
THE UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE

**THE EFFECTS OF WEATHERING AND DIAGENETIC PROCESSES ON THE
GEOCHEMICAL STABILITY OF URANIUM MILL TAILINGS**

Greg Sinclair

B.App.Sc (Chemistry)

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Adelaide

School of Earth and Environmental Sciences

2004

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	viii
Declaration	ix
Acknowledgements	x
1. Introduction	1
1.1. Overview of Mine Tailings and Management Issues	1
1.2. Uranium Mining and Milling in Australia	3
1.3. Review of Applicable Case Studies	6
1.4. Hypothesis and Research Program	11
2. The Ranger Mine Environment	13
2.1. The Alligator Rivers Region	13
2.2. Regional Overview	17
2.3. The Ranger Mine Project	18
2.4. Tailings Management	20
3. Experimental Methodology and Materials	23
3.1. Field Sampling Program and Measurements	23
3.2. Solid State Speciation Test Work	26
3.3. Kinetic Column Leach Studies	27
3.3.1. Columns	27
3.3.2. Leachant Quality	31
3.3.3. Sample Collection, Preparation and Analysis	32
3.4. Geochemical Modelling	33
4. Field Investigations and Summary of Key Observations	34
4.1. Field Sampling Campaign	34
4.2. Core Profiles	36
4.3. Piezometer Installations	39
5. Tailings Solids and Porewaters	42
5.1. Processes Affecting the Geochemical Evolution and Diagenesis of the Tailings	42
5.1.1. Geochemical Processes	42
5.1.2. Diagenetic Processes	45
5.1.3. Effect of Redox Potential on Uranium and Trace Metal Distribution within the Tailings Pile	49
5.1.4. Authigenic Phases	50

5.2. Tailings Texture, Mineralogy and Geochemistry	53
5.2.1. Tailings Texture	53
5.2.2. Tailings Mineralogy and Morphology	57
5.3. Solid State Speciation	76
5.3.1. Phase Selectivity and Mass Recovery	78
5.3.2. Uranium and Radium Trends in Geochemically Defined Phases	84
5.4. Chemical Manifestations of Dissolved Radionuclides and Metals in the Tailings Pond and Underlying Porewaters	88
5.4.1. Chemistry of the Tailings Pond Water	88
5.4.2. Major Ion Chemistry of Tailings Porewaters	92
5.4.3. Porewater Redox Chemistry	102
5.4.4. Uranium and Radium Mobility	111
6. Kinetic Column Leach Studies	121
6.1. Overview and Experimental Design	121
6.2. Tailings Texture, Mineralogy and Geochemistry Prior to Leaching	126
6.3. Tailings Mineralogy and Geochemistry Following Column Leaching	130
6.3.1. Bulk Phase Mineralogy and Geochemistry	130
6.3.2. Textural Distribution of Mineral Assemblages	135
6.4. Column Leachate Chemistry	145
6.4.1. Oxidative Dissolution of Metal Sulfides and Weathering of Phyllosilicates in the Unsaturated Tailings	146
6.4.2. Organic Matter Diagenesis	161
7. Data Synthesis and Geochemical Modelling	173
7.1. Equilibrium Model and Governing Equations	173
7.1.1. Distribution of Aqueous Species	174
7.1.2. Mineral Solubility	174
7.1.3. Redox Couples	175
7.1.4. Sorption	175
7.1.5. Source and Evaluation of Thermodynamic Data	176
7.2. Overview of the Kinetic Model	177
7.3. Conceptual Geochemical Model	179
7.3.1. Steady State Dissolution Reactions in Unsaturated Tailings	182
7.3.2. Equilibrium Trends for Saturated Tailings	185
8. Conclusions and Implications	198
8.1. Conclusions	198
8.1.1. Formation of Authigenic Minerals	199
8.1.2. Processes Governing Radionuclide and Metal Solubility	200
8.2. Implications and Recommendations for Further Research	202
Appendix 1: Physical and Analytical Methodology	204
Appendix 2: Tailings Core Mineralogy, Geochemistry and Porewater Chemistry	212

Appendix 3: Mineralogy and Geochemistry of Tailings Prior To and After Kinetic Column Leaching	225
Bibliography	229

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1: Acid leach flow diagram for Ranger ores. (Ring et.al., 1982)	4
Figure 1.2: Uranium mill tailings hazards. (Waggitt, 1994; Uranium Institute, 1991)	6
Fig. 2.1(a): Relative sizes and location of Kakadu National Park, Jabiluka and Ranger Mine leases	13
Fig. 2.1(b): Map of Kakadu National Park and Uranium mining areas	14
Figure 2.2: Cultural and natural heritage values of Kakadu National Park	15
Figure 2.3: Kakadu Wetland-Magela Floodplain	15
Figure 2.4: Mt Brockman - Site of cultural significance	15
Figure 2.5: Aerial view of Jabiluka and Ranger Mine sites	18
Figure 3.1: Sampling pontoon on the Ranger Dam 1998	23
Figure 3.2: Pontoon and piston core sampler	23
Figure 3.3: UPVC sampling tube	23
Fig. 3.4(a): Schematic of soft sediment sampling rig	24
Fig. 3.4(b): Schematic of piston core sampler	24
Figure 3.5: Composite sample taken from split core	25
Figure 3.6: General arrangement of leach column	27
Figure 4.1: Tailings dam sample profile locations	34
Figure 4.2: Cross section A-A' tailings core profiles January, 1998	35
Figure 4.3: Cross section A-A', piezometer profiles June, 1999	35
Figure 4.4: Original ground contours -Pre-tailings dam	36
Figure 4.5: Artesian pore pressures at Site 9, 8 – 8.5 m	38
Figure 4.6: Comparison of 1990 and 1999 piezometric levels	40
Figure 5.1: Schematic of microbially mediated redox processes	45
Figure 5.2: Theoretical redox zonation and dissolved species distribution of submerged sediments	48
Figure 5.3: Tailings texture and phase descriptions	53
Figure 5.4: Tailings size distribution	57
Figure 5.5: Gypsum distribution for (a) sites 4 & 6 and (b) site 5	59
Figure 5.6: Iron oxide distribution for (a) sites 4 & 6 and (b) site 5	60
Figure 5.7: Manganese oxide distribution for (a) sites 4 & 6 and (b) site 5	61
Figure 5.8: Magnesium distribution for (a) sites 4 & 6 and (b) site 5	62
Figure 5.9: Uranium phase distribution for (a) sites 4 & 6 and (b) site 5	63
Figure 5.10: Pyrite distribution for (a) sites 4 & 6 and (b) site 5	64
Fig. 5.11(a): Chlorite distribution for (a) sites 4 & 6 and (b) site 5	65
Fig. 5.11(b): Mica distribution for (a) sites 4 & 6 and (b) site 5	66
Figure 5.12: Quartz distribution phases for (a) sites 4 & 6 and (b) site 5	67
Figure 5.13: Al-Silicate distribution for (a) sites 4 & 6 and (b) site 5	68
Figure 5.14: SEM field view of coarse grain tailings site 6 (5.45 m)	71
Figure 5.15: SEM field view of silt size tailings Site 4 (11.38 m)	71
Figure 5.16: Groundmass of fine grained chlorite in the presence of gypsum laths Site 4 (11.38 m)	72
Figure 5.17: Micro-crystalline barite in the presence of ferrous sulfate and gypsum Site 4 (11.38 m)	73

Figure 5.18: SEM field view of primary and authigenic phases, Site 5 (7.11m)	74
Figure 5.19: Magnified view showing uraninite superimposed on gypsum, Site 5 (7.11m)	74
Figure 5.20: Weathered uraninite within a groundmass of amorphous Fe and Mn oxides	75
Figure 5.21: Differential XRD scan of fine tailings (Site 5 at 10.3 m) following water, exchangeable and acid soluble extractants	78
Figure 5.22: Differential XRD scan of fine tailings (Site 5 at 10.3 m) following crystalline Fe, alkaline earth and residue extractants	79
Figure 5.23: Elemental fractionation Site 5 (7.11 m) – gel fraction	81
Figure 5.24: Elemental fractionation Site 5 (10.34 m) – fine grain tailings	81
Figure 5.25: Elemental fractionation Site 6 (5.45 m) – coarse grain tailings	82
Figure 5.26: Uranium partitioning among geochemical phases	84
Figure 5.27: SEM image of coarse grain tailings showing refractory brannerite in Association with Mg – chlorite	85
Figure 5.28: Radium partitioning among geochemical phases	86
Figure 5.29: Tailings pond water pH trends	89
Figure 5.30: Tailings pond water electrical conductivity trends	89
Figure 5.31: Dominant dissolved ions in tailings pond water	90
Figure 5.32: Tailings pond water calcium trends	90
Figure 5.33: Tailings pond water trace metal trends	91
Figure 5.34: Porewater pH profiles (all stations)	93
Figure 5.35: Porewater electrical conductivity profiles (all stations)	94
Figure 5.36: Porewater magnesium profiles (all stations)	95
Figure 5.37: Porewater sulfate profiles (all stations)	96
Figure 5.38: Porewater calcium profiles (all stations)	97
Figure 5.39: Porewater manganese profiles (all stations)	98
Figure 5.40: SEM field view of a MnO _x phase sampled at Site 5 (11.1m) or RL 32	99
Figure 5.41: Porewater ammonium profiles (all stations)	100
Figure 5.42: Porewater chloride profiles (all stations)	101
Figure 5.43: Depth distributions of pH, dissolved Fe, Mn, SO ₄ ²⁻ , NO ₃ , and Eh in tailings porewaters at Site 5	103
Figure 5.44: Porewater iron profiles (all stations)	104
Figure 5.45: Porewater cobalt profiles (all stations)	106
Figure 5.46: Porewater nickel profiles (all stations)	107
Figure 5.47: Porewater copper profiles (all stations)	108
Figure 5.48: Porewater molybdenum profiles (all stations)	109
Figure 5.49: Depth distributions of dissolved NO ₃ in tailings porewaters	110
Figure 5.50: Porewater uranium profiles (all stations)	113
Figure 5.51: Schematic representation of data from Cochran et al. (1986) illustrating the behaviour of uranium in anoxic marine sediments	115
Figure 5.52: Porewater radium profiles (all stations)	116
Figure 5.53: Porewater barium profiles (all stations)	117
Figure 5.54: Porewater strontium profiles (all stations)	118
Figure 6.1: Annual recurrence interval for the Alligator Rivers Region based on Oenpelli rainfall records (Moliere, unpublished data 2004)	124
Figure 6.2: Column arrangement (a) interconnection between the unsaturated & saturated columns and (b) fresh unsaturated column image showing fresh tailings	125
Figure 6.3: Saturated columns	126
Figure 6.4: Particle size distribution of aged and fresh tailings	127
Figure 6.5: Major element composition of bulk fresh & aged tailings prior to leaching	129
Figure 6.6: Trace element composition of bulk fresh & aged tailings prior to leaching	129

Figure 6.7: XRD patterns of fresh tailings sampled from the saturated column	132
Figure 6.8: XRD patterns of aged tailings sampled from the saturated column	132
Figure 6.9: Major element composition of bulk fresh & aged tailings post leaching	133
Figure 6.10: Trace element composition of bulk fresh & aged tailings post leaching	134
Figure 6.11: Silicate mineral distribution for (a) fresh and (b) aged saturated tailings	136
Figure 6.12: Sulfide mineral distribution for (a) fresh and (b) aged saturated tailings	138
Figure 6.13: SEM field view showing (a) a cubic particle of primary pyrite and (b) tetragonal chalcopyrite (Fordham, 1993)	139
Figure 6.14: Gypsum distribution for fresh and aged saturated tailings	140
Figure 6.15: Uranium phase distribution for fresh and aged saturated tailings	141
Figure 6.16: Manganese oxide phase distributions for fresh and aged saturated tailings	141
Figure 6.17: Iron oxide phase distributions for fresh and aged saturated tailings	142
Figure 6.18: Calcium carbonate distribution for fresh and aged saturated tailings	144
Figure 6.19: pH trends for (a) fresh and (b) aged tailings leachates	147
Figure 6.20: Alkalinity trends for (a) fresh and (b) aged tailings leachates	148
Figure 6.21: Electrical conductivity trends for (a) fresh and (b) aged tailings leachates	150
Figure 6.22: Major ion trends for (a) fresh and (b) aged unsaturated tailings leachates	151
Figure 6.23: Calcium trends for (a) fresh and (b) aged tailings leachates	152
Figure 6.24: Nitrite and Nitrate trends for aged unsaturated tailings leachates	153
Figure 6.25: Al and Si trends for (a) fresh and (b) aged tailings leachates	155
Figure 6.26: Lead trends for (a) fresh and (b) aged tailings leachates	157
Figure 6.27: Copper trends for (a) fresh and (b) aged tailings leachates	158
Figure 6.28: Cadmium trends for (a) fresh and (b) aged tailings leachates	159
Figure 6.29: Uranium trends for (a) fresh and (b) aged tailings leachates	160
Figure 6.30: Major ions for (a) fresh and (b) aged saturated tailings leachates	162
Figure 6.31: Nitrite and Nitrate trends for aged saturated tailings leachates	163
Figure 6.32: Total iron trends for (a) fresh and (b) aged saturated tailings leachates	164
Figure 6.33: Molar ratio of Mn and Mg to SO ₄ (a) fresh and (b) aged saturated tailings Leachates	165
Figure 6.34: Fe and U trends for (a) fresh and (b) aged saturated tailings leachates	166
Figure 6.35: Fe and Mo trends for the (a) fresh and (b) aged saturated tailings leachates	168
Figure 6.36: Radium-226, Ba and Sr trends for (a) fresh and (b) aged saturated tailings Leachates	170
Figure 6.37: Barite and celestite saturation indices for (a) fresh and (b) aged saturated tailings leachates	172
Figure 7.1: Schematic representation of kinetic model	179
Figure 7.2: Depth distribution of saturation indices with respect to alunite at sites 5&6	186
Figure 7.3: Depth distribution of saturation indices with respect to barite at sites 5&6	187
Figure 7.4: Depth distribution of saturation indices with respect to strontianite at sites 5&6	188
Figure 7.5: Depth distribution of saturation indices with respect to gypsum at sites 5&6	189
Figure 7.6: Depth distribution of saturation indices with respect to ferrihydrite at sites 5&6	190
Figure 7.7: Depth distribution of saturation indices with respect to K-jarosite at sites 5&6	191
Figure 7.8: Depth distribution of saturation indices with respect to rhodochrosite at sites 5&6	192
Figure 7.9: Depth distribution of saturation indices with respect to schoepite at sites 5&6	193

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1:	Tailings production from historic uranium mines	8
Table 2.1:	Mineralogy of Ranger #1 (Savory, 1994)	19
Table 3.1:	Sample preparation procedures	25
Table 3.2:	Sequential extraction scheme	26
Table 3.3:	Climatic data for Jabiru Airport (Australian Bureau of Meteorology)	29
Table 3.4:	Column design parameters and material specifications	30
Table 3.5:	Chemical composition of Jabiru East rainwater (1983-84)	31
Table 3.6:	Quantities of salts and acids for the preparation of artificial rainwater	32
Table 4.1:	Summary of sample depths and relative level (RL) for each core profile	37
Table 4.2:	Summary of porewater field measurements	40
Table 5.1:	Half cell reactions of oxidants present in the tailings pile and their associated free energies and electron activities	47
Table 5.2:	Mineralogical composition of composite samples obtained from 0.5m tailings Cores	58
Table 5.3:	Energy dispersive X-Ray analyses of chlorite in various tailings samples	71
Table 5.4:	Energy dispersive X-Ray analyses of muscovite, Site 4 (11.38 m)	72
Table 5.5:	Trace metal composition of selected tailings	76
Table 5.6:	Sequential extraction samples	77
Table 5.7:	Mass recovery of elements constituting key geochemical phases	83
Table 5.8:	Porewater saturation indices for gypsum, celestite and barite Sites 4 and 9	119
Table 6.1:	Comparison of actual columns leach parameters and original design criteria	122
Table 6.2:	Mineralogical composition of fresh and aged tailings prior to leaching	128
Table 6.3:	Mineralogical composition of fresh and aged tailings sampled from the unsaturated column following the 520-day leach experiment	131
Table 7.1:	Mass action reactions to describe the geochemical model of the tailings pile	182
Table 7.2:	Kinetic model input data	185
Table 7.3:	Summary of predicted and actual leachate chemistry for unsaturated tailings	186
Table 7.4:	Saturation indices determined for fresh saturated tailings leachates	195
Table 7.5:	Saturation indices determined for aged saturation tailings leachates	196

Abstract

Uranium mill tailings from the Ranger mine, located in the Alligator Rivers Region of the Northern Territory, Australia, were examined to assess the effects of weathering and diagenesis on their long-term geochemical stability. Run of mill uranium tailings are a complex heterogeneous mixture of lithogenic (primary gangue minerals and weathering products) and secondary (components that form during milling) minerals, residual process chemicals and biogenic (products of biological activity) phases. Following transfer to the tailings storage facility, post depositional reactions alter the mineralogical and hydrochemical characteristics of the tailings solids and pore waters in accordance with weathering and diagenetic processes.

In this thesis, a detailed examination of tailings cores and pore waters, kinetic column test work and geochemical modelling was combined with results from earlier studies to examine the key processes governing the geochemical stability of the Ranger tailings. Conclusions drawn from the work clearly demonstrates that the solid state speciation and mobility of metals and radionuclides in the tailings pile are governed by the processes of oxidative dissolution of sulfide minerals, weathering of phyllosilicates and organic matter diagenesis. The processes are spatially dependent, evolve over time and are influenced by the following key factors:

- Tailings water content or degree of saturation;
- The nature and content of organic matter in the tailings;
- Redox potential of the tailings solid-pore water interface; and
- The specific reactivity of precursor minerals (primary/secondary) from the milling process and pore water solutes.

Combined, these processes lead to the formation of authigenic minerals, which control the solubility of pore water constituents. These mechanisms will also have a profound impact on the long-term geochemical stability of the tailings pile and, as such, will need to be taken into account in the design, management and closure of the final tailings repositories at the Ranger site.

Declaration

This work contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in the text.

I give consent to this copy of my thesis, when deposited in the University Library, being available for loan and photocopying.

Greg Sinclair

Acknowledgments

This thesis is dedicated to my family, Wendy, Michael and Matthew, who have made a number of personal sacrifices in my pursuit of this PhD. Without their unconditional support I would not have been able to complete this project and for that I am eternally grateful. Wendy's computer skills and keen eye for detail were also invaluable in formatting and proof reading the final document.

Gaining new insights into Mother Nature and how her natural laws govern the geochemical stability of anthropogenic waste has been one of the most rewarding aspects of this project. This new found knowledge was only possible through the oversight and guidance of my supervisors and friends, Dr Graham Taylor and Dr Paul Brown. Their dedication and enthusiasm for the discipline of environmental geochemistry made this a truly pleasurable learning experience.

Similarly I would also like to express my gratitude to the professional engineers and scientists at ERA, ANSTO and CSIRO for their assistance in both the field and laboratory aspects of the project. Their practical suggestions, based on years of experience, were value added and greatly appreciated. A special thanks goes to ERA for allowing me to conduct this research and for their significant contribution to the geosciences and development of best practice.