

# **PROVINCE OF BRITISH COLUMBIA**

## **Guidelines for Assessing the Design, Size and Operation of Sedimentation Ponds Used in Mining**

### **NOTE to READER :**

This digital copy was scanned and reproduced by Steve Dimond, Arthon Construction, in conjunction with an Environmental Assessment for the Bella Coola Port and Quarry project by No Cents Holdings and Arthon Construction from a paper copy of this report provided originally by:

Mr. Douglas Hill, P.Eng.  
Pollution Prevention Officer  
BC Ministry of Environment, Lands, and Parks  
Cariboo Region, Williams Lake  
(250) 398-4448  
Doug.Hill@gems7.gov.bc.ca

**File 43450-02/SED**

**First Draft: January 3, 1980**

**This Draft: November 22, 1996**

# Guidelines for the Design, Size, and Operation of Sedimentation Ponds used in Mining

## 1. Introduction

Contaminated surface runoff from disturbed areas of operating mines is a major source of suspended solids which can adversely affect the receiving environment around these mines<sup>17</sup>. The disturbed areas are usually large and include such items as the mine pits, benefaction plants and related facilities, mine dumps, tailings ponds roads, ditches, etc. It is the responsibility of each mining company to collect and treat the contaminated runoff from its operating area before allowing it to be discharged into natural watercourses. Most of the sediment in the contaminated surface runoff should be controlled by various techniques of erosion control, surface runoff control, and reclamation, as outlined in the Mines Regulation Guidelines, and in publications listed in Appendix A to this document.

Rock drains under coal spoil piles and waste rock dumps exhibit sediment buffering capacity. The diversion of sediment contaminated drainage into a rock drain may result in the drain's design capacity being exceeded and should never be undertaken without the approval of the design engineer and the mines inspector.

It should be emphasized that the success of the control of contaminated surface runoff depends primarily on the success of the above techniques in reducing the contaminants entering the sedimentation ponds to reasonably low values. Sedimentation (or settling) ponds should serve to polish the contaminated surface runoff to the required effluent guideline or permit standard. Sedimentation ponds may also be required to remove considerable amounts of sediment for extended periods when other erosion control, or sediment control methods cannot be employed, or for relatively short periods of heavy storm runoff or spring runoff. Particularly during such periods, approved settling aids may be needed to reduce the concentration of fine suspended particles in the pond effluent. Prior to using settling aids, the permittee must obtain the written approval of the Regional Waste Manager. The Regional Waste Manager will require the necessary information on which to base the approval, particularly the 96 Hour LC<sub>50</sub> concentration of the settling aid(s)<sup>5,7,9</sup>, and details of the settling aid selection<sup>4,6,8,10,13</sup> addition rate<sup>3,4,13</sup> (and control method), mixing conditions<sup>4,6,13</sup> and conditioning time/facilities. Details of settling aids are included in APPENDIX B.

The discharge from<sup>3,11</sup> sedimentation ponds is currently regulated by Waste Management Permits for Effluents issued by the Regional Waste Manager of the Ministry of Environment, Lands and Parks. The Effluent Permits typically restrict the concentrations of suspended solids in pond discharges to within the range of 25 to 75 mg/L, Non-filterable Residue (TSS) depending on the sensitivity of the receiving environment and down stream water uses, or as otherwise suggested by the provincial Water Quality Criteria for Particulate Matter, 1985. Contingent on the up-gradient activity (blasting, fuel storage, milling etc.) the permit may also contain limits on hydrocarbons, metals and nutrients in the pond effluent. Regional Waste Managers may set more stringent permit Standards based on sitespecific requirements to protect the receiving water.

The Ministry is presently moving away from permits towards managing waste discharges through focused regulation. This may take the form of a clause in the Conditional Exemption Regulation or an industry sector specific regulation such as the proposed Sand, Gravel and Rock Mining Waste Control Regulation. In cases where environmental considerations require a more stringent waste discharge standard than normal, permits will still be issued.

Experience has shown that extensive logging or overburden stripping prior to surface mining operations can result in greatly increased contamination of the surface runoff. The sediment laden surface run-off then becomes the responsibility of the mining company (s). Accordingly, the mining company(s) should not allow more than the minimum possible area to be logged or stripped, and this work should be done progressively. Experience has also shown that, although the principle of diverting uncontaminated surface runoff around mining operation is desirable, the diversions themselves must be properly designed, constructed, and maintained. Otherwise they may cause serious contamination of surface runoff.

Vegetation "buffer zones" have been used to assist in protecting receiving waters. Where it is not practical to leave a buffer of natural vegetation between the disturbed area and the drainage channel, revegetation of the disturbed area at the earliest opportunity is strongly recommended.

Sedimentation Ponds have been constructed "in-stream" and "out-of-stream". "In-stream" ponds, requiring dams across watercourses, have successfully removed sediment from the contaminated runoff produced in large disturbed areas. "Out-of-stream" ponds, normally formed in flat areas, have successfully removed sediment from contaminated runoff resulting from smaller disturbed areas such as waste dumps, etc.

These Guidelines supplement similar guidelines developed by the Ministry of Energy, Mines and Petroleum Resources (now Ministry of Employment and Investment) in December 1983, entitled "Guidelines for the Design, Construction, Operation and Abandonment of Tailings Impoundments". The principles for the design, construction, operation, reclamation and abandonment outlined in the latter Guidelines also apply to sedimentation ponds.

The reader's attention is directed to literature <sup>22,23,24,25</sup> in the section on "References" which provides more detail on erosion control. Erosion control is considered to be an essential component to reducing the sediment entering the settling pond, and therefore possibly reducing the amount of un-settleable particles leaving the settling pond or eliminating the need for settling aids.

## **II General Guidelines for Assessing Sedimentation Pond Design**

Sedimentation ponds should be designed as follows:

1. All structures in the sedimentation pond system should be designed, as a minimum, to withstand a 1 in 200-year flood event. Even using this design criteria, there is a 10% chance that the system could fail in a mine with a 20-year life. Therefore, "over design" and back-up construction may be required in certain instances such as where there is a high consequence resulting from failure (e.g. a sedimentation pond up gradient from a school or residential area).

2. The design flow for removal of suspended solids in sedimentation ponds should correspond to the 10-year, 24-hour flood flow. Rainfall, snowmelt, and combined rainfall-snow melt events should be considered in determining the design flow.
3. Accurate and up-to-date topographical maps should be used for the design and construction of sedimentation ponds, and these maps should have a maximum of 2 metre contours.
4. Sedimentation ponds should either last the lifetime of the mine without requiring removal of accumulated sediment, or should have provision for easy removal of sediment at regular intervals. Normally a pond is allowed to fill with sediment up to 50% of its effective depth, with 1.5 m (minimum)<sup>18</sup> depth of pond liquid above the sediment.
5. Ideally, a smaller pond should be located upstream from the main sedimentation pond to remove the coarse fraction of the sediment. This smaller pond should be designed to have easy removal of sediment.
6. The inlet section of the pond should have some type of energy dissipater (such as barriers, baffles, etc.) to spread out the flow and reduce the velocity of the incoming water.
7. The discharge section of the pond should be at the opposite end to the inlet section and should have a spillway (or decant or discharge riser) designed to maintain a minimum 0.5m freeboard on the embankment in a 1 in 200 year flood event. The spillway must be armored to prevent erosion of the spillway channel. Also, there should be provisions in the design for installing facilities for trapping, collecting and removing hydrocarbons.
8. Provisions for adding settling aids should be incorporated into the design, preferably upstream of the pond when flocculants are used, since they require longer conditioning time than coagulants. Flocculants may adversely affect sedimentation rate and effluent quality requirements for suspended solids may not be met if excess flocculants are added to the pond.
9. Suitable sampling and flow measuring facilities must be installed to enable monitoring of the pond discharge if required.
10. Sedimentation ponds should be provided with means of draining or dewatering, even though such operations are not planned during the lifetime of the pond.
11. The design and construction of sedimentation pond embankments:
  - a) greater than 2.5 metres high as measured from the downstream toe (Canadian Dam Safety Guidelines) or,
  - b) capable of impounding more than 30,000 m<sup>3</sup> of water (Canadian Dam Safety Guidelines) or,
  - c) having a high consequence to human life or infrastructure resulting from embankment failure,

must be approved by the Dam Safety Unit, Lands and Water Management Department of the Ministry of Environment, Lands and Parks or by the Geotechnical Engineer, Regional Operations, Health and Safety Branch, of the Ministry of Employment and Investment, if the sedimentation pond is on a mine site.

12. The preferred shape of sedimentation ponds is generally rectangular with ratio of length to width of about 5 to 1<sup>18</sup>. Such ponds tend to prevent short-circuiting, and facilitate removal of accumulated sediment. The proponent must investigate the need for additional pond capacity and retention time due to accumulated sediment volume, turbulence and "currents" in the pond on a project-specific basis<sup>18,21</sup>
13. The desired effluent quality from a sedimentation pond must be assessed in relation to the environmental consequences of the construction of the requisite sized pond. Sedimentation pond size is related to the inverse of the square of the diameter of the smallest particle that must be captured to attain the desired effluent quality, thus small improvements in effluent quality require large increases in pond sizes.

### III **Guidelines for Assessing the Required Size of Sedimentation Ponds**

Three methods for sizing sedimentation ponds for mine related applications are presented for consideration. Alternatively experienced engineers may use other equally effective methods and complex computer models designed for urban storm water management could be adopted for mine area use.

Method 1. is based on sedimentation tests prepared from representative soil/runoff sampling and is the preferred method when the smallest effective pond is required. Method 2. is simplified if the critical particle size to be removed is measured using a settling method to provide the Stoke's diameter. The only information lacking for Method 2. will be the answer to the question: "will the fine particles agglomerate 'naturally' in the pond?" If either Method 1. or 2. are not chosen, a third method, (Method 3) can be used which requires the assumption that the finest settleable particles will be present, thus requiring the maximum retention time. Method 3 is acceptable where the larger resulting pond does not cause environmental problems. Provisions must also be made for the addition of a sedimentation aid system.

The following is a brief description of the three methods.

#### Method 1.

A dependable method for designing the required sedimentation pond retention time is to measure sedimentation rates " and corresponding supernatant TSS quality using simulated samples. These samples should be prepared using the soils and/or mine wastes from the watershed upstream from the proposed sedimentation pond location and actual surface water from the area. In addition, soils should be sampled and analyzed for particle size, mineral composition and S.G., particularly the finer particles which are difficult to settle. Measurement of zeta potential (using the "Zeta" Meter) of these particles in simulated runoff fluid will assist in defining whether "natural agglomeration" will be a factor. If natural agglomeration is a significant factor, it will reduce the sedimentation pond area required (or may eliminate the need for sedimentation aids).

The literature<sup>4,12</sup> indicates that particle surface charge of greater negativity than -5 mV is not conducive to "natural agglomeration". Also, many of the minerals encountered (clay and silicate minerals) will have a "zero point of charge" (ZPC) at acidic pHs ( $pH_{zpc} < 5.0$ ). This implies that at the pH expected in most sedimentation ponds, the zeta potential will be

significantly negative and prevent "natural agglomeration"/sedimentation of the fine particles.

If a particle of size "x" mm (and measured settling rate  $V_{\text{actual}}$  m/hour) is to be removed by a sedimentation pond of depth D m, the retention time will be  $[D/V_{\text{actual}}]$  hours. Assuming that the settling tests indicate that removal of particles of size "x" is required to meet the necessary discharge quality, the sedimentation pond area ( $A \text{ m}^2$ ) is then equivalent to  $[Q/V_{\text{actual}}] \text{ m}^2$ , Q being the pond overflow rate in  $\text{m}^3 / \text{hour}$ . Note that D = difference in vertical elevation, in meters, between the inlet and the bottom of the pond adjacent to the outlet.

Sedimentation pond design using settling tests should strive to duplicate any "natural agglomeration" that will occur during operation of the pond.

#### Method 2.

Assuming the size distribution of the influent TSS is known, an alternative common Design approach is to use the settling velocity derived from the Stokes' Law formula:

$$V_s = g/18\mu * (S-1)D^2$$

where

- $V_s$  = spherical particle terminal settling velocity, cm/s
- $g$  = acceleration of gravity,  $981 \text{ cm/s}^2$
- $\mu$  = kinematic viscosity of water,  $\text{cm}^2/\text{s}$
- $s$  = specific gravity of the particle
- $D$  = (Stoke's) diameter (cm) of a non-interacting particle measured using a settling method.

The expected concentration and particle size distribution of suspended solids entering the sedimentation pond are used to determine the smallest particle size (Stoke's diameter or critical diameter) that must be removed to meet the effluent guidelines. The critical settling velocity ( $V_{sc}$ ) is then calculated from the formula  $V_{sc} = [Q/A]$  ( $V_{sc} = 0.01V_s$ ) and the pond retention time/area calculated as shown in Method 1.

The information available (see APPENDIX C) suggests a 20% to 100% sedimentation pond area correction is necessary due to the non-spherical shape of actual mineral particles when their diameters are measured by a method which does not utilize settling.

It is therefore recommended that the size analysis of the finer particles is determined using a settling test method, as this will provide the "Stoke's diameter", which is the diameter of the sphere which settles at the same rate as the mineral particle. Using settling methods to determine particle size ensures that the particles are "non-interacting" (using dispersing chemicals to increase the particle charge) and do not require a correction factor due to non-spherical shape. Therefore, while the use of the Stoke's diameter gains the advantage of eliminating the need for a correction factor due to the irregular shape of the particles, it has the disadvantage of not duplicating any "natural agglomeration" that may occur in practice.

APPENDIX C provides more detail on some of the limitations of Stoke's equation when used to design the size of the sedimentation pond without any on-site sampling and measurement of the Stoke's diameter. Correction factors greater than 2.0 are suggested by the literature if very flat particles, such as mica are present.

### Method 3.

This simplistic design approach has been used to design many of the sedimentation ponds at mines currently operating in the province. Use of this method is not recommended where there are environmental reasons to have the smallest effective pond. In the absence of on-site sampling, the following worst case scenario approach is suggested.

Assume that approximately 5 to 10 micron (and coarser ) particles need to be seffled out in the pond, and that the settling velocity will be in the range of  $2 \times 10^{-5}$  to  $5 \times 10^{-5}$  m/s (assuming the temperature of the fluid in the pond is close to freezing) and then calculate the sedimentation pond area as is detailed in Method 1. Given a minimum pond depth of 1.5m and a settling velocity of  $2 \times 10^{-5}$  m/s for fine silt, it will take 21 hours for a particle to sink to the bottom of the pond. With this practical approach, provision must be made so that approved settling aids can be added if required. It should be noted that the assumed range of  $2 \times 10^{-5}$  to  $5 \times 10^{-5}$  m/s for the settling velocity will remove the smallest suspended sediment particle that practically can be removed by plain sedimentation (namely fine silt at 0.005 to 0.01 mm diameter) - assuming the particle is spherical and smooth with a S.G. of 2.7. In reality the particles are angular to plate like and thus take longer to settle.

Unless there are mitigating factors, the pond should be sized to provide a minimum 10 hour detention time for a 1 in 10 year flood flow.

Using Method 3, increased pond construction costs may more than off-set investigation costs required to use the Methods 1. or 2.

## **IV. General Guidelines for Sedimentation Pond Operation**

1. Operating sedimentation ponds must be inspected and maintained at regular intervals and also after each period of heavy runoff.
2. The pond discharge (flow and TSS) must be monitored at the intervals required by the monitoring program of the Waste Management Perrrut if issued or the applicable regulation.
3. The pond freeboard must be maintained at 0.5 m minimum.
4. The depth of sediment in the sedimentation pond must be monitored at sufficient intervals to plan for sediment removal at minimum pond flow, but before the average sediment depth reaches 50% of the pond depth. A decision from the Regional Waste Manager or applicable regulation may specify a minimum fluid depth.

5. The sediment removed from the sedimentation ponds may be disposed of by burial or by use in site reclamation unless prohibited by a permit or regulation.
6. Should the suspended solids in the pond discharge exceed the maximum permitted or regulated discharge quality, then settling aids would need to be added upstream of the pond.
7. Following the final mine shutdown, the sedimentation ponds must be either:
  - a) Inspected and maintained as in 1. above, or
  - b) Properly reclaimed.

Approved: R J. Driedger, P. Eng.  
Director, Pollution Prevention and Waste Management



## **GLOSSARY**

**Agglomerate** - this occurs when the van der Waals attractive forces on particles in a suspension exceeds the repulsive forces produced by the Zeta Potential of particles in liquid suspension. Particles are then able to form clusters (agglomerules) under suitable conditions and then achieve settling

**Agglomeration** - the action or process of gathering into an agglomerule or cluster.

**Authorization** - a regulation, a permit, approval, license, pollution prevention plan, operational certificate, order, certificate, pest management plan, certificate of compliance, conditional certificate of compliance, or approval in principle.

**Brownian motion** - the phenomenon of particles in a suspension being "jostled about" by the impact of molecules of the fluid. This then results in the inability of particles of about 5 microns or smaller to settle without agglomeration or flocculation.

**Coagulant** - an inorganic compound(s) that lowers the magnitude of the Zeta Potential allowing suspended particulates to gather together to form a cluster or coagule.

**Coagules** - masses or groups of suspended particulates effectively forming larger, settleable particles.

**Contaminant** - a substance added to another substance or which renders another impure, e.g. sugar added to tea would be a contaminant.

**Contamination** - the act of adding a contaminant

**Criteria** - see Guideline

**Floc** - a flocculant mass formed by the aggregation of a number of fine suspended particles.

**Flocculant** - 1. an organic compound(s) that causes the formation of flocs, typically a long chain polymer, 2.a sediment or "precipitate" made up of flocs.

**Flocculation** - a process which occurs when (usually) high molecular weight, long chain organic polymers adsorb and "bridge" onto, and between, particles in a suspension, to produce floccules (flocs) which thereby promote settling. Agglomeration/coagulation is not necessarily a precursor to flocculation, but the two phenomena are often used together advantageously.

**Floccule** - see Floc.

**Guideline** - A numerical limit or narrative statement with respect to substances or procedures which provide policy direction on a provincial, regional or sectoral basis.

**Pollution** - The presence in the environment of substances or contaminants that substantially alter or impair the usefulness of the environment.

**Standard** - A numerical limit or narrative statement with respect to substances or procedures specified in an authorization.

**Supernatant** - A clear liquid overlying material deposited by settling, precipitation or centrifugation, such as the effluent from a tailings or sedimentation pond.

**TSS -Residue, Nonfilterable, (Previously labeled Total Suspended Solids)** The quantity of solid material suspended in a fluid as determined by method B-81 in the British Columbia Environmental Laboratory Manual for the Analysis of Water, Wastewater, Sediment and Biological Materials, 1994 Edition on samples collected in accordance with the BC Environment Field Sampling Manual or procedure approved by a Director.

**van der Waals attraction** - The weak mutual attractive force of molecules or particles in a suspension resulting from induced electric polarization. This enables agglomeration to occur, provided the Zeta Potential repulsive force is less than the van der Waals attractive force.

**Zeta Potential (ZP)** - The characteristic of a particle's charge used to determine it's ability to either coagulate with other particles or remain in a relatively stable suspended condition. ZP may be negative, zero or positive and is measurable with the Zeta meter.

**Zero Point of Charge (ZPC)** - The condition which occurs when the pH of the fluid containing a suspension of particles is adjusted to produce a Zeta Potential of zero. This is termed the Zero Point of Charge and occurs at a characteristic pH in a suspension of specific mineral particles. The Zero Point of Charge can also be achieved by the addition of suitable coagulants (and some cationic/anionic flocculants).

## APPENDIX A

### **Information Sources for the Design of Sedimentation Ponds and the Control of Suspended Solids in Run-off.**

#### **Land Development Guidelines for the Protection of Aquatic Habitats**

Department of Fisheries and Oceans Canada  
British Columbia Ministry of Environment Lands and Parks

Practical advice for stormwater management in the urban environment.

Available from : Habitat Protection Branch Ministry of Environment Lands and Parks 3rd Floor, 780 Blanchard Street Victoria B.C., V8V 1X4

#### **Reclamation and Environmental Protection Handbook for Sand Gravel and Quarry Operations in British Columbia.**

British Columbia Ministry of Transportation and Highways  
British Columbia Ministry of Employment and Investment

Practical advice on reclamation and environmental protection for gravel pits and rock quarries

Available from

Highways Operations Department  
940 Blanchard St., Victoria B.C., V0W 3E6

#### **Rainfall Frequency Atlas for Canada**

Atmospheric Environment Service  
Environment Canada

Rainfall statistics maps for Canada and instructions on how to calculate extreme rainfall events.

Available from - a) Your local public library  
b) Supply and Services Canada

#### **SWMM Storm Water Management Model**

A windows based storm water management model, large, complex and designed for the urban environment.

Available from—

USEPA - [http://www.epa.gov/docs/SWMM\\_WINDOWS/](http://www.epa.gov/docs/SWMM_WINDOWS/)  
The files are large and it may take several hours to download them to your computer.

## **APPENDIX B**

### **Settling Aids**

It is desirable to determine if there is a need for settling aids prior to the construction and operation of the sedimentation pond. This may prevent permit noncompliance and allow better planning and cost projection compared to having to add settling aid addition facilities during operation of the pond. Factors to consider include location of metering equipment, site access and the provision of electrical power.

If the size analysis of the particulate in the feed to the sedimentation pond is such that the 0.01 mm content will produce a pond overflow lower than the 25 mg/l (or as specified in a permit from the Regional Waste Manager), settling aids are unlikely to be required. When initial investigations indicate that there is sufficient 0.01 mm and finer particulate matter entering the sedimentation pond(s) to exceed the allowable pond overflow TSS quality during normal operation, the following information is applicable.

1. If the size analysis is performed using settling methods, this will measure the content of 0.01 mm "spherical" particles, which takes into account the "shape" and other factors which tend to produce slower settling.

Initial testing should establish whether 0.01 mm and finer particulate matter entering the pond settles naturally due to low particle surface charge conditions, which may lead to efficient agglomeration. The testing conditions regarding the particle surface charge, or zeta potential, must duplicate the conditions present during the operation of the sedimentation pond. If the fluid being used in the test is essentially runoff water, then particle surface charge conditions should be comparable, provided the samples tested are representative. This aspect may also be investigated by identifying the minerals in the TSS entering the pond<sup>12</sup>. The ZPCs (zero points of charge, or the pH of the fluid at which the particle charge becomes zero) for the various minerals making up the TSS entering the pond should be an indicator of whether the particles in the pond will possess a surface charge which prevents agglomeration and settling of the 0.01 mm particles<sup>6,10</sup>. The surface charge condition on the particles in the pond or surface run-off can be directly measured using a Zeta Meter<sup>4</sup>.

If "natural" agglomeration is not present, which is the prevalent condition, then there will be a need to add suitable settling aids to settle the 0.01 mm and finer particles (of S.G. 2.7 and less). The reason for this is because most of the common minerals have their ZPCs at low pHs; therefore, at the pH of most sedimentation pond operation (6.5 to 7.5) particles will have a fairly high negative charge. The high negative charge coupled with the Brownian motion effect prevents settling of 0.01 mm and finer mineral particles.

Given the success of flocculants (high molecular weight polyacrylamide and other similar organic compounds), it has become uncommon for coagulants to be chosen as settling aids to assist settling of fine particulate matter in the mine sedimentation ponds. The use of coagulants and coagulant/flocculant combinations is common in water treatment applications or, when there is a need to remove metals, as may be the case in effluents from tailings ponds.

2. The next step is the selection of a settling aid. The flocculant/coagulant suppliers are usually the best resource to obtain the necessary information and possibly the testing to select and optimise a system.

The purpose of a settling aid selection is to:

- a) determine what settling aid promotes settling of the fine particulate;
- b) select a settling aid which has a relatively low toxicity<sup>5,7,9,15,16</sup> and
- c) select a settling aid which achieves the discharge quality required at the lowest cost, consistent with other practical requirements.

The required settling aid dosage to achieve effective settling varies widely, particularly with flocculants. The higher molecular weight flocculants generally require lower dosages than those of lower molecular weight do, while the cost/Kg of flocculant is similar. The positively-charged flocculants (cationic) tend to be the more toxic compounds because they have an affinity for the negatively charged fish gills. This in turn reduces oxygen transfer across the gill.

The toxicity of the flocculants is minimised by preventing over dosing. If the flocculant addition system can add the optimum dosage, or slightly less, most of the flocculant is adsorbed on the particles and remains in the pond attached to the particles. The key test for toxicity is performed on the "supernatant" fluid.

3. The next step is to determine the settling aid dosages to achieve the required amount of enhanced settling. The "protective colloid" effect may result when using some flocculants if over dosing occurs. This results in decreased settling efficiency (and increased TSS) as more flocculant is added. Inadequate mixing may also produce the same result due to "local" over dosing of some of the particles. The "protective colloid" effect is usually irreversible, resulting in the inability of the fine particles affected to settle and high TSS.

For a two-pond system in which the larger portion of the TSS feeding the system is removed in the first pond, the settling aid should be added to the feed to the second pond. This gains the advantage of less erratic changes in flow rate (on which the settling aid addition is based) and the removal of larger TSS particles in the first pond. As the larger particles do not "consume" any settling aid, dosage rates and settling aid costs are decreased. This is only practical if there is provision for adequate mixing/conditioning between the first and second ponds.

One situation to be aware of is attempting to treat suspended particulate with settling aids when the water entering the second pond contains insufficient TSS to allow effective coagulation/flocculation. This problem is solved by increasing the TSS concentration in the water being treated to the point where there is sufficient particle density to promote effective settling.

The control of settling aid addition rates can be aided by measuring the zeta potential of the particles entering the pond.

4. The next step is to determine the required coagulant/flocculent mixing/conditioning requirements.

When the settling aid is introduced to the settling system, there must be provision to allow the particles to adsorb the settling aid and for particles to "collide" with other particles to allow flocs/coagules to "grow". Low shear mixing and adequate time is necessary to achieve this. If the flocculant is added prior to a centrifugal pump, the long chain flocculant molecule is reduced in size and tends to coil back on the same particle. This effectively prevents any further agglomeration with suspended particles and effectively produces a particle which will not settle out effectively.

A convenient location to add the flocculant/coagulant is to a rapidly moving, turbulent flow channel upstream from the settling pond. The addition point must be sufficiently far upstream to provide the required conditioning time determined by the laboratory testing.

## **APPENDIX C**

### **Limitations of Stoke's Equation**

The non-spherical shape of most mineral particles necessitates the application of a correction factor <sup>2,14,19</sup> to the area of the sedimentation pond calculated using Stoke's equation. A correction factor would be based on the lower settling rate produced by the particles not being spherical. Factors proposed vary from 0.85 <sup>19</sup> to 0.50 <sup>2</sup>, or if applied to the sedimentation pond area, 1.18 to 2.0.

Reference 2 indicates that while the direct application of the Stoke's equation is not valid for particles larger than 0.065 mm, a modified method is provided. Using the information in this same reference suggests the correct safety factor to be applied (due to the non-spherical shape of many mineral particles) is closer to 2.0 rather than 1.2. The initial draft guidelines proposed a correction factor of 1.2 This factor appears to have been derived from reference 20, which is based on calculations of symmetrical shapes which are not spheres. The higher factors are based on reference 2 which used testing of different mineral grains. This reference indicates that for very flat particles, a higher factor than 2.0 would be applicable.

Stoke's equation does not take into account other physical phenomena which effect the settling of fine particles in a fluid. These phenomena include:

- a) The movement of the fluid molecules ("Brownian motion") on the fine particles impedes settling of the 0.01 mm and finer particles, unless coagulation/flocculation is used.
- b) The van der Waals attractive forces (i.e. the forces due to the universal phenomena of matter attracting matter) aids in settling fine particles<sup>10</sup>.
- c) Partide surface charge for many of the common minerals at the pH of most settling pond operations is quite high. The zero point of charge (ZPC) for most of the minerals encountered occurs at acidic pHs <sup>12</sup>. Consequently, most of the mineral particles in the sedimentation pond will have sufficient negative charge to prevent particle agglomeration.

These aspects will be unknown unless settling tests and zeta potential measurements<sup>4</sup> are performed. Settling pond design should be based on representative soil sampling, size analyses and settling tests using surface water from the proposed pond site.

## **References**

1. AIME Mineral Processing Handbook, page 30-35 to 30-37.
2. Uniform and Non-Uniform Motion of Particles in Fluids, H. Heyward, Inst. Chem. Engs. London.
3. Settling Ponds at Line Creek Coal Mine, A. G. Chandler.
4. Everything you wanted to know about coagulants and flocculants, Zeta Meta Inc.
5. The Toxicity and Use of Flocculants for Sediment Control, Mark Strosher, Ministry of Environment Lands and Parks, Cranbrook B.C.
6. Coagulants and Flocculants, J. Bratby, Uplands Press Ltd.
7. Polyelectrolyte Toxicity Tests by Pish Avoidance Studies, L. D. Spragg, R Gehr and J. Hajinicolaou, Wat. Sc. Tech. Vol 14 pp 1564 - 1567.
8. A Systematic Approach for Flocculant Selection and Evaluation, H.A. Hamza, Proceedings of the Tenth Annual Meeting of the Canadian Mineral Processors, 1978.
9. Effects of Synthetic Polyelectrolytes on Selected Aquatic Organisms, K. E. Biesinger and G. N. Stokes, Journal WPCF, Volume 58, Number 3, March 1986.
10. Chemical Factors in Flocculation of Mineral Slurries with Polymeric Flocculants, International Mineral Processing Congress, Levingrad, 1968, R W. Slater, J. P. Clark, J. A. Kitchener.
11. A Cost-Sensitive Approach to Sediment Pond Design, Yaroslav Shumuk, CIM, 1986.
12. Aquatic Chemistry, W. Stumm and J. J. Morgan, pp. 478, Wiley-Interscience.
13. Principles of Action of Polymeric Flocculants, 1972, J. A. Kitchener, Br. Polym. J. 1972, 4, 217-229.
14. The Evaluation of Powders, H. Heywood, Journal of Pharmacy and Pharmacology Supplement, 1963, 15 pp. 56T - 73T.
15. An Evaluation of the Efficiency and Toxicity of Two Cationic Liquid Flocculants, R B. Allan and D. A. Davidge, April 1985, Environment Canada.
16. Effects on Fish of Effluents and Flocculants from Coal Mine Waste Water, June 1985, Alberta Environmental Centre.
17. Sedimentation in a Salmon Stream, S. P. Shapely and D. M. Bishop, J. Fish Res. d. Canada, 22(4), 1965.



18. Placer Mining Settling Ponds, Volume I, Design Principles, Sigma Resource Consultants Ltd., Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, June, 1986.
19. Perry's Chemical Engineer's Handbook, pages 5-61 to 5-65.
20. Pettyjohn and Christiansen, Chem. Eng. Progr. 44, 157-172, 1948.
21. Process Design Manual for Suspended Solids Removal, EPA, January 1975.
22. Erosion and Sediment Control Handbook, Goldman S.J., Jackson K., Bursztynsky T.A, McGraw Hill Book Company
23. Reclamation and Environmental Protection Handbook for Sand, Gravel and Quarry Operations in B.C., Ministry of Transportation and Highways, Properties Branch
24. Land Development Guidelines for the Protection of Aquatic Habitat, Fisheries and Oceans Canada and Ministry of Environment, Lands and Parks.
25. Erosion and Sediment Control - Surface Mining in the Eastern U.S., EPA, 1976 (Volume 1, "Design")