

OPTIMISING SHAFT PRESSURE LOSSES THROUGH COMPUTATIONAL FLUID DYNAMIC MODELLING

WILLIAM JAMES KEMPSON

Presented as fulfilment for the degree

PhD (Mining Engineering)

**IN THE FACULTY OF ENGINEERING, BUILT ENVIRONMENT AND INFORMATION
TECHNOLOGY**

DEPARTMENT OF MINING ENGINEERING

UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA



January 2012



DECLARATION

I hereby declare that this dissertation is my own unaided work. It is being submitted for the degree PhD (Mining Engineering) at the University of Pretoria, Pretoria. It has not been submitted before for any degree or examination in any other University.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'William James Kempson', written over a horizontal line.

William James Kempson

Dated this 5th day of March 2012



UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA**FACULTY OF ENGINEERING, BUILT ENVIRONMENT AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY****DEPARTMENT OF MINING ENGINEERING**

The Department of Mining Engineering places great emphasis upon integrity and ethical conduct in the preparation of all written work submitted for academic evaluation. While academic staff teaches you about systems of referring and how to avoid plagiarism, you too have a responsibility in this regard. If you are at any stage uncertain as to what is required, you should speak to your lecturer before any written work is submitted.

You are guilty of plagiarism if you copy something from a book, article or website without acknowledging the source and pass it off as your own. In effect you are stealing something that belongs to someone else. This is not only the case when you copy work word-by-word (verbatim), but also when you submit someone else's work in a slightly altered form (paraphrase) or use a line of argument without acknowledging it. You are not allowed to use another student's past written work. You are also not allowed to let anybody copy your work with the intention of passing it off as his/her work.

Students who commit plagiarism will lose all credits obtained in the plagiarised work. The matter may also be referred to the Disciplinary Committee (Students) for a ruling. Plagiarism is regarded as a serious contravention of the University's rules and can lead to expulsion from the University. The declaration which follows must be appended to all written work submitted while you are a student of the Department of Mining Engineering. No written work will be accepted unless the declaration has been completed and attached.

I (full names) William James Kempson

Student number 24552242

Topic of work Optimising Shaft Pressure Losses Through Computational Fluid Dynamic Modelling

Declaration

I understand what plagiarism is and am aware of the University's policy in this regard.

I declare that this dissertation is my own original work. Where other people's work has been used (either from a printed source, internet or any other source), this has been properly acknowledged and referenced in accordance with departmental requirements.

I have not used another student's past written work to hand in as my own.

I have not allowed, and will not allow, anyone to copy my work with the intention of passing it off as his or her own work.

Signature



LANGUAGE EDIT

I, Beverlie Margaret Davies, Member of the Professional Editors' Group, hereby declare that I performed an English language edit on the final version of this project report.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Bm Davies'.

6 March 2012

Signature

Date

ABSTRACT

Optimising Shaft Pressure Losses Through Computational Fluid Dynamic Modelling

WJ Kempson

Supervisor: Professor R.C.W. Webber-Youngman

Co-Supervisor: Professor Josua P Meyer

Department: Mining Engineering

University: University of Pretoria

Degree: PhD (Mining Engineering)

As a result of the rising electrical energy costs in South Africa, a method was sought to reduce the overall electrical consumption of typical shaft systems. A typical shaft configuration was analysed and the primary energy consumers were identified. The ventilation fans for this system were found to consume a total of 15% of the total energy of the shaft system. It was calculated that more than 50% of this energy is consumed by the shaft itself, more specifically by the pressure losses that occur in the shaft as the ventilation air passes through it.

It was recognised that there was therefore an opportunity to achieve an energy savings and therefore a costs savings in the total cost of operating a shaft system by reducing the overall resistance of the equipped downcast shaft. However, before any work could continue in this regard, the results noted above required validation. This was achieved through the comprehensive evaluation of the Impala #14 Shaft system. This system was tested and the pressure losses noted in the calculations were verified.

In order to ensure that the theory being used was accurate, the next step was to evaluate a number of shafts both from a theoretical perspective by measuring the real shaft pressure losses against time. This was done and a total of five shafts were instrumented and the actual pressure losses over the shaft plotted against time. These shafts were then subjected to a theoretical evaluation using the theory as described by McPherson in 1987.

Finally, in order to ensure a thorough understanding of the behaviour of the ventilation air in shaft systems, the systems were simulated using computational fluid dynamic (CFD) techniques.

On the whole there was not a good correlation between the tests and either the theoretical calculations or the

CFD simulations. This was attributed to the general imperfections in the shaft and the difficulty in obtaining exact values for the drag coefficients of the buntons. These differences highlight the difficulty in modelling the non-homogenous physical environment and providing a factor that can be used to ensure that the theoretical designs are aligned with the physical reality. This factor is approximately 30%.

There were also significant discrepancies between the theoretical analysis and the CFD simulation during the initial comparisons. This discrepancy reduced as the complexity of the CFD models increased, until, when the complete shaft was modelled using the full buntons sets, the pipes and the flanges, the difference between the theoretical evaluation and the CFD simulation was small.

This result demonstrates that the theory is insufficient and that the inter-related effect of the buntons and fittings has not been fully appreciated. The current theory however has been developed using drag coefficients and interference factors for the buntons sets which have been taken from measurements of similar configurations. This does account for the relative accuracy of the current theory in that there is little difference between the CFD result and that of the theory. However, as the shaft parameters are changed to reflect new layouts and scenarios, it is unlikely that theory will continue to prove accurate.

The final phase of the work presented here was to evaluate the cost-effectiveness of using different bunton shapes and shaft configurations. It is shown that:

- The increase in the pressure losses and therefore the direct operating costs of the shaft can vary by as much as 80%, depending on the bunton configuration chosen.
- The placement of the piping in the shaft can increase the pressure losses and therefore the direct operating costs of the shaft by as much as 12%, depending on the placement of the piping in the shaft; this effect includes the use of flanges.
- The use of fairings on a large cage can reduce the resistance that the cage offers to the ventilation flow by as much as 30%. This, however, does not translate into a direct saving because as the cage moves through the shaft, the overall effect is transitory.

The savings discussed above can be significant when the items highlighted in this work are applied correctly.



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my appreciation to the following organisations which made this project report possible:

Impala Platinum for the allowing me access to the various shafts to complete the testing phase of this work.

Hatch for the financial assistance in the completion of this work.

The following people are gratefully acknowledged for their assistance during the course of the study:

James Janse van Rensburg

Lister Sinclair

Karel Rossouw

Professor R.W.C. Webber-Youngman, my supervisor, and Professor Josua P. Meyer, my co-supervisor, for their guidance and support.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	V
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	VII
TABLE OF CONTENTS	VIII
LIST OF FIGURES	XIV
LIST OF TABLES.....	XVI
LIST OF SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS.....	XVII
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 OVERVIEW	1
1.2 RELEVANCE OF THE MINING INDUSTRY	1
1.3 ELECTRICAL ENERGY SUPPLY.....	3
1.3.1 Increases in Energy Costs	6
1.3.1 General Discussion	7
1.4 EVALUATION OF ENERGY CONSUMPTION IN DEEP-LEVEL MINES.....	8
1.4.1 General Parameters	8
1.4.2 Initial Evaluation.....	8
1.4.2.1 Winding maximum power requirement	10
1.4.2.2 Compressed air	11
1.4.2.3 In-stope rock handling.....	12
1.4.2.4 Pumping requirement	12
1.4.3 Evaluation of Ventilation and Refrigeration.....	13
1.4.3.1 Demand side management.....	14
1.4.3.2 General remarks	14
1.4.4 Calculation and Verification Data.....	16
1.4.4.1 Verification of the shaft pressure losses identified	17
1.5 PROJECT BACKGROUND.....	22
1.5.1 Evaluation of Costs Associated with the Sinking, Equipping and Operation of Shafts.....	22
1.5.2 Components Contributing to the Present Shaft Resistance and Subsequent Pressure Losses.....	25
1.5.2.1 Parameters used for designing a shaft	25
1.5.2.2 Shaft configuration and analysis techniques	26
1.5.3 Justification of Additional Work	27
1.6 PROBLEM STATEMENT AND PURPOSE OF STUDY.....	28
1.7 OBJECTIVES.....	29



1.7.1	Literature Study.....	29
1.7.2	Evaluation of Current Shaft Configurations	29
1.7.3	Detailed Analysis	30
1.7.4	Installation, Maintenance and Costing.....	30
1.7.5	Conclusions	30
1.8	METHODOLOGY	31
1.8.1	Literature Study.....	31
1.8.2	Evaluation of Current Shaft Configurations	31
1.8.3	Detailed Analysis	31
1.8.4	Conclusions	32
1.8.5	Outline of the Study	32
1.9	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS – CHAPTER 1	32
1.9.1	Summary	32
1.9.2	Conclusions	33
CHAPTER 2	LITERATURE STUDY	34
2.1	INTRODUCTION	34
2.2	MEASUREMENT	34
2.2.1	Efficacy of the Use of Scale Models	35
2.2.2	Measured Data Discussions, Results and Conclusions.....	36
2.2.3	Significance of Available Data	48
2.2.4	Methods of Testing Shaft Pressures.....	49
2.3	DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS	52
2.3.2	General Discussion	53
2.3.3	Significance of Available Data	59
2.4	COMPUTATIONAL FLUID DYNAMICS.....	59
2.4.1	General Discussion	60
2.4.2	Significance of Available Data	62
2.5	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS – CHAPTER 2	62
2.5.1	Measurement.....	62
2.5.2	Design.....	63
2.5.3	CFD	64
CHAPTER 3	METHOD OF EXPERIMENTATION AND ANALYSIS.....	65
3.1	INTRODUCTION	65
3.2	THEORY FOR ANALYSIS OF SHAFT RESISTANCES	65
3.2.1	Static Resistance of Shafts.....	65
3.2.1.1	Chezy-Darcy friction factor	66

3.2.1.2	Atkinson calculations.....	67
3.2.1.3	Rational resistance	69
3.2.2	Shaft Friction Resistance	70
3.2.2.1	Friction resistance of shaft	71
3.2.2.2	Resistance offered by shaft fittings	71
3.2.2.3	Resistance offered by shaft cages	75
3.2.3	Accuracy Limits of the Theory	79
3.2.3.1	Accuracy of calculation for friction resistance of shaft.....	79
3.2.3.2	Accuracy of calculation for resistance offered by shaft fittings.....	79
3.2.3.3	Accuracy of calculation for resistance offered by shaft cages.....	80
3.2.3.4	General comments on the accuracy of the theory	80
3.3	VALIDATION OF EXISTING THEORY AND INITIAL SHAFT TESTS.....	80
3.3.1	Test Methodology	81
3.4	TESTS USED TO VALIDATE THEORY.....	82
3.4.1	Test Methodology	82
3.4.1.1	Main downcast shaft test procedure.....	82
3.4.1.2	Test procedure in the rest of the mine shafts	83
3.4.1.3	Accuracy and repeatability of test data.....	85
3.4.1.4	Ideal test methodology.....	86
3.4.2	Results of Tests.....	86
3.4.3	Conclusion and Recommendations.....	88
3.4.4	Innovative Testing Methodology	88
3.5	TESTS CONDUCTED ON SHAFTS	89
3.5.1	Equipment Used.....	89
3.5.1.1	Environmental instrumentation	89
3.5.1.2	Winder measurements.....	91
3.5.1.3	Velocity measurements.....	94
3.5.2	Data Collection and Collation.....	94
3.5.2.1	Data collection.....	94
3.5.2.2	Data collation	95
3.5.3	Results and Conclusion.....	96
3.5.4	Accuracy of Data Collation Instrumentation	96
3.6	COMPUTATIONAL FLUID DYNAMICS.....	99
3.6.1	Mesh Generation	99
3.6.2	Fluid Model Selection.....	101
3.6.3	Boundary Conditions.....	102
3.6.4	Simulation Runs.....	102
3.6.5	Simulations Completed for this Analysis.....	102
3.6.5.1	T01 – Shaft barrel pressure losses	102

3.6.5.2	T02 – Shaft barrel and one bunton across the shaft.....	102
3.6.5.3	T03 – Shaft barrel and two buntions across the shaft.....	103
3.6.5.4	T04 – Shaft barrel and full buntions set	103
3.6.5.5	T05 – Shaft barrel and pipes at pipe diameter	103
3.6.5.6	T06 – Shaft barrel and pipes at flange diameter	103
3.6.5.7	T07 – Shaft barrel and pipe including flanges.....	103
3.6.5.8	T08 – Shaft barrel and buntions and pipes at pipe diameter	103
3.6.5.9	T09 – Shaft barrel and buntions and pipes at flange diameter	104
3.6.5.10	T10 – Shaft barrel and buntions and pipe including flanges	104
3.6.5.11	T11 – Shaft barrel and buntions and pipe including flanges and skip 1	104
3.6.5.12	T12 – Shaft barrel and buntions and pipe including flanges and skip 2	104
3.6.5.13	T13 – Shaft barrel and buntions and pipe including flanges and man cage 1	104
3.6.5.14	T14 – Shaft barrel and buntions and pipe including flanges and man cage 2	104
3.6.5.15	T15 – Shaft barrel and buntions and pipe including flanges and service cage.....	104
3.7	ECONOMICS.....	105
3.7.1	Shaft Modifications	105
3.7.2	Shaft Equipping	105
3.7.3	Shaft Conveyances	105
3.7.4	Operating Costs.....	106
3.8	SUMMARY OF METHOD OF EXPERIMENTATION AND ANALYSIS	106
CHAPTER 4	RESULTS AND EVALUATION OF SHAFT TESTS	108
4.1	RESULTS OF SHAFT TESTS.....	108
4.1.1	Tests on No. 14 shaft.....	108
4.1.1.1	Shaft details and installation of equipment.....	108
4.1.1.2	Environmental loggers.....	110
4.1.1.3	Rotary encoders	110
4.1.1.4	Summary of data from tests on No. 14 shaft.....	110
4.1.2	Tests on No. 11 shaft.....	113
4.1.2.1	Shaft details and installation of equipment.....	113
4.1.2.2	Environmental loggers.....	114
4.1.2.3	Rotary encoder	115
4.1.2.4	Summary of data from tests on No. 11 shaft.....	115
4.1.3	Tests on No. 1 shaft.....	116
4.1.3.1	Shaft details and installation of equipment.....	116
4.1.3.2	Environmental loggers.....	118
4.1.3.3	Rotary encoder	118
4.1.3.4	Summary of data from tests on No. 1 shaft.....	119
4.1.4	Tests on No. 11C shaft.....	121
4.1.4.1	Shaft details and installation of equipment.....	121

4.1.4.2	Environmental loggers.....	122
4.1.4.3	Rotary encoder	122
4.1.4.4	Summary of data from tests on No. 11c shaft.....	123
4.1.5	Tests on No. 12N shaft	124
4.1.5.1	Shaft details and installation of equipment.....	124
4.1.5.2	Environmental loggers.....	126
4.1.5.3	Rotary encoder	127
4.1.5.4	Summary of data from tests on No. 12N shaft.....	127
4.2	SUMMARY OF AND CONCLUSIONS FROM THE SHAFT TEST RESULTS	128
4.2.1	Accuracy of the Results	128
4.2.2	Summary of the Various Shaft Tests	129
4.2.2.1	Summary of results from the No. 14 shaft tests.....	129
4.2.2.2	Summary of results from the No. 11 shaft tests.....	130
4.2.2.3	Summary of results from the No. 1 shaft tests.....	130
4.2.2.4	Summary of results from No. 11C shaft	131
4.2.2.5	Summary of results from No. 12N shaft	131
4.2.3	Summary and Conclusions from the Shaft Test Results.....	131
4.2.3.1	Accuracy of the data.....	131
4.2.4	Conveyances Moving in the Shaft	133
4.2.5	Conclusions from the Results and Evaluation of Shaft Tests	134
CHAPTER 5	RESULTS AND EVALUATION OF CFD ANALYSIS	136
5.1	RESULTS OF CFD ANALYSIS	136
5.1.1	CFD Simulation No. 1 (Shaft Barrel)	136
5.1.2	CFD Simulations Nos T02, T03 and T04.....	138
5.1.3	CFD Simulation Nos T05, T06 and T07	142
5.1.4	CFD Simulations Nos T08, T09 and T10.....	146
5.1.5	CFD Simulations Nos T11, T12, T13, T14 and T15	150
5.2	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS FROM THE CFD SIMULATION RESULTS	154
5.2.1	Conclusions from the CFD Simulation Results.....	157
CHAPTER 6	COLLATION OF ALL RESULTS	158
6.1	GENERAL	158
6.2	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.....	161
CHAPTER 7	ECONOMIC EVALUATION OF SHAFT OPTIONS.....	162
7.1	SUMMARY OF OPTIONS.....	162
7.2	SUMMARY OF RESULTS.....	164
7.2.1	Bunton Shapes	164



7.2.2	Piping Arrangements.....	165
7.2.3	Coefficient of Fill and Cage Configurations	166
7.3	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	167
CHAPTER 8	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	168
8.1	SUMMARY	168
8.2	CONCLUSIONS	170
8.2.1	Conclusions from Perusal of the Test Data	170
8.2.2	General Conclusions from the Analysis.....	171
8.2.3	Conclusions from the Economic Evaluation	174
8.2.3.1	Buntons	174
8.2.3.2	Pipes	174
8.2.3.3	Cages	174
8.3	SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER WORK.....	175
CHAPTER 9	REFERENCES.....	176
APPENDICES	183
	APPENDIX A: CALCULATIONS FOR THE ‘MODEL’ MINE.....	184
	APPENDIX B: INITIAL TEST METHODOLOGIES	185
	APPENDIX C: VERIFICATION OF RESULTS OF THE QUOTED PAPERS	186
	APPENDIX D: RESULTS OF TESTS FOR 14 SHAFT	187
	APPENDIX E: RESULTS OF TESTS FOR 11 SHAFT	188
	APPENDIX F: RESULTS OF TESTS FOR 11C SHAFT.....	189
	APPENDIX G: RESULTS OF TESTS FOR 1 SHAFT	190
	APPENDIX H: RESULTS OF TESTS FOR 12N SHAFT.....	191

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1-1:	Summary of overall mineral sales contribution in South Africa (Statistics South Africa, 2011a)...	2
Figure 1-2:	Total quantity of electricity available for distribution in South Africa (Statistics South Africa, 2011b)	4
Figure 1-3:	Comparison of annual percentage change in available electricity and GDP (Statistics South Africa, 2011c)	5
Figure 1-4:	Consequence of increases with respect to operating costs.....	7
Figure 1-5:	Summary of mine installed electrical energy consumption requirements	9
Figure 1-6:	Summary of mine installed electrical energy consumption requirements (as % total installed consumption capacity).....	9
Figure 1-7:	Typical winder cycle	11
Figure 1-8:	Schematic of ventilation layout.....	16
Figure 1-9:	Schematic of mine shafts tested	18
Figure 1-10:	Configuration of No. 14B downcast shaft bottom	21
Figure 1-11:	Estimated cost of shaft sinking per linear metre	23
Figure 1-12:	Shaft decision cost criteria	24
Figure 2-1:	Chezy-Darcy friction factors for Harmony No. 2 and No. 3 shaft scale model tests	39
Figure 3-1:	Conveyance shock loss estimation for conveyances.....	77
Figure 3-2:	Pitot tube attachment bracket on rope above cage	84
Figure 3-3:	Pitot tube attachment bracket (above cage)	84
Figure 3-4:	Testing instrumentation – Pitot tube, barometer and whirling hygrometer	85
Figure 3-5:	EASYLog 80CL	91
Figure 3-6:	PLC, interface and GSM module for rotary encoder	92
Figure 3-7:	Rotary encoder.....	93
Figure 3-8:	Rotary encoder connection on winder side shaft	93
Figure 3-9:	Kestrel 4000 environmental logger.....	94
Figure 3-10:	Typical graph of collated results (including environmental data and winder data).....	96
Figure 3-11:	Schematic of meshed shaft arrangement	101
Figure 4-1:	Cross-section of No. 14 shaft	109
Figure 4-2:	Cross-section of No. 11 shaft	114
Figure 4-3:	Cross-section of No. 1 shaft	118
Figure 4-4:	Cross-section of No. 11C shaft	122
Figure 4-5:	Cross-section of No. 12N shaft.....	126
Figure 5-1:	Velocity profiles for simulation T01 – Shaft barrel pressure losses	137
Figure 5-2:	Velocity profiles for simulations T02, T03 and T04	141
Figure 5-3:	Velocity profiles for simulations 5, 6 and 7	145

Figure 5-4: Velocity profiles for simulations 8, 9 and 10..... 149

Figure 5-5: Velocity profiles for simulations 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15 154

Figure 5-6: Velocity profiles for simulations T04, T07 and T10 156

Figure 7-1: Typical cross-section 163

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1-1:	Summary of ventilation power requirements for mine analysed	17
Table 1-2:	Summary of ventilation pressure losses	19
Table 2-1:	No. 2 shaft (7.92 m (26 ft) diameter)	37
Table 2-2:	Pioneer shaft bunton shape changes	41
Table 2-3:	Tests on downcast shafts	45
Table 3-1:	Summary of drag coefficients of elongated bodies of infinite span (McPherson, 1987)	73
Table 3-2:	Impala No. 14 shaft – details of tested shafts	87
Table 3-3:	EASYlog 80CL specifications	90
Table 3-4:	Evaluation of Accuracy of Temperature Measurements on the Overall Results	97
Table 3-5:	Evaluation of Accuracy of Pressure Measurements on the Overall Results Typical)	98
Table 3-6:	Evaluation of Accuracy of the Velocity Measurements on the Overall Results Typical)	98
Table 3-4:	Mesh refinement evaluation	100
Table 4-1:	No. 14 shaft test results – Data	111
Table 4-2:	No. 14 shaft test results – Service cage	111
Table 4-3:	No. 14 shaft test results – Rock skip	112
Table 4-4:	No. 14 shaft test results – Man cage	112
Table 4-5:	No. 11 shaft test results – Data	115
Table 4-6:	No. 11 shaft test results	116
Table 4-7:	No. 1 shaft test results – Data	120
Table 4-8:	No. 1 shaft test results	120
Table 4-9:	No. 11C shaft test results – Data	123
Table 4-10:	No. 11C shaft test results	124
Table 4-11:	No. 12N shaft test results – Data	127
Table 4-12:	No. 12N shaft test results	128
Table 4-13:	Summary of shaft test results	132
Table 5-1:	CFD simulation No. T01 – Shaft barrel pressure losses	136
Table 5-2:	CFD simulations Nos T02, T03 and T04	138
Table 5-3:	CFD simulations Nos 5, 6 and 7	142
Table 5-4:	CFD simulations Nos 8, 9 and 10	146
Table 5-5:	CFD simulations Nos 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15 T15	150
Table 6-1:	CFD simulation No. T10 – Shaft barrel and buntons and pipes including flanges	158
Table 6-2:	CFD simulations Nos T11, T12, T13, T14 and T15	159
Table 7-1:	CFD simulation for piping placement	164
Table 7-2:	CFD simulation for piping arrangements	165
Table 7-3:	CFD simulation for varying cage fill factors	166

LIST OF SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS

μ	kg/(ms)	lb.s/ft ²	slugs/fts	Absolute/dynamic viscosity of air
A_{B1}	m ²	ft ²		Frontal area of buntuns
A_{B2}	m ²	ft ²		Frontal area of secondary buntuns
A_{B3}	m ²	ft ²		Frontal area of tertiary buntuns
A_{BF}	m ²	ft ²		Total frontal area of all buntuns
$A_{CS\ Shaft}$	m ²	ft ²		Cross -sectional area of shaft
A_{FS}	m ²	ft ²		Free cross-sectional area of shaft
A_{Conv}	m ²	ft ²		Frontal cross-sectional area of the conveyance
BC	m			Below collar
BIC	-			Bushveld Igneous Complex
BS	m	ft		Spacing between buntuns
C_D	-			Coefficient of drag
C_{D1}	-			Coefficient of drag for the primary buntuns
C_{D2}	-			Coefficient of drag for the secondary buntuns
C_{D3}	-			Coefficient of drag for the tertiary buntuns
C_{DF}				Final coefficient of drag, average on total frontal area contribution
C_f	-			Coefficient of fill
c_p	J/(kgK)			Specific heat at constant pressure
CPI	-			Consumer Price Index
DN	-			Diameter nominal (of pipe)



DSM	-		Demand side management
$E_{l(\text{meas})}$	J/kg		Energy loss (based on measured data)
f	-		Chezy-Darcy Friction factor
f_{B1}			Chezy-Darcy Frictional resistance of the bunton set 1 (primary bun tons set)
f_{B2}			Chezy-Darcy Frictional resistance of the bunton set 2 (secondary bunton set)
f_{B3}			Chezy-Darcy Frictional resistance of the bunton set 3 (tertiary bunton set)
$f_{B\text{Total}}$			Chezy-Darcy Overall frictional resistance of the bunton sets
f_{Shaft}			Chezy-Darcy Friction factor of the shaft
f_{Total}			Chezy-Darcy Total friction factor of the shaft
G	kg/s		Mass flow rate
g	m/s^2		Gravitational constant
GDP	-		Gross Domestic Product
H	m		Height
h_{ai}	J/kg		Enthalpy of dry air (inlet)
h_{ao}	J/kg		Enthalpy of dry air (outlet)
h'_{wi}	J/kg		Enthalpy of water vapour
h'_{wl}	J/kg		Enthalpy of liquid water
h'_{wo}	J/kg		Enthalpy of water vapour
k	kg/m^3	Ns^2/m^4	Atkinson friction factor



$k_{\text{Buntons Total}}$	kg/m^3	Ns^2/m^4		Total Atkinson friction factor of buntons
KIC	-			Key Industry Consumer
k_{shaft}	kg/m^3	Ns^2/m^4		Atkinson friction factor for shaft
k_{Total}	kg/m^3	Ns^2/m^4		Atkinson friction factor for total shaft
ktpm	tonnes			Thousands of Kilotonnes per month
L_{B1}	m	ft		Length of the primary buntion support
L_{B2}	m	ft		Length of the secondary buntion support
L_{B3}	m	ft		Length of the tertiary buntion support
L_{s}	m	ft		Length of shaft
P	Pa	Bar (mm Hg)	in. WG	Pressure
P_{ws}	Pa			Saturated vapour pressure
P_{Bar}	Pa			Barometric pressure
P_{FS}	m	ft		Resultant perimeter of shaft (from free cross-section)
PGM	-			Platinum Group Metals
$P_{\text{L (Atkinson)}}$	Pa			Pressure loss calculated in accordance with Atkinson friction factor
$P_{\text{L (Darcy)}}$	Pa			Pressure loss calculated in accordance with Darcy-Weisbach formula using the Chezy-Darcy friction factor
$P_{\text{L (meas)}}$	Pa			Measured pressure loss
$P_{\text{L (Rational)}}$	Pa			Pressure loss calculated in accordance with rational theory
P_{SC}	Pa			Pressure loss as a result of the stationary cage

P_{MC}	Pa		Pressure loss as a result of a moving cage
$P_{MC (Max)}$	Pa		Maximum pressure loss of a moving cage (moving against airflow)
$P_{MC (Max)}$	Pa		maximum pressure loss of a moving cage (moving with airflow)
Power	W		Measurement of power
Per	m	ft	Perimeter of shaft
P_{Static}	Pa		Static pressure
P_{Tot}	Pa		Total pressure
P_w	Pa		Vapour pressure
Q_F	m^3/s		Volumetric flow rate
R	J/(kgK)		Rydberg constant
r	kg_{water}/kg_{air}	g/lb	Moisture content
r_0	kg_{water}/kg_{air}		Moisture content of saturated air at t_{wb}
SD	m	ft	Shaft diameter
SD_{FS}	m	ft	Resultant diameter of shaft (from free cross-section)
T	°C	°F	Temperature
T_{DB}	°C	°F	Dry bulb temperature
T_{WB}	°C	°F	Wet bulb temperature
U	m/s	Fpm	Velocity of air in the shaft
V	m/s		Velocity
V_{FS}	m/s		Ventilation air flow in free area of shaft
V_p	Pa		Velocity pressure



VRT	°C	Virgin rock temperature		
V_{Conv}	m/s	Velocity of moving conveyance		
W	m	Width		
w_1	m	inches	Average width of the main buntions	
w_{b2}	m	inches	Average width of the secondary buntions	
w_{b3}	m	inches	Average width of the tertiary buntions	
w_{bf}	m	inches	Average width of all buntions (from total frontal area)	
WWB	-	West Wits Basin		
ΔP	Pa	Pressure difference		
$\Delta P/m$		Pressure difference per metre of shaft length		
ϵ	m	Roughness (shaft wall)		
λ	-	Frictional resistance in shaft		
ν	m^2/s	Kinematic viscosity		
ρ	kg/m^3	lb/ft^3	$slugs/ft^3$	Density
Γ_{B1}		Rational resistance of buntion set 1		
Γ_{B2}		Rational resistance of buntion set 2		
Γ_{B3}		Rational resistance of buntion set 3		
Γ_{BTotal}		Overall rational resistance of buntions		
Γ_{Shaft}		Rational resistance of shaft		
Γ_{Conv}		Rational resistance of conveyance		
Γ_{Total}		Calculated total rational resistance		