292 2. Nash, K. L., Gelis, A. V., Jensen, M. P., Bond, A. H., Sullivan, J. C., Rao, L., Garnov, A. Yu.:
293 Actinides in alkaline media: Dissolution, mineral associations, and speciation in Hanford waste
294 tank sludge simulants. *J. Nucl. Sci. Tech., Supplement 3*, 512-515 (2002).
- 295 3. Garnov, A. Yu., Rao, L., Nash, K. L., Bond, A. H.: Leaching of U(VI), Am(III), and Sr(II) from
296 simulated tank waste sludges. *Sep. Sci. Tech.* 38(2), 359-374 (2003).
- 297 4. Reed, W. R., Rao, L., Zanonato, P., Garnov, A., Yu., Powell, B. A., Nash, K. L., Complexation of
298 U(VI) with 1-Hydroxyethane-1,1diphosphonic acid in acidic to basic solutions. *Inorg. Chem.* 46,
299 2870-2876 (2007).
- 300 5. Lacour, S., Deluchat, V., Bollinger, J., Serpaud, B., Complexation of trivalent cations (Al(III),
301 Cr(III), Fe(III)) with two phosphonic acids in the pH range of fresh waters. *Talanta*, 46, 999-1009
302 (1998).
- 303 6. Gumienna-Kontecka, E., Silvagni, R., Lipinski, R., Lecouvey, M., Marincola, F. C., Crisoni,
304 G., Nurchi, V. M., Leroux, Y., Koslowski, H., Bisphosphonate chelating agents: complexation of
305 Fe(III) and Al(III) by 1-phenyl-1-hydroxymethylene bisphosphonate and its analogues. *Inorg.*
306 *Chim. Acta*, 339, 111-118 (2002).
- 307 7. Powell, B. A, Rao, L., Nash K. L.: Examination of Neptunium(V) and Plutonium(V) Leaching
308 During Ligand Promoted Dissolution of Waste Tank Sludge Surrogates. In preparation, 2007.
- 309 8. Zelanzy, L. W., He, L., VanWormhoudt, A.: Charge Analysis of Soils and Anion Exchange. In:
310 *Methods of Soil Analysis: Part 3 Chemical Methods* (J. M. Bigham Editor-in-Chief). Soil Science
311 Society of America, Inc. Madison, Wisconsin, 1996. p. 1231-1253.

- 312 9. Stumm W., and Morgan J. J.: *Aquatic Chemistry: An Introduction emphasizing Chemical*
313 *Equilibria in Natural Waters*, 2nd Ed., John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1981, p. 631.
- 314 10. McKinley, J. P., Zachara, J. M., Smith, S. C., Turner, G. D. The influence of uranyl hydrolysis
315 and multiple site-binding reactions on adsorption of U(VI) to montmorillonite. *Clays and Clay*
316 *Min.* 43(5), 586-598 (1995).
- 317 11. He, L. M., Zelazny L. W., Baligar, V. C., Ritchey, K. D., Martens, D. C., Ionic strength effects on
318 sulfate and phosphate adsorption on γ -alumina and kaolinite: Triple-layer model. *Soil Sci. Soc.*
319 *Am. J.* 61, 784-793, (1997).
- 320 12. APHA, *Standard Methods for the Examination of Water and Wastewater*, 17th ed. (America
321 Public Health Association, Washington, DC, 1989) p. 4-166.
- 322 13. Stumm W.: The Inner-sphere Surface Complex: A Key to Understanding Surface Reactivity. In:
323 *Aquatic Chemistry Interfacial and Interspecies Processes, Advances in Chemistry Series 244* (C.
324 P. Huang, C.R O'Melia, and J.J. Morgan eds.). American Chemical Society, Washington, DC,
325 1995.
- 326 14. Prikryl, J. D., Pabalan, R. T., Turner, D. R., Leslie, B. W., Uranium sorption on α -alumina:
327 Effects of pH and surface area/solution-volume ratio. *Radiochim. Acta.* 66/67, 291-296 (1994).
- 328 15. Redden G. D., Li, J., Leckie, J. Adsorption of U(VI) and citric acid on goethite, gibbsite, and
329 kaolinite. In *Adsorption of Metals by Geomedia* (Ed. E. A. Jenne). Academic Press, San Diego,
330 CA, 1998.
- 331 16. Cheng, T. Barnett, M. O., Roden, E. E., Zhuang, J.: Effects of phosphate on uranium(VI)
332 adsorption to goethite-coated sand. *Env. Sci. Tech.*, 38, 6059-6065 (2004).
- 333 17. Guo, Z. J., Yu, X. M., Guo, F. H., Tao, Z.Y.: Th(IV) adsorption on alumina: Effects of contact
334 time, pH, ionic strength and phosphate. *J. Colloid Inter. Sci.* 288, 14-20 (2005).
- 335 18. Guo, Z. L, Guo F. H., Tao, Z. Y.: Effects of phosphate and ionic strength upon uranium(VI)
336 sorption onto alumina as a function of pH. *Radiochim. Acta* 94(4) 223-228 (2006).


- 337 19. Davis, J. A., Leckie, J. O.: Effect of adsorbed complexing ligands on trace metal uptake by
338 hydrous oxides. *Env. Sci. Tech.* 23, 1309-1315 (1978).
- 339 20. Elliott, H. A., Huang, C. P.: The adsorption characteristics of Cu(II) in the presence of chelating
340 agents. *J. Colloid. Inter. Sci.*, 70, 29-45 (1979).
- 341 21. Benjamin, M. M., Leckie, J. O.: Conceptual model for metal-ligand-surface interactions during
342 adsorption. *Env. Sci. Tech.*, 15, 1050-1057 (1981).
- 343 22. Nowack D., Stone A. T., The influence of metal ions on the adsorption of phosphonates onto
344 goethite. *Env. Sci. Tech.* 33, 3627-3633 (1999).
- 345 23. He, L. M., Zelazny, L. W., Baligar, V. C., Ritchey, K. D., Martens, D. C.: Ionic strength effects
346 on sulfate and phosphate adsorption on γ -alumina and kaolinite: Triple-layer model. *Soil Sci. Soc.*
347 *Am. J.* 61, 784-793 (1997).




348
 349 Figure 1: Potentiometric titrations of 100 g L⁻¹ boehmite suspensions in 0.01 M NaCl (◇), 0.10
 350 M NaCl (□), and 1.0 M NaCl (△).




351
 352
 353 Figure 2: Effect of HEDPA on synthetic boehmite (γ -AlOOH) dissolution, $[\gamma\text{-AlOOH}] = 600 \text{ mg}$
 354 L^{-1} (10 mM as Al^{3+}), $[\text{NaCl}] = 1.0 \text{ M}$. (A) $[\text{HEDPA}] = 5.4 \text{ mM}$; (B) $[\text{HEDPA}] = 50 \text{ mM}$.
 355 Symbols: (\blacklozenge) 2 days, (\blacksquare) 16 days, (\blacktriangle) 36 days, (\blacklozenge) 86 days, and (\blacksquare) 135 days. (\ast) Control system
 356 contains no HEDPA and was measured after 135 days. Error bars, typically contained within
 357 area of symbol at 95% certainty, have been removed for clarity.



358
359 Figure 3: Fraction of uranium sorbed to boehmite versus pH after 10 day equilibration. System
360 parameters: $[\gamma\text{-AlOOH}] = 0.66 \text{ g L}^{-1}$; $[\text{U(VI)}] = 6.1 \text{ }\mu\text{M}$; $[\text{NaCl}] = 1.0 \text{ M}$.



361
 362 Figure 4: Effect of 5 mM (A) or 50 mM HEDPA (B) on Uranium Sorption to Boehmite:
 363 Symbols (▲) 0.2 days, (△) 1 day, (△) 6 days, (■) 14 days, (□) 30 days, (□) 59 days, and (◆) 180
 364 days. For comparison, data from Figure 3 showing steady state distribution (10 day equilibrium)
 365 of U(VI) without HEDPA present is shown (×). System parameters: $[\gamma\text{-AlOOH}] = 600 \text{ mg L}^{-1}$;
 366 $[\text{NaCl}] = 1.0 \text{ M}$; $[\text{U(VI)}] = 5.8 \text{ }\mu\text{M}$. Error bars removed for clarity, average $2\sigma = 3\%$ propagated
 367 from counting statistics.



368
 369
 370
 371
 372

Figure 5: Speciation of U(VI) in 5.4 mM HEDPA and 1.0 M NaCl, calculated with the thermodynamic constants reported by Reed et al., (4). L stands for the fully deprotonated HEDPA anion.