

Draft for Environmental Science & Technology:

RE: ES034296v // No. ES034296v

Mitigating Uranium in Ground Water: Prospects and Limitations

Noubactep C.* (a), Meinrath G. (b,c), Dietrich P. (c) & B. Merkel B. (c)

(a) Centre of Geosciences - Applied Geology; Goldschmidtstraße 3, D - 37077 Göttingen

(b) RER Consultants, Schießstattweg 3a, D-94032 Passau/D

(c) Technical University Mining Academy Freiberg, Institute of Geology, G.-Zeuner-Str. 12, D-09596 Freiberg

(*) corresponding author: cnoubac@gwdg.de;

Tel. +49 551 39 3191, FAX: +49 551 399379

Abstract

Removal of uranium(VI) by zero-valent iron (ZVI) has been suggested as a feasible pathway to control uranium contaminations in seepage waters. Available information in literature however presents discrepant evidence on the process responsible for the mitigation effect. On basis of an E_H -pH diagram of uranium and iron it is outlined that these discrepancies may be explained by the aqueous chemistry of uranium and iron. Additional effects contributing to the complexity of the system are given. Solubilization experiments using scrap iron together with water works sludge, MnO_2 and pyrite indicate that U(VI) is immobilized by iron corrosion products after about 50 days.

Key Words: uranium, remediation, zero-valent iron, environment, immobilization, corrosion

Introduction

This study was motivated by recent reports on the application of zero-valent iron (ZVI) to the removal of uranium from aqueous solutions (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8). The methodology to remove certain contaminants like chlorinated hydrocarbons, chromate or nitrate from ground waters downstream of a plume by reactive barriers holding ZVI as reactive material is well-known (i.e. 9, 10, 11). Hence, ZVI has some favorable prospects in mitigating hazards from uranium contaminations by an economically attractive technology.

Such a technology is urgently needed in areas where several decades of uranium mining in densely populated area have created both environmental, health and economic long-term risks. In the German Bundesland Sachsen (Saxonia), the strategically important uranium resources (uranium has been discovered here in 1789 by M. Klaproth) have been exploited between 1945 and 1991 by the Soviet, later Soviet-German stock company WISMUT. In total 1200 mio. tons of ores and rock have been moved. 1000 mio. tons have been deposited in waste stock piles and tailing ponds. 200 mio. tons have been transported to treatment and processing plants. In total 231.000 tons of uranium have been produced. The scars left from these activities are still widely visible. The dimension of the sites and the required likely time scale of necessary surveillance render conventional pump-and-treat techniques almost void. Hence, removal of uranium by a reactive wall system holding scrap iron promises an environmentally and economically beneficent alternative. However, available reports on uranium removal by ZVI are not univocal.

Some relevant aspects of the U-Fe-H₂O-CO₂ system

Removal of uranium by ZVI depends on the chemical thermodynamics of the two redox-sensitive system iron and uranium. In the present situation, both the aqueous solution behaviour as well as the redox thermodynamics are of primary interest. In addition, reaction kinetics is a decisive factor in designing the spatial dimensions of a reactive wall. These three factors have been investigated in previous studies from which controversial results have been

reported. On the one hand Gu et al. (5) claim about 96% of the uranium removal due to reduction by ZVI. Similarly Abdelouas et al. (7) characterize the formation of poorly crystalline $\text{UO}_{2-x} \cdot n \text{H}_2\text{O}$ by transmission electron microscopy from solutions holding 10^{-6} to $4 \cdot 10^{-5}$ mol U(VI) at pH 4 to 9 together with granular iron. Sorption effects were claimed to be insignificant. Other authors, however, find sorption by Fe corrosion products as the main removal effect with reduction being a side effect (3, 4), only observable at extremely reducing conditions (6), or being completely absent (8). In all cases, U(VI) has been removed from the solutions.




Figure 1: Comparison of E_H -pH boundaries of uranium species with relevant boundaries of the $Fe^0/Fe(II)$ and $Fe(II)/Fe(III)$ couple. The shaded right hand side section is physically not accessible under given conditions. Area **I** gives the stability field of U(V) if $U(OH)_4$ is assumed as the stable U(IV) species (minimal stability field) while in presence of U(IV) carbonato species with the highest reported formation constants the combined fields **I + II** represent the calculated stability field for U(V) (maximum stability field). The boomerang-shaped field represent the E_H -pH range of natural aqueous systems [12].

In Fig. 1, an E_H -pH diagram of uranium is given together with some relevant boundary redox potentials of the $Fe^0/Fe(II)$ couple and the $Fe(II)/Fe(III)$ couple for ionic strength 0.1 M $NaClO_4$ medium and 0.03% CO_2 partial pressure. While the uranium redox diagram is discussed in detail elsewhere (13), some comments on the $Fe(II)/Fe(III)$ solution chemistry must be given. Despite the relevance of iron species in aqueous solution to environmental and biological processes (i.e. 14, 15), the hydrolysis of $Fe(III)$ is by no means well understood (16, 17, 18). Especially data for $Fe(OH)_2^+$ and $Fe(OH)_3^0$ solution species are scarce. Evidence for amphoteric behaviour of $Fe(III)$ is inconclusive (19). Thus, the diagram combines two systems with considerable uncertainties together. In case of the $U(IV)/U(V)$ and $U(V)/U(VI)$ boundary, no attempt is made in the E_H -pH diagram to eliminate the existing gaps in our knowledge. Instead two extreme cases a) formation of $U(OH)_4^0$ species alone (stability field of $U(V)$ is limited to the area **I**) and b) formation of $U(IV)$ carbonato species with some high values (stability field of $U(V)$ is extended including both areas **I** and **II**) are given. The discrepancy between the large stability fields calculated for $U(V)$ under both assumptions and the extreme difficulties to observe $U(V)$ in the laboratory is obvious. In case of iron, the data from the JESS data base have been used (19). Advantages of JESS database is its public availability and its well documented efforts to achieve consistency (20) - as far as this is possible to be achieved at present. Including speciation, the position(s) of the $Fe^0/Fe(II)$ boundary indicate that metallic iron (Fe^0) reduces $U(VI)$ but it also indicates that $Fe(III)$ reoxidizes $U(IV)$. While the former effect is often mentioned, the potential reoxidation by $Fe(III)$ is likewise often ignored. Moreover, the reduction of $U(VI)$ by different $Fe(II)$ -minerals (pyrite, green rust...) is repeatedly reported and is claimed to be thermodynamically favorable (21, 22, 23, 24).

Notwithstanding the existing limitations in using thermodynamic data for prediction in aquatic chemistry (16, 25, 26, 27), Figure 1 indicates a complex behaviour in the $U-Fe-H_2O-CO_2$ system. Further complexity is introduced by kinetic constraints. The reduction of $U(VI)$

shows a large overpotential due to the fact that two formal metal oxygen triple bonds must be broken (28). The linear UO_2^{2+} entity is furthermore kinetically extremely inert (29).

Both uranium and iron show photosensitivity (30, 31). While Fe(III) does not quench photochemically excited U(VI), Fe(II) is an efficient quencher being itself oxidized to Fe(III) (32, 33, 34). Halide ions and organic materials likewise quench excited U(VI) under formation of radicals (33, 35).

Corrosion of ZVI produces various compounds, often poorly characterizable (6, 36). The efficient sorption of uranyl(VI) by iron oxides is well-known (37, 38, 39, 40, 41).

Hence, the variability in the outcomes of studies on uranium removal by ZVI is not surprising. The U-Fe- H_2O - CO_2 system is sensitive to several parameters that are only partly under control of the experimenter, i.e. CO_2 partial pressure, structure, composition and reactivity of the iron corrosion products or the detailed uranium speciation in solution.

In the present study, no attempt has been made to control at least more parameters than in previous work. The detailed conditions in a reactive barrier based on ZVI will certainly vary over its life time. In part it is of minor interest whether uranium is removed by reduction, sorption or a combined effect, so far the immobilized uranium can be kept away from the groundwater for a long period of time. It is expected that generally U(IV) is less mobile than U(VI). However, there are also effects that re-dissolve U(IV) species, i.e. higher carbonate concentrations forming soluble U(IV) carbonate species. It must be expected that the CO_2 partial pressure below surface may be higher than the atmospheric partial pressure (12, 42). Our interest focused on the effects of additional soil components, i.e. MnO_2 , on the mitigation property of ZVI. To avoid photochemical effects, experimental solutions were kept in darkness. While the ZVI itself was a comparatively pure scrap iron, water works sludge (WWS) has been added with the ZVI to the reaction vessels. WWS is a variable mixture of different iron oxides with some manganese content produced by an uncontrolled precipitation process in water works. Since natural iron oxides are similar mixtures (16) the use of WWS

simulates natural conditions closer than any well-defined iron oxide. In the field, variability of conditions will prevent the formation of well-defined and almost pure iron solid phases to the contrary to easily formed synthetic iron oxides obtained under controlled laboratory conditions.

Experimental

Materials

The used ZVI is a scrap iron from MAZ (Metallaufbereitung Zwickau, Co.) termed "S69". Its elemental conditions is determined as: C: 3.52%, Si: 2.12%; Mn: 0.93%; Cr: 0.66% and 92.77% Fe. The material were fractionated by sieving. The fraction 1.6 - 2.5 mm has been used without any further pretreatment.

Water works sludge (WWS) is typically a mixture of iron and manganese oxides. Detailed composition depends on the composition of the treated water. WWS from Torgau (Saxonia, Germany) water treatment plant with a low content of 1.09 % Mn (43.9 % Fe, 6.2 % Ca, 5.42 % Si) was used.

Manganese nodules from the deep sea have been crushed and sieved. An average particle size of 1.5 mm is used having the following elemental composition: Mn: 41.8%; Fe: 2.40%; Si: 2.41%; Ni: 0.74 %; Zn: 0.22%, Ca: 1.39%; Cu: 0.36% (43). The target active component is MnO₂ which occurs naturally for example as birnessite (44).

Pyrite mineral was crushed and sieved. The fractions 0.2 mm to 0.315 mm (d₁) and 0.315 mm to 0.63 mm (d₂) are used. Elemental composition is: Fe: 40%, S: 31.4%, Si: 6.7%, Cl: 0.5%, C:0.15% and Ca <0.01%. The material served as a pH shifting reagent. It is assumed that the crushed pyrite has no significant adsorptive properties in the investigated pH-range.

Fixation and Remobilization Experiments

Unless indicated otherwise, 0.3 g of ZVI and 0.1 g of WWS were allowed to react in sealed sample tubes containing 20.0 mL of an uranium solution (20 mg/L or 0.084 mM) at

laboratory temperature (about 20° C). The tubes had a total volume between 20.4 mL and 21.1 mL and a graduation to 16 mL. The tubes were filled to a total volume to reduce the head space. The solid:solution ratios were 5 g/L for WWS and MnO₂, 15 g/L for ZVI, and 25 g/L for FeS₂ respectively. For comparison, a further set of experiments was conducted with ZVI alone. All experiments were conducted with the tap water of the city of Freiberg (Saxonia, Germany) of composition (in mg/L) Cl⁻: 7.5; NO₃⁻: 17.5; SO₄²⁻: 42; HCO₃⁻: 42; Na⁺: 7.1; K⁺: 1.6; Mg²⁺: 6.8 and Ca²⁺: 37.1. Initial pH was about 7.2. After equilibration, about 13 mL of the supernatant solution were filtered for uranium analysis. The filtration occurs through a small pore size paper filter for fine precipitates filtration of the type FILTRAK®. The remaining volume with the iron corrosion products and fixed uranium were filled with 10 mL water and 10 mL of a 0.2 M Na₂CO₃ solution (final concentration of Na₂CO₃: 0.1M) were added. The uranium was allowed to desorb for about 14 hours. The contact vessels were not agitated but turned over-head at the beginning of each reaction phase and allowed to react in darkness.

Analytical Method

The samples were filtered through FILTRAK® filter paper. Analysis for uranium were performed after reduction to U(IV) with the Asernazo III method (12 and references therein). Uranium concentrations were determined by a HACH UV-Visible Spectrophotometer at a wave length of 665 nm using 1 cm glass cells. All chemicals and reagents used for experiments and analysis were of analytical grade. The pH value and the redox potential were measured by combination glass electrodes (WTW Co., Germany). Electrode were calibrated with at least five standards following a multi-point calibration protocol (45) and in agreement with the new IUPAC recommendation (46). The redox potential measurements were corrected to give equivalency to the Standard Hydrogen Electrode (SHE). Each experiment was performed in triplicate. Error bars given in figures represent the standard deviation from the triplicate runs.

Results and Discussion

Four different experiments have been performed: reaction of U(VI) with I) ZVI, II) ZVI + WWS, III) ZVI + MnO₂ and IV) ZVI + FeS₂. The latter being conducted with two different particle fractions (d₁ and d₂). The experiments were compared on basis of the total fixation P_{tot} (in %) defined by Eq. 1

$$P_{\text{tot}} = 100\% \cdot (1 - (C/C_0)) \quad (1)$$

where C₀ is the initial concentration of uranium in solution, while C gives the uranium concentration after the experiment. The percent desorption, P_{rev}, of uranium after finishing the experiment (desorption with 0.1 M Na₂CO₃) is calculated by Eq. (2)

$$P_{\text{rev}} = 100\% \frac{C_0(V_0 - V_1)}{V_0(C_0 - C)} \quad (2)$$

where V₀ gives the initial volume, and V₁ the volume after removing about 13 ml for uranium analysis.

Figure 2 compares the experimental conditions to the solubility curve of UO₃ · 2 H₂O obtained by separate experimentation in 0.1 M NaClO₄ solution. Calculations show that, under the experimental conditions of this work about 90 % of the initial amount of uranium can precipitate as schoepite (UO₃ · 2 H₂O). Figure 3 shows that, after about 140 days, almost 98% of uranium has been removed from the solution. It is, therefore, obvious that the removal was mainly caused by precipitation.




Figure 2: Comparison of U(VI) solubilities in 0.1 M perchlorate medium from this study with literature data. In addition, initial solution parameters from this work and given in several studies on U(VI) reduction by ZVI are included.

The experimental U(VI) solubility data obtained within this study are compared to available data from literature (47). The analysis of the solid phase has been done by X-ray diffraction and IR spectroscopy. The results agreed with previous reports [48] and are not repeated here. The agreement between the two solubilities also validates the analytical method for uranium determination. Solid phase below pH 7 is $\text{UO}_3 \cdot 2 \text{H}_2\text{O}(\text{s})$, above pH 7 an amorphous phase, possibly $\text{Na}_2\text{UO}_3 \cdot x \text{H}_2\text{O}$ (49). Since the solubility of U(VI) is about $4 \cdot 10^{-6} \text{ mol L}^{-1}$ at pH 7.2, while the initial concentration in the experiments are $8.5 \cdot 10^{-5} \text{ mol L}^{-1}$, the observed total fixation $P_{\text{tot}} \approx 98 \%$ is merely due to precipitation. Also indicated in Fig. 2 are the starting

concentrations given in different reports on ZVI uranium removal. It is obvious that in several cases the solutions have been considerably over-saturated with the consequence of U(VI) removal by precipitation. Precipitation of $\text{UO}_3 \cdot 2 \text{H}_2\text{O}$ is a fast process. Fig. 3 shows the precipitation process as a function of the time elapsed after starting the experiment. The differences in the first three experiments are mostly due to measurement uncertainty and slight differences in pH. To the contrary, FeS_2 seems to be able to retard U(VI) precipitation. This observation is reproducible as shown with two different particle sizes of materials resulting in different uptake kinetic. The variation of the pH value in the experiment with the larger particle fraction (0.315 - 0.63) was measured (Table 1) and shows that the pH was shifted from 7.20 (initial value) to 3.94 - 4.49.




Figure 3: Percent total fixation P_{tot} as a function of equilibration time for four different solution compositions. Two sets of experiments with solutions holding FeS_2 were conducted. They differ in the particle size applied (see text). The experiments were conducted in triplicate. Error bars give standard deviations.

Table 1: Variation of the solution chemistry (pH, E_H and iron concentration) and the percent total fixation (P_{tot}) and desorption (P_{rev}) of uranium as function of equilibration time for 15 g/L ZVI and 25 g/L FeS_2 ($0.315 < d \text{ (mm)} < 0.63$)

time (days)	pH	E_H (mV)	[Fe] (mg/L)	P_{tot} (%)	P_{rev} (%)
15	4.15	85	42.0	32	0
25	4.32	51	46.0	52	0
43	3.95	88	83.0	18	0
55	3.94	77	89.5	48	0
72	4.12	62	88.0	57	0
94	4.41	11	83.0	94	2
108	4.45	8	77.0	97	3
119	4.49	21	72.0	99	4

Table 1 shows that the pH first decreases with the time as response of FeS_2 dissolution until a value of 3.94 after 55 days and then increases progressively as iron corrosion proceeds. From the start of the experiment until day 55, the total uranium uptake decreases and reaches a minimum of 18%. This evolution is attributed to the progressive release of sorbed uranium as the pH decreases. The minimum characterizes the maximum acidic capacity of the added amount of pyrite (FeS_2) under the experimental conditions (unstirred batch experiments). At this point, the concentration of iron is maximal (90 mg/L or 1.60 mM) and decreases continuously with increasing pH. Above pH 4.12 (day 70) the percent uranium uptake raised quite suddenly to from 40% to above 90% (cf. table 1) indicating that uranium removal is the result of co-precipitation with iron corrosion products. Figure 3 shows the same trend for the experiment with 0.2-0.315 mm FeS_2 (50, 51).




Figure 4: Percent desorption P_{rev} of uranium from ZVI and corrosion products as a function of equilibration time. The solutions holding FeS_2 showed considerable pH shifts and the experiments have been finished after 70 days. All experiments have been done in triplicate. Error bars give standard deviations.

The response of the four systems to dissolution in a 0.1 M Na_2CO_3 solution is given in Fig. 4. P_{rev} is comparatively high in the first 25 days. Afterwards, P_{rev} decreases steadily and becoming almost irreversible for the ZVI and the ZVI + MnO_2 system after 125 days. Both U(VI) and U(IV) are soluble in concentrated Na_2CO_3 . Hence, this observation can only be explained by formation of amorphous aged iron corrosion products enclosing the uranium because Fe(III) is not soluble in carbonate solution.

Both WWS and MnO_2 were chosen to better simulate natural conditions (being natural themselves). In fact, efforts to investigate the adsorptive properties of these minerals have usually been conducted with synthetic birnessite (MnO_2) after the McKenzie method (52) or synthetic iron oxides, for example α -goethite, after the Atkinson method (53). In this manner experiments are conducted with almost pure and relative well defined products, which are to some extent far from that encountered in the nature. It has been reported that corrosion products have a very variable composition, and are not reproducible (54). Thus working with water works sludge is a better approximation to such a complex mixture.

Conclusion

Whether or not reduction plays a role in removing uranium by ZVI is still unclear (8). Previous work available in literature has shown that reduction is not a necessary process. The E_{H} -pH diagram (cf. Fig. 1) also suggests that special conditions must prevail to achieve reduction. The uncertainties on the uranium aqueous solution chemistry still are too large for calculating the precise behaviour of a system as complex as the U-Fe- H_2O - CO_2 system. In a field reactive barrier, additional factors like microbiology (55, 56), varying plume composition and pH will affect the performance of a ZVI. These effects are difficult to simulate in laboratory.

The present study has given two interesting aspects. First, ZVI alone is the most efficient material in preventing solubilization of precipitated uranium(VI). The additional presence of aged corrosion products (simulated by addition of water works sludge) even seems to favor the remobilization of fixed uranium. Apparently uranium must be present at the time the iron corrosion products form. Retardation is achieved by ageing of the uranium-contaminated iron corrosion products. Second, MnO_2 and FeS_2 do not favor the U(VI) retardation.

The performance of a ZVI reactive barrier certainly can only be assessed by a field study. Before such a study can be undertaken, further laboratory experiments at initial U(VI)

concentrations below the solubility limit of U(VI) seem necessary. In the present study, U(VI) was immobilized onto the ZVI surface by precipitation. Thus, the ZVI material was given enough time to coat uranium precipitates. In a field study, however, both U(VI) concentrations and residence times will be less compared to present laboratory experiments.

Acknowledgement

The authors express their gratitude for materials analysis at the Institute of Iron and Steel Technology of the Technical University Bergakademie Freiberg.

References

1. Morrison, S.J. and Spangler, R.R. *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 1992, 26, 1922-1932.
2. Cantrell K.J., Kaplan D.I., & Wietsma T.W. *J. Hazard. Mat.*, 1995, 42, 201-212.
3. Bostick W.D., Jarabek R.J., Slover W.A., Fiedor J.N., Farrell J. and Helferich R., 1996, REPORT K/TSO-35P. Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge/USA.
4. Fiedor J.N., Bostick W.D., Jarabek R.J., Farrell J. *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 1998, 32, 1466 - 1473.
5. Gu B., Liang Liyuan, Dickey M.J., Yin X. & Dai S. *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 1998, 32, 3366-3373.
6. Farrell J., Bostick W.D, Jarabeck R.J., & Fiedor J.N. *Ground Water*, 1999. 34, 618-624.
7. Abdelouas A., Lutze W., Nuttall H.E. and Gong W. C.R. *Acad. Sci. Paris, Sciences de la terre et des planètes*, 1999, 328, 315 - 319.
8. Qiu S.R., Lai H.-F., Robertson M.J., Hunt M.L., Amrhein C., Giancarlo L.C., Flynn G.W., Yarmoff Y. *Langmuir*, 2000, 16, 2230 - 2236.
9. Gillham R.W. and O'Hannesin S.F *Ground Water*, 1994, 32, 958-967.
10. Teutsch G., Tolksdorf J., Schad H. *Land Contam. Reclam.*, 1997, 5, 125 - 130.
11. Blowes D.W., Ptacek C.J., Benner S.G., Mcrae Che W.T., Bennett T.A., & Puls R. W. *J. Cont. Hydrol.*, 2000, 40, 123-137.
12. Baas-Becking L.G.M., Kaplan I.R., Moore D. *J. Geol.*, 1960, 68, 243 - 284.
13. Meinrath G., Volke P., Helling C., Dudel E.G., Merkel B.J. *Fresenius J. Anal. Chem.*, 1999, 364, 191 - 202.
14. Martin J.H., Fitzwater S.E. *Nature*, 1988, 331, 341 - 343.
15. Königsberger L.-C., Königsberger E., May P., Hefter G.T. *J. Inorg. Biochem.*, 2000, 78, 175 - 184.
16. Millero F.J., Yao W., Aicher J., . *Marine Chem.*, 1995, 50, 21 - 39.

17. Jambor L.J., Dutrizac J.E., Chem. Rev. 1998, 98, 2549 - 2585
18. Meinrath G., May P.M. Mine Water Environ., 2002, 21, 24 - 35.
19. May P., Murray K. 2000 <http://jess.murdoch.edu.au>.
20. May P.; Murray K. . J. Chem. Eng. Data , 2001, 46, 1035 - 1040.
21. Charlet L.; Liger E.; Gerasimo P Journal Environ. Eng. 1998, 124 (1), 25-30.
22. Liger E.; Charlet L.; Van Cappellen. Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta 1999, 63, 2939 - 2955.
23. Frederickson, J.K. ; Zachara, J.M. ; Kennedy, D. W.; Duff, M. C. ; Gorby, Y. A. ; Li S.-M. W. ; Krupka, K.M. Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta 2000, 64, 3085-3098.
24. O'loughlin E. J.; Kelly S. D.; Cook E. R.; Csencsits R., Kemner K.M. Environ. Sci. Technol. 2003, 37, 721-727.
25. May P. Murray K. Talanta, 1991, 38, 1409 - 1417.
26. Meinrath G., Hurst S., Gatzweiler R. Fresenius J. Anal. Chem., 2000, 368: 561 - 566.
27. Meinrath G. Fresenius J. Anal. Chem., 2000, 368: 574 - 584.
28. Denning R.G. Structure Bond, 1992, 79, 215 - 276.
29. Gordon G., Taube H., J. Inorg. Nucl. Chem. 1961, 19, 189 - 194.
30. Rabinovitch E. & Belford R.L, 1964, Pergamon Press (Frankfurt), 368 pp.
31. Sulzberger B., Laubscher H.-U. Marine Chem., 1995, 50, 103 - 115.
32. Greatorex D., Hill R.J., Kemp T.J., Stone T.J. J. Chem. Soc. Faraday Trans., 1972, 68, 2059 - 2076.
33. Matsushima R., Fujimori H., Sakuraba S. J. Chem. Soc. Dalton Trans., 1974, 70, 1702.
34. Moriyasu M., Yokoyama Y., Ikeda S. J. Inorg. Nucl. Chem., 1977, 39, 2199.
35. Matsushima R. J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1972, 94, 6010 - 6016.
36. Manning A.B., Hunt L.H., Amrhein C. & Yarmoff J.A. Environ. Sci. Technol., 2002, 36 (24), 5455 - 5461.

37. Hsi Ch.-K., Langmuir D. *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta*, 1985, 49, 1931-1941.
38. Ho C.H., Miller N.H. *J. Colloid Interface Sci.*, 1986, 110, 165 - 171.
39. Waite T.D., Davis J.A., Payne T.E., Waychunas G.A., Xu N. *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta*, 1994, 58, 5465 - 5478.
40. Wersin P., Hochella M.F., Persson P., Redden G., Leckie J.O., Harris D.W., *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta*, 1994, 58, 2829 - 2843.
41. van Geen A., Robertson A.P., Leckie J.O. *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta*, 1994, 58, 2073 - .
42. Enoch H., Dasberg S. *Geoderma*, 1971, 6, 17 - 21.
43. Dietrich P. *Wiss. Fortschr.*, 1991, 41, 458 - 462.
44. Appelo C.A.J., Postma D. *J. Contam. Hydrol.* , 1999, 40, 95-106.
45. Meinrath G., Spitzer P. *Mikrochim. Acta*, 2000, 135, 155 - 168.
46. Buck R.P, Rondinini S., Covington A.K., Baucke F.G.K., Brett C.M.A, Camoes M.F., Milton M.J.T., Mussini T., Naumann R., Pratt K.W., Spitzer P., and Wilson G.S.
(Draft, 6 July 2001): The measurement of pH - definition, standards and procedures.
Report of the working party on pH (34 pages).
47. Meinrath G., Kato Y., Kimura T., Yoshida Z., *Radiochim. Acta*, 1996, 75, 159 - 167.
48. Meinrath G., Kimura T., *Inorg. Chim. Acta*, 1993, 204, 79 - 85
49. Meinrath G., Fischer S., Köhncke K., Voigt, W, 1998, In Proc. Int Conf Uranium - Mining and Hydrogeology (Helling, Merkel eds.) *Geocongress Vol. 5*, Verlag Sven von Loga Köln/D pp. 246 - 255.
50. Noubactep C. (2003): Investigations for the passive in-situ Immobilization of Uranium (VI) from Water. (in German), *Wiss. Mitt. Institut für Geologie der TU Bergakademie Freiberg*, Band 21, 140 pp, ISSN1433-1284.

51. Noubactep C. Meinrath G., Volke P.; Peter H.-J., Dietrich P. & B. Merkel, 2002, In Proc. Int. Conf. Uranium Mining and Hydrogeology (Merkel, Planer-Friedrich & Wolkersdorfer, eds) Springer Verlag, pp. 577 - 586.
 52. McKenzie R. M. Miner. Mag., 1971, 38, 493-502.
 53. Atkinson R.J., Posner A.M., Quirk, J.P. J. Phys. Chem., 1967, 71, 550-558.
 54. May L., 1998, Theorie und Forschung Vol. 582. Chemie, Bd. 8 S. Roderer Verlag, Regensburg/FRG.
 55. Abdelouas A., Lu Y., Lutze W., Nuttall H.E. J. Contam. Hydrol. 1998, 35, 217 - 234.
- Francis A.J. 1999 In: Bioremediation of Contaminated Soils, Agronomy Monograph 37, 239 - 271.

Brief

"This contribution shows that the removal of dissolved uranium(VI) from aqueous solution by zero valent iron (ZVI) under laboratory conditions is not due to reductive precipitation".