

David Barrie Johnson
Christopher George Bryan
Michael Schlömann
Francisco Figueroa Roberto *Editors*

Biomining Technologies

Extracting and Recovering Metals
from Ores and Wastes

 Springer

Biomining Technologies

David Barrie Johnson •
Christopher George Bryan • Michael Schlömann •
Francisco Figueroa Roberto
Editors

Biomining Technologies

Extracting and Recovering Metals from Ores
and Wastes

 Springer

Editors

David Barrie Johnson
School of Natural Sciences
Bangor University
Bangor, UK

Christopher George Bryan
BRGM
Orléans, France

Michael Schlömann
Institute of Biosciences
Technische Universität Bergakademie
Freiberg
Freiberg, Germany

Francisco Figueroa Roberto
Technical Services Processing and Metallurgy
Newmont USA Limited
Denver, CO, USA

ISBN 978-3-031-05381-8 ISBN 978-3-031-05382-5 (eBook)
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-05382-5>

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s), under exclusive license to Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2023

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are solely and exclusively licensed by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, expressed or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

This Springer imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Switzerland AG
The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

This book is dedicated to the memory of Professor Douglas E. Rawlings, the pioneer of molecular studies of biomineralizing microorganisms and who also played a key role in deciphering their roles in mineral processing operations. Doug Rawlings was also the editor/co-editor of previous texts in this field.

Contents

1	Evolution and Current Status of Mineral Bioprocessing Technologies	1
	David Barrie Johnson and Francisco Figueroa Roberto	
2	Design, Construction, and Modelling of Bioheaps	15
	David Grant Dixon and Hector Mark Lizama	
3	Engineering Designs and Challenges of Stirred Tank Systems	41
	David William Dew, Gary Vernon Rorke, and Anne-Gwénaëlle Guezennec	
4	Bioprocessing of Refractory Gold Ores: The BIOX, MesoTHERM, and ASTER Processes	67
	Jan Albert van Niekerk, Craig Bradley van Buuren, and Johan Waldemar Olivier	
5	Biomining Microorganisms: Diversity and <i>Modus Operandi</i>	89
	Mark Dopson and Naoko Okibe	
6	Biomolecular and Cultivation Tools	111
	Raquel Quatrini, Elizabeth Lindsay Jane Watkin, and David Barrie Johnson	
7	Microbial Ecology of Bioheaps, Stirred Tanks, and Mine Wastes	133
	Christopher George Bryan and Susan Therese Largier Harrison	
8	Biomining in China: History and Current Status	151
	Guanzhou Qiu, Xueduan Liu, and Ruiyong Zhang	
9	Copper Bioleaching Operations in Chile: Towards New Challenges and Developments	163
	Mario Vera Véliz, Alvaro Videla Leiva, and Patricio Martínez Bellange	

10	Heap Bioleaching of an Enargite-Dominant Ore Body: Minera Yanacocha, Perú	177
	Francisco Figueroa Roberto and Hamer Arévalo Lara	
11	Biooxidation of Gold Ores in Russia and Kazakhstan	191
	Aleksandr Vasilyevich Belyi and Olga Vladimirovna Tupikina	
12	Biomining in Finland: Commercial Application of Heap and Tank Bioleaching Technologies for Nickel Recovery	209
	Mariekie Gericke, John William Neale, and Pasi Määttä	
13	Mineral Bioleaching in Brackish and Saline Environments	229
	Miao Chen and Michael Schlömann	
14	Metal Recovery from E-wastes	239
	Agathe Hubau and Christopher George Bryan	
15	Reductive Mineral Bioprocessing	261
	Ana Laura Santos and Axel Schippers	
16	Biological Removal and Recovery of Metals from Waste Streams and Process Waters	275
	Sabrina Hedrich and Päivi Hanna-Maarit Kinnunen	
17	The Future of Biomining: Towards Sustainability in a Metal-Demanding World	295
	Anna Henriikka Kaksonen and Jochen Petersen	

Editors and Contributors

About the Editors

Barrie Johnson is a research professor at the Universities of Bangor and Coventry (UK) and a Research Associate of the Natural History Museum (London) with >30 years' experience with using specialised microorganisms to extract and recover metals. He is an elected member of the Learned Society of Wales, is an Industrial Research Fellow of the Royal Society, has held honorary professorships at Exeter University and Central South University (China), has been awarded research fellowships by the US Department of Energy and Bureau of Mines, and has, on two occasions, acted on behalf of the International Atomic Energy Agency (in Peru). He has worked with many of the leading global mining companies (Rio Tinto, BHP Billiton, Newmont, Vale, etc.) and collaborates with many research groups throughout the world on fundamental and applied aspects of biohydrometallurgy. He has published over 380 articles in journals, books, and conference proceedings and has worked on over 70 funded (research council, EU, and industry) research projects. His research was highlighted by *Scientific American* as one of “10 world changing ideas” in their December 2011 edition. He co-edited (with Professor Doug Rawlings) the second edition of *Biomining*, which was published by Springer-Verlag in 2007.

Chris Bryan is head of the Geomicrobiology and Environmental Monitoring unit at BRGM—the French Geological Survey, leading a team of microbiologists and geochemists providing expertise and technological assistance for environmental protection and monitoring. This includes the remediation and restoration of mine wastes and post-mining environments and the development of ecotechnologies for the sustainable exploitation of primary and secondary raw materials. Prior to joining BRGM, he was Senior Lecturer in Sustainable Mining at the Camborne School of Mines (University of Exeter, UK). He is an environmental and molecular microbiologist, with >20 years' experience in the microbiology of biohydrometallurgical systems (both tank and heap leaching) and acidogenic mine wastes.

Michael Schlomann is full professor for environmental microbiology at Technische Universität Bergakademie Freiberg. Based on a background in the degradation of organic contaminants, molecular ecology, and white biotechnology, after having been appointed in Freiberg he turned more and more to mining-related microbiology. Several projects with regional companies and other partners dealt with microbial treatment of acid mine drainage. More recently, projects focused on leaching of ores and included partners mainly in Chile, but also Sweden and South Africa. He is the initiator and speaker of the Biohydrometallurgical Centre Freiberg. He has published ca. 140 papers in peer-reviewed journals or extended conference contributions. He has served on the editorial board of *Applied Microbiology* and *Biotechnology* as well as of *Bioresource Technology* and has published the textbook *Umweltmikrobiologie* with Prof. Reineke. For more than 15 years, he has served on the selection committee of the German Environmental Foundation (DBU) for doctoral fellowships.

Frank Roberto is a director of processing at Newmont Corporation. He joined Newmont in 2012 and held senior and chief metallurgist positions in the Newmont Metallurgical Services corporate laboratory before moving to his current role in the Technical Services process development team. He is the corporate subject matter expert (SME) for biohydrometallurgy. He is responsible for identifying and developing transformational technologies for processing, tailings, and water treatment and R&D advisor to the corporate energy and decarbonisation team. Prior to joining Newmont, he directed and executed biotechnology R&D programmes at the US Dept. of Energy's Idaho National Laboratory for 23 years, in areas ranging from bioleaching to biodefense. He was elected to the US National Academy of Engineering in 2020, is a co-inventor for 14 US patents, and has published over 75 technical articles, including a chapter with Barrie Johnson in the first edition of *Biomining* published in 1997.

Contributors

Patricio Martínez Bellange Santiago, Chile

Aleksandr Vasilyevich Belyi JSC "Polyus Krasnoyarsk", Krasnoyarsk, Russia

Christopher George Bryan BRGM, Orléans, France

Craig Bradley van Buuren Gold Technology Group, Metso Outotec, Centurion, Gauteng, South Africa

Miao Chen CSIRO Mineral Resources, Clayton South, VIC, Australia

David William Dew University of Exeter, Cornwall, UK

David Grant Dixon Department of Materials Engineering, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada

Mark Dopson Centre for Ecology and Evolution in Microbial Model Systems (EEMiS), Linnaeus University, Kalmar, Sweden

Mariekie Gericke Biometallurgy Division, Mintek, Randburg, South Africa

Anne-Gwénaëlle Guezennec BRGM, Orléans, France

Susan Therese Largier Harrison Department of Chemical Engineering & DVC: Research and Internationalisation, Centre for Bioprocess Engineering Research (CeBER), University of Cape Town, Cape Town, South Africa

Sabrina Hedrich TU Bergakademie Freiberg, Institute of Biosciences, Freiberg, Germany

Agathe Hubau BRGM, Orléans, France

David Barrie Johnson School of Natural Sciences, Bangor University, Bangor, UK
Faculty of Health and Life Sciences, Coventry University, Coventry, UK
Natural History Museum, London, UK

Anna Henriikka Kaksonen Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO), Land and Water, Floreat, Western Australia, Australia

Päivi Hanna-Maarit Kinnunen VTT Technical Research Centre of Finland Ltd, Tampere, Finland

Hamer Arévalo Lara Minera Peñasquito, Carretera Mazapil, Zacatecas, Mexico

Alvaro Videla Leiva Departamento de Ingeniería de Minería, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Santiago, Chile

Xueduan Liu Central South University, Changsha, People's Republic of China

Hector Mark Lizama Technical Services Trail, Teck Metals Ltd., Trail, BC, Canada

Pasi Määttä Elementis Minerals B.V. Suomen Sivuliike, PL, Kajaani, Finland

John William Neale Biometallurgy Division, Mintek, Randburg, South Africa

Jan Albert van Niekerk Gold Technology Group, Metso Outotec, Centurion, Gauteng, South Africa

Naoko Okibe Faculty of Engineering, Department of Earth Resources Engineering, Kyushu University, Fukuoka, Japan

Johan Waldemar Olivier Gold Technology Group, Metso Outotec, Centurion, Gauteng, South Africa

Jochen Petersen Department of Chemical Engineering, University of Cape Town, Rondebosch, Cape Town, South Africa

Guanzhou Qiu Central South University, Changsha, People's Republic of China

Raquel Quatrini Fundación Ciencia & Vida, Santiago, Chile
Facultad de Medicina y Ciencia, Universidad San Sebastián, Providencia, Santiago, Chile

ANID – Millennium Science Initiative Program – Millennium Nucleus in the Biology of the Intestinal Microbiota, Santiago, Chile

Francisco Figueroa Roberto Technical Services Processing and Metallurgy, Newmont USA Limited, Denver, CO, USA

Gary Vernon Rorke Prudentia Process Consulting, Spring Hill, QLD, Australia

Ana Laura Santos School of Natural Sciences, Bangor University, Bangor, UK

Axel Schippers Federal Institute for Geosciences and Natural Resources (BGR), Hannover, Germany

Michael Schlömann Technische Universität Bergakademie Freiberg, Institute of Biosciences, Freiberg, Germany

Olga Vladimirovna Tupikina Nordgold, Moscow, Russia

Mario Vera Véliz Departamento de Ingeniería Hidráulica y Ambiental. Escuela de Ingeniería, Instituto de Ingeniería Biológica y Médica Escuelas de Ingeniería, Ciencias Biológicas y Medicina, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Santiago, Chile

Elizabeth Lindsay Jane Watkin Curtin Medical School, Curtin University, Perth, WA, Australia

Ruiyong Zhang Key Laboratory of Marine Environmental Corrosion and Bio-fouling, Institute of Oceanology, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Qingdao, People's Republic of China

Open Studio for Marine Corrosion and Protection, Pilot National Laboratory for Marine Science and Technology (Qingdao), Qingdao, People's Republic of China

Chapter 1

Evolution and Current Status of Mineral Bioprocessing Technologies



David Barrie Johnson and Francisco Figueroa Roberto

Abstract Metals have been used for thousands of years and have had pivotal roles in the development of human civilisation. Both the scale and range of metals that are used in modern and emerging technologies, and industrial and domestic applications have increased vastly in recent years. Harnessing microorganisms to facilitate the extraction and recovery of metals from mineral ores and waste materials has been often promulgated as a more environmentally benign approach than conventional methods, such as pyrometallurgy, yet “biomining” remains a niche technology, used primarily to bioleach copper ores and biooxidise refractory gold ores. This chapter charts the development of mineral bioprocessing technologies since the discovery of the first bacteria that were shown to accelerate the dissolution of sulfide minerals, and highlights their perceived strengths and weaknesses. The diverse engineering approaches used in biomining, and the role of microbial consortia in liberating metals from sulfide ores, are highlighted.

Keywords Acidophiles · Biomining · Bioheaps · Bioleaching · Biooxidation · Microbial consortia · Stirred tank bioreactors

D. B. Johnson (✉)

School of Natural Sciences, Bangor University, Bangor, UK

Faculty of Health and Life Sciences, Coventry University, Coventry, UK

Natural History Museum, London, UK

e-mail: d.b.johnson@bangor.ac.uk

F. F. Roberto

Technical Services Processing and Metallurgy, Newmont USA Limited, Denver, CO, USA

e-mail: frank.roberto@newmont.com

1.1 Metals, Minerals, and Human Civilisation: The Context and Early History of Biomining

Humans have a long and sometimes fraught relationship with metals and metal mining. Major changes in progression of civilisations have, in the past, been driven by our ancestors discovering how to obtain and use “new” metals and alloys. The transformation of civilisations from Neolithic (New Stone Age) to the Bronze Age (the first period of the “Metal Age”) is estimated to date from about 4300 years BP in Indo-Europe. This was underpinned by the discovery and production of copper–tin alloy, which had many superior properties to the two metals individually, and was accompanied by major social and technological advances. Archaeological evidence for bronze age mining of copper and tin is widespread, stretching from the southeast (e.g., Cyprus) to the northwest (e.g., Wales) of Europe. The following era in human civilisation, the iron age, estimated to extend from ca. 2800 to 1900 years BP was defined by metalworking being dominated by ferrous metallurgy. Since iron is harder and more abundant than copper and tin, this became the metal of choice for many applications. The method used then (and mostly today) to obtain metals involved roasting with materials such as charcoal to provide the reductant for reducing the metal to zero-valent iron. As in modern times, metal mining in pre-antiquity would have doubtless provided opportunities for microorganisms to colonise exposed ore bodies and degrade minerals. There is, however, at least one reference from the Renaissance period to what appear to be bioleach liquors in *De re metallica* (“On the nature of metals”) a text written in Latin by Georg Bauer (Georgius Agricola) in 1556. In western Europe, China and probably elsewhere in the middle ages, miners learned that, by periodically allowing the deeper mines and adits to flood and then draining the waters into lagoons and ponds, it was possible to obtain crude copper without roasting the ore bodies. This was done by adding scrap iron, which dissolved concurrent with the appearance of “cement copper”, a phenomenon that was perceived as alchemy (the transformation of one metal into another). Interestingly, this approach for extracting copper (in situ (bio)mining) and its electrochemical recovery has persisted well into the modern era of biomining.

While *Homo sapiens* has been exploiting metal ores for thousands of years, this is dwarfed by the millions of years since prokaryotic microorganisms first developed intimate associations with metal-containing (and other) minerals. The first primitive single-celled life forms are thought to have emerged relatively soon (ca. 4000 million years ago; Mya) after the planet coalesced (ca. 4600 Mya). There is considerable debate about what forms of energy (electron donors) and electron acceptors were used by primitive prokaryotes, though it seems highly probable that inorganic materials are prime candidates for both roles. This may be observed today with some acidophilic archaea and bacteria that can colonise biomining environments, e.g., *Acidianus* spp. that couple oxidation of hydrogen to the reduction of sulfur. The “great oxidation event”, which caused the anoxic planet to become transformed with an oxygen-enriched atmosphere, and which is thought to have initiated somewhere between 2000 and 2400 million years Mya, would have been a major game changer

for bacteria and archaea, allowing them to access, indirectly, the energy released by transforming sulfide minerals such as pyrite (FeS_2) using molecular oxygen as an electron acceptor. This is essentially the same fundamental microbial metabolism that is harnessed in all current full-scale biomining operations.

There are two major differences between historic and modern-day mining of metals and how they are used. One is in scale. It has been estimated that humans have mined as much metal from the lithosphere in the past 30 years as in all previous times combined, with ore grades steadily decreasing, and consequently more waste produced. Second, the range of metals required for modern applications, technologies, and consumables, is far greater than in the past, and includes a number of rare earth as well as transition metals. The demand for some metals which had only minor use in past times (e.g., cobalt, which had been used primarily as a pigment) has dramatically escalated in more recent times, causing their commodity prices to rocket and increasing effort to find and exploit new sources, both primary ores and waste materials. The list of critical raw materials compiled by the European Union, the majority of which are metals, increased from 14 in 2011 to 30 in 2020. The current trend in switching from fossil fuel-driven to electric vehicles, and in generating energy from renewable sources, will doubtless result in major increases in demand for metals in general and for those used for generating and storing electric energy, in particular, in the twenty-first century. The question of whether accessible reserves of many of these metals are adequate for meeting the projected demands is something that has not always been considered sufficiently.

1.2 The Modern Era: Development and Application of Engineering Designs of Full-Scale Biomining Operations

The modern era of commercial-scale mineral bioleaching (i.e., post Antonie van Leeuwenhoek, who is credited with the discovery of bacteria in 1676) began within 20 years of the isolation of a bacterium (then named as *Thiobacillus ferrooxidans*) from an acidic ferruginous coal mine drainage stream in West Virginia. Since then, understanding how microorganisms can liberate or make accessible metals in sulfidic ore bodies, their diversities and interactions, and the engineering design options that can be used for bioprocessing sulfidic ores and concentrates has expanded greatly. A number of review articles have been written on this topic in scientific journals and books, including Brierley (2008a, b), Brierley and Brierley (2001, 2013), Rawlings (1997, 2002, 2005), Rawlings and Silver (1995), Rawlings et al. (2003), Rawlings and Johnson (2007a), Johnson (2010, 2013, 2014, 2018). In addition, proceedings published from the biennial International Biohydrometallurgy Symposia and Biohydrometallurgy/Biomining conferences are a major repository and resource of information on mineral bioprocessing from fundamental studies to full-scale operations.

Dump leaching was the initial design used for engineering a biomining operation, with the first full-scale system established by the (then) Kennecott Copper Corporation at the Bingham Canyon mine in Utah, and shortly afterwards at the Chino mine in New Mexico. Dump leaching has since been applied in many other countries and is used still to extract, primarily, copper from low grade (<0.1–0.5%) waste rock and run-of-mine-ore. Ungraded material, comprising fine dust particles to large boulders, are stacked in mounds that may exceed 100 m in height, and irrigated with sulfuric acid to stimulate the activities of indigenous acidophilic prokaryotes that degrade the copper sulfide minerals present. The copper-enriched leachates (pregnant leach solutions; PLS) are channelled into vats and copper is recovered, often using cementation as described above. The process is slow and individual dumps may be used over several years or even decades. Although it uses relatively crude engineering and little or no control of microbiology, dump leaching continues to be a major contributor to global copper production. Heap leaching, which has its origins in Chile, Australia, and elsewhere in the 1970s, uses a similar general approach, but with greater refinement and capital investment. Again, heap leaching is used largely to extract copper, though bioheaps have also been used as a pre-treatment for extracting gold from refractory ores, and more recently for processing polymetallic ores. The main upgrades used in heap compared with dump biomining are: (1) ores are usually crushed and graded, and sometimes also agglomerated; (2) materials are transferred to pads that have impermeable high-density plastic liners and pipe networks to collect and transfer PLS, and the heaps are ideally constructed by conveyor stacking rather than truck dumping; (3) heaps are actively aerated to provide the mineral-degrading microorganisms with not only a supply of oxygen, which is required for the oxidative dissolution of sulfide minerals, but also carbon dioxide, as the principal prokaryotes involved are, like green plants, autotrophic; (4) heaps are often inoculated to ensure their exposure to suitable biomining microflora (which may need to include those that operate over very different temperature ranges to cope with those often found in heterogeneous heaps); (5) target metals in PLS are often extracted using solvents (followed by electrowinning to produce high-grade cathodic metals) and the raffinate liquors generated pumped back into the heap circuit (with or without an additional inoculum) using an irrigation network placed on the heap surface, sometimes below a plastic cover that serves both to act as a thermo-insulator and, depending on climatic factors, reduce moisture loss by evaporation or inputs of meteoric water. The life of heaps is typically 1–2 years, after which they can be removed and treated to minimise the ongoing dissolution of remaining reactive minerals. Alternatively, heaps can be stacked progressively upon each other, ultimately forming a large multilayered structure, such as at the Escondida mine in Chile. A modified approach for heap leaching involves agglomerating fine-grain mineral concentrate particles onto coarser rock fragments and regenerating the carrier material once the former have been oxidised. The Geocoat[®] process (Harvey and Bath 2007) was claimed to reduce the processing time in a bioheap to about 2 months.

A radically different operational design for mineral bioprocessing was initiated in the 1980s in South Africa and has since seen plants established in many countries in

different parts of the world. Continuous-flow stirred tank reactors are used primarily to biooxidise refractory gold concentrates but have also been used to bioleach cobalt and nickel from mineral wastes. Large ($>1000\text{ m}^3$) tanks constructed from corrosion-resistant stainless steel and fitted with pipework to facilitate the flows of liquids and air, one or more impeller connected to a motor to maintain fine-grain particles in the mineral slurries in suspension, and a cooling system (the accelerated rate of mineral oxidation compared to dumps and heaps generates a lot of heat) are used either as single units or in series, through which the slurries are transferred. Target metals are recovered from the solution phase in the case of bioleaching, or from the partially processed biooxidised mineral phase by chemical extraction in the case of gold. Stirred-tank bioprocessing is much more rapid than dump and heap operations, typically requiring only 3–6 days to be complete.

A number of worked out uranium mines in Canada were subjected to an end-of-life bioleaching phase (in-place, or in situ, leaching) in the 1970s and 1980s. Controlled blasting was used to fracture the residual buried ore bodies and the collapsed underground structures were allowed to flood. Soluble uranium (VI) was extracted from the acidic leach liquors produced from the solubilised uranite (UO_2), accounting for about 300 t in one mine (the Denison mine) during 1 year of in-place leaching. This was essentially a refined application of the mediaeval practice of in situ bioleaching described above. A development of this approach (deep in situ biomining) wherein ore bodies present deep in the lithosphere are processed without the need for haulage and comminution, is currently being evaluated for its economic viability and acceptance by society as an alternative strategy for mining metals in the twenty-first century (Chap. 17).

Some milestones in the development of biomining engineering and operational designs are given in Table 1.1, and images from some of these are in Fig. 1.1.

1.3 The Biomining Niche: Limitations and Opportunities

In the late twentieth century, by which time biomining had become an established and expanding biotechnology with operations in place in various parts of the world, there was great optimism shared by many researchers working in the field that it would have major, and even revolutionary, impact on the metal mining sector. In reality, however, its impact and uptake have been far more limited. While bioprocessing of metal ores has been estimated to account for between 10 and 20% of global copper production, ~1% of gold, and smaller amounts of other base metals, such as cobalt and nickel, it remains, in essence, a niche technology. There are a number of reasons for this.

Biomining is frequently claimed by its protagonists to be a “green technology” but the actual case for this is not always that strong. While many of the bacteria and archaea involved in biomining operations are autotrophic (i.e., fix CO_2), their contributions to global carbon budgets are minor. Much of the energy demand and carbon footprint of metal mining is associated with excavating, haulage, and

Table 1.1 Some key milestones in the development of biomining technologies

Year	Event
	Dump operations
1960s	Bioleaching of run-of-mine ore in dumps established at two sites (in Utah and New Mexico) operated by (the then) Kennecott Corporation
1979	Recovery of copper from “waste” rock at the Dexing mine (China)
	Bioheap operations
1980	Copper heap bioleaching established in Chile (Lo Aguirre mine)
1992	Copper bioheap established at Mount Gordon, Australia
1998	First copper heap bioleaching operation in Myanmar (Sabetaung and Kyisintaung mine)
1999	First biooxidation heap leach commissioned for processing refractory gold ore (Newmont Corp)
2003	Commissioning of the first heap biooxidation operation using GEOCOAT [®] technology Agnes mine, South Africa)
2006	Copper bioleached from stacked bioheaps at Escondida, Chile (the world’s largest copper mine)
2008	Heap bioleaching of a polymetallic (Ni, Zn, Cu) schist established at Talvivaara, Finland
2013	First cathode produced from 1 million tonne commercial-scale enargite bioleach demonstration at Minera Yanacocha, Peru
	Continuous stirred-tank operations
1986	First commercial biooxidation reactor for refractory gold ore (Fairview, South Africa); BIOX [®] technology
1994	First full-scale operation using BacTech technology to process refractory gold ores (Youanmi, Australia)
1999	Stirred-tank bioleaching of pyritic waste to extract and recover cobalt (Kasese, Uganda)
2003	Large-scale (<8000 t/d) ore treatment of refractory gold concentrate, Olimpiada, Polyus, Russia
2015	Stirred-tank bioleaching of a nickel sulfide concentrate (by-product of talc extraction; Mondo Minerals, Finland)

Referenced from: Olson et al. (2003), Morin and d’Hugues (2007), Brierley (2008b), Wu et al. (2008), Brierley and Brierley (2013), Riekkola-Vanhanen (2013), and Chap. 12. More comprehensive lists of earlier bioheap and stirred-tank bioleaching operations can be found in Watling (2006) and Brierley (2008a).

comminution (rock grinding and sorting), which is often followed by generating mineral concentrates for final processing (Curry et al. 2014). Most stirred-tank operations require all of these up-front processing steps, and it is only the concentrate bioprocessing stage that can justifiably be regarded as relatively “green”. Dump and heap leaching do not require all of the preprocessing stages, while the bioleaching of mineral tailings and other wastes uses materials that have already been subjected to haulage etc., and are therefore among the most environmentally benign applications of biomining. Combined with this, bio- and subsequent processing can generate more secure secondary mineral wastes that could be used for other purposes, fulfilling an objective of a circular economy.

The general area of hydrometallurgy includes biomining technologies, as well as others (e.g., chemical leaching) that do not involve biological systems. The fact that



Fig. 1.1 Images from sites where different approaches are used to bioleach or biooxidise sulfidic ores and concentrates to recover base and precious metals. **(a)** precipitation pond, used to recover copper from in situ bioleaching (Mynydd Parys, Wales); **(b)** run-of-mine and crushed ore bioleach heaps (Yanacocha mine, Peru); **(c)** pond receiving copper-rich pregnant leach solution from a trial heap leach (Bingham Canyon mine, Utah); **(d)** bioleach aeration blowers and distribution plenum (Yanacocha mine, Peru); **(e)** copper cathode produced by SX-EW (Phoenix mine, Nevada); and **(f)** continuous stirred tanks used to process refractory gold ore (Suzdal mine, Kazakhstan)

biotechnologies are regarded by some, and possibly many, in the mining industry as being not sufficiently robust, has impeded their acceptance. Bioprocessing ores and concentrates has to compete with alternative approaches, such as pressure leaching, which are also continuing to make significant technological advances, as well as with pyrometallurgy. Smelters represent major investments for mining companies,

with constructing and commissioning a single smelter costing in the order of \$1 billion. However, bioprocessing mineral ores and concentrates is invariably much slower than competing technologies, and this is a significant detraction. This latter downside, throughput, is probably the biggest reason bioprocessing is not applied by mining companies on a similar scale to competitor technologies like pressure oxidation. Ultimately, time under leach is a negative for bioleach/whole-ore biooxidation compared to chemical leaching—sulfuric acid (perhaps with ferric iron) for copper, and cyanide for gold.

There are, however, niche areas where biomining can compete with alternative technologies, some of which, such as for processing low-grade/run of mine ores, reprocessing mine wastes, and biooxidising refractory gold ores, have already been touched upon. In some situations, it has not been found possible to produce a high-grade mineral concentrate from an ore (such as the polymetallic ore body at Talvivaara/Terrafame in Finland, which contained ~10% graphite) and bioleaching rather than smelting ground ore was therefore considered to be preferable. The elevated arsenic content of some mineral ores and concentrates can preclude processing in smelters due to legislative restrictions, though companies often blend high and low arsenic-containing materials to get around this barrier. New technology is emerging at the world's only smelter currently taking high-arsenic concentrates (Tsumeb in Namibia) to incorporate up to 20% arsenic (by weight) in glass. Bioprocessing, like other hydrometallurgical approaches, has the advantage that solubilised arsenic is retained in solution rather than emitted in flue gases, and can be precipitated from liquid wastes as a relatively stable mineral (such as scorodite or ferric arsenate) and stored securely.

1.4 The Microbiological Context of Biomining

Biomining environments are typified by being acidic (sometimes extremely so), rich in soluble metals and other solutes, such as sulfate, and having widely varying temperatures. Knowledge of microbial species that contribute to biomining processes and understanding of how these interact both with minerals and with each other has increased markedly since the early days when the sole bacterium thought to have a direct role in accelerating the oxidative dissolution of sulfide minerals was (*Acidi*) *thiobacillus ferrooxidans*. Since all current commercial-scale biomining operations operate at low pH, active microbial populations are limited to acidophiles. An account of how this area has expanded since the discovery of the very first acidophile (the sulfur-oxidiser (*Acidi*) *thiobacillus thiooxidans*, in the early 1920s) can be found in Johnson and Quatrini (2020). Several novel isolates, representative of genera and species that would subsequently be identified as prokaryotes that have widespread and major roles in biomining operations, were described in the 1970s. These include: (1) *Leptospirillum ferrooxidans*, isolated by Markosyan (1972) from a copper mine in Armenia, though its related thermo-tolerant relative *Leptospirillum ferriphilum* is now recognised as having a more important role in commercial biomining

operations, and has often been identified as the dominant iron-oxidising bacterium present; (2) the first thermo-acidophilic archaeon (a member of the order Sulfolobales; Brierley and Brierley 1973); (3) the first mixotrophic mineral-oxidising bacterium (the thermo-tolerant Firmicute, *Sulfobacillus*; Golovacheva and Karavaiko 1979). Many new species of acidophilic prokaryotes have since been described, which has been greatly aided by the advent of molecular microbiology techniques. For example, in the past all rod-shaped mesophilic acidophiles that could oxidise both iron and sulfur tended to be classified as strains of *At. ferrooxidans*, the iron-oxidising acidithiobacilli currently comprise five distinct species. Not all acidophilic microorganisms can thrive in bioleach liquors, however, as other factors, particularly elevated concentrations of transition metals, may preclude this.

Probably as important as the isolation and identification of species that can mediate sulfide mineral dissolution was the recognition, particularly over the past 20 years, that these both co-exist with, and interact with other microorganisms both in natural and anthropogenic environments, such as “biomines” (Rawlings and Johnson 2007b). Biomining systems from dumps to stirred tanks all necessarily operate as open, non-sterile environments where microorganisms can be introduced from a number of sources, such as atmospheric deposition or the ore/concentrate itself. Likewise, it is not possible to totally preclude microorganisms in a mine site from migrating to the wider environment, which is why it is unlikely that genetically modified acidophiles will find an application in industrial-scale biomining operations. Although sulfide minerals can be degraded by pure cultures of acidophilic iron-oxidising bacteria such as *Leptospirillum* spp. and some *Acidithiobacillus* spp. in the laboratory, microbial consortia are both more effective and robust, and invariably found in actual biomining operations. While the individual species may differ from site to site, and especially with temperature, the presence of the same three functional groups appears to be universal in dumps, tanks, and heaps. These are: (1) iron-oxidisers, which catalyse the initial oxidative dissolution of sulfide minerals by their continuous regeneration of the oxidant, ferric iron; (2) sulfur-oxidizers, which oxidise sulfur oxyanions and zero-valent sulfur, generating sulfuric acid and thereby maintaining conditions that are conducive both to the iron-oxidisers and also for retaining the cationic metals released from minerals in solution, facilitating their downstream recovery; (3) organic carbon degraders (heterotrophic and mixotrophic acidophiles) that metabolise the soluble organic carbon compounds released from active and moribund/dead iron/sulfur-oxidisers and which may otherwise build up to concentrations that inhibit the latter. Many of the third group can also oxidise iron and/or sulfur, such as *Sulfobacillus* and *Ferroplasma* spp., and some, at least, of the CO₂ they generate is used by bacteria in groups (1) and (2), which are primarily autotrophic.

While the generic composition of microbial consortia required for efficient bioleaching may be essentially the same for all engineering configurations, there are important differences between bioheaps and stirred tanks that have major influences on formulating the compositions of microbial inocula (Rawlings and Johnson 2007b). Bioheaps can be highly heterogeneous in terms of temperature

and chemical microenvironments, and major selective pressure on the indigenous microflora is their ability to attach to mineral particles (as biofilms) in the heap to minimise or avoid washout. In contrast, stirred tanks are homogeneous, providing constant conditions for microbial growth though the relatively fast throughput selects for faster-growing consortia. As a consequence, microbial populations in stirred tanks tend to be dominated by relatively few (3–4) species of acidophiles, whereas far greater biodiversity is found in heaps, and these are also subject to temporal changes as the physico-chemistry of heaps evolves during leaching. Other selection pressures will apply in certain situations, e.g., for mineral-oxidising prokaryotes that are able to tolerate elevated concentrations of salt (NaCl) as well as extreme acidity and transition metals.

1.5 Commercial Bioleach and Biooxidation Operations in 2020

Biomining was described above as a niche technology, but the encouraging reality is that within the mining industry, bioleaching is considered a viable alternative hydrometallurgical process for extraction of base metals, and biooxidation competes with pressure oxidation or roasting for pre-oxidation of refractory gold-bearing ores and concentrates. A section of the *SME Mining Reference Handbook* has devoted a chapter to bioleaching since 2002 (Briggs 2002) and major metallurgical conferences (CIM) interleave biohydrometallurgical papers among other hydrometallurgical presentations. The comprehensive *SME Mineral Processing and Extractive Metallurgy Handbook* published in 2019 (Dunne et al. 2019) dedicated two chapters to bioleaching and agitated bioleach reactors within the section devoted to hydrometallurgy. Therefore, there can be no question that bioleaching and biooxidation are accepted unit processes in mineral processing, though they have a limited range of applications compared to more common unit processes such as conventional heap leaching with sulfuric acid (for copper) and high-temperature oxidation (for gold). Ultimately the mineralogy and deportment of the base or precious metal, and the economics relative to the location and grade of the deposit, will drive the decision of which process(es) to build a mine around.

More than a decade since the last edition of *Biomining*, there have been several notable long-term studies of commercial copper bioleach operations around the world. In Chile, a focused effort to develop a logic-based control system for heap bioleaching at the Escondida mine incorporated microbiological, genetic, and production information with machine learning to optimise the bioleach component of the overall operation (Demergasso et al. 2018). Heap aeration, specialised material handling, and inoculation were key components of the Bio-Leach Sulfide Project. The Escondida mine, a joint venture of BHP Billiton, Rio Tinto, and JECO Corporation is the world's largest copper mine, produced nearly 1.2 million tonnes of copper in 2020, or about 6% of the world's copper and over 20% of Chile's national

production (2020 preliminary data). For nearly 15 years, Biosigma, a joint venture between Codelco and JX Nippon Mining and Metals operated in Chile to develop microbiological improvements in copper heap leaching, including dozens of Chilean and US patents. JX Nippon Mining and Metals sold its stake to Codelco in 2015, after which Biosigma became a part of Codelco Tech SpA, and was disbanded in 2017. At Codelco's Radomiro Tomic mine, Biosigma implemented a novel fluidised bed bioreactor to cultivate microorganisms for heap inoculation that was tested at kiloton scale. At the Zijinshan mine in China, a body of work has described the directed manipulation of environmental conditions to influence microbial populations and activities in order to improve heap leach performance that benefits both copper and gold production. This practice is being transferred to other mines operated by Zijin Mining Company including the Monywa mine in Myanmar (Chen et al. 2020). These refinements and advances are further described in Chaps. 8–10.

In refractory gold ore biooxidation, BioMin (formerly GoldFields) was acquired by mining industry support giant Outotec (now Metso Outotec) in 2016, and the BIOX[®] process is now another product offering in that company's suite of hydrometallurgical process options that include the related ASTER[™] thiocyanate biodegradation process and MesoTHERM[®] elevated temperature BIOX[®]. Coupled with Metso Outotec's strong capabilities in large-scale, stirred-tank reactor systems, it can be anticipated that the BIOX[®] process will continue to be refined and improved to increase its competitiveness with roasting and pressure oxidation for pre-oxidation of refractory gold ore concentrates. The BIOX[®] process is currently operating on 3 continents at 7 different mines and accounts for 1% (approximately 1.1 million oz. in 2020) of global gold production and will be further described in Chaps. 4 and 11. According to Metso Outotec, several new projects are in the pipeline for North America.

1.6 Scope of the Current Textbook

This book is the successor to two previous texts on biomining that became firmly established as major references for this area of biotechnology: *Biomining: theory, microbes and industrial practices* (Rawlings 1997) and *Biomining* (Rawlings and Johnson 2007a). It provides both an update on the topic and projects on how the technology is developing and expanding into potential new areas, with contributions from experts and leading authorities from industry, government agencies, and academia from around the world. The book comprises six parts. The first (this chapter) describes the context and development of biomining, while Part II has three chapters that describe the engineering designs and operation of biomining systems (bioheaps and stirred tank systems) and an up-to-date account of the bioprocessing of refractory gold ores. Part III focuses on the microbiology of biomining, with individual chapters covering the biodiversity of acidophiles and how they mediate mineral dissolution, the cultivation and molecular techniques available to study them, and the microbial ecology of bioheaps, stirred tanks, and

abandoned mine wastes. Part IV highlights commercial mineral bioprocessing operations carried out in different parts of the world (China, Chile, Peru, Russia, Kazakhstan, and Finland), while Part V describes four areas of biohydrometallurgy that are emerging as potential new areas: bioleaching in the presence of elevated salt concentrations, bioprocessing electronic wastes, reductive bioleaching of oxidised ores, and the use of microorganisms to recover metals from acidic waste and process waters. Finally, Part VI considers, in a concluding chapter, how biomining technologies may develop and be applied in the twenty-first century, in the context of ever-expanding demand for metals and the need for sustainability.

References

- Brierley CL (2008a) How will biomining be applied in future? *T Nonferrous Met Soc China* 18: 1302–1310. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1003-6326\(09\)60002-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1003-6326(09)60002-9)
- Brierley JA (2008b) A perspective on developments in biohydrometallurgy. *Hydrometallurgy* 94: 2–7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hydromet.2008.05.014>
- Brierley CL, Brierley JA (1973) A chemoautotrophic and thermophilic microorganism isolated from an acid hot spring. *Can J Microbiol* 19:183–188. <https://doi.org/10.1139/m73-028>
- Brierley JA, Brierley CL (2001) Present and future commercial applications of biohydrometallurgy. *Hydrometallurgy* 59:233–240. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-386X\(00\)00162-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-386X(00)00162-6)
- Brierley CL, Brierley JA (2013) Progress in bioleaching: part B: applications of microbial processes by the minerals industries. *Appl Microbiol Biotechnol* 97:7543–7552. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-386X\(00\)00162-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-386X(00)00162-6)
- Briggs A (2002) Bacterial oxidation. In: Lowrie RL (ed) *SME mining reference handbook*. Society for Mining, Metallurgy and Exploration, Englewood, Colorado, pp 319–323
- Chen J, Zhong S, Tang D, Kuang C (2020) Practical experience in large-scale development of Zijinshang low-grade gold-copper mine. *Min Metall Explor* 37:1339–1347. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42461-020-00237-2>
- Curry JL, Ismay MJL, Jameson GJ (2014) Mine operating costs and the potential impacts of energy and grinding. *Miner Eng* 56:70–80. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mineng.2013.10.020>
- Demergasso CS, Veliz R, Galleguillos P, Marin S, Acosta Grinok M, Zepeda Alvarez VJ, Zeballos J, Henriquez F, Pizarro R, Bekios-Calfa J (2018) Decision support system for bioleaching processes. *Hydrometallurgy* 181:113–122. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hydromet.2018.08.009>
- Dunne RC, Kowatra K, Young CA (eds) (2019) *SME mineral processing and extractive metallurgy handbook*. Society for Mining, Metallurgy and Exploration, Inc., Englewood, Colorado, pp 1267–1282, & 1283–1292
- Golovacheva RS, Karavaiko GI (1979) *Sulfobacillus* – a new genus of spore forming thermophilic bacteria. *Microbiology (English translation of Mikrobiologiya)* 48:658–665
- Harvey TJ, Bath M (2007) The GeoBiotics GEOCOAT[®] technology – progress and challenges. In: Rawlings DE, Johnson DB (eds) *Biomining*. Springer, Heidelberg, pp 97–112
- Johnson DB (2010) The biogeochemistry of biomining. In: Barton L, Mandl M, Loy A (eds) *Geomicrobiology: molecular and environmental perspective*. Springer, Heidelberg, pp 401–426
- Johnson DB (2013) Development and application of biotechnologies in the metal mining industry. *Environ Sci Pollut Res* 20:7768–7776. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-013-1482-7>
- Johnson DB (2014) Biomining – biotechnologies for extracting and recovering metals from ores and waste materials. *Curr Opin Biotechnol* 30:24–31. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copbio.2014.04.008>

- Johnson DB (2018) The evolution, current status and future prospects for using biotechnologies in the mineral extraction and metal recovery sectors. *Minerals* 8:343. <https://doi.org/10.3390/min8080343>
- Johnson DB, Quatrini R (2020) Acidophile microbiology in space and time. *Curr Issues Mol Biol* 39:63–76. <https://doi.org/10.21775/cimb.039.063>
- Markosyan GE (1972) A new iron-oxidizing bacterium, *Leptospirillum ferrooxidans* gen. et. sp. nov. *Biol J Armenia* 25:26–29. (in Russian)
- Morin D, d'Hugues P (2007) Bioleaching of a cobalt-containing pyrite in stirred reactors: a case study from laboratory scale to industrial application. In: Rawlings DE, Johnson DB (eds) *Biomining*. Springer, Heidelberg, pp 35–55
- Olson GJ, Brierley JA, Brierley CL (2003) Bioleaching review part B: progress in bioleaching: applications of microbial processes by the minerals industry. *Appl Microbiol Biotechnol* 63: 249–257. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00253-003-1404-6>
- Rawlings DE (ed) (1997) *Biomining: theory, microbes and industrial processes*. Springer/Landes Bioscience, Georgetown
- Rawlings DE (2002) Heavy metal mining using microbes. *Annu Rev Microbiol* 56:65–91. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.micro.56.012302.161052>
- Rawlings DE (2005) Characteristics and adaptability of iron- and sulfur-oxidizing microorganisms used for the recovery of metals from minerals and their concentrates. *Microb Cell Factories* 4: 13. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1475-2859-4-13>
- Rawlings DE, Johnson DB (eds) (2007a) *Biomining*. Springer, Heidelberg
- Rawlings DE, Johnson DB (2007b) The microbiology of biomining: development and optimization of mineral-oxidizing microbial consortia. *Microbiol-UK* 153:315–324. <https://doi.org/10.1099/mic.0.2006/001206-0>
- Rawlings DE, Silver S (1995) Mining with microbes. *Biotechnology* 13:773–778. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nbt0895-773>
- Rawlings DE, Dew D, du Plessis C (2003) Biomineralization of metal-containing ores and concentrates. *Trends Biotechnol* 21:38–44. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0167-7799\(02\)00004-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0167-7799(02)00004-5)
- Riekkola-Vanhanen M (2013) Talvivaara mining company – from a project to a mine. *Miner Eng* 48:2–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mineng.2013.04.018>
- Watling HR (2006) The bioleaching of sulphide minerals with emphasis on copper sulphides – a review. *Hydrometallurgy* 84:81–108. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hydromet.2006.05.001>
- Wu A, Yin S, Wang H, Qin W, Qiu G (2008) Technological assessment of a mining-waste dump at the Dexing copper mine, China, for possible conversion to an *in situ* bioleaching operation. *Bioresour Technol* 100:1931–1936. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2008.10.021>

Chapter 2

Design, Construction, and Modelling of Bioheaps



David Grant Dixon and Hector Mark Lizama

Abstract Bioheaps have become an important tool for the recovery of metals from low-grade ores. This has primarily involved bioleaching of copper and more recently other transition metals such as nickel, but mineral heaps have also been used to biooxidise refractory gold ores as the initial stage for recovering this precious metal. In the first part of this chapter, the design, construction, and operation of bioheaps is considered. The *modus operandi* of bioheaps, the different configurations of leach pads (static and dynamic) and the central roles of integrated irrigation and aeration systems are described. The second part of the chapter gives a detailed and comprehensive mathematical model of the heap bioleaching process and how this has been refined over time. A case study of simulated heap bioleaching at a copper mine (Quebrada Blanca) in northern Chile, using the HeapSim2D model, where key objectives were to simulate chalcocite leaching and identify the key parameters that control heap temperature, is outlined.

Keywords Heap bioleaching · Copper sulfides · Heap leach modelling

2.1 Introduction

Bioheaps are bioreactors, albeit very large ones, and comprise biocatalysts (micro-organisms), substrates, additives, reaction processes, transport processes, and reactor geometry. They are easily the most massive reactors ever constructed, and are measured in areas of square kilometers and volumes of millions of cubic meters (Fig. 2.1). Bioheaps have been utilised since the 1980s, and dump leaching (passive

D. G. Dixon (✉)

Department of Materials Engineering, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada
e-mail: dixon@mail.ubc.ca

H. M. Lizama

Technical Services Trail, Teck Metals Ltd., Trail, BC, Canada
e-mail: hector.lizama@teck.com



Fig. 2.1 Life cycle of a heap. Construction of the leach pad includes installation of the primary liner, the overliner, and the PLS collection system (a). Ore from the mine is crushed and then agglomerated in an agglomerating drum (b). The heap is built by stacking agglomerate using different types of stacker assemblies (c and d). The heap can be a static pad configuration, where new lifts are stacked on top of old ones (e). In a dynamic pad configuration, leached residues are removed to make way for fresh agglomerate. The residues can simply be removed by haul truck (f) or by bucket wheel excavator (g)


bioleaching of low-grade mine waste dumps) has been practised for much longer. Hence, there is a large repository of knowledge regarding their design and operation.

A bioheap is an engineered pile of ore material, within which iron- and/or sulfur-oxidising microorganisms are cultivated to catalyse the oxidation of sulfide minerals. This chapter focuses on the use of bioheaps to solubilise base metals from their sulfide ores rather than for the pretreatment (biooxidation) of gold-bearing sulfides.


2.2 The *Modus Operandi* of Bioheaps

The most common bioheaps currently in operation recover copper from secondary copper sulfides such as chalcocite (Cu_2S). Secondary sulfide ores also often contain various amounts of copper oxides, which most often take the form of basic salts. Oxide minerals, such as brochantite ($\text{CuSO}_4 \cdot 3\text{Cu}(\text{OH})_2$) readily dissolve in acid. In contrast, the oxidation of sulfide minerals in a bioheap is accomplished with ferric ions acting as the primary oxidant, supplied by the dissolution of iron-bearing minerals (often predominantly pyrite) within the ore itself. Addition of iron to the heap system is usually not required, as only a small concentration in solution is necessary to facilitate mineral oxidation, and this is continuously recycled between its two oxidation states.


Chalcocite is oxidised in two steps. In the first step, roughly 40% of the copper is liberated rapidly, leaving behind a copper sulfide known as secondary covellite (*blaubleibender*):



The rest of the copper is recovered more slowly from the *blaubleibender* covellite to leave behind elemental sulfur:



Ferrous iron and reduced sulfur are oxidised to ferric iron and sulfate by iron- and sulfur-oxidising microorganisms using oxygen as the electron acceptor. This is the essence of heap bioleaching:



Reactions (2.3) and (2.4) only occur at significant rates in the presence of suitable microorganisms. Microorganisms do not attack the sulfide minerals directly, as even those attached to mineral surfaces mediate mineral dissolution by their regeneration of ferric iron and production of sulfuric acid. In order for these reactions to proceed within a bioheap, both water and oxygen are required. Sulfur biooxidation often does not satisfy the net demand for acid, especially if the heap contains significant quantities of acid-soluble gangue minerals, and addition of extraneous (sulfuric) acid is then required.

When the ore bed is fresh and the copper recovery rate is high, the effluent draining the heap (pregnant leach solution; PLS) will have a high copper concentration and is sent directly to the recovery plant. When the heap is older, and the rate of copper extraction has diminished, the effluent solution (intermediate leach solution; ILS) is recycled or sent to newer heaps to increase the copper tenor to an

economical level prior to recovery. The most commonly used process to produce copper from PLS is solvent extraction and electrowinning (SX-EW; Kordosky 2002).

2.3 Design and Construction of Bioheaps for Processing Mineral Ores

Irrigated biomining operations have two major engineering designs: heaps and dumps. Heaps tend to have large surface footprints and are usually about 10 m in height, although multiple lifts (layers of ore) are commonplace. The height of ore dumps, on the other hand, can range from 15 to 100 m. Higher grade ore is generally destined for heaps while relatively low grade run-of-mine ore (often containing about 0.2% of target metal) is generally leached in dumps. Dumps are often highly profitable because of their low costs, and while leaching in dumps can involve periods of many years, they are a reliable revenue stream. Dump leaching has been described in a number of reviews elsewhere (e.g., Figueroa et al. 2015); and this chapter focuses on engineered bioheaps. In addition to heaps and dumps, “valley fills”, as their name indicates, are bioheaps that are built within the confines of a valley and can be similar to either a heap or dump leach operation (Reyes et al. 2015).

Ore contained in heaps is crushed to a relatively uniform particle size and heaps are constructed to have ore beds that are as homogeneous as possible. In contrast, material used to construct dumps ranges in size from very large boulders to fine dust, and is handled as little as possible to reduce costs.

2.3.1 Leach Pad Configuration

There are two types of leach pad configuration used in bioheaps: static and dynamic (Fig. 2.1). In a dynamic pad, the leached residues are removed from the leach pad at the end of the leach cycle, and fresh ore is placed to start a new leach cycle. In a static pad, the leached residues are left in place, and a fresh lift added on top. A static pad can have many lifts but only the top one is actively leached. In dynamic pads, lifts are placed and then removed.

2.3.2 Leach Pad Disposition

The leach pad has a number of functions. It has to support the weight of the heap, promote drainage of PLS from the heap but prevent it from escaping to the ground

underneath, and to hold and protect the PLS drain lines that form part of the PLS collection system. The most important component of the leach pad is the primary liner. This is a geomembrane that acts as an impermeable barrier to catch and contain the percolating leachates. Ground preparation is essential for a stable foundation; any deformation will put stress on the primary liner. An underliner, a layer of compact regolith with minimum hydraulic conductivity to control potential seepage, and an overliner of free draining sand and gravel, are used to protect the primary liner from damage. Some leach pads have double or composite liners (two geomembranes with a layer of sand and gravel between them) for additional protection. The ore is placed on top of the overliner, to generate ore beds with bulk densities ranging from 1.5 to 1.9 t m⁻³.

The leachate collection system is incorporated into the overliner, and consists of a grid of evenly spaced perforated pipe networks that feed main pipes that drain the heap. All of the leaching solution applied to the heap must be able to drain through the overliner, and may have to travel hundreds of meters horizontally before it can exit the heap. Any holdup will flood the overliner and the ore bed above it. This is referred to as the phreatic head, analogous to the water table in soil. A very high phreatic head can result in spectacularly catastrophic liquefaction failure (sidewall blowout; Lupo 2010). Drainage must be facilitated; for this reason, a leach pad is always sloped, and the angle of slope is also a function of the geotechnical stability of the ore and influenced by particle size and other physical properties.

Some static pad heaps have liners placed in between lifts. These inter-lift liners can be geomembranes with an underliner and overliner or simply a compacted layer of solid material. The purpose of the inter-lift liner is to prevent solutions irrigating more than one lift at a time (“communication between lifts”). Inter-lift liners are an added expense because they require each lift to have its own PLS collection system. However, they are important in preventing excessive phreatic head. Static pad heaps without inter-lift liners need to install additional safeguards such as downhole pumps or wick drains.

2.3.3 Ore Bed Construction

Ore beds are constructed to be as homogeneous as possible, to help ensure that all available sulfide mineral surfaces are exposed to the leaching solution. This is facilitated by crushing the ore to reduce the particle size. Typically, ore particles in a bioheap are about 25 mm in diameter. Agglomeration is often used to reduce solution flow problems due to the presence of fines. Crushed ore is passed through a rotating drum fitted with internal acid sprays. The tumbling action and acid addition cause the fines to stick to the coarser particles, forming stable aggregates of more uniform size. Acid application during agglomeration also contributes to uniform adjustment of the ore pH suitable for bioleaching. Agglomerate is then stacked by conveyors (or using trucks) to the required lift height, the quality of the agglomerate bed dictating whether the heap will meet the target recovery. The agglomerate needs

to have abundant void spaces to allow it to be permeable to both leaching solution and air.

2.3.4 Irrigation

Once the heap is built, the irrigation system is placed on its surface. This consists of a grid of evenly spaced irrigation lines fitted with evenly spaced drip emitters. The drip emitter spacing is determined by the physical properties of the agglomerate. Tighter spacing increases the uniformity of agglomerate wetting (“sweep efficiency”). Emitters require minimum flow rates to work effectively, and when the leaching solution is divided among increasing numbers of emitters some will fail to deliver solution, resulting in irrigation being uneven. Precipitates or scaling can clog or block emitter flow and anti-scalants may be added to prevent this.

Typical irrigation rates range from 1 to 12 L h⁻¹ m⁻² of heap surface. The irrigation rate used is limited at the low end by the lift height and at the high end by the properties of the (agglomerated) ore bed. Acid and other reagents are consumed and depleted as the leaching solution percolates through the ore bed; taller lifts with more ore to percolate through have greater depletion. Increasing flow rates ensure adequate acid delivery to the bottom of the heap, but also put more stress on the stability of the agglomerated ore.

2.3.5 Aeration

Many heaps have aeration systems installed within the overliner (Schlitt 2006). Air supplies the bioleaching microorganisms with both carbon dioxide, necessary for their growth, and oxygen to allow their oxidation of iron and sulfur, and humid air is a major redistributor of reaction heat in sulfide heaps. Maintaining a flow of air significantly greater than the flow of leaching solution may add 20 °C to the heap temperature, resulting in faster leach kinetics (Dixon 2000), though excessive aeration can lead to localized drying of the ore within a heap, thereby negatively impacting mineral leaching. A typical forced aeration system consists of a blower, a main header, and evenly spaced perforated lines placed under the ore bed. Air pressure inside the air lines and header falls rapidly with distance apart, limiting their useful length, and so numerous blowers are usually required to supply the entire heap. To ensure even distribution within the heap, the air must be fed from the bottom, contributing to the phreatic head if the overliner and leachate collection system are not well designed. The air pressure supplied by the blowers is generally equivalent to between 0.8 and 0.9 m of water, and a phreatic head higher than this cannot be overcome by the air blower.