

**SUCTION INDUCED SHEAR STRENGTH OF GOLD MINE
TAILINGS**

DELMÉ WESTRAAD

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ENGINEERING (GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING)

in the

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING

UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA

February 2004

DISSERTATION SUMMARY

SUCTION INDUCED SHEAR STRENGTH OF GOLD MINE TAILINGS

DELMÉ WESTRAAD

Supervisor: Prof E Rust

Department: Civil Engineering

University: University of Pretoria

Degree: Master of Engineering (Geotechnical Engineering)

The disposal of fine-grained mining and industrial waste by formation of hydraulic-fill tailings dams is becoming a design and construction activity of increasing scale. In light of the increasing pressure on the mining industry to sustain stringent safety and environmental standards it is becoming more important to gain technical knowledge of the waste problem. The upper layers of the tailings residue dams are in the unsaturated state with the matric suction component contributing to the overall shear strength. The ability to incorporate the matric suction component in shear strength calculations is important to safe design.

This research project investigates the use of the mid-plane suction probe to measure matric suction. The results obtained from the probe is used along with various tests to construct a complete soil-water characteristic curve for Mispah gold tailings as well as to investigate suction induced shear strength of drying tailings with depth.

The tests were conducted on gold tailings from Vaal Operation's Mispah tailings dam. The laboratory tests consisted of a trough test, to determine the soil-water characteristics of the gold tailing and also a drying box test that simulated the drying and desiccation of the gold tailings in the daywall.

The project concluded that the mid-plane suction probe could be used with acceptable accuracy to determine soil suctions. The model for the prediction of the soil water characteristic curve, derived by Fredlund and Xing (1992), was used successfully to predict the complete soil water characteristics curve for Mispah gold tailings. The equation derived by Vanapalli et al. (1996) was successfully used to calculate both the normal and suction induced shear strength of gold mine tailings using either the volumetric water content from the extracted samples or from the soil water characteristic curve.

Key words: air-entry, desiccation, gold mine tailings, linear shrinkage, soil-water characteristic curve, suction, suction probe, unsaturated soils, suction induced shear strength.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I wish to express my appreciation to the following organizations and persons who made this dissertation:

- The NRF for the research grant.
- Vaal Operation for the providing the tailings material.
- Professor E. Rust, my supervisor for his guidance and support.
- My family and friend for their encouragement and support during the study.
- Leon for his motivation and confidence in my abilities.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	LITERATURE REVIEW	1-1
1.1	Background	1-1
1.2	Objectives	1-1
1.3	Scope	1-2
1.4	Methodology	1-2
1.5	Organisation of the Report	1-3
2.	LITERATURE REVIEW	2-1
2.1	Introduction	2-1
2.2	Unsaturated Soil Properties	2-2
	2.2.1 <i>Introduction</i>	2-2
	2.2.2 <i>Surface tension</i>	2-2
	2.2.3 <i>Capillarity</i>	2-4
2.3	Soil Suction	2-7
	2.3.1 <i>Introduction</i>	2-7
	2.3.2 <i>Matric suction</i>	2-7
	2.3.3 <i>Osmotic suction</i>	2-7
	2.3.4 <i>The direct measurement of suction</i>	2-8
	2.3.5 <i>The mid-plane suction probe</i>	2-9
2.4	The Soil-water Characteristic Curve	2-10
	2.4.1 <i>Introduction</i>	2-10
	2.4.2 <i>Volume-mass relationships for water content</i>	2-10
	2.4.3 <i>Features of a soil-water characteristic curve</i>	2-11
	2.4.4 <i>Soil-water characteristic curve equations</i>	2-14
	2.4.5 <i>Determination of soil-water characteristic curve</i>	2-17
2.5	Stress State of Unsaturated Soil	2-19
	2.5.1 <i>Introduction</i>	2-19
	2.5.2 <i>Stress states for saturated soils</i>	2-20
	2.5.3 <i>Effective stress equation for unsaturated soil</i>	2-20
	2.5.4 <i>Unsaturated shear strength equations</i>	2-22
	2.5.5 <i>Transition to saturated case</i>	2-24
	2.5.6 <i>The shear strength behavior of unsaturated soils</i>	2-24

2.6	Soil Suction and Critical State	2-25
	2.6.1 <i>Introduction</i>	2-25
	2.6.2 <i>Stress points</i>	2-26
	2.6.3 <i>Stress paths</i>	2-27
2.7	Gold Mine Tailings dams	2-28
	2.7.1 <i>Introduction</i>	2-28
	2.7.2 <i>Ore processing</i>	2-29
	2.7.3 <i>Tailings transport, discharge and depositioning</i>	2-30
	2.7.4 <i>Tailings disposal methods</i>	2-32
	2.7.5 <i>Engineering behavior of tailings</i>	2-36
3.	EXPERIMENTAL METHOD	3-1
3.1	Introduction	3-1
3.2	Material Used	3-1
3.3	Equipment	3-2
	3.3.1 <i>Suction probe</i>	3-2
	3.3.2 <i>Shrinkage troughs</i>	3-5
	3.3.3 <i>Drying box</i>	3-6
	3.3.4 <i>Tailings dispenser</i>	3-8
	3.3.5 <i>Load cell</i>	3-9
	3.3.6 <i>Tube sampler</i>	3-9
	3.3.7 <i>Hand Vane Shear</i>	3-10
	3.3.8 <i>Base plate stabiliser</i>	3-12
	3.3.9 <i>Probe holder</i>	3-13
3.4	Trough Test	3-13
	3.4.1 <i>Preparation of material and trough</i>	3-13
	3.4.2 <i>Measurement of change in mass, suction and volume</i>	3-14
	3.4.3 <i>Determination of volume-mass relations</i>	3-14
	3.4.4 <i>Determination of SWCC</i>	3-16
3.5	Drying Box Test	3-16
	3.5.1 <i>Drying of material</i>	3-17
	3.5.2 <i>Mixing and pouring of tailings slurry</i>	3-17
	3.5.3 <i>Measurement of water level and sedimentation</i>	3-18
	3.5.4 <i>Weighing of drying box and tailings</i>	3-18
	3.5.5 <i>Measurement of air and soil temperature</i>	3-19

3.5.6	<i>Measurement of crack propagation</i>	3-19
3.5.7	<i>Suction measurement and sampling</i>	3-19
3.5.8	<i>Vane shear measurements</i>	3-21
3.5.9	<i>Determination of volume-mass relations</i>	3-21
3.6	Field Testing	3-23
3.6.1	<i>Measurement of crack widths and distribution</i>	3-24
3.6.2	<i>Sampling</i>	3-24
3.6.3	<i>Direct shear strength measurement</i>	3-25
3.6.4	<i>Measurement of suctions</i>	3-25
3.6.5	<i>Determination of volume-mass relations</i>	3-26
4.	SHEAR STRENGTH OF GOLD MINE TAILINGS	4-1
4.1	Introduction	4-1
4.2	Soil-water Characteristic Curve	4-1
4.3	Shear Strength Induced By Suctions	4-7
4.4	Drying and Desiccation of Gold Tailings Material	4-8
4.5	Field Testing	4-25
5.	DISCUSSION	5-1
5.1	Introduction	5-1
5.2	Soil-water Characteristic Curve	5-2
5.3	Shear Strength Induced By Suctions	5-9
5.4	Drying and Desiccation	5-10
5.5	Field testing	5-27
6.	CONCLUSIONS	6-1
6.1	Summary of Conclusions from Experimental Programme	6-1
6.2	Conclusions in Reference to Research Objectives	6-2
7.	REFERENCES	7-1
APPENDIX A: TRUOGH TEST RESULTS		
APPENDIX B: DRYING BOX TEST RESULTS		
APPENDIX C: FIELD TEST RESULTS		

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1:	Intermolecular forces on contractile skin (Fredlund and Rahardjo, 1993)	2-2
Figure 2.2:	Curved two-dimensional surface (Fredlund and Rahardjo, 1993)	2-3
Figure 2.3:	Physical model related to capillarity (Holtz and Kovacs, 1981)	2-5
Figure 2.4:	Operating principle of a high air entry disk as described by Kelvin's capillary model (Fredlund and Rahardjo, 1993)	2-8
Figure 2.5:	Schematic diagram of the mid-plane suction probe (Theron, 2000)	2-9
Figure 2.6:	Typical desorption and adsorption curves (Fredlund et al. 1994)	2-12
Figure 2.7:	Soil-water characteristic curve for sandy, silty and clayey soil (Fredlund and Xing, 1994)	2-13
Figure 2.8:	A sample plot for the graphical solution of the four parameters a , n , m and ψ_r (Fredlund and Xing, 1994)	2-15
Figure 2.9:	A best-fit curve to the experimental data of Kid Creek tailings (Yang, 1992)	2-17
Figure 2.10:	The Fredlund Soil Water Characteristic Cell	2-18
Figure 2.11:	Small divisions of particle size used to build complete SWCC (Fredlund et al. 1997)	2-19
Figure 2.12:	Graphical representation of the shape of the failure envelope with respect matric suction for various soils (Rassam et al. 2002)	2-25
Figure 2.13:	Representative stress point for an extended Mohr circle (Fredlund and Rahardjo, 1993)	2-26
Figure 2.14:	A series of Mohr circles (Fredlund and Rahardjo, 1993)	2-27
Figure 2.15:	A stress path series of stress states (Fredlund and Rahardjo, 1993)	2-28
Figure 2.16:	Decant tower at Mispah tailings dam	2-31
Figure 2.17:	Upstream depositional method (Vick, 1987)	2-33
Figure 2.18:	Downstream depositional method (Vick, 1987)	2-33
Figure 2.19:	Centerline depositional method (Vick, 1987)	2-34
Figure 2.20:	Daywall-Nightpan Paddock System (Wagener, 1997)	2-35
Figure 3.1:	Saturation of miniature suction probe	3-3
Figure 3.2:	Calibration of the suction probe	3-4
Figure 3.3:	Shrinkage troughs	3-5

Figure 3.4: Drying Box	3-6
Figure 3.5: Bidim Geotextile cover	3-7
Figure 3.6: Tailings dispenser	3-8
Figure 3.7: Tube samplers	3-10
Figure 3.8: Hand vane shear	3-11
Figure 3.9: Base plate stabiliser	3-12
Figure 3.10: Probe holder	3-13
Figure 3.11: Experimental set-up for the determination of the SWCC	3-14
Figure 3.12: a) Completion of first lift	3-18
b) Completion of second lift	3-18
Figure 3.13: Weighing of drying box and tailings	3-18
Figure 3.14: Suction measurements using the probe holder	3-20
Figure 3.15: Blocks formed by crack formation	3-23
Figure 3.16: Full sized samples	3-24
Figure 3.17: Surface suction measurements	3-26
Figure 3.18: Suction measurements at 5cm	3-26
Figure 4.1: Moisture content versus suction	4-2
Figure 4.2: Void ratio versus suction	4-2
Figure 4.3: Degree of saturation versus suction	4-3
Figure 4.4: Percentage linear shrinkage versus suction	4-3
Figure 4.5: Volumetric water content versus suction	4-4
Figure 4.6: Volumetric water content versus suction – Trough test 2	4-5
Figure 4.7: Volumetric water content versus suction – Trough test 3	4-5
Figure 4.8: Extrapolated Soil-Water Characteristic Curves	4-6
Figure 4.9: Average Soil-Water Characteristic Curve	4-7
Figure 4.10: Calculated shear strength versus suction	4-7
Figure 4.11: Average calculated shear strength versus suction	4-8
Figure 4.12: Average moisture content versus suction – Lift 1	4-9
Figure 4.13: Average moisture content versus suction – Lift 2	4-10
Figure 4.14: Average void ratio versus suction – Lift 1	4-10
Figure 4.15: Average void ratio versus suction – Lift 2	4-11
Figure 4.16: Average degree of saturation versus suction – Lift 1	4-11
Figure 4.17: Average degree of saturation versus suction – Lift 2	4-12

Figure 4.18: Percentage linear shrinkage versus suction – Lift 1	4-12
Figure 4.19: Percentage linear shrinkage versus suction – Lift 2	4-13
Figure 4.20: Calculated shear strength versus suction at 0cm – Lift 1	4-14
Figure 4.21: Calculated shear strength versus suction at 8cm – Lift 1	4-14
Figure 4.22: Calculated shear strength versus suction at 0cm – Lift 2	4-15
Figure 4.23: Calculated shear strength versus suction at 10cm – Lift 2	4-15
Figure 4.24: Calculated shear strength versus suction at 20cm – Lift 2	4-16
Figure 4.25: Comparison of calculated shear strength and vane shear readings at 0cm – Lift 1	4-16
Figure 4.26: Comparison of calculated shear strength and vane shear readings at 8cm – Lift 1	4-17
Figure 4.27: Comparison of calculated shear strength and vane shear readings at 0cm – Lift 2	4-17
Figure 4.28: Comparison of calculated shear strength and vane shear readings at 10cm – Lift 2	4-18
Figure 4.29: Comparison of calculated shear strength and vane shear readings at 20cm – Lift 2	4-18
Figure 4.30: Theoretical shear strength versus suction at 0cm – Lift 1	4-19
Figure 4.31: Theoretical shear strength versus suction at 8cm – Lift 1	4-20
Figure 4.32: Theoretical shear strength versus suction at 0cm – Lift 2	4-20
Figure 4.33: Theoretical shear strength versus suction at 10cm – Lift 2	4-21
Figure 4.34: Theoretical shear strength versus suction at 20cm – Lift 2	4-21
Figure 4.35: Comparison of theoretical shear strength and vane shear readings at 0cm – Lift 1	4-22
Figure 4.36: Comparison of theoretical shear strength and vane shear readings at 8cm – Lift 1	4-23
Figure 4.37: Comparison of theoretical shear strength and vane shear readings at 0cm – Lift 2	4-23
Figure 4.38: Comparison of theoretical shear strength and vane shear readings at 10cm – Lift 2	4-24
Figure 4.39: Comparison of theoretical shear strength and vane shear readings at 20cm – Lift 2	4-24
Figure 4.40: Depth versus suction – Site visit 1	4-25

Figure 4.41: Depth versus suction – Site visit 2	4-26
Figure 4.42: Depth versus suction – Site visit 3	4-26
Figure 4.43: Volumetric water content versus suction – Lift 1 and field tests	4-27
Figure 4.44: Volumetric water content versus suction – Lift 2 and field tests	4-28
Figure 4.45: Comparison of shear strengths [0-5cm] – Lift 1	4-29
Figure 4.46: Comparison of shear strengths [5-10cm] – Lift 1	4-29
Figure 4.47: Comparison of shear strengths [0-5cm] – Lift 2	4-30
Figure 4.48: Comparison of shear strengths [5-10cm] – Lift 2	4-30
Figure 4.49: Comparison of shear strengths [15-30cm] – Lift 1	4-31
Figure 5.1: Comparison of moisture content versus suction	5-3
Figure 5.2: Comparison of void ratio versus suction	5-4
Figure 5.3: Comparison of degree of saturation versus suction	5-5
Figure 5.4: Estimated soil-water characteristic curve for mine tailings (Fredlund et al., 1997)	5-6
Figure 5.5: Water characteristic curve (Rassam et al., 2000)	5-7
Figure 5.6: A best-fit curve to the experimental data of Kid Creek tailings (Fredlund et al., 1994)	5-8
Figure 5.7: Average moisture content versus suction – Lift 1 and Lift 2	5-11
Figure 5.8: Average void ratio versus suction – Lift 1 and Lift 2	5-12
Figure 5.9: Average degree of saturation versus suction – Lift 1 and Lift 2	5-13
Figure 5.10: Percentage linear shrinkage versus suction – Lift 1 and Lift 2	5-14
Figure 5.11: Calculated shear strength versus suction at 0 and 8 cm – Lift 1	5-16
Figure 5-12: Calculated shear strength versus suction at 0cm – Lift 1 and Lift 2	5-17
Figure 5-13: Calculated shear strength versus suction at 0cm, 10cm and 20cm – Lift 2	5-18
Figure 5.14: Comparison of calculated shear strength and vane shear readings at 0cm and 8cm – Lift 1	5-19
Figure 5.15: Comparison of calculated shear strength and vane shear readings at 0cm, 10cm and 20cm – Lift 2	5-21
Figure 5.16: Theoretical shear strength versus suction at 0cm and 8cm – Lift 1	5-22
Figure 5.17: Theoretical shear strength versus suction at 0cm, 10cm and 20cm – Lift 2	5-23
Figure 5.18: Comparison of theoretical shear strength and vane shear readings at 0cm and 8cm – Lift 1	5-24
Figure 5.19: Comparison of theoretical shear strength and vane shear readings	

at 0cm, 10cm and 20cm – Lift 2	5-25
Figure 5.20: Comparison of theoretical shear strength and normally calculated shear strength at 0cm and 8cm – Lift 1	5-26
Figure 5.19: Comparison of theoretical shear strength and normally calculated Shear strength at 0cm, 10cm and 20cm – Lift 2	5-26

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1: Soil parameters for Mispah whole tailings (Vermeulen, 2001)	3-2
Table 3.2: Specifications of Grade A2 Bidim Geotextile	3-8
Table 4.1: Fitting parameters	4-6
Table 5.1: Particle range used by Van Heerden (2001)	5-2

LIST OF SYMBOLS

A_{dw}	-	the total area of water at 100% saturation [mm ²]
A_{tw}	-	the total area of water corresponding to any degree of saturation [mm ²]
a	-	approximate of the air-entry value of the soil
C_r	-	is the suction value corresponding to residual water content q_r
$C(Y)$	-	a correcting function that forces the SWCC through a suction of 1 000 000 kPa and zero water content.
e	-	the void ratio
G_s	-	specific gravity [2.74]
g	-	gravitational acceleration [9.81m.s ⁻²]
h_c	-	capillary height [m]
M	-	daily total mass measurement [kg]
M_{box}	-	mass of drying box [kg]
M_i	-	initial mass of sample [kg]
M_s	-	mass of solids [kg]
M_{sample}	-	mass of sample taken at every stage [kg]
M_{trough}	-	mass of trough [kg]
M_w	-	mass of water [kg]
M_{wi}	-	initial mass of water [kg]
m	-	parameter that is related to the residual q_r
n	-	parameter controlling the slope at the inflection point in the SWCC
n	-	the porosity
r	-	radius of capillary tube [m]
R_s	-	radius of curvature of the meniscus [m]
S	-	degree of saturation
S_r	-	residual degree of saturation
T_s	-	surface tension of the water [N]
u	-	pore-water pressure
u_a	-	pore-air pressure [kPa]
u_w	-	pore-water pressure [kPa]
V_{sample}	-	volume of the sample [cm ³]

University of Pretoria etd – Westraad, D (2005)

V_t	-	total volume of soil specimen [m ³]
V_v	-	volume of voids in the soil specimen [m ³]
V_w	-	volume of water in the soil specimen [m ³]
a	-	contact angle [degree]
p	-	osmotic suction [kPa]
q	-	volumetric water content
q_r	-	residual volumetric water content
w	-	gravimetric water content of soil
w_0	-	initial moisture content [%]
r_d	-	dry density of soil [kg/m ³]
r_w	-	density of water [0.000981 kg/cm ³]
s	-	total stress
s'	-	effective stress
c	-	parameter related to the degree of saturation of the soil
κ	-	fitting parameter
Ψ_p	-	intercept of the tangent line on the semi-log plot and the matric suction axis.
$2R_s \sin b$	-	projected length of membrane [m]
Du	-	change in pore pressure [kPa]
$(u_a - u_w)$	-	matric suction [kPa]
$(u_a - u_w)$	-	matric suction [kPa]
$(s_1 - u_a)$	-	vertical net normal stress
$(s_2 - u_a)$	-	horizontal normal stress
$(u_a - u_w)$	-	matric suction