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Performance Objective of a Dry Cover

- reduce infiltration of water or oxygen through the surface sufficiently to achieve a ‘significant’ reduction in contaminant loading

A significant reduction in loading could:
- Permit direct discharge
- Reduce overall mitigation costs (e.g., reduces $ for treatment)
- Reduce off site impacts (less-regulated site)
• The performance objective for oxygen reducing cover is to prevent or significantly reduce sulphide oxidation.

• The performance objective for drainage reducing cover is to reduce the volume component of contaminant loading.

Many covers are intended for both purposes.
Cover Materials
Most commonly clayey soil or geotextile or some combination. Also organic covers and some new ideas (e.g., permanganate)
Cover mechanisms for reducing $O_2$ and $H_2O$ infiltration are well understood, many references to contributing factors and predicted performance

E.g., Diffusion of oxygen through covers described by Fick’s Laws. Flux of oxygen is proportional to the oxygen gradient and the effective diffusion coefficient (D) of the cover. The value of “D” is controlled by the degree of saturation.
Example of Evaluation of Factors Contributing to Performance of Soil Covers for Oxygen Control

Moisture retention is a function of grain size.

Fine grained materials retain high degrees of moisture.
Components of a Dry Cover

- Low conductivity material to reduce O₂ and H₂O infiltration (e.g., compact clay or geotextile)

- Surface
  - conduct excess water off the cover
  - protect low conductivity layer
  - support plant growth and increase evapotranspiration

- Bottom
  - may contribute to the impedance of infiltration
  - prevent contamination of biota on surface.
Cover Design and Construction

Need:

• cost-effective source of cover materials;
• engineered design, which should include the following;
  – detailed materials testing;
  – site preparation;
  – QA/QC during construction;
  – vegetation management plan;
  – drainage management plan; and
  – plans for monitoring, maintenance, repair and if required replacement and supplemental mitigation.
Site preparation may include resloping angle of repose waste rock dumps prior to cover construction. Some regrading may also be required to remove drainage from covered tailings.
Sullivan uses a lower layer of float rock as a barrier to the upward migration of contaminants from tailings into the soil cover.
Moisture, clay and coarse fragment content all affect soil compaction.
With massive quantities and machinery involved, detailed QA/QC is needed to ensure required soil quality and depth of different layers.
Construction requirements are also very important for geotextile covers. Lots of data on construction requirements available from use of geotextile liners by heap leaches and landfills.
Species Use in Cover Revegetation

- Advantages of herbaceous species are that they make it easier to identify surface deformation, and provide better erosion control and a barrier to native invasion than woody species.
- Tree-throw by woody species may damage cover.
- Root growth by both woody and herbaceous plant species can damage compacted soil layer if at times of the year this layer becomes the only source of water and nutrients.
Vegetation Management

- Removal of woody species from cover
- Repair areas of erosion, disease, etc.
- Likely need to reseed, fertilize and/or lime to keep herbaceous cover healthy and competitive
Drainage Plan for Cover

Adequate slope and frequency of ditches are required to prevent increased infiltration due to ponding. Open ditches are less likely to plug than drains or culverts.
Runoff collection structures must be properly sloped, sized, armoured and maintained.

Where contaminated drainage is also collected, an additional challenge is separately disposing of clean drainage diverted by the cover system.
Overall Performance of Cover System

Reduction in drainage and oxygen depends on:
1. cover effectiveness in preventing surface infiltration; and
2. amount of water or oxygen infiltrating through subsurface.
Ideal situation for drainage is if the waste is on a height of land with no groundwater inputs, as is the case with this tailings impoundment in Quebec.
Cirque placed a liner underneath and above to totally encapsulate the 24,000 m³ pile of waste rock.
More commonly subsurface inputs are significant and a ‘dry cover system’ must incorporate measures such as upslope barrier walls and ditches to reduce subsurface inputs.
Long-Term Performance

Cover systems need to be designed, operated and financed in a manner that allows pro-active detection and resolution of problems prior to significant environmental impact. This requires:

– conservative design;
– ability to handle future geochemistry, hydrology, ecology, etc.;
– monitoring, maintenance* & contingency plans;
– regularly updated operating manuals and monitoring database; and
– financial resources to conduct the above.

*including repair and replacement
Decreased performance of the cover may result from dump settling, changes to the cover materials, changes to plant cover, root growth, burrowing animals, erosion and freeze/thaw.
• Dump settling may result from chemical and physical weathering or melting of snow and ice within the dump.

• Changes to the cover material may result from soil development (pedogenesis) or degradation of geotextile.

• Changes to plant cover include decreased growth due to fire, insects and disease, plant succession, and root growth into low conductivity material.
Decreased performance of the cover system may also result from damage to drainage diversion and collection systems, through ditch scouring, overtopping or damage when snow, ice and other debris are removed.
Conservative Cover System Design
Has the durability and capacity to achieve operational objectives during and after extreme climate or seismic events.
Depth of Cover: At Waihi Mine in New Zealand, cover is 2.5 m deep, with 50 cm topsoil, 50 cm loose subsoil and 1.5 m compacted clayey soil.
Extra Drainage Capacity: Waste backfilled so drainage through or around the cover flows under the potentially ARD generating wastes.

Not To Scale

Modified from J.G. Skousen, et.al., 1987
In this design, a deep soil cover, extra drainage and placement of tailings in cells are all included to minimize the impacts of a local failure.
Supplemental Mitigation

Must be aware of dependence of primary mitigation measures on performance of cover system.

Sizing of collection system, treatment plant and financing may all assume some minimal cover performance.
Increased infiltration through cover or failure of ditches on cover could greatly increase size of peak runoff events and consequently the required capacity of toe ditches collecting contaminated discharge.
Maintenance Plan for ‘Cover System’
Includes:

- removal of woody species invading cover,
- repair erosion,
- removal of vegetative debris and sediment from ditches, and
- removal of ice from ditches prior to freshet
Monitoring Plan for Cover System

Key aspect of the work to sustain the design capacity:
– provide early warning of potential problems
– inform corrective measures
– allow timely implementation of contingency plans
Micro-Scale Monitoring

Typical measurements include cover moisture content and H$_2$O infiltration. These results can be misleading if:

– equipment installation impacts surrounding cover (e.g., lysimeter);
– lack monitoring in areas of concern (e.g., ponding, lower slopes, collection ditches);
– do not detect local features with wider implications such as settlement fractures.
Macro-Scale Monitoring of Cover

Includes visual observations of cover appearance and drainage, and measuring precipitation and snow accumulation, and the resulting water quality and flow.
• Equity and Sullivan monitor height of water table and groundwater quality.
• Lack of information regarding groundwater inputs is a major impediment in calculating a water balance and evaluating cover performance.
• Where groundwater inputs are uncertain, comparison of runoff volumes with volume of incident precipitation + snow pack is perhaps the best indicator of overall cover performance.

• Changes in local runoff may prove to be a good tool for indicating when and approximately where repairs are required.
Sites presently do not continuously monitor cover runoff and therefore cannot measure runoff.

Challenges in continuous monitoring of runoff include a large number of monitoring locations, snow cover at critical times of the year, potential for exposed water to freeze, lack of power, and wide fluctuations in flow.
The Waste Beneath the Cover

Performance of the cover system also depends on the geochemistry and hydrogeology of the waste beneath the cover. Usually overlooked by cover design and researchers.
• Groundwater rebound following mining may greatly increase subsurface drainage inputs.
• Conversely, measures that lower the water table may significantly increase subsurface oxygen entry
Changes in weathering and drainage chemistry of the waste may increase concentrations of acidity and metals sufficiently to increase overall loadings.
Monitoring beneath the cover commonly limited to temperature and oxygen. These parameters provide useful data. However, drainage chemistry may deteriorate decrease in both temperature and oxygen.
Studies indicate that $O_2$ concentration must be $< 2\%$ to reduce rate of sulphide oxidation
- Need large decrease in $O_2$ to reduce sulphide oxidation.

Studies also indicate that rate of sulphide oxidation is typically $>>$ rate of trace metal leaching
- Need large decrease in sulphide oxidation to reduce accumulation of trace metals
Presently the main way to measure changes in drainage chemistry is by monitoring seeps. In seep monitoring, it is important to monitor when and where new seeps occur.
Also important to monitor frequently and measure discharge rate. Changes in seep chemistry may result from changes in flow or drainage sources rather than dump weathering.
A risk in using dry covers that needs to be considered in cover system design

If the cover reduces leaching but does not reduce sulphide oxidation, there will be a greater accumulation of weathering products in the underlying waste compared to an uncovered dump.
The accumulation of soluble weathering products increases the likelihood of potential environmental consequences should the dump cover break. It could also potentially result in increased loadings compared to an uncovered dump during large runoff events.
Much of the cover work has been done on small scale trials, computer simulations, and micro-scale monitoring. As a result mechanisms of cover performance are well understood, with many references to the contributing factors and theoretical performance.

Far less information is available on real cover performance, departures from the ideal, such as permafrost, and cover durability.
Associated with the uncertainty about durability is significant uncertainty about how to pro-actively repair covers, repair and replacement costs, and triggers to initiate that work.
Future work needs to address ways to monitor local cover and ditch performance, the performance of the waste beneath the cover and the risks where weathering products accumulate underneath the cover.
Conclusions
The three most commonly used ML/ARD mitigation strategies are underwater disposal, collect and treat drainage, and dry cover systems. All three have strengths and weaknesses.
The selection of the best mitigation strategy for a particular site should be based on a site-specific assessment of which strategy creates the least liability and environmental risk.

For dry covers, this includes having a realistic view of the breadth and depth of the information, design and maintenance requirements; and your ability to collect the necessary information and answer the required questions in a pro-active manner.
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