Conceptual model of mass transfer at 300 A

Chongxuan Liu, PNNL Douglas B. Kent, USGS Roy Haggerty, OSU

Characterizing mass transfer



Pore-scale diffusion

- Migration through pore network in response to ∂µ^e_i/∂x
- Formation of surface complexes
- Formation of aqueous complexes (f(a_{Ca}, a_{CO3}, a_{UO2}, etc.))





Upper vadose zone



Mass transfer of U(VI) in minerals to adsorbed U(VI)

Impact of variable chemistry on diffusive mass transfer: batch experiments

North Pond Pit 1 (16 ft bgs) 200 g/L, pH 7.9 – 8.3



Impact of variable chemistry on diffusive mass transfer: column experiments



Characterization of porosity

- Bulk characterization (N₂ adsorption, Hgporisimetry)
- Stop flow elution (tritium, other tracers with high values of C₀/ql)
- Microscopic characterization (e.g., EM)

- Current grain-scale mass transfer models
- Parameters in the models
- Upscaling of grain-scale model to large or field scale systems

Current modeling approaches of grain-scale mass transfer:

Multi-rate approach (WRR, in press)

$$\frac{\partial q_i^k}{\partial t} = \alpha_k (S_i^k - q_i^k) \qquad i = 1, 2, ..., N; k = 1, 2, ...M$$

q: sorbed concentration, *S*: sorption at equilibrium, α : mass transfer rate coefficient, *N*: number of species, *M*: number of rate sites.

- Link with surface complexation (SC) and aqueous speciation
- Requirement of mass-transfer rate coefficients
- Empirical nature: rate coefficients dependent on geochemical conditions?
- Difficulty to link with dissolution/precipitation reactions in mass transfer-limited domains?

Example of the multi-rate approach

NPP 1-14 fine-grained materials (< 2mm), SGW



Is p(a) dependent on geochemical conditions?

Current modeling approaches of grain-scale mass transfer:

Diffusion-based approach (WRR, 2006)

$$\theta_{d} \frac{\partial c_{i}}{\partial t} + (1 - \theta_{d}) \rho_{s} \frac{\partial s_{i}}{\partial t} = \sum_{k=1}^{N} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left(\theta_{d} D_{ik} \frac{\partial c_{k}}{\partial x} \right) + \theta_{d} r_{i} \quad D_{ik} = \tau \left(D_{i} \delta_{ik} - \frac{Z_{i} Z_{k} D_{i} D_{k} c_{k}}{\sum_{k=1}^{N} Z_{k}^{2} c_{k} D_{k}} \right)$$

c and *s*: aqueous and sorbed concentration in diffusionzone, τ : apparent tortuosity; D_i : molecular diffusion coefficient of species *i*, θ_d : diffusion zone porosity.

- Link with surface complexation (SC), aqueous speciation, and dissolution/precipitation reactions
- More mechanistic and predictive?
- Requirements of molecular diffusion coefficients, apparent tortuosity factor, and diffusion zone porosity

Diffusion coefficient and apparent tortuosity



Diffusion coefficient:
1) MD calculation for molecular diffusion coefficients.
2) Experiments?

Apparent tortuosity: 1) Bulk-based tracer experiments (tritium), 2) direct intragrain pore connectivity measurements (NMR), 3) pore connectivity simulation, and others?

Effect of water content on mass transfer



Effects of water content on grain-scale mass transfer?



Proposed scaling approach

- Grain-scale mass transfer model for reactive, fine-grained materials
- Flow domain properties from tracer data of a large system: mobile/immobile porosity, mass transfer rate between flow domains
- Distribution of reactive, fine-grained materials in different flow domains within the REV based on their porosity ratio
- Volume-averaging of grain-scale mass transfer models in each flow domain
- Mass exchange between flow domains

Example of the scaling approach

NPP1-14 field-textured materials, SGW



Applicable under other geochemical conditions? other textured-sediments? field conditions?

Haggerty*: Series of 3 benchscale experiments What are essential intermediate-scale processes time-varying velocity vadose zone mass transfer intermediate-scale mass transfer (sm vs med length-scales) that must be included along with *chemistry* in reaction & multiscale mass transfer model? * with assistance from J Istok lab

Changes in gradient & water table

352

River Stage at 300 Area (ft) 348 346 347 347 340 340

338

1/1

1/31

3/1

4/1

5/1

6/1

8/1

7/1

Date (1996)



Zachara presentation, Nov. 2007

'Hourly'

— 'Daily' — 'Monthly'

8/31 10/1 10/31 11/30 12/31

Sand box experiments



Artificial Hanford GW

Sand box experiments

Artificial Hanford GW – high CaCO₃

Time-varying boundaries
Hanford sediment
artificial CR &
Hanford waters
U(VI) injection at SPP conc. Art



Artificial Columbia River – low CaCO3

 Do we see the essential features of 300 Area?

Fluctuating water table experiments

- column 50? cm long, 10? cm ID
 - question re: >2 mm fraction include or not? Capillarity scaling issue.
- water flows from top or bottom

Water table moves up and down

- instruments:
 - sample ports every 5 cm vertically
 - water content
 - electrical conductivity
- measure long-term leaching of U(VI)
- post-mortem analysis of U(VI) spatial distribution (budget-dependent)

Mass Transfer Scale & Process

motivation:
– movie 1
– movie 2
– movie 3



Zinn et al., 2004 DOE grant DE-FG02-ooER15030

Intermediate-scale, long-term desorption/dissolution exps

- 2 saturated columns <2mm size and same grain size distribution
 - 1 homogenized
 - 1 heterogeneous
 - zones with larger sizes
 - embedded zones with smaller sizes
- measure long-term leaching of U(VI)
- post-mortem analysis of U(VI) spatial distribution (budget-dependent)
- ?post-mortem flow-path analysis with water-soluble epoxy or fluorescent microspheres?