

energy.gov



Craig Criddle Scott Fendorf

Michael Fienen Margy Gentile Matt Ginder-Vogel Peter Kitanidis Jian Luo

Anna Michalak Jennifer Nyman Julie Stevens Weimin Wu

**Miami Univ** Matthew Fields

#### Universitat Stuttgart

Olaf Cirpka

Frank-Andreas Weber

Retec



Robert Hickey Raj Rajan Dan Wagner LBNL 🚔



Susan Hubbard Ken Williams



Ken Kemner

Argonne

Gill Geesey David Cummings

#### OAK RIDGE NATIONAL LABORATORY

Craig Brandt Scott Brooks Sue Carroll Matthew Fields Baohua Gu

Philip Jardine Tonia Mehlhorn Terry Gentry Ye-Kyoung Ku Ken Lowe Lynda Campbell Jeff Riggs Jizhong Zhou Yul Roh Jack Carley Bobette Nourse

NABIR Field Research Center



David Watson



Terry Marsh MICHICAN STATE



# The Oak Ridge S3 por

- Depleted uranium
- Strong acids  $(HNO_3 and H_2SO_4)$
- Halogenated solvents
- Heavy metals

#### **1951-1984 : wastes stored in unlined ponds**











#### Pore scale

Close-up of structured saprolite. cm scale matrix blocks surrounded by fractures Field meso-scale

Watershed and regional scale

Convergent flow and formation of empherial and perennial streams

#### SCALE OF INTEREST FOR THIS WORK



• Saprolite contains a highly interconnected fracture network with densities of 100-200 fractures/m. Fractures are < 5-10% of the total porosity, but carry >95% of the groundwater flow.

• The fractures surround a high porosity, low permeability matrix that is a source and sink for contaminants.



**Overlying Saprolites** 



Underlying Bedrock

#### **Core Mineralogical Evaluations**

Overlying Gleyed leached flow zone with high U, low pH groundwater

A high U zone was detected in the center of the test cell at a depth of 46'.

XRD results:

Gleyed Zone - Quartz, Vermiculite, Mica, HIV, Ca-feldspar

Black Zone - Quartz, Ca-feldspar, Vermiculite, Mica,



U=730 mg/kg

U=155 mg/kg

Very fine sands with Fe oxide precipitates Fe oxide accumulation zone

0.25 cm

0.25 cm





## Contaminants in groundwater near the S3 p

Inorganic		Organic	
<u>Constituents</u>	<b>Concentrations</b>	<u>Constituents</u>	<b>Concentrations</b>
рН	3.4-3.6		
	202-401 mg/L		
	249-298 mg/L		
	843-1116 mg/L		
	7500-8963 mg/L Low		
	42-51 mg/L		
	35-40 nCi/L		2100-3300 µg/L
	(80-89 dpm/ml)		
			94-130 µg/L
	0.45 mg/L		
	541±47 mg/L		
	931±74 mg/L		
	174±11 mg/L		
	130±9 mg/L		
	<0.003 mg/L		
	0.17 mg/L		
	0.03 mg/L		
	0.02 mg/L		

- estimated value
- values for MLS FW 100, 40' depth.

## Rationale for work near the source zo

The source zone is a reservoir of U(VI) for long-term groundwater and surface water contamination.

About 98% of the U(VI) in the near source zone is sorbed to solids or part of a solid phase.

The remaining 2% of U(VI) is dissolved in the groundwater at highly toxic levels (20-50 mg/L).

Conversion of solid-associated U(VI) into bigbly insoluble U(IV) will provent

# PRIMARY OBJECTIVE Evaluate the rates and mechanisms of U(VI) reduction by microbial populations

 $UO_2(CO_3) + H^+ + 2e^- = UO_2 + HCO_3^-$ 

 119 mg U are reduced for every mmol of electrons transferred

- This is equivalent to 119 mg U reduced/mg H<sub>2</sub>
- It is also equivalent to 15 mg U reduced/ mg COD

# **Hypotheses**

• Biological reduction of U(VI) in the S-3 soils is a multistep process: desorption/dissolution of U(VI), followed by uptake/reductive mineralization.

• Desorption/dissolution will typically limit the reduction rate.

• Both metal- and sulfate-reducing bacteria will play a role.

# Chemistry considerations

Low pH (~3.5):

- buffered by Al<sup>3+</sup> (~20 mM)

High U(VI): ~98% on the soil (~400 mg/kg) ~2% in groundwater(~ 40 mg/L)

High NO<sub>3</sub>-:

130-480 mM in groundwater - NO<sub>3<sup>-</sup></sub> and denitrification intermediates inhibit U(VI) reduction (Senko et al., 2001)

High Ca<sup>2+</sup>:

~20 mM in groundwater - Ca<sup>2+</sup> inhibits U(VI) reduction at 5 mM (Brooks et al., 2003)

 $UO_2(CO_3) + H^+ + 2e^- = UO_2 + HCO_3^-$  E°' = +0.105 V

 $Ca_2UO_2(CO_3)_3 + 2e^- = 2Ca^{2+} + UO_2 + 3CO_3^{2-} E^{\circ} = -0.046 V$ 

#### Uranium adsorption



U sorption is concentration dependent It is also strongly pH dependent.



# Eh/pH Plot of Uranium Speciation (300 mg/L TIC, 40 mg/L U)

No Ca

#### + 20 mM Ca





 $ggam_{1}^{0.0}$ , T = 25 /C, P = 1.013 bars, a [main] =  $10^{21.04}$ , a [ $\frac{1}{9}$  O] = 1, a [HCQ] =  $10^{11.02}$ , (speedates) a [ $Ca^{2}$ ] =  $10^{21.02}$ .

# Batch microcosms: ethanol biostimulated U reduction in the presence of contaminated sediment



uranium in viable, but not control, microcosms.

### Column microcosm



Before





After

# **Clogging agents**

- Aluminum hydroxide form at pH 5.
- Calcium and magnesium carbonates form at pH 7-9.
- N<sub>2</sub> gas forms during denitrification.
- High levels of biomass are produced during denitrification.





2 g/L solids produced



#### Geophysics was used to identify areas of contaminant tran

S-3 Ponds Cap Surface Seismic/Electrical Resistivity (Doll et al., *SAGEEP*, 2002).



#### Electrical Resistivity Low (~4 Ohm-m) High (~150 Ohm-



Low Resistivity ~ High Niti

Contour Lines: Seismic Velocity (m/s)



# Tanker for chemical sludge disposal



The "Big Top" where extracted groundwater is treated to enable metal reduction *insitu* 



# Bag filters for disposal of biomass





## Inside the Big Top



# **Ex-situ** conditioning of water in treatment

- 1. Precipitate Al and Ca
- 2. Remove NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> by denitrification in FBR
- 3. Vacuum strip to remove VOCs and N<sub>2</sub>

#### **ABOVEGROUND PROCRESS TRAIN**



#### The aboveground treatment train



#### Vacuum stripper

Two-step Fluidized bed reactor chemical precipitation (FBR)

> FBR sampling and characteriza Phylogenetic analyses Functional gene microarray Functional monitoring

Well TPB16



Two piilot scale FBRs Full scale FBR

FluidizedRemoves NO3- as N2BedEfficientBedCheapReactorDemonstrated in twoSystems (pH 7.4 and

Efficient Cheap Raises pH Demonstrated in two continuous pilot-scale systems (pH 7.4 and 9.2)



Denitrifying biofilms growing on granular activated carbon in pilot scale FBR at Stanford. Some of the bacterial general found in this community include *Zoogloea*, *Xanthomonas*, *Dechloromonas*, *Dechlorosoma*, *and Sporumosa*.

#### **FBR: nitrate removal**



#### Community Analysis Based Upon SSU rRNA Gene







# Well layout



#### before plumbing





MLS well locations

after plumbing



Skid with pumps and meters for wells inside Big Top

#### **Multilevel sampling wells**









Cross-sectional view of the injection/extraction wells and the MLS wells.

#### Chemical profiles with depth at the MLS wells - before biosti



#### Chemical profiles with depth at the MLS wells - before biosti





Hubbard et al., 2003


## **Regions of the subsurface**



## **Overall Strategy**

1. Perform a tracer study to determine connectivity of wells and residence time distribution. Obtain desorption rates from the rebound.

2. Flush outer and inner cell with clean water at pH 4 to remove AI, Ca, and most of the nitrate. Follow with flush at pH 5-6 to prepare for denitrification.

3. Stimulate denitrification *in-situ* and vacuum strip  $N_2$  to remove residual nitrate.

4 Increase nH of inner cell to mobilize U(VI)



#### Tracer study of the Inner loop

A dual dipole tracer injectionwithdraw test was conducted using  $CaBr_2$  and  $CaCl_2$  in an effort to create an inner and outer hydraulic cell.

Results confirmed location and transport features of preferential flow regimes and slow flowing matrix regimes.

Experimental data was numerically simulated and the model used to design the *in situ* U bioreduction





## **Tracer study simulations**



Seismic tomography data complements tracer measurements.

ĝ



Hubbard et al., 2003 Mehlhorn et al., 2003

Tracer Breakthrough at 3 Multi-Level Samplers along Geologic Dip Direction

## Effect of tracer clean water flush on nitrate in MLS wells





### Natural gradient site recovery solute breakthrough

Natural gradient contaminant transport monitored during site recovery.

Quantification of solute residence times, direction of groundwater flow, and strike vs. dip interactions.







## **Overall Strategy**

1. Perform a tracer study to determine connectivity of wells and residence time distribution. Obtain desorption rates from the rebound.

2. Flush outer and inner cell with clean water at pH 4 to remove AI, Ca, and most of the nitrate. Follow with flush at pH 5-6 to prepare for denitrification.

3. Stimulate denitrification *in-situ* and vacuum strip  $N_2$  to remove residual nitrate.

4 Increase nH of inner cell to mobilize U(VI)











#### pH increase in inner and outer loop extraction well



▲ FW026 ● FW103

### Mass transfer during the flush

## Model assumptions:

- Kinetically controlled sorption/desorption
- Kinetic mass transfer between two regions



### **Modeling of**



•The half-life of nitrate in the second immobile region is about 3 months. To deplete the second immobile zone would take about one year.

•The mobile region definitely responds to flushing and a low average Nitrate concentration can be maintained while removing the Nitrate as it enters the mobile zone.



## **Overall Strategy**

 Perform a tracer study to determine connectivity of wells and residence time distribution. Obtain desorption rates from the rebound.

2. Flush outer and inner cell with clean water at pH 4 to remove Al, Ca, and most of the nitrate. Follow with flush at pH 5-6 to prepare for denitrification.

3. Stimulate denitrification *in-situ* and vacuum strip  $N_2$  to remove residual nitrate.

I increase nH of inner cell to mobilize U(VI)

## Cumulative ethanol injected (Jan.7 to Oct. 5, 2004)



Ethanol was added 34 times. To date, a total of 1.54 kg was injected.

### COD in inner loop Injection and extraction wells



## Nitrate in inner loop injection and extraction wells



## pH in inner loop injection and extraction wells



## Sulfate in inner loop injection and extraction wells



## U(VI) in inner loop injection and extraction wells



## Aluminum in inner loop injection and extraction wells



Time, da



Clogged pump head screen. The white precipitate dissolved in a 2% HCl solution after 1.5 hour.





### Biofouling of pump intake on inner loop extraction well - Day 245

# Water level in inner loop injection and extraction wells during biostimulation





Surge block for cleaning

## Surge block allowed for sampling of sediment/biomas s in wells

QuickTime<sup>™</sup> and a TIFF (LZW) decompressor are needed to see this picture.

QuickTime\*\* and a TIFF (LZW) decompress QuickTime<sup>TM</sup> and a TEF (L2H) decompressor

QuickTime™ and a TIFF (L2W) decompressor are needed to see this picture.

### **Effects of** surging: what a borehole camera shows

#### reference well

QuickTime™ and a TIFF (LZW) decompressor are needed to see this picture.



#### after

QuickTime<sup>™</sup> and a TIFF (LZW) decompressor are needed to see this picture.

QuickTime<sup>™</sup> and a TIFF (LZW) decompressor are needed to see this picture.

## Model - coupled mass transfer and reaction

### Assumptions

- Kinetically controlled sorption/desorption
- Kinetic mass transfer between two regions
- 以(VI) in the mobile zone Microbia aq.eq

 $k_{\rm w}$  is a lumped parameter accounting for mass transfer. It has units of time<sup>-1</sup>.  $U_{eq,aq}$  is the concentration of U in equilibrium with the solid phase concentration. It is a function of pH and TIC. X is biomass concentration, and k' is a pseudo second order rate coefficient.

Rate of mass transfer =  $k_w(U_{aq. eq} -$ U<sub>aq</sub>) Rate of reduction =  $k'X U_{ac}$ 

### At steady state: Rate of mass transfer = $k_w(U_{aq,eq}-U_{aq})$ = Rate of reduction = k'X



Preliminary calculations indicate that MT limitation is likely

#### InitIal biostimulation period (Days 165-195)

MLS 102-3 NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>



#### Soluble COD



### MLS 102-3 (Days 165-195) pH



Soluble U(VI)


## Mid-stage biostimulation (Days 277 - 284)

## MLS 101-2

1. Nitrate decline occurs immediately after ethanol injection.

 Sulfate decline occurs after 3 hours of of ethanol injection.
U(VI) decline occurs after 5 hours of ethanol injection.







### Recent biostimulation (Days 345-349)



Time, day

Recent biostimulation (Days 345-349)





Energy (keV)

% U(IV)

13

16

May 9 - injection well sediment 2 days post stimulation (pre - surge)

May 20 - injection well sediment 3 days post stimulation (pre - surge)

May 20 - injection well sediment 3 days post stimulation (post surge) QuickTime™ a TIFF (LZW) decom

June 21 - injection well sediment 6 days post stimulation (pre surge)

June 21 - injection well sediment 6 days post stimulation (post surge)

# MPN values for different trophic groups (number/mL)

		Sulfate	Iron
Well	Denitrifiers	Reduce rs	Reduce rs
Inner loop			
extraction	$3.5 \times 10^5$	$1.6 \ge 10^5$	$2.0 \times 10^3$
MLS 101-2	$5.6 \ge 10^2$	$1.4 \ge 10^5$	$2.4 \times 10^3$
MLS102-2	$5.4 \times 10^5$	$0.92 \times 10^4$	$2.8 \times 10^2$
MIS102-3	$2.1 \times 10^6$	$2.4 \times 10^5$	$3.2 \times 10^3$
106			
Control well	5.4 x 10	0	0

Note: MPN values for five replicates. Test wells sampled 8/20/04. Control well sampled 5/28/04.

# Key points

• Aluminum buffers the system at low pH and precipitates when the pH is increased. It can be removed *ex-situ*.

• Nitrate inhibits U(VI) reduction. Bulk nitrate can be removed *ex-situ*, and residual nitrate can be removed *in-situ*.

• A nested recirculation scheme appears to protect the treatment zone from aluminum, nitrate, and acidity.

• We have evidence of in-situ microbial U reduction.

#### Stage 1 -removal of aluminum, calcium, nitrate



### Stage 2 - conversion of U(VI) to U(IV)



# Next up

Single pass experiments:

•Br-/He + ethanol

•Tracer + ethanol + U

Tracer + ethanol + oxidants

