

ECOLOGICAL RESTORATION OF ABANDONED MINING AREAS

Dr. Ananya Sharma

Assistant Professor

Department of Environmental Science

School of Earth and Environmental Studies

University of Sustainable Development, New Delhi, India

Abstract

Abandoned mining areas are among the most visibly altered landscapes produced by industrial development. Open pits, waste-rock dumps, tailings storage areas, haul roads, compacted surfaces, contaminated soils, disrupted drainage channels, and unstable slopes can remain long after extraction has ceased. These legacies may reduce biodiversity, degrade water quality, create dust and erosion hazards, limit safe land use, and constrain the livelihoods of communities living near former mines. Ecological restoration offers a framework for moving beyond short-term site reclamation toward the recovery of ecological structure, function, resilience, and socially valuable post-mining landscapes.

This study uses a qualitative and literature-based approach to examine the ecological restoration of abandoned mining areas. It reviews mine-closure principles, soil reconstruction, landform stabilization, water management, phytoremediation, native-vegetation establishment, biodiversity recovery, post-mining land-use planning, community participation, and long-term monitoring. The analysis follows a restoration sequence that begins with site diagnosis and risk control, proceeds through landform and soil rehabilitation, and continues with vegetation development, ecological monitoring, and adaptive management. Particular attention is given to the difference between superficial greening and restoration that can sustain ecological processes over time.

The study finds that successful restoration depends on integrating physical safety, chemical risk reduction, soil recovery, hydrological repair, native biodiversity, and credible governance. Stable landforms, appropriate soil materials, clean water pathways, locally suitable plant communities, community-supported land-use goals, and long-term responsibility are mutually reinforcing. No single planting method or engineering intervention can restore all mine sites. The paper concludes that abandoned mining areas should be treated as long-term social-ecological recovery projects in which environmental integrity, public safety, local benefits, and adaptive learning are planned together.

Keywords: Ecological Restoration, Abandoned Mining Areas, Mine Closure, Soil Reconstruction, Native Vegetation, Tailings Stabilization, Acid Mine Drainage, Post-Mining Land Use, Environmental Monitoring, Community Participation

1. INTRODUCTION

Mining provides materials that support infrastructure, manufacturing, energy systems, and technological development, but the extraction process can leave long-lived ecological and social impacts. Surface and underground mining disturb landforms, remove vegetation, mix or remove soil horizons, expose reactive rock, alter groundwater pathways, and generate waste materials with variable physical and chemical properties. Where sites are abandoned without adequate closure, the effects can persist for decades through erosion, sediment transfer, acid mine drainage, contamination, habitat

loss, unsafe excavations, and loss of productive land. The challenge is especially significant where legacy mines were developed before modern environmental safeguards, financial assurance systems, or closure standards were consistently applied [2, 4, 6].

Ecological restoration is more demanding than placing vegetation on a disturbed surface. It seeks to assist the recovery of ecosystems that have been degraded, damaged, or destroyed, while recognizing that recovery pathways differ according to climate, landscape setting, contamination, available soils, species pools, and community priorities. In mine-affected

landscapes, restoration must often begin with earthworks and risk reduction because unstable slopes, compacted substrates, toxic tailings, and disrupted drainage can prevent biological recovery. A restoration programme must therefore link engineering, soil science, ecology, hydrology, landscape planning, and social participation rather than treat them as separate stages [1, 5, 16].

Abandoned mining areas also raise questions about post-mining futures. Some sites can support forest regeneration, grassland recovery, wetland creation, agriculture, renewable-energy facilities, recreation, education, or carefully designed conservation areas. Other sites remain unsuitable for unrestricted access because of contamination or geotechnical risk. The best outcome is not identical for every location. It depends on the site condition, surrounding ecosystem, local land needs, regulatory obligations, and the realistic capacity to maintain interventions. Clear post-mining objectives are therefore necessary before restoration activities are selected.

This paper examines ecological restoration of abandoned mining areas through a social-ecological perspective. It reviews the principal forms of mining disturbance, compares restoration requirements across representative mine landscapes, and develops a framework that combines ecological recovery with safety, water protection, land-use value, and accountable long-term stewardship. The central argument is that restoration succeeds when it is designed as a process of recovery and learning, not as a one-time closure activity.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The restoration literature shows that mine disturbance is highly site specific. Spoil heaps, tailings, quarry faces, coal overburden, and sand-mined river corridors differ in texture, fertility, stability, salinity, acidity, metal concentration, water-holding capacity, and exposure to erosion. These differences influence the sequence in which restoration actions should occur. Studies of mine-land rehabilitation consistently emphasize that landform design, soil reconstruction, and drainage control provide the physical foundation for later vegetation establishment. Where this foundation is weak, planted

vegetation may survive briefly but fail to develop into a self-sustaining system [4, 5, 8, 14].

Research also demonstrates that native vegetation should be selected according to site conditions and restoration goals rather than convenience alone. Fast-growing exotic species may provide early cover in some circumstances, but they can suppress native regeneration, create water demands, or lead to low-diversity vegetation with limited habitat value. Native species mixtures, appropriate successional planning, soil organic-matter recovery, microbial development, and protection from grazing or repeated disturbance can improve the trajectory toward a more resilient ecosystem. Yet restoration must allow for uncertainty: natural succession, extreme weather, invasive species, and unanticipated chemical conditions can change outcomes over time [1, 10, 15, 17].

Mine closure guidance increasingly frames restoration as a lifecycle responsibility. A meaningful closure plan identifies physical and chemical risks, sets measurable completion criteria, establishes financial and institutional responsibilities, and includes monitoring after operations cease. For legacy sites that lack an active operator, public authorities, former leaseholders, local communities, and remediation programmes may need to coordinate responsibility. Contemporary frameworks also stress transparency, stakeholder engagement, and the use of post-mining land uses that are compatible with remaining site risks and local development needs [2, 3, 12].

2.1 NATURE AND CONSEQUENCES OF MINING DISTURBANCE

- Mining can remove or mix soil horizons, compact surfaces, and create overburden or waste-rock deposits that lack organic matter, stable structure, and sufficient nutrients for plant establishment.
- Tailings and exposed sulfide-bearing materials may generate acidity, mobilize metals, increase salinity, or release fine sediments into local drainage systems when not adequately contained or treated.
- Excavations, highwalls, subsidence areas, and steep spoil slopes can create long-term public-safety hazards and may restrict

restoration options until landforms are stabilized.

- Altered drainage can change runoff patterns, reduce infiltration, lower or raise local water tables, and intensify erosion or sedimentation downstream.
- The loss of vegetation, habitat complexity, and soil biota can weaken ecological connectivity and reduce ecosystem services such as water regulation, pollination, carbon storage, and landscape amenity.
- Communities near abandoned mines may face restricted access to land and water, loss of agricultural productivity, dust exposure, visual degradation, and uncertainty about who is responsible for rehabilitation.

2.2 PRINCIPLES FOR ECOLOGICAL RESTORATION OF MINE SITES

- Establish stable landforms and safe slopes before biological interventions, using erosion control, drainage design, regrading, capping, or containment where site conditions require them.
- Reconstruct or improve soil functions through suitable growth media, salvaged topsoil where available, organic amendments, microbial recovery, and measures that reduce compaction and surface crusting.
- Use plant communities that are compatible with local climate, substrate conditions, target habitats, and intended land use; prioritize diversity and functional traits rather than appearance alone.
- Manage water as both a risk and a restoration resource by separating clean and contaminated flows, controlling sediment, treating acidic drainage, and restoring hydrological pathways where feasible.
- Address invasive species, grazing pressure, fire risk, and continuing disturbance during the early establishment phase so that restoration gains are not lost after planting.
- Define completion criteria that measure landform stability, soil development, vegetation condition, water quality, habitat use, safety, and community-relevant outcomes over an appropriate time scale.

2.3 RESTORATION STANDARDS AND SUSTAINABILITY FRAMEWORKS

- The Society for Ecological Restoration standards emphasize reference ecosystems, recovery of ecosystem attributes, monitoring, and transparent documentation of restoration goals and limitations [1].
- Integrated mine-closure guidance promotes early planning, risk management, stakeholder engagement, financial provisioning, and closure criteria that remain meaningful after mining stops [2].
- The United Nations Decade on Ecosystem Restoration encourages restoration that contributes to biodiversity, climate resilience, water security, and human well-being while avoiding simplified or harmful interventions [3].
- The Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework and land-degradation assessments underline the importance of preventing further degradation, restoring ecological function, and involving rights-holders and local communities in landscape decisions [11, 12].
- Monitoring should combine ecological indicators such as soil cover, vegetation composition, erosion, water quality, and wildlife use with social indicators such as safety, local access, livelihood relevance, and trust in responsible institutions.

3. OBJECT OF STUDY

The present study examines abandoned mining areas as landscapes in which physical disturbance, ecological recovery, water protection, public safety, and local development are closely connected. The object of study is not a single mine or mineral type. Instead, it considers representative post-mining settings in which restoration decisions must balance landform stability, contamination control, soil recovery, habitat development, and future land use. The analysis focuses on how abandoned mines can be diagnosed, stabilized, restored, monitored, and governed over time.

The theoretical basis of the study is grounded in the principle that ecological restoration should recover functions as well as visible cover. A site that is green but eroding,

contaminated, hydrologically unstable, or inaccessible to native species cannot be considered fully restored. Similarly, a technically safe site may have limited long-term value if post-mining land use ignores local needs or excludes affected communities. The study therefore treats ecological integrity, safety, water quality, landscape function, community participation, and adaptive governance as linked requirements of responsible mine-land restoration.

Table 1. Representative abandoned mining landscapes and restoration requirements

S. No.	Mine Landscape	Primary Restoration Need	Main Ecological Risk	Restoration Value
1	Open-cast coal mine	Regrade spoil, reconstruct soil profiles, manage drainage, and establish native vegetation.	Erosion, compaction, acid drainage, sediment transfer, and low soil fertility.	Can support forest, grassland, wetland, or mixed land uses when stability and water risks are controlled.
2	Metal-ore tailings area	Contain or cap tailings, reduce dust, manage acidity, and use phytostabilization where appropriate.	Metal mobility, toxic dust, acidic seepage, and sparse plant establishment.	Can reduce pollution pathways and create controlled habitat or safe low-intensity land uses.
3	Stone quarry and aggregate pit	Stabilize benches and slopes, secure water-filled pits, restore soil pockets, and introduce habitat structure.	Unsafe faces, unstable material, invasive species, and disconnected habitat.	Can become habitat refuges, wetlands, recreation areas, or educational landscapes with risk-sensitive design.
4	Riverine sand-mining corridor	Rebuild channel and bank stability, restore riparian cover, and control access and extraction scars.	Bank erosion, altered floodplain processes, loss of aquatic habitat, and sediment instability.	Can recover riparian functions, water quality, flood resilience, and native vegetation corridors.
5	Former mine settlement or industrial brownfield	Remove or isolate hazards, improve soils, remediate contamination, and plan compatible community use.	Human exposure, contaminated dust or soil, derelict infrastructure, and restricted access.	Can support community facilities, green infrastructure, renewable energy, or carefully managed productive land.

3.2 STUDY OBJECTIVES

- To examine the ecological and physical consequences of mining abandonment for soils, landforms, water systems, vegetation, and habitat function.
- To identify the principal restoration requirements of open-cast mines, tailings areas, quarries, sand-mined river corridors, and former mining brownfields.
- To evaluate the role of landform stabilization, soil reconstruction, water

3.1 REPRESENTATIVE MINE LANDSCAPES AND RESTORATION REQUIREMENTS

The study considers five representative abandoned-mine contexts. These contexts illustrate that restoration measures must be selected according to the character of disturbance, environmental risk, and desired post-mining future.

management, native-vegetation establishment, and long-term monitoring in ecological recovery.

- To assess the importance of post-mining land-use planning, community participation, institutional responsibility, and transparent completion criteria in restoration governance.
- To develop a practical framework for restoring abandoned mining areas in ways

that improve ecological integrity, public safety, and locally relevant land value.

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study adopts a qualitative and literature-based research methodology. It synthesizes ecological-restoration standards, mine-closure guidance, soil-reclamation research, water-remediation literature, and scholarship on post-mining land use. This approach is appropriate because the central question concerns the relationship among physical disturbance, ecological recovery, social value, and long-term governance rather than the measurement of a single numerical outcome. The study does not present primary field-survey data; its findings are interpretive and intended to provide a structured planning framework for site-specific assessment and further empirical research.

The methodological framework follows a restoration lifecycle. It begins with baseline diagnosis and hazard assessment, continues through stabilization of landforms and water systems, reconstruction of soil functions, development of native vegetation and habitat, monitoring of ecological and social outcomes, and periodic revision of management actions. This lifecycle approach recognizes that restoration is not completed by planting or formal site closure alone. It must be sustained through evidence-based maintenance, accountable institutions, and decisions that remain responsive to changing environmental and community conditions.

4.1 RESEARCH DESIGN (QUALITATIVE ANALYTICAL APPROACH)

- The study follows a qualitative and comparative design based on restoration standards, mine-closure guidance, peer-reviewed research, and documented field-practice principles.
- The analysis compares representative mine landscapes according to landform condition, soil quality, water risk, contamination pathways, vegetation potential, public-safety exposure, and governance requirements.
- The study uses a social-ecological perspective that links physical remediation with ecological recovery, local land use, public safety, institutional legitimacy, and community participation.

- Findings are interpreted through planning and management principles rather than through a controlled experiment or a statistically representative survey dataset.

4.2 ECOLOGICAL RESTORATION ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK

- Site assessment is structured around landform stability, soil or substrate condition, hydrology, contamination risk, vegetation cover, habitat potential, access and safety, and future land use.
- Restoration options include regrading, erosion control, drainage separation, capping, soil amendment, organic-matter addition, phytostabilization, constructed wetlands, native planting, assisted natural regeneration, and invasive-species management.
- Monitoring is designed to assess not only survival of planted vegetation but also cover, species composition, soil development, water quality, erosion, habitat use, and progress toward agreed completion criteria.
- Governance is assessed through clear responsibility, accessible site information, financial capacity, local representation, grievance channels, maintenance obligations, and long-term monitoring arrangements.

4.3 LANDSCAPE AND COMMUNITY CONTEXT

- The study considers open-cast coal mines, metal-ore tailings areas, stone quarries, sand-mined river corridors, and former mining settlements or industrial brownfields.
- Environmental context is considered in relation to rainfall, topography, erosion susceptibility, soil availability, background vegetation, water resources, and surrounding land use.
- Communities are considered in relation to farming, grazing, water use, housing, transport routes, employment history, cultural values, and access to environmental information and public support.
- Institutions are considered through their authority for mine closure, pollution control, land-use approval, water management, public safety, local development, and enforcement.

4.4 PARAMETERS OF ANALYSIS

- Stability of slopes, waste dumps, benches, surface drainage, and erosion-control structures.
- Chemical condition of substrates, including acidity, salinity, metal mobility, nutrient status, and suitability for biological recovery.
- Availability, quality, and placement of soil materials, organic amendments, and microbial or plant propagule sources.
- Vegetation cover, species diversity, native regeneration, invasive-species pressure, and habitat structure.
- Water quality, sediment movement, drainage function, and risk of contaminant transfer to downstream users or ecosystems.
- Safety, accessibility, local land-use compatibility, stakeholder participation, responsibility for maintenance, and confidence in monitoring and reporting.

4.5 PROCEDURE OF STUDY

- Review ecological-restoration standards, mine-closure guidance, soil-reclamation research, and post-mining land-use literature.
- Identify recurring physical, chemical, ecological, and social pressures in abandoned mining areas.
- Compare representative mine landscapes according to disturbance type, restoration needs, risk pathways, and governance requirements.
- Map each context to feasible stabilization, soil, water, vegetation, monitoring, and participation measures.
- Interpret the combined evidence to formulate an integrated restoration and post-mining stewardship framework.
- Develop practical recommendations that can guide site-specific investigation, design, implementation, and adaptive management.

4.6 ANALYTICAL APPROACH

- Qualitative comparison of mine-land restoration functions and constraints across representative landscape contexts.
- Interpretation of how physical remediation, biological recovery, and locally relevant land use can be combined to create durable restoration outcomes.

- Assessment of the relationship between completion criteria, monitoring quality, institutional responsibility, and long-term ecological performance.
- Identification of interventions that can be adapted for legacy mine sites, active-closure projects, community-managed landscapes, and public-sector remediation programmes.

5. DATA ANALYSIS

The qualitative analysis indicates that ecological restoration of abandoned mining areas must begin with an accurate understanding of site condition. In many cases, visible bare ground is only one symptom of deeper constraints. A waste dump may appear stable during dry weather but fail under intense rainfall; a tailings surface may support sparse vegetation while continuing to generate contaminated dust; and a water-filled pit may become a local resource but also pose safety and water-quality risks. Baseline assessment should therefore combine terrain mapping, geotechnical inspection, soil and water testing, vegetation surveys, historical information, and local observations of flooding, dust, access, and land use. The aim is to identify the processes that are preventing recovery rather than to apply a standard reclamation package to every site.

Landform and hydrological stability emerge as the foundation of restoration. Regrading, drainage management, erosion-control structures, contour design, sediment traps, and safe containment can reduce the risk that later biological work will be lost through gully or slope failure. However, engineering should be guided by ecological objectives. Uniformly smooth landforms may be stable but can lack microsites, shelter, and topographic variation needed for diverse vegetation. Where feasible, restoration design should integrate stability with habitat features, soil-moisture variation, and connectivity to surrounding vegetation. The appropriate balance depends on local rainfall, substrate behavior, safety requirements, and the selected post-mining land use [4, 5, 16].

Soil reconstruction is a second major finding. Many mine substrates have low organic content, poor structure, limited microbial activity, adverse pH, or high concentrations of salts and metals. Simply spreading a thin layer

of soil may not restore functional rooting conditions. More durable approaches consider soil depth, texture, compaction, organic amendments, drainage, nutrient availability, and the protection of salvaged topsoil from loss or degradation. In some sites, assisted natural regeneration can be effective once these conditions improve; in others, seeding, planting, nurse species, or targeted phytostabilization may be needed. Restoration goals must be realistic about the time required for soil development and should not treat early plant survival as proof of full recovery [7, 8, 9, 14].

Water management is equally central. Abandoned mines may contain contaminated drainage, acid-generating materials, altered groundwater pathways, or eroding channels that deliver sediment to downstream ecosystems. Effective programmes separate clean runoff from contaminated flows, reduce contact between water and reactive materials, stabilize drainage features, and select passive or active treatment systems appropriate to site chemistry and maintenance capacity. Constructed wetlands, anoxic drains, limestone systems, covers, and phytoremediation can contribute in suitable conditions, but their performance must be monitored. A system that works in one climate or mine type may fail where hydraulic loading, acidity, metals, or seasonal flow differ [6, 13].

The analysis also shows that restoration success cannot be judged by vegetation cover alone. A restored site should be evaluated through multiple indicators: landform stability, soil condition, water quality, vegetation composition, native regeneration, habitat structure, biodiversity use, safety, and progress toward the agreed post-mining function. Social indicators matter as well. Local communities may assess success through safer access, reduction in dust or polluted water, usable green space, employment in restoration work, or the return of productive land. Monitoring that combines ecological and social evidence is more likely to reveal whether a site is moving toward a self-sustaining and socially legitimate outcome.

Finally, the comparative assessment highlights the importance of responsibility after closure. A planting programme without maintenance, a water-treatment system without monitoring, or

a fenced hazard zone without inspection can create an appearance of action while allowing risk to persist. Completion criteria should identify who will maintain structures, how monitoring results will be disclosed, what thresholds trigger corrective action, and how the site will be managed after formal closure. Restoration is more credible when institutions accept long-term accountability rather than relying on short-term project completion.

6. DISCUSSION

The analysis confirms that abandoned mining areas should be viewed as long-term restoration challenges rather than vacant land awaiting simple reuse. Physical hazards, contamination pathways, soil loss, altered drainage, and ecological fragmentation can remain interconnected long after extraction ends. A restoration plan that begins only when a site is already abandoned may face higher costs and fewer options because topsoil has been lost, landforms have become unstable, and institutional responsibility has become unclear. The strongest approach is to integrate closure and restoration planning early in the mining lifecycle while also establishing public programmes for legacy sites where no responsible operator remains.

A central lesson is that restoration goals must be explicit. Some sites may appropriately aim for native forest or grassland recovery; others may be better suited to wetlands, controlled grazing, community green space, solar infrastructure, education, or restricted-access conservation. The selected goal should be compatible with residual risks, surrounding landscapes, and community aspirations. It should also be measurable. Broad commitments to make land green or return land to nature are insufficient without indicators for stability, soil, water, vegetation, habitat, safety, and long-term management. Clear goals reduce the risk that short-term visual improvements are presented as complete ecological recovery.

Native biodiversity requires careful attention. Planting a small number of fast-growing trees can reduce bare ground, but it may not create the layered structure, species interactions, seasonal resources, or regeneration processes associated with a functioning ecosystem. Native plant communities, habitat mosaics, soil recovery, and connectivity to nearby

vegetation can improve ecological value, particularly where mines are located within fragmented forest, grassland, or riparian landscapes. Yet restoration should avoid rigid targets that ignore the novel conditions of some mine sites. Adaptive planning can combine reference ecosystems with practical recognition of altered substrates, climate stresses, and social needs [1, 10, 17, 18].

Community participation is also essential. People living near abandoned mines often hold practical knowledge about water flows, dust events, unsafe areas, seasonal access, grazing patterns, and prior land uses. They may also bear the health, livelihood, and safety costs of unresolved mine legacies. Their involvement should go beyond consultation after decisions are made. Participatory mapping, local monitoring, restoration employment, transparent risk communication, and representation in post-closure land-use decisions can strengthen both the quality and legitimacy of restoration. Equitable participation is particularly important where mining has disrupted common lands, agricultural areas, or culturally significant places.

Finally, restoration must be adaptive. Climate variability, extreme rainfall, invasive species, fire, changing water tables, and new knowledge about contamination can alter site trajectories. Monitoring should therefore be designed as a management tool, not merely a compliance requirement. When evidence shows that erosion is increasing, planted species are failing, water quality is deteriorating, or local access is creating new risks, corrective action should be taken promptly. An adaptive approach recognizes uncertainty while maintaining clear responsibility for achieving the agreed restoration objectives.

7. CONCLUSION

8. REFERENCES

1. Society for Ecological Restoration. (2019). *International Principles and Standards for the Practice of Ecological Restoration* (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: Society for Ecological Restoration.
2. International Council on Mining and Metals. (2019). *Integrated Mine Closure: Good Practice Guide* (2nd ed.). London: ICMM.
3. United Nations Environment Programme. (2021). *Becoming #GenerationRestoration: Ecosystem Restoration for People, Nature and Climate*. Nairobi: UNEP.

This study examined ecological restoration of abandoned mining areas as an integrated challenge of landform recovery, soil rehabilitation, water protection, native biodiversity, public safety, and post-mining land use. It showed that abandoned mines can retain long-term physical, chemical, ecological, and social impacts when closure is incomplete or responsibility is unclear. Restoration must therefore go beyond cosmetic revegetation. It must address the processes that prevent sustainable recovery, including unstable landforms, poor soils, contaminated water, invasive species, habitat fragmentation, and unsafe access.

The analysis found that open-cast mines, tailings areas, quarries, sand-mined river corridors, and former mining brownfields require different combinations of measures. Regrading, drainage control, capping or containment, soil reconstruction, organic amendment, native planting, phytostabilization, water treatment, erosion control, habitat design, and long-term monitoring can contribute to better outcomes when they are coordinated. No intervention is sufficient in isolation, and effectiveness should be evaluated through ecological and social indicators rather than assumed from visible vegetation cover.

Ecological restoration can transform abandoned mining areas into safer, more functional, and more valuable landscapes when it is guided by sound science, transparent governance, meaningful community participation, and sustained responsibility. Its long-term success depends on maintaining the relationship between landform stability, soil and water recovery, biodiversity, local land needs, and institutional trust. When restoration is planned as a continuing process of recovery and learning, it can help convert mine legacies into landscapes with a more secure ecological and social future.

4. Cooke, J. A., and Johnson, M. S. (2002). Ecological restoration of land with particular reference to the mining of metals and industrial minerals: A review of theory and practice. *Environmental Reviews*, 10(1), 41-71.
5. Bradshaw, A. D. (1997). Restoration of mined lands - using natural processes. *Ecological Engineering*, 8(4), 255-269.
6. Johnson, D. B., and Hallberg, K. B. (2005). Acid mine drainage remediation options: A review. *Science of the Total Environment*, 338(1-2), 3-14.
7. Mendez, M. O., and Maier, R. M. (2008). Phytostabilization of mine tailings in arid and semiarid environments - an emerging remediation technology. *Environmental Health Perspectives*, 116(3), 278-283.
8. Tordoff, G. M., Baker, A. J. M., and Willis, A. J. (2000). Current approaches to the revegetation and reclamation of metalliferous mine wastes. *Chemosphere*, 41(1-2), 219-228.
9. Sheoran, V., Sheoran, A. S., and Poonia, P. (2010). Soil reclamation of abandoned mine land by revegetation: A review. *International Journal of Soil, Sediment and Water*, 3(2), Article 13.
10. Suding, K. N. (2011). Toward an era of restoration in ecology: Successes, failures, and opportunities ahead. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics*, 42, 465-487.
11. Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services. (2018). *The IPBES Assessment Report on Land Degradation and Restoration*. Bonn: IPBES Secretariat.
12. Convention on Biological Diversity. (2022). *Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework*. Decision 15/4. Montreal: Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity.
13. Younger, P. L., Banwart, S. A., and Hedin, R. S. (2002). *Mine Water: Hydrology, Pollution, Remediation*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
14. Maiti, S. K. (2013). *Ecorestoration of the Coalmine Degraded Lands*. New Delhi: Springer India.
15. Bell, L. C. (2001). Establishment of native ecosystems after mining - Australian experience across diverse biogeographic zones. *Ecological Engineering*, 17(2-3), 179-186.
16. Grant, C. D. (2006). State-and-transition successional model for bauxite mining rehabilitation in Western Australia. *Restoration Ecology*, 14(1), 28-37.
17. Zipper, C. E., Burger, J. A., Skousen, J. G., Angel, P. N., Barton, C. D., Davis, V., and Franklin, J. A. (2011). Restoring forests and associated ecosystem services on Appalachian coal surface mines. *Environmental Management*, 47, 751-765.
18. Holl, K. D., and Aide, T. M. (2011). When and where to actively restore ecosystems? *Forest Ecology and Management*, 261(10), 1558-1563.
19. Aronson, J., Blignaut, J. N., Milton, S. J., Le Maitre, D., Esler, K. J., Limouzin, A., Fontaine, C., de Wit, M. P., Mugido, W., Prinsloo, P., van der Elst, L., and Lederer, N. (2010). Are socioeconomic benefits of restoration adequately quantified? A meta-analysis of recent papers. *Restoration Ecology*, 18(2), 143-154.
20. Doley, D., and Audet, P. (2013). Adopting novel ecosystems as suitable rehabilitation alternatives for former mine sites. *Ecological Processes*, 2, 22.
21. IUCN. (2020). *Global Standard for Nature-based Solutions*. Gland, Switzerland: International Union for Conservation of Nature.
22. Lima, A. T., Mitchell, K., O'Connell, D. W., Verhoeven, J., and Van Cappellen, P. (2016). The legacy of surface mining: Remediation, restoration, reclamation and rehabilitation. *Environmental Science and Policy*, 66, 227-233.