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Pb/Zn smelter slag site in Katowice Poland in 1994. Materials were 3 to 10% total-Zn, > 1000 ppm water soluble Zn, and > 90 ppm water soluble Cd.
Three Important Principles

In order to develop appropriate reclamation protocols for any site, we must develop a detailed understanding of:

1. Soil, biotic and water quality conditions before disturbance or in an appropriate reference area.
Three Important Principles

2. We must thoroughly understand the nature of the mining or other disturbance process and how it impacts soil and site conditions during and after mining.

3. We must be able to predict how soil, site, and vegetation conditions will change with time after reclamation is initiated.
The Mid-Atlantics

“Disturbing History”

• Land Clearing/Erosion (1600’s on)
• Surface Mining (1800’s on)
• Urbanization (minor before 1950’s)
• Suburbanization (1940’s on)
• Road Building (Expansion in 1950’s)
• Utility Corridor Development
Modern Contour Coal Mine
Coal Processing Waste Pile
Acid Mine Drainage (AMD)
Dredge Spoil Utilization
Good Silt Loam Topsoil or Black Toxic Goo?
Mineral Mining – Sand/Agg.
Road Building
Suburbanization Disturbance is Major and Highly Variable!
Four Things That Control Reclamation Success!

1. Sulfidic/Pyritic acid forming materials must be avoided or neutralized for any successful stabilization project. Worldwide, there is no doubt that acid-sulfate weathering processes are the major risk to environmental quality from any drastic land disturbance.
Active pyrite depositional environment in high C and sulfate input tidal marsh.
Acid-forming materials on 1970’s “pre-SMCRA” surface mine in Virginia
AMD impact in northern WV
Outcrop of tertiary aged marine sediments near Richmond, VA, with soil pH's in the 1.8 to 3.0 range.

Acid-S soil bank at Mechanicsville
Compiling a state-wide sulfide hazard map for Virginia: Devonian black shales.

Inside the culvert at Clifton Forge.
However, many mining spoils and mine soils are actually quite low in sulfides, and suffer from other limitations.
Four Things That Control Reclamation Success!

2. **Compaction** is the most common limiting factor in disturbed lands worldwide. Many mine soils with otherwise suitable chemical and physical properties are of very low quality due to severe compaction.

3. **Very coarse textures (sands) or high rock contents** limit the water holding and effective rooting volume of many disturbed land soils.
Regardless of their overall acidity and fertility status, the number one limitation to plant growth in mine soils worldwide is severe compaction.
Mixed Topsoil + Weathered Overburden (A+B+C+R)

Rocky (15% fines), High pH (7.5) Sandstone Spoil
Benefits of Topsoil

Whenever it is economically feasible, native topsoils should be salvaged and re-applied to final reclamation surfaces.

In general, native soil materials will be much higher in organic matter, available N and P, and perhaps most importantly, beneficial microbial populations than any topsoil substitute materials.
Four Things That Control Reclamation Success!

4. Assuming you’ve avoided acid forming materials, compaction, and excessively sandy/rocky materials, the last thing you really have to be concerned about is slope/aspect/albedo effects. For example, black coal waste on a 35% south-facing slope is going to be very, very difficult to stabilize without significant soil amendments due to heat loads and drought stress.
Coal Refuse Disposal Area
Mine Soil Amendments

Once you take care of the four basic challenges pointed out earlier, you can start working towards really improving the quality of drastically disturbed soils via the addition of appropriate soil amendments such as compost, manures, biosolids, waste limes, alkaline fly ash, etc..
Biosolids plus Woodchips @ 140 Mg/ha on Rocky Spoils
Reconstructed Topsoil from One-time Application of Biosolids
Incorporation of 45 Mg/ha lime on sulfidic coal waste materials.
Effects of 10 Mg/ha Lime plus 50 Mg/ha Papermill Sludge on Acidic Coal Refuse
33% volumetric addition of alkaline fly ash to acidic coal refuse.
Soluble salt/B damage on soybean plants grown in sandstone mine spoil amended with 10% coal fly ash.

Most legumes are very sensitive to salt damage, so seeding should be delayed until after salts leach where possible.
Summary

• The vast majority of mine wastes, overburden material, or industrial/urban soils can be successfully reclaimed and revegetated once the appropriate suite of analyses have been conducted.

• However, it is essential that sulfidic wastes (> 0.3% pyritic-S) be isolated away from the final reclamation surface, or very high rates of suitable liming materials must be applied and incorporated, or thick covers employed.
Summary

• Assuming sulfidic materials are eliminated, long term revegetation success in mine soils is most commonly limited by compaction in most mining environments, and excessive rockiness or hot aspects in other mining/construction environments.

• Waste products such as biosolids and fly ash can have great utility for enhancing mine soil physical and chemical properties.
Summary

That being said, we need to carefully balance utilization of wastes/residuals against potential for soil pollution or environmental harm from excess salts, metals, nutrients etc.
Location of mineral sands ore bodies in Virginia (in red). Similar ore bodies lie approximately 100 km south in North Carolina.
Typical prime farmland landscape at Old Hickory with significant enrichment of heavy minerals to a depth of > 8 meters. This field was the top producing peanut field in Virginia twice in the 1980’s and is used as our “unmined control” for research comparisons.
Typical highly productive soil in the Old Hickory area.

Productivity of this soil is greatly enhanced by the low bulk density, well structured subsoil that readily allows rooting to 48 inches or more.
Test pit filled with mixed slimes/tailings from pilot plant in April, 1995.
25 cm of Topsoil over Ripped/Limed + P Tailings/Slimes

112 Mg/ha Yardwaste Compost + Deep Ripping, + 300 kg/ha P, + 8 Mg/ha Lime applied to Tailings/Slimes
Cotton Crop in 1998
Overall crop yields were reduced approximately 20% relative to unmined control plots. Effects of topsoil return vs. compost amendment were not consistent from crop to crop.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unmined control</td>
<td>3750 a</td>
<td>2449 ab</td>
<td>8553 a</td>
<td>1384 a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit#1 topsoil</td>
<td>3573 a</td>
<td>1810 c</td>
<td>6587 b</td>
<td>1194 b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit#1 compost</td>
<td>2892 b</td>
<td>2386 b</td>
<td>7589 b</td>
<td>1088 b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit#3 topsoil</td>
<td>2756 bc</td>
<td>2684 a</td>
<td>4987 c</td>
<td>1004 b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit#3 compost</td>
<td>2375 c</td>
<td>2594 ab</td>
<td>6620 b</td>
<td>1130 b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Yields within columns followed by the same letter are not significantly different (P < 0.05). Data analysed via one-way ANOVA followed by pairwise contrasts (Fisher’s Protected LSD).
Project History and Background

60 % Quartz Tailings
40% Fe-Coated Kaolinite

Typical active backfill pit at Old Hickory
Early mine soil productivity was limited by significant segregation of tailings and slimes in pit backfills. Pockets of white coarse tailings surrounded by red, high clay slimes. Limited topsoil was available to cover this pit.
Final pit dewatering at Old Hickory. Material in foreground is topsoil forming enclosing dike. Overall wet pit surface elevation is 1 to 3 m higher than original ground, but drops with dewatering and final grading.
Topsoil Return Issues

• In many instances, topsoil was used to construct dikes before swell factor was full understood, making it impossible to return topsoil to mine pits.

• Vague regulatory definition of “topsoil” allowed the operator and certain landowners to process topsoil for mineral return. This was rectified via threat of litigation in 2004 and all lands received topsoil afterwards until 2011.
Typical tails+slimes pit dewatering. Material in foreground is clayey slimes; background is sandy tailings
Compacted, platy replaced topsoil over highly compacted tails/slimes subsoil.
This is the “appropriate ripper” for these kinds of soil problems! Clint Zimmerman (pictured) was primarily responsible for recognizing the need and implementing routine ripping.
Row crop plots with numbers and treatments

101 (2) biosolids, no-till
102 (3) biosolids, conventional till
103 (1) control
104 (4) topsoil
201 (4) topsoil
202 (2) biosolids, no-till
203 (1) control
204 (3) biosolids, conventional till
301 (2) biosolids, no-till
302 (3) biosolids, conventional till
303 (4) topsoil
304 (1) control

401 (1) control
402 (4) topsoil
403 (3) biosolids, conventional till
404 (2) biosolids, no-till
Topsoil strip after grading and disking in April 2005.
Topsoil yields were reduced by compaction and heavy crusting. Are these “problems” typical of the topsoil replacement process?
Corn yield (bu/ac)

- 11 - 20
- 21 - 30
- 31 - 40
- 41 - 50
- 51 - 60
- 61 - 70
- 71 - 80
- 81 - 90
- 91 - 100
- 101 - 110
- 111 - 120
- 121 - 130
- 131 - 140
- 141 - 150
- 151 - 160
- 161 - 170
- 171 - 180
- 181 - 190
- 191 - 200
- 201 - 210
- 211 - 220
- 221 - 230
- 231 - 240

- biosolids no-till
- biosolids conv-till
- control
- topsoil
- topsoil
- biosolids no-till
- control
- biosolids conv-till
- biosolids no-till
- biosolids conv-till
- topsoil
- control
- control
- biosolids conv-till
- biosolids no-till
Harvested (non-topsoiled) mined land in Fall 2005
For 9 years, row-crop yields have consistently exceeded target “county average yields” in all years and have typically been 75 to 85% of an adjacent prime farmland that is most likely the most productive row-crop field in the state of Virginia. **Topsoil return has not improved productivity.** In 2011, mined land yields equaled prime farmland for the first time ever.

### TABLE 2

Crop yields from the Carraway-Win Reclamation Research Farm and a local unmined prime farmland soil for years 2005 - 2010 and Dinwiddie County five year crop yield averages as applicable. Crops on all areas received identical management, including irrigation as needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Corn</th>
<th>Wheat</th>
<th>Soybeans</th>
<th>Cotton (lint)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LBS-CT</td>
<td>10.85a</td>
<td>3.62b</td>
<td>5.04a</td>
<td>5.97a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBS-NT</td>
<td>10.90a</td>
<td>3.43b</td>
<td>5.16a</td>
<td>5.65a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS</td>
<td>3.79c</td>
<td>7.23a</td>
<td>4.29b</td>
<td>4.89b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>8.53b</td>
<td>7.30a</td>
<td>4.10b</td>
<td>4.64b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UM</td>
<td>14.36</td>
<td>9.91</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinwiddie Co average (2004 - 2008)</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinwiddie Co. Average (2006 - 2010)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Means in the same column followed by the same letter are not significantly different at α = 0.05. Data analysed via one-way ANOVA followed by pairwise contrasts (Fisher’s Protected LSD).
LBS = Lime stabilized biosolids @ 78 Mg/ha; TS = 15 cm topsoil return; C = Limed and fertilised control; UM = Unmined control area; COMP = Compacted, non-ripped zone.
Soybeans established in wheat stubble on Carraway-Winn farm, July 2006
Typical profile in control plot (tailings + lime + NPK).

Light colored materials at base of trowel are pure sandy tailings.

Orange bands in lower profile are layers of high slimes ‘sandwiched” between tailings.
Virginia state regulations require that a self-sustaining vegetation capable of supporting the designated post-mining land use (hayland and pasture here) be maintained for two full growing seasons before the lands are returned to their owners.
COPE Location

- Primarily bituminous coal
- Primarily semianthracite coal

Map showing the location of Southwest Virginia Coalfield within Virginia. The coalfields are divided into Valley Coalfields and Eastern Coalfields.
Controlled Overburden Placement

Rock Mix Experiment

Pure Sandstone (SS), 2:1 SS:SiS, 1:1 SS:SiS, 1:2 SS:SiS, Pure Siltstone (SiS)
Experimental Design

- Randomized complete block design
- Each treatment replicated 4x

- Split plot design
- Tree vs. fescue
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rock Mix Experiment</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sandstone</td>
<td>SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:1 SS:SiS</td>
<td>2:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:1 SS:SiS</td>
<td>1:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:2 SS:SiS</td>
<td>1:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siltstone</td>
<td>SiS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surface Amendment Experiment</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>CON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topsoil 30cm</td>
<td>TS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sawdust 112 Mg ha(^{-1})</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biosolids 22 Mg ha(^{-1})</td>
<td>B-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biosolids 56 Mg ha(^{-1})</td>
<td>B-56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biosolids 112 Mg ha(^{-1})</td>
<td>B-112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biosolids 224 Mg ha(^{-1})</td>
<td>B-224</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
April-1982

224 Mg/ha BS
2:1 SS:SiS prior to sampling in 2008.
Volumetric Sampling Approach

• 0.09 m² or a ft²
• 0-5 and 5 to 25 cm bulk sampled
• All materials sampled “straight down” including RF using a digging bar to shear where needed
• Fines separated per depth; average of 1600 g (0-5) vs. 6700 g (5 to 25)
• C, N etc. analyzed on a concentration basis on the fines
• Mass C per unit area/depth calculated as mass x conc.
• Total C taken as sum of litter + 0-5 + 5-25 in Mg/ha.
• Completely eliminates errors due to very high RF content and inability to accurately estimate bulk density!
Figure 60. Whole soil mass carbon for litter layer, surface and subsurface depths of mine soils of the Surface Amendment Experiment sampled in 2008.
Table 57. Carbon accumulated at depths of 0-25 cm in the Surface Amendment Experiment between 1982 and 2008.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Carbon</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Net Annual Accumulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Amendment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control (2:1) §</td>
<td>17.70</td>
<td>31.84</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>31.34</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sawdust (112 Mg ha⁻¹)†</td>
<td>68.10</td>
<td>41.11</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biosolids 22 Mg ha⁻¹</td>
<td>22.55</td>
<td>30.51</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biosolids 56 Mg ha⁻¹</td>
<td>30.04</td>
<td>30.17</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biosolids 112 Mg ha⁻¹</td>
<td>42.38</td>
<td>38.94</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biosolids 224 Mg ha⁻¹</td>
<td>67.07</td>
<td>49.42</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

†SD is 45% C + C present in CON in 1982. (Ragland et al, 1991).
‡See table 2b for C present in 1982.
§All plots were seeded over a 2:1 mix represented by the CON. The C present in this constant has been applied to each treatment to account for this residual C.
¶1982 is a bulk sample taken at the time of amendment application.
Figure 62. Total estimated C present at depth 0-25 cm in May 1982 post biosolids application vs. total C present at depth 0-25 cm in 2008 after 26 years of accumulation.

1982
\[ y = 17.67 + 0.49x - 1.89x^2 \]
\[ R^2 = 1.0 \]

2008
\[ y = 31.95 + 0.072x + 0.0005x^2 \]
\[ R^2 = 0.66 \]
What’s it all mean?

- Many (most?) published C-sequestration rate estimates to date for coal mined lands may be seriously overestimated.

- Our estimates range from 0.5 to 0.9 Mg/ha/y with an apparent “equilibrium level” of around 30 Mg/ha.

- However, if up to 15 Mg/ha of the C in 2008 was “fossil coal”, the actual equilibrium levels are much lower.
What’s it all mean?

• To be “fair” any C-sequestration estimate for mine soil systems that receive large initial applications of organics should account for (A) geogenic C errors, (B) net losses of added C over time and (C) the C-sequestration potential of similar unamended mine soils.
19-year old mine soil that received biosolids treatment in 1989. A horizon is 5 inches thick and exhibits well developed granular structure.
Mine soil pedon 15 feet away from previous soil that did not receive biosolids.
Please contact me if you’d like copies of our papers or reports on our research results since 1990?

W. Lee Daniels, wdaniels@vt.edu; www.landrehab.org