



Reply to the Comments made by

F.S.A. de Frey

on the paper 'Design of Merensky Reef crush pillar'

by B.P. Watson, J.S. Kuijpers, and T.R. Stacey

The discussion written by Dr de Frey suggests that mine design should be based on closely spaced stability pillars. However, this concept leads to low extraction ratios at depth. The concept of 'crush' pillars in conjunction with more widely, appropriately spaced stability pillars allows for significantly larger extraction ratios, particularly at depth. It should be noted that the rock conditions in many areas of South African platinum and gold mines are good, allowing significant spans to be mined safely between stability pillars.

'Crush' pillars are cut small enough to fail stably near the face under stiff loading conditions, and their residual strength is intended to support about 10 m rock height between stability pillars. While this support resistance cannot be achieved by conventional support, crush pillars have been proven to have the required capacity for this purpose. The concept of leaving smaller crush pillars with appropriately positioned stability pillars has been used successfully for more than 30 years in areas of South African platinum and gold mines.

Crush pillars were inadvertently designed by Korf¹ in 1978. In his paper Korf describes how serious problems were experienced where stoping advanced to a point 30 m to 40 m on both sides on the centre gully. Sudden failure of the hangingwall beam frequently occurred at this stage. Korf¹ maintains that the introduction of the crush pillars stopped the 'backbreak' problem. Crush pillar residual strength was subsequently estimated by Ozbay *et al.*² to be at least 5% to 10% of the peak pillar strength. Back analysis performed by Roberts *et al.*³ showed that normal sized crush pillars have a residual strength in excess of 10 MPa. Watson *et al.*⁴ describes underground measurements of residual strength.

It should also be noted that a system of 'small', closely spaced stable pillars has problems of its own. For instance, these pillars are susceptible to 'pillar runs' (large-scale pillar failure) if one or two pillars are inadvertently overloaded due to unforeseen weaknesses. Such failures have been observed at Everest Mine in South Africa (Lombard⁴). In addition, overloaded stability pillars can be a source of seismicity.

Dr de Frey, in an unsubstantiated argument, claims that crush pillars have negligible cohesion, suggesting a limited residual strength. Several other opinions are also presented in his discussion. His arguments are shown below in blue with a joint response from the authors of the paper: 'Design of Merensky Reef crush pillars' in red.

The crush pillar

A crushed pillar will have the following characteristics:

- ▶ Fragmented material with limited resistance to closure

- ▶ Negligible vertical or lateral cohesion in the pillar as well as its surrounding region
- ▶ No shock absorption ability to transfer shockwaves vertically or laterally
- ▶ Increased vertical and lateral stresses in the hangingwall and footwall
- ▶ Diminished ability to form stable beams between crushed pillars
- ▶ Failure to assist in maintaining equilibrium by the inability to distribute strains and stresses, especially tensile stresses, equally amongst the pillars and their host rock
- ▶ Weak clamping affect between pillars, especially where geological disturbances are present in the pillars as well as the bords.

In theory, failed/fractured rock may be expected to have negligible cohesive strength and consequently limited (residual) strength. However, crush pillars have been proven to be effective in stabilizing large spans (Korf¹). In addition, underground stress measurements demonstrated substantial residual strength of such crush pillars. Although it is not immediately clear what is causing this residual strength, it is clear that the theoretical assumption of negligible cohesive strength is incorrect. This was addressed in the paper by Watson *et al.*⁵. It is empirically accepted within the platinum mining industry that crush pillars with width-to-length ratios of about 3 have a residual strength in excess of 10 MPa (Roberts *et al.*³). However, we (the authors of the paper Watson *et al.*⁵) agree that further investigations are necessary to understand the mechanism of the non-zero residual cohesion.

The squat pillar

The failure of realistic pillar systems, with the probable exception of very slender pillars in hard rock, is to large extent controlled by fracture and failure processes in the foundation. The author would like to add failure in the hangingwall.

The foundation of a pillar in mining includes both hanging- and footwall.

Increasing pillar strength and pillar load results in increasing damage and failure in the hanging and or footwall. The author is of the opinion this can be alleviated by smaller pillars carrying smaller loads as a result of smaller spans. Stable pillar design and behaviour cannot be considered in isolation.

The determination of stable spans was not directly addressed in the paper, which deals with pillar behaviour.

Reply to the Comments: Design of Merensky Reef crush pillar

Span stability is dependent on several factors such as: geology, depth, and stress ratios. The crush pillars provide local support and (squat) stability pillars provide regional support.

In their paper 'Design of Merensky Reef Crush pillars' Watson *et al.*⁵ state that pillar size should be designed with residual strength in mind, and also the need to consider peak strength and loading environment. It is the author's considered opinion that no crush pillar design will achieve this.

Refer to our initial comment on empirical and measured residual strength.

Watson *et al.*⁵ again concentrate on assessing pillar strength but come to the conclusion that, and the author quotes: 'The calculations should include panel spans between pillars rather than a pure extraction ratio.' It is the author's opinion that this should not allow any probability of failure by loading pillars in excess of their peak pillar strength.

Stability pillars are designed not to fail and to provide regional support. However, crush pillars are designed to provide local support and maintain a considerable residual strength.

Wagner⁵ states that the most important parameters that control the magnitude of induced stresses, decrease with increasing pillar size and decreasing bord width.

Ultimately a zero extraction ratio will provide the safest conditions!

References

1. KORF, C.W. Stick and pillar support on Union Section, Rustenburg Platinum Mines. *Association of Mine Managers of South Africa*, 1978. pp. 71–82.
2. OZBAY, M.U., RYDER, J.A., and JAGER, A.J. Design of pillar systems in South Africa. *Journal of the Southern African Institute of Mining and Metallurgy*, July/August 1995. pp. 195–196.
3. ROBERTS, D.P., ROBERTS, M.K.C., and JAGER, A.J. Alternative support systems for mechanised stopes. *PlatMine project report 2004-0189*. CSIR, Division of Miningtek, Johannesburg, South Africa, 2004.
4. LOMBARD, J. Large collapse of hangingwall over the declines from Strike 0 to Strike 5. *Internal mine report no. RED 103/08*. Everest Platinum Mine, 2008. ◆
5. WATSON, B.P., KUIJPERS, J.S., AND STACEY, T.R. Design of Merensky Reef crush pillars. *Journal of the Southern African Institute of Mining and Metallurgy*, vol. 110, 2010. pp. 581–591.



METIX

SMS group

Metix joins SMS Group

Metix is proud to announce that it has joined SMS Siemag AG as part of the SMS Group. SMS Siemag AG has purchased the majority share in Metix (Pty) Ltd on 22 June 2011.

Metix will continue to operate as a standalone business unit in South Africa from its headquarters in Johannesburg; keeping the well established Metix name. The difference will be that Metix's current portfolio of products will

In photo from left to right: Dr. Rolf Degel (Director Technical Sales SMS Siemag), Jacques Venter (Technical Equipment Director Metix), Pat Davies (Marketing Director Metix), Kay Mayland (President and CEO SMS Siemag), Reinier Meyjes (Managing Director Metix), Frank Günther (Financial Director Metix), Burkhard Dahmen (Managing board of SMS Siemag), Wynand Moolman (Projects Director Metix), Franz Axtmann (Executive Vice President of Steelmaking and Continuous Casting Division SMS Siemag), Andrew van Niekerk (Engineering Director Metix)

be significantly expanded to cover the entire range of technology available within SMS Siemag. In addition Metix will expand its market area to the entire Southern Africa. However, Metix will continue with its basic philosophy to maintain valued relationships with our clients whilst extending our new services in a sustainable manner.

Active in plant construction and equipment supplies for the ferroalloy industry for almost ten years, Metix has carved out a leading market position for itself in Southern Africa, which when combined with SMS Siemag takes the group market share close to 50% of the world ferroalloys market.

The SMS group is internationally active in plant construction and mechanical engineering relating to the processing of steel and nonferrous metals. The group is divided into the business areas SMS Siemag and SMS Meer.

In 2010 the group employs approximately 9 600 people and had an order intake of approximately 3 billion Euro. The world leading submerged arc furnace technology of SMS Siemag is managed through the Düsseldorf office in Germany.

Whilst previously Metix concentrated mainly on supply of equipment and plants for the production of ferrochrome and ferromanganese, its merger with SMS Siemag will expand its range of with Si-metal, non-ferrous, precious metals, calcium carbide and TiO₂-slag. Metix will have access to new technology equipment and processes related to DC furnaces, rectangular furnaces, energy recovery systems and gas cleaning.

Metix can now offer complete plant concepts and associated performance guarantees based on the data base and track record of SMS Siemag. A new 1 MVA testing facility in Aachen Germany will allow the evaluation of single and multiple electrode configurations for AC and DC technology in the same furnace. Test campaigns will promote confidence in the correct technology decision and contribute to more accurate design references and process guarantees for new processes.

Contact: Andrew van Niekerk • Tel: 011 676 2300
Email: andrew@metix.co.za • www.metix.co.za