

Title	Groundwater uranium origin and fate control in a river valley aquifer
Authors	Banning, Andre;Demmel, Thomas;Rüde, Thomas R;Wrobel, Michael
Publication date	2013-10-10
Original Citation	Banning, A., Demmel, T., Rüde, T. R. and Wrobel, M. (2013) 'Groundwater Uranium Origin and Fate Control in a River Valley Aquifer', Environmental Science & Technology, 47 (24), pp. 13941-13948. doi: 10.1021/es304609e
Type of publication	Article (peer-reviewed)
Link to publisher's version	https://pubs.acs.org/doi/10.1021/es304609e - 10.1021/es304609e
Rights	This document is the Accepted Manuscript version of a Published Work that appeared in final form in Environmental Science and Technology, copyright © American Chemical Society after peer review and technical editing by the publisher. To access the final edited and published work see https://pubs.acs.org/doi/10.1021/ es304609e
Download date	2025-04-06 12:58:48
Item downloaded from	https://hdl.handle.net/10468/12342



University College Cork, Ireland Coláiste na hOllscoile Corcaigh



Article

Subscriber access provided by RUHR-UNIVERSITAET BOCHUM

Groundwater uranium origin and fate control in a river valley aquifer

Andre Banning, Thomas Demmel, Thomas R. Rüde, and Michael Wrobel Environ. Sci. Technol., Just Accepted Manuscript • Publication Date (Web): 10 Oct 2013 Downloaded from http://pubs.acs.org on October 11, 2013

Just Accepted

"Just Accepted" manuscripts have been peer-reviewed and accepted for publication. They are posted online prior to technical editing, formatting for publication and author proofing. The American Chemical Society provides "Just Accepted" as a free service to the research community to expedite the dissemination of scientific material as soon as possible after acceptance. "Just Accepted" manuscripts appear in full in PDF format accompanied by an HTML abstract. "Just Accepted" manuscripts have been fully peer reviewed, but should not be considered the official version of record. They are accessible to all readers and citable by the Digital Object Identifier (DOI®). "Just Accepted" is an optional service offered to authors. Therefore, the "Just Accepted" Web site may not include all articles that will be published in the journal. After a manuscript is technically edited and formatted, it will be removed from the "Just Accepted" Web site and published as an ASAP article. Note that technical editing may introduce minor changes to the manuscript text and/or graphics which could affect content, and all legal disclaimers and ethical guidelines that apply to the journal pertain. ACS cannot be held responsible for errors or consequences arising from the use of information contained in these "Just Accepted" manuscripts.



Environmental Science & Technology is published by the American Chemical Society. 1155 Sixteenth Street N.W., Washington, DC 20036

Published by American Chemical Society. Copyright © American Chemical Society. However, no copyright claim is made to original U.S. Government works, or works produced by employees of any Commonwealth realm Crown government in the course of their duties.

¹ Groundwater uranium origin and fate control in a

² river valley aquifer

3 Andre Banning 1^{\dagger} , Thomas Demmel ¹, Thomas R. Rüde ¹*, Michael Wrobel ²

¹Institute of Hydrogeology, RWTH Aachen University, Lochnerstraße 4-20, 52064 Aachen,
Germany

⁶ ²Bavarian Environment Agency, Hans-Högn-Straße 12, 95030 Hof/Saale, Germany

7

8 ABSTRACT

9 Groundwater in a Quaternary gravel aquifer partly exhibits uranium (U) concentrations exceeding the new German drinking water limitation (22 % of the samples >10 μ g L⁻¹). This 10 11 study assesses relevant U reservoirs and hydrogeochemical processes responsible for U transfer 12 between them. A large dataset of solid materials (sediments and soils, 164 samples total) and 13 groundwater (114 samples total) characteristics was created in terms of geo- and hydrochemistry, 14 mineralogy, U microdistribution and mobilization potential. Results show that U primarily 15 derived from lignitic inclusions in Tertiary sediments is transported to and accumulated 16 (complexation to organic substance and UO₂ precipitation) in lowland moor peats of the river valley grown on the aquifer gravels. The alkaline character of the system predefines a 17 hydrogeochemical framework fostering U mobility. Elevated concentrations (up to 96 μ g L⁻¹ U) 18

occur downstream of the moor areas and under Mn/NO₃-reducing groundwater conditions. Oxic
and stronger reduced settings are rather little affected. Supporting previous laboratory studies,
this suggests enhanced U mobility in the presence of nitrate also in the field scale. While no
anthropogenic U input was detected in the study area, agricultural usage of the moor areas
triggers geogenic U release via nitrate fertilization, surface peat degradation and erosion.

6 INTRODUCTION

7 In response to a successively deeper understanding and recognition of uranium (U) impact on human health, mainly as a nephrotoxic heavy metal,¹ German authorities recently established a 8 fixed U threshold value of 10 μ g L⁻¹ for drinking water valid since 11/2011. This led to an 9 10 enhanced necessity for water suppliers to identify geogenic and anthropogenic sources of U input 11 especially to groundwater, and to understand hydrogeochemical processes responsible for 12 mobilization and immobilization. The general task for researchers and practitioners is thus to 13 unravel the trace element's fate in potentially and actually affected environments, and to develop 14 suitable site-specific reactions to the problem.

15 The Bavarian Environment Agency recently calculated an arithmetic mean U concentration of 1.32 μ g L⁻¹ in an evaluation of 15,182 groundwater samples from the whole southeastern 16 17 German federal state. Thereby, a large geology related heterogeneity was figured out with elevated values mainly found in Upper Triassic² and Ouaternary aquifers. The latter especially 18 19 refers to fluvial gravels in the southern part of Bavaria and is assumed to be related with U output from organic matter (OM).³ Nevertheless, distinct reservoir structures, i.e. U sources and 20 21 sinks, and responsible hydrogeochemical mechanisms and conditions remain unknown. In this 22 study, these were assessed for a postglacial gravelly aquifer used for drinking water extraction

ACS Paragon Plus Environment

and partly affected by elevated groundwater U concentrations in excess of the new threshold
 value.

3	The present study area (\sim 150 km ²) is located in the valley of the river Lech, around 50 km
4	northwest of Munich, in southern Bavaria, southeastern Germany. Quaternary carbonate-
5	dominated gravels in the valley with a thickness of up to 10 m represent a regionally important
6	aquifer used for drinking water supply. The contained groundwater partly exhibits U
7	concentrations >10 μ g L ⁻¹ . Agricultural use of the area resulted in significant nitrate contents.
8	Due to shallow depths of water table (~0.5-2 m below ground surface), hydromorphic soils and
9	lowland moor areas are present along the valley. The latter is surrounded and geologically
10	underlain mainly by Miocene alluvial sandy sediments with a thickness of around 140 m in the
11	study area. These deposits are partly covered by Pleistocene aeolian (loess) sediments.

12

13 MATERIALS AND METHODS

14 Sampling

Sampling of sedimentary rock, soil and groundwater was conducted in two field campaigns.
Thereby, the first one represented an area-wide overview identifying relevant units and zones in
terms of U occurrences, while the second one served for detailed characterization of the
identified "hot spots".

A total of 46 rock samples were obtained from outcrops and boreholes using percussion
 drilling. These covered both Quaternary (aquifer gravel, loess, alluvial valley deposits) and
 Tertiary (alluvial sands including peculiar intercalations therein: Fe-(hydr)oxide concretions,

ACS Paragon Plus Environment

1 clayey lenses, lignitic seams) sediments. Furthermore, eleven lignitic inclusions from the whole 2 distribution area of the Miocene sands were sampled from nine sediment cores drilled in the past 3 by rotary drilling and also percussion drilling and stored at the core warehouse of the Bavarian 4 Environment Agency. The dm thick layers of lignitic material were drilled at a wide range of 5 depth between 8 to 150 m below surface. Locations of these nine cores are shown in the 6 supplementary Figure S1. Using a soil probe, soil samples were taken as mixed samples from a 7 depth of $\sim 0.5-0.9$ m below ground level, covering all pedological units occurring in the study 8 area whereby a focus was set on OM-rich and hydromorphic soils. Additionally, topsoil (0-0.3 m 9 below ground level) was sampled at ten locations to characterize potential agricultural U input. 10 Depth-oriented soils sampling was accomplished in trial pits at three lowland moor locations. 11 Altogether, 98 soil samples were obtained for analysis. Groundwater was extracted from both the 12 shallow Quaternary (100 samples) and the deeper Tertiary (14 samples) aquifers.

13 Experimental

14 All solid samples were homogenized, air-dried and sieved to win the <2 mm fraction which 15 was used for further analysis. Bulk sediment geochemistry including concentrations of U and 16 other trace elements was assessed applying Instrumental Neutron Activation Analysis (INAA, detection limit for U: 0.5 µg g⁻¹) or acid digestion (HClO₄-HNO₃-HCl-HF at 240° C) followed 17 18 by ICP-OES analysis. Soil samples were digested with aqua regia, followed by trace element 19 determination with ICP-MS. Contents of Corg, Cinorg, N and S were measured for 38 samples 20 following dry combustion, soil pH was detected in CaCl₂ suspension. Physico-chemical 21 groundwater parameters (T, eC, pH, dissolved O₂) were analyzed on-site during sampling. For 22 selected samples. Eh was determined by addition of 200 mV to the on-site redox potential 23 readings. TOC/DOC contents were determined in the laboratory (high temperature catalytic

1	oxidation), as were major and trace element concentrations applying ICP-OES, IC and ICP-MS
2	(detection limit for U: 0.1 μ g L ⁻¹).

Based on the obtained data, selected solid samples were subjected to further analysis. X-ray diffraction was applied to 15 samples to study the mineralogical composition and to identify potential U host phases. Samples were finely ground in a corundum mill and measured using a Co-K_{α} diffractometer. Results were evaluated for mineral phase identification and quantification applying Rietveld analysis with the software BGMN 4.2.3⁴ and using the database MINCRYST⁵ for peak allocation (cf. Table S4).

9 For estimating U solid phase association and mobilization potential, an operationally defined 5-step sequential extraction procedure was performed for 16 sediment and soil samples (SEP 1: 10 0.4 M MgCl₂, 1 h at room temperature (RT), targeting the water soluble/exchangeable fraction⁶ 11 - SEP 2: 0.025 M EDTA, 1.5 h at RT, targeting the surface complexed fraction⁷ - SEP 3: 0.2 M 12 13 NH₄-oxalate+0.1 M ascorbic acid, 0.5 h at 96°C, targeting the reducible, e.g. Fe-(hydr)oxideassociated, fraction⁸ – SEP 4: 30 % H₂O₂ 3 h at 85 °C, targeting the oxidizable, e.g. sulphide-14 associated, fraction⁹ – SEP 5: residual fraction $[U_{tot}-\Sigma U_{SEP 1-4}]$). After the respective extraction, 15 16 centrifugation (15 min at 3000 rpm) and filtration (0.45 µm) of the supernatant solution, the 17 remaining sediment was subjected to the subsequent step. Uranium concentrations in 0.45 µm 18 filtered leachates were analyzed by ICP-MS.

The distribution of U and other elements on a microscale was characterized in 5 solid samples
applying Laser-Ablation-ICP-MS with a spot diameter of 75 μm and the trace element standard
NIST 612.

1 Uranium speciation in groundwater as well as mineral phase saturation states were modelled using the software code PhreeqC 2.¹⁰ To classify dominant redox processes in groundwater 2 samples, a USGS worksheet was used.¹¹ It determines prevailing redox categories based on the 3 concentrations of redox-sensitive parameters (dissolved O₂, NO₃⁻, Mn²⁺, Fe²⁺, SO₄²⁻ and 4 sulphides). 5 6 7 **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION** 8 Collected data is presented and discussed in the following, distinguished between findings 9 from solid materials and groundwater characterization, and finalised by some concluding 10 remarks. A more detailed tabulation of obtained data and additional materials are accessible in 11 the supporting information. 12 Sediments and soils 13 Geochemistry and mineralogy Uranium concentrations in the different sediment sample groups are shown in Figure 1a. 14 15 Locations of the samples are given in the supplementary Figure S2.



1

Figure 1. U distribution in different sample groups of (a) sediments and (b) soils.

3

Quaternary deposits exhibit relatively low and homogeneously distributed bulk U contents
with higher median values in loess/loess loam sediments (3.2 µg g⁻¹) than in alluvial valley
deposits (2.6 µg g⁻¹) and aquifer gravels (1.3 µg g⁻¹). Eye-catching intercalations (Fe-hydroxide
concretions, clay lenses, lignitic seams) contain significantly higher U concentrations than the

ambient Tertiary pure sands (0.8 µg g⁻¹). Thereby, the lignitic inclusions show highest median
values (7.6 µg g⁻¹) and variability (<0.5-50 µg g⁻¹) (Fig. 1a, Table 1). Two samples from a
borehole in the direct vicinity of the study area exhibited 22.8 and 33.1 µg g⁻¹ U, respectively.
Iron hydroxide concretions within the Tertiary sands (median U: 3.9 µg g⁻¹) partly contain high
As contents of up to 1800 µg g⁻¹ which supports previous observations in similar samples.¹²

6

7 **Table 1.** Bulk U concentrations, water soluble/exchangeable ("SEP₁") and totally soluble

8 ("SEP₁₋₄") U and mineralogy of sediment and soil samples (without topsoil samples). ["Q":

9 Quaternary, "T": Tertiary, "n=" number of samples in the respective sample groups analyzed for bulk

10 U/sequential extraction/mineralogy, "n.a."=not analysed, "Qtz"= quartz, "Dol"= dolomite, "Cal"= calcite,

11 "Ms"= muscovite, "Fsp"= feldspars, "Cm"= clay minerals, "Ttn"= titanite, "Anh"= anhydrite, "Gt"=

	Samples	U [μg g ⁻¹]			SEP ₁ [% U _{tot}]			SEP ₁₋₄ [% U _{tot}]			Mineralogy
		min	med	max	min	med	max	min	med	max	phases (decreasing wt.%)
	loesses and loess loams (Q, n=4/1/2)	2.7	3.2	3.7	0.3			0.3 8.2			
	alluvial valley deposits (Q, n=6/0/1)	<0.5	2.6	10	n.a.			n.a.			Qtz, Dol, Ms, Cal, Cm, Fsp
ents	gravels (Q, n=8/0/0)	<0.5	1.3	2.8	n.a.			n.a.			n.a.
edime	alluvial sands (T, n=12/0/1)	<0.5	0.8	1.6	n.a.			n.a. n.a.			Qtz, Ms, Fsp
\mathbf{v}	clay lense (T, n=1/1/1)	4.2			<0.2			19			Qtz, Cm, Ms, Ttn, Fsp, Anh
	Fe-rich concretions (T, n=4/2/3)	<0.5	3.9	4.8	<0.2		6.0	6.4	6.8	Qtz, Fsp, Ms, Cm, Ttn, Gt, Alm	
	lignitic inclusions (T, n=11/5/0)	<0.5	7.6	50	1.8 6.7 22		40	59	74	n.a.	

12 goethite, "Alm"= almandine]

Soils	cambisols (n=4/0/0)	0.8	1.1	2.8	n.a.			n.a.			n.a.
	calcaric arenosols (n=6/0/1)	1.1	1.5	2.5	n.a.			n.a.			Qtz, Dol, Cal, Ms, Fsp, Cm
	calcaric fluvisols (n=9/0/1)	1.0	1.7	1.9	n.a.			n.a.			Dol, Cal, Qtz, Ms, Fsp, Cm
	gleys (n=11/1/1)	0.6	1.6	1.7	3.6			52			Qtz, Dol, Cal, Ms, Fsp, Cm
	calcaric-humic gleysols (n=15/1/1)	1.2	2.5	4.5		2.1			100		Cal, Dol, Qtz
	lowland moor peats (n=19/5/0)	2.1	5.8	15	<0.2	0.4	1.1	18	44	59	n.a.

2 In terms of mineralogy (Table 1), quartz is the dominant phase in all analyzed sediment 3 samples. Feldspars, muscovite and clay minerals are present in varying amounts. Carbonate phases (calcite, dolomite) only appear in the Ouaternary sediments. For loess loam samples, 4 5 decarbonatization is observed (Table 1). This carbonate loss does not seem to affect bulk U 6 concentrations, therefore calcite is not considered a significant U carrier phase here, although the mineral can generally represent a U host.¹³ In addition to silicate phases assembling the Miocene 7 8 sands, reddish concretions therein contain goethite and the heavy minerals titanite and almandine 9 (a Fe-bearing garnet). The latter reaches quantities of up to 30 wt.% – part of the eye-catching 10 red inclusions in the Tertiary sands is therefore probably existent as garnet placers with goethite cement. While the Fe-hydroxide tends to accumulate U via surface complexation¹⁴ or 11 coprecipitation¹⁵, the aforementioned garnet is able to include U in its crystal structure.¹⁶ 12 13 Figure 1b and Table 1 show U distribution in the different soil types (mixed samples from 14 \sim 0.5-0.9 m below ground surface). Values for the ten sop soil samples are discussed later. Highest median (5.8 μ g g⁻¹) and single (15 μ g g⁻¹) values are found in lowland moor peats, thus 15 16 documenting an enrichment factor of ~4 compared to OM-poor soil types (cambisols, calcaric

- 1 arenosols, calcaric fluvisols, gleys; median U contents between 1.1 and 1.7 μ g g⁻¹, no single
- 2 value above $3 \mu g g^{-1}$). The second highest median concentration (2.5 $\mu g g^{-1}$) is found in calcaric-
- 3 humic gleysols OM contents and U concentrations appear to co-vary in soils.
- 4 After having identified lowland moor as highest-U soil type, trial pits were accomplished to
- 5 characterize depth-dependent distribution and behaviour of U at three relevant locations. Figure
- 6 2 illustrates soil horizonation as well as U and C_{org} concentrations development in one of these
- 7 pits with a total depth of ~ 2 m below ground level. The location is in agricultural use.



8

Figure 2. Soil profile and depth-dependent development of U and C_{org} concentrations in one of
the lowland moor trial pits. Upper left image: example of calcite precipitates mainly found in the
upper part of the peat.

1 The excavated representative profile can be roughly split into Ouaternary aquifer gravel at the 2 bottom and the lowland moor peat grown thereon. The latter extends to a depth of ~1.05 m b.g.l., 3 it may be subdivided into a brownish-black lower peat horizon and a rather grevish degraded 4 mineralized topsoil. Low concentrations of both U and Corg prevail in the gravels, increasing 5 slightly in the more peaty top of the aquifer material (Fig. 2). The peat hosts significantly higher U (up to 32 μ g g⁻¹) and C_{org} (up to 51 wt.%) concentrations, both of which massively decrease 6 7 again in the mineralized topsoil. It is interpreted that in the course of peat degradation associated 8 with agricultural activity, organic matter and U are released from the soil. The parallel 9 development of both parameters documented for a large part of the profile indicates a common 10 occurrence, i.e. U hosting by organic matter as will be discussed later on. This subparallel trend 11 is separated at the top of the peat horizon where a well-compacted black horizon (probably derived from compaction by agricultural machinery) shows peak Corg contents while U values 12 13 already decrease.

In the pits, occurrences of subhorizontal white carbonate intercalations were uncovered. These represent pure calcite (~99 wt.% as determined by quantitative XRD) groundwater precipitates locally referred to as "Alm" (Fig. 2). They contain little U and C_{org} but clearly indicate alkaline conditions in the lowland moor, supported by an average soil pH of 7.3 in the given profile and a pH of 7.2 measured in the groundwater sampled from the pit bottom. Moreover, horizontal orange Fe hydroxide precipitates were partly detected within the peat horizon arguing for at least temporary oxic redox conditions.

Observations in the other soil profiles support the reported findings. At locations yielding
 profiles without a visible mineralized topsoil (i.e. without visible signs of peat degradation;
 mainly under usage as grassland), U and C_{org} concentrations develop parallely throughout the

ACS Paragon Plus Environment

profile. Approaching the soil surface, their decrease is much less articulate as compared to
 agriculturally used sites (cf. Fig. 2).

3 The association of U and organic matter is underlined for the whole soil dataset by a U-C_{org} coefficient of determination of $R^2=0.74$. Uranium(VI) tends to accumulate in OM-rich soils, 4 mostly via complexation to humic and fulvic acids.¹⁷ This was identified as the dominant process 5 in a lowland moor in California by Idiz et al.¹⁸ while plant uptake and mere surface adsorption 6 7 were considered to be of minor importanceFurthermore, microbiologically mediated reducing 8 conditions in such milieus lead to U immobilization as uraninite (UO_2) or other U(IV) species 9 associated with biomass. Bog environments can thus represent effective barriers for aqueous U transport with documented elevated concentrations, partly up to mineable levels.¹⁹⁻²⁴ This second 10 11 potentially relevant U immobilization mechanism in the given environment occurs under strongly, i.e. Fe(III)-reducing, conditions.²⁵⁻²⁹ An evaluation of this process in the study area is 12 conducted by means of hydrogeochemical modelling as presented in the discussion on 13 14 groundwater later on.

15 Uranium microdistribution and mobility

Laser Ablation ICP-MS (LA-ICP-MS) measurements conducted for 5 solid samples aimed at
characterizing U distribution on a microscale and allowed for statements on either homogenous
occurrence or existence of preferential U accumulation areas (cf. supporting information).
Results supported the assumption that U in Tertiary sediments is associated with Fe concretions:
point analysis in the Fe-rich sections yielded 8.0±1.9 µg g⁻¹ U, compared to 1.7 µg g⁻¹ in the nonmineralized area. Goethite was identified as Fe host in these intercalations (Table 1) and most
likely functions as main U sorbent in the sediments. Uranium remobilization potential from these

ACS Paragon Plus Environment

Environmental Science & Technology

1	deposits appears quite limited as evidenced by a non-detectable water soluble/exchangeable
2	fraction (SEP 1) and a residual fraction (SEP 5) accounting for >93 % U_{tot} (Table 1).
3	Point measurements in two lignitic sediments obtained from different drillcores resulted in U
4	concentrations of 49±15 μ g g ⁻¹ and 225±67 μ g g ⁻¹ , respectively. While this proved a certain
5	variability within single samples as well as different sampling locations, distinctive U nests were
6	not identified. Supported by the microscopically observed homogeneous dark brownish
7	appearance, this argues for a rather extensive U uptake by Fe-hydroxides (40-60 $\%$ U _{tot} were
8	dissolved in the reducible step (SEP 3), positive correlation between U and Fe from the point
9	measurements of $R^2=0.76$). Water soluble/exchangeable U (SEP 1) was present in all analyzed
10	lignites accounting for up to 5.1 μ g g ⁻¹ . Bulk U remobilization potential (SEP 1-4) from these
11	deposits is significantly higher as compared to the other analyzed sediments (Table 1).
12	Similar to the findings for lignitic inclusions LA-ICP-MS measurements in the lowland moor
13	peats (appearing as relatively homogenous greyish material including carbonate and silicate
13 14	peats (appearing as relatively homogenous greyish material including carbonate and silicate grains under the microscope) did not indicate the presence of primary U phases. Uranium
13 14 15	peats (appearing as relatively homogenous greyish material including carbonate and silicate grains under the microscope) did not indicate the presence of primary U phases. Uranium concentrations in the two samples were $46\pm13 \ \mu g \ g^{-1}$ and $8.7\pm1.7 \ \mu g \ g^{-1}$, respectively. In the LA-
13 14 15 16	peats (appearing as relatively homogenous greyish material including carbonate and silicate grains under the microscope) did not indicate the presence of primary U phases. Uranium concentrations in the two samples were $46\pm13 \ \mu g \ g^{-1}$ and $8.7\pm1.7 \ \mu g \ g^{-1}$, respectively. In the LA-ICP-MS point analysis, positive correlations towards Fe were not detected, making U
13 14 15 16 17	peats (appearing as relatively homogenous greyish material including carbonate and silicate grains under the microscope) did not indicate the presence of primary U phases. Uranium concentrations in the two samples were $46\pm13 \ \mu g \ g^{-1}$ and $8.7\pm1.7 \ \mu g \ g^{-1}$, respectively. In the LA-ICP-MS point analysis, positive correlations towards Fe were not detected, making U complexation by organic substances the most likely accumulation process. Total U
 13 14 15 16 17 18 	peats (appearing as relatively homogenous greyish material including carbonate and silicate grains under the microscope) did not indicate the presence of primary U phases. Uranium concentrations in the two samples were $46\pm13 \ \mu g \ g^{-1}$ and $8.7\pm1.7 \ \mu g \ g^{-1}$, respectively. In the LA-ICP-MS point analysis, positive correlations towards Fe were not detected, making U complexation by organic substances the most likely accumulation process. Total U remobilization potential (SEP 1-4) in these soils is similar to that of the lignitic inclusions
 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 	peats (appearing as relatively homogenous greyish material including carbonate and silicate grains under the microscope) did not indicate the presence of primary U phases. Uranium concentrations in the two samples were $46\pm13 \ \mu g \ g^{-1}$ and $8.7\pm1.7 \ \mu g \ g^{-1}$, respectively. In the LA-ICP-MS point analysis, positive correlations towards Fe were not detected, making U complexation by organic substances the most likely accumulation process. Total U remobilization potential (SEP 1-4) in these soils is similar to that of the lignitic inclusions described above while the water soluble/exchangeable fraction (SEP 1) yields a maximum of 0.1
 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 	peats (appearing as relatively homogenous greyish material including carbonate and silicate grains under the microscope) did not indicate the presence of primary U phases. Uranium concentrations in the two samples were $46\pm13 \ \mu g \ g^{-1}$ and $8.7\pm1.7 \ \mu g \ g^{-1}$, respectively. In the LA-ICP-MS point analysis, positive correlations towards Fe were not detected, making U complexation by organic substances the most likely accumulation process. Total U remobilization potential (SEP 1-4) in these soils is similar to that of the lignitic inclusions described above while the water soluble/exchangeable fraction (SEP 1) yields a maximum of 0.1 $\mu g \ g^{-1}$ only. The latter observation argues for the necessity to fully mobilize the U-hosting
 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 	peats (appearing as relatively homogenous greyish material including carbonate and silicate grains under the microscope) did not indicate the presence of primary U phases. Uranium concentrations in the two samples were $46\pm13 \ \mu g \ g^{-1}$ and $8.7\pm1.7 \ \mu g \ g^{-1}$, respectively. In the LA- ICP-MS point analysis, positive correlations towards Fe were not detected, making U complexation by organic substances the most likely accumulation process. Total U remobilization potential (SEP 1-4) in these soils is similar to that of the lignitic inclusions described above while the water soluble/exchangeable fraction (SEP 1) yields a maximum of 0.1 $\mu g \ g^{-1}$ only. The latter observation argues for the necessity to fully mobilize the U-hosting organic matter in order to enable significant U release to solution, i.e. groundwater. Remarkably,

indicates a high mobilizability and a potential U source function of this soil type despite lower
bulk concentrations (Table 1).

3 Anthropogenic uranium input?

4 Phosphorus fertilizer has been recognized as a potential anthropogenic U source in agricultural areas during the past decade.³⁰ Partly elevated U concentrations in the raw material derive from 5 6 U tendency to substitute for Ca in the mineral structure of apatite representing the dominant P carrier for fertilizer production.³¹⁻³³ Suchlike U will accumulate especially in the uppermost 7 layers of cropping soils.³⁴ To evaluate a fertilizer-derived U input in the given study area, ten 8 9 topsoil (0-30 cm b.g.l.) samples were taken from farmland and reference locations without agricultural usage. While the latter yielded U concentrations of $2.1\pm0.4 \ \mu g \ g^{-1}$, farmland topsoils 10 contained $1.9\pm0.6 \ \mu g \ g^{-1}$. Uranium contents are therefore comparably low. Consequently, the 11 12 given dataset does not suggest an anthropogenic U input to the studied soils.

13

14 Groundwater

15 Hydrochemistry and uranium distribution

16 In both the Tertiary (T) and the Quaternary (Q) aquifer, Ca-Mg-HCO₃ represents the dominant

17 hydrochemical water type. Circumneutral to slightly alkaline pH conditions prevail in both

18 aquifers (Q: 7.1 ± 0.2 ; T: 7.4 ± 0.1). Variable contents of Fe, Mn and dissolved O₂ in both aquifers

- 19 argue for heterogenous redox conditions.
- 20 **Table 2.** Attributed redox category (after ¹¹), U and DOC concentrations and percentage of U
- 21 drinking water limitation exceedance in Quaternary and Tertiary groundwater of the study area.

Aquifer	Redox category	U [μg L ⁻¹]		% data > 10 μg L ⁻¹	DOC [mg L ⁻¹]			NO_{3}^{-} [mg L ⁻¹]	
		min	mean	max		min	mean	max	median
ıry	oxic (n=73)	0.9	7.0	19	18	<0.5	1.4	3.0	39
aterna	Mn/NO ₃ - reducing (n=18)	0.9	17	96	61	0.7	3.6	20	33
Qu	Fe/SO ₄ - reducing (n=9)	0.1	4.6	10	0	<0.5	3.9	7.4	<0.5
y	oxic (n=8)	0.4	1.8	3.7	0	<0.5	0.4	0.8	4.8
ertiar	Mn/NO ₃ - reducing (n=0)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
L	Fe/SO ₄ - reducing (n=6)	0.2	2.2	6.0	0	<0.5	0.5	0.7	<0.5

2 Nitrate concentrations are higher in the Quaternary groundwater than in the deeper layers. Elevated concentrations of dissolved organic carbon (DOC) and U (22 % of samples of the total 3 4 dataset in excess of the new drinking water limitation) are found in the Quaternary aquifer only, 5 whereby redox-dependent differences become obvious (Table 2). Uranium speciation is largely dominated by carbonate complexes $UO_2(CO_3)_2^{2-}$ and $UO_2(CO_3)_3^{4-}$ as indicated by PhreeqC 6 7 equilibrium modelling.Uranium fate control: role of Eh 8 To unravel the mechanisms leading to the observed U distribution and accumulation in 9 Quaternary groundwater, U behaviour towards other hydrochemical parameters was analysed.

10 Figure 3 illustrates a scatter plot of U vs. DOC concentrations, set in relation to prevailing redox

11 conditions.



Figure 3. U vs. DOC for Quaternary (Q) and Tertiary (T) groundwater samples, distinguished by
 prevailing redox conditions as determined after ¹¹.

5 While no trend between U and DOC is visible for Tertiary groundwater, oxidizing Quaternary 6 samples exhibit a weak, significant (p<1 %) positive correlation between these parameters 7 ($R^2=0.52$ for n=70, ignoring 3 statistical outliers). High U concentrations of up to 96 µg g⁻¹ are 8 detected especially in waters with Mn/NO₃-reducing conditions. 61 % of the samples from this 9 cohort, which includes the groundwaters obtained from the aforementioned trial pits, exceed 10 10 µg g⁻¹ (Table 2). Stronger (Fe/SO₄-) reducing conditions, on the other hand, coincide with lower 11 U contents – no single value exceeds the drinking water limit (Table 2, Fig. 3). These

observations suggest a common source material for U and Corg, probably the lowland moor peats. 1 2 Highest U groundwater concentrations within or downstream the swampy areas support this 3 assumption. Microbiological degradation of the released humic substances leads to successively more reducing conditions in solution. As soon as Eh drops into the stability field of UO_{23}^{35} 4 dissolved U is reduced and immobilized by precipitation as uraninite or other U(IV) species³⁶. In 5 6 summary, an ideal "redox window" appears required for allowing high U concentrations in 7 groundwater, provided that sufficient source material (expressed by DOC) is available and redox 8 conditions are not yet reducing enough to enable U withdrawal from solution. These findings are 9 in accordance with earlier laboratory and field studies where U mobility was shown to be 10 significantly enhanced in the presence of nitrate as an electron acceptor. Thereby, both abiotic 11 and bacterial oxidation of U(IV) to U(VI), leading to U release, were observed. Furthermore, 12 reduction and thus immobilization of U(VI) are constrained when NO_3^{-1} is present in solution. 13 Failure of U remediation measures by induction of reducing conditions was partly explained by this finding.^{26, 37-41} 14

To evaluate the possibility of UO₂ precipitation in the studied environment, hydrogeochemical scenario modelling was conducted using PhreeqC. Groundwater data from the lowland moor trial pits samples representing initial conditions for U release from peat were chosen as starting points. Figure 4 shows the simulation of successively more reducing conditions aiming at a characterization of newly adapting equilibria with potential U host phases.



1

Figure 4. Modelled development of SI_{uraninite} (blue lines) and SI_{goethite} (red lines) during
successively stronger reductive conditions (decreasing pe) for groundwater samples taken in
lowland moor trial pits.

6 Starting from oxic conditions in the samples and associated significant undersaturation of UO₂, 7 uraninite SI increases with decreasing pe. Saturation is reached at Eh values between +13 and +20 mV, a redox zone typical for peat bog waters.⁴² Therefore, U immobilization by UO₂ 8 9 precipitation is a presumable second fixation process besides complexation with organic acids in 10 the studied environment (although, as mentioned above, UO₂ was not observed during microscopical and LA-ICP-MS analyses). Pyrite representing another potential U host phase⁴³ is 11 clearly undersaturated (SI_{pyrite} around -40) over the whole modelled Eh range and therefore 12 13 unlikely to contribute to U fixation in the system. Goethite saturation conditions develop 14 oppositionally to those of uraninite: initial oversaturation inverts to undersaturation at Eh = -10 to 15 -40 mV (Fig. 4). Thus, potentially released U in the course of Fe hydroxide reductive dissolution 16 should be re-immobilized as UO_2 . Nevertheless, caution should be exercised if applying these

1	findings in order to fix U in a lowland moor by inducing stronger reducing conditions via, e.g.
2	swamp rehydration. On the one hand, Spycher et al. ⁴⁴ found that UO ₂ reoxidation in the presence
3	of Fe hydroxides can occur even under SO ₄ -reducing conditions. On the other hand, other
4	potentially harmful trace elements bound to sesquioxides and thus immobile under oxic
5	conditions, e.g. As, might be remobilized. Arsenic concentrations of up to 170 μ g g ⁻¹ were
6	detected in the peats of the study area.

7

8 Uranium fate control: role of pH

9 Enhanced mobility of U under oxidizing conditions is mainly reasoned by its tendency to form stable U(VI)-carbonato-complexes governing U speciation in bicarbonate-dominated 10 waters.^{40,41,45} Uranium concentrations in the studied Quaternary groundwater do not exhibit a 11 direct dependence from pH ($R^2=0.01$). Elevated values >10 µg L⁻¹ appear over the whole pH 12 range of the samples (~6.9-7.5). Nevertheless, the alkaline character of the calcaric lowland 13 14 moors is likely to play a crucial role for U distribution and mobility. In lowland moor peats, Idiz et al.¹⁸ found U concentrations elevated by a factor of ~ 10 compared to this study while release 15 to groundwater was not detected – the peat functions as U sink. This was attributed to the low pH 16 17 (~ 5) of the swamp. In laboratory experiments, the authors identified this pH as the sorption efficiency peak of UO_2^{2+} to organic matter (>90 %). With increasing pH, sorption efficiency 18 decreases substantially reaching ~ 60 % in the pH range found in this study.¹⁸ The mechanism 19 behind this pH-dependent U release was studied by Zielinski and Meier⁴⁶ and referred to as 20 "carbonate leaching" generally following the process 21

22
$$UO_2(Hu) + 2 CO_3^{2-} \rightarrow (Hu)^{2-} + UO_2(CO_3)_2^{2-}$$

where "Hu" represents humic substances.⁴⁶

1 Consequently, U bound in organic substance is released under carbonate presence forming 2 stable carbonato complexes. Hydrogeochemical, physico-chemical and speciation analyses 3 suggest that these conditions correspond exactly to those found in the present study area. The 4 given process, referred to as major U release mechanism from organic matter besides peat oxidative destruction and erosion,⁴⁶ is therefore likely to further trigger U mobilization from the 5 6 lowland moors and foster elevated concentrations in near-surface Quaternary groundwater. 7 In summary, geogenic uranium was mobilized from Tertiary lignitic sediments (primary U 8 source), transported into a swampy river valley and accumulated in lowland moor peats (primary 9 U sink/secondary U source). The hydrogeochemical framework determines the presence of

11 Quaternary river valley gravel aquifer whereby slightly alkaline and Mn/NO₃-reducing

12 conditions are decisive. Against this background of naturally enhanced U mobility potential,

13 agricultural activity further triggers the U source function of the moor via peat degradation and

elevated U groundwater concentrations partly exceeding drinking water limitations in the

14 nitrate fertilization. Direct anthropogenic U input, however, was not identified.

10

15 The present process-oriented examination combines previous laboratory results on 16 environmental U behaviour to explain its dynamics in a natural system and thus documents their 17 transferability to the field scale. It was successful in characterizing the origin and fate control of 18 elevated groundwater U concentrations in an important aquifer. Findings of this study will be 19 used to identify U occurrences and dynamics in similar areas in southern Germany and can prove 20 helpful in doing so for comparable environments worldwide. They have to be considered when it 21 comes to drinking water extraction from U-affected aquifers or remediation approaches in a high 22 U/C_{org} milieu, especially if under agricultural usage.

2	Supporting Information available. Study area maps and additional figures, full data tables on
3	sediment and soil geochemistry and mineralogy, LA-ICP-MS analyses and hydrochemistry. This
4	material is available free of charge via the Internet at <u>http://pubs.acs.org</u>
5	
6	AUTHOR INFORMATION
7	Corresponding Author
8	* Corresponding author, ruede@hydro.rwth-aachen.de, phone: 0049-241-80-95743, fax: 0049-
9	241-80-92280
10	Present Addresses
11	† Present address: Andre Banning, Hydrogeology Department, Ruhr University Bochum,
12	Universitätsstraße 150, 44801 Bochum, Germany
12	
13	ACTIONIEDCMENTS
14	ACKNOW LEDGMEN IS
15	This study was conducted on behalf of the Bavarian Environment Agency and funded by the
16	Bavarian State Ministry of the Environment and Public Health. The authors thank the Water
17	Management Office Donauwörth (esp. Bernhard von Roda, Karl Spanowsky and Dr. Kurt Nunn)
18	and the Bavarian Environment Agency (esp. Dr. Peter Fritsch, Dr. Michael Wittenbecher,
19	Reinhard Jochum and Raphael Meier) for assistance in field sampling, laboratory analysis and
20	for discussions. The help of the Institute of Hydrogeology student assistants (esp. David
21	Bulmann, Marc Fröwis and Iris Lasitschka) during fieldwork and sample preparation is

ACS Paragon Plus Environment

acknowledged. We thank three anonymous reviewers for their comments which significantly
 improved this paper.

3

4	REFERENCES
---	------------

5 (1) Orloff, K. G.; Mistry, K.; Charp, P.; Metcalf, S.; Marino, R.; Shelly, T.; Melaro, E.;

Donohoe, A. M.; Jones, R. L. Human exposure to uranium in groundwater. *Environ. Res.* 2004,
94, 319–326.

8 (2) Banning, A.; Rüde, T.R.; Cardona, A.; Aguillón-Robles, A.; Padilla-Sanchez, L. Uranium
9 and arsenic in some aquifers from Mexico and Germany – a common geogenic development? In

Water-Rock Interaction; Birkle, P., Torres-Alvarado, I. S., Eds.; CRC Press: Leiden, 2010; pp
367-370.

12 (3) Friedmann, L.; Lindenthal, W. Uran im Grund- und Trinkwasser in Bayern. *Wasser*13 *Abfall* 2009, *4*, 21–24.

14 (4) Taut, T.; Kleeberg, R.; Bergmann, J. The new Seifert Rietveld program BGMN and its
15 application to quantitative phase analysis. *Mater. Struct.* 1998, *5*, 57–66.

16 (5) Chichagov, A. V.; Varlamov, D. A.; Dilanyan, R. A.; Dokina, T. N.; Drozhzhina, N. A.;

17 Samokhvalova, O. L.; Ushakovskaya, T. V. MINCRYST: a crystallographic database for

18 minerals, local and network (www) versions. *Crystallogr. Rep.* **2001**, *46*, 876–879.

19 (6) Schultz, M. K.; Burnett, W.; Inn, K. G. W.; Smith, G. Geochemical partitioning of

20 actinides using sequential chemical extractions: Comparison to stable elements. J. Radioanal.

21 Nucl. Chem. 1998, 234, 251–256.

1	(7)	Zeien, H.; Brümmer, G. W. Chemische Extraktionen zur Bestimmung von
2	Schwe	ermetallbindungsformen in Böden. Mitt. Dtsch. Bodenkd. Ges. 1989, 59, 505-510.
3	(8)	Wenzel, W. W.; Kirchbaumer, N.; Prohaska, T.; Stingeder, G.; Lombi, E.; Adriano, D. C.
4	Arsen	ic fractionation in soils using an improved sequential extraction procedure. Anal. Chim.
5	Acta 2	001 , <i>436</i> , 309–323.
6	(9)	Tessier, A.; Campbell, P. G. C.; Bisson, M. Sequential extraction procedure for the
7	specia	tion of particulate trace metals. Anal. Chem. 1979, 51, 844-851.
8	(10)	Parkhurst, D. L.; Appelo, C. A. J. User's Guide to PHREEQC (Version 2) – A Computer
9	Progr	am for Speciation, Batch-Reaction, One-Dimensional Transport, and Inverse Geochemical
10	Calcu	lations; Water-Resour. Invest. Rep. 99-4259; U.S. Department of the Interior, U.S.
11	Geolo	gical Survey: Denver, Colorado, 1999.
12	(11)	Jurgens, B. C.; McMahon, P. B.; Chapelle, F. H.; Eberts, S.M. An Excel Workbook for
13	identij	fying redox processes in ground water; Open-File Rep. 2009-1004; U.S. Department of the
14	Interio	or, U.S. Geological Survey: Denver, Colorado, 2009.
15	(12)	Bayer, M. Natürliche Arsenanreicherungen in der Oberen Süßwassermolasse Bayerns.
16	Veröff	f. Grundbauinst. LGewerbeanst. Bayern 1997 , 77, 1–250.
17	(13)	Sturchio, N. C.; Antonio, M. R.; Soderholm, L.; Sutton, S. R.; Brannon, J. C. Tetravalent
18	uraniu	m in calcite. Science 1998, 281, 971–973.

(14) Katsoyiannis, I. A.; Althoff, H. W.; Bartel, H.; Jekel, M. The effect of groundwater
 composition on uranium(VI) sorption onto bacteriogenic iron oxides. *Water Res.* 2006, *40*,
 3646–3652.

4 (15) Bruno, J.; de Pablo, J.; Duro, L.; Figuerola, E. Experimental study and modeling of the
5 U(VI)-Fe(OH)₃ surface precipitation/coprecipitation equilibria. *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta*6 1995, *59*, 4113-4123.

7 (16) Yudintsev, S. V.; Lapina, M. I.; Ptashkin, A. G.; Ioudintseva, T. S.; Utsunomiya, S.;

8 Wang, L. M.; Ewing, R. C. Accommodation of uranium into the garnet structure. *Mater. Res.*

9 Soc. Symp. Proc. 2002, 713, 477–480.

10 (17) Lenhart, J. J.; Cabaniss, S. E.; MacCarthy, P.; Honeyman, B. D. Uranium(VI)

11 complexation with citric, humic and fulvic acids. *Radiochim. Acta* **2000**, *88*, 345–353.

12 (18) Idiz, E. F.; Carlisle, D.; Kaplan, I. R. Interaction between organic matter and trace metals

13 in a uranium rich bog, Kern County, California, U.S.A. Appl. Geochem. 1986, 1, 573–590.

14 (19) Read, D.; Bennett, D. G.; Hooker, P. J.; Ivanovich, M.; Longworth, G.; Milodowski, A.

15 E.; Noy, D. J. The migration of uranium into peat-rich soils at Broubster, Caithness, Scotland,

16 U.K. J. Contam. Hydrol. 1993, 13, 291–308.

17 (20) Halbach, P.; Borstel, D., von; Gundermann, K. H. The uptake of uranium by organic

substances in a peat bog environment on a granitic bedrock. Chem. Geol. **1980**, *29*, 117–138.

19 (21) Lovley, D. R.; Phillips, E. J. P.; Gorby, Y. A.; Landa, E. R. Microbial reduction of

20 uranium. *Nature* **1991**, *350*, 413–416.

1	(22) Spirakis, C. S. The roles of organic matter in the formation of uranium deposits in
2	sedimentary rocks. Ore Geol. Rev. 1995, 11, 53-69.
3	(23) Regenspurg, S.; Margot-Roquier, C.; Harfouche, M.; Froidevaux, P.; Steinmann, P.;
4	Junier, P.; Bernier-Latmani, R. Speciation of naturally-accumulated uranium in an organic-rich
5	soil of an alpine region (Switzerland). Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta 2010, 74, 2082–2098.
6	(24) Sharp, J. O.; Lezama-Pacheco, J. S.; Schofield, E. J.; Junier, P.; Ulrich, KU.; Chinni, S
7	Veeramani, H.; Margot-Roquier, C.; Webb, S. M.; Tebo, B. M.; Giammar, D. E.; Bargar, J. R.;
8	Bernier-Latmani, R. Uranium speciation and stability after reductive immobilization in aquifer
9	sediments. Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta 2011, 75, 6497–6510.
10	(25) Senko, J. M.; Istok, J. D.; Suflita, J. M.; Krumholz, L. R. In-situ evidence for uranium
11	immobilization and remobilization. Environ. Sci. Technol. 2002, 36, 1491–1496.
12	(26) Senko, J. M.; Suflita, J. M.; Krumholz, L. R. Geochemical controls on microbial nitrate-
13	dependent U(IV) oxidation. Geomicrobiol. J. 2005, 22, 371-378.
14	(27) Gu, B.; Chen, J. Enhanced microbial reduction of Cr(VI) and U(VI) by different natural
15	organic matter fractions. Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta 2003, 67 (19), 3575-3582.
16	(28) Gorby, Y. A.; Lovley, D. R. Enzymatic uranium precipitation. <i>Environ. Sci. Technol.</i>
17	1992 , <i>26</i> , 205–207.
18	(29) Moon, H. S.; McGuinness, L.; Kukkadapu, R. K.; Peacock, A. D.; Komlos, J.; Kerkhof,
19	L. J.; Long, P. E.; Jaffé, P. R. Microbial reduction of uranium under iron- and sulfate-reducing

- 1 conditions: Effect of amended goethite on microbial community composition and dynamics.
- 2 Water Res. 2010, 44, 4015–4028.
- 3 (30) Zielinski, R. A.; Orem, W. H.; Simmons, K. R.; Bohlen, P. J. Fertilizer-derived uranium
 4 and sulphur in rangeland soil and runoff: a case study in central Florida. *Water, Air, Soil Pollut.*5 2006, *176*, 163–183.
- 6 (31) Starinsky, A.; Katz, A.; Kolodny, Y. The incorporation of uranium into diagenetic
 7 phosphorite. *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* 1982, *46*, 1365–1374.
- 8 (32) Fuller, C. C.; Barger, J. R.; David, J. A.; Piana, M. J. Mechanisms of uranium
 9 interactions with hydroxyapatite: Implications for groundwater remediation. *Environ. Sci.*10 *Technol.* 2002, *36*, 158–165.
- 11 (33) Rakovan, J.; Reeder, R. J.; Elzinga, E. J.; Cherniak, D. J.; Tait, C. D.; Morris, D. E.
- 12 Structural characterization of U(VI) in apatite by X-ray absorption spectroscopy. *Environ. Sci.*
- 13 *Technol.* **2002**, *36*, 3114–3117.
- 14 (34) Zielinski, R. A.; Simmons, K. R.; Orem, W. H. Use of U-234 and U-238 isotopes to
- 15 identify fertilizer-derived uranium in the Florida Everglades. *Appl. Geochem.* **2000**, *15*, 369–383.
- 16 (35) Langmuir, D. Uranium solution-mineral equilibria at low temperatures with applications
 17 to sedimentary ore deposits. *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* 1978, *42*, 547–569.
- 18 (36) Boyanov, M. I.; Fletcher, K. E.; Kwon, M. J.; Rui, X.; O'Loughlin, E. J.; Löffler, F. E.;
- 19 Kemner, K. M. Solution and microbial controls on the formation of reduced U(IV) species.
- 20 Environ. Sci. Technol. 2011, 45, 8336-8344.

1	(37) Moon, H. S.; Komlos, J.; Jaffé, P. R. Uranium reoxidation in previously bioreduced
2	sediment by dissolved oxygen and nitrate. Environ. Sci. Technol. 2007, 41, 4587-4592.
3	(38) Bots, P.; Behrends, T. Uranium mobility in subsurface aqueous systems: the influence of
4	redox conditions. <i>Mineral. Mag.</i> 2008, 72, 381–384.
5	(39) Wu, WM.; Carley, J.; Green, S. J.; Luo, J.; Kelly, S. D.; Nostrand, J., van; Lowe, K.;
6	Mehlhorn, T.; Carroll, S.; Boonchayanant, B.; Löffler, F. E.; Watson, D.; Kemner, K. M.; Zhou,
7	J.; Kitanidis, P. K.; Kostka, J. E.; Jardine, P. M.; Criddle, C. S. Effects of nitrate on the stability
8	of uranium in a bioreduced region of the subsurface. Environ. Sci. Technol. 2010, 44, 5104-
9	5111.
10	(40) Katsoyiannis, I. A.; Hug, S. J.; Ammann, A.; Zikoudi, A.; Hatziliontos, C. Arsenic
11	speciation and uranium concentrations in drinking water supply wells in Northern Greece:
12	Correlations with redox indicative parameters and implications for groundwater treatment.
13	Environ. Sci. Technol. 2007, 383, 128–140.

14 (41) Curtis, P. C.; Kohler, M.; Davis, J. A. Comparing approaches for simulating the reactive
15 transport of U(VI) in ground water. *Mine Water Environ.* 2009, *28*, 84–93.

16 (42) Reddy, K. R.; D'Angelo, E. M.; Harris, W. G. Biogeochemistry of Wetlands. In

17 Handbook of Soil Science; Sumner, M. E., Eds.; CRC Press: Leiden, 2000; pp G89-119.

18 (43) Qafoku, N. P.; Kukkadapu, R. K.; McKinley, J. P.; Arey, B. W.; Kelly, S. D.; Wang, C.;

- 19 Resch, C. T.; Long, P. E. Uranium in framboidal pyrite from a naturally bioreduced alluvium
- 20 sediment. Environ. Sci. Technol. 2009, 43, 8528–8534.

ACS Paragon Plus Environment

- 1 (44) Spycher, N. F.; Issarangkun, M.; Stewart, B. D.; Sengör, S. S.; Belding, E.; Ginn, T. R.;
- 2 Peyton, B. M.; Sani, R. K. Biogenic uraninite precipitation and its reoxidation by iron(III)
- 3 (hydr)oxides: a reaction modeling approach. *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* 2011, 75, 4426–4440.
- 4 (45) Carvalho, I. G.; Cidu, R.; Fanfani, L.; Pitsch, H.; Beaucaire, C.; Zuddas, P.
- 5 Environmental impact of uranium mining and ore processing in the Lagoa Real district, Bahia,
- 6 Brazil. Environ. Sci. Technol. 2005, 39, 8646–8652.
- 7 (46) Zielinski, R. A.; Meier, A. L. The association of uranium with organic matter in
- 8 Holocene peat: an experimental leaching study. *Appl. Geochem.* **1988**, *3*, 631–643.
- 9
- 10 TOC/Graphical abstract
- 11





193x103mm (300 x 300 DPI)



Figure 1. U distribution in different sample groups of (a) sediments and (b) soils. 173x162mm (300 x 300 DPI)



Figure 2. Soil profile and depth-dependent development of U and Corg concentrations in one of the lowland moor trial pits. Upper left image: example of calcite precipitates mainly found in the upper part of the peat. $152 \times 189 \text{mm} (300 \times 300 \text{ DPI})$



Figure 3. U vs. DOC for Quaternary (Q) and Tertiary (T) groundwater samples, distinguished by prevailing redox conditions as determined after 11. 190x131mm (300 x 300 DPI)



Figure 4. Modelled development of SIuraninite (blue lines) and SIgoethite (red lines) during successively stronger reductive conditions (decreasing pe) for groundwater samples taken in lowland moor trial pits. $171 \times 123 \text{ mm} (300 \times 300 \text{ DPI})$