Applying the "Seven Questions" to Heap Leaching[1]

By Mark E. Smith, PE, GE[2]

In 1999 the International Institute for Environment and Development was commissioned by the World Business Council for Sustainable Development to under take the Mining, Minerals and Sustainable Development (MMSD) project. MMSD North America was then formed as a partnership of the International Institute for Sustainable Development and the Mining Life-Cycle Center at Mackay School of Mines, which produced *The Seven Questions to Sustainability: How to Access the Contribution of Mining and Minerals Activities.* This created a framework for evaluating mineral development in terms of the goal of sustainable development. Each of the Seven Questions follows along with a discussion of how to apply them in a rural South American heap leaching context – specifically, how does heap leaching advance the goals of SD in comparison to the alternative process options?

1 - Engagement. *Are engagement processes in place and working effectively?* At first glance heap leaching offers no better inroads to this aspect of sustainable development than any other mining activity. However, deeper consideration brings forth some interesting points. Since a heap leach project is not as capital driven as a conventional milling operation, there is more room for consideration of alternatives. And since the construction technologies are more accessible to local contractors, there are more opportunities for partnering between the owner and contractors, and less reliance on imported technologies and equipment. Thus, a heap leach operation is more accessible to the local community, improving opportunities for engagement.

2 - People. *Will people's well-being be maintained or improved?* Heap leaching is an inherently more hands-on process then milling. It is the "low technology" solution for low grade ores, and as such requires more people doing things that are more transferable to other industries. Transferable skills learned by heap leach personnel include pipe laying, irrigation systems, operating and maintenance of pumps and controls, surveying, earthworks, liner construction and maintenance, slope and erosion control, reclamation and revegetation, and various other aspects of civil construction. All of these have broad applications outside the mineral industry, making a heap leach work force highly employable.

3 - Environment. *Is the integrity of the environment assured over the long term?* Arguably the two biggest mining environmental legacies are acid drainage and failures of dams and waste dumps (either structural failure or loss of containment). Heap leach facilities in general have had far fewer serious ARD problems then conventional milling operations, in part because by leaching lower grade ore they can reduce the size (and for a copper project, the sulfide content) of the waste dumps. This is not to trivialize the problem of residual acid from copper leaching operations, something that has not yet

[1] Published in The Mining Record, June, 2004.
[2] Mark E. Smith is vice president for South American operations for Vector Engineering, Inc. and is based in Lima, Peru. smith@vectoreng.com

been fully addressed by the industry. On the other hand, spent heap leach ore (ripios) from gold operations is usually strongly alkaline; mixing waste types can help compensate for acidic waste rock.[3]

In terms of catastrophic failures, tailings dams and waste dumps are the principal cause of fatalities (not related to direct mine workplace accidents) with an average of 10 fatalities per year caused by tailings and waste dump failures.[4] It is not clear if this trend is improving[5]. People even remotely related to mining know about the Omai and Los Frailes tailings dam failures. Simply reducing reliance on conventional tailings disposal is of itself a move towards more sustainable development.[6] The history of heap and dump leaching is, by comparison, very good. There have been no significant leach heap or dump slope failures and no failure-related fatalities. Spent heaps are more stable and easier to reclaim than old tailings deposits if for no other reason than their self-draining characteristics. In the study entitled *Mineral recovery, recycling, waste prevention and confinement for sustainable development in Asia and the Pacific Rim* the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific listed heap leaching as one of the "clean technologies for mineral waste minimization, recovery and recycling" (1995) because of its efficiency, cost effectiveness and environmental acceptability.

4 - Economy. *Is the economic viability of the project or operation assured, and will the economy of the community and beyond be better off as a result?* The obvious points here are that heap leach technology allows more ore to be processed since a lower cut off grade results, allowing a longer life or a larger operation, or both. It is also less capital intensive and thus less sensitive to commodity price fluctuations and generally a lower risk investment. Beyond these obvious answers lie some other important considerations. One of the common criticism of our industry is that, while mining investment is very large, because it is very capital intensive the investment overstates the benefits to the local community and therefore can not be directly compared with other types of economic development. For example, consider the Antamina copper-zinc mining-milling complex in Peru, with a total capital cost of about US $1.8 billion. A similar investment in public infrastructure would touch nearly every person in Peru, something that a single mine cannot hope to achieve. Heap leach technology shifts the balance of investments, de-emphasizing capital in favor of operating expenses. Payments for operations are something that the communities can generally share in to a greater extent than initial capitalization. Heap leaching also increases employment beyond the process circuit. Lower cut off grades means bigger mines and the ore handling is very labor intensive.

---

[3] *Breaking New Ground*, chapter 10, MMSD, Earthcan Publishing, London, 2002.

[4] Smith, M. E., "*Copper Dump Leaching*" in Mining magazine, July 2002.

[5] Martin, T. E., M. P. Davies, S. Rice, T. Higgs and P. C. Lighthall, "*Stewardship of Tailings Facilities,*" report no. 20 prepared for the MMSD project, April, 2002.

[6] Leduc, M., M. Bachens and M. E. Smith, "*Tailings Co-disposal™ in Sustainable Development,*" proceedings of the annual meeting of the Society for Mining, Metals and Exploration, SME, Denver, Feb., 2004 and "*Safer, Cleaner, and Potentially Cost-Effective*," in Mining Environmental Management magazine, March, 2004.

Tables 1 and 2 summarize this. The employment figures are total direct permanent employment during operations; capitalization is estimated in constant year 2000 US dollars and generally excludes land acquisition, financing charges, working capital. Both employment and capital are in very round figures and are from a mix of official and unofficial sources.

Table 1: Capital and Employment: Milling

	Pascua-Lama[1] (Au, Chile-Arg)	**Confidential[1] (Cu, Peru)**	**Antamina[2] (Cu-Zn, Peru)**	**Total**
Capital, US $	$1,100m	$400m	$1,760m	$3,260m
Employment				
Total	900	700	1,400	3,000
Per $1m capitalization	0.8	1.7	0.8	0.9

Notes: 1= in development; 2= in operation

Table 2: Capital and Employment: Heap Leaching

	Pierina[2] (Au, Peru)	**Veladero[1] (Au, Argentina)**	**Andacollo[3] (Au, Chile)**	**Alto Chicama[1] (Au, Peru)**	**Total**
Capital, US $	$290m	$280m	$110m	$280m	$960m
Employment					
Total	500	400	300	600	1,800
Per $1m capital	1.7	1.4	2.7	2.1	1.9

Notes: 1= in development; 2= in operation; 3= in closure

5 - Traditional and non-market activities. *Are traditional and non-market activities in the community and surrounding area accounted for in a way that is acceptable to the local people?* By expanding employment in areas with transferable skills, a more sustainable workforce results. In an Andean setting, for example, many of these skills are directly applicable to traditional activities, such as irrigation, erosion control, stone masonry, slope stabilization, and so forth. Admittedly the tools and techniques used at a modern mine are not directly applicable to traditional *campesino* life, but certainly they have more in common than with the relatively high technology/equipment intensive requirements of mill operations and maintenance.

6 - Institutional arrangements and governance. *Are rules, incentives, programs and capacities in place to address project or operational consequences?* The key here is having systems in place to address project consequences, especially unforeseen ones (since the foreseen consequences should already have been provided for). As discussed elsewhere, the potential for catastrophic failure or chronic long-term problems such as ARD may be less in a heap leach environment, thus the need for responsive systems is likewise less. Further, the types of problems inherent to a heap leach project tend to be more manageable at a local level. The typical threat being excessive leakage from the leach pad during its operating life. At closure heaps are usually self-draining and thus the potential for post-closure leakage is significantly reduced.

7 - Synthesis and continuous learning. *Does a full synthesis show that the net result will be positive or negative in the long term, and will there be periodic reassessments?* Heap leaching has the potential for reducing all types of impacts, improving economic benefits in the local community and reducing economic risk. It also leaves a more secure site after operations and thus reduces long-term environmental liability. At the same time, it uses technologies that are both more locally available and have more applications outside mining. Since the projects are less capital intensive and typically subject to expansions or revisions in the leach pad and stacking operations annually or bi-annually, project re-evaluation is a deeply engrained part of the heap leach culture. Expanding this to include the local community should be an easy step.

Acknowledgements
Much of this paper is founded on the work of On Common Ground (Vancouver, B.C. and Lima, Peru), especially Susan A. Joyce (susanajoyce@shaw.ca), as well as a series of articles published in The Latin American Mining Record and The Mining Record (Howell International, Colorado) between July, 2003 and March, 2004. This paper first appeared in The Latin American Mining Journal in 2004.