

**HYDROGEOLOGICAL CHARACTERISATION OF COAL MEASURES
AND OVERVIEW OF
IMPACTS OF COAL MINING ON GROUNDWATER SYSTEMS
IN THE UPPER HUNTER VALLEY OF NSW**

by
C.D. Mackie

A thesis submitted in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor
of Philosophy in Groundwater Management

Faculty of Science, University of Technology, Sydney
N.S.W. Australia

January 2009

CERTIFICATE OF ORIGINALITY

I hereby declare that this submission is my own work and that to the best of my knowledge and belief, it contains no material previously published or written by another person nor material which to a substantial extent has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma of a university or other institute of higher learning, except where due acknowledgement is made in the text.

Signed

Production Note:
Signature removed prior to publication.

Colin D. Mackie



ABSTRACT

Open cut coal mining in the Upper Hunter region of New South Wales has resulted in mine pit depths of 150 metres or more below the natural water table, and the backfilling and reshaping of more than 10 billion cubic metres of spoils waste rock.

Groundwater impact studies are a pre-requisite for mine pit regulatory approvals. Such studies often rely heavily upon computer based numerical models to simulate pit development and predict impacts. These models are sometimes poorly designed and reliant upon conjecture in prescribing strata hydraulic properties and other parameters. In addition, regional groundwater chemistry and the impacts relating thereto, are often addressed in a simplistic way while spoils leachate which is generated following pit resaturation, is poorly characterised if at all.

In order to assist groundwater practitioners in their assessments, a large amount of hydrogeological data has been consolidated as part of this research effort, hydrophysical and hydrochemical methodologies have been documented, and aquifers in the Upper Hunter region characterised.

Compilation and trend analysis of 172 packer tests conducted on coal seams (aquifers) at different locations and depths has resulted in a new and potentially useful coal seam depth versus hydraulic conductivity relationship based on coal brightness.

Testing of 180 interburden core samples comprehensively demonstrates the very low matrix conductivity (less than $1.0\text{E-}04$ m/day) of non coal interburden strata. Expected ranges in compressible storage for both coal seams and interburden have been calculated directly from reported ranges in elastic moduli derived from geomechanical studies.

Groundwater qualities within the regional coal measures and the shallow alluvial aquifers have been re-assessed through the compilation of 850 laboratory ion speciated samples. Tri-linear plotting of samples lends weight to some previously defined hydrochemical provinces. However there appears to be no useful division that might support regional scale inference within the coal measures.

XRD analyses of 24 interburden core samples exhibit a remarkably common mineral regime dominated by quartz with subordinate albite, kaolinite, illite-smectite and dolomite. The presence of dawsonite is also noted.

Vertical section numerical modelling of a typical open cut pit demonstrates that coal seams, by virtue of their relatively high hydraulic conductivity, tend to preferentially depressurise the strata and induce a component of leakage from adjacent less permeable interburden. Pressure losses within shallower strata are likely to be restricted to less than 2 km from a pit face while losses in deeper strata could migrate distances of 6 to 7 km over a period of 100 years.

Following pit closure, water levels will recover within a pit shell due to rainwater and groundwater contributions. A leachate will evolve from progressive re-saturation of spoils. The hydrochemistry of leachate derived from rainwater percolation has been explored by conducting batch reaction trials on 58 core samples representing different interburden lithologies in the Upper Hunter region. Trial results demonstrate leachates exhibiting $\text{Na} \gg \text{Mg} > \text{Ca}$ and $\text{HCO}_3^- \gg \text{Cl-SO}_4$ ionic species distributions. TDS projections out to 100 years support a range from 500 mg/L to more than 5000 mg/L with an average of about 2150 mg/L.

Inverse geochemical modelling of leachate trials has shown ion exchange to be particularly relevant. Findings suggest rapid dissolution of halite and dolomite will occur while ion exchange will enhance the dominance of Na through the presence of Na-smectite. Reaction path modelling results demonstrate that in the absence of exchangeable Na, the leachate quality is likely to be Na-Mg > Ca (Ca is minor) and HCO_3^- -Cl-SO₄ (no dominant anion). Progressively increasing the availability of exchangeable Na leads to an increasing presence of Na and HCO_3^- .

Research findings suggest subsurface hydrophysical impacts of mining on the high value alluvial groundwater system adjacent to the Hunter River, are relatively minor at the present time and are likely to remain so providing the hydraulic conductivities of Permian strata adjacent to the alluvial system, are not enhanced by fracturing and bedding shears.

Potential hydrochemical impacts on regional high value aquifers equate largely to the long term potential for spillage/leakage of leachate from mine pits. Predictive analyses suggest this leachate is likely to be Na- HCO_3^- type water with potential enhancement of Na-Cl from washery rejects if present. The pit closure design may also lead to enhancement of Na-Cl in the long term through evaporative concentration. Design of an appropriate passive pit closure scheme is especially relevant to long term groundwater quality in the region.

A C K N O W L E D G E M E N T S

I wish to express my gratitude to my supervisors Dr. N.P. Merrick and Dr. W.A. Milne-Home for the advice and liberal freedom given to me in generating and preparing the content of this manuscript. Thanks also to Prof. C. Ward (UNSW) for assistance in the quantitative analysis of XRD.

I am indebted to the many mining Companies of the Upper Hunter region and their dedicated personnel involved in environmental and water management who have facilitated the numerous studies in which I have been involved over a period of more than 20 years. Without these studies it would not have been possible to formulate opinions and devise measurement and prediction strategies aimed at understanding and minimising the impacts of mining on groundwater resources.

I also wish to thank staff of the Department of Water and Energy for the various data supplied over many years and more particularly for providing objective comment and thought provoking questioning, all of which acted in a feedback sense by stimulating my research effort in strategic areas.

Finally I wish to thank my wife Lynn for supporting my efforts over many years.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 RESEARCH FOCUS.....	1
1.2 REGIONAL SETTING & MINING HISTORY	5
1.3 THE RESEARCH AREA.....	7
GEOLOGY OF THE UPPER HUNTER REGION	9
2.1 STRATIGRAPHIC SUCCESSION	9
2.1.1 <i>Greta Coal Measures</i>	10
2.1.2 <i>Maitland Group</i>	11
2.1.3 <i>Wittingham Coal Measures</i>	13
2.1.4 <i>Newcastle (Wollombi) Coal Measures</i>	16
2.1.5 <i>Igneous intrusives</i>	16
2.1.6 <i>Alluvial and colluvial deposits</i>	18
2.2 MINERALOGY OF INTERBURDEN STRATA.....	19
2.2.1 <i>Diagenesis of interburden strata</i>	23
2.3 COALIFICATION.....	24
2.4 REGIONAL STRUCTURAL INFLUENCES	25
REGIONAL HYDROLOGY	27
3.1 RIVER FLOW	27
3.2 RIVER WATER SALINITY (EC) TRENDS.....	31
REGIONAL HYDROGEOLOGY	35
4.1 THE COAL MEASURES AQUIFER SYSTEM	35
4.1.1 <i>Groundwater flow within the coal measures</i>	37
4.1.2 <i>Regional piezometric surface</i>	38
4.1.3 <i>Hydraulic properties of coal measures</i>	39
4.1.4 <i>Coal seams - historical hydraulic conductivity data</i>	40
4.1.5 <i>Coal seams - cleat induced hydraulic conductivity</i>	42
4.1.6 <i>Calculated hydraulic conductivities for randomised cleat networks</i>	44
4.1.7 <i>Representative range in hydraulic conductivity of coal seams</i>	47
4.1.8 <i>Interburden - historical hydraulic conductivity data</i>	48
4.1.9 <i>Calculated hydraulic conductivities for randomised joint networks</i>	51
4.1.10 <i>Representative range in hydraulic conductivity of interburden</i>	53
4.1.11 <i>Elastic storage of coal seams and interburden</i>	54
4.1.12 <i>Specific yield of coal seams and interburden</i>	56
4.2 THE SHALLOW REGOLITH.....	56
4.2.1 <i>Regolith hydraulic properties</i>	58
4.3 THE ALLUVIAL AQUIFER SYSTEM.....	58
4.3.1 <i>Groundwater flow within the alluvial aquifer</i>	60
4.3.2 <i>Alluvium hydraulic properties</i>	60
4.4 REGIONAL GROUNDWATER CHEMISTRY	61
4.4.1 <i>Overview of hydrochemical provinces</i>	66
4.4.2 <i>Bivariate relationships for groundwater speciation</i>	66

4.4.3	<i>Recent hydrochemical speciation data</i>	68
4.4.4	<i>Characterisation of groundwaters using tri-linear plots</i>	71
OPEN CUT MINING METHOD		77
5.1	PIT DEVELOPMENT	77
5.2	MUCKPILE FRAGMENTATION	79
5.3	SPOILS DUMPS.....	81
5.3.1	<i>Rainfall runoff and infiltration through spoils</i>	83
IMPACTS DURING THE ACTIVE MINING PHASE		84
6.1	HYDROPHYSICAL IMPACTS	84
6.1.1	<i>Numerical modelling as a predictive tool</i>	84
6.1.2	<i>Prediction of the phreatic surface and groundwater pressures</i>	85
6.1.3	<i>Simplification of stratigraphic successions for modelling purposes</i>	87
6.1.4	<i>Generic model for regional assessment of depressurisation impacts</i>	89
6.1.5	<i>Sectional model design</i>	92
6.1.6	<i>Sectional model outputs</i>	95
6.1.7	<i>Buffer zone between alluvial lands and mine pits</i>	99
6.2	HYDROCHEMICAL IMPACTS.....	110
6.2.1	<i>Groundwater mixing through strata depressurisation</i>	111
6.2.2	<i>Leaching of waste rock</i>	111
6.2.3	<i>Emplacement of rejects materials</i>	112
IMPACTS POST MINING		114
7.1	RECOVERY OF AQUIFER PRESSURES.....	116
7.1.1	<i>Hydraulic properties of spoils</i>	117
7.1.2	<i>Rainfall recharge to spoils</i>	117
7.1.3	<i>Water level recovery in spoils</i>	120
7.2	LONG TERM WATER QUALITY WITHIN SPOILS	122
7.2.1	<i>Leachate derived from rainwater interaction</i>	123
7.2.2	<i>Inverse geochemical modelling of batch reaction samples</i>	127
7.2.3	<i>Reaction path modelling of rainwater-spoils interactions</i>	133
7.2.4	<i>Reaction path modelling of groundwater-spoils interactions</i>	138
7.2.5	<i>Characterisation of long term spoils leachate</i>	142
7.3	PIT CLOSURE DESIGNS AND WATER QUALITY ASPECTS.....	144
SUMMARY AND FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS		147
8.1	METHODOLOGIES TO IMPROVE HYDRAULIC ASSESSMENTS ..	148
8.1.1	<i>Estimation of strata hydraulic conductivity from fracture spacings</i>	148
8.1.2	<i>Estimation of coal seam hydraulic conductivity change with depth</i>	149
8.1.3	<i>Estimation of compressible storage from elastic moduli</i>	149
8.1.4	<i>Estimation of fragment distributions in spoils</i>	149
8.2	UPPER HUNTER REGION APPLICATION OF METHODOLOGIES.	150
8.2.1	<i>Hydrogeological setting</i>	150
8.2.2	<i>Numerical modelling of flow systems</i>	152
8.2.3	<i>Leachate generation from waste rock spoils</i>	154
8.2.4	<i>Simplified options for mine pit closure</i>	156
8.3	IMPACTS ON UPPER HUNTER GROUNDWATER SYSTEMS	157
8.4	FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS.....	158

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Study area in the upper Hunter region of New South Wales	2
Figure 2: Open cut mine sites and approximate mine pit crest outlines (some beneath rehabilitated areas)	8
Figure 3: Regional geology, structure and bedding strike and dip directions	10
Figure 4: Stratigraphic succession with basic coal seam descriptions	12
Figure 6: Regional geology showing dykes and bedding orientation.....	17
Figure 7: XRD sample locations in the stratigraphic column.....	21
Figure 8: XRD quantitative analyses for main minerals.....	22
Figure 9: Major drainages within the study area	28
Figure 10: Daily flow exceedance probabilities for Hunter River gauging stations (1999 to 2007 flow data)	29
Figure 11: Variability in Hunter River low flows for selected months in 2002-2003.....	30
Figure 12: Salinity (EC) duration plots for Hunter River gauging stations (1999 to 2007 flow data)	31
Figure 13: Variability in Hunter River salinity (EC) for selected months in 2002-2003.....	32
Figure 14: Regional composite piezometric surface showing mining related depressurisation.....	38
Figure 15: Coal seam hydraulic conductivities from packer tests	41
Figure 16: Relationship between vitrinite reflectance and cleat spacing (after Law, 1993)	43
Figure 17: Geometry of cleating in banded coals.....	43
Figure 20: Simplified representation of the influence of brightness on coal seam hydraulic conductivity.....	47
Figure 21: Interburden hydraulic conductivities from packer tests	49
Figure 22: Massive sandstone beneath siltstones and shales – Warkworth mine (CD Pit).....	50
Figure 23: Calculated interburden K_{xy} for typical joint characteristics	52
Figure 24: Typical range in specific storage for coal and interburden	55
Figure 27: Approximate demarcation of Kellet et al. hydrochemical provinces.....	64
Figure 28: Sampling locations – Kellett et al.....	65
Figure 29: Bivariate plots of Kellet et al. bore and well data.....	67
Figure 30: Sampling locations for additional data set.....	69
Figure 31: Bivariate plots of additional mine monitoring bore and well data.....	70
Figure 32: Piper tri-linear plot of Kellet et al. data set	72
Figure 33: Piper tri-linear plot of supplementary data set	73
Figure 34: Piper tri-linear plot of combined data set.....	73
Figure 35: Overlap of Kellet provinces.....	74
Figure 36: Typical open cut pit operations.....	78
Figure 37: Fragmentation distributions for typical blasting parameters	81
Figure 38: Low wall (background) showing the geometric profile of dragline spoils	82
Figure 39: Conceptual sectional model for evaluation of strata depressurisation.....	91
Figure 40: Sectional realisations (assuming horizontal strata).....	92
Figure 41: Drawdown induced by Scenario 1 – Interburden immediately beneath regolith..	101
Figure 42: Drawdown induced by Scenario 2 – Coal seam immediately beneath regolith	102
Figure 43: Drawdown induced by Scenario 3 – Coal seam immediately beneath regolith (jointed interburden)	103
Figure 44: Drawdown induced by Scenario 4 – Interburden immediately beneath alluvium.....	104
Figure 45: Drawdown induced by Scenario 5 – Coal seam immediately beneath alluvium ...	105

Figure 46: Drawdown induced by Scenario 6 – Coal seam beneath alluvium and regolith (jointed interburden)	106
Figure 47: Drawdown induced by mine pit at 50 years – Coal seam beneath alluvium	107
Figure 48: Drawdown induced by mine pit at 50 years – Coal seam beneath alluvium (jointed interburden)	108
Figure 49: Pit wall seepage for different buffer zone widths between the pit crest and an alluvial aquifer.....	109
Figure 50: Mine pit closure – passive groundwater control options	116
Figure 51: Relationship between runoff and rainfall percolation through spoils based on Pitman model.....	120
Figure 52: Trilinear plot of all interburden leachate trials – by sample area	125
Figure 53: Trilinear plot of all interburden leachate trials – by lithology.....	125
Figure 54: Bivariate plots of all leachate trials.....	126
Figure 55: Typical fragmentation distribution in spoils – Case 1	130
Figure 56: Reactive rock mass (per cubic metre of spoils) for the fragment distribution Case 1 (upper plot)	130
Figure 57: Reaction path model for pure water and the base case mineralogy with variable exchange (Na for Ca)	135
Figure 58: Reaction path model for pure water and the base case mineralogy with increased halite presence	136
Figure 59: Reaction path model – pure water and the base case mineralogy with increased gypsum presence	137
Figure 60: Tri linear plot of reaction path model - base case mineralogy with 3 regional groundwaters	140

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Calculated mixing of Hunter River waters expressed in EC units	33
Table 2: Attributes of simulated cleat networks	45
Table 3: Typical range of coal seam horizontal (K_{xy}) hydraulic conductivities based on Figure 20	48
Table 4: Expected range in isotropic hydraulic conductivities for non coal interburden	53
Table 5: Expected range of hydraulic conductivities for the regolith-weathered bedrock.....	58
Table 6: Expected range of alluvium hydraulic conductivities	61
Table 7: Summary of Kellett et al. speciated data	62
Table 8: Hydrochemical provinces of the Upper Hunter Valley (after Kellett et al, 1989)	63
Table 9: Generalised characterisation of groundwaters in the Upper Hunter region	76
Table 10: Key variables used to generate fragmentation distributions	81
Table 11: Examples of equivalent hydraulic conductivities for alternating strata of uniform thicknesses.....	88
Table 12: Hydraulic properties for sectional model without joint enhanced hydraulic conductivities	94
Table 13: Hydraulic properties for sectional model with joint enhanced hydraulic conductivities	95
Table 14: Seepage and leakage contributions for different buffer zone widths	100
Table 15: Estimated leakage losses from the Hunter River and connected alluvium	110
Table 16: Cation exchange capacities for identified clay minerals	131
Table 17: Comparison of commonly available minerals in rock samples (from XRD) and transferred minerals to/from the aqueous phase during leachate trials	132

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A: Bore and well locations	160
Appendix B: X-ray diffraction analyses of mineralogy	166
Appendix C: Hydrochemical speciation data.....	171
Appendix D: Hydraulic properties data.....	189
Appendix E: Two component blast fragmentation model	206
Appendix F: Type borehole stratigraphic details	213
Appendix G: Interburden batch reaction trials	219
Appendix H: Inverse modelling of batch reaction trials	232
Appendix I: Reaction path modelling of spoils interactions.....	243

LIST OF FIGURES IN APPENDICES

Figure B1: Typical diffractograms.....	167
Figure C1: Histograms of TDS and pH by province – all data.....	186
Figure D1: Bore locations for hydraulic conductivity tests – all types.....	190
Figure D2: Confidence intervals for coal seam packer tests.....	194
Figure E1: Typical staggered blast hole configuration.....	207
Figure E2: Typical fragmentation distribution – Case 1.....	211
Figure E3: Definition of projected diameter from Harr (1977).....	212
Figure F1: Graphic logs for ID1030 showing hydraulic conductivity distribution.....	218
Figure G1: Sample locations for core used in leachate trials.....	222
Figure G2: Typical monitoring results from leachate batch reaction trials.....	223
Figure G3: Typical trend fits to EC data for projection to 100 years.....	225
FigureH1: Phreeqc data file for inverse modelling with dionised (pure) water.....	234
Figure H2: Results from Phreeqc inverse modelling.....	235
Figure I1: Phreeqc data file for reaction path modelling – rainwater.....	245
Figure I2: Phreeqc data file for reaction path modelling – groundwater.....	246
Figure I3: Reaction path models - base case mineralogy and no exchange.....	248
Figure I4: Reaction path models - base case mineralogy and low exchange.....	248
Figure I5: Reaction path models - base case mineralogy and moderate exchange.....	249
Figure I6: Reaction path models - base case mineralogy and high exchange.....	249
Figure I7: pH and TDS plots for reaction path models and base case mineralogy.....	250

LIST OF TABLES IN APPENDICES

Table A1: Bore and well locations.....	160
Table B1: Quantitative analysis of core samples (% by weight) using Siroquant.....	170
Table C1: Major ions speciation data used in Kellet et al. (1989) study.....	171
Table C2: Additional major ions speciation data sourced from environmental studies.....	181
Table D1: Horizontal and vertical intergranular hydraulic conductivities.....	193
Table D2: Packer tests on seams and interburden intervals.....	198
Table D3: Hydraulic conductivity tests in alluvial materials.....	203
Table D4: River bed falling head conductivity tests – Hunter Valley Operations.....	207
Table E1: Key variables used to generate fragmentation distributions.....	211
Table F1: Partial geological log for ID1030 and assigned hydraulic properties.....	214
Table F2: Hydraulic conductivity look up table for borehole ID1030.....	217
Table G1: Speciation data for leachate trials on core samples.....	226
Table G2: Summary of projected trends for leachate trials.....	228
Table G3: Saturation indices of common minerals for leachate trials.....	230
Table I1: Groundwater samples used in Phreeqc reaction path modelling.....	244