

SAND93-7112C

VARIATION OF STABILITY CONSTANTS OF THORIUM AND URANIUM OXALATE  
COMPLEXES WITH IONIC STRENGTH

H.N. Erten,<sup>1</sup> A.K. Mohammed,<sup>2</sup> and G.R. Choppin  
Department of Chemistry  
Florida State University  
Tallahassee, Florida 32306-3006 USA

**DISCLAIMER**

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

- 
- <sup>1</sup> On leave of absence from Bilkent University, 06533 Bilkent, Ankara, Turkey.  
<sup>2</sup> Present address: Department of Chemistry, North Carolina A&T State University, Greensboro, NC 27411 USA

**MASTER**

zb

### ABSTRACT

The extraction of Th(IV) and  $\text{UO}_2^{2+}$  by a solution of TTA and HDEHP, respectively, in toluene has been used to obtain stability constants of their oxalate complexes in 1, 3, 5, 7 and 9 M ionic strength ( $\text{NaClO}_4$ ) solutions. The complexes formed were the  $\text{MOx}$ ,  $\text{MHOx}$ ,  $\text{MOx}_2$  and  $\text{M}(\text{HOx})_2$  ( $\text{M} = \text{Th}, \text{UO}_2$ ) species. The values were analyzed by the Specific Interaction Theory and agreed to  $I \leq 3 \text{ M}$  but required an additional term for fitting at  $I > 3 \text{ M}$ .

94-2584

## INTRODUCTION

The solution chemistry of actinides is relevant to radioactive waste management. The behavior of actinide elements in the natural environments associated with geologic repositories is of particular interest. The hydrolysis of actinide cations in natural waters can limit their solubility, lead to precipitation or sorption, and reduce complexation by other ligands in the waters. Modeling of chemical behavior requires values for hydrolysis constants and stability constants with ligands present in natural waters. Normal titration techniques to determine such constants require relatively high metal ion concentrations, which may not be attainable for some systems due to hydrolysis. Furthermore, high concentrations increase the effects of radiolysis, which can complicate the measurements and perturb the results. These difficulties can be avoided by using solvent extraction techniques with tracer concentrations of the metal ions [1-4].

In this study, the stability constants of thorium and uranium oxalate complexes were measured over a range of ionic strengths.

The distribution coefficient,  $D$ , is defined for the extraction system as:

$$D = \sum[M]_o / \sum[M]_a \quad (1)$$

Assuming only a single organic phase species,  $MA_n$ , and the various species in the aqueous phase, equation (1) can be expressed by:

$$D = [MA_n]_o / ([M]_a + [ML]_a + [MHL]_a + [ML_2]_a + [M(HL)_2]_a + \dots) \quad (2)$$

where L is a complexing anion in the aqueous phase. This equation can be written, with the conventional symbols for stability constants, [5] as,

$$D = [MA_n]_o/[M]_a(1+(\beta_{101}+\beta_{111}[H])[L]+(\beta_{102}+\beta_{122}[H]^2)[L]^2+\dots) \quad (3)$$

We define "apparent" stability constants as:

$$\beta_1^{app} \equiv \beta_{101} + \beta_{111}[H] \quad (4)$$

$$\beta_2^{app} \equiv \beta_{102} + \beta_{122}[H]^2 \quad (5)$$

The constant in the absence of complexation is:

$$D_o \equiv [MA_n]_o/[M]_a \quad (6)$$

This allows restating equation (3) as:

$$D_o/D = 1 + \beta_1^{app}[L] + \beta_2^{app}[L]^2 + \dots \quad (7)$$

A plot of  $\beta_1^{app}$  vs. [H] should give a straight line with an intercept equal to  $\beta_{101}$  and a slope of  $\beta_{111}$  while a plot of  $\beta_2^{app}$  vs.  $[H]^2$  should be linear with an intercept of  $\beta_{102}$  and a slope of  $\beta_{122}$ .

## EXPERIMENTAL

### Reagents and Solutions

All reagents were analytical grade. A stock solution of 0.0010 M sodium oxalate (Aldrich) was prepared. Thenoyltrifluoroacetone, TTA, was purified by sublimation. A 0.01 M stock solution of TTA in toluene was stored in the dark. Di-(2-ethylhexyl) phosphoric acid, HDEHP, (Pfaltz and Bauer Co.) was purified by precipitation as  $Cu(DEHP)_2$  using the procedure of McDowell et al.[1] The purified HDEHP was dissolved in toluene and standardized with standard NaOH solution. Sodium perchlorate (anhydrous,

Mallinckrodt) was used for ionic strength adjustment without further purification.

$^{230}\text{Th}$  and  $^{233}\text{U}$  tracers were obtained from Oak Ridge National Laboratory. A  $^{230}\text{Th}$  tracer solution of approximately  $4.5 \times 10^3$  cpm/ $\mu\text{L}$  was prepared in perchloric acid with pH 2. The  $^{233}\text{U}$  solution of approximately  $3.5 \times 10^3$  cpm/ $\mu\text{L}$  was prepared by evaporating the stock U solution to dryness, and dissolving in perchloric acid with pH 3. All solutions used in the experiments were filtered with a 0.45  $\mu\text{m}$  microfiltration system. All experimental manipulations were performed in a laminar flow hood (Environmental Air Control, Inc.) to reduce contamination from airborne particles.

#### Silanizing

To minimize sorption of the uranyl and thorium radiotracers on extraction vials, the vials were silanized according to the process in ref. [3]. The 20 mL standard borosilicate scintillation vials were washed with 1 M NaOH, soaked in 3 M HCl, rinsed, and dried at 100°C. The precleaned vials and their caps were silanized by shaking for 4-6 hours in a solution containing 5% trimethylchlorosilane and 5% hexamethyldisilazane in toluene. The vials were dried overnight at 120°C.

#### pH Measurements

A research pH meter (Accumet 950, Fischer Scientific) was used with a combination glass electrode. The KCl solution in the salt bridge was replaced with NaCl because the low solubility of  $\text{KClO}_4$  at high ionic strengths can cause erratic readings. The electrode was calibrated with  $4.01 \pm 0.01$  and  $7.00 \pm 0.01$  pH buffer

standards. The pH readings were converted to hydrogen ion concentration (pCH) using calibration curves obtained by a series of  $\text{HClO}_4$  dilutions in 1 to 9 M  $\text{NaClO}_4$  solutions.

#### Radioactive Tracer

The radioactive tracers used were checked for radioactive purity by alpha and gamma ray spectrometry. The alpha radioactivity in aliquots from the experiments was counted on a Packard Instrument Tri-Carb 4000 (Hewlett Packard Instruments) liquid scintillation counter using an emulsion scintillation cocktail (Ecolume, ICN Biomedicals Co.) for both aqueous and organic phases.

#### Experimental Procedure

##### Determination of the Dissociation Constants of Oxalic Acid

The  $\text{pK}_a$  values of oxalic acid were determined at 3, 5, 7, and 9 M ionic strengths by potentiometric ( $\text{NaClO}_4$ ) titration. The titrations were carried out using 40 mL solutions in a 150 mL vessel. A water bath maintained at  $25 \pm 0.2$  °C was used for circulating water in the jacket of the titration vessel. The Gran method was used for calibrating the glass electrode at each ionic strength [7, 8]. A standardized solution of 0.1 M  $\text{HClO}_4$  (in  $\text{NaClO}_4$  of a certain ionic strength) was titrated against a volume  $V_0$  of  $\text{NaClO}_4$  of the same ionic strength as that of  $\text{HClO}_4$ . The exact concentration of the titrant ( $\text{HClO}_4$  in  $\text{NaClO}_4$ ) was determined by titrating a known amount of  $\text{Na}_2\text{CO}_3$  using bromocresol green as indicator. The titration used constant amounts of titrant for each addition. The data analysis of  $\text{pK}_a$  determination was done by using the Fortran program HNFITMQ [9].

### Solvent Extraction Procedure

For each extraction experiment, 5.0 mL of pre-equilibrated aqueous solution adjusted to the appropriate pH were placed in silanized vials. Aliquots of oxalate stock solution were added to each vial followed by 5 mL of TTA and HEDHP in toluene. The concentration of the organic extractant was adjusted according to the ionic strength and pH of the solutions used. After addition of 10  $\mu$ L of either  $^{230}\text{Th}$  or  $^{233}\text{U}$ , the vials were shaken for 2 - 3 hours at room temperature. Kinetic measurements indicated that equilibrium was attained in these experiments in about 10 min. (Th) and 1 hr. (U). The vials were centrifuged and duplicate aliquots from both phases were taken for counting and pH measurement.

## RESULTS

### Dissociation Constants Of Oxalic Acid

The experimental acid dissociation constants of oxalic acid are given in Table I.  $\text{pK}_a$  values up to 3 M ionic strength are reported in the literature [10]. The  $\text{pK}_{a1}$  values have somewhat larger errors than those of  $\text{pK}_{a2}$ , reflecting the increased difficulty in determining the values for  $\text{pK}_{a1}$ .

### The Thorium Oxalate Complexes

Speciation calculations of the oxalate ligand indicate that in the pH range of these studies the predominant species is the protonated anion  $\text{HOx}^-$ .

### Metal Oxalate Complexation

A series of experiments covering pH's from 1.5 to 4.0 were conducted at ionic strengths of 1, 3, 5, 7, and 9 M NaClO<sub>4</sub>. The concentration of oxalate anion in each vial was calculated from the measured pH, the total oxalate and the  $pK_a$  values of oxalic acid.

Typical curves showing the variation of  $1/D$  with oxalate anion concentration at different pH values are shown in Figure 1. The data were analyzed with Eq. 7 when nonlinear curves were obtained over higher oxalate ranges as this indicates the presence of both 1:1 and 1:2 complexes. From analysis of the curves, the apparent stability constants  $\beta_{101}^{app}$  and  $\beta_{102}^{app}$  were obtained as listed in Tables II and III. These values represent results of at least two determinations. The relationship of these apparent stability constants to the  $\beta_{101}$ ,  $\beta_{111}$ ,  $\beta_{102}$ , and  $\beta_{122}$  stability constants are given by equations (4) and (5). Figure 2 is a plot of the apparent  $\beta_{101}^{app}$  as a function of hydrogen ion concentration. The intercept and slope of the linear least squares fit correspond to  $\beta_{101}$  and  $\beta_{111}$ , respectively. The experimental points deviate from a straight line at low hydrogen ion concentrations due to hydrolysis of the Th(IV) cation. The  $\beta_{101}$ ,  $\beta_{102}$ ,  $\beta_{111}$ , and  $\beta_{122}$  values are given in Tables IV (a) and (b) where the errors indicated represent  $1\sigma$ .

### DISCUSSION

The bonding of Th(IV) to inorganic and organic ligands in complexes can be described by an ionic model. As a result the number of ligands as well as their geometric arrangement about the

thorium cation are determined primarily by electrostatic and steric factors. The hydrolysis of Th(IV) can be extensive even in relatively acidic solutions ( $\text{pH} \geq 1$ ). Since most organic ligands involving carboxylate groups (e.g., oxalate) require pH values of 3 or higher in order to provide enough ionization of the ligand for interaction, studies of thorium complexation are limited due to hydrolytic competition. Only a single study exists in the literature of the stability constants  $\beta_{101}$  and  $\beta_{102}$  of thorium-oxalate complexes in perchlorate solution [11]. This measurement, based on solubility studies which are not a very reliable technique for such measurements and the reported constants do not agree with our values.

Uranyl ion,  $\text{UO}_2^{2+}$ , does not hydrolyze as readily and has been studied more extensively than thorium. Stability constants for the  $\text{UO}_2^{2+}$ -oxalate system are available in the literature for 4 M ionic strength [11, 12, 13] and below. In the present work, we obtained a  $\log \beta_{101}$  of  $6.00 \pm 0.05$  which compares well with that reported at 4M [13].

The Nuclear Energy Agency has recommended [14] the use of Specific Ion Interaction Theory (SIT) in the analysis of stability constants measured at different ionic strengths up to ca. 3m. In the SIT approach, the value of the stability constant at zero ionic strength,  $\beta_0$ , is related to the value  $\beta$ , at ionic strength  $I$  (in molality) by:

$$\log \beta = \log \beta_0 - \Delta Z^2.D - \Delta \epsilon.I \quad (8)$$

Here,

$$\Delta Z^2 = (Z_{ML})^2 - Z_M^2 - Z_L^2 \quad (9)$$

and

$$D = 0.509I^{1/2}/1+1.5I^{1/2} \quad (10)$$

$$\Delta \epsilon = \epsilon_{ML} - \epsilon_M - \epsilon_L \quad (11)$$

Where  $Z$  is the charge on the designated species and  $\epsilon$  is an interaction coefficient. Values of  $\log \beta$  predicted by the SIT agree well with the experimental values from 0 to ca. 3 M ionic strength. Above  $I = 3$  M there is usually a growing difference between the experimental data and the SIT calculation.

Recently an extension of the SIT theory has been proposed [15] to cover higher ionic strengths by including a quadratic term of the interaction,  $-\Delta\epsilon \cdot I^2$ , in equation (8). The results of extended SIT analysis of our data are given in Table V and while Figure 3 illustrates the extended SIT fitting of the  $\text{ThOx}^{2+}$  complex stability constant.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

HNE acknowledges financial support from Turkish Scientific and Technical Research Council (TUBITAK).

This research carried out through the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant Project, was supported by the USDOE under Contract DE-1C04-76DP0089 to Sandia National Laboratories and Subcontract 691734 to Florida State University.

## REFERENCES

1. F.I.Khalili, G.R.Choppin and E.N.Rizkalla, *Inorg.Chim.Acta* 143, 131 (1988).
2. M.S.Caceci and G.R.Choppin, *Radiochim. Acta* 33, 101 (1983).
3. M.S.Caceci and G.R.Choppin, *Radiochim. Acta* 33, 207 (1983).
4. G.R.Choppin and J.N.Manthur, *Radiochim. Acta* 52/53 (1991).
5. L.G.Sillen and A.E.Martell, *Spec.Pub.Chem. Soc.No* 17 (1964).
6. McDowell, W. J.; Perdue, P. T.; Case, G. N. *J. Inorg. Nucl. Chem.* 1976, 38, 2127-2129.
7. G. Gran, *Acta Chem. Scand.* 1950, 4, 559-577.
8. G. Gran, *Analyst*, 1952, 77, 661-671.
9. R. A. Torres, private communication, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory.
10. Martell, A. E.; Smith, R. M. In *Critical Stability Constants*; Plenum: New York, 1989; Vol. 6 (Second Supplement), p. 325.
11. A.I.Moskvin and L.N.Essen, *Russian J.Inorg.Chem.* 12, 630 (1967).
12. Miyake, C.; Nurnberg, H. W. *J. Inorg. Nucl. Chem.* 1967, 29, 2411-2429.
13. Havel, J. *Coll. Czech. Chem. Commun.* 1969, 34, 3248-3265.
14. I.Grenthe, J.Fuger, R.Lemire, A.Muller, C.N.T-Gegu, H.Wanner, *Chemical Thermodynamics of Uranium*, NEA-TDB, OECD, France (1991).
15. M.Du, Chemistry Department, Florida State University Tallahassee, Private Communication (1993).
16. Martell, A. E.; Smith, R. M. In *Critical Stability Constants*; Plenum: New York, 1989; Vol. 6 (Second Supplement), p. 325.

TABLE I

Dissociation Constants of Oxalic Acid at Different  
Ionic Strengths ( $\text{NaClO}_4$ ) and  $T = 298\text{K}$ .

I (M)	pK <sub>a1</sub>		pK <sub>a2</sub>	
	Reference 10	present work	Reference 10	present work
1	$1.04 \pm 0.04$		$3.56 \pm 0.02$	
3	1.3	$1.0 \pm 0.3$	3.81	$3.85 \pm 0.1$
5		$2.19 \pm 0.04$		$4.47 \pm 0.01$
7		$2.61 \pm 0.04$		$4.91 \pm 0.01$
9		$2.26 \pm 0.08$		$5.20 \pm 0.01$

TABLE II  
Apparent Stability Constants  $\beta_{101}^{\text{app}}$ ,  $\beta_{102}^{\text{app}}$  of Th+Ox Complexes.

T = 298 K.

Ionic Strength

<u>pcH</u>	<u>1M</u>	<u>3M</u>	<u>5M</u>	<u>7M</u>	<u>9M</u>
1.29	7.92±0.06	8.02±0.04	8.96±0.02	9.57±0.02	8.92±0.02
1.40	7.90±0.01	7.99±0.01			
1.50	7.88±0.02	-	8.68±0.02		
1.58	-	7.94±0.03	8.66±0.05		
1.67	7.79±0.05				
1.84	7.70±0.02	7.78±0.04	8.37±0.06	8.99±0.05	8.79±0.07
1.90	7.62±0.03				
1.94	7.58±0.04				
2.17	7.37±0.01				
2.30	7.44±0.06				
2.37	7.19±0.04	-	7.68±0.07	8.40±0.07	8.53±0.04
2.41	-	7.31±0.04			
3.08	-	-	-	7.23±0.09	7.27±0.04
3.12	6.76±0.02	6.78±0.05	6.76±0.04	-	7.18±0.04
3.32	-	-	-	7.15±0.05	7.08±0.01
3.46	6.50±0.04	6.47±0.01	6.45±0.01	6.91±0.05	7.14±0.05
3.98	6.00±0.08	6.09±0.17	6.29±0.07	6.75±0.08	7.06±0.10

TABLE III

Apparent Stability Constants,  $\log \beta_1^{\text{app}}$  and  $\log \beta_2^{\text{app}}$  of  $\text{UO}_2^{2+}$  + Ox Complexes.

T = 298 K.

Ionic Strength

<u>pcH</u>	<u>3M</u>	<u>5M</u>	<u>7M</u>	<u>9M</u>
1.61	6.20±0.02			
1.89	6.13±0.01			
2.19	6.07±0.02			
2.23				7.96±0.03
2.27		7.16±0.02		
2.32	6.12±0.02			
2.49		6.70±0.02		
2.79		6.80±0.05		
2.84			7.60±0.06	
3.03		6.92±0.01 12.92±0.01		
3.07			7.50±0.05 14.43±0.21	
3.11				7.54±0.04 14.14±0.09
3.22	6.05±0.06 11.07±0.20			
3.34				7.43±0.04 14.09±0.10
3.42	5.97±0.06 11.09±0.10			
3.52		6.84±0.04 12.40±0.11		
3.54			7.04±0.06 13.18±0.19	

TABLE IV

## (a) Stability Constants of Th+Ox Complexes

<u>I (M)</u>	<u><math>\log \beta_{101}</math></u>	<u><math>\log \beta_{111}</math></u>	<u><math>\log \beta_{102}</math></u>	<u><math>\log \beta_{112}</math></u>
1	6.93±0.03	9.47±0.01	13.13±0.17	17.01±0.04
3	7.06±0.09	9.52±0.12	13.16±0.05	16.95±0.03
5	7.12±0.08	10.24±0.05	13.19±0.17	19.29±0.01
7	7.37±0.04	10.84±0.01	13.76±0.06	20.21±0.01
9	6.74±0.12	10.63±0.01	13.03±0.18	19.79±0.01

---

(b) Stability Constants of  $\text{UO}_2^{2+}$  + Ox Complexes

<u>I (M)</u>	<u><math>\log \beta_{101}</math></u>	<u><math>\log \beta_{111}</math></u>	<u><math>\log \beta_{102}</math></u>	<u><math>\log \beta_{122}</math></u>
1	5.99 <sup>11</sup>			
3	6.00 ± 0.05	7.57 ± 0.06	11.21 ± 0.18	
5	6.55 ± 0.28	9.22 ± 0.17	12.28 ± 0.11	18.86 ± 0.15
7	6.55 ± 0.33	10.43 ± 0.07	12.94 ± 0.40	20.04 ± 0.42
9	7.37 ± 0.05	10.06 ± 0.02	14.08 ± 0.11	19.48 ± 0.59

---

TABLE V

## Results of the Extended SIT Analysis

<u>Species</u>	<u>Log <math>\beta^\circ</math></u>	<u><math>\Delta\epsilon</math></u>	<u><math>\Delta\delta</math></u>
$\text{HOx}^-$	4.33	0.26	-0.0062
$\text{UO}_2\text{HOx}^+$	5.60	1.03	-0.044
$\text{UO}_2\text{Ox}$	5.60	0.45	-0.019
$\text{ThHOx}^{3+}$	11.0	0.51	-0.020
$\text{ThOx}^{2+}$	9.8	0.42	-0.022
$\text{Th}(\text{HOx})_2^{2+}$	18.13	1.42	-0.061
$\text{ThOx}_2$	17.5	0.56	-0.028

TABLE VI

Hydrolysis Constants of Th at Different Ionic Strengths ( $\text{NaClO}_4$ )

T = 298 K.			
Ionic Strength (M)	$\text{Log } {}^{\text{H}}\beta_1$	$\text{Log } {}^{\text{H}}\beta_2$	$\text{Log } {}^{\text{OH}}\beta_1$
1	$-3.77 \pm 0.02$	$-7.63 \pm 0.15$	$10.03 \pm 0.02$
3	$-3.37 \pm 0.03$	$-7.60 \pm 0.30$	$10.83 \pm 0.19$
5	$-3.95 \pm 0.02$	-	$10.75 \pm 0.08$
7	$-4.02 \pm 0.07$	-	$11.18 \pm 0.07$
9	$-4.37 \pm 0.04$	-	$11.28 \pm 0.05$

### Captions

Figure 1. The variation of  $1/D$  for Th(IV) as a function of total oxalate concentration at an ionic strength of 5 M  $\text{NaClO}_4$ .

Figure 2. Variation of the apparent stability constant,  $B_1^{\text{app}}$ , for thorium + oxalate complexes as a function of hydrogen ion concentration at 1 M ionic strength.

Figure 3. The "extended" SIT treatment of the  $\beta_{101}$  values for Th + Ox as a function of the ionic strength (in molality).





