Environmental Mine Waste Management: Strategies for the Prevention, Control, and Treatment of Problematic Drainages Volume 1 of 2







Advances in Mine Waste Management Project Final Report to the Minerals Coordinating Committee June 30, 2001

> Minnesota Department of Natural Resources Division of Lands and Minerals

ENVIRONMENTAL MINE WASTE MANAGEMENT:

STRATEGIES FOR THE PREVENTION, CONTROL, AND TREATMENT OF PROBLEMATIC DRAINAGES

Volume 1 of 2

Advances in Mine Waste Management Project Report to the Minerals Coordinating Committee June 30, 2001

> Emmelyn Leopold Kim Lapakko

Minnesota Department of Natural Resources Division of Lands and Minerals 500 Lafayette Road Saint Paul, MN 55155

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Considerable mineral potential for base and precious metals is associated with Minnesota's Precambrian rocks, specifically in Archean metavolcanics, metasedimentary formations, and the Duluth Complex. If mineral development occurs, the potential for generation of acidic mine waste drainage is the primary water quality concern. The goal of this document is to evaluate current methods and identify strategies for environmental mine waste management that show potential for application in Minnesota.

A search of literature contained in the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, Division of Lands and Minerals literature database and various mine waste management conference proceedings resulted in a large number of citations. Consequently, it was necessary to refine the scope of this document. This was accomplished by reviewing similar efforts in Canada, Australia, the United States, and Sweden to compile information on the current state of environmental mine waste management technology.

As a result of the literature search and scope refinement, fifteen environmental mine waste management strategies were identified for further investigation. In order to create an organized and efficient presentation, the fifteen strategies were divided into three generalized categories: prevention, control, and treatment. The first category deals with strategies intended to **prevent** the generation of problematic drainages. Strategies that **control** problematic drainage in situ are considered in the second category. Finally, existing problematic drainages generally require **treatment**, the third category. Within this context, the fifteen target strategies are arranged as follows:



Selected literature regarding these fifteen environmental mine waste management strategies will be reviewed in terms of: 1) a brief description; 2) methods used to assess performance; 3) generalized cost analysis; and 4) applicability to environmental mine waste management issues in Minnesota. When available, case studies are included in the appropriate appendix. It is important to note that this review does not represent a comprehensive literature review on the prevention, control, or treatment of acid mine drainage, nor does it address the entire range of possible preventive technologies currently in use.

As a result of this literature review, it was determined that there is no single, correct approach to environmental mine waste management. Successful mine waste management and mitigation programs implement multiple strategies to address a wide array of site- and waste-specific variables. Integrated management systems, including contingencies to treat impacted waters, are often necessary to meet regulatory standards. Four examples of integrated environmental mine waste management approaches used in Minnesota, Wisconsin, and South Dakota are presented.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

1.	Mining in Minnesota				
	1.1.	Mine Waste Drainage Mitigation in Minnesota	. 1		
		1.1.1. MN DNR laboratory and small-scale field studies	. 2		
		1.1.2. MN DNR operational-scale field studies	. 3		
	1.2.	Objectives and Scope	. 3		
		1.2.1 United States	. 4		
		1.2.2 Canada	. 5		
		1.2.3 Australia	. 5		
		1.2.4 Sweden	. 6		
		1.2.5 International	. 6		
	1.3	Structure of this Document	. 7		
	1.4.	References	. 9		
2.	Geoch	emical Background	14		
	2.1.	Mine Waste Dissolution and Acid Mine Drainage	14		
	2.2.	References	15		

PREVENTION STRATEGIES

Selec	tive Handling	g of Read	ctive Mine Wastes	17
3.1.	Backfilling	g Reactiv	ve Mine Wastes	17
	3.1.1. Ob	jectives of	of Backfilling Reactive Mine Wastes	17
	3.1.2. Mo	nitoring	Water Quality Associated with Backfilled Mine W	Vorks
				18
	3.1.3. Eco	onomic E	Benefits of Backfilling Mine Voids	19
	3.1.4. Pot	ential Ap	pplication of Backfill Technology in Minnesota	19
3.2.	Co-disposa	al of Tail	ings and Waste Rock as a Preventative Strategy .	19
	3.2.1. Ob	jectives o	of Co-disposal	19
	3.2.2. Eva	aluation	of Co-disposal Performance	20
	3.2.3. Eco	onomic E	Benefits of Co-disposal of Mine Wastes	22
	3.2.4. Co-	-disposal	Studies and Applications in Minnesota	23
	3.2	.4.1.	MN DNR Joint Disposal Studies	
	3.2	.4.2.	Minnesota Mineral Research Center Studies J	Involving
			Co-disposal	
	3.2	.4.3.	Full-Scale Application of Co-disposal in a	Taconite
			Tailings Basin	
3.3.	References	s for Sele	ective Handling of Reactive Mine Wastes	27
	Selec 3.1. 3.2. 3.3.	Selective Handlin, 3.1. Backfilling 3.1.1. Ob 3.1.2. Mc 3.1.3. Ecc 3.1.4. Pot 3.2. Co-disposa 3.2.1. Ob 3.2.2. Eva 3.2.3. Ecc 3.2.4. Co 3.2 3.2 3.2 3.2 3.2 3.2	Selective Handling of Read 3.1. Backfilling Reactive 3.1.1. Objectives of 3.1.2. Monitoring 3.1.3. Economic H 3.1.4. Potential App 3.2. Co-disposal of Tail 3.2.1. Objectives of 3.2.2. Evaluation of 3.2.3. Economic H 3.2.4.1. 3.2.4.2. 3.2.4.3. 3.3. References for Selection	 Selective Handling of Reactive Mine Wastes 3.1. Backfilling Reactive Mine Wastes 3.1.1. Objectives of Backfilling Reactive Mine Wastes 3.1.2. Monitoring Water Quality Associated with Backfilled Mine V 3.1.3. Economic Benefits of Backfilling Mine Voids 3.1.4. Potential Application of Backfill Technology in Minnesota 3.2. Co-disposal of Tailings and Waste Rock as a Preventative Strategy 3.2.1. Objectives of Co-disposal 3.2.2. Evaluation of Co-disposal Performance 3.2.3. Economic Benefits of Co-disposal of Mine Wastes 3.2.4.1. MN DNR Joint Disposal Studies 3.2.4.2. Minnesota Mineral Research Center Studies I Co-disposal 3.2.4.3. Full-Scale Application of Co-disposal in a Tailings Basin

4.1.	Liners	5	
4.2.	Dry C	over Systems	
	4.2.1.	Objectives of	a Dry Cover System
	4.2.2.	Dry Cover Sy	vstem Designs
	4.2.3	Assessment o	f Dry Cover System Designs
		4.2.3.1.	Variables Affecting Dry Cover System Design
		4.2.3.2.	Predictive Modeling of Dry Cover System Design
		4.2.3.3.	Materials Testing
		4.2.3.4.	Effectiveness of a Dry Cover System Design
	4.2.4.	Cost Analysis	s of Dry Cover Systems
	4.2.5.	Potential for t	he Use of Dry Cover Systems for Reactive Mine Wastes in
		Minnesota	
		4.2.5.1.	Dry Cover Systems Used in Minnesota
		4.2.5.2.	Potential for Capillary Barriers
		4.2.5.3.	Potential for Organic Cover Systems
4.3.	Water	Cover System	s
	4.3.1.	Principles of	Water Cover Systems
	4.3.2.	Water Cover	System Designs
	4.3.3.	Assessment o	f Water Cover Systems
		4.3.3.1.	Variables Affecting the Design of a Water Cover System
		4.3.3.2.	Modeling Water Cover Systems
		4.3.3.3.	Effectiveness of a Water Cover System
	4.3.4.	Cost Analysis	s of Water Cover Systems
	4.3.5.	Water Cover	Studies and Potential Use in Minnesota
		4.3.5.1.	MN DNR Subaqueous Disposal Studies
		4.3.5.2.	MN DNR Study to Create Wetlands on Reactive Tailings
		4.3.5.3.	Potential Use of Water Covers in Minnesota
4.4.	Refere	ences on Physic	cal Isolation of Reactive Mine Wastes

CONTROL STRATEGIES

5.	Chem	ical Stabilization of Reactive Mine Wastes	7
	5.1.	Alkaline Amendments	7
		5.1.1. The Goals of Alkaline Amendments	7
		5.1.2. Assessment of Alkaline Amendment Effectiveness	3
		5.1.3. Cost Analysis of Adding Alkaline Materials to Reactive Mine	
		Wastes	3
		5.1.4. Alkaline Amendments and Reactive Mine Wastes in Minnesota 59)
	5.2.	Microencapsulation of Reactive Wastes)
		5.2.1. Mechanisms of Microencapsulation)
		5.2.2. Assessment of Microencapsulation Effectiveness	1
		5.2.3. Cost Analysis of Microencapsulation Techniques	1
		5.2.4. Potential Use of Microencapsulation Technology to Address Mine Waste	Э
		Issues in Minnesota	3
	5.3.	Organic Amendments	3

	5.4.	References on the Chemical Stabilization of Reactive Mine Wastes 64
6.	Biolo	gical Stabilization of Reactive Mine Wastes
	6.1.	Inhibition of Biological Sulfide Oxidation Using Bactericides
	6.2.	Assessment of Bactericides as Sulfide Oxidation Inhibitors
		6.2.1. Preliminary Evaluation of Bactericides
		6.2.2. Parameters Used to Assess Bactericide Effectiveness
	6.3.	Cost Analysis of Bactericides
	6.4.	Potential Use of Bactericides to Inhibit Sulfide Oxidation in Minnesota Mine
		Wastes
	6.5.	References on the Use of Bactericides

TREATMENT SYSTEMS

7.	Passiv	e Treatment Systems	74
	7.1.	Constructed Wetlands	75
		7.1.1. Aerobic Wetlands	75
		7.1.2. Organic Substrate Wetlands	75
		7.1.3. Assessment of Constructed Wetland Treatment System Designs and	
		Size	76
		7.1.4. Cost Analysis of Constructed Wetland Treatment Systems	77
		7.1.5. Constructed Wetland Treatment of Problematic Drainages in	
		Minnesota	78
	7.2.	Permeable Reactive Barriers	80
		7.2.1. Factors Affecting Permeable Reactive Barrier Performance	81
		7.2.2. Evaluation of Reactive Barrier Systems	83
		7.2.3. Construction Costs Associated with Reactive Barriers	83
		7.2.4. Potential Application of Reactive Barrier Technology in	
		Minnesota	83
	7.3.	Passive Treatment References	85
8.	Active	Treatment Systems	95
	8.1	Acid Neutralization Treatment Systems	95
	8.2.	Chemical Precipitation Systems	98
	8.3.	Ion Exchange Technology	99
		8.3.1. The GYP-CIX Process	99
		8.3.2. BIO-FIX Beads	.00
		8.3.3. Zeolites and Selective Chelating Resins	.00
	8.4.	Membrane Filtration	.02
	8.5.	Biological Sulfate Reduction Treatment Systems 1	.03
	8.6.	Assessment of Active Treatment Systems 1	.05
	8.7.	Cost Comparison of Different Active Treatment Systems 1	.06
	8.8.	Application of Active Treatment Systems to Problematic Mine Drainages	in 08
		8.8.1. AMAX/Kennecott Test Site	08

	8.8.2.	MN DNR Field Research Site, Hibbing, MN	110
	8.8.3.	Dunka Mine Site	110
8.9.	Active	e Treatment References	113

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

9.	Integra	ated Case Studies	118
	9.1.	Dunka Mine, Babbitt, Minnesota	118
	9.2.	Flambeau Mine, near Ladysmith, Wisconsin	120
		9.2.1. Mine Waste Characterization and Storage	120
		9.2.2. Backfill Operation	122
		9.2.3. Environmental and Ground Water Monitoring	123
	9.3.	Richmond Hill Gold Mine, South Dakota	124
		9.3.1. Short-term Mitigation Measures	125
		9.3.2. Closure Plans	125
		9.3.3. Environmental and Ground Water Monitoring	126
	9.4.	Crandon Deposit (Proposed Mine), Crandon, Wisconsin	127
	9.5.	References	128

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.	Environmental mine waste management strategies addressed in this
	document
Figure 2.	Schematic of a generalized dry cover system design
Figure 3.	Dry cover designs generally fall into one of seven categories
Figure 4.	Constructed wetland design depends upon the chemistry of water to be
-	treated
Figure 5.	Cross-sectional view of a permeable reactive wall
Figure 6.	Drainage from field experiments conducted at the MN DNR Hibbing research
-	facility is treated with magnesium hydroxide
Figure 7.	Area map of the Dunka Mine, near Babbitt, MN
Figure 8.	Aerial view of the Flambeau pit seen from the northeast
Figure 9.	Schematic diagram of the Richmond Hill Mine complex, near Lead, South
-	Dakota

LIST OF TABLES

 Table 1.
 Several practical waste handling design and transportation issues must be

	addressed when considering a co-disposal strategy
Table 2.	Costs associated with co-disposal of tailings and waste rock
Table 3.	Flow-weighted concentrations from joint disposal bins
Table 4.	Calcite-bearing taconite tailings reduced the amount of nickel and copper release
	from Duluth Complex ore
Table 5.	Water chemistry measured from monitoring wells and seeps in LTV Steel
	Mining Company's tailings basin
Table 6.	Summary of water chemistry measured from a seep on the southwest side of LTV
	Steel Mining Company's tailings basin
Table 7.	Summary of cover construction costs by type of cover
Table 8.	Oxygen solubility/concentration and diffusion coefficient in air and water at
	25EC
Table 9.	A wide array of factors should be assessed prior to disposing of reactive waste
	rock beneath a water cover
Table 10.	Natural geologic, industrial, and waste products have been used as alkaline
	amendments
Table 11.	Prices for alkaline materials vary widely
Table 12.	Summary of drainage quality results from microencapsulation laboratory tests
	and field demonstrations
Table 13.	Summary of results from laboratory studies designed to evaluate the
	effectiveness of bacterial inhibitors
Table 14.	Summary of results from field tests on the effect of bacterial inhibitors70
Table 15.	Summary of naturally occurring removal mechanisms
Table 16.	Summary of major cost components for constructed wetlands
Table 17.	Five wetland treatment systems located at the Dunka Mine site near Babbitt, MN
	have treated near-neutral drainage from stockpiles with variable results 79
Table 18.	The long-term success of permeable reactive barriers have not been
	established
Table 19.	Summary of the advantages and disadvantages of some common neutralization
	chemicals
Table 20.	Summary of the sludge dewatering methods used in coal mining
Table 21.	The GYP-CIX process resulted in elevated pH and decreased levels of Ca, Mg,
	Fe, Mn, Cu, Zn, and SO_4 in waters from the Berkeley Pit, Butte, MT 101
Table 22.	Two different treatment approaches have been used to demonstrate metal
	removal by BIO-FIX beads in four field-scale tests
Table 23.	Summary of membrane filtration techniques
Table 24.	Optimum drainage chemistry for various active treatment systems 105
Table 25.	Average operational costs of selected North American acid neutralization
	treatment operations
Table 26.	Several active treatment system requirements increase operating costs 107
Table 27.	Qualitative cost analysis information indicate that ion exchange and reverse
	osmosis are the most expensive active treatment options
Table 28.	MN DNR Hibbing research site treatment plant specifications
Table 29.	Leachate treatment specifications for the MN DNR research site treatment
	plant
Table 30.	Summary of environmental mine waste management activities and research

Table 31	projects at the Dunka Mine, Babbitt, MN
Table 31. Table 32.	Overburden and waste rock were classified based on sulfur content and placed
	in separate surface storage facilities during operation of the Flambeau Mine

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1:	Mitigation and Treatment References (In progress)
APPENDIX 2:	Selective Handling of Reactive Mine Wastes
APPENDIX 3:	Physical Isolation of Reactive Mine Wastes
APPENDIX 4:	Chemical Stabilization of Reactive Mine Waste Materials
APPENDIX 5:	Biological Stabilization of Reactive Mine Wastes (Bactericides)
APPENDIX 6:	Treatment Systems for Problematic Drainage
APPENDIX 7:	Integrated Case Studies

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Funding for this project was provided by the Minerals Coordinating Committee from the Minerals Diversification Program of the Minnesota Legislature. Char Fiest obtained much of the literature reviewed in this document. Her contribution was invaluable. Additional people who provided information related to the development of this compilation include: Dave Antonson (MN DNR), Jon Bennett (ANSTO), David Blowes (U of Waterloo), Angus Campbell (CO Dept. of Health), Richard Clark (MN PCA), Paul Eger (MN DNR), Bill Evangelou (Iowa State U), James Gusek (Knight Piesold & CO), Mike Holm (EPA), Victor Ketalapper (EPA), Larry Lynch (WI DNR), Mark Nelson (SD DENR), Bill Price (BC Ministry of Energy and Mines), Dan Scheppers (CO Dept. of Health), Mary Scott (CO Dept. of Health), Giles Tremblay (CANMET), and Jon Wagner (MN DNR). Special thanks to Dave Antonson (MN DNR), Daniel Doctor (MN DNR), Jennifer Engstrom (MN DNR), Larry Lynch (WI DNR), Mark Nelson (SD DENR), and Jon Wagner (MN DNR), and Jon Wagner (MN DNR), commenting on sections of this document.

INTRODUCTION

1. Mining in Minnesota

Minnesota has an extensive mining industry and potential for mineral expansion and diversification. Iron mining began in Minnesota over a century ago and led to the taconite mining industry which, in 1996, shipped 45 million long tons of iron ore valued at 2.4 billion dollars (Minnesota Department of Revenue, 1997). Nonferrous mining development shows promise for the future. The state is presently the subject of extensive mineral exploration, with 59 leases covering more than 26,000 acres of state land (MN DNR, 1998).

Considerable base and precious metal mineral potential is associated with Minnesota's Precambrian rocks, specifically in Archean metavolcanics, metasedimentary formations and the Duluth Complex. The Archean metavolcanics and metasedimentary formations, or greenstone belts, of Minnesota extend north into Canada, where they have yielded substantial mineral production. These formations are potential hosts for gold, zinc-copper massive sulfides with various by-products, and magmatic sulfide deposits containing copper, nickel, and platinum group elements. Recent exploration of greenstone belt metasedimentary formations has focused on gold, base metals, and silver-cobalt-copper deposits. The Duluth Complex contains an estimated copper-nickel resource of 4.4 billion tons (Minnesota Environmental Quality Board, 1979), as well as significant titanium resources. Drill core analyses have also revealed the presence of chromium, vanadium, cobalt, and platinum group elements.

If mineral development occurs, tailings and waste rock, as well as the mine itself will be wastes remaining after the operation is abandoned. The potential for generation of acidic mine waste drainage is the primary water quality concern, and this potential is largely determined by the mine waste composition. Mine wastes capable of producing problematic drainage must be managed to ensure that the quality of Minnesota waters is not adversely impacted. Mine waste management strategies directed at this objective include prevention, control, and treatment of problematic drainage. However, implementation of mitigative strategies alone is not sufficient insurance of non problematic drainage. Empirical data on the long-term performance of most mine waste management strategies is limited. Consequently, surface and ground water monitoring must also be included in any environmental mine waste management plan.

1.1. Mine Waste Drainage Mitigation in Minnesota

The Reclamation Section within the Division of Lands and Minerals, Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (MN DNR) has conducted numerous studies on environmental mine waste management (Lapakko et al., 1998a). Mitigative laboratory and small-scale field studies include the use of alkaline solids and subaqueous disposal of sulfidic waste rock. Operational-scale mitigative measures include capping and selective placement of reactive waste rock, drainage diversion, and passive and active treatment systems.

In addition to these studies, disposal of taconite tailings within existing open mine pits and associated surface and ground water quality have been investigated (Berndt et al., 1999; Lapakko and Jakel, 1999). However, taconite tailings contain very little sulfidic material and sufficient carbonate minerals to prevent acidic drainage in waters associated with them. Thus, these studies are beyond the scope of this presentation and will not be mentioned here.

1.1.1. MN DNR laboratory and small-scale field studies

A two-phase, laboratory and field program examined the feasibility of removing trace metals (Cu, Ni, Co, Zn) from stockpile drainage using readily available materials (peat, till, wood chips, Cu-Ni tailings, and zeolite) in low-cost, low-maintenance systems at the AMAX/Kennecott site. The results of the entire program are presented in two reports (Lapakko et al., 1986a,b), and synopses of various research segments are presented in several symposium proceedings (Lapakko and Eger 1981, 1983, 1988; Lapakko et al., 1983; Eger et al., 1984).

Laboratory experiments were conducted to examine the mitigative potential of mixing alkaline solids with acid-producing mine waste. In one of these laboratory experiments, rotary kiln fines (RK fines; a waste product generated by the conversion of limestone to lime), ! 10 mesh limestone, and +10 mesh/-0.25 inch limestone were each mixed with finely crushed Duluth Complex rock (0.053 < d # 0.149 mm) to examine their effectiveness in reducing the release of acid and trace metals in drainage from the rock (Lapakko and Antonson, 1989a, 1990a, 1991; Lapakko et al., 1997, 2000).

Laboratory and small-scale field tests were conducted to determine the effectiveness of limestone beds for treating mine waste drainage. In the laboratory, columns containing +10 mesh/ -0.25 inch high calcium limestone were used to treat three problematic mine drainages, one from a stockpile at the Dunka mine site and two from field test piles at the AMAX/Kennecott site (Lapakko and Antonson, 1989b, 1990a,b). Based on the results from the laboratory study, a field-scale limestone bed (1.4 m³ bed volume) was constructed to treat one of the problematic drainages at the Dunka site (Lapakko and Antonson, 1989c, 1990c).

Finally, disposal of sulfidic rock in a subaqueous setting with and without various layers to inhibit oxygen transport (unmodified subaqueous, composted yard waste, taconite tailings, compost and taconite tailings, and limestone) is under investigation in laboratory experiments. Taconite tailings, tailings and compost, and limestone barriers are also being examined in field experiments (MN DNR, unpublished data).

Although these laboratory and small-scale field tests show promise as mitigative techniques for reactive mine wastes in Minnesota, it is important to note that, at this time, none of them have been tested at an operational-scale. Furthermore, each of these tests was conducted on a single rock type. Consequently, conclusions related to the application of these techniques to specific, large-scale, environmental mine waste problems in Minnesota should be regarded cautiously.

1.1.2. MN DNR operational-scale field studies

Operational-scale field studies of passive wetland and active treatment systems have been implemented at the Dunka mine site. Based on the observation that metals were removed from waste rock stockpile drainage as it flowed through a white cedar swamp (Eger et al., 1980; Eger and Lapakko, 1988), studies were conducted to evaluate the use of wetlands as a technique for mitigating mine waste drainage. Literature was reviewed to summarize reported mechanisms and capacities for metal removal by peat (as well as other materials, Lapakko et al., 1985, 1986a, b) and laboratory experiments were conducted with native peat and waste rock drainage to more accurately assess the reactions applicable to situations in Minnesota (Lapakko and Eger, 1983). These results were subsequently used to estimate metal removal by peat under field conditions in Minnesota (Lapakko and Eger, 1988).

Based on the laboratory results, as well as observed metal removal by peat in a white cedar swamp and other natural wetlands, field test plots were designed (Eger and Lapakko, 1989) and metal removal in these systems was quantified (Eger et al., 1994). Based partly on these studies, wetland treatment systems were designed to treat drainage from operational-scale stockpiles (Eger et al., 1996, 1997, 2000). In addition to the wetland treatment system, the stockpiles were covered with various dry cover systems to reduce flow to these treatment systems (STS Consultants Ltd., 1993, 1994a, 1994b). An active lime precipitation treatment plant treats drainage from several of the aforementioned systems.

Sulfate reduction is an additional mechanism of metal removal (and pH elevation) in wetlands. Field experiments were initiated in 1990 to determine the efficiency, rates, and capacities of this mitigative approach (Eger, 1992, 1994a). In 1993, the field phase of this experiment was completed, although subsequent laboratory experiments have continued since 1995 (Eger and Wagner, 1995, 2001).

1.2. Objectives and Scope

Our goal is to further evaluate current methods and identify additional strategies for environmental mine waste management that show potential for application in Minnesota. For the purposes of this presentation, "environmental mine waste management" refers to mitigative methods used to prevent, control, and treat acidic and/or metal-laden drainage from sulfidic mine waste materials.

A literature search of the Reclamation Unit's literature database for the keyword string "mitigation or treatment" yielded more than 900 citations (MN DNR, Saint Paul, MN; Appendix 1.1). Approximately 400 additional citations were found in proceedings of mine waste management conferences that took place between 1994 and 2000 and other sources not yet entered into the database (Appendix1.2). It is important to note that the list of citations in Appendix 1 is largely comprised of references that were on hand in the Saint Paul office of the MN DNR. It does not represent an exhaustive literature review of mine waste mitigation strategies.

Due to the large number of citations found during the initial literature search, it was necessary to refine the scope of this document. This was accomplished by reviewing similar efforts in Canada, Australia, the United States, and Sweden to describe the current state of environmental mine waste management technology. These national efforts have resulted in several published compilations of mitigative strategies for waste management issues in metal mining (Feasby et al., 1997; MISTRA, 1998; Parker and Robertson, 1999; Gusek et al., in progress) and coal mining (Skousen and Ziemkiewicz, 1995; PA DEP, 1998; Skousen et al., 1998). Each compilation represents a comprehensive summary of mitigative approaches relevant to site-specific conditions. Our objective is to analyze these strategies to determine their applicability to environmentally sound mine waste management in Minnesota.

1.2.1 United States

The US Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA) has actively reviewed various active treatment options for acidic drainage from reactive mine wastes (US EPA, 1983). In 1983, the US EPA published a design manual for acid mine drainage neutralization that outlined procedures, advantages and disadvantages for different methods, and cost estimates for a variety of treatment options (US EPA, 1983). This design manual also includes information on reverse osmosis and ion exchange treatment. More recent research in the area of environmental mine waste management includes advances in active and passive treatment systems, source control, biological barriers, and engineered cover systems (US EPA, 1999).

In 1995, West Virginia University and the National Mine Land Reclamation Center published a compilation of articles on the prevention and treatment of acid mine drainage related to coal mining (Skousen and Ziemkiewicz, 1995). These articles covered a range of mitigative strategies with particular focus on the addition of alkaline materials to reactive mine wastes, neutralization of acidic drainage, and passive treatment systems for acidic drainage. Three years later, a similar publication was produced by the Acid Drainage Technology Initiative (ADTI)-Avoidance and Remediation Working Group (Skousen et al., 1998; Hornberger et al., 2000). However, this document was considered Phase 1, and summarized various mitigative and treatment technologies considered to be appropriate for specific drainage problems. Most of these strategies also appeared in Skousen and Ziemkiewicz (1995) with the addition of more active and passive treatment methods, bioremediation, and mineral surface treatment techniques.

The ADTI-Metal Mining Sector, a coalition of government agencies, industry, academia, and consultants, has been investigating metal mining environmental mine waste management issues since 1996 (Hornberger et al., 2000). One goal of the Metal Mining Sector of ADTI is to produce a technology handbook that describes the design, performance, applicability, and limitations of various mitigative strategies. This workbook will include information on sampling, monitoring, prediction, mitigation, and modeling of metal mining drainage problems (Hornberger et al., 2000; Gusek et al., in progress).

A state-wide effort by the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PA DEP) and other governmental agencies, academia, and industry resulted in a compilation of current

strategies to predict, prevent, and control acidic drainage from coal wastes (PA DEP, 1998). Highlighted strategies include reclamation and vegetation, including bactericide technology, addition of alkaline materials to mine wastes, special handling techniques for mine wastes and drainage, and remining.

1.2.2 Canada

The Mine Environment Neutral Drainage (MEND) program, a cooperative effort between the Canadian government and industry, has focused on the prevention and control of acid mine drainage since 1998 (Tremblay, 2000; Tremblay and Weatherell, 2000; MEND, 2001). MEND has identified water covers as the "best prevention technology" against the generation of acidic drainage from unoxidized sulfidic wastes (Feasby et al., 1997; Tremblay, 2000). In areas where water covers are not suitable, MEND has investigated the use of various innovative dry cover designs and materials, disposal of mine wastes in cold (permafrost) environments, and surrounding reactive mine wastes with porous material to control ground water flow. Passive treatment technologies such as constructed wetlands and anoxic limestone drains were reported to have limited, site-specific applicability. However, newer passive technologies involving permeable sulfate reduction barriers and the biosulfide process were mentioned as promising (Feasby et al., 1997).

1.2.3 Australia

The Australian Minerals and Energy Environment Foundation (AMEEF) was established in 1991 to "promote the implementation of the principles of sustainable development in Australia's mineral, energy and related industries." This is a non-profit organization supported by grants from industry and government. A recent publication summarized the current state-of-knowledge on environmental mine waste management in Australia and around the world (Parker and Robertson, 1999). While this review covered a wide range of mitigative strategies, innovative cover systems, mineral surface treatments, porous surroundings, and long-term passive treatment systems were specifically identified as requiring additional investigation.

Several other Australian organizations concerned with environmental mine waste management exist. The Environmental Division of the Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation (ANSTO) conducts project-oriented, applied research in many areas of environmental impact, including mine waste treatment and disposal. ANSTO's Managing Mine Wastes Project focuses primarily on sulfidic mine waste and acidic drainage management through laboratory and field measurements, hydrologic and geochemical modeling, and ecological risk assessment (ANSTO, 1999; Bennett, 2000).

The Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation's (CSIRO) is a government research organization that is involved with environmental research on a wide range of topics (Bennett, 2000). Research related to environmental mine waste management tends to be focused in the areas of acid drainage, sulfidic mine waste management, innovative capping techniques for tailings storage facilities, and mine waste characterization (CSIRO, 2000).

The Australian Mineral Industries Research Association (AMIRA) coordinates efforts by researchers and industry to develop proposals, identify sponsors, and manage research projects. The main area of focus is mineral processing. However, some of these projects involve environmental mine waste management (AMIRA, 2000; Bennett, 2000; Greenhill, 2000).

The Australian Centre for Mining Environmental Research (ACMER) was established as an industry supported organization with the goals of conducting environmental research and disseminating information throughout the mining industry. Several research organizations, including ANSTO, have been involved in the research aspects of their work (ACMER, 1998; Bennett, 2000).

1.2.4 Sweden

In Sweden, the Mitigation of the Environmental Impact from Mining Waste (MiMi), has also initiated a coordinated effort to improve the economic efficiency of mine waste management (MISTRA, 1998; Hoglund, 2000). The multidisciplinary MiMi program goals include using predictive modeling to identify existing mine waste deposits that can be reclaimed using simple, cost-efficient methods. The MiMi program is also developing strategies that will prevent future environmental problems associated with reactive mine wastes. To this end, five research projects were initiated during the first program period from 1999 to 2000. These projects will address dry and wet cover systems, biotic barriers (i.e. shallow wetlands in tailings ponds), passive leachate treatment systems, permeable reactive walls, and co-deposition of tailings and waste rock (MISTRA, 1998).

1.2.5 International

In October 1998, the International Network for Acid Prevention (INAP) was officially launched (Brehaut, 2000; INAP, 2000). This international movement was initiated after the success of the Canadian MEND program led to the realization that this level of technology transfer on an international scale was important. INAP consists of an international committee with representatives from industry, academia, and government from Australia, Canada, and the United States. INAP's objectives are "to promote significant improvements in the management of sulfidic mine materials and the reduction of liability associated with acid drainage through knowledge sharing and research and development of technology" (INAP, 2000).

At the present time, INAP has developed a web site, which provides access to information on professionals working on acid drainage issues, INAP research projects and proposals, case studies on the implementation of new techniques, and a forum for online discussion (Brehaut, 2000; INAP, 2000). Research areas specifically mentioned in INAP media releases include wet and dry cover systems for reactive mine wastes and passivation techniques to prevent the oxidation of sulfide minerals present in waste materials.

1.3 Structure of this Document

Thirty six different strategies for the environmentally sound management of reactive mine wastes were identified in aforementioned compilations (Appendix 1.3). Six of these strategies were referred to in more than one compilation. These strategies were:

- layered barriers or water cover systems to inhibit oxygen and/or water transport,
- alkaline amendments for in situ acid neutralization,
- microencapsulation to inhibit sulfide mineral reactivity,
- bactericides to inhibit biological sulfide oxidation in mine wastes,
- passive treatment of mine waste drainage, and
- active treatment of mine waste drainage.

These six strategies were used as a starting point for this project. Additional strategies have been included to provide a more complete review of the current state-of-technology of environmental mine waste management. For the organizational purposes of this document, they have been divided into three generalized sections: prevention, control, and treatment (Figure 1).

The first section deals with strategies intended to **prevent** the generation of problematic drainages. This is generally accomplished by physically isolating reactive mine wastes from the surrounding environment. Topics covered in this section include backfilling mine wastes into existing mine voids (section 3.1), co-disposal of fine and coarse-grained waste materials (section 3.2), and cover systems (section 4).

Strategies that **control** problematic drainage in situ are dealt with in the second section. In general, control strategies are used to stabilize reactive mine wastes either chemically or biologically. Addition of alkaline amendments (section 5.1) and microencapsulation (section 5.2) are two chemical stabilization strategies presented. The use of bactericides to inhibit biological sulfide oxidation represents biological stabilization (section 6).

Finally, existing problematic drainages generally require **treatment**. Both passive and active treatment options have been applied to problematic mine drainages. Passive treatment systems often utilize a combination of constructed wetlands, anoxic limestone drains, and settling/aeration ponds to treat surface waters and seeps (section 7.1). More recently, permeable reactive barriers have been developed to treat ground waters in situ (section 7.2). In some cases, an active treatment system may be the only option to meet regulatory standards. Numerous

active treatment systems have been developed. Acid neutralization (section 8.1), chemical precipitation (section 8.2), ion exchange (8.3), membrane filtration (8.4), and biological sulfate reduction (8.5) will be presented in this document.

Selected literature will be reviewed in terms of 1) a brief description of the mitigation strategy; 2) methods used to assess the strategy performance; 3) generalized cost analysis; and 4) applicability of the strategy to environmental mine waste management issues in Minnesota. When available, case studies of the use of each strategy are included in the appendices. It is important to note that this review does not represent a comprehensive literature review on the prevention, control, or treatment of acid mine drainage, nor does it address the entire range of possible preventative technologies currently in use.



Figure 1. Environmental mine waste management strategies addressed in this document are grouped based on their general objective: prevention, control, or treatment of problematic drainages from reactive mine wastes.

1.4. References

ACMER, 1998. Australian Centre for Mining Environmental Research. URL: http://acmer.com.au.

AMIRA, 2000. Australian Mineral Industries Research Association LTD. URL: http://www.amira.com.au.

ANSTO, 1999. Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation. URL:http://www.ansto.gov.au/ansto/environment1/abt.html.

Bennett, J.W. 2000. Principal Research Scientist. ANSTO, Environmental Division, Managing Mine Wastes Project. personal communication.

Berndt, M.E.; Lapakko, K.A.; Jakel, M.E. 1999. In-pit disposal of taconite tailings: geochemistry. Final report. MN Dept. Nat. Resour., Division of Lands and Minerals, Saint Paul, MN. 77 p. plus appendices.

Brehaut, H. 2000. The International Network for Acid Prevention - a progress report. In: Proc. of the 5th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Denver, CO, May 21-24, pg 29-32.

CSIRO, 2000. Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation. URL: http://www.csiro.au

Eger, P. 1992. The use of sulfate reduction to remove metals from AMD. In: Proc. Am. Soc. for Surface Mining and Reclamation Meeting. ASSMR, pg 563-575.

Eger, P. 1994a. The use of sulfate reduction to remove metals from acid mine drainage. In: Internat. Land Reclamation and Mine Drainage Conf. and 3rd Internat. Conf. on the Abatement of Acidic Drainage, Pittsburgh, PA, April 24-29, 2, pg 412.

Eger, P.; Lapakko, K. 1988. Nickel and copper removal from mine drainage by a natural wetland. In: Proc. 1988 Mine Drainage and Surface Mine Reclamation Conf., Pittsburgh, PA, April 19-21, 1, pg 301-309.

Eger, P.; Lapakko, K. 1989. The use of wetlands to remove nickel and copper from mine drainage. In: Constructed Wetlands for Wastewater Treatment. June 12-17, Chattanooga, TN, pg 780-787.

Eger, P.; Lapakko, K.; Chamberlain, P.G. 1984. Mixed disposal of waste rock and tailings to reduce trace metal release from waste rock. Symp. on Surface Mining, Hydrology, Sedimentology, and Reclamation, University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY, Dec. 2-7, pg 49-56.

Eger, P.; Lapakko, K.; Otterson, P. 1980. Trace metal uptake by peat: Interaction of a white cedar bog and mining stockpile leachate. In: Proc. of the 6th Internat. Peat Congress, Duluth, MN, Aug. 17-23, pg 542-547.

Eger, P.; Wagner, J. 1995. Sulfate reduction for the treatment of acid mine drainage: long term solution or short term fix? In: Mining and the Environment Conf. Proc., Sudbury, ON, May 28-June 1, 2, pg 515-524.

Eger, P., Wagner, J. 2001. Sulfate reduction - Designing systems for long term treatment. SME Annual Meeting, Denver, CO, Feb 26-28, Preprint 01-115.

Eger, P.; Wagner, J.; Kassa, Z.; Melchert, G. 1994. Metal removal in wetland treatment systems. In: Internat. Land Reclamation and Mine Drainage Conf. and 3rd Internat. Conf. on the Abatement of Acidic Drainage, Pittsburgh, PA, April 24-29, 1, pg 80-88.

Eger, P.; Wagner, J.; Melchert, G. 1996. The use of overland flow wetland treatment systems to remove nickel from neutral mine drainage. In: Successes and Failures: Applying Research Results to Insure Reclamation Success. Proc. 13th Nat. Meeting, Knoxville, TN, May 18-23, pg 580-589.

Eger, P.; Wagner, J.R.; Melchert, G. 1997. The use of a peat/limestone system to treat acid rock drainage. In: Proc. 4th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Vancouver, British Columbia, May 31-June 6, 3, pg 1195-1209.

Eger, P.; Wagner, J.; Melchert, G.; Antonson, D.; Johnson, A. 2000. Long term wetland treatment of mine drainage at LTV Steel Mining Company's Dunka Mine. MN Dept. Nat. Resour., Division of Lands and Minerals, 54 p. plus appendices.

Feasby, D.G.; Tremblay, G.A.; Weatherell, C.J. 1997. A decade of technology improvement to the challenge of acid drainage- A Canadian perspective. In: Proc. 4th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Vancouver, British Columbia, May 31-June 6, 1, pg i.

Greenhill, P.G. 2000. AMIRA international: AMD research through industry collaboration. In: Proc. of the 5th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Denver, CO, May 21-24, pg 13-19.

Gusek, J.J. et al. 2001. Draft: Handbook of Technologies for Avoidance and Mitigation of Metal Mine Drainage, Acid Drainage Technology Initiative (ADTI), Publ. by University of Reno, NV, in progress.

Hoglund, L.O. 2000. Mitigation of the environmental impact from mining waste (MiMi) - a Swedish multidisciplinary research programme. In: Proc. of the 5th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Denver, CO, May 21-24, pg 3-12.

Hornberger, R.J.; Lapakko, K.A.; Krueger, G.E.; Bucknam, C.H.; Ziemkiewicz, P.F.; vanZyl, D.J.A.; Posey, H.H. 2000. The Acid Drainage Technology Initiative (ADTI). In: Proc. of the 5th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Denver, CO, May 21-24, pg 41-50.

INAP. 2000. International Network for Acid Prevention. URL: http://www.inap.com.au.

Lapakko, K.A.; Antonson, D.A. 1989a. Alkaline addition reactor experiments: April 1989 status report. MN Dept. Nat. Resour., Division of Minerals, Saint Paul, MN, 28 p.

Lapakko, K.A.; Antonson, D.A. 1989b. Limestone column treatment of stockpile drainage: April 1989 status report. MN Dept. Nat. Resour., Division of Minerals, Saint Paul, MN, 16 p.

Lapakko, K.A.; Antonson, D.A. 1989c. Seep 1 limestone bed: 1988 Progress report. MN Dept. Nat. Resour., Division of Minerals, Saint Paul, MN, 17 p.

Lapakko, K.A.; Antonson, D.A. 1990a. Laboratory experiments on the mixture of alkaline solids with sulfide bearing rock. MN Dept. Nat. Resour., Division of Minerals, Saint Paul, MN, 37 p. plus appendices.

Lapakko, K.A.; Antonson, D.A. 1990b. Laboratory treatment of three acidic stockpile drainages by limestone columns. MN Dept. Nat. Resour., Division of Minerals, Saint Paul, MN, 22 p. plus appendices.

Lapakko, K.A.; Antonson, D.A. 1990c. Pilot scale limestone bed treatment of the Seep 1 waste rock drainage. MN Dept. Nat. Resour., Division of Minerals, Saint Paul, MN, 24 p. plus appendices.

Lapakko, K.A.; Antonson, D.A. 1991. Mixing of limestone with acid producing rock. In: Proc. of the 2nd Internat. Conf. on the Abatement of Acidic Drainage, Montreal, Quebec, Sept. 16-18, pg 343-358.

Lapakko, K.; Antonson, D.; Jakel, E. 1998a. Mine waste characterization and drainage mitigation: Research summary 1998. MN Dept. Nat. Resour., Division of Minerals, Saint Paul, MN, 50 p.

Lapakko, K.A.; Antonson, D.A.; Wagner, J.R. 1997. Mixing of alkaline solids with finelycrushed acid-producing rock. In: Proc. 4th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Vancouver, British Columbia, May 31-June 6, pg 1345-1360.

Lapakko, K.A.; Antonson, D.A.; Wagner, J.R. 2000. Mixing of rotary kiln fines with finegrained acid-producing rock. In: Proc. of the 5th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Denver, CO, May 21-24, pg 901-910. Lapakko, K.; Eger, P. 1981. Trace metal removal from mining stockpile runoff using peat, wood chips, tailings, till, and zeolite. Symp. on Surface Mining, Hydrology, Sedimentology, and Reclamation, University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY, Dec. 7-11, pg 105-116.

Lapakko, K.; Eger, P. 1983. Passive treatment of sulfide stockpile runoff. In: Proc. 1983 Nat. Conf. on Environmental Engineering, A. Medine and M. Anderson eds. ASCE, New York, pg 643-651.

Lapakko, K.; Eger, P. 1988. Trace metal removal from stockpile drainage by peat. In: Proc. 1988 Mine Drainage and Surface Mine Reclamation Conf., Pittsburgh, PA, April 19-21, 1, pg 291-300.

Lapakko, K.A.; Eger, A.P.; Strudell, J.D. 1986a. Low-cost removal of trace metals from copper-nickel mine stockpile drainage. Vol 1, Laboratory and field investigations. Report to the US Bureau of Mines, Contract J0205047, 103p.

Lapakko, K.A.; Eger, A.P.; Strudell, J.D. 1986b. Low-cost removal of trace metals from copper-nickel mine stockpile drainage. Vol 2, Trace metal sequestration by peat, other organics, tailings, and soils: a literature review. Report to the US Bureau of Mines, Contract J0205047, 45p.

Lapakko, K.; Jakel, M.E. 1999. Summary of potential impacts of taconite tailings disposal in the Minorca Pit on water quality in the Missabe Mountain Pit. MN Dept. Nat. Resour., Division of Lands and Minerals, Saint Paul, MN, 29 p. plus appendices.

Lapakko, K.; Strudell, J.; Eger, P. 1983. Sulfide stockpile leachate flow through a tailing bed: trace metal removal and flow modeling for a low maintenance treatment system. Symp. on Surface Mining, Hydrology, Sedimentology, and Reclamation, University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY, Nov. 27-Dec. 2, pg 321-327.

MEND. 2001. Mine Environment Neutral Drainage Program Manual, Report 5.4.2, Volumes 1-6. (eds: G.A. Tremblay and C.M. Hogan) Energy, Mines and Resources Canada, Candian Centre for Mineral and Energy Tecnology (CANMET).

MN DNR. 1998. October 1997 (Q2 F1998) Report on state mineral leasing activities. MN Dept. Nat. Resour., Division of Minerals, Minerals Leasing and Mineral Rights Management Section, St. Paul, MN.

Minnesota Department of Revenue, 1997. Personal communication with Tom Schmucker, Administrative engineer, Eveleth, MN.

Minnesota Environmental Quality Board. 1979. Regional copper-nickel study, Executive summary, volume 1. MN State Planning Agency, St. Paul, MN, 118 p.

MISTRA, 1998. Programme plan for the period 1999-2000. Mitigation of the environmental impact from mining waste. A MISTRA research programme, 50 p.

PA DEP, 1998. Coal mine drainage prediction and pollution prevention in Pennsylvania. The Pennsylvania Dept. of Environmental Protection. Harrisburg, PA, 375p.

Parker, G.; Robertson, A. 1999. Acid drainage. Occasional Paper No. 11. Australian Minerals and Energy Environment Foundation, Melbourne, Victoria, 227 p.

Skousen, J.G.; Ziemkiewicz, P.F. 1995. Acid mine drainage: Control & treatment. West Virginia University and the National Mine land Reclamation Center, Morgantown, WV, 255p.

Skousen, J.; Rose, A.; Geidel, G.; Forman, F.; Evans, R.; Hellier, W. 1998. A Handbook of Technologies for Avoidance and Remediation of Acid Mine Drainage. Acid Drainage Technology Initiative (ADTI), Morgantown: National Mine Land Reclamation Center at West Virginia University.

STS Consultants Ltd. 1993. Final closure plan for Dunka Mine. Report to LTV Steel Mining Company, Hoyt Lakes, MN, 218 p. plus appendices.

STS Consultants Ltd. 1994a. Stockpile 8018 capping, Dunka Mine NPDES Permit No. MN0042579. Report to LTV Steel Mining Company, Hoyt Lakes, MN, 6 p. plus appendices.

STS Consultants Ltd. 1994b. 051 treatment system, Dunka Mine NPDES Permit No. MN0042579. Report to LTV Steel Mining Company, Hoyt Lakes, MN, 14 p. plus appendices.

Tremblay, G. 2000. The Canadian Mine Environmental Neutral Drainage 2000 (MEND 2000) Program. In: Proc. of the 5th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Denver, CO, May 21-24, pg 33-40.

Tremblay, G., Weatherell, C. 2000. MEND 2000: Progress through partnerships. http://mend2000.nrcan.gc.ca/mend2000/cim.html.

US EPA. 1983. Design manual: Neutralization of acid mine drainage. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Industrial Environmental Research Laboratory. EPA-600/2-83-001, 231p.

US EPA. 1999. United States Environmental Protection Agency, Mine Waste Technology Program. URL: http://www.epa.gov/ ORD/NRMRL/std/mtb/activities.htm.

2. Geochemical Background

2.1. Mine Waste Dissolution and Acid Mine Drainage

The dissolution of iron sulfide minerals such as pyrite and pyrrhotite is responsible for the majority of mine waste acid production (Stumm and Morgan, 1981). Equations 1 and 2 are commonly published reactions representing pyrite and pyrrhotite oxidation by oxygen (Nelson, 1978; Stumm and Morgan, 1981).

$$FeS_{2} + (15/4)O_{2} + (7/2)H_{2}O = Fe(OH)_{3} + 2SO_{4}^{2!} + 4H^{+}$$
(1)

$$FeS + (9/4)O_2 + (5/2)H_2O = Fe(OH)_3 + SO_4^{2!} + 2H^+$$
(2)

The rate of oxidation and attendant acid production is dependent on solid-phase compositional variables. Oxidation rates vary among sulfide minerals, and it is often reported that reactivity decreases in the order marcasite > pyrrhotite > pyrite (e.g. Kwong and Ferguson 1990). For a given sulfide mineral, the oxidation rate increases with the reactive surface area available. It also varies with the crystal form of the mineral. For example, the oxidation rate of framboidal pyrite is reported to be much more rapid than that of euhedral pyrite (Pugh et al. 1984; White and Jeffers 1994).

The rate of sulfide mineral oxidation also increases as pH decreases into a range conducive to bacterial catalysis of ferrous iron oxidation. Nordstrom (1982) reported that as "pH decreases to 4.5, ferric iron becomes more soluble and begins to act as an oxidizing agent." As pH further decreases bacterial oxidation of ferrous iron becomes the rate limiting step in the oxidation of pyrite by ferric iron (Singer and Stumm, 1970), which is the only significant oxidizing agent in this pH range (Singer and Stumm, 1970; Kleinmann et al., 1981; Nordstrom, 1982).

These weathering reactions produce acidic, iron- and sulfate-rich aqueous water which can 1) contact sulfide minerals and accelerate their oxidation, 2) evaporate partially or totally to precipitate hydrated iron sulfate and other minerals, and/or 3) contact host rock minerals which react to neutralize some or all of the acid. Acidic flow which migrates through the mine waste may eventually exit as acid rock drainage.

Hydrated iron sulfate minerals precipitate during the evaporation of acidic, iron- and sulfate-rich water within mine waste materials and store (for potential subsequent release) acid generated by iron sulfide mineral oxidation. The more common hydrated iron sulfate minerals that occur as efflorescent salts on the surfaces of weathering pyrite include melanterite, rozenite, szomolnokite, romerite, and copiapite (Alpers et al., 1994). According to Nordstrom (1982) and Cravotta (1994), these sulfate salts are highly soluble and provide an instantaneous source of acidic water upon dissolution and hydrolysis. They are partially responsible for increased acidity and metals loadings in the receiving environment during rainstorm events.

As an example, equations 3, 4, and 5 summarize the step-wise dissolution of melanterite.

$$FeSO_4@H_2O = Fe^{2+} + SO_4^{2!} + 7H_2O$$
 (3)

$$Fe^{2+} + (\frac{1}{4})O_2 + H^+ = Fe^{3+} + (\frac{1}{2})H_2O$$
 (4)

$$Fe^{3+} + 3H_2O = Fe(OH)_3 + 3H^+$$
 (5)

The net result of equations 3 through 5 is summarized in equation 6, which shows a net production of two moles of acid produced for each mole of melanterite dissolved.

$$FeSO_4@H_2O + (1/4)O_2 = Fe(OH)_3 + SO_4^{2!} + (9/2)H_2O + 2H^+$$
(6)

Cravotta (1994) showed that a similar aqueous dissolution of romerite produced six moles of acid for each mole of romerite dissolved. Their cumulative storage and incremental release may help explain the lag from mine waste placement to acid mine drainage formation, particularly in arid climates.

According to Nordstrom (1982), the formation of hydrated iron sulfates is an important intermediate step that precedes the precipitation of the more common iron minerals such as goethite and jarosite. Jarosite is slightly soluble (Alpers et al., 1994) and can, therefore, contribute acid according to equation 7.

$$KFe_3(SO_4)_2(OH)_6 = K^+ + 3FeOOH + 2SO_4^{2!} + 3H^+$$
 (7)

For example, recent preliminary leach studies on natural and synthetic jarosites conducted by the United States Bureau of Mines showed a drop in pH from 6 in the deionized water leachant to pH 3 or 4 after contact with the jarosites. Because of its relatively low solubility, the acid contributed by jarosite dissolution is probably small relative to that by dissolution of more soluble hydrated iron sulfates.

2.2. References

Alpers, C.N.; Blowes, D.W.; Nordstrom, D.K.; Jambor, J.L. 1994. Secondary minerals and acid mine water chemistry. In: Short Course Handbook on Environmental Geochemistry of Sulfide Mine Wastes, Waterloo, Ontario, May 1994. Mineralogical Association of Canada, pg 247-270.

Cravotta, C.A. III. 1994. Secondary iron-sulfate minerals as sources of sulfate and acidity: Geochemical evolution of acidic ground water at a reclaimed surface coal mine in Pennsylvania. In: Environmental Geochemistry of Sulfide Oxidation, ACS Symposium Series No. 550; American Chemical Society: Washington, DC, 1993, pg 343-364.

Kleinmann, R.L.P.; Crerar, D.A.; Pacelli, R.R. 1981. Biogeochemistry of acid mine drainage and a method to control acid formation. Mining Eng. March 1981, pg 300-305.

Nelson, M. 1978. Kinetics and mechanisms of the oxidation of ferrous sulfide. Ph. D. Thesis, Stanford University, Palo Alto, CA.

Nordstrom, D.K. 1982. Aqueous pyrite oxidation and the consequent formation of secondary iron minerals. In: Acid Sulfate Weathering. J.A. Kittrick, D.S. Fanning, and L.R. Hossner (eds.), Soil Sci. Soc. America Spec. Pub. 10, Madison, WI, pg 37-56.

Singer, P.C.; Stumm, W. 1970. Acid mine drainage: The rate determining step. Science, 167, pg 1121-1123.

Stumm, W., Morgan, J. J. 1981. Aquatic Chemistry-An introduction emphasizing chemical equilibria in natural waters. John Wiley and Sons, Inc. New York. 780p.

PREVENTION STRATEGIES

Whether or not a mine waste produces problematic drainage depends on a wide array of variables that describe the physical, chemical, and mineralogical characteristics of the waste, pre-existing site conditions, climate, and government regulations. Consequently, there is no single, correct approach to environmental mine waste management. One approach is to use strategies that prevent the generation of problematic drainages in the first place. Typical prevention strategies involve constructing a barrier between reactive mine wastes and air (i.e. oxygen) and/or water. This section will review the use of backfill options and cover systems commonly used to physically isolate reactive mine waste materials from the surrounding environment.

- 3. Selective Handling of Reactive Mine Wastes
 - 3.1. Backfilling Reactive Mine Wastes

3.1.1. Objectives of Backfilling Reactive Mine Wastes

Backfilling existing mine voids with reactive mine waste materials is a prevention strategy currently practiced at both surface and underground mines. In terms of environmental mine waste management, the goal of backfilling is to isolate reactive mine wastes from the atmosphere and/or water. Additional benefits to the mining operation include increased stability of underground mine workings and reduced land development, disposal, and reclamation costs.

Numerous techniques for backfilling mine voids have evolved over the years. In a situation where an open pit is to be backfilled, transporting mine wastes from a temporary storage area may simply involve truck hauling or pumping a tailings slurry. Typically, reactive materials are placed near the center of the pit. The surrounding material usually consists of less reactive mine waste that limit exposure to water and oxygen. Highly reactive mine wastes often require additional mitigative measures. Ideally, the reactive mine waste can be encapsulated with net neutralizing mine wastes. However, if these materials are not available locally, alkaline materials such as limestone or fly ash can be intermixed with the reactive mine waste to neutralize any acid generated.

Prior to mine closure, backfilled pits must be reclaimed. Reclamation can vary from a simple replacement of topsoil and vegetation to complex multi-layer cover schemes (see section 4.2). Alternatively, if the pit intersects the ground water table, it may be preferable to inundate the waste materials. A major benefit of establishing a water cover is that oxygen diffusion will be limited, reducing the potential for acid generation (see section 4.3).

Occasionally, underground mines can be backfilled using ordinary haul trucks and bulldozers. However, more complicated methods, such as hydraulic flushing or pneumatic stowing are frequently required. Hydraulic flushing involves pumping fill material as a slurry into the void. This method has several drawbacks. Operators have very little control over the direction and compaction of the backfill that results. Furthermore, the particle size distribution of the fill material varies with respect to slurry velocity during deposition. Finally, this method requires transport of relatively large volumes of water into the mine, which may or may not be beneficial (Walker, 1993).

Pneumatic stowing is a second method for backfilling mine voids, which eliminates the volume of water introduced into the mine. While a greater degree of compaction can be achieved using pneumatic stowing, abrasion of the injection nozzle and elbows leads to rapid equipment failure (Walker, 1993). This problem has been addressed, in part, by the development of a high efficiency ejector that uses a supersonic airstream to project fill material horizontally into the void (Burnett et al., 1995).

Handling of mine wastes, particularly tailings, can often present problems. A common goal is to create a high density fill material using paste technology. Pastes are mixtures of tailings and water, similar to a slurry. However, pastes are differentiated from slurries by the fact that they do not segregate with respect to particle size when at rest. In order for this to occur, a paste must contain approximately 15% fines (< 20 um) by weight. The fines retain moisture due to their high surface tension, preventing segregation (Cincilla et al., 1997). Portland cement can be added to the paste to increase strength and durability (Cincilla et al., 1997).

Similar to the open pit situation, alkaline materials (e.g. limestone, fly ash etc.) are often used to increase backfill strength and neutralize acidic drainage. However, laboratory studies have demonstrated the preferential dissolution of alkaline binders in cemented paste backfills (Bertrand et al., 2000). These results also indicated that the backfill material became passivated, although the exact mechanism of passivation was unclear. Consequently, cemented paste backfills may not provide long-term buffering against acidic drainage generated within backfilled mine works.

3.1.2. Monitoring Water Quality Associated with Backfilled Mine Works

Post-closure monitoring must be included in the disposal design in order to determine the overall effectiveness of a backfill program. Objectives are likely to include monitoring the movement of water into and out of the backfill as well as water quality. If poor water quality is anticipated, a liner and underdrain system should be installed prior to construction. These are necessary to collect drainage for additional treatment if needed.

Monitoring instrumentation may include a series probes and piezometers to measure gas concentrations (e.g. oxygen), moisture content, and water levels within the backfill. These instruments can easily be connected to an automated datalogger system to streamline data collection. Both ground and surface water quality should be monitored. Lysimeters and wells can be installed in strategic locations to obtain ground water quality samples. Seeps and ponded water, in the case of flooded wastes, also give an indication of the extent to which backfill materials may have reacted with ground and surface waters.

3.1.3. Economic Benefits of Backfilling Mine Voids

Backfilling mine voids with reactive mine waste materials can be a cost effective approach to environmental mine waste management. This is particularly true if abandoned pits or mine workings are available on-site. If mine wastes are to be redeposited in an operational mine, a temporary disposal plan will be required. In this situation, mine wastes are effectively disposed of twice (once as they are removed from the mine and again to their final disposal location), which increases design, transportation, handling, and management costs. However, these costs can be offset by the savings due to reductions in storage volume required. As with any disposal situation, the economic impacts of each variable must be evaluated on a site-specific basis.

3.1.4. Potential Application of Backfill Technology in Minnesota

Numerous mined out natural iron ore pits exist along the Cuyuna and Mesabi Iron Ranges in northern Minnesota. If mineral development were to occur in these areas, backfilling these pits with reactive mine wastes may appear to be a feasible option. However, potential impacts to aquifers (i.e. local drinking water supplies) must be considered. According to the Laws of Minnesota, 1996, Chapter 407, Section 56, the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency may issue a permit to dispose of fine taconite tailings into taconite mine pits provided, "the proposer demonstrates through an environmental impact statement and risk assessment that the deposition will not pose an unreasonable risk of pollution or degradation of groundwater." It should be noted that this law refers specifically to taconite mine wastes, which generally do not produce problematic drainage. Sulfide-bearing mine wastes may have a higher probability of impacting local ground waters due to their reactivity and the likelihood that mine workings will intersect local aquifers. Whether or not backfilling open pits with reactive materials is a practicable mine waste management option in Minnesota will largely depend on the solid-phase characteristics of the mine waste material and the hydrogeology of the open pit and surrounding area. Consequently, practicability of this strategy is likely to be determined by site-specific evaluations.

- 3.2. Co-disposal of Tailings and Waste Rock as a Preventative Strategy
 - 3.2.1. Objectives of Co-disposal

Traditional handling of mining wastes calls for separate disposal of coarse waste rock and finegrained tailings. However, recent investigations into the co-disposal of tailings and waste rock suggest that this strategy has both environmental and economic benefits. Co-disposal simply refers to the combining of tailings and waste rock prior to disposal. Layered co-disposal involves placing layers of tailings at predefined intervals within a waste rock deposit during construction. In both cases, the resulting deposit has improved physical and chemical characteristics that decrease the potential for acid generation and trace metal release.

Generation of problematic drainages is the result of sulfide mineral oxidation, which is, in turn, a function of the amount of water and oxygen present in reactive mine wastes (equations 1 and

2). The primary goal of co-disposal is to exploit the hydraulic properties of fine-grained materials (i.e. tailings) to limit exposure of mine waste materials to oxygen. This is accomplished by mixing tailings and waste rock prior to disposal. The high moisture-retention capacity of the tailings creates saturated conditions throughout the deposit. Since oxygen diffuses more slowly through water than air (Table 8), the rate of sulfide oxidation is minimized. Additional benefits of co-disposal include:

- short-term control as reactive wastes are disposed,
- increased physical stability of the deposit due to waste rock sheer strength,
- increased density within the deposit,
- increased water recovery from tailings,
- relatively high surface area associated with fine-grained material increases potential for adsorptive trace metal removal,
- certain fine-grained waste materials (e.g. taconite tailings) may contain acid neutralizing minerals, and
- reduced land development, disposal, and reclamation costs.

Despite these advantages, co-disposal of tailings and waste rock may involve considerable planning and design. Both pumped and layered co-disposal strategies involve departures from conventional waste handling and transportation techniques (Table 1). If the objective is an intermixed deposit of tailings and coarse reject, the two waste streams can be combined and pumped to an impoundment or abandoned pit. However, specialized equipment is needed to handle the additional strain on pumps and pipelines. Waste handling and transportation issues also arise for layered co-disposal situations. Compaction of the tailings layers maximizes the capillary effect. However, compaction requires dewatered tailings. Consequently, practical issues of how to transport dewatered tailings to the impoundment must be addressed. This usually involves truck hauling (Table 1). In general, co-disposal of tailings and waste rock will involve a greater effort in the areas of deposit design, disposal scheduling, and supervision.

3.2.2. Evaluation of Co-disposal Performance

Generation of problematic drainages in waste rock piles is directly related physical as well as chemical processes. Without a good conceptual model of the disposal system, performance is difficult to evaluate. Numerous efforts have been made to characterize the physical processes (i.e. water and oxygen flow) operating within waste rock piles and fine-grained materials (Nicholson et al. 1989; Lefebvre and Gelinas 1995; Nichol et al. 2000; Wilson et al. 2000b). Quantification of these processes is essential in determining mechanisms that control drainage chemistry. By understanding these mechanisms, they can be exploited to optimize waste rock deposit design and develop monitoring programs to evaluate overall performance.

Table 1.	Several practical waste handling design and transportation issues must be
	addressed when considering a co-disposal strategy for mine waste management.

Co-disposal Description	Issue	Consider	
		1. high-pressure, large bore	
	pump & pipeline wear	2. ceramic- or polyurethane-lined pipes	
		3. particle shape	
		4. decrease solids concentration	
		1. increase flow velocity	
Pumped	pipeline blockages	2. increase pressure	
	fines wash out of pore spaces among coarse particles	1. high coarse to fine mass ratio	
		2. small size gap between coarse	
		3. decrease flow velocity	
	hydraulic sorting upon discharge	1. direct discharge up slope	
Layered	transportation of dewatered tailings	1. truck hauling	

3.2.3. Economic Benefits of Co-disposal of Mine Wastes

Pumping, specialized heavy duty equipment, and/or transportation of dewatered tailings will increase the expense incurred by co-disposal of fine and coarse waste materials. However, these costs may be offset by the savings due to reductions in storage volume required. For example, a coal operation in Australia pumped tailings and coarse reject to an abandoned pit, resulting in a reported savings of \$0.52/ton of product (Williams, 1997). This estimate may be higher than can be expected at other sites due to the availability of an abandoned pit and site-specific problems associated with conventional waste disposal. An alternative estimate predicted a 20% reduction in operating costs (Sellgren and Addie, 1998). As with any disposal situation, the economic impacts of each variable must be evaluated on a site-specific basis (Table 2).

Conventional Disposal Cost Items	Economic Benefit/Liability of Co-Disposal	
tailings thickener (capital, operation, maintenance)	A portion of the tailings stream may be able to bypass the thickener.	
tailings impoundment construction	Increased density of the deposit reduces the size requirements.	
acquiring land	Increased density of the deposit reduces the amount of land required.	
pumps & pipeline (capital, operation, maintenance)	Considerably higher due to the need for heavy duty equipment.	
water recovery	site-specific	
reclamation	site-specific	
coarse reject hopper	A hopper to combine tailings and coarse streams will still be necessary.	
conveyor system (capital, operation, maintenance)	None required	
truck (capital, operation, maintenance, replacement)	No truck hauling for pumped co-disposal. May be a factor for layered co-disposal.	
haul roads (construction, maintenance)	No truck hauling for pumped co-disposal. May be a factor for layered co-disposal.	
drainage management (collection, treatment)	site-specific	

Table 2.Costs associated with co-disposal of tailings and waste rock may be reduced,
depending on the relative savings compared to conventional disposal.

3.2.4. Co-disposal Studies and Applications in Minnesota

Several laboratory-scale investigations into the effectiveness of tailings and waste rock codisposal have been conducted (Lapakko and Eger, 1981; Iwasaki et al., 1982; Eger et al., 1984; Lapakko et al., 1983, 1985, 1986a, b; Johnson et al., 1995; Fortin et al., 2000; Lamontagne et al., 2000). This discussion will focus on those using tailings and mine wastes from northern Minnesota.

3.2.4.1. MN DNR Joint Disposal Studies

Laboratory and field studies examining the ability of taconite tailings to passively treat stockpile drainages were conducted by the MN DNR (Lapakko and Eger, 1981; Eger et al., 1984; Lapakko et al., 1983, 1985, 1986a, b). The two-phase experimental program was conducted under US Bureau of Mines funding to examine the feasibility of removing copper, nickel, cobalt, and zinc from stockpile drainage using readily available materials in low cost, low maintenance systems (Lapakko et al., 1986a,b). The first phase was a laboratory program using: 1) batch experiments as a screening program; and 2) column experiments to select the most promising materials for field trials (Lapakko and Eger, 1981; Lapakko et al., 1985, 1986a).

Low sulfide tailings were chosen for the phase two field testing, utilizing both treatment beds and joint disposal bins. Saturated and unsaturated flow tailings treatment beds demonstrated the greatest removal efficiency for copper and lowest for nickel (Lapakko et al., 1983, 1985, 1986a).

In the joint disposal study, total effluent from waste rock was reduced 34% by the addition of tailings and 66% by the addition of tailings followed by an additional cover layer of tailings and vegetation (Eger et al., 1984; Lapakko et al., 1985, 1986a). During the 1983 field season, both treatments produced effluent that met the copper guideline; the nickel concentration was also reduced, but it nevertheless exceeded the guideline by more than a factor of two (Table 3).

Furthermore, these successes were short-lived. After three years, metal concentrations had increased three to five fold and effluent pH had begun to decrease (MN DNR, 1987). Among the conclusions from the MN DNR joint disposal field study were the following general considerations for operational-scale co-disposal (Lapakko et al., 1985, 1986a):

• optimal tailings and waste rock incorporation methods to reduce the area required for overall waste disposal,

- correct positioning of the discharge pipe relative to the deposit to avoid hydraulic sorting,
- quantification of the hydraulic and metal removal capacities of the system,
- construction of toe ditch and berms, settling basins, or similar structures to minimize total suspended solids in the effluent,
- · deposit reclamation to reduce erosion, and
- potential long-term trace metal release from the tailings.

Parameter	Guideline Limitation (mg/L)	Average flow-weighted concentration (mg/L)		
		Controls	Unvegetated Tailings	Vegetated Tailings
Cu	0.15	0.31	0.11	0.06
Ni	0.75	3.2	1.58	1.78
Со	0.15	0.11	0.06	0.05
Zn	0.75	0.23	0.07	0.15
pН	6.0-9.0	6.0	6.2	6.2
TSS	20.0	1.4	3200	280

Table 3. Flow-weighted concentrations from joint disposal bins compared to effluent guidelines (Lapakko et al., 1985).

Table 4. Calcite-bearing taconite tailings reduced the amount of nickel and copper release from Duluth Complex ore (Iwasaki et al., 1982).

Parameter	Ore	Ore + taconite tailings
pH^{1}	6.3	6.6-6.7
Cu (mg/L) ¹	0.09	below detection
Ni ¹	3	0.95-1.8
SO_4^{-2}	1500	900-1300

¹ 120 day leach test ² after 8 months
3.2.4.2. Minnesota Mineral Research Center Studies Involving Co-disposal

The Minnesota Minerals Research Center also conducted laboratory studies in which the potential use of carbonate-bearing taconite tailings as acid neutralizing additives was investigated (Iwasaki, 1982). Shake flask leaching of Duluth Complex (copper-nickel) ore was conducted using 0.5%, 1.0%, and 2.0% taconite tailings. The results indicated that taconite tailings did provide some neutralization and decreased heavy metal release from the ore (Table 4).

3.2.4.3. Full-Scale Application of Co-disposal in a Taconite Tailings Basin

Finally, there is one known, operational-scale case of waste rock disposal within a tailings basin in Minnesota. Upon closure of the Dunka Mine near Babbitt, MN, LTV Steel Mining Company disposed of approximately 262,000 long tons of high sulfur Virginia Formation hornfels waste rock (LTV, 1996). Hornfels and dolomitic limestone (ratio of 8.35:1) were encapsulated within a section of their taconite tailings basin. Monitoring wells were installed in 1995, however, subsequent mining activity damaged the two wells to the extent that they were no longer usable. Two additional wells were installed in the spring of 1998. Monitoring of water quality in these wells and local seeps continues on a quarterly basis (Table 5).

Table 5. Water chemistry measured from monitoring wells and seeps in LTV Steel Mining Company's tailings basin between March 1995 and February 2000. Concentrations in µg/L unless noted otherwise. See Appendix 2 for a more detailed summary (Clark, 2000).

	Wells (N=43)	Seeps (N=112)		
Parameter	Range Average		Range	Average	
pH	7.0 - 10.0	8.3	7.1 - 8.7 ¹	7.9	
Cu	<1 - 125	13	<1 - 80.8	1.4	
Ni	<1 - 243	19	<1 - 13.6	1.4	
Со	<1 - 20.6	4	<1 - 7.8	1.0	
Zn	<10 - 181	27	<10 - 20	6.4	
SO ₄ (mg/L)	54.5 - 825	153	132 - 531 ¹	210	

 $^{^{1}}$ N = 84

Between 1996 and 1999, water samples were collected from a seep along the southwest side of the tailings basin as part of a MN DNR-University of Minnesota joint study (Berndt et al., 1999). High sulfate levels in these samples indicate transport of sulfate from the hornfels rock (Table 6). However, it cannot be determined whether the sulfate was the result of rinsing of oxidation products produced prior to placement of the hornfels rock in the tailings basin, or subsequent continued sulfide oxidation within the tailings basn. Seepage pH and trace metal levels were considered non-problematic. This suggested that the additional dolomite and taconite tailings (i.e. ankerite) contained adequate capacity for neutralization. Iron oxides present in the tailings (approximately 19 wt%) were believed to provide sites for trace metal adsorption (Berndt et al., 1999).

Table 6. Summary of water chemistry measured from a seep on the southwest side of LTV Steel Mining Company's tailings basin between June 1996 and February 1999. Appendix 2 for a more detailed summary. Concentrations in µg/L unless noted otherwise.

Parameter	Range	Average	Ν	
pН	7.1-7.7	7.3	11	
Cu	0.0-1.5	0.7	11	
Ni	0.9-3.3	1.8	11	
Со	1.6-5.1	2.6	11	
Zn	5.0-30.2	17.3	11	
$SO_4 (mg/L)$	169-284	230	11	

In summary, results from laboratory studies suggest that co-disposal of tailings and waste rock can be used to mitigate problematic drainages (Lapakko and Eger, 1981; Iwasaki et al., 1982; Eger et al., 1984; Lapakko et al., 1983, 1985, 1986a, b; Johnson et al., 1995; Fortin et al., 2000; Lamontagne et al., 2000). However, these studies indicate that practical issues of waste deposit design, use of alkaline additives, transportation and discharge of wastes, reclamation, and long-term contaminant release present potential technical, economic, and environmental problems. Individual operations must resolve these issues (i.e. large-scale field tests) before co-disposal strategies can be considered a viable waste disposal strategy.

3.3. References for Selective Handling of Reactive Mine Wastes

Aiken, S.R.; Pettit, C.M.; Halbert, B.E.; Knapp, R.A. 1999. Whistle mine closure modelling studies and water treatment considerations. In: Mining and the Environment Conf. Proc., Sudbury, Ontario, Sept. 13-17, 2, pg 771-780.

Amaratunga, L.M. 2000. Designing a strong total tailings pastefill using cold-bonded tailings agglomerates. CIM Bulletin, 93, 1043, pg 119-122.

Berndt, M.E.; Lapakko, K; Jakel, E. 1999. In-pit disposal of taconite tailings: geochemistry. Final Report. MN DNR, Division of Lands and Minerals, Saint Paul, MN, 77 p. plus appendices.

Bernier, L.R.; Li, M.G.; Moerman, A. 1999. Effects of tailings and binder geochemistry on the physical strength of paste backfill. In: Mining and the Environment Conf. Proc., Sudbury, Ontario, Sept. 13-17, 3, pg 1113-1122.

Bertrand, V.J.; Monroy, M.G.; Lawrence, R.W. 2000. Weathering characteristics of cemented paste backfill: Mineralogy and solid phase chemistry. In: Proc. of the 5th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Denver, CO, May 21-24, 2, pg 863-876.

Burnett, J.M.; Burnett, M.; Ziemkiewicz, P.; Black, D.C. 1995. Pneumatic backfilling of coal combustion residues in underground mines. In: Mining and the Environment Conf. Proc., Sudbury, ON, May 28-June 1, 3, pg 1211-1220.

Chapman, J.; Hockley, D.; Sevick, J.; Dachel, R.; Paul, M. 1998. Pit backfilling on two continents: Comparison of recent experiences. In: Proc. 5th Internat. Conf. on Tailings and Mine Waste '98, Fort Collins, CO, USA, Jan. 26-28, A.A. Balkema, Rotterdam, Netherlands, 968 p.

Chen, L.J.; Millette, D.G.; Annor, A. 1999. A new development in paste backfill technology. In: Proc. 6th Internat. Conf. on Tailings and Mine Waste '99, Fort Collins, CO, USA, Jan. 24-27, A.A. Balkema, Rotterdam, Netherlands, 808 p.

Cincilla, W.A.; Landriault, D.A. Verburg, R. 1997. Application of paste technology to surface disposal of mineral wastes. In: Proc. 4th Internat. Conf. on Tailings and Mine Waste '97, Fort Collins, CO, USA, Jan. 13-17, A.A. Balkema, Rotterdam, Netherlands, 788 p.

Clark, R. 2000. Operations/Planning/Major Facilities, North District, Minnesota Pollution Control Agency. personal communication.

Cravotta, C.A. III; Brady, K.B.C.; Gustafson-Minnich, L.C.; DiMatteo, M.R. 1994. Geochemical and geohydrological characteristics of bedrock and spoil from two methods of mining at a reclaimed surface coal mine, Clarion County, PA, USA. In: Internat. Land Reclamation and Mine Drainage Conf. and 3rd Internat. Conf. on the Abatement of Acidic Drainage, Pittsburgh, PA, April 24-29, 2, pg 242-249.

Dahlstrom, D.A. 1997. Disposal of fine tailings in the underground mine. In: Proc. 4th Internat. Conf. on Tailings and Mine Waste '97, Fort Collins, CO, USA, Jan. 13-17, A.A. Balkema, Rotterdam, Netherlands, 788 p.

Dorey, R.; Willow, M.; Duckett, R. 1999. Open pit reclamation at the Kennecott Ridgeway gold mine. In: Proc. 6th Internat. Conf. on Tailings and Mine Waste '99, Fort Collins, CO, USA, Jan. 24-27, A.A. Balkema, Rotterdam, Netherlands, 808 p.

Duex, T.A. 2000. Reclamation at the Richmond Hill Mine, Lawrence County, South Dakota. In: Proc. of the 5th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Denver, CO, May 21-24 2, pg 807-811.

Dusseault, M.B.; Davidson, B.C. 1997. Salt solution cavern disposal for toxic solid mining wastes. In: Proc. 4th Internat. Conf. on Tailings and Mine Waste '97, Fort Collins, CO, USA, Jan. 13-17, A.A. Balkema, Rotterdam, Netherlands, 788 p.

Eger, P.; Lapakko, K.; Chamberlain, P.G. 1984. Mixed disposal fo waste rock and tailings to reduce trace metal release from waste rock. Symp. on Surface Mining, Hydrology, Sedimentology, and Reclamation, University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY, Dec. 2-7, pg 49-56.

Flambeau Mining Company. 2001. 2000 Annual Report. Flambeau Mining Company, Ladysmith, WI. 36 p. plus appendices.

Fortin, S.; Lamontagne, A.; Tasse, N.; Poulin, R. 2000. The use of basic additives to tailings in layered co-mingling to improve AMD control. In: Environmental Issues and Management of Waste in Energy and Mineral Production, Singhai & Mehrotra eds. Balkema, Rotterdam, pg 549-556.

Gay, F.; Constantiner, D. 1998. Additives for improving paste backfill mixes. In: Proc. 5th Internat. Conf. on Tailings and Mine Waste '98, Fort Collins, CO, USA, Jan. 26-28, A.A. Balkema, Rotterdam, Netherlands, 968 p.

Helms, W.; Heinrich, D. 1997. Development of backfill material for minimizing acid mine drainage generation in abandoned underground mines. In: Proc. 4th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Vancouver, British Columbia, May 31-June 6, 3, pg 1251-1266.

Hill, T.H.; Benson, C.H. 1999. Hydraulic conductivity of compacted mine rock backfill. In: Proc. 6th Internat. Conf. on Tailings and Mine Waste '99, Fort Collins, CO, USA, Jan. 24-27, A.A. Balkema, Rotterdam, Netherlands, 808 p.

Hockley, D.; Paul, M.; Chapman, J.; Jahn, S.; Weise, W. 1997. Relocation of waste rock to the Lichtenberg Pit near Ronneburg, Germany. In: Proc. 4th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Vancouver, British Columbia, May 31-June 6, 3, pg 1267-1283.

Hockley, D.; Chapman, J.; Sevick, J.; Moe, D. 1998. Estimating contaminant concentrations in a re-flooded underground mine. In: Proc. 5th Internat. Conf. on Tailings and Mine Waste '98, Fort Collins, CO, USA, Jan. 26-28, A.A. Balkema, Rotterdam, Netherlands, 968 p.

Hu, Z. 1995. Coal waste disposal and management in Chinese Shouli Mine. In: Mining and the Environment Conf. Proc., Sudbury, ON, May 28-June 1, 3, pg 1183-1188.

Iwasaki, I.; Smith, K.A.; Makicsi, A.S. 1982. By-product recovery from copper-nickel bearing Duluth Gabbro. University of Minnesota, Mineral Resources Research Center, Minneapolis, MN, 283p.

Jakubick, A.T.; Gatzweiler, R.; Mager, D.; Robertson, A. MacG. 1997. The Wismut waste rock pile remediation program of the Ronneburg mining district, Germany. In: Proc. 4th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Vancouver, British Columbia, May 31-June 6, 3, pg 1285-1301.

Johnson, G.; Sperring, P.; Phelan, K. 1995. Co-disposal of tailings and mine waste. Proc. of the Randol Gold Forum, Perth, Western Australia, March 14-17, pg 443-447.

Kerr, T.; Machin, D.; Aiken, S.; Stevens, A.; Potocic, W. 1999. Use of a by-product to mitigate acid mine drainage from an historic mine at Goudreau, Ontario. In: Mining and the Environment Conf. Proc., Sudbury, Ontario, Sept. 13-17, 3, pg 1093-1102.

Kump, D. 2001. Backfill - whatever it takes. Mining Engineering, 53, 1, pg 50-52.

Lamontagne, A.; Fortin, S.; Poulin, R.; Tasse, N.; Lefebvre, R. 2000. Layered co-mingling for the construction of waste rock piles as a method to mitigate acid mine drainage - Laboratory investigations. In: Proc. of the 5th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Denver, CO, May 21-24, 2, pg 779-788.

Landriault, D.A.; Brown, R.E.; Counter, D.B. 2000. Paste backfill study for deep mining at Kidd Creek. CIM Bulletin, 93, 1036, pg 156-161.

Lapakko, K.; Eger, P. 1981. Trace metal removal from mining stockpile runoff using peat, wood chips, tailings, till, and zeolite. Symp. on Surface Mining, Hydrology, Sedimentology, and Reclamation, University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY, Dec. 7-11, pg 105-116.

Lapakko, K.A.; Eger, A.P.; Strudell, J.D. 1986a. Low-cost removal of trace metals from copper-nickel mine stockpile drainage. Vol 1, Laboratory and field investigations. Report to the US Bureau of Mines, Contract J0205047, 103p.

Lapakko, K.A.; Eger, A.P.; Strudell, J.D. 1986b. Low-cost removal of trace metals from copper-nickel mine stockpile drainage. Vol 2, Trace metal sequestration by peat, other organics, tailings, and soils: a literature review. Report to the US Bureau of Mines, Contract J0205047, 45p.

Lapakko, K.; Strudell, J.; Eger, P. 1983. Sulfide stockpile leachate flow through a tailing bed: trace metal removal and flow modeling for a low maintenance treatment system. Symp. on Surface Mining, Hydrology, Sedimentology, and Reclamation, University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY, Nov. 27-Dec. 2, 321-327.

Lapakko, K.; Strudell, J.; Eger, P. 1985. Trace metal removal from copper-nickel mine stockpile drainage. MN DNR, Division of Minerals, Saint Paul, MN, 147 p. plus appendices.

Lefebvre, R.; Gelinas, P. 1995. Numerical modelling of AMD production in waste rock dumps. In: Mining and the Environment Conf. Proc., Sudbury, ON, May 28-June 1, 3, pg 869-878.

Lewis-Russ, A.; Bronson, J.; Lupo, J.F.; Long, B.G. 1997. Control of acid rock drainage by pit backfilling. In: Proc. 4th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Vancouver, British Columbia, May 31-June 6 3, pg 1377-1388.

Lord, E.RF.; Liu, Y. 1998. Depositional and geotechnical characteristics of paste produced from oil sands tailings. In: Proc. 5th Internat. Conf. on Tailings and Mine Waste '98, Fort Collins, CO, USA, Jan. 26-28, A.A. Balkema, Rotterdam, Netherlands, 968 p.

LTV Steel Mining Company. 1996. Dunka Mine: Updated Final Closure Plan, Revision 4, March 15, NPDES/SDS Permit No. MN 0042579, 58 p. plus drawings.

Luppnow, D.J.; Dorman, S.A. 1998. The advantages of paste disposal of tailings in arid environments. In: Proc. 5th Internat. Conf. on Tailings and Mine Waste '98, Fort Collins, CO, USA, Jan. 26-28, A.A. Balkema, Rotterdam, Netherlands, 968 p.

Mehling, P.E.; Day, S.J.; Sexsmith, K.S. 1997. Blending and layering waste rock to delay, mitigate or prevent acid generation: a case study review. In: Proc. 4th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Vancouver, British Columbia, May 31-June 6, 3, pg 951-969.

MN DNR. 1987. Progress report for contract #J0205047 - Joint disposal of tailings and waste rock. MN Dept. Nat. Resour., Division of Minerals, Saint Paul, MN, 23 p.

Morin, K.A.; Hutt, N.M. 2000. Relocation and submergence of net-acid-generating waste rock for control of acidic drainage: a case study. In: Proc. of the 5th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Denver, CO, May 21-24, 2, pg 819-825.

Nichol, C.; Smith, L.; Beckie, R. 2000. Hydrogeologic behavior of unsaturated waste rock: an experimental study. In: Proc. of the 5th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Denver, CO, May 21-24, 1, pg 215-224.

Nicholson, R.V.; Gillham, R.W.; Cherry, J.A.; Reardon, E.J. 1989. Reduction of acid generation in mine tailings through the use of moisture-retaining cover layers as oxygen barriers. Canadian Geotechnical Journal, pg 1-8.

Orava, D.A.; Tremblay, G.A.; Tibble, P.A.; Nicholson, R.V. 1997. Prevention of acid rock drainage through the application of in-pit disposal and elevated water table concepts. In: Proc. 4th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Vancouver, British Columbia, May 31-June 6, 3, pg 973-987.

Ouellet, J.; Benzaazoua, M.; Servant, S. 1998. Mechanical, mineralogical, and chemical characterization of a paste backfill. In: Proc. 5th Internat. Conf. on Tailings and Mine Waste '98, Fort Collins, CO, USA, Jan. 26-28, A.A. Balkema, Rotterdam, Netherlands, 968 p.

Peterson, L.D.; Swanson, D.A.; Atkins, D.A.; Bennett, M.W.; Travers, C.L.; Kempton, J.H. 1998. Sulfide oxidation in pit-backfilled, waste rock facilities. In: Proc. 5th Internat. Conf. on Tailings and Mine Waste '98, Fort Collins, CO, USA, Jan. 26-28, A.A. Balkema, Rotterdam, Netherlands, 968 p.

Poulin, R.; Hadfigeorgiou, J.; Lawrence, R.W. 1996. Layered mine waste co-mingling for mitigation of acid rock drainage. Trans. Inst. Min. Metal., 105, pg A55-A62.

Qiu, Y.; Sego, D.C.; Szymanski, J. 1999. Innovative tailings backfill using HSM. In: Proc. 6th Internat. Conf. on Tailings and Mine Waste '99, Fort Collins, CO, USA, Jan. 24-27, A.A. Balkema, Rotterdam, Netherlands, 808 p.

Scheetz, B.E.; Schantz, C.R. 1999. Utilization of dredge material-based grouts for mineland reclamation. In: Proc. 6th Internat. Conf. on Tailings and Mine Waste '99, Fort Collins, CO, USA, Jan. 24-27, A.A. Balkema, Rotterdam, Netherlands, 808 p.

Scheetz, B.E.; Silsbee, M; Schueck, J. 1998. Acid mine drainage abatement resulting from pressure grouting of buried bituminous mine spoils. In: Proc. 5th Internat. Conf. on Tailings and Mine Waste '98, Fort Collins, CO, USA, Jan. 26-28, A.A. Balkema, Rotterdam, Netherlands, 968 p.

Sellgren, A.; Addie, G. 1998. Effective integrated mine waste handling with slurry pumping. In: Proc. 5th Internat. Conf. on Tailings and Mine Waste '98, Fort Collins, CO, USA, Jan. 26-28, A.A. Balkema, Rotterdam, Netherlands, 968 p.

Sevick, G.W.; Hutchinson, J.B.; Murphy, J. Chapman, J.T. 1998. Engineered open pit mine backfilling. In: Proc. 5th Internat. Conf. on Tailings and Mine Waste '98, Fort Collins, CO, USA, Jan. 26-28, A.A. Balkema, Rotterdam, Netherlands, 968 p.

Skousen, J.; Foreman, J. 2000. Water management techniques for acid mine drainage control. Greenlands, 30, 1, pg 44-52.

Verburg, R.; Atkin, S.; Hansen, B.; McWharter, D. 2000. Subaqueous and subaerial kinetic testing of paste tailings. In: Proc. of the 5th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Denver, CO, May 21-24, 2, pg 877-889.

Walker, J.S. 1993. State-of-the-art Techniques for Backfilling Abandoned Mine Voids. (Information Circular 9359) United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Mines, Pittsburgh, PA. 17 p.

Wickham, M.; Johnson, B.; Johnson, D. 2001. A dynamic systems modeling approach to evaluating backfill designs. SME Annual Meeting, Denver, CO, Feb 26-28, Preprint 01-64.

Williams, D.J. 1997. Effectiveness of co-disposing coal washery wastes. In: Proc. 4th Internat. Conf. on Tailings and Mine Waste '97, Fort Collins, CO, USA, Jan. 13-17, A.A. Balkema, Rotterdam, Netherlands, 788 p.

Wilson, G.W.; Newman, L.L.; Ferguson, K.D. 2000a. The co-disposal of waste rock and tailings. In: Proc. of the 5th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Denver, CO, May 21-24, 2, pg 789-796.

Wilson, J.A.; Wilson, G.W.; Fedlund, D.G. 2000b. Numerical modeling of vertical and inclined waste rock layers. In: Proc. of the 5th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Denver, CO, May 21-24, 1, pg 257-268.

Zou, D.H.S. 1997. An innovative technology for tailings treatment. In: Proc. 4th Internat. Conf. on Tailings and Mine Waste '97, Fort Collins, CO, USA, Jan. 13-17, A.A. Balkema, Rotterdam, Netherlands, 788 p.

4. Physical Isolation of Reactive Mine Wastes

One approach to environmental mine waste management involves construction of a barrier between reactive mine wastes and air (i.e. oxygen), water, or both. This section will review the use of cover systems commonly used to physically isolate reactive mine waste materials. During the literature search for this document, it was discovered that each research group seemed to have developed their own terminology to describe physical isolation of reactive mine wastes. Consequently, it is important to define the terminology that will be used in this document. This section describes three general physical isolation methods. The first is a liner (section 4.1), which is defined as a material placed beneath mine wastes. The remaining two are "dry" and "water" cover systems. The dry cover systems in section 4.2 describe layers of solid-phase materials intentionally placed over mine wastes. In contrast, "water" cover systems (section 4.3) submerge mine waste materials.

4.1. Liners

Although not technically a mitigative strategy, it is important to mention the use of high strength, low permeability liners in environmental mine waste management. Liners have been used in the mining industry for containment and reinforcement purposes for years. For the purposes of this document, a "liner" will be defined as a material placed beneath mine wastes or mitigative system component (e.g. constructed wetland cells are often lined, section 7.1). This is distinct from a "cover" placed over a reactive mine waste (sections 4.2).

The most commonly applied liners are either compacted clay (CCL) or a flexible synthetic membrane (i.e. HDPE or PVC). However, in recent years, geosynthetic clay liners (GCL) have been developed (see section 4.2.1; Miller and Hornaday, 1998). Improved leak protection and lower susceptibility to desiccation and freeze-thaw damage give GCLs a practical advantages over CCL and synthetic liners despite the higher cost.

The need to meet government regulations generally leads to the decision to incorporate a liners into mine waste disposal designs. Frequently, synthetic liners are used to divert water to desired locations (e.g. constructed wetlands). However, they may also be a component in a backup system designed to minimize impacts if the primary mitigative strategy fails. Many of the mine waste strategies described in this document have liners incorporated into their design, although they usually are not mentioned specifically.

4.2. Dry Cover Systems

This section reviews the use of dry cover systems to physically isolate reactive mine wastes from the surrounding environment, and in doing so, preventing the generation of problematic drainages. During the literature search for this document, it was discovered that a consistent terminology used to describe cover systems did not exist. Consequently, it is important to define the term "dry cover system." Section 4.2 describes dry cover systems, in which solid-phase materials are systematically placed on top of reactive mine wastes. This may involve one or more layers of one or more materials (e.g. compacted clay, sand, top soil etc.). Some cover system layers may be designed to retain moisture within pore spaces, however, these are distinct from "water" covers in that the mine wastes are not submerged in water.

4.2.1. Objectives of a Dry Cover System

The amount of acidity and associated trace metals released due to oxidative sulfide dissolution is a function of the amount of water and oxygen present in reactive mine wastes. Furthermore, water is necessary to transport these reaction products from the mine wastes to the environment. The rate of sulfide oxidation can be minimized, by limiting exposure of mine waste materials to water and oxygen (equations 1 and 2). Dry cover systems are designed to achieve one or more of the following objectives: 1) minimize water infiltration into underlying mine wastes, 2) inhibit oxygen diffusion into reactive mine wastes, and 3) consume oxygen within a cover layer over reactive mine wastes. Each cover system will have an effect, to some degree, toward these objectives depending on the physical properties (permeability, grain and pore size, etc.) of the cover materials used.

In reality, there are as many dry cover system designs as there are dry cover applications. However, dry cover system designs generally fall into one of seven categories: soil covers, compacted clay covers, anisotropic barriers, capillary barriers, oxygen consuming barriers, synthetic covers, and self-sealing/self-healing barriers. Three main design components can be used to describe a dry cover system (Figure 2). Frequently, a distinct, support layer is incorporate into a dry cover system design. A barrier layer is then laid out over the support layer. Physical properties of barrier layer materials are utilized to inhibit water infiltration and/or oxygen diffusion. Certain materials (e.g. organic matter) may be used to consume oxygen within the barrier layer. Usually a protection layer is laid out over the barrier layer. Protection layers increase lateral drainage of surface runoff, minimize erosion, protect against damage caused by freeze-thaw cycles, and prevent biointrusion of the barrier layer. Frequently, an additional layer of topsoil is added as a support for vegetation, which increases evapotranspiration further reducing water infiltration into the underlying mine wastes. Each of the six dry cover system designs will be described in terms of the support layer, a barrier layer, and any protection layers increase incorporated into the design.

DRY COVER SYSTEMS



Figure 2. Schematic of a generalized dry cover system design for acid producing mine waste material.

4.2.2. Dry Cover System Designs

The simplest and least expensive dry cover system to install is a **basic soil cover** (Figure 3). This cover design does not necessarily involve a support layer. Instead, a barrier layer of soil is deposited directly over the mine waste. The thickness of the soil layer depends upon the type of mine waste and site-specific requirements. While this design will reduce infiltration to the underlying mine waste, it will not eliminate it unless used in an arid climate. However, compaction of the soil barrier layer will further reduce infiltration. A protective layer of loose topsoil is often used with conventional soil covers. This layer supports vegetation as well as protects against erosion.

Compacted clay cover designs are similar to conventional soil covers. The main difference is that clay (e.g. bentonite) is mixed into the soil used for the barrier layer (Figure 3). The addition of clay to the barrier layer increases the cost and the complexity of this cover design. However, the higher clay content and compaction serve to minimize the hydraulic conductivity of the barrier layer, and consequently, limit downward movement of water to the underlying mine waste. Occasionally, a drainage layer of a relatively coarse grained material (e.g. sand) will be installed directly over the barrier layer. The drainage layer helps minimize infiltration into the barrier layer by enhancing lateral drainage away from the mine waste. Finally, a protection layer of loose soil is used to support vegetation and to prevent damage to the barrier layer caused by erosion or freeze-thaw cycles.

Anisotropic barriers utilize layers of capillary breaks to minimize vertical movement of water while maximizing horizontal drainage. Different physical properties and compaction techniques are used to maximize lateral drainage away from underlying mine wastes. One example of an anisotropic barrier consisted of four layers (Figure 3). A coarse-grained support layer of gravel is used to create a capillary break beneath an interface of fine sand. The fine sand interface increases lateral drainage of any water that percolated through the barrier layer. Native soils are typically used for the barrier layer which is designed to store water for subsequent evapotranspiration. The barrier layer is overlain by a soil and gravel protection layer which encourages evapotranspiration as well as protecting underlying layers and allowing vegetation growth.

Capillary barrier designs contrast hydraulic properties of cover materials to minimize downward migration of water by creating a capillary break between layers. The capillary break is achieved by placing a fine-grained (i.e. barrier) layer between two coarse-grained layers (i.e. support and protection layers; Figure 3). The capillary barrier itself consists of the support layer and the barrier layer. Coarse sand or gravel is typically used for the support layer. The support layer also has the added benefit of enhancing lateral drainage of any water that infiltrates the barrier layer. Fine sand, soil, clay, and inert tailings have been used as barrier layers in capillary barrier covers. The lower hydraulic conductivity of these materials relative to that of the support layer enhances moisture retention and inhibits oxygen diffusion across the capillary break. A protection layer of sand or gravel overlies the capillary barrier to encourage lateral drainage.

Once again, topsoil is usually used as the surface layer to support vegetation and minimize damage to the underlying active layers.

Oxygen consuming barriers utilize organic material as a barrier to oxygen diffusion into underlying mine wastes. If adequate organic material is present, the rate of oxygen consumption will exceed the rate of oxygen diffusion through the barrier layer, preventing oxygen from reacting with the underlying reactive wastes. The relatively low hydraulic conductivity of most organic materials coupled with increased compaction of the barrier layer as organic materials oxidize often results in the additional benefit of reduced infiltration of water to underlying wastes. Organic barrier layers are often applied as a single layer, simplifying the construction of the design (Figure 3). Furthermore, organic materials are usually locally available, reducing the cost of this cover design.

Impermeable cover systems can also be constructed of **synthetic materials** such as plastic. Oftentimes, synthetic cover materials provide a simple alternative to natural soil materials. Synthetic cover materials have also been incorporated into other cover system designs to maximize their effectiveness. A number of plastic (geosynthetic) materials are commercially available, most of which consist of flexible polymeric membranes (e.g. PVC or HDPE) that act as a barrier to water infiltration. Another option is a geosynthetic clay liners (GCLs), where sodium bentonite clay is encapsulated between two layers of geotextiles (Stewart and von Maubeuge, 1997; Miller and Hornaday, 1998).

Geosynthetic membrane installation is simple and can be accomplished year round. Installation merely involves unrolling the geosynthetic membrane out over the mine waste. Since they are relatively light weight, thin, and do not require compaction, geosynthetic membranes are relatively inexpensive to install. Geosynthetic membranes are extremely durable and resistant

to leaching, however, they are also thin and susceptible to damage (i.e. tears, leaks along seams, photodegradation), particularly during installation. Geosynthetic membranes and GCLs perform well under extreme conditions such as freeze-thaw cycles and dessication, but because they tend to deteriorate when exposed to sunlight, they are commonly covered with one or more protective layers of soil. A common configuration involves a geosynthetic membrane overlain by a drainage layer (e.g. sand) and a topsoil protective layer, although geosynthetic membranes have been used in combination with numerous natural cover materials (Figure 3).

Impermeable hardpan barriers represent a recent development in dry cover system design. This basic concept behind this cover system is that two parent materials, when placed in layers one on top of the other, will chemically react to form insoluble precipitates at the interface between the parent materials (Figure 3). Proposed parent materials include, but are not limited to, magnesium carbonate and high-calcium hydrated lime. The insoluble precipitates result in an impermeable seal that prevents migration of water and dissolved contaminants (i.e. self-sealing). The primary benefit of this type of cover system over the other options is that if the barrier is damaged, surrounding parent materials will react, self-healing the breach.

DRY COVER SYSTEM DESIGNS

Soil Cover



Oxygen Consuming Barrier

Compacted Clay Cover



Anisotropic Barrier



Figure 3. Dry cover designs generally fall into one of seven categories, each of which is designed to minimize water infiltration and/or oxygen diffusion into the mine waste.

4.2.3 Assessment of Dry Cover System Designs

4.2.3.1. Variables Affecting Dry Cover System Design

The primary issue concerns the type of materials to be used in the dry cover system. Cover requirements are almost always site-specific, depending on variables such as the physical, chemical and mineralogical properties of the wastes, climatic conditions, local regulations, and availability of cover materials. Consequently, a cover system implemented at one mine site may not meet the objectives intended for similar reactive wastes at another site. The choice of cover materials is often based upon numerous variables including costs, ease of construction, and overall effectiveness.

4.2.3.2. Predictive Modeling of Dry Cover System Design

How well a proposed dry cover system will perform is usually tested using predictive modeling, and occasionally, laboratory column studies. Predictive models are frequently used to predict the long-term effectiveness of a cover system, since long-term performance of a specific cover system cannot be determined prior to installation. Predictive models are typically used to meet one of the following objectives: determine ground water flow through a mine waste mass as well as over or around it, estimate surface water and precipitation infiltration through the cover system, and predict the water quality of drainage from the covered mine wastes. The use of models in this way is an inexpensive method to evaluate multiple cover systems and their long-term impacts on local surface and ground water quality in a very short amount of time.

4.2.3.3. Materials Testing

Laboratory tests are typically used to determine the hydraulic and geotechnical properties of particular dry cover materials under consideration as well as how layers of multiple cover materials may interact to reduce infiltration and oxygen diffusion to the underlying waste. Hydraulic conductivity and porosity are the most frequently determined properties. However, D_{10} , specific gravity, plasticity index, and numerous other parameters have been determined as well. Occasionally, the same parameters will be determined for the mine waste, particularly if the mine waste is tailings rather than waste rock. The most thorough studies also determined the physical, chemical, and mineralogical properties of potential cover materials and/or the mine waste.

4.2.3.4. Effectiveness of a Dry Cover System Design

The effectiveness of a cover system is typically measured in terms of oxygen concentrations and water content profiles throughout and beneath the cover. Column experiments are designed with instrumentation to measure temperature and pressure changes, water content and oxygen concentrations at regular intervals in the column. Since sulfide oxidation is an exothermic reaction, temperature measurements provide a qualitative indication of the extent to which oxidation had occurred in the mine waste. Pressure changes were measured using tensiometers

connected to pressure transducers, while moisture content was measured by Time Domain Reflectometry (TDR) electrodes. Oxygen sensors placed at regular intervals down the length of the column measured oxygen concentrations at various depths. These were used to construct oxygen profiles and gradients ($\delta C/\delta z$), which in conjunction with the effective diffusion coefficient (D_e), were used to determine the oxygen flux for the cover system.

4.2.4. Cost Analysis of Dry Cover Systems

In general, the expense associated with each type of cover system increases as the cover system becomes more complex (Table 7). If cover materials require compaction or other special treatment, construction costs increase. However, using locally available cover materials such as glacial till or non-reactive mine wastes can substantially decrease costs.

Table 7.Summary of cover construction costs by type of cover. The estimated price
range generally increases as the complexity of the cover system increases.

Type of Cover System	Estimated Price Range (US\$/hectare ¹)		
single layer of clay or clayey till	\$9 - 62 k ²		
GCL	\$17 k		
single layer of soil	\$ 15 - 25 k ²		
PVC	\$36 - 60 k ³		
capillary barrier (non-reactive mine wastes)	\$59-70 k		
capillary barrier (general)	\$50 - 300 k		

¹No attempt was made to adjust for inflation or fluctuating exchange rates. ²The higher end of this range includes compaction costs.

³Range varies depending on the required thickness.

4.2.5. Potential for the Use of Dry Cover Systems for Reactive Mine Wastes in Minnesota

4.2.5.1. Dry Cover Systems Used in Minnesota

Dry cover systems have been shown to limit water infiltration into reactive mine wastes in Minnesota. Simple soil and synthetic cover materials were applied to stockpiled reactive mine wastes at LTV Steel Mining Company's Dunka Mine near Babbitt, Minnesota (Eger and Lapakko, 1985; Udoh, 1993). These systems were designed to minimize the amount of drainage from the stockpiles rather than prevent drainage acidification.

Six test stockpiles containing 820 to 1300 metric tons of sulfidic mine waste material were constructed in 1977 at the AMAX/Kennecott site (Eger and Lapakko, 1985). Three of the stockpiles remained exposed to the atmosphere as controls, and the other three were covered with 18-29 cm of soil obtained from a nearby borrow pit in 1978. Stockpile 2 was covered with topsoil, while piles 3 and 5 were covered with a coarse, sandy soil. However, 30 cm of sandy till was added to the coarse sand on pile 5 in 1980. Revegetation efforts began immediately in 1978. There was no flow reduction by the vegetated coarse sand cover (pile 3). The vegetated covers of topsoil (pile 2) and combined sandy till over coarse sand (pile 5) both produced runoff coefficients 30 to 50% less than the control values.

Three different soil cover systems and one synthetic cover were evaluated for their effectiveness at stemming infiltration into sulfidic mine wastes at the Dunka site (Udoh, 1993). The cover materials under consideration were glacial tills screened to minus 2.5 inches and 0.5 inches, glacial till screened to minus 2.5 inches mixed with 5% bentonite, and a 20-mil PVC membrane. Laboratory tests indicated that the permeability of these materials ranged from 1.55×10^{-6} cm/s (49 cm/yr) for the glacial till down to 4.12×10^{-9} cm/s (0.13 cm/yr) for glacial till mixed with 5% bentonite, meeting the set standard of 2 x 10^{-6} cm/s (63 cm/yr). These results were similar to Hydrologic Evaluation of Landfill Performance (HELP) model simulations that predicted permeabilities ranging from 2.1 x 10^{-6} cm/s (66 cm/yr) for minus 2.5 inches of glacial till down to 5.2×10^{-10} cm/s (0.02 cm/yr) for glacial till mixed with 5% bentonite. The model simulations also indicated that the major water loss would be to evapotranspiration. Infiltration was predicted to be reduced by 34% for glacial till cover, and could be decreased by up to 80% if the cover materials were compacted. Actual field test results showed that infiltration was reduced by 60%, 88%, 89%, and 97% for glacial till screened to minus 2.5 inches, till screened to minus 0.5 inches, till screened to minus 2.5 inches mixed with 5% bentonite, and the PVC membrane, respectively.

4.2.5.2. Potential for Capillary Barriers

Cover systems designed to retain moisture within their layers (e.g. capillary barriers), appear to be well-suited to the climate in northern Minnesota, where most reactive mine wastes are found. Northern Minnesota receives approximately twenty eight inches of precipitation each year, two thirds of which falls between May and September (MN DNR, 2000). This amount of rainfall

should be sufficient to maintain a moisture-retaining layer within a capillary barrier. Moistureretaining layers not only divert infiltration, but also inhibit oxygen transport to the underlying waste. These characteristics help minimize the extent of drainage acidification. Laboratory and field scale studies world-wide have demonstrated the effectiveness of capillary barriers under similar climatic conditions.

There are several potential drawbacks to capillary barrier cover systems. First, most operational demonstrations of capillary barriers have been on tailings within a basin, where side slopes were not an issue. Methods to cover side slopes without additional expense must be developed before extensive use of capillary barriers on stockpiles is feasible. In practice, capillary barriers may be better suited for tailings within a basin or covering waste material disposed of in an open pit rather than large stockpiles.

Second, the cost of constructing a capillary barrier cover system may be prohibitive. Since several layers of different cover materials must be purchased, transported, and put in place, capillary barriers are generally more expensive to construct than simple cover systems. In practice, costs are minimized by using locally available materials. For example, local glacial till is frequently used to construct capillary barriers. However, similar materials are not readily available in northern Minnesota, the third potential drawback. Local alternative materials are likely to include low or desulfurized tailings. One particularly attractive alternative is taconite tailings, which generally contain very little sulfur and several percent carbonate minerals. It is important to note however, that the availability of taconite tailings or any other alternative material will be highly site specific.

4.2.5.3. Potential for Organic Cover Systems

Oxygen-consuming organic covers also show potential for preventing acidic drainage from reactive mine wastes in Minnesota. However, several questions must be addressed before organic cover systems can be used extensively. Two methods of applying organic material to reactive mine wastes have been described in the literature. The first method involves the application of successive layers of organic material over reactive wastes throughout the life of the disposal operation. Ultimately, this practice results in layering and/or blending of organic and mine waste materials. The second method assumes that operations have ceased and that the organic material represents the final cover. At this time, it is not entirely clear which of these methods would be best suited for Minnesota mine wastes.

Numerous organic materials have been tested in laboratory and field cover system demonstrations conducted world-wide. Listed among these materials are forestry wastes, peat, paper residue, and various municipal wastes. Based on demonstrated results reported in the literature and local availability, paper recycling residues, and possibly municipal wastes, appear to be the most promising organic cover materials in northern Minnesota. Both of these options are also attractive in that they use one waste material to contain another.

Unfortunately, both paper recycling residues and municipal wastes contain metals, nutrients, and bioorganic contaminants. As these materials oxidize and break down, these contaminants could be released into surface and ground water, presenting additional environmental toxicity issues. In order to avoid trading one environmental problem for another, laboratory and field leaching tests of any potential organic cover material should be conducted.

4.3. Water Cover Systems

This section reviews the use of water cover systems to physically isolate reactive mine wastes from the surrounding environment, and in doing so, preventing the generation of problematic drainages. During the literature search for this document, it was discovered that a consistent terminology used to describe cover systems did not exist. Consequently, it is important to define the term "water cover system." Section 4.3 describes water cover systems, in which water is used to submerge reactive mine wastes. This is distinct from "dry" cover systems which utilize solid-phase materials to cover mine wastes.

4.3.1. Principles of Water Cover Systems

As stated previously, the rate of sulfide oxidation can be minimized, by limiting exposure of mine waste materials to water and/or oxygen (equations 1 and 2). Water cover systems are designed to chemically isolate reactive mine wastes by inhibiting oxygen diffusion through a water column (i.e. in a pit or lake) or through interstitial pore spaces (i.e. in a tailings basin). This is due to the marginal solubility of oxygen in water. Dissolved oxygen concentrations are approximately 8.6 mg/L at 25EC, whereas oxygen concentrations in air are 285 mg/L (21%) at 25EC (Table 8). Furthermore, the oxygen diffusion coefficient is four orders of magnitude slower in water than in air (Table 8). As a result, the oxygen flux into a waste material at the sediment interface decreases by a factor of at least 3100 compared to air (Dave, 1992).

Parameter	Air	Water	Air:Water
concentration (mg/L)	285	8.6	33
molecular diffusion coefficient, $D_0 (m^2/s)$	1.78 x 10 ⁻⁵	2 x 10 ⁻⁹	8900
effective diffusion coefficient, D _e (m ² /s)	1.43 x 10 ⁻⁶	1.6 x 10 ⁻¹⁰	8900
flux at the interface (g m ² /s)	3.5 x 10 ⁻⁴	1.1 x 10 ⁻⁷	3100

Table 8.Oxygen solubility/concentration and diffusion coefficient in air and water at
25EC (adapted from Dave, 1992).

In a theoretical, ideal situation, sulfide oxidation rates can be slowed by placing reactive wastes beneath a water cover. Although it is unlikely that sulfide oxidation rates would decrease to such an extreme extent at an operational scale, the amount of alkalinity required to neutralize any acid produced due to sulfide oxidation will be lower beneath a water cover than in air. Depending on specific conditions on site, the required alkalinity may be supplied by neutralizing minerals in the waste itself, surrounding rocks, or surface and/or ground water inputs to the system. The presence of organic materials (e.g. dissolved organic matter, algae, etc.) is also beneficial in that they may further limit the rate of sulfide oxidation by consuming dissolved oxygen.

4.3.2. Water Cover System Designs

There are two general types of water cover systems: underwater disposal and elevated water tables. **Underwater disposal** assumes a permanent water cover above the waste material. Simple underwater disposal consists of depositing reactive mine wastes at the bottom of an existing pit or natural lake. If the pit or lake is deep enough, the water column may become chemically and/or thermally stratified, resulting in a deep layer of anaerobic water above the waste. This stratification further isolates waste materials from oxygen.

In some situations, it may be beneficial to place a surface barrier layer of fine-grained, nonreactive material (clay, sand, soil, till etc.) above the submerged reactive waste. The surface barrier layer further inhibits diffusion of oxygen to and may reduce metal release from reactive wastes. Alternatively, organic materials may be used as a surface barrier layer, which promotes sulfate reduction and metal sulfide precipitation.

If ground water outflow from the system is a concern, a ground water barrier layer can be placed below the reactive waste material. Ground water barriers either block ground water flow (e.g. clay liners), create preferential low resistance flow paths for ground water (e.g. porous envelopes), or remediate outflow prior to entering ground water (e.g. reactive walls or anoxic limestone drains). In some situations, surface and ground water barriers may be used to isolate reactive wastes under water.

Elevated water tables involve raising the water table to saturate reactive wastes placed in a pit or tailings basin. In this situation, a ground water gradient often exists. Consequently, infiltrating precipitation and ground water can be expected to flow through the reactive waste as directed by the gradient. Additional surface and ground water barriers can be incorporated into an elevated water table design. Generally speaking, these options are the same as described for the case of simple underwater disposal. However, surface barriers designed to reduce infiltration of precipitation may also be considered.

4.3.3. Assessment of Water Cover Systems

4.3.3.1. Variables Affecting the Design of a Water Cover System

Many of the variables affecting water cover design, such as the physical, chemical and mineralogical properties of the wastes, climatic conditions, local regulations, and economics, are identical to those that must be considered when constructing a dry cover. However, water cover designs must also take into account local hydrology, pit, lake, or tailings pond dimensions and orientation, storage volume requirements, minimum water depth for bed stability, and structural engineering requirements (Table 9). Each of these variables is site-specific. Consequently, a water cover system designed for one location will not be suitable for any other.

4.3.3.2. Modeling Water Cover Systems

Frequently, a water cover system will be tested for potential success under several different sets of conditions using hydrologic and/or geochemical predictive models. Predictive models are frequently used to predict the long-term effectiveness of a water cover, since this cannot be determined prior to implementation. Predictive hydrologic models are typically used to establish steady-state flow into or out of the system and future water levels (e.g. in an open pit after closure). Predictive geochemical models are used to determine oxygen transport through the cover, sulfide oxidation rates, metal release, and geochemical equilibria in the water column. The use of models in this way is an inexpensive method to evaluate multiple scenarios (e.g. diversion of surface water to or from a water cover) and their long-term impacts on local surface and ground water quality in a very short amount of time.

4.3.3.3. Effectiveness of a Water Cover System

The effectiveness of a water cover system is typically measured in terms of water chemistry and trace metal release into pore waters, the overlying water layer, and surface and ground water outflow from the system (if applicable). The ultimate water quality overlying a reactive waste will ultimately depend upon sediment transport and wave effects, oxygen flux at the water-waste interface, the nature of waste-water interaction, rate of sulfide oxidation, diffusion of reaction products into the water cover, and dilution or evaporation due to climatic conditions. Each of these factors can be estimated using relatively simple numeric models, laboratory experiments, and field observations. Laboratory experiments are generally designed to determine the physical and/or chemical interactions between reactive wastes and the water cover. They have also been used to test the effectiveness of various barrier layers (e.g. sand, peat, etc.) at reducing oxidation in reactive wastes placed beneath a water cover. These results are often used as input for predictive models (see previous section). Field lysimeter studies are conducted to verify laboratory studies and to demonstrate the effectiveness of these methods under environmental conditions.

Factor		Tailings Basin	Open Pit	Underground Mine	Natural Lake
D' 1 ' 1	aquatic resources	U	U	U	U
Biological	biota inventory				U
Economic	cost estimate	U	U	U	U
	dam safety	U			
Engineering	extreme climate events (drought, earthquake, flood)	U	U	U	U
	structural integrity	U		U	
	ground water chemistry	U	U	U	U
	pore water chemistry	U	U	U	U
	surface water chemistry	U	U		U
	waste chemistry	U	U	U	U
Geochemical	waste mineralogy	U	U	U	U
	waste particle density	U		U	U
	waste particle size	U		U	U
	waste type (fresh or oxidized)	U	U	U	U
	climate	U	U		U
Hydrologic	local topography	U	U		U
	water balances	U	U	U	U
	bathymetry		U		U
Physical	discharge rate	U	U	U	U
	minimum water depth	U	U		U
	orientation	U	U		U
	storage volume	U	U	U	U
	surface dimensions	U	U		U
	wave action	U			U

Table 9.A wide array of factors should be assessed prior to disposing of reactive waste
rock beneath a water cover.

4.3.4. Cost Analysis of Water Cover Systems

The expense associated with a water cover system increases as the cover system becomes more complex. Construction costs may become an issue if a bottom rock drain or dams must be included in the disposal design. Maintaining dams around flooded tailings basins will also increase long-term costs. Even relatively simple disposal of waste materials in an open pit or lake involves transportation of the material to the disposal site. Due to the wide range of water cover system options and site-specific variables, the actual expense of a water cover system must be evaluated in terms of the needs and requirements of individual operations.

4.3.5. Water Cover Studies and Potential Use in Minnesota

4.3.5.1. MN DNR Subaqueous Disposal Studies

Water cover systems represent another promising method for preventing acidic drainage from reactive mine wastes in Minnesota. The MN DNR, Division of Lands and Minerals has conducted five laboratory experiments and one field experiment to examine the effectiveness of subaqueous disposal and subaqueous disposal with various barrier layers for controlling the oxidation of sulfide minerals present in mine wastes (Lapakko et al., 1998a):

1. Subaqueous disposal tests in the absence of oxygen consuming layers or oxygen diffusion barriers were initially conducted in 2-L Erlenmeyer flasks;

2. Subsequent tests were conducted in 2-in.-diameter columns to describe the release of sulfate as a function of sulfidic mine waste depth for two different mine waste particle sizes;

3. In a second phase of the Erlenmeyer flask experiment (#1), composted yard waste was added to some of these flasks to determine if organic amendments would further inhibit oxidation;

4. Composted yard waste and fresh rock, as well as controls for compost and rock, were subjected to subaqueous dissolution in the laboratory;

5. A column experiment was conducted to determine the effectiveness of taconite tailings, yard waste compost/tailings mixtures, and limestone layers as potential oxygen diffusion barriers above sulfidic mine wastes; and

6. Barriers of tailings, a yard waste compost/tailings mixture, and limestone are presently under examination in small-scale field tests.

Subaqueous disposal tests in the absence of oxygen consuming layers or oxygen diffusion barriers were initially conducted in flasks (#1 above) using Virginia Formation hornfels rock containing 14% pyrrhotite and in columns (#2 above) using sulfidic Duluth Complex rock (Lapakko et al., 1998). These two experiments revealed that separating sulfidic mine waste from the atmosphere with a layer of water would reduce the rate of oxidation of sulfide minerals present. However, oxidation would continue and possibly produce acidic waters.

Modified subaqueous disposal experiments with barrier layers were conducted in flasks (#3 above), beakers (#4 above), and columns (#5 above; Lapakko et al., 1998a). Composted yard waste was used as an oxygen consuming layer between sulfidic rock and the overlying water in the flask and beaker tests. Tailings, tailings/yard waste compost mixtures, and limestone were used as barrier layers in the column tests. In general, the inorganic barrier layers were more effective at decreasing sulfide oxidation rates than the compost barriers (MN DNR Hibbing laboratory, unpublished data). However, it was noted that experimentally determined rates of acid production averaged roughly 500% higher than theoretical values based on oxygen diffusion through a water column. This is a considerable difference, and should be considered a result of the weekly addition of fresh, oxygen saturated water. The amount of water removed for sampling and replaced with new water was nearly 5% of the entire column water volume for each sample. Therefore, the rates of acid production due to pyrrhotite oxidation in this experiment are not controlled by the rate of oxygen diffusion, but by the addition of oxygenated water to the rock bed.

A field test (#6 above) examining the effectiveness of limestone, tailings and a tailings compost mixture above sulfidic rock in a subaqueous environment is presently in progress at the MN DNR Research Site in Hibbing, MN (Lapakko et al., 1998a). The subaqueous tests are being conducted in large cylindrical tanks (d = 46-in., h = 11-ft.), fitted with a 30-mil PVC liner. The tanks were filled to a depth of 48 inches with minus 3/4 inch Duluth Complex rock with sulfur contents ranging from 0.63 % to 0.69 %. Initial calculations have yielded negative acid production rates (MN DNR Hibbing laboratory, unpublished data). The most likely explanation for this is that the amount of sulfate released due to sulfide oxidation is very small relative to sulfate concentrations already present in the water cover, and therefore, cannot be measured accurately.

4.3.5.2. MN DNR Study to Create Wetlands on Reactive Tailings

In addition to subaqueous disposal, the MN DNR, Division of Lands and Minerals has been investigating various strategies to create wetlands on acid and non-acid generating tailings (Eger et al., 2000a,b). This discussion will focus on small-scale field studies conducted on acid-generating tailings at the MN DNR field research facility in Hibbing, MN (Eger et al., 2000a). Acid-generating tailings from a massive zinc sulfide deposit in Winston Lake, Ontario, were placed in small cylindrical tanks. Two uncovered controls were established in addition to five treatments: 61-cm cover of wetland soil, 61-cm of glacial till, 61-cm of tailings, and two tanks with 71-cm of water. One of the water covers included the aquatic macrophytes: *Elodea canadensis, Potamegeton sp.*, and *Ceratophyllum demersum*. Cattails (*Typha sp.*) were planted in the tanks with substrate cover. Overall, the wetlands created over acid generating tailings were effective at preventing acid conditions (pH = 6.0-6.5) and minimizing metal release (Zn = 0.02 - 0.1 mg/L) relative to the "on-land" controls (pH = 3.1-3.2; Zn = 6400-7400 mg/L; Eger et al., 2000a). The authors suggested that successful creation of wetlands in large tailings basins would require a 60-cm soil cover along the shoreline and establishment of submergent vegetation in the deeper water areas.

4.3.5.3. Potential Use of Water Covers in Minnesota

In summary, both of these strategies show promise as mitigative strategies for reactive mine wastes in Minnesota. Subaqueous disposal in abandoned open mine pits represents one alternative for water covers. Decades of iron mining in northern Minnesota has left a large number of abandoned open mine pits across the Mesabi and Cuyuna Iron Ranges. One option may be to backfill reactive mine wastes into selected pit lakes. The advantage of this alternative is that these pits lie below local ground water tables and fill with surface and ground water naturally.

However, backfilling open pit lakes with reactive mine waste should be approached cautiously. As open pits fill with water, local ground water gradients can reverse, resulting in ground water outflow into local aquifers. Any contamination of water within the pit due to oxidation of reactive mine waste will be carried into the aquifer, potentially resulting in contamination. This would be particularly disadvantageous, since a large number of communities in northern Minnesota draw drinking water from these aquifers. Consequently, any plan to dispose of reactive mine wastes within an existing open pit should involve extensive geochemical and hydrologic characterization as well as ground water monitoring to ensure that local water supplies are protected.

Elevating the local water table and establishing wetlands on reactive tailings represent a second alternative water cover system. Wetlands have several advantages including the creation of an anoxic zone above reactive wastes, accumulation of decaying organic matter provides additional substrate to improve growth, and fits with reclamation goals aimed at restoring wetlands in mining areas.

4.4. References on Physical Isolation of Reactive Mine Wastes

Ahmed, S.M. 1994. Surface chemical methods of forming hardpan in pyrrhotite tailings and prevention of the acid mine drainage. In: Internat. Land Reclamation and Mine Drainage Conf. and 3rd Internat. Conf. on the Abatement of Acidic Drainage, Pittsburgh, PA, April 24-29, 2, pg 57-66

Ahmed, S.M. 1995. Chemistry of pyrrhotite hardpan formation. In: Mining and the Environment Conf. Proc., Sudbury, ON, May 28-June 1, 1, pg 171-180.

Aubertin, M., Bussiere, B., Barbera, J.M., Chapuis, R.P., Monzon, M., Aachib, M. 1997a. Construction and instrumentation of in-situ test plots to evaluate covers built with clean tailings. In: Proc. 4th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Vancouver, British Columbia, May 31-June 6, 2, pg 715-730.

Aubertin, M., Chapuis, R.P., Bouchentouf, A., Bussiere, B. 1997b. Unsaturated flow modeling of inclined layers for the analysis of covers. In: Proc. 4th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Vancouver, British Columbia, May 31-June 6, 2, pg 731-746.

Aziz, M.L.; Ferguson, K.D., 1997. Equity silver mine- integrated case study. In: Proc. 4th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Vancouver, British Columbia, May 31-June 6, 1, pg 181-196.

Bell, A.V., Riley, M.D., Yanful, E.K. 1994. Evaluation of a composite soil cover to control acid waste rock pile drainage. In: Internat. Land Reclamation and Mine Drainage Conf. and 3rd Internat. Conf. on the Abatement of Acidic Drainage, Pittsburgh, PA, April 24-29, 2, pg 113-121.

Benzaazoua, M., Bussiere, B., Nicholson, R.V., Bernier, L. 1998. Geochemical behavior of a multi-layered cover composed of desulfurized mine tailings. In: Proc. 5th Internat. Conf. on Tailings and Mine Waste '98, Fort Collins, CO, USA, Jan. 26-28, A.A. Balkema, Rotterdam, Netherlands, 968 p.

Boorman, R.S.; Watson, D.M. 1976. Chemical processes in abandoned sulphide tailings dumps and environmental implications for northeastern New Brunswick. CIM Bulletin, August, pg 86-96.

Brennecke, D.F.; Corser, P.G. 1998. Performance issues related to geosynthetic liners at Monticello, Utah. In: Proc. 5th Internat. Conf. on Tailings and Mine Waste '98, Fort Collins, CO, USA, Jan. 26-28, A.A. Balkema, Rotterdam, Netherlands, 968 p.

Brown, R. 1989. Water management at Brenda Mines. In Proc. of the Thirteenth Annual British Columbia Mine Reclamation Symposium, Vernon, British Columbia, June 7-9,1989, pg 8-17.

Bussiere, B., Nicholson, R.V., Aubertin, M., Servant, S. 1997. Effectiveness of covers built with desulfurized tailings: column tests investigation. In: Proc. 4th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Vancouver, British Columbia, May 31-June 6, 2, pg 763-778.

Cabral, A.; Burnotte, F.; Lefebvre, G.; Amyot, G.; Lacassa, G. 1999. Design construction and monitoring of a waste rock cover using pulp and paper residues. In: Proc. 6th Internat. Conf. on Tailings and Mine Waste '99, Fort Collins, CO, USA, Jan. 24-27, A.A. Balkema, Rotterdam, Netherlands, 808 p.

Cabral, A.; Lefebvre, G.; Burnotte, F.; Proulx, M.F.; Racine, I.; Audet, C. 1998. Developments in the use of deinking residues in cover systems for mine tailings. In: Proc. 5th Internat. Conf. on Tailings and Mine Waste '98, Fort Collins, CO, USA, Jan. 26-28, A.A. Balkema, Rotterdam, Netherlands, 968 p.

Cabral, A.; Lefebvre, G.; Proulx, M.F.; Audet, C.; Labbe, M.; Michaud, C. 1997. Use of deinking residues as cover material in the prevention of AMD generation at an abandoned mine site. In: Proc. 4th Internat. Conf. on Tailings and Mine Waste '97, Fort Collins, CO, USA, Jan. 13-17, A.A. Balkema, Rotterdam, Netherlands, 788 p.

Catalan, L.J.J.; Yanful, E.K.; Boucher, J.F.; Shelp, M.L. 2000. A field investigation of tailings resuspension in a shallow water cover. In: Proc. of the 5th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Denver, CO, May 21-24, 2, pg 921-931.

Chermak, J.A.; Runnells, D.D. 1997. Development of chemical caps in acid rock drainage environments. Mining Engineering, pg 96-97.

Chtaini, A.; Bellaloui, A; Ballivy, G.; Narasiah, S.; Lalancette, J.; Bilodeau, C. 1997. A study of acid mine drainage control by addition of a alkaline mill paper waste. In: Proc. 4th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Vancouver, British Columbia, May 31-June 6, 3, pg 1145-1162.

Crusius, J.; Dunbar, D.; McNee, J.J. 2001. Predictions of pit lake water column properties using a coupled mixing and geochemical speciation model. SME Annual Meeting, Denver, CO, Feb 26-28, Preprint 01-165.

Dave, N.K., 1992. Water cover on acid generating mine/mill wastes: A technical review. CANMET, Project # 30.14.99, 118 p.

Day, S.; Flemming, A.; Demchuk, J. 2000. Waste management planning at the Telkwa Coal Project, Telkwa, British Columbia. In: Proc. of the 5th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Denver, CO, May 21-24, 2, pg 769-777.

Delaney, T.; Hockley, D.; Sollner, D. 1997. Applications of methods for delaying the onset of acidic drainage. In: Proc. 4th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Vancouver, British Columbia, May 31-June 6, 2, pg 795-810.

De Vos, K.; Barone, F.; Hall, G.; Blowes, D. 2000. Management of water quality in a flooded tailings impoundment. In: Proc. of the 5th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Denver, CO, May 21-24, 2, pg 933-942.

Eger, P; Antonson, D.; Folman, J.; Wagner, J. Melchert, G. 2000a. Creating wetlands on acidgenerating tailings; an alternative to encapsulation. MN Dept. Nat. Resour., Div. of Lands and Minerals, St. Paul, MN. 33 p. plus appendices.

Eger, P; Johnson, A.; Melchert, G.; Antonson, D.; Dewar, S. 2000b. The use of dredge material as an organic substrate to create wetlands in taconite tailings basins. MN Dept. Nat. Resour., Div. of Lands and Minerals, St. Paul, MN. 54 p. plus appendices.

Eger, A.P., Lapakko, K.A. 1985. Heavy metals study progress report on the field leaching and reclamation program: 1977-1983. MN Dept. Nat. Resour., Div. of Minerals, St. Paul, MN. 53 p. plus appendices.

Elliott, L.C.M., Liu, L., Stogran, S.W. 1997a. Organic cover materials for tailings: do they meet the requirements of an effective long term cover? In: Proc. 4th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Vancouver, British Columbia, May 31-June 6, 2, pg 811-824.

Elliott, L.C.M., Liu, L., Stogran, S.W. 1997b. Evaluation of single layer organic and inorganic cover materials for oxidized tailings. In: Proc. 4th Internat. Conf. on Tailings and Mine Waste '97, Fort Collins, CO, USA, Jan. 13-17, A.A. Balkema, Rotterdam, Netherlands, 788 p.

Ettner, D.C.; Brasstad, G. 1999. Induced hardpan formation in a historic tailings impoundment, Roros, Norway. In: Proc. 6th Internat. Conf. on Tailings and Mine Waste '99, Fort Collins, CO, USA, Jan. 24-27, A.A. Balkema, Rotterdam, Netherlands, 808 p.

Ganguli, R.; Wilson, T.E.; Bandopadhyay, S. 2001. STADES: an expert system for marine disposal of mine tailings. SME Annual Meeting, Denver, CO, Feb 26-28, Preprint 01-11.

Gardiner, R.T., Dawson, B.B., Gibson, G.G. 1997. Application of ard abatement technology in reclamation of tailing ponds at Cominco Ltd., Sullivan Mine. In: Proc. 4th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Vancouver, British Columbia, May 31-June 6, 1, pg 47-64.

Germain, D.; Tasse, N.; Dufour, C. 2000. A novel treatment for acid mine drainage using a wood-waste cover preventing sulfide oxidation. In: Proc. of the 5th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Denver, CO, May 21-24, 2, pg 987-998.

Hanselman, K.; Courtin, G.M. 1999. Effect of different cover, cover/tailings mixes and capillary breaks on water dynamics within tailings and paper waste cover materials. In: Mining and the Environment Conf. Proc., Sudbury, Ontario, Sept. 13-17, 2, pg 801-810.

Kowalewski, P.E.; Dorey, R.; Wilson, G.W.; Duckett, R. 1998. Tailings impoundment reclamation soil cover design at the Ridgeway Mine. In: Proc. 5th Internat. Conf. on Tailings and Mine Waste '98, Fort Collins, CO, USA, Jan. 26-28, A.A. Balkema, Rotterdam, Netherlands, 968 p.

Lapakko, K.; Antonson, D.; Jakel, E. 1998a. Mine waste characterization and drainage mitigation: Research summary 1998. MN Dept. Nat. Resour., Division of Minerals, Saint Paul, MN. 50 p.

Lewis, B.A.; Gallinger, R.D.; Wiber, M. 2000. Poirier Site reclamation program. In: Proc. of the 5th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Denver, CO, May 21-24, 2, pg 959-968.

Li, M.; Catalan, L.J.J.; St-Germain, P. 2000. Rates of oxygen consumption by sulphidic tailings under shallow water covers - field measurements and modelling. In: Proc. of the 5th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Denver, CO, May 21-24, 2, pg 913-920.

Lin, Z.; Herbert, R.B. Jr. 1997. Formation of Fe precipitated layers in a mill-tailings deposit: barriers to metal mobilization. In: Proc. 4th Internat. Conf. on Tailings and Mine Waste '97, Fort Collins, CO, USA, Jan. 13-17, A.A. Balkema, Rotterdam, Netherlands, 788 p.

Lindvall, M., Lindahl, L.A., Ericsson. 1997. The reclamation project at Saxberget Mine, Sweden. In: Proc. 4th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Vancouver, British Columbia, May 31-June 6, 3, pg 1389-1400.

McGregor, R.G.; Stegemann, J.A.; van der Sloot, H.A. 1997. Preliminary results of a field study of a self-sealing/self-healing cover system. In: Proc. 4th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Vancouver, British Columbia, May 31-June 6, 3, pg 1435-1450.

Miller, B., Hornaday, C. 1998. Geosynthetic clay liners for the mining industry. In: Proc. 5th Internat. Conf. on Tailings and Mine Waste '98, Fort Collins, CO, USA, Jan. 26-28, A.A. Balkema, Rotterdam, Netherlands, 968 p.

MN DNR, 2000. DNR Waters, Climate of Minnesota. URL: http://www.dnr.state.mn.us/waters/climate/index.html.

Morin, K.A.; Hutt, N.M. 2000. Relocation and submergence of net-acid-generating waste rock for control of acidic drainage: a case study. In: Proc. of the 5th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Denver, CO, May 21-24, 2, pg 819-825.

Nicholson, R.V., Akindunni, F.F., Sydor, R.C., Gillham, R.W. 1991. Saturated tailings covers above the water table: the physics and criteria for design. Proc. 2nd International Conference on the Abatement of Acidic Drainage, Montreal, Canada, Sept.16-18, 1, pg 443-460.

Nicholson, R.V., Elberling, B., Williams, G. 1995. A New oxygen consumption technique to provide rapid assessment of tailings reactivity in the field and the laboratory. In: Mining and the Environment Conf. Proc., Sudbury, ON, May 28-June 1, 3, pg 999-1006.

Nicholson, R.V., Gillham, R.W., Cherry, J.A., Reardon, E.J. 1989. Reduction of acid generation in mine tailings through the use of moisture-retaining cover layers as oxygen barriers. Can. Geotech. J., 26, pg 1-8.

Nicholson, R.V.; Rinker, M.J. 2000. Metal leaching from sulfide mine waste under neutral pH conditions. In: Proc. of the 5th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Denver, CO, May 21-24, 2, pg 951-957.

O'Kane, M., Wilson, G.W., Barbour, S.L., Swanson, D.A. 1995. Aspects on the performance of the till cover system at Equity Silver Mines Ltd. In: Mining and the Environment Conf. Proc., Sudbury, ON, May 28-June 1, 2, pg 565-574.

O'Kane, M., Perterfield, D., Endersby, M., Haug, M.D. 1998. The design and implementation of the field test plots at BHP Iron Ore, Mt Whaleback-a cover system for an arid climate. SME Annual Meeting, Preprint 98-70.

Ricard, J.F., Aubertin, M., Firlotte, F.W., Knapp, R., McMullen, J., Julien, M. 1997. Design and construction of a dry cover made of tailings for the closure of Les Terains Auriferes Site, Malartic, Quebec, Canada. In: Proc. 4th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Vancouver, British Columbia, May 31-June 6, 4, pg 1515-1530.

Sevick, G.W., Paruvakat, N., Black, K.P., Hockley, D. 1998. Engineered upland sulfide tailings management facility. In: Proc. 5th Internat. Conf. on Tailings and Mine Waste '98, Fort Collins, CO, USA, Jan. 26-28, A.A. Balkema, Rotterdam, Netherlands, 968 p.

Shay, D.A.; Cellan, R.R. 2000. Acid remediation at Homestake's Santa Fe Mine using a chemical cap. Proc. 2000 Billings Land Reclamation Symposium, March 20-24, Billings, MT. CD-ROM.

Shuri, F.S., Brown, M.L., Schumacher P.M. 1998. Design of the tailings disposal facilities for Battle Mountain Gold Company's Crown Jewel Mine near Oroville, Washington. In: Proc. 5th Internat. Conf. on Tailings and Mine Waste '98, Fort Collins, CO, USA, Jan. 26-28, A.A. Balkema, Rotterdam, Netherlands, 968 p.

Stewart, D., vonMaubeuge, K. 1997. Cost effective and efficient solutions with geosynthetic clay liners for sealing applications in the mining industry. In: Proc. 4th Internat. Conf. on Tailings and Mine Waste '97, Fort Collins, CO, USA, Jan. 13-17, A.A. Balkema, Rotterdam, Netherlands, 788 p.

Stogran, S.W.; Wiseman, M.E. 1995. A comparison of organic and inorganic covers for long term prevention or amelioration of acid mine drainage. In: Mining and the Environment Conf. Proc., Sudbury, ON, May 28-June 1, 2, pg 555-564.

Tasse, N. 1999. Long term efficiency of wood waste covers: Indications from pore gas compositions. In: Mining and the Environment Conf. Proc., Sudbury, Ontario, Sept. 13-17, 2, pg 655-660.

Tasse, N. 2000. Efficient prevention of sulfide oxidation by an organic cover: For how long can a reactive barrier be reactive? In: Proc. of the 5th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Denver, CO, May 21-24, 2, pg 979-986.

Tasse, N., Germain, D., Dufour, C., Tremblay, R. 1997a. Organic-waste cover over the East Sullivan mine tailings: beyond the oxygen barrier. In: Proc. 4th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Vancouver, British Columbia, May 31-June 6, 4, pg 1627-1642.

Tasse, N.; Germain, D.; Dufour, C.; Tremblay, R. 1997b. Hard-pan formation in the Canadian Malartic mine tailings: implication for the reclamation of the abandoned impoundment. In: Proc. 4th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Vancouver, British Columbia, May 31-June 6, 4, pg 1797-1812.

Udoh, F.D. 1993. Minimization of infiltration into mining stockpiles using low permeability covers. PhD thesis, University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI. 121p.

Williams, D.J., Wilson, G.W., Currey, N.A. 1997. A cover system for a potentially acid forming waste rock dump in a dry climate. In: Proc. 4th Internat. Conf. on Tailings and Mine Waste '97, Fort Collins, CO, USA, Jan. 13-17, A.A. Balkema, Rotterdam, Netherlands, 788 p.

Wilson, G.W., Newman, L., Barbour, S.L. 1997. The cover research program at Equity Silver Mine Ltd. Proc. In: Proc. 4th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Vancouver, British Columbia, May 31-June 6, 1, pg 197-210.

Woyshner, M.R., St Arneault, C., St Arnaud, L.C. 1997. Five years after covering tailings and waste rock with a composite soil cover: a case review and water quality predictions at the Millenbach Site near Rouyn-Noranda, Quebec. In: Proc. 4th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Vancouver, British Columbia, May 31-June 6, 4, pg 1673-1690.

Woyshner, M.R., Swarbrick, B. 1997. First year findings from soil cover test plots on Kidd Creek thickened tailings near Timmins, Ontario. In: Proc. 4th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Vancouver, British Columbia, May 31-June 6, 3, pg 1075-1092.

Yanful, E.K. 1991. Engineered soil covers for reactive tailings management: theoretical concepts and laboratory development. Proc. 2nd International Conference on the Abatement of Acidic Drainage, Montreal, Canada, Sept.16-18, 1, pg 461-486.

Yanful, E.K. 1993. Oxygen diffusion through soil covers on sulfidic mine tailings. J. Geotech. Eng., 119, 8, pg 1207-28.

Yanful, E.K., St-Arnaud, L.C. 1991. Design, instrumentation, and construction of engineered soil covers for reactive tailings management. Proc. 2nd International Conference on the Abatement of Acidic Drainage, Montreal, Canada, Sept.16-18, 1, pg 487-504.

Yanful, E.K., Bell, A.V., Woyshner, M.R. 1993a. Design of a composite soil cover for an experimental waste rock pile near Newcastle, New Brunswick, Canada. Can. Geotech. J., 30, pg 578-587.

Yanful, E.K., Riley, M.D., Woyshner, M.R., Duncan, J. 1993b. Construction and monitoring of a composite soil cover on an experimental waste-rock pile near Newcastle, New Brunswick, Canada. Can. Geotech. J., 30, pg 588-599.

Yanful, E.K., Aube, B.C., Woyshner, M., St-Arnaud, L.C. 1994. Field and laboratory performance of engineered covers on the Waite Amulet tailings. In: Internat. Land Reclamation and Mine Drainage Conf. and 3rd Internat. Conf. on the Abatement of Acidic Drainage, Pittsburgh, PA, April 24-29, 2, pg 138-147.

Zahn, G.; Aubertin, M.; Mayer, A.; Burke, K.; McMullen, J. 2001. Capillary cover design for leach pad closure. SME Annual Meeting, Denver, CO, Feb 26-28, Preprint 01-137.

Zhixun, L.; Herbert Jr., R.B. 1997. Formation of Fe precipitated layers in a mill-tailings deposit: Barriers to metal mobilization. In: Proc. 4th Internat. Conf. on Tailings and Mine Waste '97, Fort Collins, CO, USA, Jan. 13-17, A.A. Balkema, Rotterdam, Netherlands, 788 p.

CONTROL STRATEGIES

Whether or not a mine waste produces problematic drainage depends on a wide array of variables that describe the physical, chemical, and mineralogical characteristics of the waste, pre-existing site conditions, climate, and government regulations. Consequently, there is no single, correct approach to environmental mine waste management. In some cases, it may be acceptable to limit generation of problematic drainages rather than strict prevention. Referred to as "control strategies," these methods generally utilize amendments to stablize mine wastes and inhibit formation of problematic drainages. This section will review the use of alkaline amendments, microencapsulation techniques, and bactericides to control drainage chemistry.

- 5. Chemical Stabilization of Reactive Mine Wastes
 - 5.1. Alkaline Amendments
 - 5.1.1. The Goals of Alkaline Amendments

One approach to controlling the acid release from reactive mine waste is to amend reactive wastes with alkaline materials. While the most commonly used alkaline amendment, limestone, is a natural geologic material, industrial materials and waste products have also been used in mining applications (Table 10).

Table 10.Natural geologic, industrial, and waste products have been used as alkaline
amendments to neutralize acidity produced by reactive mine wastes.

Natural Geologic Industrial		Waste Products		
limestone/calcite	lime	alkaline waste rock or tailings		
dolomite	caustic soda (NaOH)	active treatment sludges		
phosphate/apatite	Bauxsol	lime kiln dust		
	sodium carbonate	coal combustion by-products		
		steel making slag		
		lime stabilized sewage sludge		

Alkaline solids neutralize acid produced by the oxidation of sulfide minerals. This neutralization has three secondary effects. First, the elevated pH yields an environment which is unsuitable

for *Thiobacillus ferrooxidans*, a strain of bacteria which catalyzes sulfide mineral oxidation. The elimination of these bacteria limits the rate of sulfide oxidation, and therefore, the rate of acid production. Second, the elevated pH enhances the oxidation of ferrous iron and the subsequent precipitation of ferric oxyhydroxides. If the pH is elevated in the immediate neighborhood of iron sulfide mineral surfaces, precipitates will form on the mineral surface. This would impede chemical transport to and from the iron sulfide mineral surface, and consequently, inhibit iron sulfide oxidation and the attendant acid production. Third, as pH increases the equilibrium concentrations of trace metals decrease. The decrease in trace metal concentrations is due to increased precipitation (as hydroxides, oxides, and/or carbonates) and adsorption.

An important factor in the balance between acid production and acid neutralization is the relative masses of the iron sulfide and calcium and magnesium carbonate minerals. The alkaline dosage requirement can be estimated based on theory or empirical evidence. The theoretical alkalinity requirement can be calculated assuming that each mole of sulfur produces two moles of acid and that each mole of calcium carbonate equivalent consumes two moles of acid. Calculation of the acid-producing sulfur content should be based on sulfur associated with iron sulfide minerals.

5.1.2. Assessment of Alkaline Amendment Effectiveness

The effectiveness of an alkaline amendment is measured in terms of the quality of water draining from the mine waste. This is usually determined in terms of drainage pH, acidity, and chemical release (e.g. sulfate and trace metals). In other words, a successful amendment will result in near-neutral drainage pH with low levels of sulfate and trace metals.

Laboratory studies on alkaline amendments are typically conducted in columns, where reactive waste rock or tailings are mixed with alkaline material (e.g. limestone, lime, fly ash, etc.). Alkaline loadings are geochemically determined by the acid producing potential (AP) of the waste material and the neutralization potential (NP) of the alkaline amendment. Although a wide range of NP to AP ratios have been tested, those in the range of 1:1 to 2:1 tend to temporarily neutralize acid produced due to sulfide oxidation (Day, 1994; Stewart et al., 1994; Lapakko et al., 1997, 2000).

5.1.3. Cost Analysis of Adding Alkaline Materials to Reactive Mine Wastes

The actual cost involved with amending reactive mine wastes with alkaline material varies widely depending on the type of alkaline material used, application ratio, and accessibility of the location. Chemical costs tend to be low, ranging from zero to tens of dollars per ton (Table 11). Waste alkaline materials, such as fly ash, are the least expensive and are usually free.

Regardless of the type of alkaline material used, transportation constitutes the majority of the expense involved with this strategy. Estimated overland hauling costs for a driver and 20-ton capacity truck range from \$60 to \$80 per hour. Assuming an average hauling speed of 40-mph, overland hauling costs would be \$0.10 per mile per ton.

Alkaline Material	Suppliers ¹	Cost of Material (\$/ton)
limestone	Presque Isle, Alpena, MI; Great Lakes Calcium; Bryan Rock, Bayport, MN; Northland Constructors, Duluth, MN	\$8-60
manufactured sand (limestone product)	Camas, Shiely Division, Grey Cloud Island, St Paul, MN	\$7.50
fly ash	Archer Daniels Midland, Mankato, MN; NSP ² , Riverside & Black Dog plants, MN	0-\$2
lime kiln dust	Cutler-Magner, Duluth, MN	free

Table 11.	Prices for alkalir	e materials	vary	widely.	These	values	do	not include
	transportation cost	s.						

¹Suppliers of alkaline materials used by the MN DNR for past laboratory and field experiments.

²Northern States Power now owned by Excel Energy

5.1.4. Alkaline Amendments and Reactive Mine Wastes in Minnesota

While a few successes have been reported in laboratory studies, field demonstrations of alkaline amendments have been less successful at neutralizing acidic drainage (Evans and Rose, 1995). In rare cases, marginal, short-term results have been claimed as mitigative successes (Davis et al., 1999). The differences in results between laboratory and field studies is not particularly surprising. Incomplete mixing of the reactive waste and alkaline material, as well as the formation of preferential flow paths, are cited as limitations to the effectiveness of field treatments (Mehling et al., 1997). Furthermore, the reactivity of limestone, in particular, is limited when particle size is large. This situation may be improved when alkaline amendments are used to treat fine-grained mine wastes such as tailings. With finer mine wastes and alkaline solids a homogeneous mixture can be more readily attained and, due to more uniform particle size is, find the wide range of particle sizes in waste rock piles.

Recent analyses of alkaline amendment strategies indicates that these physical and hydrologic limitations may have a greater impact on mitigative success than the geochemical characteristics of the waste and alkaline materials (Kempton et al., 1997; Morin and Hutt, 2000). The latter publication indicated that waste rock drainage acidity is dependent on the flow path length within acid neutralizing rock separating zones of acid generating rock. Analysis indicated that waste rock with a bulk NP:AP ratio of 300:1 could release acidic drainage if appropriate neutralizing rock flow path length was not attained (Morin and Hutt, 2000).

5.2. Microencapsulation of Reactive Wastes

5.2.1. Mechanisms of Microencapsulation

Generation of problematic drainage can be controlled by isolating reactive surfaces from oxidizing agents (i.e. O_2 , Fe³⁺). This can be accomplished by chemically precipitating a ferric coating on the surface of the waste material. This process, often called microencapsulation, prevents further oxidation of sulfide minerals by blocking the transport of oxidants to the sulfide surface and consuming ferric iron before it can become an oxidant.

The coating is produced by reacting sulfidic material with low concentrations of an oxidizing agent in the presence of soluble phosphate or silica in a buffered solution. Hydrogen peroxide or calcium hypochlorite are typically used as oxidizing agents. The oxidizing agent reacts with the sulfide to produce ferric ions:

$$FeS_2 + 15/2H_2O_2 \ 6 \ Fe^{3+} + 2SO_4^{2!} + 7H_2O + H^+$$
 (8)

$$FeS_{2} + 15/4Ca(OCl)_{2} + 1/2H_{2}O \ 6 \ Fe^{3+} + 2SO_{4}^{2!} + 15/4Ca^{2+} + 15/2Cl^{!} + H^{+}$$
(9)

Sodium acetate is used to buffer the solution at a pH of 5 to 6. At this pH, dissolved ferric iron is unstable and precipitates as ferric hydroxide. If dissolved phosphate is present, it will scavenge ferric ions and ferric phosphate will precipitate:

$$Fe^{3+} + KH_2PO_4 6 FePO_4 + K^+ + 2H^+$$
 (10)

If silicic acid is present in the solution, it will react with the ferric hydroxides, producing an insoluble ferric silicate precipitate that is chemically stable at low pH (Evangelou, 1996):


Silicate coatings are generally considered more "environmentally friendly" than phosphate coatings. This is because the addition of excess dissolved phosphate species to the mine waste may result in contamination of local surface and/or ground waters. Silicate coatings are more resistant to degradation, especially under acidic conditions.

In addition to phosphate and silicate coating materials, organic derivatives have been used to create a thin surface coating on reactive mine wastes. The exact composition of these materials are frequently vague but, some examples include epoxy resins, dust suppressants, and latex coatings.

5.2.2. Assessment of Microencapsulation Effectiveness

Approximately half of the studies cited here dealt with the feasibility of chemically producing coatings on reactive mine wastes and tailings. Reasonably successful coatings were reported in laboratory studies using phosphates, silicates, and various organic materials. Generally, the presence of coatings on rock and tailing surfaces were confirmed using SEM, although decreased iron levels in drainages was often cited as evidence of coating formation.

Twelve laboratory and field studies addressed issues of drainage quality from treated samples of waste rock and tailings (Table 12). Seven studies reported drainage pH, which was usually in the range of 6 to 7. However, alkaline materials were used during two of these tests, which would have influenced the results. Finally, laboratory and field tests have reported that induced coatings inhibited the release of arsenic and heavy metals (e.g. lead, zinc, and cadmium) from mine waste materials (Table 12).

5.2.3. Cost Analysis of Microencapsulation Techniques

Microencapsulation is a fairly new technology and few field-scale applications exist. Most field applications are proprietary demonstrations that did not include cost analyses. Only two estimates were found in the literature. In 1995, microencapsulation of a waste material containing 30% pyrrhotite was estimated to be \$4-5/ton of waste (Georgopoulou et al., 1995). A more recent estimate for one acre of soil treated to a depth of 50-cm was \$20,000 - 30,000 (Conca et al., 1999). Since application of microencapsulation solutions requires no specialized equipment, the major expense is that of chemicals.

Deference	Coating Turns	Drainage Quality Results		Test Duration
Kelefelice	Coating Type	pH > 6	Reduced Metals	Test Duration
Laboratory Studies:				
Fytas et al., 1999	silicate	U	U	80 days
Fytas and Evangelou, 1998	phosphate	U	U	5 weeks
Fytas et al., 2000	phosphate	U ¹	U	101, 227, 318 days
Vandiviere & Evangelou, 1998	phosphate & silicate	U ²	nd ³	16, 18, 19, 28 months
Field Studies:				
Conca et al., 1999	phosphate	nd	U	nr ⁴
Littlepage et al., 2000	phosphate	nd	U	nr
Jensen et al., 1999	phosphate	nd	U	nr
US EPA, 1999	phosphate	nd	U	nr
Williams et al., 1999	phosphate & silicate	U	U	nr
Mitchell and Anderson, 2000	silicate	U	U	nr
Chatham and Svee, 1996	silicate	U	U	nr
KEECO	silicate	nd	U	nr

Table 12. Summary of drainage quality results from microencapsulation laboratory tests and field demonstrations.

¹all but one column experiment maintained pH >6 ²mixed with CaCO₃ ³ nd = not determined 4 nr = not reported

5.2.4. Potential Use of Microencapsulation Technology to Address Mine Waste Issues in Minnesota

Application of microencapsulation techniques are likely to be very site-specific based on individual rock types. It has been suggested that physical parameters such as particle size and shape may determine the extent to which an effective microencapsulation coating can be induced (Evangelou, 2000). Furthermore, mineralogic characteristics of the waste material may also affect microencapsulation effectively encapsulate pyrrhotite-bearing waste material (i.e. from the Duluth Complex). Therefore, laboratory tests should be conducted on specific rock types to optimize the method of microencapsulation prior to implementation of a field-scale project.

Field demonstrations of microencapsulation technology suggest that a wide range of metals can be immobilized in soils and tailings using a phosphate- or silicate-type coating (Chatham and Svee, 1996; Conca et al., 1999; Jensen et al., 1999; US EPA, 1999; Williams et al., 1999; Littlepage et al., 2000; Mitchell and Anderson, 2000). While these results look promising, the exact method of application on an operational scale is unclear at this time. Several questions still need to be answered:

- How are microencapsulation coatings induced under field conditions?
- How are optimized coating solutions determined in the laboratory scaled up for use in the field?
- Most of these studies used pyritic tailings or finely crushed waste rock. Can a uniform coating on larger particle size material (i.e. 1-2 inches) be achieved?
- What is the long-term stability of these coatings?
- 5.3. Organic Amendments

The following information was excerpted from Gusek et al. (in progress). Oxygen is one of the key reactants in the generation of acidic drainage from reactive mine wastes (reactions 1 and 2). If the presence of oxygen within a stockpile, tailings basin, or waste rock dump can be limited, the rate of acid generation can be minimized. One approach is to intermix organic material with the waste. As the organic material decomposes, it consumes oxygen (reaction 12):

$$CH_2O + O_{2(g)} 6 CO_2 + H_2O$$
 (12)

where, CH₂O represents a generic organic material. If adequate organic material is present, the rate of oxygen consumption will exceed the rate of oxygen diffusion, preventing oxygen from reacting with reactive minerals. Ultimately, organic materials may begin to ferment, producing reducing conditions within the waste. Under reducing conditions the rate of sulfide oxidation is extremely low. Reducing conditions also favor sulfate reducing bacteria, which help increase drainage pH and remove metals from pore waters.

Although there are several case studies where organic material has been placed on top of tailings (Appendix 3), there is little information on incorporation of organic material into mine waste. Greenworld Science has several patents on the use of this technology and have injected soluble organics at metal mining sites to remediate contaminated groundwater (Greenworld Science).

5.4. References on the Chemical Stabilization of Reactive Mine Wastes

Adams, R.L.; Ninesteel, J.J.; Rauch, H.W. 1994. Laboratory testing of coatings for prevention of acid drainage in underground coal mines. In: Internat. Land Reclamation and Mine Drainage Conf. and 3rd Internat. Conf. on the Abatement of Acidic Drainage, Pittsburgh, PA, April 24-29, 2, pg 218-225.

Chatham, W.H.; Svee, W.A. 1996. Evaluation of KEECO product KB-SEA to permanently fix arsenic and other heavy metals in mine tailings characteristic of southwest Montana. (Prepared for Bureau of Abandoned Mines, Department of Environmental Quality, State of Montana) (Phase 1 Sample characterization and batch stability tests.) University of Montana, Butte, MT. 56 p.

Chen, Y.; Belzile, N.; Goldsack, D.E. 1999. Passivation of pyrite oxidation by organic compounds. In: Mining and the Environment Conf. Proc., Sudbury, Ontario, Sept. 13-17, 3, pg 1063-1072.

Conca, J.; Wright, J.; Mockler, T.J. 1999. Phosphate-induced metal stabilization for the remediation of acid mine drainage and heavy-metal contamination. In: Mining and the Environment Conf. Proc., Sudbury, Ontario, Sept. 13-17, 3, pg 1143-1152.

Condon, P. 1999. Improved waste rock pile design at the Kennecott Greens Creek Mine. In: Proc. 6th Internat. Conf. on Tailings and Mine Waste '99, Fort Collins, CO, USA, Jan. 24-27, A.A. Balkema, Rotterdam, Netherlands, 808 p.

Davis, A.; Eary, L.E.; Helgen S. 1999. Assessing the efficacy of lime amendment to geochemically stabilize mine tailings. Environ. Sci. and Tech., 33, pg 2626-2632.

Day, S. J. 1994. Evaluation of acid generating rock and acid consuming rock mixing to prevent acid rock drainage. In: Internat. Land Reclamation and Mine Drainage Conf. and 3rd Internat. Conf. on the Abatement of Acidic Drainage, Pittsburgh, PA, April 24-29, 2, pg 77-86.

Evangelou, V. P. 1994. Potential microencapsulation of pyrite by artificial inducement of $FePO_4$ coatings. In: Internat. Land Reclamation and Mine Drainage Conf. and 3^{rd} Internat. Conf. on the Abatement of Acidic Drainage, Pittsburgh, PA, April 24-29, 2, pg 96-103.

Evangelou, V. P. 1996. Oxidation proof silicate surface coating on iron sulfides. U.S. Patent, Patent number 5494703.

Evangelou, V. P. 2000. Department of Agronomy, Iowa State University, Ames, IA. personal communication.

Evans, D.R.; Rose, A.W. 1995. Experiments on alkaline addition to coal mine spoil. In: Mining and the Environment Conf. Proc., Sudbury, ON, May 28-June 1, 1, pg 49-58.

Fytas, K.; Bousquet, P.; Evangelou, B. 1999. Application of silicate coatings on pyrite to prevent acid mine drainage. In: Mining and the Environment Conf. Proc., Sudbury, Ontario, Sept. 13-17, 3, pg 1199-1207.

Fytas, K.; Bousquet, P.; Evangelou, B. 2000. Silicate coating technology to prevent acid mine drainage. In: Proc. of the 5th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Denver, CO, May 21-24, 1, pg 87-95.

Fytas, K.; Evangelou, B. 1998. Phosphate coating on pyrite to prevent acid mine drainage. Internat. J. Surface Mining, Reclamation and Environment, 12, pg 101-104.

Georgopoulou, Z.J.; Fytas, K.; Soto, H.; Evangelou, B. 1995. Pyrrhotite coating to prevent oxidation. In: Mining and the Environment Conf. Proc., Sudbury, ON, May 28-June 1, 1, pg 7-16.

Green World Science, Boise, ID. www.greenworldscience.com.

Gusek, J.J. et al. 2001. Draft: Handbook of Technologies for Avoidance and Mitigation of Metal Mine Drainage, Acid Drainage Technology Initiative (ADTI), Publ. by University of Reno, NV, in progress.

Jensen, R.; Sogue, A.; Schurman, S. 1999. Treating heavy metals in mine soil and waste using EnvirobondTM binder. In: Proc. 6th Internat. Conf. on Tailings and Mine Waste '99, Fort Collins, CO, USA, Jan. 24-27, A.A. Balkema, Rotterdam, Netherlands, 808 p.

KEECO (Klean Earth Environmental Company), Lynnwood, WA.

Kempton, J.H.; Swanson, D.; Bennett, M.; MacDonald, R.; Locke, W.; Gillespie, C.; Lechner, M.; Maley, P. 1997. Application of probabilistic acid/base accounting to minimize waste-rock handling in semi-arid climates. In: Proc. 4th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Vancouver, British Columbia, May 31-June 6, 2, pg 871-888.

Lapakko, K.A.; Antonson, D.A.; Wagner, J.R. 1997. Mixing of alkaline solids with finelycrushed acid-producing rock. In: Proc. 4th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Vancouver, British Columbia, May 31-June 6, 3, pg 1345-1360. Lapakko, K.A.; Antonson, D.A.; Wagner, J.R. 2000. Mixing of rotary kiln fines with finegrained acid-producing rock. In: Proc. of the 5th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Denver, CO, May 21-24, pg 901-910.

Littlepage, B.; Schurman, S.; Maloney, D. 2000. Treating metals contaminated sludges with EnvirobondTM. Mining Environmental Management, May, pg 22.

Maki, S.; Belzile, N.; Goldsack, D. 1995. Inhibition of pyrite oxidation by surface treatment. In: Mining and the Environment Conf. Proc., Sudbury, ON, May 28-June 1, 1, pg 1-5.

Mehling, P.E.; Day, S.J.; Sexsmith, K.S. 1997. Blending and layering waste rock to delay, mitigate or prevent acid generation: A case study review. In: Proc. 4th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Vancouver, British Columbia, May 31-June 6, 2, pg 951-969.

Mitchell, P.; Anderson, A. 2000. Silica micro encapsulation treatment of tailings. Mining Environmental Management, May, pg 16-17.

Morin, K.A.; Hutt, N.M. 2000. Discrete-zone blending of Net-acid-neutralizing and net-acidgenerating rock: Avoiding the argument over appropriate ratios. In: Proc. of the 5th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Denver, CO, May 21-24, pg 797-806.

Moskalyk, R.R. 1995. Development of a protective cover for mine waste rock. In: Mining and the Environment Conf. Proc., Sudbury, ON, May 28-June 1, 1, pg 99-108.

Roy, S.; Worral, F. 1999. Pyrite oxidation in coal-bearing strata - the use of P-blocking techniques. In: Mining and the Environment Conf. Proc., Sudbury, Ontario, Sept. 13-17, 1, pg 177-181.

Rybock, J.; Mitchell, P.; Wheaton, A.; Hopper, R. 1999. Silica micro encapsulation: an innovative technology for the prevention and treatment of ARD. Proc. Randol Gold & Silver Forum, '99. Denver, CO, May 12-14.

Stewart, B.R.; Jackson, M.L.; Daniels, W.L. 1994. The effects of fly ash blending rates and ash properties on leachate quality from fly ash/coal refuse mixtures. In: Internat. Land Reclamation and Mine Drainage Conf. and 3rd Internat. Conf. on the Abatement of Acidic Drainage, Pittsburgh, PA, April 24-29, 2, pg 425.

US EPA (1999): EnvironbondTM Process: Rocky Mountain Remediation Services. Superfund Innovative Technology Evaluation, Demonstration Bulletin, July, EPA/540/MR-99/502.

Vandiviere, M.M.; Evangelou, V.P. 1998. Comparative testing between conventional and microencapsulation approaches in controlling pyrite oxidation. J. Geochem. Exploration, 64, pg. 161-176.

Williams, B.C.; Nimmer, R.E.; McGeehan, S.L. 1999. Demonstration of metals-fixation technologies on the Coeur d'Alene River, Idaho. In: Proc. 6th Internat. Conf. on Tailings and Mine Waste '99, Fort Collins, CO, USA, Jan. 24-27, A.A. Balkema, Rotterdam, Netherlands, 808 p.

Zhang, Y.L.; Evangelou, V.P., 1998. Formation of ferric hydroxide-silica coatings on pyrite and its oxidation behavior. Soil Sci., 163, 1, pg 53-62.

- 6. Biological Stabilization of Reactive Mine Wastes
 - 6.1. Inhibition of Biological Sulfide Oxidation Using Bactericides

Bacteria, such as *Thiobacillus ferrooxidans*, have been shown to catalyze the oxidation of ferrous iron in reactive mine waste effluents below a pH of approximately 4.5. Bacterial oxidation produces acid, which may result in highly acidic drainage. **Surfactants** have been shown to interrupt bacterial activity, reducing the rate of oxidation, and therefore, controlling the rate of drainage acidification.

Surfactants can be obtained as a powder or in a controlled release pellet. Powdered surfactants can be slurried with water and sprayed directly onto the mine waste material, or incorporated with the mine waste material as it is deposited. Drawbacks to powdered surfactants are that they are easily flushed through the waste material and that they degrade over time. Consequently, surfactants require frequent re-application. Re-application rates are estimated at three to six months (Patterson, 1987; Delaney et al., 1997).

Control release pellets incorporate the surfactant in a rubberized matrix. The surfactant is gradually released through a diffusion mechanism. Since pellets are not likely to be flushed from the waste material, their bactericidal properties can last for several years.

Recently, a second class of bactericides has been investigated. **Thiol-blocking agents** have been shown to block the oxidation thiosulfate and sulfur to sulfate (i.e. sulfuric acid). Most of these chemicals are toxic and unsuitable for environmental applications. However, one class of thiol-blocking agents, heterocyclic mercaptans, are considered "relatively non-toxic." Heterocyclic mercaptans, have been reported to inhibit the activity of *Thiobacillus thioparus*, a neutrophilic sulfur-oxidizing bacteria, in laboratory column and field tests (Stichbury et al., 1995; Lortie et al., 1999). As with the surfactants, the affects of heterocyclic mercaptans are temporary and would require re-application.

- 6.2. Assessment of Bactericides as Sulfide Oxidation Inhibitors
 - 6.2.1. Preliminary Evaluation of Bactericides

Prior to application on an operational-scale, physical, chemical, and biological characterization of the waste material should be completed. Laboratory studies are generally designed to determine the acid generation potential in terms of sulfide minerals present as well as bacterial activity (i.e. bacteria counts). This information, used in conjunction with laboratory column tests, can be used to determine an appropriate bactericide application rate for a specific waste rock type (Kleinmann and Erickson, 1988). However, application rates determined in the laboratory do not always extrapolate well to operational-scale, environmental conditions (Patterson, 1987; Delaney et al., 1997).

6.2.2. Parameters Used to Assess Bactericide Effectiveness

The effectiveness of a bactericide application can be measured in terms of the quality of water draining from the mine waste. This can be determined in terms of drainage pH, acidity, chemical release (e.g. sulfate, iron, and other metals), and bacteria counts. If the application of bactericide successfully inhibits biological oxidation of sulfides in a mine waste, drainage pH should remain neutral, while acidity, chemical release of sulfate and metals, and bacteria counts remain low.

In laboratory and field studies reported in the literature, the effectiveness of **surfactants** as bactericides was frequently reported in terms of drainage acidity (Tables 6.2.2a and 6.2.2b). Unfortunately, these data did not indicate whether or not the drainage met the environmental water quality standard (pH >6). The fact that acidity was present suggested that these drainages did not meet this standard. This is not an unexpected result because surfactants inhibit the activity of acidophilic bacteria. Acidophilic bacteria do not become active until the pH reaches an acidic range, approximately 4-4.5. Consequently, drainage pH values as low as 4 can be expected when surfactants are used as bactericides.

Heterocyclic mercaptans, however, inhibit the activity of neutrophilic sulfide oxidizing bacteria. When heterocyclic mercaptans are used as bactericides, drainage pH values in the neutral range are more likely to occur. Drainage pH did remain elevated in the two studies that have been conducted on heterocyclic mercaptans (Stichbury et al., 1995; Lortie et al., 1999). However, it did not necessarily remain above 6.0 (Tables 13 and 14).

6.3. Cost Analysis of Bactericides

Based on case studies presented by Benedetti et al. (1990) and Rastogi et al. (1990), a single application of surfactant to an acre of waste material will cost between \$1000 and \$3000. Note that these are 1990 dollars and have not been adjusted. These cost estimates do not include those associated with waste disposal, neutralization chemicals, grading, or other reclamation measures. No estimates were found for heterocyclic mercaptans.

6.4. Potential Use of Bactericides to Inhibit Sulfide Oxidation in Minnesota Mine Wastes

Bactericide proponents claim that bactericides show promise as a preventative strategy against the development of acidic drainage from mine wastes. They are attractive because they are inexpensive and can be applied easily either sprayed on as a slurry or distributed within the waste in pellet form. Bactericides appear to be the most effective at preventing acid mine drainage when they are used on fresh waste material and reapplied frequently throughout operations. They should not be expected to remediate an existing drainage problem.

Summary of results from laboratory studies designed to evaluate the Table 13. effectiveness of bacterial inhibitors at reducing the effects of sulfide oxidation.

			Drainage Quality Results			T 1 1 1 1 1	
Reference	Leference Inhibitor Used		Reduced Acidity	Sulfate Reduced	Metals Reduced	Bacteria	
Sobek, 1987	surfactant	nd^1	U	nd	nd	nd	
Patterson, 1987	surfactant	nd	nd	nd	U (Cu)	nd	
Watzlaf, 1988	surfactant	nd	U	nd	nd	U	
Stichbury et al., 1995	heterocyclic mercaptans	no U	nd nd	neg. ² no	nd nd	nd nd	

 ${}^{1}_{2}$ nd = not determined ${}^{2}_{neg.}$ = negligible reduction

Summary of results from field tests on the effect of bacterial inhibitors on Table 14. reactive mine waste drainage quality.

		Maintainad	Drai		inage Quality Results		
Reference	Inhibitor Used	pH >6	Acidity Reduced	Sulfate	Metals	Bacteria	
Patterson, 1987 & Delaney et al., 1997	surfactant	no	nd ¹	nd	nd	no	
Parisi et al., 1994	surfactant	no	U	U	nd	nd	
Lortie et al., 1999	heterocyclic mercaptan	no	nd	U	U (Fe, Cu, Ni, Zn)	U	
Lortie et al., 1999	heterocyclic mercaptan	no	nd	U	U (Fe)	U	

 1 nd = not determined

It is important to remember that bactericides represent a short-term mitigative strategy that will require the use of another, longer-term mitigative strategy for long-term control. The most frequently reported objective of bactericide usage has been to prevent acidification long enough for vegetation to become established on a reclaimed surface. In these cases, reclamation efforts are usually expected to minimize the amount of water that must be collected and treated prior to discharge into the environment. Bactericides used in this manner are considered to be a cost effective method to minimize treatment costs. Alternatively, establishment of a healthy vegetative cover may, in some situations, be sufficient to prevent future acidification of drainage. Although reported less frequently, it seems logical that bactericides could be used to prevent acidification of mine wastes during operations until a dry cover system, including a vegetated surface, can be placed over the mine waste.

There are two major drawbacks to the use of bactericides. First, surfactants cannot be relied upon to maintain drainage pH above 6.0. This pH may be sufficient to maintain a healthy vegetative cover in some instances. However, it generally does not meet acceptable environmental standards. As a result, the use of surfactants alone is not a viable option for preventing acidic drainage problems in Minnesota.

Second, the "relatively non-toxic" nature of heterocyclic mercaptans has not been defined in the literature. It is unclear at this time whether or not heterocyclic mercaptans can or should be released to the environment. Furthermore, neither of the two heterocyclic mercaptans described in the literature could be found in the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MN PCA) database (Clark, 2000). Based on information found on Material Safety Data Sheets for these two chemicals, aquatic toxicity has not yet been determined. Since the MN PCA does not have adequate toxicity information on either of the two heterocyclic mercaptans, no standard exists to govern their usage. Consequently, the MN PCA recommends conducting biological toxicity tests on drainages containing these compounds prior to extensive use (Clark, 2000).

6.5. References on the Use of Bactericides

Benedetti, B.A.; Rastogi, V.; Sobek, A.A. 1990. Minimizing water treatment costs at active operations. Nat. Symp. on Mining, Knoxville, TN.

Clark, R. 2000. Operations/Planning/Major Facilities, North District, Minnesota Pollution Control Agency. personal communication.

Delaney, T.; Hockley, D.; Sollner, D. 1997. Applications of methods for delaying the onset of acidic drainage. In: Proc. 4th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Vancouver, British Columbia, May 31-June 6, 2, pg 795-810.

Fox, L.A.; Rastogi, V. 1983. Developments in controlled release technology and its application in acid mine drainage. Symposium on Mining, Hydrology, Sedimentology, and Reclamation. University of Kentucy, Lexington, KY.

Gould, W.D.; Lortie, L.; Bechard, G. 1996. Method for inhibiting the formation of acid mine drainage. U.S. Patent #5,550,141.

Kleinmann, R.L.P. 1980. Bactericidal control of acid problems in surface mines and coal refuse. Symp. Surf. Mining Hydrology, Sedimentology, and Reclamation, University of Kentucky, Dec 1-5, pg 333-337.

Kleinmann, R.L.P.; Erickson, P.M. 1988. Control of acid drainage from coal refuse using anionic surfactants. US BOM Report of Investigations 8847. 16p.

Lortie, L.; Gould, W.D.; Stichbury, M.; Blowes, D.W.; Thurel, A. 1999. Inhibitors for the prevention of acid mine drainage. In: Mining and the Environment Conf. Proc., Sudbury, Ontario, Sept. 13-17, 3, pg 1191-1198.

Parisi, D.; Horneman, J; Rastogi, V. 1994. Use of bactericides to control acid mine drainage from surface operations. In: Internat. Land Reclamation and Mine Drainage Conf. and 3rd Internat. Conf. on the Abatement of Acidic Drainage, Pittsburgh, PA, April 24-29, 2, 319-325.

Patterson, R.J. 1987. Environmental and reclamation measures at Equity Silver Mines Ltd. Proc. Acid Mine Drainage Seminar/Workshop, March 23-26, Halifax, Nova Scotia, pg 457.

Rastogi, V.; Sobek, A.A. 1986. The economics of using bactericides in active mining and reclamation to control acid mine drainage. National Symposium on Mining, Hydrology, Sedimentology, and Reclamation. University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY.

Rastogi, V.; Sobek, A.A.; Benedetti, D.A. 1990. Prevention of water pollution problems in mining: The bactericide technology. Society for Mining, Metallurgy, and Exploration, Inc.

Sobek, A.A. 1987. The use of surfactants to prevent AMD in coal refuse and base metal tailings. Proc. Acid Mine Drainage Seminar/Workshop, Halifax, Nova Scotia. March 23-26, 1987. pg 357.

Sobek, A.A.; Benedetti, D.A.; Rastogi, V. 1990. Successful reclamation using controlled release bactericides: Two case studies. American Society for Surface Mining and Reclamation Conference, Charleston, WV.

Stichbury, M.; Bechard, G.; Lortie, L.; Gould, W.D. 1995. Use of inhibitors to prevent acid Mine drainage. In: Mining and the Environment Conf. Proc., Sudbury, ON, May 28-June 1, 2, pg 613-622.

Unknown. 1995. ProMac: bacterial inhibition. Mining Environmental Management, June, pg 27-29.

Watzlaf, G.R. 1988. Chemical inhibition of iron-oxidizing bacteria in waste rock and sulfide tailings and effect on water quality. Mine Drainage and Surface Mine Reclamation Conference, Pittsburgh, PA.

Ziemkiewicz, P.F. 1995. Acid mine drainage control technologies. Ch 5. Acid Mine Drainage Control and Treatment. West Virginia University and the National Mine Land Reclamation Center, Morgantown, WV.

TREATMENT SYSTEMS

Whether or not a mine waste produces problematic drainage depends on a wide array of variables that describe the physical, chemical, and mineralogical characteristics of the waste, pre-existing site conditions, climate, and government regulations. Consequently, there is no single, correct approach to environmental mine waste management. Oftentimes, prevention and control strategies are insufficient to mitigate problematic drainages satisfactorily. In these cases, it is necessary to collect and treat the drainage prior to discharge to the surrounding environment. Both passive and active approaches have been taken to treat mine drainages. This section will review the application of constructed wetlands, permeable reactive barriers, and several active treatment options for the treatment of problematic mine drainages.

7. Passive Treatment Systems

Passive treatment systems take advantage of naturally occurring biological, physical, and chemical processes to remove contaminants from surface and ground waters (Table 15). Removal of metals from waste rock stockpile drainage as it flowed through a white cedar swap in northern Minnesota has been well documented (Eger et al., 1980; Eger and Lapakko, 1988). These and similar observations in other natural wetlands (Wieder and Land, 1982; Samuel et al., 1988; Sencindiver and Bhumbla, 1988; Sobolewski, 1997; Skousen et al., 1998; Wildeman and Pavlik, 2000) are the basis for engineering systems with conditions that promote metal removal and/or elevate alkalinity in mine drainages without continuous chemical or operational requirements.

Removal Mechanism	Elements Affected
sulfate reduction	SO ₄ , acidity
sulfide precipitation	As, Cd, Cu, Fe, Mn, Ni, Pb, Zn
oxyhydroxide precipitation	Al, Fe, Mn, Zn
carbonate precipitation	trace metals
adsorption	trace metals and As
ion exchange/chelation	trace metals
filtration	suspended and colloidal material
uptake by plants	metals

Table 15.Summary of naturally occurring removal mechanisms for species commonly
found in acidic mine waste drainages.

7.1. Constructed Wetlands

Although the design of wetland treatment systems can vary substantially, there are two basic types; aerobic (overland or surface flow) wetlands, and organic substrate (vertical flow) wetlands (Eger, 2000). Settling ponds and alkaline producing systems (i.e. SAPS and open limestone channels) are often incorporated into passive treatment system designs to improve effluent metal and alkalinity levels. Constructed wetlands require little operational attention or maintenance, and therefore, may be favorable over conventional active treatment systems. Disadvantages of constructed wetland systems include the large area of open land required for adequate treatment, the relatively low flow requirements, and diminished performance in cold climates.

7.1.1. Aerobic Wetlands

Aerobic wetland systems promote metal removal via oxidation reactions in the surface water or upper portion of the substrate where oxygen is present in the highest concentrations. Iron removal occurs primarily through precipitation of ferric oxyhydroxides. Trace metals are removed by adsorption, chelation, or ion exchange processes associated with the organic component of the substrate. Since these reactions are favored at high pH, aerobic wetlands are most effective when the mine drainage is net alkaline.

Aerobic wetlands can be used for acidic drainages following adequate pretreatment using an anoxic limestone drain (ALD). ALDs are typically constructed in an area with seeps, where the water will contain little to no dissolved oxygen. The presence of even a small amount of dissolved oxygen will result in precipitation of iron oxyhydroxides, which can coat limestone rendering it ineffective and/or plug the drain. Thus, oxygen must be excluded from the drain.

An ALD usually consists of a trench constructed to intercept the contaminated ground water and filled with two to three inch limestone. The goal of the drain is to provide sufficient alkalinity to the drainage so that when the water surfaces, there is sufficient alkalinity to maintain a neutral pH. Outflow from the drain collects in an aerobic wetland or settling pond to remove iron and other metals.

7.1.2. Organic Substrate Wetlands

Organic substrate wetlands are anaerobic systems that promote bacterial sulfate reduction, which produces dissolved hydrogen sulfide and bicarbonate alkalinity (reaction 13),

$$2CH_2O + SO_4^{2!} 6 H_2S + 2HCO_3^{!}$$
(13)

where CH₂O represents a low molecular weight organic substance such as lactate or acetate.

The wetland is constructed with organic material (e.g. compost) that is usually supplemented with limestone. Trace metal removal occurs primarily through the precipitation of metal

sulfides, hydroxides, and carbonates. Acid is neutralized both through sulfate reduction processes and limestone dissolution. Organic substrate wetlands are most effective when the mine drainage is acidic.

7.1.3. Assessment of Constructed Wetland Treatment System Designs and Size

Wetland treatment systems are evaluated primarily by the water quality at the outflow of the wetland (Hedin et al., 1994). In order to produce an effluent which meets water quality standards, wetlands must be designed properly. For detailed information on wetland treatment design considerations, a reasonably comprehensive overview was compiled by Wildeman et al. (1993).

Important factors in the design are the drainage pH and total metal load (Figure 4). Net alkaline waters can be treated using an aerobic wetland. Net acidic waters must either be pretreated using an ALD or treated using an organic substrate wetland. If the raw water contains high levels of dissolved oxygen and iron, an organic substrate wetland is the preferred treatment strategy. Oftentimes, a combined system is the most effective. Several wetland cells may be connected to optimize metal removal or to treat large flow volumes.



Figure 4. Constructed wetland design depends upon the chemistry of water to be treated. Modified Gusek et al., 2001.

Wetland treatment systems require large areas of space in order to be effective. Inadequate metal removal and poor performance will result if the size of the system is underestimated. Hedin et al. (1994) developed sizing criteria for constructed wetlands based on previous cases. In order to consistently meet regulatory guidelines for an alkaline drainage, sizing factors were $10 \text{ g/m}^2\text{d}$ and $0.5 \text{ g/m}^2\text{d}$ for iron and manganese, respectively. The acidity sizing factor for a net acid drainage was $3.5 \text{ g/m}^2\text{d}$. It is important to note that these "compliance criteria" were generated for coal mine drainages in Appalachia and may not be appropriate for metal mining operations or other regions. However, Wildeman et al. (1993) considered these sizing factors reasonable for wetland treatment of metal mine drainages in Colorado.

7.1.4. Cost Analysis of Constructed Wetland Treatment Systems

Costs for these systems can vary depending on the system design and complexity. Construction costs for liners, trenches, and spillways will increase as the number of treatment cells increase. Since constructed wetland treatment system designs are site-specific, average construction costs are difficult to determine. Costs estimates include a wide variety of capital, construction, and operation costs (Table 16). It has been estimated that constructed wetland installation costs range from \$5 to \$32/m² (Wildeman et al., 1993). Installation of constructed wetlands at the Dunka Mine site in northern Minnesota varied from \$19 - \$31/m² (Eger, 2000).

Table 16.	Summary of major cost components for constructed wetlands (modified from
	Wildeman et al., 1993).

Capital	Construction	Operation/Maintenance
engineering (design, testing, & specifications)	personnel	inspections
environmental studies & permitting	transportation	monitoring
land acquisition	site preparation	cleaning of conveyances
access (rights of way)	source control /diversion	flow adjustments
	earthwork	major overhauls (i.e. substrate rejuvenation/replacement)
	basin lining	
	concrete	
	plumbing	
	substrate conditioning /installation	
	vegetation	

7.1.5. Constructed Wetland Treatment of Problematic Drainages in Minnesota

The majority of constructed wetlands have been applied to coal mine drainage issues. However, they do have some potential for addressing hard rock mining issues. A survey of 128 coal mine drainages found that coal mine drainages can have copper, nickel, and zinc concentrations as high as 2.49, 10, and 146 mg/L, respectively (Hyman and Watzlaf, 1996). These levels are comparable to those expected for hard rock mine drainage.

The MN DNR has conducted considerable research on the topic of constructed wetlands to treat problematic drainages on a laboratory-, field-, and operational-scale. Field studies have also addressed issues related to establishing wetlands on sulfidic tailings as a preventative technique. A bibliography of MN DNR publications related to these studies is provided here (Appendix 6).

Currently in Minnesota, there are five operating constructed wetland treatment systems at the Dunka Mine site near Babbitt, and one proposed sulfate reduction system at the Soudan State Park (Eger, 2000). The sulfate reduction system proposed to treat mine drainage at the Soudan State park will probably be built in the spring of 2001.

The five operating systems were designed to treat drainage from covered stockpiles (section 4.2.5). The drainage is generally near-neutral, although pretreatment systems help increase drainage pH from W1-D and Seep 1 prior to wetland treatment. These drainages also contain elevated levels of nickel, copper, cobalt, and zinc (Eger and Lapakko, 1991; Eger and Melchert, 1992). These systems are basically overland flow wetlands with some subsurface flow occurs through limestone drains which were built as part of the berms within the wetlands. Treatment efficiency varies for each of the five wetland systems due to the fact that each system treats drainage from a different stockpile area (Table 17). In general, these wetlands have decreased metal loads in the stockpile drainage (Eger et al., 1996, 1997, 2000b; MN DNR, unpublished data).

Based on results from the Dunka Mine site, constructed wetland treatment of near-neutral drainage appears to be a viable treatment system throughout much of the year. However, it is important to note that the wetlands at Dunka are part of an integrated mine waste management system involving dry covers on the stockpiles (section 4.2.5) and a neutralization treatment plant (section 8.8.2). Wetland treatment alone has not been able to consistently meet regulatory discharge limits at Dunka.

Two climatic conditions common to northern Minnesota limit the extent to which constructed wetlands can be used to treat problematic mine drainages. First, cold temperatures typical during winter months severely limit biological activity. Second, constructed wetland treatment failures are common when flow rates fluctuate widely or are too high. Consequently, elevated flow rates in the spring (i.e. snow melt) occurring immediately after an extended period of cold winter temperatures may render constructed wetlands ineffective for a substantial period of time. Due

Wetland Treatment System	Parameter of Concern	Influent (mg/L)	Effluent (mg/L)
	pН	7.1	7.0
	Cu	0.06	< 0.005
W2D-3D ¹	Ni	1.94	0.06
	Со	0.02	< 0.005
	Zn	0.06	< 0.005
	pН	7.2	7.4
	Cu	0.03	< 0.005
W1D ^{2,4}	Ni	0.90	0.13
	Со	0.01	0.02
	Zn	0.02	< 0.005
	pН	6.9	7.2
	Cu	0.27	0.06
Seep 1 ^{2,4}	Ni	7.24	3.34
	Со	0.19	0.06
	Zn	0.94	0.41
	pН	7.1	7.2
	Cu	0.41	0.14
Seep X ²	Ni	1.82	0.99
	Со	0.09	0.03
	Zn	0.57	0.35
	pH	7.2	7.1
EM-8 ³	Cu	0.03	0.01
	Ni	1.62	1.04
	Со	0.01	< 0.005
	Zn	0.05	0.04

Five wetland treatment systems located at the Dunka Mine site near Babbitt, MN Table 17. have treated near-neutral drainage from stockpiles with variable results.

¹average influent concentrations monitored from 1992-1994, average effluent concentrations for 1992-1998

² average concentrations from July 1995 (wetland brought online) through 1999
³ average concentrations from 1998 (wetland brought online) through 1999
⁴ "Influent" monitoring stations represent the effluent from limestone pretreatment cells intended to raise drainage pH prior to entering the W1D and Seep 1 wetlands.

to these climatic factors, a constructed wetland system in northern Minnesota may only be effective for six months out of the year. Thus, constructed wetland systems should be used as one part of an integrated system, as at Dunka.

7.2. Permeable Reactive Barriers

Permeable reactive barriers represent an alternative method for treating contaminated ground waters. In the most general sense, a permeable reactive barrier consists of a reactive material installed within an aquifer in such a way that contaminated ground water flows through it (Figure 5). The reactive material induces chemical reactions, which result in contaminant removal from the ground water. Two detailed reports have been published that summarize permeable reactive barrier technology (US EPA, 1998; Yin and Allen, 1999).



Figure 5. Cross-sectional view of a permeable reactive wall used to passively treat contaminated ground waters. Color is used to represent gradual improvement in contaminated (brown) ground water quality.

The mechanisms by which permeable reactive barriers remove contaminants vary depending upon the type of application. Acidic drainage from mine wastes is usually treated using a biological sulfate reduction system. Sulfate reducing bacteria consume dissolved sulfate, converting it to hydrogen sulfide (reaction 14). Metal removal occurs when the biologically produced sulfide reacts with metals in solution to form insoluble metal sulfides (reaction 15):

$$SO_4^{2!} + 2CH_2O \ 6 \ H_2S + 2HCO_3^{!}$$
 (14)

$$H_2S + Me^{2+} 6 MeS + 2H^+$$
 (15)

where, CH_2O generically refers to an organic carbon source and Me^{2+} represents a dissolved metal.

Adsorption is another mechanism by which metals can be removed from ground waters contaminated by mining activities. In addition to adsorption to organic substrates in sulfate reducing barriers, laboratory-scale tests have also been conducted on the ability of various inorganic absorbents to remove metals from contaminated water. Column experiments have shown that arsenic removal can be achieved using basic oxygen furnace oxide (a by-product of steel manufacturing; McRae et al., 1999), zero valent iron (McRae et al., 1999; Su and Puls, 2001), activated alumina (McRae et al., 1999), and hydrous ferric oxide (Martin and Kempton, 1999). Hydrous ferric oxide (Martin and Kempton, 1999). Hydrous ferric oxide (Martin and Kempton, 1999) and zero valent iron (Astrup et al., 2000; Phillips et al., 2000) were also able to remove hexavalent chromium from solution. Recent research in the area of mesoporous molecular sieves (nanostructures with high adsorptive capacities and specificity) may also have an application in permeable reactive barriers for a wide variety of heavy metals and mercury (Mercier et al., 1999).

Finally, Conca et al. (1999) suggest that phosphate induced metal stabilization can be used in a permeable reactive barrier system to passively remove metals from ground waters. The removal mechanism in this system involves the secondary precipitation of metal phosphate phases in the presence of a poorly crystalline apatite mineral referred to as Apatite II. This system is particularly effective at removing U, Pb, Cd, and Zn from solution.

7.2.1. Factors Affecting Permeable Reactive Barrier Performance

Several site-specific factors affect the performance of a permeable reactive barrier. Drainage chemistry, ground water flow patterns and velocity, and site accessibility must be considered when designing a permeable reactive barrier. Careful selection of reactive materials is another critical factor in reactive barrier performance. Selected materials must be reactive enough to handle contaminant loads. However, they must not react so quickly that they are rapidly consumed. Materials used in a reactive barrier must also be permeable enough to transmit ground water flow at the site for an extended period of time. Finally, materials must be readily available and affordable. Although several different reactive barrier technologies exist, subsequent discussion of these factors will focus on treatment of acid rock drainage using sulfate reduction barriers.

Success of a sulfate reducing barrier depends on establishment of sulfate reducing bacteria within the barrier. Sulfate reducing bacteria require an organic substrate, nutrients, near neutral pH, and anoxic conditions for optimum growth. The ideal organic substrate should be fresh and contain short carbon chains with single bonds. Numerous organic materials have been tested. Those that have shown some success include leaf mulch (Waybrant et al., 1995, 1997; Benner et al., 1997, 1999, 2000; McGregor, 1999, 2000), wood wastes (Blowes et al., 1995; Waybrant et al., 1995, 1997; Benner et al., 1997, 1999, 2000), animal by-products (Waybrant et al., 1995; Canty, 1999a,b, 2000), and municipal wastes (Benner et al., 1997, 1999, 2000; Waybrant et al., 1995, 1997;). The use of these particular organic materials is primarily based on laboratory experiments conducted by Waybrant et al. (1997). Partially decomposed straw has also been used as an organic substrate for sulfate reducing bacteria in a reactive barrier with limited success (Bechard et al., 1991; 1995).

One problem inherent to sulfate reducing reactive barrier systems is that the permeability of the barrier decreases over time as the organic substrate decomposes. This loss of permeability may restrict ground water flow to the point where it is forced around the reactive barrier rather than through it. To avoid this problem, the organic substrate must be thoroughly mixed with a material with a relatively high hydraulic conductivity, such as pea gravel. Any layering of hydraulic conductivities within the reactive barrier may result in channeling, which reduces residence time and diminishes effectiveness.

The overall hydraulic conductivity of the reactive mixture may be very sensitive to the substrategravel ratio. Therefore, permeability tests should be conducted prior to installation to determine the gravel requirement for a specific substrate and ground water flow. Hydrologic modeling can be used to determine appropriate target hydraulic conductivities for the reactive mixture. Benner et al. (1997) found that the hydraulic conductivity of the wall must be an order of magnitude greater than that of the surrounding aquifer to achieve good flow distribution within a reactive barrier.

Strongly acidic environments typical of acid rock drainage do not favor sulfate reducing bacteria. To avoid this problem, limestone is usually added to the organic substrate to elevate the solution pH within the barrier. Oxygen will also inhibit the activity of sulfate reducing bacteria. Consequently, a protective cap (e.g. clay) should be placed across the upper section of the barrier to minimize oxygen ingress.

7.2.2. Evaluation of Reactive Barrier Systems

Field evaluation of reactive barrier systems typically involves the use of monitoring wells and piezometers. Contaminant removal can be qualitatively estimated by the water chemistry of samples collected from monitoring wells placed both up and down gradient from the reactive barrier. Monitoring wells and piezometers may also be installed within the barrier or at different depths. Careful planning and installation makes it possible to track ground water flow and identify zones of maximum contaminant removal relative to barrier placement. These data are often used as input for geochemical models.

Geochemical models are used to describe geochemical interactions and mass transport occurring within a reactive barrier. Application of reactive transport models is used to meet two important objectives. First, models can be used as a design tool. Quantification of potential loss or accumulation of mass within the barrier and estimation of long-term permeability of the substrate are critical factors to consider during the reactive material selection phase of barrier design. Second, modeling is used to evaluate reactive barrier performance and to provide insight into geochemical mechanisms controlling contaminant removal.

7.2.3. Construction Costs Associated with Reactive Barriers

Construction costs for permeable reactive barriers will vary widely depending on the size of the barrier needed, barrier design, and reactive materials used. Very few operational-scale examples of permeable reactive barriers used to treat mining impacted ground water were found in the literature. Probably the most relevant example was the reactive barrier installed at the Nickel Rim Mine tailings impoundment near Sudbury, Ontario. Materials and installation for this reactive barrier were estimated to cost US \$30,000 (Yin and Allen, 1999). No other cost estimates were found in the literature.

7.2.4. Potential Application of Reactive Barrier Technology in Minnesota

Results from laboratory and field studies suggest that permeable reactive barrier technology can be used to remove sulfate (Waybrant et al., 1995, 1997), metals (Blowes and Ptacek, 1992; Waybrant et al., 1995, 1997; Blowes et al., 1998; Conca et al., 1999; Martin and Kempton, 1999; McRae et al., 1999; Mercier et al., 1999), halogenated organics (Gillham and O'Hannesin, 1992; 1994; Yabusake et al., 2001), and phosphate (Ptacek et al., 1994; Baker et al., 1996, 1997, 1998) from contaminated ground waters. In addition to these, field-scale studies have demonstrated the use of permeable reactive barriers to treat ground water contaminated with acid rock drainage (Bechard et al., 1991, 1995; Blowes and Ptacek, 1994; Blowes et al., 1994, 1995; Benner et al., 1997, 1999, 2000; Canty, 1999a, b, 2000; McGregor et al., 1999, 2000) and seepage from landfills (Greenwald et al., 1999). This technology can also be incorporated into septic system designs to prevent nitrate contamination of local ground water (Robertson and Cherry, 1995).

Permeable reactive barriers using sulfate reduction technology may be an attractive strategy to treat certain ground waters contaminated with acid rock drainage. One of the advantages of this strategy is that the reactive wall is underground, eliminating the need to create anaerobic conditions for sulfate reducing bacteria. The in-ground location of a permeable reactive barrier system makes it less visible from the surface, and therefore, more aesthetic than other treatment systems. Finally, it is less expensive than typical ground water "pump and treat" strategies, because the reactive barrier is installed within the ground water flow path. These advantages make application of permeable reactive barriers particularly attractive at abandoned or inactive mine sites and possibly the toe of tailings impoundments.

However, there are two main disadvantages to this strategy that must be addressed. Permeable reactive barrier systems are not feasible at all sites. In order for a permeable reactive barrier system to be successful, the contaminated ground water must flow through the barrier. Local hydrogeology must facilitate movement of ground water through the barrier at a rate at which it can be treated. If subsurface features allows ground water to flow around the barrier, this strategy will be ineffective. Consequently, detailed knowledge of the local geohydrologic setting is required if this strategy is to be considered.

This problem may prove critical for mining applications in northern Minnesota. Bedrock in northern Minnesota is shallow, with only a few feet of overburden (i.e. glacial till) present in most areas (Olsen and Mossler, 1982). Correct placement of a permeable reactive barrier in this situation would be difficult, and in areas with significant outcropping, impossible without blasting and excavation.

The second disadvantage is that the long-term effectiveness of permeable sulfate reducing barriers has not been demonstrated. There are only a few operational-scale demonstrations reported in the literature. Only three mining-related demonstrations have been cited in this document. Of these three, only one demonstrated the ability to remove metals from ground water for more than three years (Table 18). This is most likely due to the gradual degradation of the substrate, resulting in a loss of reactivity and/or permeability. Since substrate degradation is inevitable, permeable reactive barriers will have a definite, finite lifetime. For example, the lifetime of the Nickel Rim reactive barrier was calculated to be only fifteen years. This is a rather short period of time relative to the potential lifetime of water quality problems associated with acid mine drainage (i.e. hundreds of years). Maintenance costs associated with replacing or overhauling reactive barriers may actually be cost prohibitive in some cases. However, a comparison of long-term costs associated with periodic maintenance of a permeable reactive barrier system to active ground water treatment has not been conducted.

Site	Duration of Study	Reference
Nickel Rim Mine, Sudbury, Ontario, Canada	38 months - documented declining reactivity over time.	Benner et al. (2000) Benner et al. (1999) Benner et al. (1997) Blowes et al. (1995) (test cell)
Halifax International Airport, Nova Scotia, Canada	The cells were not very effective. Best results were observed between 252 and 336 days out of >500 days monitored.	Bechard et al. (1995) Bechard et al. (1991)
Ore transfer location, Greater Vancouver Area, Canada	21 months - Acid neutralization and metal precipitation documented	McGregor et al. (2000) McGregor et al. (1999)

 Table 18.
 The long-term success of permeable reactive barriers have not been established.

7.3. Passive Treatment References

Astrup, T.; Stipp, S.; Christensen, T. 2000. Immobilization of chromate from coal fly ash leachate using an attenuating barrier containing zero-valent iron. Environ. Sci. & Tech., 34, pg 4163-4168.

Baker, M.J.; Blowes, D.W.; Ptacek, C.J. 1996. Development of a reactive mixture to remove phosphorous from on-site wastewater disposal systems. Waterloo Centre for Groundwater Research Conference Proceedings for Disposal Trenches, Pre-Treatment, and Re-Use of Wastewater. University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario. pg 51-56.

Baker, M.J.; Blowes, D.W.; Ptacek, C.J. 1997. Phosphorous adsorption and precipitation in a permeable reactive wall: applications for wastewater disposal systems. Land Contamination and Reclamation, 5, 3, pg 189-193.

Baker, M.J.; Blowes, D.W.; Ptacek, C.J. 1998. Laboratory development of permeable reactive mixtures for the removal of phosphorous from onsite wastewater disposal systems. Environ. Sci. Tech., 32, pg 2308-2316.

Beaulieu, S.; Zagury, G.J.; Deschenes, L.; Samson, R. 1999. Use of bioactivation and bioaugmentation techniques for treating acidic metal-rich drainage. In: Phytoremediation and Innovative Strategies for Specialized Remedial Applications. 5th Internat. In Situ and On-Site Bioremediation Symp., San Diego, CA, 19-22 April, pg 211-216.

Bechard, G.; Goudey, P.; Rajan, S.; McCready, R.G.L. 1991. Microbiological process for the treatment of acidic drainage at the Halifax International Airport. In: Proc. 2nd International Conference on the Abatement of Acidic Drainage, (Ed: MEND Program) Quebec Mining Association, Ottawa, 3, pg 171-183.

Bechard, G.; McCready, R.G.L.; Koren, D.W.; Rajan, S. 1995. Microbial treatment of acid mine drainage at Halifax International Airport. In: Mining and the Environment Conf. Proc., Sudbury, ON, May 28-June 1, 2, pg 545-554.

Benner, S.G.; Blowes, D.W.; Gould, W.D.; Herbert, R.B. Jr., Ptacek, C.J. 1999. Geochemistry of a permeable reactive barrier for metals and acid mine drainage. Environ. Sci. Technol. 33, 16, pg 2793-2799.

Benner, S.G.; Blowes, D.W.; Ptacek, C.J. 1997. A full-scale porous reactive wall for the prevention of acid mine drainage. Groundwater Monitoring and Remediation, 17, 4, pg 99-107.

Benner, S.; Blowes, D.; Ptacek, C. 2000. Long term performance of the Nickel Rim reactive barrier: a summary. In: Proc. of the 5th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Denver, CO, May 21-24, 2, pg 1221-1225.

Blowes, D.W.; Ptacek, C.J. 1992. Geochemical remediation of groundwater by permeable reactive walls: removal of chromate by reaction with iron-bearing solids. Subsurface Restoration Conf., Dallas, TX, 21-24 June, pg 214-216.

Blowes, D.W.; Ptacek, C.J. 1994. Acid-neutralization mechanisms in inactive mine tailings. Chap. 10. In: Short Course Handbook on Environmental Geochemistry of Sulfide Mine-Wastes. Vol. 22. (Waterloo, Ontario, May 1994) (Eds: Jambor, JL; Blowes, DW) (Short Course Handbook.) Mineralogical Society of Canada, Ontario, Canada, pg 271-292.

Blowes, D.W.; Ptacek, C.J.; Bain, J.G.; Waybrant, K.R.; Robertson, W.D. 1995. Treatment of mine drainage water using in situ permeable reactive walls. In: Mining and the Environment Conf. Proc., Sudbury, ON, May 28-June 1, 3, pg 979-987.

Blowes, D.W.; Ptacek, C.J.; Benner, S.G.; McRae, C.W.T.; Puls, R.W. 1998. Treatment of dissolved metals using permeable reactive barriers. Groundwater Quality: Remediation and Protection. Proc. of the GQ '98 Conf., Sept. 1998, Tubingen Germany.

Blowes, D.W.; Ptacek, C.J.; Jambor, J.L. 1994. Remediation and prevention of low-quality drainage from tailings impoundments. Chap. 13. In: Short Course Handbook on Environmental Geochemistry of Sulfide Mine-Wastes. Vol. 22. (Waterloo, Ontario, May 1994) (Eds: Jambor, JL; Blowes, DW) (Short Course Handbook.) Mineralogical Society of Canada, Ontario, Canada, pg 365-379.

Brant, D.L.; Ziemkiewicz, P.F.; Svonavec, J. 1995. Anoxic limestone foundation drains for AMD control in coal refuse piles. In: Mining and the Environment Conf. Proc., Sudbury, ON, May 28-June 1, 2, pg 537-543.

Brodie, G.A. 1991. Engineered wetlands for effective treatment of acid drainage - applications, results, and prospects in the Tennessee Valley. 34th Annual Meeting of the Assoc. of Engineering Geologists, Chicago, IL, pg 558-568.

Brodie, G.A.; Britt, C.R.; Taylor, H.N. 1992. Staged, aerobic constructed wetlands to treat acid drainage - the Tennessee Valley Authority Program. West Virginia Surf. Mine Drainage Task Force Symp., Morgantown, WV.

Brodie, G.A.; Britt, C.R.; Tomaszewski, T.M.; Taylor, H.N. 1991. Anoxic limestone drains to enhance performance of aerobic acid drainage treatment wetlands - experiences of the Tennessee Valley Authority. Internat. Conf. on Constructed Wetlands for Water Quality Improvement. October, Pensacola, FL.

Canty, M. 1999a. Innovative in situ treatment of acid mine drainage using sulfate reducing bacteria. In: Phytoremediation and Innovative Strategies for Specialized Remedial Applications. 5th Internat. In Situ and On-Site Bioremediation Symp., San Diego, CA, 19-22 April, pg 193-204.

Canty, M. 1999b. Overview of the sulfate reducing bacteria demonstration project under the mine waste technology program. Mining Engineering, June, pg 93-99.

Canty, M. 2000. Innovative in situ treatment of AMD using sulfate-reducing bacteria. In: Proc. of the 5th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Denver, CO, May 21-24, 2, pg 1139-1147.

Chilakapati, A.; Williams, M.; Yabusaki, S.; Cole, C.; Szecsody, J. 2000. Optimal design of an in situ Fe(II) barrier: transport limited reoxidation. Environ. Sci. Tech., 34, 24, pg 5215-5221.

Conca, J.; Wright, J.; Mockler, T.J. 1999. Phosphate-induced metal stabilization for the remediation of AMD and heavy metal contamination. In: Mining and the Environment Conf. Proc., Sudbury, Ontario, Sept. 13-17, 3, pg 1143-1152.

Cravotta, C.A. III; Trahan, M.K. 1999. Limestone drains to increase pH and remove dissolved metals from acidic mine drainage. Appl. Geochem., 14, pg 581-606.

Eger, P. 1992. The use of sulfate reduction to remove metals from AMD. In: Proc. Am. Soc. for Surface Mining and Reclamation Meeting. ASSMR, pg 563-575.

Eger, P., 1994a. The use of sulfate reduction to remove metals from acid mine drainage. In: Internat. Land Reclamation and Mine Drainage Conf. and 3rd Internat. Conf. on the Abatement of Acidic Drainage, Pittsburgh, PA, April 24-29, pg 412.

Eger, P. 1994b. Wetland treatment for trace metal removal from mine drainage: the importance of aerobic and anaerobic process. Wat. Sci. Tech., 29, 4, pg 249-256.

Eger, P., 2000. Principal Engineer. Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, Division of Lands and Minerals. personal communication.

Eger, A.P.; Lapakko, K.A. 1985. Heavy metals study progress report on the field leaching and reclamation program: 1977-1983. MN Dept. Nat. Resour., Div. of Minerals, St. Paul, MN. 53 p. plus appendices.

Eger, P.; Lapakko, K. 1988. Nickel and copper removal from mine drainage by a natural wetland. In: Proc. 1988 Mine Drainage and Surface Mine Reclamation Conf., April 19-21, Pittsburgh, PA, 1, pg 301-309.

Eger, P.; Lapakko, K. 1989. The use of wetlands to remove nickel and copper from mine drainage. In: Constructed Wetlands for Wastewater Treatment, Chattanooga, TN, June 12-17, pg 780-787.

Eger, P.; Lapakko, K. 1991. Use of wetlands to remove nickel and copper from mine drainage. In: Constructed Wetlands for Wastewater Treatment. (Ed: D.A. Hammer) 780p.

Eger, P.; Lapakko, K.; Chamberlain, P. 1984. Mixed disposal of waste rock and tailings to reduce trace metal release from waste rock. In: Proc. 1984 Symp. on Surface Mining Hydrology, Sedimentology and Reclamation, Lexington, KY. pg 49-56.

Eger, P.; Lapakko, K.; Otterson, P., 1980. Trace metal uptake by peat: Interaction of a white cedar bog and mining stockpile leachate. In: Proc. of the 6th Internat. Peat Congress, Duluth, MN, Aug. 17-23, pg 542-547.

Eger, P.; Melchert, G. 1992. The design of a wetland treatment system to remove trace metals from mine drainage. Am. Soc. Surf. Mining and Reclamation Meeting, Duluth, MN., June 14-18.

Eger, P.; Melchert, G.; Antonson, D.; Wagner, J.; Folman, J. 2000a. Creating wetlands on acid generating tailings - maintenance free reclamation? In: Proc. of the 5th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Denver, CO, May 21-24, 2, pg 1149-1158.

Eger, P.; Melchert, G.; Wagner, J. 1999a. Using passive systems for mine closure-A good approach or a risky alternative. In: Mining in a New Era. CD-Rom. Soc. of Mining Engineers Ann. Meeting, Denver, CO, March 1-3, Preprint 99-38.

Eger, P.; Wagner, J. 1995. Sulfate reduction for the treatment of acid mine drainage: long term solution or short term fix? In: Mining and the Environment Conf. Proc., Sudbury, ON, May 28-June 1, 2, pg 515-524.

Eger, P., Wagner, J. 2001. Sulfate reduction - Designing systems for long term treatment. SME Annual Meeting, Denver, CO, Feb 26-28, Preprint 01-115.

Eger, P.; Wagner, J.; Kassa, Z.; Melchert, G. 1994. Metal removal in wetland treatment systems. In: Internat. Land Reclamation and Mine Drainage Conf. and 3rd Internat. Conf. on the Abatement of Acidic Drainage, Pittsburgh, PA, April 24-29, 1, pg 80-88.

Eger, P.; Wagner, J.; Melchert, G. 1996. The use of overland flow wetland treatment systems to remove nickel from neutral mine drainage. In: Successes and Failures: Applying Research Results to Insure Reclamation Success. Proc. 13th Nat. Meeting, Knoxville, TN, May 18-23, pg 580-589.

Eger, P.; Wagner, J.R.; Melchert, G. 1997. The use of a peat/limestone system to treat acid rock drainage. In: Proc. 4th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Vancouver, British Columbia, May 31-June 6, 3, pg 1195-1209.

Eger, P.; Wagner, J.; Melchert, G.; Antonson, D.; Johnson, A. 2000b. Long term wetland treatment of mine drainage at LTV Steel Mining Company's Dunka Mine. MN Dept. Nat. Resour., Division of Lands and Minerals, 54 p. plus appendices.

Faulkner, B.B.; Skousen, J.G. 1994. Treatment of acid mine drainage by passive treatment systems. In: Internat. Land Reclamation and Mine Drainage Conf. and 3rd Internat. Conf. on the Abatement of Acidic Drainage, Pittsburgh, PA, April 24-29, 2, pg 250-257.

Fyson, A.; Kalin, M.; Smith, M.P. 1995. Microbially mediated metal removal from acid mine drainage. In: Mining and the Environment Conf. Proc., Sudbury, ON, May 28-June 1, 2, pg 459-466.

Gammons, C.H.; Drury, W.J.; Li, Youning. 2000. Seasonal influences on heavy metal attenuation in an anaerobic treatment wetland, Butte, Montana. In: Proc. of the 5th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Denver, CO, May 21-24, 2, pg 1159-1168.

Gillham, R.W.; O'Hannesin, S.F. 1992. Metal-catalysed abiotic degradation of halogenated organic compounds. Modern Trends in Hydrogeol. Conf. Internat. Assoc. Hydrogeologists, Hamilton, ON, May 11-13, pg 94-103.

Gillham, R.W.; O'Hannesin, S.F. 1994. Enhanced degradation of halogenated aliphatics by zero-valent iron. Ground Water, 32, 6, pg 958-967.

Greenwald, R.M.; Rich, P.A.; Ochs, L.D. 1999. Field demonstration of a permeable bioreactive barrier for leachate control. In: Phytoremediation and Innovative Strategies for Specialized Remedial Applications. 5th Internat. In Situ and On-Site Bioremediation Symp., San Diego, CA, 19-22 April, pg 169-174.

Gusek, J.J. et al. 2001. Draft: Handbook of Technologies for Avoidance and Mitigation of Metal Mine Drainage, Acid Drainage Technology Initiative (ADTI), Publ. by University of Reno, NV, in progress.

Gusek, J.; Mann, C.; Wildeman, T.; Murphy, D. 2000. Operational results of a 1200 gpm passive bioreactor for metal mine drainage, West Fork, Missouri. In: Proc. of the 5th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Denver, CO, May 21-24, 2, pg 1133-1137.

Gusek, J.; Wildeman, T.; Miller, A. 1999. Design, construction and operation of a 1200 gpm passive bioreactor for metal mine drainage. In: Phytoremediation and Innovative Strategies for Specialized Remedial Applications. 5th Internat. In Situ and On-Site Bioremediation Symp., San Diego, CA, 19-22 April, pg 217-223.

Hedin, R.S.; Nairn, R.W. 1992. Designing and sizing passive mine treatment systems. 13th Annual West Virginia Surface Mine Drainage Task Force Symp., Morgantown, WV, April 8-9.

Hedin, R.S.; Nairn, R.W.; Kleinmann, R.L.P. 1994. Passive treatment of coal mine drainage. US Bureau of Mines Information Circular 9389, 35p.

Hedin, R.S.; Watzlaf, G.R. 1994. The effects of anoxic limestone drains on mine water chemistry. In: Internat. Land Reclamation and Mine Drainage Conf. and 3rd Internat. Conf. on the Abatement of Acidic Drainage, Pittsburgh, PA, April 24-29, 1, pg 185-194.

Hyman, D.M.; Watzlaf, G.R. 1996. Metals and other components of coal mine drainage. 18th Annual Conf. of the Assoc. of Abandoned Mine Lands Programs, Kalispell, MT, September 15-18, pg 105-114.

Kleinmann, R.L.P.; Hedin, R.S. 1993. Treat mine water using passive methods. Pollution Engineering, August, pg 20-22.

Kolmert, A.K.; Hallberg, K.B.; Johnson, D.B. 1999. Remediation of acid mine drainage by sulfate reducing bacteria in biofilm reactors. In: Phytoremediation and Innovative Strategies for Specialized Remedial Applications. 5th Internat. In Situ and On-Site Bioremediation Symp., San Diego, CA, 19-22 April, pg 225-230.

Lapakko, K.; Antonson, D. 1990. Pilot scale limestone bed treatment of the Seep 1 waste rock drainage. MN Dept. Nat. Resour., Division of Minerals, Saint Paul, MN 45p.

Lapakko, K.; Antonson, D.; Wagner, J.; Jakel, E. 1998. Pilot scale limestone bed treatment of the Seep 1 waste rock drainage. MN Dept. Nat. Resour., Division of Minerals, Saint Paul, MN 23p plus appendices.

Lapakko, K.; Eger, P. 1981. Trace metal removal from mining stockpile runoff using peat, wood chips, tailings, till, and zeolite. In: Proc. 1981 Symp. on Surface Mining Hydrology, Sedimentology and Reclamation, Lexington, KY, pg 105-116.

Lapakko, K.; Eger, P. 1983. Passive treatment of sulfide stockpile runoff. In: Proc. 1983 Nat. Conf. on Environmental Engineering, (Eds:A. Medine and M. Anderson) ASCE, New York. pg 643-651.

Lapakko, K.; Eger, P. 1988. Trace metal removal from stockpile drainage by peat. In: Proc. 1988 Mine Drainage and Surface Mine Reclamation Conf., Pittsburgh, PA, April 19-21, 1, pg 291-300.

Lapakko, K.A.; Eger, A.P., Strudell, J.D. 1986a. Low-cost removal of trace metals from coppernickel mine drainage. Final Report BuMines Contract J0205047. U.S.D.I. Bureau of Mines NTIS #PB 87-186136. 103p.

Lapakko, K.; Strudell, J.; Eger, P. 1983. Sulfide stockpile leachate flow through a tailing bed: Trace metal removal and flow modeling for a low maintenance treatment system. Proc. 1983 Symp. on Surface Mining Hydrology, Sedimentology and Reclamation. Lexington, KY. pg 321-327.

Lapakko, K.; Strudell, J.; Eger, P. 1986b. Trace metal sequestration by peat, other organics, tailings, and soils: A literature review. Final Report BuMines Contract J0205047. U.S.D.I. Bureau of Mines NTIS #PB 87-186144. 45p.

Martin, T.A.; Kempton, J.H. 1999. In situ stabilization of metal contaminated ground water. In: Mining and the Environment Conf. Proc., Sudbury, Ontario, Sept. 13-17, 2, pg 611-615.

Mayer, K.U.; Benner, S.G.; Blowes, D.W. 1999. The reactive transport model MIN3P: application to AMD generation and treatment - Nickel Rim Mine Site, Sudbury, Ontario. In: Mining and the Environment Conf. Proc., Sudbury, Ontario, Sept. 13-17, 1, pg 145-154.

McCarthy, D.; Bullock, R.; Pantano, J. 1999. Evaluation of wetland treatment for the removal of metals from mining impacted ground water. In: Proc. 6th Internat. Conf. on Tailings and Mine Waste '99, Fort Collins, CO, USA, Jan. 24-27, A.A. Balkema, Rotterdam, Netherlands, 808 p.

McGregor, R.; Blowes, D.; Ludwig, R.; Choi, M. 2000. The use of an in-situ porous reactive wall to remediate a heavy metal plume. In: Proc. of the 5th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Denver, CO, May 21-24, 2, pg 1227-1232.

McGregor, R.; Blowes, D.; Ludwig, R.; Pringle, E.; Choi, R.; Booth, R.; Duchene, M.; Pomeroy, M. 1999. Remediation of heavy metal-contaminated groundwater using a porous reactive wall within an urban setting. In: Mining and the Environment Conf. Proc., Sudbury, Ontario, Sept. 13-17, 2, pg 645-653.

McRae, C.W.T.; Blowes, D.W.; Ptacek, C.J. 1999. In situ removal of arsenic from groundwater using permeable reactive barriers: a laboratory study. In: Mining and the Environment Conf. Proc., Sudbury, Ontario, Sept. 13-17, 2, pg 601-609.

Mercier, L.; Brown, J.; Bell, V.; Richer, R. 1999. Functionalized ordered mesoporous materials for heavy metal ion trapping: an emerging environmental technology. In: Mining and the Environment Conf. Proc., Sudbury, Ontario, Sept. 13-17, 2, pg 765-769.

Mine Environment Neutral Drainage Program (MEND). 1999. Review of passive systems for treatment of acid mine drainage. MEND Report 3.14.1, 72p. plus appendices.

Olsen, B.M.; Mossler, J.H. 1982. Geologic map of Minnesota, Depth to bedrock, Map S-14. Minnesota Geological Survey, University of Minnesota, Saint Paul, MN.

Orava, D.; Hallam, C.E.; Swider, R. 1995. Evaluating alternative long-term strategies for treatment of AMD. In: Mining and the Environment Conf. Proc., Sudbury, ON, May 28-June 1, 2, pg 505-514.

Ordonez, A.; Loredo, J.; Pendas, F. 2000. Treatment of mine drainage water using a combined passive system. In: Proc. of the 5th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Denver, CO, May 21-24, 2, pg 1121-1129.

Phillips, D.H.; Gu, B.; Watson, D.B.; Roh, Y.; Liang, L.; Lee, S.Y. 2000. Performance evaluation of a zero valent iron reactive barrier: mineralogical characteristics. Environ. Sci. & Tech., 34, pg 4169-4176.

Ptacek, C.J.; Blowes, D.W.; Robertson, W.D.; Baker, M.J. 1994. Adsorption and mineralization of phosphorous from septic system effluent in aquifer materials. Waterloo Centre for Groundwater Research, Wastewater Nutrient Removal Technologies and Onsite Management Districts Conference Proceedings, Waterloo, Ontario, June 6.

Reisinger, R.W.; Gusek, J.J.; Richmond, T.C. 2000. Pilot-scale passive treatment test of contaminated waters at the historic Ferris-Haggarty Mine, WY. In: Proc. of the 5th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Denver, CO, May 21-24, 2, pg 1071-1077.

Robertson, W.D.; Cherry, J.A. 1995. In situ denitrification of septic system nitrate using reactive porous media barriers: field trials. Ground Water, 33, 1, pg 99-111.

Samuel, D.E.; Sencindiver, J.C.; Rauch, H.W. 1988. Water and soil parameters affecting growth of cattails. In: Proc. Mine Drainage and Surface Mine Reclamation, April 19-21, 1, IC# 9183, US Bureau of Mines, Pittsburgh, PA, pg 367-374.

Sencindiver, J.C.; Bhumbla, D.K. 1988. Effects of cattails (Typha) on metal removal from mine drainage. In: Proc. Mine Drainage and Surface Mine Reclamation, April 19-21, 1, IC# 9183, US Bureau of Mines, Pittsburgh, PA, pg 359-366.

Sjoblom, A.; Allard, B. 2000. Changes in water chemistry along a river receiving treated AMD - the influence of different kinds of wetlands, phase 1. In: Proc. of the 5th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Denver, CO, May 21-24, 2, pg 1185-1192.

Skousen, J. 1991. Anoxic limestone drains for acid mine drainage treatment. Green Lands, 21, 4, pg 30-35.

Skousen, J.G.; Faulkner, B. 1992. Preliminary results of anoxic limestone drains in West Virginia. Minelands, 4, 1, 3-5.

Skousen, J.; Rose, A.; Geidel, G.; Forman, F.; Evans, R.; Hellier, W. 1998. A Handbook of Technologies for Avoidance and Remediation of Acid Mine Drainage. Acid Drainage Technology Initiative (ADTI), Morgantown: National Mine Land Reclamation Center at West Virginia University.

Sobolewski, A. 1997. The capacity of natural wetlands to ameliorate water quality: a review of case studies. In: Proc. 4th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Vancouver, British Columbia, May 31-June 6, 3, pg 1551-1563.

Su, C.; Puls, R.W. 2001. Arsenate and arsenite removal by zero valent iron: kinetics, redox transformation, and implications for in situ groundwater remediation. Environ. Sci. Technol., 35, 7, pg 1493-1503.

US EPA. 1998. Permeable Reactive Barrier Technologies for Contaminant Remediation. Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response, Washington, DC. EPA-600-R-98-125.

Watzlaf, G.R.; Hedin, R.S. 1993. A method for predicting the alkalinity generated by anoxic limestone drains. Poster session, ASSMR meeting, Spokane, WA, May.

Waybrant, K.R.; Blowes, D.W.; Ptacek, C.J. 1995. Selection of reactive mixtures for the prevention of acid mine drainage using porous reactive walls. In: Mining and the Environment Conf. Proc., Sudbury, ON, May 28-June 1, 3, pg 945-953.

Waybrant, K.R.; Blowes, D.W.; Ptacek, C.J.; Benner, S.G. 1997. A geochemical and mineralogical investigation of porous reactive walls for the prevention of acid mine drainage.

In: Proc. 4th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Vancouver, British Columbia, May 31-June 6, 4, pg 1643-1658.

Wieder, R.K.; Lank, G.E. 1982. Modification of acid mine drainage in a freshwater wetland. In: Symp. on Wetlands of the Unglaciated Appalachian Region, West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV, pg 43-53.

Wildeman, T.; Brodie, G.; Gusek, J. 1993. Wetland Design for Mining Operations. BiTech Publishers LTD., Richmond, B.C., Canada.

Wildeman, T.R.; Dinkel, J.W.; Smith, R.M.; McCallister, M.L. 1997. Field assessment of Fe(III), Al, and dissolved O_2 for passive treatment options. In: Proc. 4th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Vancouver, British Columbia, May 31-June 6, 3, pg 1659-1672.

Wildeman, T.; Pavlik, M. 2000. Accumulation of metals in a natural wetland that receives acid mine drainage. In: Proc. of the 5th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Denver, CO, May 21-24, 2, pg 1193-1200.

Yabusaki, S.; Cantrell, K.; Sass, B.; Steefel, C. 2001. Multicomponent reactive transport in an in situ zero-valent iron cell. Environ. Sci. Technol., 35, 7, pg 1504-1510.

Yin, Y.; Allen, H.E. 1999. In situ chemical treatment. Technology Evaluation Report, TE-99-01. Ground-Water Remediation Technologies Analysis Center. Pittsburgh, PA. 74p.

Zaluski, M.; Foote, M.; Manchester, K.; Canty, M.; Willis, M.; Consort, J.; Trudnowski, J.; Johnson, M.; Harrington-Baker, M.A. 1999. Design and construction of bioreactors with sulfate-reducing bacteria for acid mine drainage control. In: Phytoremediation and Innovative Strategies for Specialized Remedial Applications. 5th Internat. In Situ and On-Site Bioremediation Symp., San Diego, CA, 19-22 April, pg 205-210.

Zaluski, M.; Trudnowski, J.; Canty, M.; Baker, M.A.H. 2000. Performance of field bioreactors with sulfate reducing bacteria to control AMD. In: Proc. of the 5th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Denver, CO, May 21-24, 2, pg 1169-1175.

8. Active Treatment Systems

Active treatment is an effective strategy to ameliorate problematic drainages, however capitol and operational costs make active treatment an expensive alternative. It may also require long-term liability, even beyond the life of the operation. In this section, several active treatment strategies will be reviewed.

The most commonly utilized active treatment system for problematic mine drainages in the United States is a neutralization system. Acid neutralization systems are generally moderately expensive, relatively simple to operate, require no pretreatment or specialized chemicals, and address a wide variety of water quality issues. In addition, acid neutralization systems can be enhanced with chemical precipitation circuits for additional metals removal.

Ion exchange and reverse osmosis systems tend to be used in cases where conventional chemical precipitation fails to meet regulatory discharge limits. These technologies are rarely used as stand alone treatment systems. Rather, circuits are added to the existing systems to enhance removal of target dissolved species. In most cases, there are only one or two dissolved species that cannot be removed using conventional methods.

Biological treatment systems are less expensive then the aforementioned systems. However, they require a high level of technical expertise to operate and maintain. They are particularly beneficial when sulfate concentrations must be reduced to relatively low levels to meet regulatory discharge requirements.

8.1 Acid Neutralization Treatment Systems

Active treatment of problematic drainage in the United States typically involves neutralization of acid followed by oxidation and precipitation of iron oxyhydroxides, sedimentation/dewatering, and sludge disposal. Much of the information presented in this section was summarized in a design manual published by the US EPA (1983).

Lime, limestone, caustic soda, and soda ash are examples of chemicals that have been used to neutralize acidic drainage in active treatment systems. Each of these chemicals has specific advantages and disadvantages (Table 19) for use in active treatment systems. Lime neutralization is used the most frequently.

Neutralization is usually followed by aeration to promote precipitation of iron oxyhydroxides. Ferric iron is much less soluble than ferrous iron in a neutral pH range. Therefore, iron removal will be more efficient if ferrous iron present in acidic drainages can be oxidized to ferric iron. This can be accomplished using mechanical or chemical aeration systems. Mechanical aeration is designed to introduce large amounts of oxygen into the drainage and keep iron oxyhydroxide precipitates suspended until reaching a settling basin. Chemical oxidation can be achieved

Neutralization Chemical	Advantages	Disadvantages
Lime	 available in bulk low cost/gram acidity neutralized efficient neutralization raises pH high enough to remove Mn simple handling and storage useful in high flow situations 	 quicklime must be slaked which increases capital costs and requires daily monitoring may absorb moisture during storage may contain "grit" sludges settle slowly large initial capital expenditure
Limestone	 generally inexpensive higher density sludge than lime safe and easy handling 	 low solubility slow reactivity adequate reactivity requires high quality limestone (high Ca, -325 mesh, high specific surface area) difficult to achieve an adequate pH for Fe and Mn removal easily armored, especially if [Fe]>5mg/L
Caustic Soda	 highly reactive liquid, can be pumped or fed by gravity mixes easily with drainage raises pH high enough to remove Mn produces effluent with low suspended solids, turbidity, and Fe content sludges have "acceptable" settling properties 	 expensive dangerous to handle 50% solution freezes at 54 EF
Soda Ash	 briquettes easy to handle dissolution rate ensures continual treatment treatment cells can be arranged in series or parallel to suit needs sludge settles and compacts comparable to lime 	 expensive limited availability only effective for low flow drainages only effective for low Fe drainages, since briquettes may become coated with iron

Table 19.Summary of the advantages and disadvantages of some common neutralization
chemicals used for active treatment of acidic drainages.
through the addition of oxidants such as ozone (Sato and Robbins, 2000), hydrogen peroxide, and potassium permanganate.

Acid neutralization treatment methods produce large volumes of sludge that must be handled and disposed of in an environmentally appropriate manner. Sludges are composed of iron and other metal oxyhydroxides, gypsum and other sulfate salts, and unused neutralization chemicals (e.g. lime, calcium carbonate etc.). Settling and dewatering of sludges can be difficult. However, the addition of polyelectrolytes (water soluble, high molecular weight, charged organic polymers) improves sludge settling rates. Settling units vary from large earthen basins to mechanical clarifiers to filtration units (Table 20). Sludge handling and dewatering tend to be the most costly aspects of neutralization treatment systems. Engineered basins offer a low cost alternative. However, mechanical clarifiers and filtration units offer more control over the final sludge characteristics.

Sludge must be disposed of in a basin or landfill. On-site disposal is less expensive, however it requires a large amount of open space. It is, therefore, advantageous to produce sludges with high solids contents. Numerous conventional and patented processes are used to produce high density sludges (Kuyucak, et al., 1995; Murcock et al., 1995; Orava et al., 1995; Aube and Payant, 1997; Poirier and Roy, 1997; Aube, 1999; Aube and Zinck, 1999; Zinck and Aube, 2000; Zinck and Griffith, 2000). Although each process may have a unique component, they all incorporate a circuit for recycling the sludge into a neutralization reactor. The recycled sludge provides alkalinity to neutralize AMD as well as solid surfaces to promote precipitation of metal oxyhydroxides.

Method	Sludge Density (weight % solids)
Centrifugation	8 - 64
Vacuum filtration	9 - 35
Pressure filtration	9 - 26
Porous drying beds	15 - 25
Drying lagoon	12 - 20
Mechanical clarifier	1 - 7
Lagoon or settling pond	0.5 - 4.5

Table 20.Summary of the sludge dewatering methods used in coal mining (adapted from
US EPA, 1983).

An alternative method to produce a more innocuous sludge is known as the "Ferrite Process" (Choung et al., 2000; McKinnon et al., 2000). Ferrites are magnetic iron oxide minerals that incorporate divalent metals into their crystal lattice, MFe_2O_4 . They can be produced by heating aerated sludges to approximately 65 EC. The sludge must have a ferric to ferrous iron ratio of approximately 1.75, which can be attained by adding $FeSO_4C7H_2O$. The optimum pH is between 9 and 11.

Ferrites containing trace metals can be magnetically separated from the sludge, resulting in a less hazardous sludge. A potential drawback to the Ferrite Process is that high levels of calcium in the sludge will result in coprecipitation of calcite and/or gypsum. These precipitates interfere with ferrite crystal growth. Consequently, pH adjustments are made using NaOH and excess calcium must be removed prior to ferrite production. Calcium removal involves additional expense. However, the commercial value of ferrites may offset the cost.

8.2. Chemical Precipitation Systems

In some systems, the lime treatment system may be followed by an additional circuit to precipitate dissolved species as gypsum, sulfides, or ferric iron co-precipitates. In high sulfate drainages, the lime-treated effluent tends to be supersaturated with respect to gypsum (CaSO₄). Excess sulfate can be removed from solution by adding seed crystals of gypsum, which provide active surfaces to catalyze precipitation (Smit, 2000). Precipitated gypsum is thickened, filtered, and removed as a waste product, or recycled as seed crystals.

Additional metal removal can be accomplished by taking advantage of the relatively low solubility of metal sulfides. The addition of sodium sulfide to the lime-treated effluent promotes metal sulfide precipitation. As with the lime treatment circuit, a polymer can be added to improve settling of fine-grained sulfides, which are usually removed using gravity filtration.

Ferric iron co-precipitation typically occurs prior to the neutralization step (Lapakko, 1993; Ericksen et al., 1999; Aube and Stroiazzo, 2000). This process can be used to remove dissolved species (i.e. molybdenum and arsenic) that do not precipitate well using standard neutralization methods. Ferric iron is added to the raw drainage in the form of ferric sulfate. The pH of the solution is adjusted to 4.5 to optimize co-precipitation. Solids are removed by standard techniques and the clarified water can be sent on to the neutralization circuit for additional metals removal and polishing before discharge to the environment.

Finally, a unique chemical precipitation treatment system, in which heavy metals are encapsulated in a silica structure, is being developed (Mitchell and Atkinson, 1995; Mitchell and Wheaton, 1999; Rybock et al., 1999; Mitchell et al., 2000). The primary reagent is a proprietary calcium/silica-based powder, called KB-1TM. It can be applied dry or in a slurry, similar to typical neutralization reagents. The removal mechanism takes place in phases initiated by different reagent components. One component raises the pH to precipitate metals. The second component polymerizes, incorporating metals into a silica matrix. Within this silica matrix,

metals precipitate as relatively coarse, dense particles, creating a sludge that is chemically stable under normal environmental conditions.

8.3. Ion Exchange Technology

Ion exchange involves the interchange of ions between a solid medium and aqueous solution. The solid medium typically consists of monovalent ions electrostatically attracted to charged functional groups on an inert, polymeric substrate (i.e. resin). Di- and trivalent ions in solution are more strongly attracted to the charged functional groups than monovalent ions. Consequently, di- and trivalent ions replace monovalent ions on the resin, releasing the monovalent species to solution. Water softening is the most common example of ion exchange, where dissolved calcium and magnesium ions exchange with sodium ions on the ion exchange resin.

The long-term effectiveness of an ion exchange resin is determined by the density of functional groups, and therefore the concentration of monovalent ions, on the resin. Once all the monovalent ions on the resin have been replaced, the ion exchange resin will be rendered ineffective. However, ion exchange resins are easily regenerated by periodically back flushing the system with a strong acid, base, or salt solution. Waste water produced by regeneration must also be treated and disposed of properly. The higher the dissolved solids concentration, the more frequently the exchange resins will need to be regenerated.

Ion exchange resins have been shown to remove trace metals and anions from problematic mine drainages. Dissolved di- and trivalent metal ions are removed from solution and exchanged for monovalent ions, typically sodium or hydrogen. Dissolved anions, such as sulfate and arsenate, can also be removed using anion exchange resins. However, high calcium and sulfate concentrations typical of most mine drainages result in the need for frequent resin regeneration. This potential drawback has been avoided in more complicated treatment systems, where a pretreatment step removes some of the dissolved solid load prior to the ion exchange step.

8.3.1. The GYP-CIX Process

Several ion exchange processes have been developed to treat mine drainages. The GYP-CIX process has been particularly promising in the treatment of drainages with elevated calcium and sulfate levels (Bowell, 2000). It uses a series of different ion exchange resins to remove both cations and anions from low acidity mine water without pretreatment (Robertson and Rohrs, 1995). In the first stage, calcium is removed by a strong acid cation exchange bed. This results in a strongly acidic solution, which is passed through an anion exchange unit to remove sulfate and arsenate. The anion exchange unit releases hydroxide ions, which neutralizes the solution. The cation exchange bed can be regenerated using sulfuric acid, which is neutralized with lime to precipitate gypsum and metal hydroxides. Similarly, the anion resin is regenerated with a lime solution, which also precipitates gypsum. These gypsum sludges are similar to those produced by typical neutralization treatment systems and can be disposed of in the same manner.

The GYP-CIX process has been used to treat water from the Berkeley Pit, Butte, MT with encouraging results (Table 21; Bowell, 2000).

8.3.2. BIO-FIX Beads

In the late 1980s, the US Bureau of Mines developed a porous polymeric bead to remove metals from mining-related waste waters (Bennett and Jeffers, 1990; USBM, 1990; Bennett et al., 1991; Jeffers et al., 1992). Nonliving biomass (i.e. sphagnum moss) was immobilized in a polysulfone matrix to create a biomass-foam immobilized extractant (BIO-FIX) bead. Laboratory and field tests showed that the nonliving biomass in BIO-FIX beads effectively adsorbed heavy metals commonly found in mine drainages (Bennet and Jeffers, 1990; USBM, 1990; Bennett et al., 1991; Jeffers et al., 1992).

One of the advantages of BIO-FIX beads is that they are easy to handle and can be used in conventional processing equipment without producing sludge. They are less cumbersome compared to living biomass treatment systems because they do not require additional nutrients or special conditions. Since the biomass is incorporated into a synthetic matrix (i.e. bead), separating the metal-laden biomass from the treated water can be accomplished easily.

Laboratory tests have established the stability of BIO-FIX beads for a wide range of pH values, flow rates, and treatment volumes (Bennet and Jeffers, 1990; Bennett et al., 1991). High metal removal efficiencies were demonstrated in four field-scale tests using two different treatment approaches (Table 22). While maintenance requirements for these tests were generally low, high suspended solid loads resulted in plugging problems (Jeffers et al., 1992). Although the laboratory and field tests have demonstrated effective metal removal in the pH range of 3 - 8, it is not certain how effective metal removal would be in a strongly acidic mine drainage (Bennett et al., 1991; Parker and Robertson, 1998). It should also be noted that BIO-FIX bead treatment does not provide alkalinity or increase drainage pH.

8.3.3. Zeolites and Selective Chelating Resins

Not all ion exchange materials consist of polymeric resins. Naturally occurring zeolites also exhibit cation exchange characteristics (Leppert, 1990; Gussmann et al., 1991; Vos and O'Hearn, 1993; Schultze et al., 1994; Riveros, 1995; Gilbert et al., 1999). The crystal structure of natural zeolites produce negative surface charges that attract cations. Structural differences between zeolites result in variable affinities for different metal ions. Therefore, zeolites should be selected based on site-specific drainage water chemistry and metal removal needs. Advantages of using zeolites as ion exchangers include high physical integrity and loading capacity. However, substantial desorption of sodium, potassium, calcium or other metals into solution may prove to be a major disadvantage. Another disadvantage of natural zeolites is that in practice they cannot be regenerated and must be replaced regularly.

Table 21.The GYP-CIX process resulted in elevated pH and decreased levels of Ca, Mg,
Fe, Mn, Cu, Zn, and SO_4 in waters from the Berkeley Pit, Butte, MT (from
Bowell, 2000).

Concentrations (mg/L, unless noted)	Untreated	GYP-CIX
pH (su)	2.7	8.0
Ca	490	50
Mg	420	20
Na	70	50
Fe	1100	<0.1
Mn	182	<0.1
Cu	186	<0.1
Zn	550	<0.1
SO_4	8000	200

Table 22.Two different treatment approaches have been used to demonstrate metal
removal by BIO-FIX beads in four field-scale tests (Bennet and Jeffers, 1990;
USBM, 1990; Bennett et al., 1991).

Paramete r	Percent Removal	Treatment Approach	Met Discharge Limits?
Cd	90	low-maintenance troughs	U
Со	94	3-column circuit	U
Cu	99	3-column circuit; low-maintenance troughs	U
Fe	>83	3-column circuit; low-maintenance troughs	in 2 out of 3 field tests
Mn	>97	3-column circuit	U
Ni	96	3-column circuit	U
Pb	18	low-maintenance troughs	

ě – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – –

Selective chelating resins and synthetic zeolites have also been investigated as ion exchange materials. However, these materials tend to be degraded at low pH typical of most mine drainages. Furthermore, iron interferes with their ion exchange capacities. One example of a chelating resin that may have application to mine drainage treatment is the Octolig[®] treatment system (Metre-General Inc., 2000). Metal immobilization occurs via chelation by ligands bound to silica gel (resin). These ligands are reported to be highly selective for metals without retaining "benign" ions such as sodium, potassium, or calcium. This selectivity results in effluent metal concentrations in the parts per billion level.

The Octolig[®] resin is insoluble and stable at a range of pH values from 0.5 to 10.5 and temperatures from 0EC to 80EC (Metre-General Inc., 2000). It comes in packed columns from 12 to 42 inches in diameter. The 42 inch columns can treat up to 25 gpm of water. For larger flows, the columns are arranged in parallel. Pretreatment precipitation or filtration circuits can also be added, particularly if the drainage contains high levels of heavy metals. Field demonstrations of the Octolig[®] treatment system have taken place at a Colorado gold mine, the Berkeley Pit in Montana, the Summitville mine in Colorado, and the Leadville drainage tunnel in Colorado (Metre-General Inc., 2000; Appendix 7).

8.4. Membrane Filtration

Reverse osmosis can be applied to a wide variety of water purification needs. Commonly, it is used to desalinate seawater and brackish water to produce potable water. It has also been used to treat problematic mine drainages (Sastri and Ashbrook, 1976; Blackshaw et al., 1983; Awadalla and Hazlett, 1992; Stewart et al., 1997; Berg and Arthur, 1999; Bowell, 2000; HW Process, 2000). Membrane filtration techniques purify water by forcing water under pressure through membranes that are impervious to certain dissolved species. Several membrane filtration techniques, as determined by membrane pore size, have been used world-wide. The exact technique used depends upon water usage requirements (Table 23).

Table 23.	Summary of membrane filtration techniques based on operation parameters and
	water usage.

Filtration Technique	Pore Radius (nm)	Operating Pressure (MPa)	Potential Applications for Problematic Mine Drainages
Reverse osmosis	<1.5	2.7 - 10.3	removal of mono- and divalent salts
Nanofiltration	1.5 - 2.5	1.0 - 2.7	removal of divalent salts
Ultrafiltration	2.5 - 50.0	0.35 - 1.4	removal of colloids and fine particles

		1	
Microfiltration	100 - 10000	0.04 - 0.35	filtration of fine particles

Reverse osmosis separates mono- and divalent salts from water through the application of pressure that exceeds the osmotic pressure of the drainage. Flow through the membrane will be proportional to the net applied pressure and the natural osmotic pressure. Dissolved solids are retained in a brine, which requires special disposal (e.g. lime neutralization).

Advantages of reverse osmosis include removal of both dissolved inorganic and organic contaminants, a simple modular configuration, minimal space requirement, and continuous operation. However, water chemistry typical of most mine drainages may lead to several problems. High levels of dissolved species (i.e. iron, calcium, and sulfate) can result in; (1) high osmotic pressures, which lower the effective driving force for separation, (2) deterioration of product water quality, (3) shortened membrane life, and (4) precipitation of sparingly soluble salts (i.e. gypsum, metal hydroxides), which can lead to membrane fouling and increased resistance to permeation.

Although the lower pH typical of many mining effluents may improve efficiency, it also contributes to the deterioration of the membrane. Reverse osmosis is also an expensive technology relative to more conventional chemical precipitation techniques (section 8.6). Consequently, reverse osmosis is usually only used as a pre- or post-treatment step to remove contaminants not removed by more conventional means.

8.5. Biological Sulfate Reduction Treatment Systems

Biological sulfate reduction systems represent one alternative to typical neutralization systems used to treat contaminated ground waters (Nakamura, 1988; Dvorak et al., 1991; Boreck et al., 1995; de Vegt et al., 1997; Diaz et al., 1997; Rowley et al., 1997; de Vegt et al., 1998; Dijkman et al., 1999; Kolmert et al., 1999). These systems utilize sulfate reducing bacteria to consume dissolved sulfate and acid, producing hydrogen sulfide gas and alkalinity. In order for sulfate reduction to occur, however, a dissolved species capable of donating electrons (i.e. energy source) must be available. Both hydrogen gas (reaction 16) and simple organic compounds (reaction 17) can be used for this purpose and both types of systems have been used to treat mining effluents (Boreck et al., 1995; Diaz et al., 1997; Dijkman et al., 1999).

$$SO_4^{2!} + 4H_2 + 2H^+ 6 H_2S + 4H_2O$$
 (16)

$$3SO_4^{2!} + 2C_2H_5OH + 2H^+ 6 3H_2S + 4HCO_3^{!} + 2H_2O$$
(17)

Hydrogen is generally used in systems with high sulfate loads. However, hydrogen must be produced on site by cracking methanol or using a natural gas steam reformer. Organic electron donors are preferred for smaller sulfate loads.

Contaminated ground water must be pumped to a surface biological reactor, where sulfate reduction takes place. Although systems vary, they generally proceed in a series of steps beginning with sulfate reduction. Alkalinity generated during the reaction helps consume acidity in the waste stream, while biologically produced hydrogen sulfide reacts with dissolved metals (reaction 18):

$$H_2S + Me^{2+} 6 MeS_{(s)} + 2H^+$$
 (18)

where, Me²⁺ represents a dissolved metal. Subsequent steps allow metal sulfide precipitates to settle out of solution. Some systems utilize a "chemical loop," which enables selective precipitation of metals (Nakamura, 1988; Dvorak et al., 1991; de Vegt et al., 1997, 1998).

As a final step, some biological treatment systems recover elemental sulfide as a saleable product. This is accomplished by oxidizing either gaseous or dissolved hydrogen sulfide to elemental sulfur. One documented method utilizes aerobic sulfur bacteria to oxidize excess dissolved hydrogen sulfide to elemental sulfur (reaction 19):

$$2HS' + O_2 6 S^0 + OH'$$
(19)

A second method utilizes the two step Claus Process (reactions 20 and 21),:

$$2H_2S + 3O_2 6 2SO_2 + 2H_2O$$
(20)

$$2H_2S + SO_2 6 3S^0 + 2H_2O$$
(21)

where hydrogen sulfide is stripped from metal sulfides in the sludge.

Biological sulfate reducing treatment systems have the potential to effectively remove sulfate and metals from ground waters contaminated by mining wastes. Biological treatment systems are advantageous over traditional neutralization systems because; 1) lower levels of sulfate, iron, and other metal can be achieved, 2) it produces a relatively innocuous sludge that settles rapidly, and 3) organic waste materials (e.g. municipal sludge) can be used as the electron donor. Sulfate reducing treatment systems have an additional advantage in that saleable elemental sulfur can be recovered, making these systems more economical.

Despite these advantages, biological sulfate reducing treatment systems can be fragile. Sulfate reducing bacteria require an anaerobic and pH neutral environment to effectively reduce dissolved sulfate to hydrogen sulfide. Most ground waters contaminated by mining wastes are anaerobic, satisfying the first requirement. However, these waters tend to be acidic rather than neutral. Acidic influents require neutralization prior to entering the sulfate reducing reactors. The addition of neutralization circuits to treatment system design increases capitol and operating costs, as well as creating additional sludge disposal issues.

Although ground waters are generally anaerobic, they must be pumped to the surface for treatment in biological reactors. Once contaminated ground waters reach the surface, it can be difficult to maintain anaerobicity, particularly in large reactors. Oxygen leaks into the system will lead to decreased effectiveness, and possibly, system failure. Additional problems can be encountered when excess hydrogen sulfide builds up within the system. Hydrogen sulfide gas trapped within the treatment bed may result in gas-lock and diminished flow. It may be possible to bleed hydrogen sulfide out of the system. However, the odor may be problematic, especially in populated areas.

Successful biological treatment of contaminated ground water produces an effluent with low sulfate and metal loads. However, this effluent may not be suitable for discharge into the environment. Low dissolved oxygen levels and high biological oxygen demand (BOD) in treated waters can have detrimental effects on streams and other receiving waters. Therefore, effluents should be aerated prior to discharge. Dissolved contaminants leached from waste materials (e.g. paper sludges) used as organic substrates in the treatment system also present potential problems in the effluent. These contaminants may not be suitable for discharge into the environment and additional treatment steps will be required for their removal. Materials used for organic substrates should be evaluated carefully, since aeration may be an ineffective method of removing contamination from waste materials.

8.6. Assessment of Active Treatment Systems

The goal of an active treatment system is to increase drainage pH and decrease metal concentrations to meet local and national regulatory discharge limits. Active treatment system requirements are almost always site-specific. Drainage chemistry is one of the most important variables that must be considered when choosing an active treatment system. Factors such as pH, sulfate concentration, dissolved metals, and oxygen levels are used to determine which treatment system will best fit the needs for a particular drainage (Table 24).

Treatment Option	рН	Sulfate (mg/L) ¹	Dissolved Metals	Oxygen Levels
Acid neutralization/ chemical precipitation	acidic	> 10,000	low or high	high
Ion exchange	acidic to neutral	500 - 10,000	low	
Reverse osmosis	acidic to neutral	500 - 10,000	low	
Biological sulfate reduction	near-neutral	500 - 10,000	high	anoxic

 Table 24.
 Optimum drainage chemistry for various active treatment systems.

Other variables include site accessability, the amount of available space for process equipment and sludge disposal, climate, and local discharge limits. In some situations, it may be necessary to use a combination of active treatment systems to optimize treatment and/or meet discharge limits. Finally, sludge produced as a result of metals precipitation must meet Toxic Contaminant Leaching Protocol (TCLP) standards in order to be disposed of in a municipal landfill. If sludges do not meet these standards, they must be treated as hazardous waste, greatly increasing the cost of handling and disposal.

8.7. Cost Comparison of Different Active Treatment Systems

Operational costs of active treatment systems vary depending on the choice of system, chemicals and materials required, sludge handling and disposal, and site-specific considerations such as transportation costs. Additional precipitation circuits to remove metals also add to construction and operational costs. However, these costs can be reduced if an economically valuable product, such as elemental sulfur, pyrite, or a specific metal, can be recovered from the waste stream.

Based on information collected from several North American treatment plants (Appendix 6), operational costs for acid neutralization plants are on the order of several dollars per thousand gallons treated (Table 25). One operation reported that chemicals accounted for approximately two thirds of their operational costs (Aziz and Ferguson, 1997). Very little information was available for design, capital, and construction costs for neutralization plants. Based on information provided for a single operation, the Argo Tunnel, CO, these costs are estimated at \$5.8 million dollars.

Ultimately, the costs associated with an ion exchange treatment system depend upon the dissolved solids load in the drainage relative to the drainage quality that must be achieved (Table 26). Due to the regeneration frequency required to remain effective, ion exchange systems tend to be cost prohibitive as a lone treatment for problematic mine drainage. However, in certain situations, ion exchange systems may be cost effective. For example, ion exchange may be cost effective if the drainage in question contains high levels of metals that are difficult to remove by neutralization alone. In this case, an ion exchange circuit placed prior to neutralization can reduce the quantity of neutralization chemicals and associated expense that would otherwise be required to meet discharge limits. Ion exchange should also be considered when very low water quality standards must be met. In this situation, ion exchange is used as a polishing step after neutralization but prior to discharge. Finally, extraction of economically valuable metals may make ion exchange a viable and efficient treatment option.

As with ion exchange systems, the cost associated with a membrane filtration treatment system (i.e. reverse osmosis) depends upon the drainage chemistry relative to the quality of water that must be achieved to meet discharge limits (Table 26). No current mine drainage applications of reverse osmosis were identified during the course of this study. Past applications were used

to treat a specific mine drainage issue and were discontinued, presumably due to the high cost of

Table 25. Average operational costs of selected North American acid neutralization treatment operations (see Appendix 6 for references and contact information).

Operation	Process	Average Flow (gpm)	Estimated Annual Operation Costs (\$ 10 ⁶ /year)	Operation Cost Estimate (\$/1,000 gal)
Argo Tunnel, CO	caustic soda	320	1.2	7.13
California Gulch Superfund Site, Leadville drainage, CO	caustic soda	1600 ¹	1.0	1.61
California Gulch Superfund Site, Yak Tunnel, CO	caustic soda	400 ²	nr ³	nr
Eagle Mine, CO	lime	160	nr	nr
Summitville, CO	hydrated lime	1300 ¹	2.5	9.51
Equity Silver, British Columbia	quicklime	nr	1.1	4.73

¹ Assumes operational period of approximately nine months, excluding winter ² Plant operates three to four days a week ³ nr = not reported

Several active treatment system requirements increase operating costs. Table 26. Qualitative comparison of these variables indicates that ion exchange and reverse osmosis systems are the most expensive systems to operate.

Variable	Acid Neutralization/ Chemical Precipitation	Ion Exchange	Reverse Osmosis	Sulfate Reduction
Pretreatment for solids	na ¹	optional	required	required
Reagent consumption	high	moderate	low	low
Nutrient consumption	na	na	na	high
Energy consumption	moderate	moderate	high	low
Sludge disposal	high	na	na	low
Brine disposal or treatment	na	high	high	na

 1 na = not applicable

operation. High costs are largely due to high energy consumption and the need to dispose of brine wastes.

In general, biological treatment systems are the least expensive, but the most complicated systems to operate (Table 26). Only a few operational-scale examples of biological treatment systems for mining impacted ground water are reported here. Projected capital and annual operating costs for the "Biosulphide Process" treatment system installed at the Britannia Copper Mine, British Columbia were \$2.2 million and \$1 million, respectively (Rowley et al., 1997). The more recently applied THIOPAQ Process, used at Budelco Zinc Refinery, The Netherlands and a pilot plant at Kennecott's Bingham Canyon, Utah Copper Mine, is estimated to cost US \$340/t of sulfate removed. Depending on the current market value, operating costs can be decreased by adding a circuit to recover elemental sulfur for resale.

Cost comparisons between the various active treatment strategies are difficult to quantify. This is due, in part, to a lack of adequate cost analysis data. However, the validity of any such comparison would be questionable on the basis that these systems are employed to meet site-specific treatment needs. Comparisons are further complicated by the fact that one or more of these systems may be used in series to optimize conditions for a particular system or to meet local discharge requirements.

Qualitative comparisons can be made based on the various system requirements (Table 26). Pretreatment circuits and high energy consumption often result in high operational costs (Table 27). Consequently, reverse osmosis and ion exchange systems tend to be more expensive than acid neutralization alone. Sulfate reduction circuits are generally the least expensive because they require very little energy input and reagents can be regenerated on-site. In relative terms, annual operating costs for ion exchange and reverse osmosis systems may be as much as 30 - 50% higher than a conventional acid neutralization system, while operation of a sulfate reduction system may cost as much as 50% less.

- 8.8. Application of Active Treatment Systems to Problematic Mine Drainages in Minnesota
 - 8.8.1. AMAX/Kennecott Test Site

In 1976, AMAX Exploration, Inc. began construction of an exploration shaft near Babbitt, Minnesota. Six small test piles containing 62,000 tons of low grade copper-nickel Duluth Complex rock taken from an exploration shaft, were constructed. In 1982, Kennecott Mining Company took over state leases for the prospect. In 1998 Kennecott reclaimed the site with the exception of the six test piles and the settling basin. The MN DNR assumed liability for the test piles and as part of a NPDES permit had to establish an acceptable active treatment system for the effluent from the piles. Treatment objectives were to develop a low maintenance, low cost treatment system that would reduce all metals in the drainage to less than 1 mg/L (Eger et al., 1993).

Table 27.Qualitative cost analysis information indicate that ion exchange and reverse
osmosis are the most expensive active treatment options, while sulfate reduction
is the least expensive.

Treatment System	Relative Capital Cost	Relative Operating Costs	Estimated Operating Costs (\$/1000 gal)
Acid neutralization	high	1	$1.6-10^{1}$ 0.3-0.7 ³
Ion exchange	moderate	1.3 - 1.5	0.3-0.83
Reverse osmosis	high	1.3 - 1.5	$1-4.6^{2,3}$
Sulfate reduction	low	0.5	highly variable

¹see Table 25

² information obtained from HW Process Technologies, Inc.

³Federal Remediation Technology Roundtable (excludes sludge disposal)

Laboratory tests were conducted by the MN DNR to compare the effectiveness of lime, magnesium hydroxide, and sodium hydroxide at neutralizing acid and removing trace metals (Eger et al. 1993). Tests were designed to determine contact time requirements, sludge production, and dosage requirements for each neutralizing agent. Magnesium hydroxide was selected for field tests based on the following results:

- Easy application,
- Safe handling,
- Maximum pH of 9.5, reducing the possibility of over-treatment,
- Lower mass and volume of sludge per dosage unit,
- Produced the highest density sludge,
- Residual neutralizing capacity available in the sludge,
- Non-hazardous sludge produced.

At the field site, a treatment system designed to be compatible with the existing water collection system was constructed (Eger et al., 1993). The system consisted of a central 3785 L collection sump with a float activated pump. As the sump filled, the float activated pump engaged and discharged about 750 L of treated water to a settling basin. Roughly 570 L remained in the sump after the pump shut off. To maximize contact time between the leachate and the magnesium hydroxide slurry (58% by weight), the alkaline material was added immediately after the sump emptied.

Based on the laboratory results, an initial magnesium hydroxide dose between 1.0 - 2.0 g/L was used (Eger et al., 1993). By the end of the field season, this dose was increased to 2.2 g/L to provide better treatment at high flow rates. Field results generally agreed with the laboratory results. When dosage and contact time (>6hr) were adequate, pH generally exceeded 8.0 and suitable treatment was achieved. However, treatment efficiency decreased, particularly in terms of nickel removal, as flow rates increased above 3.7 L/min. Overall, it was concluded that magnesium hydroxide could effectively neutralize acid and remove metals from problematic mine drainages (Eger et al., 1993).

8.8.2. MN DNR Field Research Site, Hibbing, MN

In 1996, the magnesium hydroxide treatment technology developed at the AMAX/Kennecott site was applied to drainage from field experiments conducted at the MN DNR field research site in Hibbing, Minnesota (Figure 6). Construction cost for the building and treatment system were approximately \$95,000. The treatment plant operates continuously and is designed for a daily maximum flow of 1.5 gpm (Table 28). Approximately 60,000-80,000 gallons of waste water is treated annually at a cost of approximately \$12,000 (MN DNR, unpublished data).

Drainage from field experiments is generally acidic, containing elevated levels of copper, nickel, cobalt, and zinc. Since effluent from the treatment plant discharges into the Hibbing sewer system, it must meet local discharge limits (Table 29). Sludge produced during the treatment process must also meet TCLP limits for landfill disposal.

8.8.3. Dunka Mine Site

Active treatment of problematic mine drainages is currently used at LTV Steel Mining Company's Dunka Mine Site near Babbitt, Minnesota. More than 50 million tons of sulfide bearing rock is stockpiled at this site. The most recent report indicates total flow from the stockpiles ranges from 50 to 200 million gallons per year. Drainage seeping from the stockpiles is generally near-neutral, however, pH values as low as 4.5 have been reported. Despite the neutral drainage pH, copper, nickel, cobalt, and zinc concentrations exceed ambient levels by 10 to 10,000 times.

At present, drainage from these stockpiles is collected and discharged into wetland treatment systems. Outflow from the wetland treatment systems can be pumped to a collection basin for lime precipitation treatment to further reduce trace metal concentrations prior to discharge into Unnamed Creek, and ultimately, Birch Lake. Each year, this system treats approximately three million liters of drainage at a cost of \$200,000 (see A6.2 for description of the process).

Early in 2000, LTV Steel Mining Company announced that they would be closing their operation. In July 2000, LTV proposed re-issuance of their National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit to allow them to shut down the lime precipitation plant at Dunka. In response, the MN DNR requested that the facilities remain in such a condition that



Figure 6. Drainage from field experiments conducted at the MN DNR Hibbing research facility is treated with magnesium hydroxide to neutralize acid and precipitate metal oxyhydroxides.

Source of waste water	mine waste drainage
Flow rate	1.5 gpm
Operating time	24 hours/day, 7 days/week

Table 28.MN DNR Hibbing research site treatment plant specifications.

Mg(OH)₂ dosage

Leachate volume/batch

Sludge volume after settling

Sludge mass / 400 gal batch

Table 29.	Leachate treatment specifications for the MN DNR research site treatment plant,
	Hibbing, Minnesota.

2 .2 g/L

380 gal

2% or 8 gal

7.3 lbs or 3.33 kg

Parameter	Concentration Range in Drainage (ppm)	Concentration Range in Effluent (ppm)	Required Discharge Limit
pН	4.0	7.25-9.0	6.5-8.5
Cu	50 - 150	0.001-0.05	0.5
Ni	100 - 300	0.137-2.1	3.0
Со	10 - 30	0.001-0.1	1.0
Zn	10 - 30	0.001-1.34	4.0

operation of the treatment plant could resume on short notice should the wetland treatment systems fail or if water quality standards in Unnamed Creek are exceeded. Both requests were granted, and the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency reissued LTV's NPDES permit in August 2000 (Permit MN 0042579).

8.9. Active Treatment References

Aube, B.C. 1999. Innovative modifications to High Density Sludge Process. In: Mining and the Environment Conf. Proc., Sudbury, Ontario, Sept. 13-17, 3, pg 1103-1112.

Aube, B.; Payant, S. 1997. The GECO process: a new high density sludge treatment for AMD. In: Proc. 4th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Vancouver, British Columbia, May 31-June 6, 1, pg 165-179.

Aube, B.C.; Stroiazzo, J. 2000. Molybdenum treatment at Brenda Mines. In: Proc. of the 5th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Denver, CO, May 21-24, 2, pg 1113-1119.

Aube, B.C.; Zinck, J.M. 1999. Comparison of AMD treatment processes and their impact on sludge characteristics. In: Mining and the Environment Conf. Proc., Sudbury, Ontario, Sept. 13-17, 1, pg 261-270.

Awadalla, F.T.; Hazlett, J.D. 1992. Application of membranes for the treatment of mining and metallurgical effluents. Proc. Internat. Symp. on Waste Processing and Recycling in Mining and Metallurgical Industries, Edmonton, Alberta, August 23-27, pg 87-103.

Aziz, M.L.; Ferguson, K.D. 1997. Equity silver mine- integrated case study. In: Proc. 4th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Vancouver, British Columbia, May 31-June 6, 1, pg 181.

Bennett, P.G.; Ferguson, C.R.; Jeffers, T.H. 1991. Biological treatment of acid mine waters - case studies. In: Proc. 2nd Internat. Conf. on the Abatement of Acidic Drainage, Montreal, Canada. Sept. 16-18, 1, pg 283-300.

Bennett, P.G.; Jeffers, T.H. 1990. Removal of metal contaminants from a waste stream using BIO-FIX beads containing sphagnum moss. Ch 35. In: Mining and Mineral Processing Wastes. Proc. Western Regional Symp. on Mining and Mineral Processing Wastes, Society for Mining, Metallurgy, and Exploration. Berkeley, CA, May 30 - June 1., pg 279-286.

Berg, G.; Arthur, B. 1999. Proposed mine water treatment in Wisconsin. In: Mining and the Environment Conf. Proc., Sudbury, Ontario, Sept. 13-17, 2, pg 627-634.

Blackshaw, G.L.; Pappano, A.W.; Thomas, G.E. Jr.; Cheng, S.Y. 1983. Pilot plant treatment of acid mine drainage by reverse osmosis. Project Summary. EPA-600/S2-83-031, June.

Borek, S.L.; Dvorak, D.H.; Edenborn, H.M. 1995. Ability of cheese whey to support bacterial sulfate reduction in mine water treatment systems. In: Mining and the Environment Conf. Proc., Sudbury, ON, May 28-June 1, 3, pg 879-885.

Bowell, R.J., 2000. Sulphate and salt minerals: the problem of treating mine waste. Environ. Management, May, pg 11-13.

Choung, J.W.; Xu, Z.; Finch, J.A. 2000. Ambient temperature ferrite process for ARD treatment. In: Proc. of the 5th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Denver, CO, May 21-24, 2, pg 1101-1111.

de Vegt, A.L.; Bayer, H.G.; Buisman, C.J. 1997. Biological sulfate removal and metal recovery from mine waters. SME preprint 97-93, SME Annual Meeting, Denver, CO, Feb. 24-27.

deVegt, A.L.; Bayer, H.G.; Buisman, C.J. 1998. Biological sulfate removal and metal recovery from mine waters. Mining Engineering, November, pg 67-70.

Diaz, M.A.; Monhemius, A.J.; Narayanan, A. 1997. Consecutive hydroxide-sulfide precipitation treatment of acid rock drainage. In: Proc. 4th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Vancouver, British Columbia, May 31-June 6, 3, pg 1179-1193.

Dijkman, H.; Buisman, C.J.N.; Bayer, H.G. 1999. Biotechnology in the mining and metallurgical industries: cost savings through selective precipitation of metal sulfides. Presented at Copper 99 Internat. Conf., Phoenix, AZ, Oct 10-13.

Dvorak, D.H.; Hedin, R.S.; Edenborn, H.M.; Gustafson, S.L. 1991. Treatment of metal contaminated water using bacterial sulfate reduction: results from pilot-scale reactors. Proc. 2nd Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage. Montreal, Quebec, Sept. 16-18, 1, pg 301-314.

Eger, P.; Melchert, G.; Antonson, D.; Wagner, J. 1993. Magnesium hydroxide as a treatment for acid mine drainage in northern Minnesota. Presented at the American Society for Surface Mining and Reclamation Meeting, Spokane, WA, May 16-19.

Ericksen, L.P.; Walker, W.J.; Maslanka, C.K.; Burau, R.G.; Zasoski, R.J. 1999. Bi-phasic neutralization of evapoconcentrated acid mine drainage. In: Proc. 6th Internat. Conf. on Tailings and Mine Waste '99, Fort Collins, CO, USA, Jan. 24-27, A.A. Balkema, Rotterdam, Netherlands, 808 p.

Federal Remediation Technology Roundtable. Remediation Technologies Screening Matrix and Reference Guide, Version 3.0. www.frtr.gov/matrix2/section4.

Gilbert, J.S.; O'Meara, P.M.; Wildeman, T.R.; Crock, J.G.; Desborough, G.A. 1999. Adsorption capabilities of clinoptilolite relating to mine drainage remediation. In: Proc. 6th Internat. Conf. on Tailings and Mine Waste '99, Fort Collins, CO, USA, Jan. 24-27, A.A. Balkema, Rotterdam, Netherlands, 808 p.

Gussmann, H.W.; Everett, D,J.; Du Plessis, J. 1991. The treatment of underground mine waters for the removal of calcium and sulfates by a GYP-CIX process. 2nd Internat. Conf. on the Abatement of Acidic Drainage, Montreal, Sept. 16-18, 2, pg 377-390.

HW Process Technologies, Inc., 2000. Denver, CO. www.harrisonwestern.com.

Jeffers, T.H.; Bennett, P.G.; Corwin, R.R. 1992. Wastewater remediation using BIO-FIX bead technology. In: Proc. 2nd Internat. Conf. Environmental Issues and Waste Management in Energy and Minerals Production. Balkema, Rotterdam. pg 1379-1387.

Kolmert, A.K.; Hallberg, K.B.; Johnson, D.B. 1999. Remediation of acid mine drainage by sulfate reducing bacteria in biofilm reactors. In: Phytoremediation and Innovative Strategies for Specialized Remedial Applications. 5th Internat. In Situ and On Site Bioremediation Symp. San Diego, CA, 19-22 April, pg 225-230.

Kuyucak, N.; Payant, S.; Sheremata, T. 1995. Improved lime neutralization process. In: Mining and the Environment Conf. Proc., Sudbury, ON, May 28-June 1, 1, pg 129-137.

Lapakko, K.A. 1993. Non-ferrous mine waste characterization project, Final Report. MN Dept. Nat. Resour., Division of Lands and Minerals. Saint Paul, MN. 98 p. plus appendices.

Leppert, D. 1990. Heavy metal sorption with clinoptilolite zeolite: Alternative for treating contaminated soil and water. Mining Engineering, pg 604-608.

McKinnon, W.; Choung, J.W.; Xu, Z.; Finch, J.A. 2000. Magnetic seed in ambient temperature ferrite process applied to acid mine drainage treatment. Environ. Sci. Technol., 34, pg 2576-2581.

Metre-General Inc. Advantages of Octolig® Treatment. Westminster, CO. www.octolig.com.

Miedecke, J.; Miller, S.; Gowen, M. Ritchie, I.; Johnston, J.; McBride, P. 1997. Remediation options (including Cu recovery by SX/EW) to reduce acid drainage from historical mining operations at Mount Lyell, western Tasmania, Australia. In: Proc. 4th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Vancouver, British Columbia, May 31-June 6, 4, pg 1451-1468.

Mitchell, P.B.; Atkinson, K. 1995. The treatment of ARD: a preliminary study of enhanced lime treatment by the coapplication of soluble sodium silicate. In: Mining and the Environment Conf. Proc., Sudbury, ON, May 28-June 1, 2, pg 467-476.

Mitchell, P.; Wheaton, A. 1999. From environmental burden to natural resource: new reagents for cost effective treatment of, and metal recovery from, acid rock drainage. In: Mining and the Environment Conf. Proc., Sudbury, Ontario, Sept. 13-17, 3, pg 1231-1239.

Mitchell, P.; Potter, C.; Watkins, M. 2000. Treatment of ARD: field demonstration of silica micro encapsulation technology and comparison with an existing caustic soda-based system. In: Proc. of the 5th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Denver, CO, May 21-24, 2, pg 1035-1043.

Murdock, D.J.; Fox, J.R.W.; Bensley, J.G. 1995. Treatment of AMD by the HDS process. In: Mining and the Environment Conf. Proc., Sudbury, ON, May 28-June 1, 2, pg 431-439.

Nakamura, K. 1988. Biological metal removal from mine drainage. Mine Drainage and Surface Reclamation, Vol. 1, U.S. Bureau of Mines IC #9183, pg 274-278.

Nicolet Minerals Company. Crandon, WI. www.crandonmine.com.

Orava, D.; Hallam, C.E.; Swider, R. 1995. Evaluating alternative long-term strategies for treatment of AMD. In: Mining and the Environment Conf. Proc., Sudbury, ON, May 28-June 1, 2, pg 505-514.

Poirier, P.J.; Roy, M. 1997. AMD characterization and treatment at La Mine Doyon. In: Proc. 4th Internat. Conf. on Tailings and Mine Waste '97, Fort Collins, CO, USA, Jan. 13-17, A.A. Balkema, Rotterdam, Netherlands, 788 p.

Riveros, P.A. 1995. Applications of ion exchangers to the treatment of AMD. In: Mining and the Environment Conf. Proc., Sudbury, ON, May 28-June 1, 2, pg 441-449.

Robertson, A. MacG; Rohrs, R.G. 1995. Sulfate removal of AMD water after lime treatment. In: Mining and the Environment Conf. Proc., Sudbury, ON, May 28-June 1, 2, pg 575-586.

Rowley, M.V.; Warkentin, D.D.; Sicotte, V. 1997. Site demonstration of the biosulfide process at the former Britannia Mine. In: Proc. 4th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Vancouver, British Columbia, May 31-June 6, 4, pg 1531-1547.

Rybock, J.; Mitchell, P.; Wheaton, A.; Hopper, R. 1999. Silica micro encapsulation: an innovative technology for the prevention and treatment of ARD. Proc. Randol Gold & Silver Forum, '99. Denver, CO, May 12-14.

Sastri, V.S.; Ashbrook, A.W. 1976. Performance of some reverse osmosis membranes and their application in the separation of metals in acid mine-water. Separation Science, 11, 2, pg 133-146.

Sato, M.; Robbins, E.I. 2000. Recovery/removal of metallic elements from acid mine drainage using ozone. In: Proc. of the 5th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Denver, CO, May 21-24, 2, pg 1095-1100.

Schultze, L.E.; Zamzow, M.J.; Bremmer, P.R. 1994. AMD cleanup using natural zeolites. In: Internat. Land Reclamation and Mine Drainage Conf. and 3rd Internat. Conf. on the Abatement of Acidic Drainage, Pittsburgh, PA, April 24-29, 2, pg 341-347.

Smit, J.P., 2000. Potable water from sulphate polluted mine sources. Environ. Management, Nov., pg 7-9.

Stewart, D.; Norman, T.; Cordery-Cotter, S.; Kleiner, R.; Sweeney, E. 1997. Utilization of a ceramic membrane for AMD treatment. In: Proc. 4th Internat. Conf. on Tailings and Mine Waste '97, Fort Collins, CO, USA, Jan. 13-17, A.A. Balkema, Rotterdam, Netherlands, 788 p.

Tempel, R.N.; Lengke, M.F.; Ford, R.C.; Eastep, T.E.; Romig, B.R.; Clothier, G. 2000. A quantitative approach to optimize chemical treatment of acid drainage using geochemical reaction path modeling methods: Climax Mine, CO. In: Proc. of the 5th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Denver, CO, May 21-24, 2, pg 1053-1058.

USBM. 1990. Removal of heavy metals from LTV Steel Mining Company water using BIO-FIX beads. U.S. Bureau of Mines, Salt Lake City Research Center, US Dept of the Interior. 13 p.

US EPA. 1983. Design manual: Neutralization of acid mine drainage. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Industrial Environmental Research Laboratory. EPA-600/2-83-001. 231p.

Vos, R.J.; O'Hearn, T.A. 1993. Use of zeolite to treat acid rock drainage from Britannia minesite. In: Proc. 17th Annual British Columbia Mine Reclamation Symposium: Mine Reclamation "Building Confidence". (Ed: Sponsored by: Mining Association of British Columbia) The Ministry of Energy, Mines and Petroleum Resources, British Columbia, pg 223-232.

Willow, M.; tenBraak, C. 1999. Survey of three hard rock acid drainage treatment facilities in Colorado. In: Proc. 6th Internat. Conf. on Tailings and Mine Waste '99, Fort Collins, CO, USA, Jan. 24-27, A.A. Balkema, Rotterdam, Netherlands, 808 p.

Zinck, J.M.; Aube, B.C. 2000. Optimization of lime treatment processes. CIM Bulletin, 93, 1043, pg 98-105.

Zinck, J.M.; Griffith, W.F. 2000. An assessment of HDS-type lime treatment processes - efficiency and environmental impact. In: Proc. of the 5th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Denver, CO, May 21-24, 2, pg 1027 - 1034.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

9. Integrated Case Studies

Whether or not a mine waste produces problematic drainage depends on a wide array of variables that describe the physical, chemical, and mineralogical characteristics of the waste, pre-existing site conditions, climate, and government regulations. Consequently, there is no single, correct approach to environmental mine waste management. A comprehensive mine waste management plan usually involves multiple mitigative strategies to achieve the desired results. Integrated systems, including contingencies to treat impacted waters, are necessary to meet regulatory standards.

Numerous examples of integrated environmental mine waste management approaches could be cited here. However, this section will focus on one example from the Dunka Mine in Minnesota, one existing and one proposed mine in Wisconsin, and a South Dakota mine. The Wisconsin and South Dakota case studies were selected based on geographic, climatic, and regulatory similarities to northern Minnesota. Finally, a list summarizing additional case studies from Canada can be found in Appendix 7.

9.1. Dunka Mine, Babbitt, Minnesota

Although the Dunka Mine near Babbitt, Minnesota is listed in this section, the majority of the information regarding mine waste management strategies employed at Dunka can be found throughout this document (Table 30).

Activity or Research Project	Section in this document
Limestone treatment beds	1.1.1
Stockpile capping program	4.2.5
Co-disposal of hornfels rock in LTV's taconite tailings basin	3.2.4
Wetland treatment systems	1.1.2, 7.1.4, 7.1.5
Active treatment plant	8.7.1, 8.7.2

Table 30.Summary of environmental mine waste management activities and research
projects at the Dunka Mine, Babbitt, MN.

Beginning in the 1960's, Duluth Complex rock was excavated and stockpiled at the Dunka site in order to access the underlying iron formation. In the mid-1970s it was discovered that trace metal concentrations were elevated in Unnamed Creek, which drains the mining watershed (Figure 7). The metal sulfide minerals present in the stockpiled Duluth Complex rock were determined to be the source of the metals in the creek. Taconite mining from the Dunka Mine ceased on August 26, 1994. The location of environmental mine waste management activities and research reviewed in this document can be found in Table 30. Additional information is available in Appendix 7.1 and cited references.



Figure 7. Area map of the Dunka Mine, near Babbitt, MN.

9.2. Flambeau Mine, near Ladysmith, Wisconsin

In January 1991, permits were granted to the Flambeau Mining Company to develop a copper/gold/silver mine near Ladysmith, Wisconsin. Approximately 1.9 million tons of ore was recovered from the mine between 1993 and 1997, resulting in a 32 acre open pit (Table 31). The mine plan called for on-site storage of nearly 5 million yd³ of overburden and potentially reactive waste rock during operations. Upon closure, these materials were backfilled into the open pit and the site was returned to its approximate pre-mining state.

Over time, the backfilled waste rock will be saturated by in-flowing groundwater. Eventually groundwater levels over the pit will return to approximate pre-mining conditions with groundwater flow occurring mainly in the overburden material at average depth to groundwater expected to be less than 20 feet. Similarly, the direction of groundwater flow will return to pre-mining conditions so that flow is predominantly from east to west, toward the Flambeau River which lies about 140 feet from the edge of the pit (Figure 8).

9.2.1. Mine Waste Characterization and Storage

During the Mining operation, nearly 5 million yd³ of waste material was removed from the Flambeau pit. Topsoil was scraped from the surface and stored in a separate stockpile at the northeast edge of the pit. Till, sandstone, and saprolite were stripped and stored in separate cells of the "Type I" stockpile. Site-specific waste rock characterization tests indicated that waste rock should be sorted based on its potential for acid generation as determined by sulfur content. The operational limit for non-acid and acid generating rock was 1% sulfur. That is, waste rock containing less than 1% sulfur was not expected to generate acidic drainage. This was considered to be a conservative estimate.

Parameter	Magnitude
Extent of mine operation	181 ac
Extent of the pit	32 ac
Pit trend	NE-SW
Pit length	- 2600 ft
Pit width	- 550 ft
Maximum pit depth	- 220 ft
Minimum distance to Flambeau River	- 140 ft

Table 31.Physical characteristics of the Flambeau open mine pit and operation (Sevick et
al., 1998; WDNR, 2001).



Figure 8. Aerial view of the Flambeau pit seen from the northeast (WDNR, 2001). The Flambeau River can be seen along the upper edge of the photo.

Approximately, 2.7 million yd³ material was stockpiled in the "Type I" stockpile, which contained roughly 0.63 million yd³ low sulfur waste rock (Table 32). Surface runoff from the Type I stockpile was collected in settling ponds and treated prior to discharge to the Flambeau River. "Type II" material (> 1% sulfur) was placed in a surface storage facility underlain by a liner and leachate collection system (Table 32). Leachate from the high sulfur stockpile, along with water pumped from the open pit and surface runoff from the crusher/loading area, was treated at the on-site wastewater treatment facility before discharge to the river.

Table 32.Overburden and waste rock were classified based on sulfur content and placed
in separate surface storage facilities during operation of the Flambeau Mine
(Chapman et al., 1998; Sevick et al., 1998; WDNR, 2001).

Stockpile	Type I	Type II
Amount of material	2.7 million yd ³	2.1 million yd^3
Amount of waste rock	0.63 million yd ³	2.1 million yd ³
S-content	< 1%	> 1%
Storage area	40 ac	27 ac
Storage facility	unlined surface storage	1' fine grained till 60 mil HDPE liner
Drainage collection	drain to lined settling ponds	lined conveyance to surge ponds
Wastewater treatment	evaporation or pumped to treatment plant	treatment plant: lime neutralization sulfide precipitation filtration

9.2.2. Backfill Operation

The backfill strategy was to place the high-sulfide material in the bottom of the pit followed by the low-sulfur waste rock and then replacing the unconsolidated overburden in its approximate original stratigraphic position. Potentially acid generating material returned to the bottom of the pit was expected to be below the recovered water table. By refilling the pit in this manner, and allowing the ground water table to recover, reactive waste rock would be placed in anoxic conditions similar to those that existed before mining began.

Backfilling of the Flambeau Pit began in fall 1996 and continued through 1997 (Foth & Van Dyke, 1997, 1998). Between August and November 1996, high sulfur waste rock was placed in the bottom of the pit in three foot, compacted lifts. Crushed limestone was applied to high sulfur rock to neutralize stored acidity accumulated while the material was stockpiled, as well as potential acidity generated as the ground water table recovers. Laboratory and field studies and oxygen transport calculations were used to determine alkaline addition rates required to neutralize stored and future acidity, respectively (Foth & Van Dyke, 1997; Chapman et al., 1998).

The rate of limestone addition for high sulfur rock that was excavated from the west end of the pit and immediately deposited in the east end ranged from 4.0 - 4.9 lb/ton. Application rates of 20 lb/ton were used for stockpiled high sulfur rock backfill. In practice, limestone was applied to the surface of each waste rock lift prior to its removal from the stockpile (Foth & Van Dyke, 1998). Approximately 1.5 million pounds of crushed limestone was applied to the high sulfur rock during this portion of the backfill operation (Foth & Van Dyke, 1998). After placement of the high sulfur rock and limestone in the pit was completed, backfilling continued with low sulfur waste rock amended with a limited amount of limestone, saprolite, sandstone, and till.

Surface reclamation of the site began in 1998 by regrading the land surface to its approximate original contour. Stockpiled topsoil was spread over the site and vegetated to create grasslands, woodlands, and wetlands. Reclamation activities through 2000 included seeding, plug planting, tree planting, erosion control, mowing, invasive species control, trail construction, and prescribed burning (Flambeau Mining Co., 2001).

9.2.3. Environmental and Ground Water Monitoring

According to permit requirements, the Flambeau Mining Company must regularly monitor ground water, backfill pore water, wetland, and Flambeau River water levels and quality in addition to aquatic ecology characteristics (WDNR, 2001). As part of the permitting process, both hydrologic and geochemical modeling were used to characterize the potential impacts of the backfilled pit on the Flambeau River (Prickett et al., 1996; Foth and Van Dyke, 1997; Eng. Tech. Assoc. Inc., 1998). Hydrologic modeling indicated that it would take fifteen years for ground water levels in the backfilled pit to recover (Eng. Tech. Assoc. Inc., 1998). Furthermore, calculations showed that the flux of backfill pore water to the river would be 6.5 x 10⁵ times lower than the ten year, seven day, low flow for the river (Flambeau Mining Company, 2001). Consequently, it was assumed that backfill pore water quality would not have a measurable affect on surface water quality. The October 2000 assessment concluded that regional ground water flow, including backfill pore water, is indeed moving toward the Flambeau River as expected (Flambeau Mining Company, 2001).

Ground water quality monitoring in nineteen wells has been conducted on a regular basis. Trends in backfill pore water chemistry indicate a calcium-magnesium-sulfate-carbonate dominated water in equilibrium with calcite and gypsum (Flambeau Mining Company, 2001). This equilibrium condition suggests that stored acidity in the backfill has been neutralized by limestone. Major elements, pH, and alkalinity concentrations have been stable, although iron, manganese, and carbon dioxide levels are higher than anticipated (Flambeau Mining Company, 2001). Concentrations of other metals, including copper, are similar to predicted values. In the October 2000 assessment, it was concluded that backfill pore water chemistry had stabilized and was not affecting Flambeau River water quality.

9.3. Richmond Hill Gold Mine, South Dakota

In 1988, South Dakota granted permits to develop the 400 acre Richmond Hill surface gold mine near Lead, South Dakota (Figure 9; Durkin, 1995; Durkin et al., 1998; Duex, 2000). Approximately 8.2 million tons of ore was recovered from a single pit between 1988 and 1993. Gold and silver were produced from three heap leach pads until 1995. During operation, approximately 3.5 million tons of waste rock was placed in the Spruce Gulch waste rock dump.

In 1992, the South Dakota Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR) discovered a 200,000 ton stockpile of sulfide ore on top of the Spruce Gulch waste rock dump (Durkin, 1995). Subsequent investigation identified acidic drainage containing elevated metal concentrations coming from the toe of the waste rock pile (Durkin, 1995; Duex, 2000). This lead to a series of events including mine shutdown, increased bonds, fines for permit and water quality standard violations, and development of a reclamation plan.



Figure 9. Schematic diagram of the Richmond Hill Mine complex, near Lead, South Dakota. Reactive wastes from the waste dump and process areas were relocated in the mine pit and covered.

9.3.1. Short-term Mitigation Measures

Short-term mitigation measures focused on collection and treatment of impacted waters (Durkin, 1995; Durkin et al., 1998). Beginning in the spring of 1992, treatment and retention ponds were constructed to collect drainage from the waste rock depository. An anoxic limestone drain was used for the initial treatment. However, it was quickly rendered ineffective by ferric hydroxide armoring of the limestone. Subsequent treatment in the ponds utilized caustic soda to neutralization acid and precipitate metal hydroxides. After partial treatment, this water was pumped to an 80 million gallon storm water pond for storage, and ultimately, treatment in the waste water treatment plant. A system of pumping wells was constructed within the retention pond area to collect local impacted ground water within a near surface alluvial/colluvial aquifer.

Several other measures were taken to contain the reactive sulfide ore and inhibit further oxidation. In order to contain further drainage problems, the sulfide ore stockpile was moved to the heap leach pads. Diversion ditches were constructed to prevent unimpacted surface water from entering the depository and becoming contaminated. Since it was likely that some reactive waste rock remained in the depository, lime, limestone, and fly ash were applied to key areas for additional neutralization. Finally, the surface of the depository was sprayed with a semi-sealant to minimize infiltration of precipitation.

9.3.2. Closure Plans

The primary goal of the closure plan was to isolate and stabilize the reactive sulfide ore to reduce the potential for long-term environmental risk to surface and ground waters (Durkin, 1995; Durkin et al., 1998; Duex, 2000). To achieve this goal, 2.7 million tons of reactive material from the waste rock depository and heap leach pads was relocated to the former open pit (Figure 9). The remaining, non-acid generating, waste rock from the depository was incorporated into a multilayer cover system designed to minimize exposure to precipitation and oxygen. The backfilled and covered pit is now referred to as the "Engineered Pit Backfill Facility."

Because the pit lies above the regional ground water table, there was little concern from contamination of deep ground water (Duex, 2000). However, shallow water entered the pit through seeps in the highwalls. Chimney drains were constructed near these seeps to divert shallow ground water around the backfill waste.

The backfill operation was accomplished by placing reactive waste rock in the bottom of the pit in three foot, compacted lifts (Durkin, 1995; Duex, 2000). Before emplacing the cover system, the backfill surface was graded to 3:1 to 6:1 slopes. The cover system, from bottom to top, consisted of 6 inches crushed limestone, an 18 inch low permeability layer, a 54 inch thermal barrier/drainage layer made of non-acid generating waste rock and limestone, and 6 inches of topsoil and vegetation. The low permeability layer, constructed by mixing non-acid generating waste rock crushed to minus $\frac{1}{2}$ inch with high sodium bentonite clay, was placed in two nine inch lifts. Reported permeabilities ranged from 1×10^{-9} to 8×10^{-9} cm/s, which met the target maximum permeability of 1×10^{-7} cm/s (Duex, 2000).

Performance monitoring focuses mainly on water movement into and out of the backfilled waste (Durkin et al., 1998; Duex, 2000). However, pore gas (i.e. oxygen and carbon dioxide) levels, settling, temperature, ground and surface water quality, and aquatic ecology characteristics are also monitored. Monitoring results through 1999 indicate that the multilayer cover system does limit infiltration of precipitation and oxygen into the backfilled waste (DENR, 2000; Duex, 2000). Furthermore, surface and ground water quality and aquatic ecological monitoring suggest that the Engineered Pit Backfill Facility has not adversely impacted the surrounding environment (Durkin et al., 1998; Holm et al., 1999; DENR, 2000).

Water quality at the toe of the former waste dump was markedly improved by removal of the waste rock, although soluble acid salts remain in the colluvium and near-surface fractured bedrock of Spruce Gulch. Consequently, water treatment is still required prior to discharge. It is anticipated that these soluble contaminants will rinse from the impacted colluvium, and that long-term water treatment will not be required in this area.

Reclamation of the three heap leach pads was approved by the DENR in June 1996 (DENR, 1996). Closure issues related to the leach pads included acid drainage from leach pad three, and near neutral pH contaminant mobility from leach pads one and two. Remediation at leach pad three included blending limestone with the spent ore. The limestone was mined on-site, crushed to minus 1/4 inch, and blended at a ratio of 3:1 neutralization potential:acid potential, including an additional factor for the effective calcium carbonate efficiency due to the grain size distribution of the limestone. All three pads were capped with a low-permeability clay cap similar to the Engineered Pit Backfill Facility. Double liner, leak detection, collection, and recover systems are required by South Dakota state law below all heap leach pads. The spent ore from the site was reclaimed in place on the existing leach pad liners to limit potential migration of pad effluent solutions to ground water.

Intermittent water treatment is currently required at the site. Water is collected year-round from the three leach pads and several sources in the former waste dump area and stored in a lined pond. The water treatment plant is operated on a intermittent basis as required by the site water balance.

9.3.3. Environmental and Ground Water Monitoring

According to permit requirements, the backfilled pit must be monitored for water movement, pore gas content, and temperature as well as surface and ground water quality and aquatic health (i.e. Squaw Creek). Performance monitoring as of 2000 indicate that the cover system is stable and effective (Holm et al., 1999; DENR, 2000; LAC Minerals, 2001).

• Neutron probe measurements indicate that the clay cap has limited infiltration of water into the underlying waste, although some infiltration has occurred.

• Oxygen levels in the waste pore spaces remain elevated in local ore zones. However, this is thought to be due to diffusive or convective transport from the base of the backfill along contacts rather than through the cap.

• Temperature profiles were relatively stable and did not indicate the occurrence of accelerated sulfide oxidation.

• Vegetation has become well established on the covered surface, and no cracks or serious erosion problems were visible.

A series of ground water monitoring wells were installed around the former pit, waste dump, and process area. Surface water monitoring sites were established at the toe of the waste dump and at several points along Squaw Creek. Monitoring results indicate that ground water quality trends are improving and collection systems are adequate to prevent impacts to surface water (Duex, 2000). Metal concentrations in the pad effluent are low enough that passive treatment may become a feasible long-term treatment option. A pilot-scale passive treatment system was installed in 1999 (DENR, 2000). Brief summaries of surface and ground water quality appear in Appendix 7.3. All monitoring data is considered public and is available from the DENR (Durkin et al., 1998; Nelson, 2001).

9.4. Crandon Deposit (Proposed Mine), Crandon, Wisconsin

The Crandon Deposit is a massive zinc-copper ore body located near Crandon, Wisconsin. The Nicolet Minerals Company has submitted permit applications to develop an underground mine to remove approximately 55 million tons of sulfidic ore (WDNR, 2001). The WDNR is in the process of reviewing the project. Since the project is only in the proposal stage, a detailed review in this document is not yet warranted. However, a few aspects of the proposed mine waste management plan are listed below (Hockley et al., 1998; Sevick et al., 1998; WI DNR, 2001).

Tailings Management

- De-pyritization of the tailings
- Underground disposal of pyrite tailings
 - incorporation of pyrite in a cement-based paste backfill
 - submergence of the paste backfill upon closure
- Placement of depyritized tailings in the Tailings Management Area
 - base liner (described from bottom to top)
 - fine soil layer (1 ft thick)
 - GCL
 - 60-mil HDPE geomembrane
 - leachate collection system
 - dry cover system (described from bottom to top)
 - site soils placed directly over waste
 - fine soil layer (1 ft thick)
 - GCL
 - 60-mil HDPE geomembrane

- drainage layer
 - vegetative layer

Water Management

- Grouting of underground mine workings to minimize ground water inflow
- Reflooding underground mine workings upon closure
- Active treatment of contaminated ground water from the mine
 - lime neutralization and precipitation
 - sulfide precipitation
 - filtration
 - reverse osmosis
 - evaporation
 - discharge to a soil adsorption system
- Recycling of water from the Tailings Management Area to the mill
- 9.5. References

Berndt, M.E.; Lapakko, K; Jakel, E., 1999. In-pit disposal of taconite tailings: geochemistry. Final Report. MN DNR, Division of Lands and Minerals, Saint Paul, MN, 77 p plus appendices.

Chapman, J.; Hockley, D.; Sevick, J.; Dachel, R.; Paul, M. 1998. Pit backfilling on two continents: comparison of recent experiences in the Wismut and Flambeau projects. In: Proc. 5th Internat. Conf. on Tailings and Mine Waste '98, Fort Collins, CO, USA, Jan. 26-28, A.A. Balkema, Rotterdam, Netherlands, 968 p.

DENR. 1996. 1996 Mineral Summary. South Dakota Department of Environment & Natural Resources, Minerals and Mining Program.

http://www.state.sd.us/denr/DES/Mining/1996sum.htm.

DENR. 2000. Summary of the Mining industry in South Dakota 1999. Prepared by the Minerals and Mining Program, South Dakota Department of Environment and Natural Resources, April 2000. http://www.state.sd.us/denr/DES/Mining/1999minesum.html.

Duex, T.A. 2000. Reclamation at the Richmond Hill Mine, Lawrence County, South Dakaota. In: Proc. of the 5th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Denver, CO, May 21-24, 2, 807-811.

Durkin, T.V. 1995. Acid mine drainage: reclamation at the Richmond Hill and Gilt Edge Mines, South Dakota. Infomine/Enviromine - www.infomine.com.

Durkin, T.V.; Townsend, R.D.; Cepak, M.D. 1998. South Dakota gold Mining: regulations, compliance, and environmental history. SME Annual Meeting, Orlando, Florida, March 9-11. Preprint No. 98-47.

Eger, P., 2000. Principal Engineer. Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, Division of Lands and Minerals. personal communication.

Eger, A.P., Lapakko, K.A. 1985. Heavy metals study progress report on the field leaching and reclamation program: 1977-1983. MN Dept. Nat. Resour., Div. of Minerals, St. Paul, MN. 53 p. plus appendices.

Eger, P.; Lapakko, K., 1991. Use of wetlands to remove nickel and copper from mine drainage. In: Constructed Wetlands for Wastewater Treatment. D.A. Hammer, ed., 780p.

Eger, P.; Melchert, G. 1992. The design of a wetland treatment system to remove trace metals from mine drainage. Am. Soc. Surf. Mining and Reclamation Meeting, Duluth, MN., June 14-18.

Eger, P.; Wagner, J.; Melchert, G., 1996. The use of overland flow wetland treatment systems to remove nickel from neutral mine drainage. In: Successes and Failures: Applying Research Results to Insure Reclamation Success. Proc. 13th Nat. Meeting, May 18-23, Knoxville, TN. 580-589.

Eger, P.; Wagner, J.R.; Melchert, G. 1997. The use of a peat/limestone system to treat acid rock drainage. In: Proc. 4th Internat. Conf. on Acid Rock Drainage (ICARD), Vancouver, British Columbia, May 31-June 6, 3, pg 1195-1209.

Eger, P.; Wagner, J.; Melchert, G.; Antonson, D.; Johnson, A. 2000. Long term wetland treatment of mine drainage at LTV Steel Mining Company's Dunka Mine. MN Dept. Nat. Resour., Division of Lands and Minerals, 54 p. plus appendices.

Engineering Technologies Associates, Inc. 1998. Addendum to Flambeau Mine Ground Water Model. 43 p. plus appendices.

Flambeau Mining Company. 2001. 2000 Annual Report. Flambeau Mining Company, Ladysmith, WI., 36 p. plus appendices.

Flambeau Mining Company. 1997. 1997 Annual Reclamation Report. Flambeau Mining Company, Ladysmith, WI.

Foth & Van Dyke and Associates, Inc. 1997. 1997 Backfilling plan for stockpiled type II material. Prepared for Flambeau Mining Company. Foth & Van Dyke, Green Bay, WI., 87 p. plus appendices.

Foth & Van Dyke and Associates, Inc. 1998. Pit Backfill QA/QC 1997 summary. Prepared for Flambeau Mining Company. Foth & Van Dyke, Green Bay, WI., 57 p. plus appendices.

Hockley, D.; Chapman, J.; Sevick, J.; Moe, D. 1998. Estimating contaminant concentrations in a re-flooded underground mine. In: Proc. 5th Internat. Conf. on Tailings and Mine Waste '98, Fort Collins, CO, USA, Jan. 26-28, A.A. Balkema, Rotterdam, Netherlands, 968 p.

Holm, E.; Burtts, D.; Nelson, M.; Nelson, E. 1999. SOUTH DAKOTA – 1999 Mineral Summary. South Dakota Department of Environment & Natural Resources, Minerals and Mining Program. http://www.state.sd.us/denr/DES/Mining/1999sum.htm#Environmental Issues.

LAC Minerals (USA), Inc. 1996. Richmond Hill Mine: heap leach pad closure geochemical characterization summary report. Prepared by Schafer and Associates, Lakewood, CO, Bozeman, MT. 35 p. plus appendices.

LAC Minerals (USA), LLC. 2001. Richmond Hill Mine: mine pit backfill monitoring annual report. Prepared by Shepherd Miller, Inc., Fort Collins, CO. 81 p.

Lapakko, K.A.; Antonson, D.A., 1989a. Limestone column treatment of stockpile drainage: April 1989 status report. MN Dept. Nat. Resour., Division of Minerals. Saint Paul. MN, 16 p.

Lapakko, K.A.; Antonson, D.A., 1989b. Seep 1 limestone bed: 1988 Progress report. MN Dept. Nat. Resour., Division of Minerals. Saint Paul, MN. 17 p.

Lapakko, K.A.; Antonson, D.A., 1990a. Laboratory experiments on the mixture of alkaline solids with sulfide bearing rock. MN Dept. Nat. Resour., Division of Minerals. Saint Paul, MN. 37 p. plus appendices.

Lapakko, K.A.; Antonson, D.A., 1990b. Laboratory treatment of three acidic stockpile drainages by limestone columns. MN Dept. Nat. Resour., Division of Minerals. Saint Paul, MN. 22 p. plus appendices.

Lapakko, K.A.; Antonson, D.A., 1990c. Pilot scale limestone bed treatment of the Seep 1 waste rock drainage. MN Dept. Nat. Resour., Division of Minerals. Saint Paul, MN. 24 p. plus appendices.

Lapakko, K.; Antonson, D.; Jakel, E., 1998a. Mine waste characterization and drainage mitigation: Research summary 1998. MN Dept. Nat. Resour., Division of Minerals. Saint Paul, MN. 50 p.

Lapakko, K.; Eger, P. 1981. Trace metal removal from Mining stockpile runoff using peat, wood chips, tailings, till, and zeolite. Symp. on Surface Mining, Hydrology, Sedimentology, and Reclamation, University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY, Dec. 7-11, 105-116.

Lapakko, K.; Eger, P., 1983. Passive treatment of sulfide stockpile runoff. In: Proc. 1983 Nat. Conf. on Environmental Engineering, A. Medine and M. Anderson eds. ASCE, New York. 643-651.

Lapakko, K.; Eger, P., 1988. Trace metal removal from stockpile drainage by peat. In: Proc. 1988 Mine Drainage and Surface Mine Reclamation Conf., April 19-21, Pittsburgh, PA. Vol. 1, pg 291-300.

Lapakko, K.A.; Eger, A.P.; Strudell, J.D. 1986a. Low-cost removal of trace metals from copper-nickel mine stockpile drainage. Vol 1, Laboratory and field investigations. Report to the US Bureau of Mines, Contract J0205047, 103p.

Lapakko, K.A.; Eger, A.P.; Strudell, J.D. 1986b. Low-cost removal of trace metals from copper-nickel mine stockpile drainage. Vol 2, Trace metal sequestration by peat, other organics, tailings, and soils: a literature review. Report to the US Bureau of Mines, Contract J0205047, 45p.

Lapakko, K.; Strudell, J.; Eger, P. 1983. Sulfide stockpile leachate flow through a tailing bed: trace metal removal and flow modeling for a low maintenance treatment system. Symp. on Surface Mining, Hydrology, Sedimentology, and Reclamation, University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY, Nov. 27-Dec. 2, 321-327.

LTV Steel Mining Company. 1996. Dunka Mine: Updated Final Closure Plan, Revision 4, March 15, NPDES/SDS Permit No. MN 0042579, 58 p plus drawings.

Nelson, Mark. 2001. Senior Hydrologist, Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Rapid City, SD. personal communication.

Prickett, T.A. & Associates; Engineering Technologies Associates, Inc. 1996. Flambeau Mine Ground Water Model. 66 p. plus appendices.

Schafer, W.M.; Duex, T.; Luckay, C.; King, D. 1995. Characterization of the contaminant potential and remediation measures in waste rock piles in the US, Case study: Richmond Hill Min, USA, site closure - pit backfill with sulfide waste rock. 1995 Wismut Waste Rock Remediation Workshop, Chemnitz-Siegmar, Germany, November 6-8.

Sevick, G.W.; Hutchinson, J.B.; Murphy, J.; Chapman, J.T. 1998. Engineered open pit mine backfilling. In: Proc. 5th Internat. Conf. on Tailings and Mine Waste '98, Fort Collins, CO, USA, Jan. 26-28, A.A. Balkema, Rotterdam, Netherlands, 968 p.

Sevick, G.W., Paruvakat, N., Black, K.P., Hockley, D. 1998. Engineered upland sulfide tailings management facility. In: Proc. 5th Internat. Conf. on Tailings and Mine Waste '98, Fort Collins, CO, USA, Jan. 26-28, A.A. Balkema, Rotterdam, Netherlands, 968 p.

STS Consultants Ltd., 1993. Final closure plan for Dunka Mine. Report to LTV Steel Mining Company. Hoyt Lakes, MN. 218 p. plus appendices.
STS Consultants Ltd., 1994a. Stockpile 8018 capping, Dunka Mine NPDES Permit No. MN0042579. Report to LTV Steel Mining Company. Hoyt Lakes, MN. 6 p. plus appendices.

STS Consultants Ltd., 1994b. 051 treatment system, Dunka Mine NPDES Permit No. MN0042579. Report to LTV Steel Mining Company. Hoyt Lakes, MN. 14 p. plus appendices.

Udoh, F.D., 1993. Minimization of infiltration into Mining stockpiles using low permeability covers. PhD thesis, University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI. 121p.

WDNR. 2001. www.dnr.state.wi.us/org/es/science/Mining/flambeau/flambeau.html. Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources.

WDNR, 2001. Crandon Mine Information. www.dnr.state.wi.us. Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources.