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1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose
The Draft Rehabilitation and Closure Plan (RCP) for the proposed Chandler Facility (the Proposal) within Northern Territory (NT) Mining Lease Area (MLA) 30612 is being submitted as a requirement of the Final Terms of Reference for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) under the NT Environmental Assessment Act.

The purpose of the draft RCP is to:

- Provide an overview of the Proposal.
- Identify the rehabilitation and closure obligations and commitments (determined in conjunction with relevant stakeholders).
- Describe the proposed post Proposal land use and closure objectives.
- Develop completion criteria for closure of the Chandler Project.
- Document the method of financial provisioning for mine closure.
- Describe how the RCP will be implemented.
- Describe monitoring and maintenance programs for the Proposal.

1.2 Scope
The Proposal comprises two components:

- Mining of rock salt and processing for export.
- Storage and permanent isolation of hazardous waste materials in the mined voids.

Tellus will obtain approval to mine salt under the Mining Management Act and permanently isolate hazardous waste materials under the Waste Management Pollution Control Act (WMPC Act). Hazardous waste is regulated by the NT Environment Protection Authority under Schedule 2 of the WMPC Act.

The scope of this RCP includes:

- Rehabilitation of disturbed surface areas of the mining lease (application MLA 30612) and associated miscellaneous licences (pending).
- Decommissioning of infrastructure listed in Table 1-1 used to operate the mine located on mining lease and associated miscellaneous licences (pending).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Primary component</th>
<th>Secondary component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chandler Facility</td>
<td>Underground infrastructure</td>
<td>Mine decline 6 km long&lt;br&gt;Two mine shafts: 820m and 860m deep&lt;br&gt;Underground salt handling infrastructure&lt;br&gt;Underground waste rooms&lt;br&gt;Underground services, utilities and workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandler Facility</td>
<td>Above ground infrastructure</td>
<td>Salt loading area&lt;br&gt;Waste unloading area&lt;br&gt;Vertical shaft headframe&lt;br&gt;Hydraulic backfill plant&lt;br&gt;Overburden stockpiles&lt;br&gt;Run of mine salt stockpile&lt;br&gt;Internal roads&lt;br&gt;Laboratory building (hydraulic backfill plant)&lt;br&gt;Plant maintenance shed&lt;br&gt;Administration building&lt;br&gt;Power plant (solar/hybrid)&lt;br&gt;Bore field, pipelines and tanks&lt;br&gt;Surface water retention ponds&lt;br&gt;Future technology park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mine camp</td>
<td>Above ground infrastructure</td>
<td>Accommodation buildings&lt;br&gt;Gymnasium&lt;br&gt;Leisure centre&lt;br&gt;Mess hall / dining room&lt;br&gt;Administration buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apirnta Facility</td>
<td>Above ground infrastructure</td>
<td>Rail siding&lt;br&gt;Storage yard&lt;br&gt;Warehouse&lt;br&gt;Liquid waste tanks&lt;br&gt;Quarantine area&lt;br&gt;Maintenance shed&lt;br&gt;Internal access roads&lt;br&gt;Laboratory building&lt;br&gt;Carpark area&lt;br&gt;Weigh bridge&lt;br&gt;Hardstand storage area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandler Haul Road</td>
<td>Above ground infrastructure</td>
<td>Drainage swales&lt;br&gt;Check dams&lt;br&gt;Light aircraft landing area&lt;br&gt;Traffic signs&lt;br&gt;Culverts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apirnta Access Road</td>
<td>Above ground infrastructure</td>
<td>Drainage swales&lt;br&gt;Check dams&lt;br&gt;Traffic signs&lt;br&gt;Culverts&lt;br&gt;Floodway (Finke River Crossing)&lt;br&gt;Controlled intersection at Stuart Highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryvale Access Road</td>
<td>Above ground infrastructure</td>
<td>Drainage swales&lt;br&gt;Check dams&lt;br&gt;Traffic signs&lt;br&gt;Culverts&lt;br&gt;Floodway (Hugh River Crossing)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.3 **Environmental objectives**

As far as practicable, rehabilitation will achieve a stable and functioning landform which is compatible with the surrounding landscape and other environmental values.

Potential impacts to downstream water quality / potable-water supplies, ecosystems, beneficial uses, environmental / cultural values or human health, associated with closure and rehabilitation of the Proposal will be identified, and adequately avoided, mitigated and/or minimised.

Rehabilitation of areas impacted by mining and waste storage will be undertaken to ensure health risks to members of the public, including traditional owners, will be as low as is reasonably achievable.

1.4 **Document review**

This draft RCP is a ‘live’ document, and will be reviewed and revised as the Project progresses through the design/planning stage to the construction and operation phases.
2 METHODOLOGY

2.1 Literature review
In preparing this draft RCP, Tellus Holdings Ltd (the Proponent) has followed the principles and objectives identified in the Strategic Framework for Mine Closure (ANZMEC, 2000). In addition, the following documents were also used to guide the development of the methodology for the delivery of the project:

- Leading Practice Sustainable Development in Mining Handbooks
  - A Guide to Leading Practice Sustainable Development in Mining
  - Evaluating Performance: Monitoring and Auditing
  - Mine Closure and Completion
  - Mine Rehabilitation
  - Risk Management
- Planning for Integrated Mine Closure: Toolkit (ICMM 2008)
- Guidelines for Preparing Mine Closure Plans (Department of Mines and Petroleum Western Australia/EPA, 2011).
- Mine Close Out Objectives, Life of Mine Planning Objectives, Advisory Note (Department of Mines and Energy 2008)

2.2 Risk assessment
During preparation of the EIS, a series of detailed risk workshops were undertaken to identify risks that may impede the successful rehabilitation and closure of the Proposal, including risks to prescribed closure timeframes.

Potential risks identified during the risk workshop included:

- Closure timeframes and objectives and the Proposal not realising its projected outcomes (i.e. delays, unexpected or forced closure).
- Risks that the Proposal may create an ongoing environmental, social and/or economic legacy if operations are required to cease ahead of schedule due to unforeseen circumstances, prior to the planned closure and rehabilitation of the site.

A quantified post-closure risk assessment was undertaken for the EIS (refer to Appendix E in the EIS). The post-closure risk assessment addressed potential risks on local groundwater resources, pathways leading to potential contamination and natural events, including earthquakes, future climate change scenarios involving elevated average rainfall.

A bushfire risk assessment and management plan was also prepared as part of the EIS.
2.3 **Collection and analysis of closure data**

Data presented throughout this RCP is based on existing information collated during the preparation of the EIS as well applicable legislative and policy needs. This data and information has been collected:

- Using recognised and accepted industry methodologies and standards.
- Incorporating appropriate quality assurance testing and data management.
- Considering the interaction between the receiving environment, receptors and the exposure pathways.
3 PROJECT OVERVIEW

3.1 Overview
The Proposal would comprise:

- Mining a salt (halite) bed at a depth of about 850 metres below ground level (bgl).
- Providing for the permanent isolation of hazardous waste\(^1\) or the temporary storage of materials in void spaces left from salt mining.
- Haulage of salt products and waste materials via private haul roads.
- A Storage and Transfer Facility known as Apirnta located adjacent to the Darwin to Adelaide railway.
- Transport of salt to port via rail.
- Delivery of waste predominantly by rail.
- Transport of workers and mine consumables via public and private roads.

The Proposal includes two key sites, the Chandler Facility and the Apirnta Facility (comprising a rail siding and transfer station), which combined, comprise the Proposal.

3.2 Location
The project is located approximately 120 kilometres (km) south of Alice Springs in the NT (Figure 3-1). The project site is currently accessed from the Maryvale Road. The Maryvale Road is predominantly unsealed for approximately 100 km and links Alice Springs to the Aboriginal Community of Titjikala, Maryvale store and the Chambers Pillar Road.

3.3 Land ownership
Tellus will apply for a conversion of land from pastoral to Crown reserve in perpetuity under the NT Crown Lands Act. This process will execute an agreement between existing landowners on Maryvale and Henbury Estates and Tellus.

Tellus will compensate both landowners for the right to use the agreed parcel of land for the construction of mine access and / or ancillary mine infrastructure. The NT Department of Lands Planning and Environment will facilitate negotiations between Tellus and landowners. They will also execute the final land access and necessary conversions.

---

\(^1\) Hazardous waste is a generic term but is equivalent to Listed Waste in the Northern Territory and by other descriptions in other states and Territories.
3.4 **Mining tenure**

The project is owned by Tellus. Present tenure includes 5 granted exploration licences and MLA 30612 which was lodged on the 10th October 2014.

3.5 **Contact details**

The Proponent’s details are:

**Tellus Holdings Ltd**
Suite 2, Level 10
151 Castlereagh Street
Sydney NSW 2000
Tel: +61 2 8257 3395

The key contact for this draft RCP is:

**Mr Richard Phillips**
**Environment and Approvals Manager**
Suite 2, Level 10
151 Castlereagh Street
Sydney NSW 2000
Tel: +61 2 8257 3395
Email: richie@tellusholdings.com
Figure 3-1 Proposal location
Key information about the Proposal is listed in Table 3-1.

Table 3-1 Key Proposal information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>Northern Territory Portion 810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered use</td>
<td>Cattle grazing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned use</td>
<td>• Salt mining of an average of 895,000 tonnes per annum with salt processing deferred for the first 5 years of mining operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The storage, disposal, and permanent isolation of up to 400,000 tonnes per annum of waste material (30,000t in year 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned life</td>
<td>Four years of construction plus 25 years of operation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital expenditure</td>
<td>$644.5 million (nominal, including finance).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>270-540 workers (including indirect)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation</td>
<td>180-216 workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface footprint disturbance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandler Facility (including camp)</td>
<td>219 hectares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apirnta Facility (including rail siding)</td>
<td>170 hectares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (roads and services)</td>
<td>231 hectares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underground footprint</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed mining area (including decline and</td>
<td>403 hectares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shaft pillar)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt production (export)</td>
<td>Life of mine average of 750,000 tonnes per annum (tpa) from year 6 of mining operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste storage</td>
<td>Maximum of 400 ktpa waste sales (Yr1 30kt, annual av. 293kt)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 STAKEHOLDERS

4.1 Introduction
The key external stakeholders of the Proposal are identified in the EIS. In summary, they include:

- The NT Department of Mines and Energy (DME).
- The NT EPA.
- The CLC.
- Traditional Owners.

Each of the key external stakeholders have been consulted during development of the EIS. Should the Proposal be approved, Tellus will continue to consult with the above stakeholders through the development of the RCP.

4.2 Stakeholder identification
‘Stakeholders’ are defined as internal and external parties who are likely to affect, to be affected by or to have an interest in mine closure planning and outcomes.

The internal stakeholders for mine closure are:

- The Tellus Board and Executive Management
- Project Manager – Mr Stephen Hosking
- Mine Manager – To be confirmed
- Environment and Approvals Manager – Mr Richard Phillips

A list of key external stakeholders and interested parties can be found in Table 4-1.
Table 4-1: Stakeholder list through the development of the Chandler project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder category</th>
<th>Sector / Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal groups</td>
<td>Native title claimant groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Commonwealth government representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northern Territory government representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local government representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-government organisations and service providers</td>
<td>Community groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private sector service providers (including indigenous businesses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry and business</td>
<td>Regional and economic development boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local and regional industries and businesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General public</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Stakeholder engagement register

4.3.1 Stakeholder engagement strategy

Purpose of Communication

For mine closure to be effective, engagement with stakeholders is required at every phase of the Chandler Project. The Community Engagement and Development Handbook (DITR, 2009) outlines two frameworks generally implemented by miners to engage with the community and stakeholders.

Tellus considers the International Association of Public Participation (IAP2) process as the appropriate framework for the Chandler Project, as it allows for a continuum of consultation with stakeholders. Tellus has interpreted the purpose of each type of engagement as described below:

- **Inform** – providing information about the mine.
- **Consult** – direct conversation on specific areas of risk and opportunity in relation to mine closure.
• **Involve** – interactive mode between Tellus and the stakeholder to achieve a common closure outcome.

• **Collaborate** – Stakeholder-driven consultation on aspects of closure.

• **Empower** – participation in planning and decision-making, not only on issues related to operational impacts, but also on decisions regarding the community’s future once the mine has closed.

In the initial stages of mine closure planning, Tellus will inform stakeholders of the plans for mine closure. As the project develops and is operational, there will be a move towards the consult, involve and collaborate forms of engagement. Nearing the end of the mine life, there may be opportunities to empower stakeholders. The purpose of communication and method chosen will be evaluated following each engagement event, and reflected upon during the three yearly review of this MCP.

**Methods of Communication**

Single or multiple methods may be used to communicate with stakeholders, depending on the purpose of the communication. Several methods are listed in Table 4-2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inform</td>
<td>Information booths, media releases, newsletters, brochures, mail out programs, websites and hotlines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult</td>
<td>Public meetings, discussion groups, polls, surveys and focus groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve and Collaborate</td>
<td>Workshops and discussion groups, learning circles, interviews, reference groups and community consultative committees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>Site visits, direct phone calls and electronic mail.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Targeted Communication**

The consultation to be undertaken prior to the submission of the next revision of this RCP includes:

1. Discussions internally within Tellus to agree on any required changes to the post-mining land use and closure objectives (Section 5). If changes are proposed, these are to be assessed and a list of changes to the Closure Obligations Register (Section 6), Collection and Analysis of Closure Data which is built on baseline data and Closure Implementation (Section 10) and Closure Monitoring and Maintenance (Section 11) prepared.

2. The list of required changes will be discussed with all external stakeholders with the aim of achieving agreement.

3. Once agreed, Tellus will make the changes to the sections outlined above, and also recalculate and amend the Financial Provisioning for Closure (Section 11).

The revised RCP will be issued to all external stakeholders for comment, and where appropriate comments incorporated.
Adequate Resources for Engagement

Financial resources as documented in Section 12, have been allocated for expenses related to carrying out stakeholder engagement.

In this draft RCP the Project Planner/Engineer and the Environment & Approvals Manager are responsible for stakeholder engagement, and have adequate time available as part of their current roles to engage with stakeholders.

Documentation

All stakeholder engagement, regardless of purpose or form, will be recorded.
5 IDENTIFICATION OF CLOSURE OBLIGATIONS AND COMMITMENTS

5.1 Legal obligations register

The Proposal’s environmental commitments contained within the EIS and, subject to planning approval, conditions of consent, will be used to fulfil a legal register for the Proposal. This would be completed in conjunction with the Proposal’s Mining Management Plan (MMP). The Proponent will comply with the legal requirements both of the NT and the Commonwealth of Australia.

A mining agreement is currently being negotiated with Traditional Owners and environmental commitments will be set under the agreement as facilitated through the CLC. The mining agreement details Tellus’ environmental commitments made to protect Traditional Owners and traditional land use. The details of the mining agreement with the Traditional Owners are confidential and cannot be disclosed in this document.

Accordingly, the overall objective of closure is to create stable final landforms, returning as much of the project area as practicable to a similar landscape and ecosystem to what was the pre-existing land use.

The rehabilitation strategy will remain flexible and can be amended as operations evolve, new rehabilitation techniques are developed, and environmental investigations progress.

All legal obligations relevant to rehabilitation and closure at Chandler are identified in the Legal Obligations Register (Table 5-1). Note: this register will be updated following receipt of environmental approvals.
### Table 5-1 Legal obligations register

#### Relevant DME conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenement No</th>
<th>Condition No</th>
<th>Closure Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Ministerial Statement (Date)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition No</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Works approval (No and Date) Relates to Tenement No.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Aspect Related to Closure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Waste Management Pollution Control Act

- Environmental Approval No.
- Environmental Licence No.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Aspect Related to Closure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2 Regional environment

5.2.1 Climate

The location of the study site falls within the arid zone of Central Australia.

Climate data taken from the Alice Springs weather station indicates that average annual rainfall is approximately 274 mm per year. Average annual evapotranspiration rates are on average approximately 3,100 mm per year.

Average daily temperatures range in summer from 22-36 °C to winter temperatures of 4-20 °C. Maximum summer temperatures can reach 45 °C with overnight temperatures sometimes dropping below freezing point.

5.2.2 Geology

The Tellus exploration leases are located within the Amadeus Basin in the southern region of the Northern Territory. The Amadeus Basin is an asymmetrical, east-west trending, intracratonic depression covering 155,000 km² of central Australia.

The site location lies within surface outcrop of undifferentiated Quaternary cover consisting of quartz sands, with some Tertiary Silcrete and Devonian Sandstone outcrops (Santo Sandstone). The site location lies towards the south of the Central Ridge and is not associated with any major local or regional structural elements.

The stratigraphy within the Chandler area has been well defined from drilling of historic petroleum wells Mt Charlotte 1 and Magee 1, and correlate well with recent drilling completed by Tellus.


5.2.3 Groundwater

The project area falls within the south-eastern groundwater system of the Amadeus Basin which is characterised by geographical folding and faulting which has resulted in the development of a regional fractured rock aquifer of low to moderate productivity.

Three major sandstone aquifers are north-west of the Amadeus Basin; the Mereenie, Pacoota and Hermannsburg Sandstones. In the north-west, the three main aquifers act independently, separated by two main aquicludes (Parke Siltstone and Horn Valley Siltstone). The three sandstone aquifers act as a double-aquifer system in the central Amadeus Basin as the Parke Siltstone is absent. In the eastern region of the basin, the three sandstone formations are hydraulically connected and act as a single, widespread sandstone aquifer.
The recharge area for the Great Artesian Basin (GAB) lies about 70 km to the southeast of the Charlotte Blocks (the project area) and the linkage between the two areas is low or non-existent due to the lack of connectivity between the fractured rock aquifer system and the porous regional aquifer system of the GAB (Aurora Environmental, 2012).

### 5.2.4 Surface water

Tellus’ leases lie on the easterly edge of the Amadeus Basin. It is within the Finke bioregion, characterised by arid sand plains with dissected uplands and valleys. The region has extensive low-lying topography with a drainage network that can best be described as being ‘uncoordinated’ (Finlayson et al 1988). Surface waters drain inland and not towards the coast. There are two major inland river systems bordering the project area. They are the Finke River and the Hugh River. The Hugh River is a major tributary to the Finke River system.

The Finke River lies to the west and south west. Its tributaries flow to the east and southeast and elevations range from 28 m AHD (Australian Height Datum) to 1500 m AHD. The Hugh River is approximately 15-20 km to the east of the site and dissects Chambers Pillar Road. The two river systems are formed in arid zones, and flow over hundreds of kilometres. They have particularly low and infrequent flows.

There are no major lake bodies in close proximity to the project area. A man-made dam on the Maryvale Station (Halfway Dam) lies within the southern boundary of the proposed surface infrastructure area. Tellus proposes to remove this dam as part of the proposal, for which the pastoralist will be offered compensation.

Rain gauges installed adjacent to hydrographic stations provide information on total rainfall and rainfall localisation. North, south, east and west facing photographs of the rain gauges enable a ground cover monitoring system similar to the NTG tier 2 pastoral vegetation monitoring stations. Although there are no major surface water bodies such as lakes in the area, clay saltpans, water courses and floodplains are periodically inundated after rain. Due to higher clay content in some low lying areas, clay/salt pans are capable of holding surface water for longer periods of time.

### 5.2.5 Flora and fauna

The bioregion is dominated by Mulga with various Senna, Eremophila and Acacia species present over short grasses and forbs. No Critically Endangered, Endangered or Vulnerable species listed under the Territory Parks and Wildlife Conservation Act have been recorded in the vicinity (NRETAS Database).

Seasonal flora and fauna surveys of the proposed mine infrastructure area, camp site, access and haul roads and the Apiunta rail siding area have been carried out since Spring 2013. The results of seasonal surveys indicate none of the sites are constrained by rare, threatened, endangered or critically listed plants or animals.
5.2.6  Cultural heritage

A search of the NT Archaeological Site Register (Heritage Branch of NRETAS) has indicated that registered archaeological sites have previously been recorded in the vicinity of the project area, but none are recorded within it. The closest sites are located at Chamber’s Pillar and a location to the north of EL28900 (around 24.80S and 133.75E GDA94).

The Aboriginal Areas Protection Authority (AAPA) have provided an Abstract of Records in relation to land covered by Tellus Exploration Licenses (Correspondence: File: 2012/1238 No. 201213299) and advised that there are no records of sacred sites listed within the area.

The Central Land Council (CLC) issued sacred site clearance certificate (SSCC 2012-303) for stage 1 activities within a defined boundary.

Desktop and field cultural heritage surveys have been completed. Field surveys included consultation with Traditional Owners. The project area does contain items of cultural importance but can be easily managed through the implementation of a cultural heritage management Plan. The layout of the surface infrastructure will be designed to avoid known items of cultural heritage.

5.3  Design and construction of waste rock dumps

The design of the waste rock dumps and temporary stockpiles will ensure they are safe, stable and non-polluting, having no risk on the environment and/or future land use. Measures adopted to achieve this outcome will include:

- Design of the overall formed profiles to minimise run-off.
- Formation of a low permeability layer in sedimentation basins to limit seepage (long term salt stockpiles only).
- Surface water monitoring.
- Groundwater monitoring (long term salt stockpiles only).
- Characterisation of the waste rock units using drilling data, visual observations and erosion testing.
- Limit erosion and potential for chemical reactions.
6 REHABILITATION

For the purposes of rehabilitation, the Proposal has been divided into five key areas of rehabilitation which will require differing rehabilitation treatments. They are:

- The Apirnta Facility – which includes a rail siding.
- The Chandler Facility (above ground).
- The Chandler Facility (below ground).
- Accommodation village.
- Bore field and pipelines.

Details of each proposed rehabilitation aspect is outlined in the following sections.

6.1 Apirnta Facility

The Apirnta Facility will cover an area of approximately 170 hectares. The Facility includes a rail siding, storage and transfer area, and access road. It is proposed to sell or donate all buildings to external parties, or commission a demolition/salvage company to dismantle the facility and associated infrastructure.

Where practicable this material will be recycled and removed from site.

Once the facility has been removed any below ground services (i.e. electrical cabling) within 0.5 metre of the surface are to be removed, other deeper services will be cut 0.5 metre below the ground surface and backfilled. Any below ground septic systems will be decommissioned and backfilled. The area will then be re-contoured into the surrounding landscape, ripped and covered with local topsoil to ensure water infiltration, establish a soil profile and vegetation. Once ripping has been completed, any cabling, pipework of other camp items that have been bought to the surface will be collected for disposal.

6.1.1 Rail Siding

The rail siding will cover an area of approximately 55 hectares. The siding track has been offset from the mainline to provide clearance from existing services. Opportunities to move the siding track closer to the main line will be investigated during detailed design. Moving the track closer to be the mainline could reduce the overall disturbance footprint.

An elevated hardstand (nominally 1800m long by 30m wide) is proposed adjacent to the rail siding track.

6.1.2 Storage and transfer area

The storage and transfer facility will cover an area of approximately 115 hectares. The storage and transfer area will be located adjacent to the rail siding and incorporates the following components:
• Inspection shed and office
• Weighbridge
• Vehicle wash-down facility
• Workshop
• Quarantine area
• Internal roads and access ways
• Lighting
• Security fencing and gatehouse
• Fuel farm
• Power generation
• Waste water treatment plant
• Potable water treatment plant
• Site office/administration building
• Car park

6.1.3 Access road

The Apirnta access road will cover an area of approximately 128 hectares.

The access road will be approximately 56km in length and will connect the Stuart Highway to the Apirnta Facility.

6.2 Chandler Facility (above ground)

The Chandler Facility will cover an area of approximately 219 hectares.

It is proposed to sell or donate all buildings to external parties, or commission a demolition/salvage company to dismantle the facility and associated infrastructure.

Where practicable this material will be recycled and removed from site.

Once all facilities have been removed any below ground services (i.e. electrical cabling) within 0.5 metre of the surface are to be removed, other deeper services will be cut 0.5 metre below the ground surface and backfilled. Any below ground septic systems will be decommissioned and backfilled. The area will then be re-contoured into the surrounding landscape, ripped and covered with local topsoil to ensure water infiltration, establish a soil profile and vegetation. Once ripping has been completed, any cabling, pipework of other camp items that have been bought to the surface will be collected for disposal.
6.2.1  Run of mine salt stockpile

The Chandler surface layout includes a run of mine salt stockpile of up to 3.5Mt. Salt processing will be deferred for the first 5 years of salt mining to allow waste operations to ramp up unencumbered and for pilot processing and test work to be carried out prior to full operations and product export.

Tellus will use the run of mine stockpile as a blending feedstock to the salt processing plant as well as bulk salt backfill for underground closure activities.

No salt will be left on surface at closure with all surface stocks either processed and sold or returned underground to backfill underground development.

6.2.2  Other stockpiles

Spoil from the mine development and underground development within the strata overlying the Chandler Salt bed will be segregated and stockpiled on surface.

These stockpiles will be used for bulk earthworks and road building and maintenance where appropriate during the initial construction phase and during operations.

Remaining stockpiles will be utilised in the shaft and decline backfilling activities at closure. All stockpiles will therefore be fully drawn down by closure.

6.2.3  Run-off detention basins

A run off detention basin will be constructed adjacent to the salt stockpile to capture run off and trap salt carried in solution from the stockpile.
6.3  Chandler Facility (below ground)

The life of mine below ground footprint (including decline and shaft pillar) will cover an area of 403 hectares.

6.3.1  Salt rooms

The underground workings would be developed by room and pillar using continuous miners. The rooms would be 250 long by 6m high by 15m wide. It is estimated that approximately 313 rooms would be mined over the 25 years of operations.

Each room would be progressively filled with waste materials, either by hydraulic placement via a surface hydraulic backfill plant and pipeline, or by dry placement of bulk bags, drums or similar packaging. Fine salt would be placed around all dry placed waste packages and an integrated operational activity. The underground rooms and development drives would be progressively closed using bulk salt from the mining operations.

6.3.2  Decline access

The mine will be accessed by a 5.5km long decline, development by drill and blast. Any aquifer contacts during construction would grouted and sealed prior to development into the salt bed.

A decline sealing system will be developed for the closure of the mine which will be designed to limit entry of water into the facility and restricts the release of contaminants. Decline plugs and seals will address fluid transport paths through the opening itself, along the interface between the seal material and the host rock surrounding the opening.

The decline sealing system will comprise multiple elements that will completely fill the decline with engineered materials possessing high density and low permeability. Examples of potential system elements are as follows:

- **Decline Bottom Monolith/Plug** - At the bottom of the decline a salt saturated concrete monolith is positioned. A salt-saturated concrete or ‘saltcrete’ is specified and placed using conventional slickline construction methodologies where the concrete is batched on surface.
- **Clay Columns/Seals** - A clay/bentonite material will be placed at each aquifer contact (which would have previously been grouted during the construction phase).
- **Earthen/General Fill** - The remainder of the decline will be filled with the stockpiled spoil which would have been segregated during construction allowing placement within the respective geological strata within the decline.

6.3.3  Shafts

The mine development will also include two shafts each of 5 m finished internal diameter. The purpose of each shaft can be summarised as follows:

- An 860 m Air Intake Shaft, also used for personnel conveyance and salt hoisting
• An 820 m Air Exhaust Shaft

A shaft sealing system will be developed for the closure of the mine which will be designed to limit entry of water into the facility and restricts the release of contaminants. Shaft seals will address fluid transport paths through the opening itself, along the interface between the seal material and the host rock surrounding the opening.

The shaft sealing system will comprise multiple elements that will completely fill the shaft with engineered materials possessing high density and low permeability. Examples of potential system elements are as follows:

• ** Shaft Bottom Monoliths/Plugs** - At the bottom of each shaft a salt saturated concrete monolith is positioned. A salt-saturated concrete or ‘saltcrete’ is specified and placed using conventional slickline construction methodologies where the concrete is batched on surface.

• **Clay Columns/Seals** - A clay/bentonite material will be placed at each aquifer contact (which would have previously been grouted during the construction phase).

• **Earthen/General Fill** - The remainder of the shaft will be filled with the stockpiled spoil which would have been segregated during construction allowing placement within the respective geological strata within the shaft.

6.4 Accommodation village

The accommodation village will cover a total area of 15 hectares and consists of a car park, workshop, accommodation units, dry mess, offices, and sewage system. It is proposed to sell or donate the dongas and transportable buildings to external parties, or commission a demolition/salvage company to dismantle the village and associated infrastructure.

Where practicable this material will be recycled and removed from site.

Once the camp has been removed any below ground services (i.e. electrical cabling) within 0.5 metre of the surface are to be removed, other deeper services will be cut 0.5 metre below the ground surface and backfilled. Any below ground septic systems will be decommissioned and backfilled. The area will then be re-contoured into the surrounding landscape, ripped and covered with local topsoil to ensure water infiltration, establish a soil profile and vegetation. Once ripping has been completed, any cabling, pipework of other camp items that have been bought to the surface will be collected for disposal.

6.5 Bore field and pipelines

Pipelines will consist of PVC pipe. At closure the pipelines will either be rolled up for removal off site or cut into sections to be shredded for recycling or left if requested by Traditional Owners.

If required, pipeline routes will be ripped to breakup compacted areas that may have formed during the movement of vehicles along the pipeline. Groundwater and monitoring bores will be rehabilitated if they are not transferred to the traditional owners or a third party.
Rehabilitation of the bore holes will encompass:

- The removal of pumping infrastructure.
- The permanent plugging of the holes below surface.
- Reshaping the surface, topsoil placement and ripping of any compacted areas.

Both groundwater and monitoring bores will be decommissioned in accordance to the Departments of Mines and Energy advisory note titled “Construction and Rehabilitation of Exploration Drill Sites” and the document titled “Minimum Construction Requirements for Water Bores in Australian, Edition 3.

6.6 **Borrow pits**

Borrow pits will be identified around the site, specifically to support the construction of roads and bulk earthwork pads. The location of the borrow pits will be finalised following surface site investigations.
Chapter 5 identifies a number of rehabilitation strategies. Tellus must demonstrate that these strategies can be resourced with the required volumes of rehabilitation materials. Table 7-1 has been constructed to document the required rehabilitation balance.

### Table 7-1 Rehabilitation spoil budget and materials balance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rehabilitation area</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Volume taken (m³)</th>
<th>Volume required for rehabilitation (m³)</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apirnta Facility</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>405,900</td>
<td>405,900</td>
<td>Volumes to be confirmed following detailed design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandler Facility (above ground)</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>494,280</td>
<td>494,280</td>
<td>Volumes to be confirmed following detailed design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandler Facility (below ground)</td>
<td>Salt</td>
<td>8,834,602</td>
<td>883,460</td>
<td>Volumes to be confirmed following detailed design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation village</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>29,928</td>
<td>29,928</td>
<td>Volumes to be confirmed following detailed design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bore field and pipelines</td>
<td>Topsoil</td>
<td>112,680</td>
<td>112,680</td>
<td>Volumes to be confirmed following detailed design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrow pits</td>
<td>Topsoil and subsoils</td>
<td>1,940,000</td>
<td>388,000</td>
<td>Volumes to be confirmed following detailed design</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As detailed in Table 7-1, an estimated 1,430,788m³ of topsoil stockpiled on site will be sufficient for the surface rehabilitation required. Sufficient rock recovered from the construction of the mine decline and shafts will be utilised to provide clay lining for any detention basins required.

Core logging has identified three main rock types (Sandstone, Siltstone and Claystone) which can all be utilised in surface construction activities and underground closure.
8 POST-MINING

8.1 Post-mining land use
The Mineral Lease covers an area of 90,000 ha with the proposed underground footprint of the mine estimated at 403 ha (including decline and shaft pillar areas). Land within the Proposal area is on pastoral land which is used for cattle grazing. It is expected this activity will continue in the post-mining phase.

8.2 Closure objectives

8.2.1 Compliance
Ensure that the rehabilitation for closure of the Proposal is compliant with all commitments and conditions, as specified by the DME and EPA and all legally binding commitments made with the DME and the CLC. These commitments are yet to be finalised.

8.2.2 Infrastructure and rubbish clean-up
During the decommissioning and through closure, wastes and material produced through dismantling will be managed consistent with waste minimisation principles and the Proposal’s Waste Management Plan. Rubbish will be either removed from site or disposed of in agreement with relevant regulatory agencies and stakeholders.

Infrastructure will be removed from its location with the only infrastructure to remain on site to be that agreed to by regulators and the CLC for the purposes of future use e.g. roads.

All disturbed surfaces will be rehabilitated to facilitate future specified land use.

8.2.3 Physical safety
The rehabilitated landscape and landforms are to be designed to minimise potential harm or injury to employees, fauna and the public during and post closure. Landforms and excavations are made safe to allow ongoing access for post mining land uses (cattle grazing and general access).

8.2.4 Stability of landforms and landscape (including visual amenity)
The waste rock dump areas will be constructed to be safe, stable and non-polluting with any adverse materials encapsulated within the waste rock dump to prevent environmental impacts.

In the unlikely event run-off or seepage does occur from detention ponds, water shall be of a quality compatible with baseline water values determined during preparation of the EIS.
8.2.5 Revegetated or otherwise improved

Vegetation will be rehabilitated naturally by local seed dispersal and seed germination from seed banks stored in topsoil to ensure similarity in species composition of landforms to the surrounding natural environment.

The aim of the re-vegetation will be to re-establish a rehabilitated ecosystem with equivalent functions and resilience to the surrounding ecosystems. This will allow integration into the future land use while enabling recovery after fire events.

Progressive rehabilitation, where practicable, will ensure the viability of the soil properties of the stockpiled topsoil ensuring the support of the target ecosystem in rehabilitation.

The surface and groundwater levels and quality will reflect background levels and water chemistry.

8.2.6 Low risk to biota

Rehabilitated areas are to have native vegetation and similar landscape to that of the surrounding natural landscape including rocky slopes and drainage areas, providing natural habitat for fauna.

Removal of any obstructions (i.e. infrastructure, pipelines etc.) to enable movement of native fauna throughout the landscape.
9 CLOSURE IMPLEMENTATION

9.1 Overview

Closure objectives are focused on creating a safe, stable, non-polluting and sustainable landforms for Pastoralists and Traditional Owner uses and, to reinstate “natural” ecosystems as similar as possible to the original ecosystem.

To determine whether the rehabilitated areas are meeting this objective, monitoring will be conducted during the post-closure period in all rehabilitated areas to measure landscape function over time comparative to the natural landscape.

This monitoring will be undertaken until it is demonstrated that the rehabilitation has comparable functioning to the surrounding landscape.

The aspects of closure are identified in Chapter 5.

9.2 Progressive rehabilitation

Where practical, Tellus proposes to undertake progressive rehabilitation across the Proposal sites listed in Chapter 6.

9.3 Underground domain closure work program

Underground storage and disposal rooms will have been progressively sealed during operations at the point when materials have been deemed not to have any further potential use. At the point of closure engineered seals will be placed in the shafts and decline to control any potential pathway into the underground working.

The precise position and design of these seals will be determined during future work stages. The PFS assumes major seals towards the bottom of the shafts and decline above the salt horizon as well as secondary seals adjacent to any aquifers encountered in the shafts and decline. The PFS sealing strategy is shown in Figure 9-1 below.

9.4 Unexpected closure or temporary closure

Tellus will ensure that there is adequate resourcing available financial assurance and insurance for rehabilitation, particularly for the premature closure of the mine (refer to Chapter 11).

During operations the site will be environmentally bonded under the Mining Managing Act to ensure complete rehabilitation at any stage of the project if the mine is closed prematurely.

In the occurrence of unexpected closure, the site would be made secure, safe and an accelerated closure process will be implemented in accordance to the current plans.
Figure 9-1 PFS sealing strategy
9.5 Accommodation camp closure work program

Accommodation at the site is located within Tellus’ leases, located a few kilometres from the operational area. The village is designed for approximately 180 people (to be refined in further studies) and includes en-suite rooms, wet and dry mess, gymnasium, outdoor relaxation area and supporting infrastructure.

All infrastructure associated with the accommodation camp will be decommissioned and removed from site, and their footprints ripped, vegetated and fertilised (if applicable) and then monitored for a period of two years. A description of the closure work program for the accommodation camp domain is outlined in Table 9-5.

Table 10-1 Closure task register – accommodation camp domain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disturbance area</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disturbance area</td>
<td>16 hectares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity types in this domain</td>
<td>Accommodation camp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current status of rehabilitation</td>
<td>Not commenced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated closure date</td>
<td>Year 30 from start of construction (assuming a 4 year construction phase and a 25 year operations phase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicable closure objectives</td>
<td>• Vegetation in rehabilitated areas are comparable as reasonably practicable to the analogue site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mining related infrastructure removed from site during the Decommissioning Phase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicable landform design</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicable completion criteria</td>
<td>• At the completion of the 10 year rehabilitation monitoring period vegetation composition is comparable to the species diversity/richness and structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• All plants used in rehabilitation to be of local provenance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No declared pests to be introduced into the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• At mine closure no mining related infrastructure is left on the tenement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicable general implementation strategies</td>
<td>• Collection of Baseline Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Research Investigation and Trials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Materials Handling and Utilisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Identification of Potential Contamination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Progressive Rehabilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key considerations for closure</td>
<td>• Removal of buildings and structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Disconnection of power, water and fuel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Removal of concrete and imported fill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Removal of fences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Disturbance area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Clean-up of general wastes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Obtaining volumes of fill, needed to fill any excavations back to natural soil surface.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key tasks for premature closure

The accommodation camp will be secured and any power, water and fuel supplies shut off.

Performance monitoring

Vegetation monitoring as per Section 10.1.

A rehabilitation schedule for the accommodation camp domain is presented in Table 9-6.

**Table 10-2 Accommodation camp domain rehabilitation schedule**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Last use of all camp facilities</td>
<td>Year 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decommissioning of the majority of the camp</td>
<td>Year 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ripping of soil surface</td>
<td>Year 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spread of growth medium</td>
<td>Year 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of vegetation</td>
<td>Year 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring of vegetation (10 years)</td>
<td>Year 30 – Year 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion Criteria Met</td>
<td>Year 41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10 CLOSURE MONITORING AND MAINTENANCE

10.1 Vegetation monitoring

10.1.1 Methodology

The methodology appropriate for monitoring vegetation from year 30 to 40 will be based on the considered industry practice at the time. Currently the methodologies used by the industry include:

- **Point / Line intercept** — Uses a large number of observations to estimate cover values with high precision.
- **Quadrat monitoring** — Square or rectangle areas in the vegetation are examined and information regarding cover, frequency and diversity are collected.
- **Landscape Function Analysis** — measures the patchiness and quality of patch zones along a transect.
- **Plotless– vegetation monitoring** — the Point Cantered Quarter method estimates density. A set of points (usually positioned along a transect to traverse the area) is initially selected. The area around each point is divided into four 90° quadrants, and the plant closest to the point in each quadrant is identified. The distance between the central point and selected plant in each quadrant is measured, and then averaged across the four to represent the distance at each sample point. At the conclusion of data collection, the average distance for all sample points is calculated (University of Arizona, 2016).
- **Photo–point monitoring** — photos are taken at fixed locations every monitoring event to visually see the change in vegetation.
- **Remote sensing** — a drone or similar may be used to look at the rehabilitation from a ‘birds eye view’. GIS data can be collected and compared between monitoring events to see the change in vegetation cover.
- **Relevés method** — a list of plants in a delimited plot of vegetation, with information on species cover and a substrate and other abiotic features of the plot (Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, 2013).
- **Diameter at breast (DBH) height** — used as a measure of tree maturity, involves measuring the breast and height of a tree.

The method chosen will be part of an integrated approach designed for the specific climate of the site. The method or combination of methods will be repeatable (and auditable) and supported by studies and scientific literature. The methodology will also be discussed with the regulator prior to implementation.
10.1.2 Quality control

An analogue site is an unmined feature against which a mined feature may be compared (DITR, 2006). Two analogue sites will be setup and monitored, as per the same methodology as the rehabilitation sites. The purpose of the analogue sites will be to act as a control site, and used for comparison of monitored parameters.

10.1.3 Monitoring frequency

Monitoring frequency has yet to be determined. However, seasonal monitoring is considered appropriate given baseline surveys are undertaken during seasonal changes.

10.1.4 Reporting of results

Results will be graphed against historical monitoring results. Graphs and raw data will be included in Annual Environmental Reports to the DME. An assessment of the results of the monitoring in relation to achieving the completion criteria will be discussed in Annual Environmental Reports for each revegetated area.

10.1.5 Remedial strategy

Targeted remediation of poor-performing rehabilitation areas may be necessary. Tellus will consult a botanist to determine the appropriate remedial strategy for rehabilitation should the results of the monitoring not be trending towards the completion criteria. Remedial strategies may include; amendments to the soil, more seed broadcasting, weed management and feral animal controls.

10.2 Surface and groundwater monitoring

A surface and groundwater monitoring plan would be undertaken during the post-closure period. Details of both monitoring plans are outlined in the Proposal’s draft Water Management Plan.
11 FINANCIAL PROVISIONING FOR CLOSURE

The following section outlines the financial provisioning for closure of the Chandler Project.

Closure cost estimates were calculated using the NT government calculator in an MS Excel spreadsheet as part of Tellus’ overall financial planning of the project, and the final estimates are summarised below.

The costings were estimated based on the size of areas within each domain to be closed (as defined during the pre-feasibility phase of the project development) and 2016 rates. Rates account for; supply, labour, construction equipment and freight. The rate multiplied by the size of the area (quantity) provided the cost estimate.

The cost estimate is then considered in terms of growth (inflated) over the projects life (i.e. growth of the rates and interest earned). The outcome is a total estimated provision at the end of the project life.

Tellus recognise the importance of updating the financial provisioning cost estimates with each revision of the MCP, to ensure closure is included in Tellus annual financial budgets.

Tellus will provide appropriate financial assurance for the expected closure costs of the Chandler Project. Tellus will agree the final legal structure of the financial assurances to be put in place following detailed legal, tax and accounting advice and following consultation with relevant government agencies. Such financial assurance packages will also be considered on a holistic basis with other financial assurances to be provided for the Project (i.e. for the institutional control period).

The key aspects of Tellus’ financial provisioning for closure are as follows:

- Future closure costs based on disturbance within the rolling Mine Management Plan will be funded through an upfront bond
- NT government calculator used and estimates $13 million is required in upfront bonds (which is $14 million by the time the bond is paid due to inflation)
- Allowance of $402,000 per annum is made over life of operations, totalling $16m over life
- Additionally, interest on the account is earned of $19 million over life

Total nominal value of Tellus’ provisioning for closure at end of operations is $48 million
All closure information and data, including previous versions of this MCP will be stored in Tellus’ Environmental Management System (EMS) which is located on the Q drive of the Sydney server. The Tellus EMS is accredited to ISO 14001 standard and is regularly audited internally, and annually audited by an external party.

Each mine closure record, including monitoring reports and raw data will be saved electronically in the EMS with a unique reference number. Technical studies as outlined in Section 7 are saved electronically in the EMS.

Appropriate data management policies (including off site data back up and security) are in place.
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Executive summary

A geomechanical evaluation of the salt horizon of Chandler salt mine, taking into consideration the time-dependent mechanical behaviour of the Chandler Halite formation, was carried out by implementing appropriate numerical investigations. The objective of the geomechanical studies of the planned Chandler mine was achieved by employing engineering judgement in analysing the results of the geomechanical modelling, by making use of established experience and knowledge in utilising appropriate parameters concerning the strength and the constitutive response of the Chandler Halite, and by realistically modelling the geometry, the in situ geostatic stresses and the boundary conditions that characterise the planned room and pillar mine layout.

The finite difference method was successfully used for the numerical simulation of the planned Chandler mine in investigating the development of the subsurface stress concentrations and creep response of the Chandler Halite that surrounds the planned room and pillar mine layout. With respect to the geomechanical response of the planned Chandler mine, a significant element is the Jay Creek Limestone strata that overlay the Chandler formation, which have an average thickness of more than 250 m. Provided that no major faults or prevalent systems of significant discontinuities exist, the Jay Creek Limestone will act as an enormous thick plate, with built-in-ends, that is expected to contribute significantly to the stability of the planned excavations.

Examination of the distribution of the principal stresses, for the first 23 years, indicates that the minor principal stress is essentially very close to the compressive regime. Consequently, during the first 23 years following the excavation of the panels, the possibility of developing in the roof of the rooms tensile stresses that may exceed the tensile strength of the Chandler Halite is almost unlikely. However, the excessive creep closure that has been identified in the roof of the rooms next to edge of the panels will, in all probability, result in the development of tensile cracks.

Calculation of the Strength Factor against shear failure for the salt pillars has shown that, even at the early life of the mine, the Strength Factor values indicate no shear failure. The identified Strength Factor values demonstrate that the Chandler Halite of the pillars, when subjected to the stress concentrations caused by the excavations, is able to endure shear stresses over a period of thirty years. Moreover, assessment of the distribution of the minor principal stress and the Von Mises stress above the salt mine provided evidence that the 20 m thickness of salt, which is left between the roof of the rooms and the top of the Chandler Halite, prevents the establishment of a pathway to the biosphere. Essentially, the roof salt above the underground excavations constitutes an adequate barrier that prevents the development of migration paths for potential contaminants (associated with the underground storage operations) towards the non-salt formations.

Practical experience from in situ measurements and observations concerning underground openings in salt formations, suggests that the identified order of magnitude of the rates of creep displacements, both along the vertical and horizontal directions, are excessive and they are expected to have a long term negative effect on the serviceability limit state of the underground excavations. The identified rates of room creep convergence are very high, indicating that the roof of the rooms (especially those rooms located near the edges of the panel) may be unstable in the long term.

In summary, the preliminary assessment of the geomechanical conditions of the planned Chandler mine indicates that, although the 15 m wide rib pillars are expected to accept the high stress concentrations while maintaining their long term stability, the 15 m width of the roof span of the rooms is considered to be too large and will potentially result in unacceptable creep convergence of the rooms. It is important of course to take into consideration that the derived preliminary conclusions are based on the use of assumed material parameters for the Chandler Halite which clearly have an effect both on the creep convergence of the rooms and the shear strength of the pillars. Although the assumed material parameters are based on well-established practical experience derived from designing and monitoring underground openings in salt formations, once laboratory test results from the Chandler Halite will be made available, there will be a need to re-evaluate the investigated geomechanical conditions.

Taking into consideration that the 15 m width of the roof span of the rooms is considered to be too large, it is recommended to undertake a series of parametric studies to determine the maximum permissible roof span that will provide the requisite long term stability while satisfying the requirements of the serviceability limit state.
The barrier pillars that form the boundaries of the panels, should be able to withstand all anticipated loading conditions encountered during panel development and also should provide adequate isolation to minimise the structural interaction of adjacent panels. The configuration of the planned barrier pillars, concerning their proposed width, is considered to be insufficient especially since there are plans to reduce their cross-sectional area by driving ventilation tunnels through them. It is recommended to investigate the geomechanical conditions of the central barrier pillar in addition to the other barrier pillars to optimise their required width.

Assessment of the stress distribution around the excavated rooms indicates high stress concentrations limited around the corners of the rooms. The adopted geomechanical model employed rectangular openings and the stress distribution plots are based on square corners. To minimise the effect of the square corners it is recommended to consider using a continuous miner equipped with a rotating drum cutting head system comprising specially designed cutter pick configuration that will allow the rooms to be excavated with rounded angles at the corners of the cut.

The identified stress gradients above the mine should be used as guide to decide the particular depths from which we should select core samples to be used for rock testing. Similarly, in planning the future rock mechanics laboratory test programme, the confining pressures that will be used in the triaxial compression tests and the deviatoric stresses that will be used in the required triaxial creep tests should be determined by considering the identified stress concentrations. As part of the future recommendations, consideration should also be given to investigate the influence of the sequence of the excavation operations on the long term stability of the room and pillar layout, by carrying out a series or parametric geomechanical numerical analyses.

The benefit of the active support, provided by the proposed post-tensioned resin grouted rockbolts, and also by the passive support, exerted both by the packaged and the hydraulically backfilled waste materials, is important since it is expected that these measures will bring under control the development of the identified tensile regime in the roof of the rooms and the shear stresses near the walls of the pillars. Another positive measure that is expected to contribute to the overall stability of the underground excavations is the plan to stow with crushed salt all the main access roads when they are no longer required for use.
1. Introduction

Atkins were commissioned by Douglas Partners Pty Ltd to undertake the geomechanical evaluation of the salt horizon of Chandler salt mine, taking into consideration the time-dependent mechanical behaviour of the Chandler Halite formation, by implementing appropriate numerical investigations. For this reason, we have investigated and assessed the influence of the geometry of the planned mine layout on the geomechanical stability of the salt horizon to allow us to draw the conclusions we have reached in this report.

This report presents the results of the numerical modelling of the planned mine layout, which was undertaken by making use of the following information that was provided by Douglas Partners:

- the geometry of the planned mine layout (i.e. corresponding depth, dimensions and shape of the room and pillar layout);
- the local geology as established from the available technical report by Douglas Partners (2016);
- the results of the analyses concerning the non-soluble material of the Chandler Halite (Terra Search, 2011); and
- the core photographs from the exploratory borehole CH001A (ErcosPlan, 2009).

In addition, use was made of salt mechanics data and results from \textit{in situ} measurements, derived from previous geomechanical studies carried out by Atkins.

The stability assessment of underground excavations in salt formations, involves a number of components that require careful consideration. These include:

- physical and mechanical properties of the geological materials that surround the underground excavations;
- information on the geostatic stress field conditions to which the geological formations are subjected; and
- computational methods for predicting and/or evaluating the geomechanical performance of the underground excavations.

A mine layout in the Chandler Halite formation may be considered unfit for use for underground storage purposes when it reaches the limit state in which it infringes on one of the criteria governing its performance or use. Such limit states are directly associated with the salt excavations’ ability or inability:

- to prevent the development of migration paths for potential contaminants (associated with the underground storage operations) towards the non-salt formations, and
- to contain the stored materials,

which typically depends on a number of factors. The significance and influence of these factors may be addressed by comparing the results of the applied geomechanical numerical modelling of the planned mine layout with the appropriate relevant criteria.

Following a holistic approach for the geomechanical analysis of the planned mine layout in the Chandler Halite formation, the implemented numerical modelling employed its site-specific geomechanical characterisation incorporating:

- the proposed depth and geometrical configuration of the planned room and pillar mine layout;
- the geological formations involving the stratigraphy and geology of the Chandler mine location;
- the \textit{in situ} geostatic stress parameters in relation to the respective gradient of the vertical and horizontal components; and
- the physical and mechanical characteristics of the geological materials that surround the underground excavations (including the shear and tensile strength as well as the creep behaviour, in the case of salt).
2. Geological succession

The successful development of an underground excavation is crucially dependent on knowing the geological environment. A good understanding of the stratigraphy and geological structure is therefore essential.

The generalised geological succession that is used in the geomechanical modelling of the planned mine layout was based on the information given in Appendix C of the report by Douglas Partners (2016) from which a description of the identified strata, ranging between 502 m bgl and 825 m bgl, is summarised in Table 2-1. Moreover, concerning the geological formations encountered from 825 m bgl and below, additional information, shown also in Table 2-1, was taken from the report produced by Wakelin-King et al. (1992).

Table 2-1 Stratigraphic column and description of the geological formations in the Chandler mine location from a depth of 502 m bgl

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth range [m bgl]</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Stratigraphic interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>502 - 607</td>
<td>SILSTONE: banded/laminated multi-coloured (brown, green, blue, grey, yellow) silstone. The initial finely laminated silstone beds are calcareous- probably calcitic cement. Intermittent fine to medium grained sandstone beds. Becoming weakly to non-calcareous with depth- probably becoming dolomitic as cement is hard and carbonitic in appearance. Interbedded dark red brown clastic silstone with paler grey/green/blue dolostone/dolomitic silstone - paler units are harder. Minor bioturbation in places. Dolomite patches, blebs and nodules appear at approximately 572.5 m bgl, narrow veins concordant with bedding also begin. Occasional discordant dolomite veins. From approximately 555 m bgl crystalline dolomite becomes apparent.</td>
<td>Jay Creel Limestone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>607-772</td>
<td>SILSTONE: Interbedded dark red brown and pale bluish grey units. Red brown is silstone and pale unit is dolostone. Only occasional multi-coloured laminae- predominantly dm scale and repetitive beds. Common dolomite blotsches, veins (discordant) and laminae (concordant), probably 1-5% of core mass. Red brown clastic silstone grades to very fine grained silstone in parts. Minor calcareous laminae in parts. Chert nodules appear at 672.5 m bgl. Natural breaks/fractures occur along narrow stylolites in dolostone. Dolostone beds become hard/partially silicified with depth. At approximately 728 m bgl fractured dolostone with chert and dolomite fracture fill. Fairly homogeneous red brown silstone 720.5 m bgl – 725 m bgl.</td>
<td>Jay Creel Limestone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>772-780</td>
<td>SILTY CLAYSTONE: Dark grey to medium grey finely laminated claystone very similar in texture and colour to 720 m bgl .726 m bgl interval in borehole CH003. Anhydrite blottches to 20 mm diameter abundant in final 1.5 m. Secondary gypsum growth post drilling.</td>
<td>Jay Creel Limestone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>780-825</td>
<td>SILSTONE: red brown to dark brown laminated silstone grading to silty claystone; micaceous in part. Interbedded with pale grey dolostone- homogeneous and finely bedded In parts- some coarse anhydrite crystal clusters/aggregates visible in dolostone 100 mm chert at 799.8 m bgl - fractured; also a large nodule at 807.4 m bgl. Appearance of vughy fractures in dolostone at 807.4 m bgl, halite appears as fracture fill at 811.5 m bgl. Vughy red silstone with halite matrix In parts 818 m bgl - 825.3 m bgl.</td>
<td>Jay Creel Limestone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>825-1,090</td>
<td>HALITE: The target halite horizon is between the depths of 825 m bgl and 860 m bgl. The halite is light pink, coarsely crystalline with interbedded reddish, clayey silstone and scattered quartz, potassiumfeldspar and some green biotite grains. Some of the quartz grains have reddish iron coatings. Very fine anhydrite and carbonate crystals occur throughout the salt. Mudstone, silstone and dolomite are interbedded with the salt units. The mudstone is haematitic. The silstone is halitic and anhydritic with angular to rounded coarse grained ferruginous clastics. The dolomite is ferruginous, cryptocrystalline and slightly calcareous.</td>
<td>Jay Creel Limestone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,090 – 1,540 estimated</td>
<td>SILSTONE, SANDSTONE: The Winnall Beds are a monotonous sequence of greenish-grey to reddish brown shale and silstone interlaminated with very thin sandstone streaks. Rare dolomite bands occur near the contact with the Bitter Springs Formation. Green biotite and muscovite are aligned parallel to bedding planes. Grains are cemented by chlorite, limonite, haematite, and pyrite. Very fine dolomite crystals occur throughout the Formation. Sandstone is present in fine laminations grading to shale and silstone. The sandstone is composed of fine to very fine grained, angular, well sorted quartz, some potassium feldspar, very rare albite, igneous and sericitised rock grains and muscovite. Authigenic or autochthonous glauconite occurs in grains, pellets, in irregular aggregates moulded around quartz particles and as staining in the matrix. The glauconite is associated with phosphatic grains. Heavy minerals form the accessories. The cement is chlorite, as well as some kaolinite, sericite, intergranular quartz and a very small amount of dolomite.</td>
<td>Winnall Beds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The geostatic stress field

The *in situ* geostatic stresses in the earth’s crust have been widely recognised as a basic parameter necessary in the engineering design of underground structures. More specifically, the analysis of the geomechanical stability of excavations in salt beds is greatly dependent upon the magnitudes of these primitive, otherwise known as geostatic stresses, naturally existing in the underground formations before the caverns were leached. In general, the larger these geostatic stresses are, the larger are the induced stress concentrations to which the geological materials are subjected.

The geostatic state of stress within an undisturbed and continuous geological formation is expected to depend on two stress fields:

- the lithostatic or gravitational stress field, which may be defined in terms of its principal stress components $\sigma_v$, $\sigma_H$ and $\sigma_h$, acting approximately along the vertical and the two horizontal directions respectively (see sketch below), and
- the stress field related to the possible presence of tectonic forces or locked-in stresses that may act in any direction.

Stresses due to tectonic loading are superimposed on the lithostatic stress field, and will lead in general to a change in magnitude and direction of the principal stresses. In areas which are tectonically inactive and in the absence of any specific knowledge on the magnitude and direction of the tectonic stresses, which is usually the case, it is acceptable to assume for design purposes that the geostatic stress field is simply lithostatic.

The vertical stress component $\sigma_v$ resulting from the weight of the superincumbent strata increases linearly with vertical depth. If there are $n$ layers of geological formations overlying an underground excavation, each of thickness $t_i$ and density $\rho_i$, then the compressive (i.e. negative) vertical stress may be estimated using the following relationship:

$$\sigma_v = -g \sum_{i=1}^{n} \rho_i t_i$$

Equation 1

where $g = 9.80665$ m/s$^2$ is the standard gravitational acceleration.

Measurements of vertical stress around the world (as published by Brown & Hoek, 1978) confirm that this relationship is valid although, as illustrated in Figure 3-1, there is a significant amount of scatter in the measurements.

The geostatic vertical stress gradient of 0.027 MPa/m, shown in Figure 3-1, corresponds to an average overburden density of 2,750 kg/m$^3$. Nevertheless, a value of 0.025 MPa/m has been used in the geomechanical modelling of the Chandler salt mine, as recommended by Douglas Partners.
Moreover, an estimate of the geostatic stress components $\sigma_h$ and $\sigma_v$, from rock strength and tele-viewer breakout, as identified in the exploratory borehole CH001A by Douglas Partners (2016), suggests that the horizontal geostatic stresses may be calculated (in MPa) by the following relationships:

$$\sigma_h = 0.75 \sigma_H$$  \hspace{1cm} \text{Equation 2}$$

$$\sigma_H = 1.5 \sigma_v + 0.5$$  \hspace{1cm} \text{Equation 3}

On the other hand, the assumption that the in situ stress state in salt is isotropic (i.e. $\sigma_h^{\text{max}} = \sigma_h^{\text{min}} = \sigma_v$) is generally accepted since it is well established that salt is a geological material characterised by a time dependent deformational response. Results from more than 200 laboratory creep experiments (Hunsche, 1981), using salt samples taken from a number of localities, confirmed that the steady state creep strain ($\dot{\varepsilon}_S$) is related to the differential stress ($\sigma_1 - \sigma_3$) by the following Arrhenius’ relationship:

$$\dot{\varepsilon}_S = A \exp \left(-\frac{Q}{RT}\right) (\sigma_1 - \sigma_3)^n$$  \hspace{1cm} \text{Equation 4}

Where $\sigma_1$ and $\sigma_3$ are the major and minor effective principal stresses (expressed in MPa), $A$ is creep constant (expressed in MPa$^{-n} \text{ d}^{-1}$), $Q$ is the activation energy (expressed in cal/mol), $R = 1.987 \text{ cal/(mol K)}$ is the universal gas constant and $n$ is a dimensionless stress exponent.

Equation 4 indicates that the salt will have a non-zero strain rate as long as $\sigma_1 \neq \sigma_3$. Thus, over long times, especially geological times, creep will continue until $\sigma_1 = \sigma_3$ (i.e. the in situ stress is isotropic). This effect, that long-term creep has in removing any differences in the horizontal and vertical stress components, has been confirmed by in situ investigations (Arnold et al., 1975). For this reason, in the Chandler Halite formation that ranges between 825 m bgl and 1,090 m bgl the geostatic stress have been modelled to be isotropic, while in the non-salt formations Equations 2 and 3 are considered to be valid.
4. Modelling of the geological materials

4.1. The Drucker-Prager plasticity model

The Drucker-Prager model (Drucker & Prager, 1952) is used for geological materials that yield when subjected to shear loading and the corresponding shear failure envelope is expressed by the following relationship:

\[ f^s = \sqrt{J_2} + \frac{1}{3} \sigma_1 - k_0 \]

while the tensile failure is given by the following tension yield function:

\[ f^s = \sigma_t - \sigma_3 \]

where \( \sigma_t \) is the tensile strength.

Examination of Equation 5 indicates that that the yield stress depends on the two stress invariants:

- the first invariant \( (I_1) \) of the Cauchy stress tensor equal to:
  \[ I_1 = \sigma_1 + \sigma_2 + \sigma_3 \]
  \[ \text{Equation 7} \]

and

- the second invariant \( (J_2) \) of the deviatoric stress tensor equal to
  \[ J_2 = \frac{1}{6} \left( (\sigma_1 - \sigma_2)^2 + (\sigma_1 - \sigma_3)^2 + (\sigma_2 - \sigma_3)^2 \right) \]
  \[ \text{Equation 8} \]

where: \( \sigma_1, \sigma_2 \) and \( \sigma_3 \) are the major, intermediate and minor principal stresses respectively and where \( q_0 \) and \( k_0 \) are constant material properties. The parameter \( q_0 \) corresponds to \( \frac{1}{3} \phi \) of the slope of the Drucker-Prager failure envelope and the parameter \( k_0 \) is the intercept of the Drucker-Prager failure envelope with the \( \sqrt{J_2} \) axis.

The Drucker-Prager model belongs to the family of the plastic models which potentially involve some degree of permanent, path-dependent deformation (failure): a consequence of the nonlinearity of the stress-strain relation that governs its constitutive response. The model is characterised by its yield function, hardening/softening functions and flow rule. The yield function defines the stress combination for which plastic flow takes place and is represented by a combination of limiting surfaces in a generalised stress space with points below or on the surface being characterised by an incremental elastic or plastic behaviour, respectively. The adopted plastic flow formulation rests on basic assumptions from plasticity theory that the total strain increment may be decomposed into elastic and plastic parts, with only the elastic part contributing to the stress increment by means of an elastic law. In addition, both plastic and elastic strain increments are taken to be coaxial with the current principal axes of the stresses (this is only valid if elastic strains are small compared to plastic strains during plastic flow). The flow rule specifies the direction of the plastic strain increment vector as that normal to the potential surface - it is called associated if the potential and yield functions coincide, and non-associated otherwise. For the Drucker-Prager model a shear yield function and a non-associated shear flow rule are used. In addition, the failure envelope is characterised by a tensile yield function with associated shear flow rule.

In the implemented numerical analysis the out-of-plane stress is taken into consideration in the formulation that is expressed in three-dimensional terms. In the numerical implementation of the model, an elastic trial (or “elastic guess”) for the stress increment is first computed from the total strain increment using the incremental form of Hooke’s law. The corresponding stresses are then evaluated. If they violate the yield criterion (i.e., the stress point representation lies above the yield function in the generalised stress space), plastic deformations take place. In this case, only the elastic part of the strain increment can contribute to the stress increment; the latter is corrected by using the plastic flow rule to ensure that the stresses lie on the composite yield function.

4.2. The Hoek-Brown failure criterion

Reliable estimates of the strength and deformation characteristics of rock masses are required for almost any form of analysis used for the design of underground excavations. Hoek & Brown (1980a, 1980b) proposed a method for obtaining estimates of the strength of rock masses, based upon an assessment of the interlocking
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of rock blocks and the condition of the surfaces between these blocks. This method was modified over the years in order to meet the needs of users who were applying it to problems that were not considered when the original criterion was developed (Hoek 1983, Hoek & Brown 1988).

The Hoek-Brown failure criterion is an empirical relation that characterises the stress conditions that lead to failure in intact rock and rock masses and has been used very successfully in design approaches that use limit equilibrium solutions. The “generalised” Hoek-Brown criterion (Hoek & Brown, 1980a and 1998) that has been used in modelling the shear strength of the non-salt geological materials encountered in the Chandler mine location - adopting the convention of positive compressive stress - is:

\[ \sigma_1 = \sigma_3 + \sigma_{ci} \left\{ m_b \frac{\sigma_3}{\sigma_{ci}} + s \right\}^a \]  \hspace{1cm} \text{Equation 9}

where \( \sigma_1 \) and \( \sigma_3 \) are the major and minor effective principal stresses at failure, \( m_b \) is the value of the Hoek-Brown constant for the rock mass, \( s \) and \( a \) are constants which depend upon the rock mass characteristics and can be related to the Geological Strength Index and rock damage (Hoek et al., 2002), and \( \sigma_{ci} \) is the uniaxial compressive strength of the intact rock.

Note that the criterion shown in Equation 9, does not depend on the intermediate principal stress, \( \sigma_2 \), implying that the failure envelope is not isotropic.

4.3. The concept of the Strength Factor for the Chandler Halite

To evaluate whether or not salt fracturing is likely to occur around the investigated underground excavations, the available strength of the modelled Chandler Halite must be compared to the induced stresses on a point-by-point basis around the openings. In general, the ratio of available strength to induced stress is referred to as the ‘factor of safety’.

The traditional method of calculating the Factor of Safety has been to express the ratio of the peak strength (i.e. maximum permitted value of the major principal stress, \( \sigma_1 \)) to the calculated value of \( \sigma_1 \), at a point as determined from the model. The maximum permitted value of \( \sigma_1 \) is calculated from the employed strength criterion, based on the calculated value of the confining stress, \( \sigma_3 \), at the same point.

The Strength Factor, on the other hand, is a ratio which expresses available strength and induced stress in terms of deviatoric stress. That is, the allowable maximum shear stress divided by existing shear stress at a point.

As is evident from the example shown in Figure 4-1, in assessing the loading of a pillar there is a subtle difference between the calculated Factor of Safety and Strength Factor. Further deliberations on the difference between factor of safety and Strength Factor may be found in the publication by McCreath & Diederichs (1994).

To assess the geomechanical stability of the investigated room and pillar layout, use was made of the Strength Factors corresponding to the Drucker-Prager failure criterion for shear and tensile strength as specified respectively by Equations 5 and 6. In particular, if the minor principal stress \( \sigma_3 \) is greater or equal than the positive stress, that corresponds to the tensile strength of the geological material, (i.e. if \( \sigma_3 \geq \sigma_t \)) then the Strength Factor is set equal to -1 indicating that tensile failure has occurred. If on the other hand \( \sigma_3 < \sigma_t \) then the Strength Factor is calculated by dividing the shear strength of the geological material by the induced shear stress expressed in terms of \( \sqrt{J_2} \), i.e.:

\[ \text{Strength Factor} = \frac{k_\phi + q_\phi \frac{\sigma_1}{\sigma_3}}{\sqrt{J_2}} \]  \hspace{1cm} \text{Equation 10}
If the *Strength Factor* is greater than 1, this indicates that the salt’s shear strength is greater than the induced shear stress and as such no shear failure occurs. However, if $0 < \text{Strength Factor} \leq 1$, this indicates that the shear stress in the Chandler Halite exceeds the salt’s shear strength signifying that shear failure occurs. Since all three principal stresses ($\sigma_1$, $\sigma_2$ and $\sigma_3$) have an influence on the *Strength Factor*, the calculated *Strength Factor* can be considered three dimensional.

4.4. **The WIPP-creep viscoplastic model**

Appraisal of the safety of underground structures in rock salt formations requires a constitutive law that accurately models the time-dependent mechanical behaviour of rock salt. Rock salt is characterised by a distinctive creep response which is manifested by the fact that it is capable of deforming with time even if the applied stress remains constant.

Creep typically occurs in three stages: primary, or Stage I; secondary, or Stage II and tertiary, or Stage III (see Figure 4-2). At first, as the load is applied the initial elastic strain occurs (virtually instantaneously) but as time passes, under constant stress, the rate of strain reduces. Initially, the strain rate is relatively high but it slows with increasing strain and this period of decelerating strain-rate is identified as primary creep. Resistance to creep increases as the strain rate eventually reaches a minimum and becomes near constant when the secondary creep phase is reached. The rate of creep during the secondary creep phase becomes roughly steady and for this reason this stage is often referred to as steady state creep.
The idealised strain-time curve for a creep test

At the end of Stage II, as the strain rate exponentially increases with strain, the creep rate begins to accelerate resulting in the initiation of a creep fracture process. This final stage of accelerating deformation that leads to a rapid material failure is called Stage III, or tertiary creep.

The creep law that describes the behaviour of rock salt should be valid for wide ranges of stress states, stress magnitude and time, and also for complex stress histories and temperature histories. For this reason the time-dependent behaviour of rock salt in this report has been modelled by combining the non-linear visco-elastic WIPP model (Herrmann et al., 1980a, 1980b) with the Drucker-Prager plasticity model. Of the available plasticity models the Drucker-Prager model is the most compatible with the WIPP-reference creep law, because both models are formulated in terms of the second invariant of the deviatoric stress tensor ($J_2$).

The WIPP creep law is based in the exponential function of Arrhenius according to the following mathematical configuration:

\[ \varepsilon = A \sigma^n \exp \left( -\frac{Q}{RT} \right) t + \varepsilon_a (1 - \exp[-B\dot{\varepsilon}_{ss} t]) \quad \text{for} \quad \dot{\varepsilon}_{ss} \geq \dot{\varepsilon}_{ss}^* \quad \text{Equation 11} \]

\[ \varepsilon = A \sigma^n \exp \left( -\frac{Q}{RT} \right) t + \varepsilon_a \left( \frac{\dot{\varepsilon}_{ss}^*}{\dot{\varepsilon}_{ss}} \right) \left( 1 - \exp[-B\dot{\varepsilon}_{ss} t] \right) \quad \text{for} \quad \dot{\varepsilon}_{ss} \leq \dot{\varepsilon}_{ss}^* \quad \text{Equation 12} \]

where:

- $\varepsilon$ = creep strain expressed in [m/m],
- $t$ = time expressed in [d],
- $T$ = temperature expressed in [K],
- $\sigma$ = applied stress (stress difference) expressed in [MPa],
- $Q$ = activation energy for rock salt expressed in [cal/mol],
- $R = 1.987 \text{ cal/(mol K)}$ is the universal gas constant,
- $n$ = dimensionless stress exponent,
- $A$ = creep constant expressed in [MPa$^{-n}$.d$^{-1}$],
- $B$ = dimensionless empirical material parameter relating the creep rate parameters to the steady-state creep rate,
- $\dot{\varepsilon}_{ss}^*$ = the critical steady-state creep rate expressed in [(m/m).d$^{-1}$], and
- $\varepsilon_a$ = the asymptotic transient strain parameter expressed in [m/m].
In Equations 11 and 12, which express mathematically the WIPP creep law, the first part i.e. the expression:

\[ \epsilon = A \sigma^n \exp\left(-\frac{Q}{RT}\right)t \]

represents the secondary creep, while the remaining terms correspond to the primary creep.
5. Properties of the geological materials

5.1. Non-salt materials

By employing the available descriptive categories of rock mass structure and the respective discontinuities surface conditions, it was possible to estimate the Geological Strength Index (GSI) in accordance with the chart (shown in Figure 5-1), produced by Hoek et al. (2013), by assigning to the non-salt formations respective characteristic GSI ranges. GSI is a system of rock mass characterisation that was developed in engineering rock mechanics to meet the need for reliable input data related to rock mass properties required as input for numerical analysis for designing rocks structures. Different colours have been used in Figure 5-1 to define the GSI range for the:

- Jay Creek Limestone upper formation (502 m bgl – 607 m bgl);
- Jay Creek Limestone lower formation (607 m bgl – 772 m bgl);
- Chandler Silty Claystone and Siltstone formation (772 m bgl – 825 m bgl); and
- Winnall Beds (1,090 m bgl – 1,540 m bgl estimated)

![Figure 5-1: Quantification of GSI by Joint Condition and RQD (after Hoek et al., 2013) for Winnall Beds, Jay Creek Limestone (lower layer), Jay Creek Limestone (upper layer), and Chandler Silty Claystone and Siltstone.](image-url)
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By making use of the rock materials databases incorporated in the programs RocLab (Rocscience, 2004a) and RocSupport (Rocscience, 2004b), besides the identified GSI ranges, the following assumed material properties were assigned to the non-salt formations:

**Jay Creek Limestone upper formation**
Density: 2.56 Mg/m$^3$, Uniaxial compressive strength of the intact rock: 52 MPa, Hoek-Brown material constant $m_i$: 14, Hoek-Brown reduced material constant $m_b$: 3.36, Hoek-Brown rock mass constant $s$: 0.0117, Hoek-Brown rock mass constant $a$: 0.503, Hoek-Brown upper limit of confining stress over which the material no longer dilates $\sigma_3^{cv}$: 16.5 MPa, Young’s modulus: 33.3 GPa, Poisson’s ratio: 0.15.

**Jay Creek Limestone lower formation**
Density: 2.62 Mg/m$^3$, Uniaxial compressive strength of the intact rock: 65 MPa, Hoek-Brown material constant $m_i$: 16, Hoek-Brown reduced material constant $m_b$: 5.48, Hoek-Brown rock mass constant $s$: 0.0357, Hoek-Brown rock mass constant $a$: 0.501, Hoek-Brown upper limit of confining stress over which the material no longer dilates $\sigma_3^{cv}$: 27.5 MPa, Young’s modulus: 48 GPa, Poisson’s ratio: 0.16.

**Chandler Silty Claystone and Siltstone formation**
Density: 2.59 Mg/m$^3$, Uniaxial compressive strength of the intact rock: 58 MPa, Hoek-Brown material constant $m_i$: 16, Hoek-Brown reduced material constant $m_b$: 5.48, Hoek-Brown rock mass constant $s$: 0.0067, Hoek-Brown rock mass constant $a$: 0.504, Hoek-Brown upper limit of confining stress over which the material no longer dilates $\sigma_3^{cv}$: 17 MPa, Young’s modulus: 42 GPa, Poisson’s ratio: 0.17.

**Winnall Beds**
Density: 2.71 Mg/m$^3$, Uniaxial compressive strength of the intact rock: 70 MPa, Hoek-Brown material constant $m_i$: 17, Hoek-Brown reduced material constant $m_b$: 8.32, Hoek-Brown rock mass constant $s$: 0.1084, Hoek-Brown rock mass constant $a$: 0.501, Hoek-Brown upper limit of confining stress over which the material no longer dilates $\sigma_3^{cv}$: 39.6 MPa, Young’s modulus: 86 GPa, Poisson’s ratio: 0.18.

**5.2. Chandler Halite**
The derivation of the assumed material parameters for the Chandler Halite was based on our well-established practical experience in the testing and characterisation of salt formations and the identified average percentage of the non-soluble material as well as the inspection of the core photographs from the exploratory borehole CH001A.

The Chandler Halite was modelled as a WIPP-creep visco-plastic material whose plastic constitutive response conforms to the Drucker-Prager elasto-plastic model. The corresponding physical and mechanical properties that refer to the time-independent mechanical response of the halite were taken to be:

- Density: $\rho = 2.37$ Mg/m$^3$
- Young’s modulus: $E = 33,000$ MPa
- Poisson’s ratio: $\nu = 0.225$
- Uniaxial tensile strength: $\sigma_t = 1.83$ MPa
- Drucker-Prager constants: $q_\phi = 0.116$, $k_\phi = 15.38$ MPa and $q_\psi = 0.001$

The non-linear visco-elastic characteristics of the halite conformed to the WIPP creep law and the corresponding mechanical properties that refer to the time-dependent mechanical response of the Chandler halite were taken to be:

- Activation energy: $Q = 14,070$ cal/mol
• Universal gas constant: \( R = 1.987 \text{ cal/(mol K)} \)
• Dimensionless stress exponent: \( n = 2.71 \)
• Creep constant: \( \lambda = 256.8 \text{ MPa}^{-n} \text{ d}^{-1} \)
• Dimensionless empirical material parameter relating the creep rate parameters to the steady-state creep rate: \( B = 569.8 \)
• Critical steady-state creep rate: \( \dot{\varepsilon}^* = 1.4 \times 10^{-5} \text{ (m/m) d}^{-1} \)
• Asymptotic transient strain parameter: \( \varepsilon_a = 0.067 \text{ m/m} \)
• Temperature at depth of salt horizon: \( T = 27^\circ \text{C} \)
6. Geomechanical numerical analysis

6.1. Introduction

In the design of underground excavations in salt formations, numerical tools such as the finite element and finite difference techniques play an increasingly important role. However, in order to successfully employ geomechanical numerical modelling for such a purpose, simulation approaches must fulfill strong requirements. An essential demand is that the geomechanical analyses are efficient and lead to accurate and reliable results. This in turn will depend upon the mathematical model of the physical structure of the salt caverns under investigation, which should be undertaken:

- using appropriate numerical tools;
- adopting realistic material properties;
- applying rational assumptions about the caverns’ loading conditions; and
- specifying suitable boundary conditions.

Before commencing the stability analysis of the planned salt mine, it is necessary to develop a meaningful geomechanical ground model and to identify which constitutive law and which failure criteria best match the prevailing geological conditions. This issue has been addressed in Section 4 of this report where it was specified that the plastic behaviour of the modelled geological materials is best simulated by the Hoek-Brown criterion with the exception of the Chandler Halite which was modelled by combining the non-linear viscoelastic WIPP model with the Drucker-Prager plasticity model. Moreover, prior to any geomechanical numerical modelling of room and pillar layouts, it is useful to make a cursory evaluation of the loading conditions that are expected to develop in the pillars by making use of appropriate pillar strength equations. Such a pillar-design equation was used as a basic tool for the calculation of the average stresses in the investigated salt pillars and the resulting findings are presented in Appendix E.

This section provides a description of the finite difference analysis that was employed to investigate the geomechanical stability and creep convergence of the room and pillar mine layout over a period of thirty years.

The computer aided numerical technique, employed to model the geomechanical response of the geologic materials, was the finite difference method and the particular code used was the Fast Lagrangian Analysis of Continua (FLAC) developed by Itasca Consulting Group, Inc. FLAC is the most well-known stress analysis computer code for engineering problems that employs the finite difference technique, and is based upon a ‘Lagrangian’ calculation scheme which is well suited for modelling large distortions, primarily encountered in geomechanical applications in salt formations. The finite difference method is one of the oldest numerical techniques used for the solution of sets of differential equations, given initial values and/or boundary values and allows the implementation of complicated loading paths and highly non-linear constitutive behaviour without requiring the complex iterative procedure of a standard implicit code. The finite difference method can be used to discretise both time and space; it provides easy error estimation techniques and is particularly suitable for large, non-linear problems which may involve creep deformation or progressive failure. The ability of FLAC to employ successfully the WIPP creep model (Munson, 1997) in the modelling of Chandler Halite was verified with known close form solution (Passaris & Horseman, 1982) for an externally pressurised cylindrical cavity.

6.2. System configuration for analysis

In order to set up the finite difference model for the geomechanical numerical simulation of the investigated room and pillar mine layout, three fundamental components were specified:

- the constitutive behaviour, the strength characteristics and the physical properties of the geological materials,
- a model grid, and
- the boundary and initial conditions.

The constitutive behaviour and the associated material properties dictate the type of reaction the model will have upon the imposed disturbances such as the deformational response due to the excavation of the rooms. The grid defines the geometry of the problem and the boundary and the initial conditions define the in situ state (i.e. the condition before a change or disturbance in problem state was introduced).
During the implementation of the finite difference code, the modelled structure of the virgin ground needs to be pre-stressed in conformance with the *in situ* geostatic stress field before an alteration can be introduced in the model by the excavation of the rooms.

The applied geostatic stresses may be derived employing the relationships specified in Section 3 of this report, by which way the vertical geostatic component is a function of the body forces that correspond to the weight of the geological material surrounding each grid-point. If no initial stresses are present, the forces will cause the material to move (during stepping) in the direction of the forces until equal and opposite forces are generated by zone stresses. Given the appropriate boundary conditions (e.g., fixed bottom, roller side boundaries), the model will, in fact, generate extrinsically its own gravitational stresses that are compatible with the applied gravity. However, this process is inefficient, and the pre-stressing of the modelled ground has been incorporated intrinsically by using the INITIAL command of FLAC that sets all stresses to the given values. When employing this approach it is possible that the pre-stressing of the ground could lead to unrealistic stress profiles caused by the stress redistribution that may take place as a result of the large deformations that could occur. For this reason, during the pre-stressing of the ground model, the mechanical parameters of the geological materials were artificially increased to prevent any excessive deformations while still embodying the applied geostatic stresses. Following the pre-stressing of the ground and before any modelling actions are taking place, the material parameters were reinstated to their original values.

The distribution of the geostatic stresses for the modelled mine, following the pre-stressing phase, are shown in Figures 6-1 and 6-2 for the vertical \(\sigma_{yy}\) and horizontal \(\sigma_{xx}\) geostatic stress components respectively.

![Figure 6-1](image_url)  
*Figure 6-1  Distribution of the vertical geostatic stress component \(\sigma_{yy}\), resulting from the pre-stressing of the ground model*

The vertical geostatic stress \(\sigma_{yy}\) distribution, shown in Figure 6-1, reflects a linear gradient with depth. However, the linearity of the horizontal geostatic stress \(\sigma_{xx}\), shown in Figure 6-2, is disrupted at the location of the Chandler Halite (which ranges between 825 m bgl and 1,090 m bgl) where the stress regime has been modelled by assuming a hydrostatic configuration (in accordance with Section 3 of this report). This is made clear in Figure 6-3, where the profile of \(\sigma_{xx}\), along the vertical direction, is plotted against depth.

It is important to clarify here that, during the numerical analysis that was carried out for the preliminary assessment of the salt horizon geom mechanics, the excavation of the rooms was modelled by instantaneously creating all the rooms at the same time. Clearly, this modelling process will result in a significant overestimate of the stress concentration during the early part of the time-dependent analysis and this need to
be considered in interpreting the numerical results. Future geomechanical modelling should investigate the influence of the sequence of the excavation operations on the long term stability of the room and pillar layout, by carrying out a series or parametric numerical analyses.

Figure 6-2   Distribution of the horizontal geostatic stress component $\sigma_{xx}$, resulting from the pre-stressing of the ground model

Figure 6-3   Profile of the horizontal geostatic stress $\sigma_{xx}$ vs depth, along the vertical direction, resulting from the pre-stressing of the ground model
In assessing the deformational response of the modelled underground excavations to the geostatic pre-stressing, it is necessary to recognise the development of the displacements caused only by the excavation of the rooms and to distinguish them from the displacements that resulted from the previously applied gravitational pre-stressing. For this reason, the horizontal and vertical displacement components are zeroed before the creation of the underground excavations is modelled. In this way only the deformational response caused by the excavations is recorded. This technique does not affect the calculations since the finite difference modelling of FLAC does not require displacements in the calculation sequence. They are kept simply as a convenience to the user.

The geometrical details of the room and pillar layout were derived from Drawing 4 of Appendix B of the technical report by Douglas Partners (2016), which is reproduced accordingly in Appendix D of this report with appropriate “cloud mark-up” annotations. The planned room and pillar mine layout involves a number of panels (separated by barrier pillars) that comprise 16 rooms, each with a length of 240 m, which alternate with rib pillars (i.e. pillars whose length is large compared with their cross-sectional dimensions). Both the rooms and the pillars have a height of 6 m and a width of 15 m. The width of the ordinary barrier pillars is 45 m, while the central barrier pillar (which is aligned with the bottom of the shaft) is characterised by a width of 95 m.

Taking into consideration that the dimension of the investigated mine layout in one direction is very large in comparison with the respective dimensions in the other two directions, the geomechanical modelling of the pillar layout was realised by employing a two dimensional plane strain analysis of a vertical transverse cross-section (Obert and Duvall, 1967). Since one of the tasks of the geomechanical analysis was to investigate the structural adequacy of the planned barrier pillars, the modelled pillars were purposely configured by employing a width larger than 45 m to help in the identification of the extent of the penetration of the high stress concentrations caused by the underground excavations.

6.3. Results of the geomechanical numerical analysis

The potential development of tensile stresses at the roof of the excavated rooms is typically assessed by evaluating the distribution of the minor principal stress $\sigma_3$, while the shear stresses that are expected to develop in the pillars are investigated by considering the Von Mises stress components. The likelihood of shear failure, as a consequence of the potential occurrence of high compressive stresses, cannot be evaluated by simply considering the individual values of $\sigma_1$ and $\sigma_3$. Instead, the shear stress intensity is typically assessed by employing the Von Mises stress component defined by the following expression:

$$\sigma_{vm} = \sqrt{3J_2}$$  \hspace{1cm} \text{Equation 13}

where $J_2$ is the second invariant of the deviatoric stress tensor specified in Equation 8.

The interpretation of the numerical modelling results is best accomplished by presenting the analysis output graphically in the form of a series of relevant contour plots. The contour plots comprise the major, intermediate and minor principal stress components $\sigma_1$, $\sigma_2$ and $\sigma_3$ as well as the Von Mises stress component. In addition, graphs are presented of the time-dependent development over a span of thirty years for:

- the average Von Mises stress of the pillars,
- the vertical displacements of the roof and the floor of the rooms,
- the horizontal displacements of the walls of the rooms,
- the differential creep vertical convergence of the rooms,
- the average $\sigma_3$ at the roof of the excavated rooms, and
- the average Von Mises stress at the upper corner of the room at the centre of the panel,

Moreover, graphs were produced showing the distribution of the stress components and the respective Strength Factor, across the width of the pillar at the centre of panel, after one, five and thirty years following the excavation of the panel.

To minimise any boundary effects, the cross-section that was used in geomechanical analysis extended 200 m in the horizontal direction and 340 m in the vertical direction above and below the mining level (as shown in Figure 6-4).
Furthermore, to model the existing geologic formations in a satisfactory manner and to improve the accuracy of the finite difference calculations, a relatively fine grid was used 20 m above and below the excavated rooms. The grid was composed of 151,470 grid-points resulting in a total number of 150,640 zones, corresponding to 561 zones along the x-axis and 269 zones along the y-axis.

In addition to the initialisation of the geostatic stresses (in accordance with Section 3 of this report) suitable displacement constraints were also specified along the edges of the grid. The kinematic boundary conditions specified along the sides of the model were:
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- no horizontal displacement along the vertical sides (i.e. roller side boundaries), and
- no vertical displacement along the top and bottom horizontal boundaries (i.e. fixed top and bottom).

The results of the finite difference analysis, in the form of contour diagrams showing the distribution of the three principal stresses, the Von Mises stress, and the vertical and horizontal stress components are presented in:
- Appendix A, for the conditions corresponding to one year after the excavation of the rooms;
- Appendix B, for the conditions corresponding to five years after the excavation of the rooms; and
- Appendix C, for the conditions corresponding to thirty years after the excavation of the rooms.

Assessment of the Von Mises stress concentrations in the pillars (as shown in Figures A-4, B-4 and C-4 included in Appendices A, B and C respectively) indicates that the pillar in the centre of the panel is subjected to a higher loading than the one exerted to the pillars at the edge of the panel. This is evident from the time graphs shown in Figure 6-5, where it is shown that (although the difference is relatively small) the pillar at the centre of the panel is not subjected to the same stress relief with time as the pillar at the edge of the panel.

![Figure 6-5 Reduction with time of the pillar average Von Mises stress](image)

Examination of the displacements resulting from the creep deformation of the room at the edge of the panel (as shown in Figure 6-6), indicate that the rate of the roof's mid-span vertical convergence is approximately 72.0 mm/year while the floor's vertical displacement is characterised by a time-dependent heave with an approximate rate of 46.6 mm/year. Concerning the horizontal displacements of the walls (at mid-height) the wall nearer to the barrier pillar (i.e. left wall) converges at a rate of approximately 71.0 mm/year while at the anti-diametric location the wall converges at an approximate rate of 33.8 mm/year. The proximity of the barrier pillar provides a potential explanation for the difference in the horizontal deformation of the walls, since the left wall is affected by the stress concentrations that develop near the edge of the panel resulting in higher lateral displacements when compared with the right wall.
Inspection of the displacements resulting from the creep deformation of the room at the centre of the panel (as shown in Figure 6-7), indicate that the rate of the roof's mid-span vertical convergence is approximately 59.5 mm/year while the floor's vertical displacement is characterised by a time-dependent heave with an approximate rate of 52.8 mm/year. In a similar way to the room at the edge of the panel, once more the roof displacement is larger than the respective floor vertical displacement. However, this time the difference between roof and floor is smaller since the loading of the pillars at the centre of the panel is more uniform than the loading of the pillars adjacent to the edge of the panel.

Concerning the horizontal displacements of the walls (at mid-height), as expected, the difference in the convergence of the wall is very small. The left wall converges at a rate of approximately 53.9 mm/year while at the anti-diametric location the right wall converges at an approximate rate of 51.8 mm/year.

The identified differences in the rate of the displacements along the vertical direction between the roof and floor for the two rooms (i.e. at the centre of the panel and next to the barrier pillar) are shown in the time graphs of Figure 6-8 that present the differential vertical convergence that the rooms are experiencing.

As already mentioned, the room at the edge of the panel exhibits a higher rate of differential creep convergence than the room near the centre of the panel. In particular, the room at the edge of the panel is characterised by a differential creep convergence of 25.6 mm/year while the room near the centre of the panel, is only subjected to a differential creep convergence rate of approximately 6.7 mm/year.

Practical experience from in situ measurements and observations concerning underground openings in salt formations, suggests that the identified order of magnitude of the rates of creep displacements, both along the vertical and horizontal directions, are very high and they are expected to have a negative effect on the serviceability limit state of the underground excavations. An encouraging sign, but not significant enough to ameliorate the identified excessive creep convergence, is the very slightly concave nature of the creep convergence displacement curves (shown in Figures 6-6 and 6-7). This behaviour indicates that the creep closure is decelerating, providing evidence that the creep response remains within the primary creep stage, implying that the creep closure has not entered the constant strain rate stage.
Figure 6-7  Development of creep displacements of the room at the centre of the panel

Figure 6-8  Development of the vertical differential creep closure of the rooms

Evaluation of the development, with time, of the average minor principal stress at the roof of the rooms (shown in Figure 6-9) indicates that, up to 23 years following the excavation of the panel, although the $\sigma_3$ is slightly tensile, the corresponding Strength Factor against tensile failure for both rooms is of the order of 13, implying
that the development of any tensile cracks is practically unattainable. However, as shown in Figure 6-9, after 23 years from the excavation of the panel, the minor principal stress at the roof of the room at the edge of the panel becomes more and more tensile and towards the end of 30 years the Strength Factor, against tensile failure, drops to about 1.04 which signifies potential tensile failure.

The distribution of the Von Mises stress, across the width of the pillar located at the centre of panel (i.e. the pillar with the most severe load), at one year, five years and thirty years after the excavation of the panel (shown in Figure 6-10) follows the same trend shown in Figure 6-5 whereby the shear stress loading of the pillars reduces with time. It is interesting to note that (as expected) this reduction with time does not affect significantly the core of the pillar (see the curves for year 1 and year 5 in Figure 6-10).

![Figure 6-9 Development of the average minor principal stress at the roof of the rooms](image)

Examination of the of the time-dependent development of the stress concentrations that develop, following the excavation of the room, at the upper corner of the room located at the centre of the panel, indicates a relatively high Von Mises stress of the order of 26 MPa. Evidently, within a very short time (as shown in Figure 6-11), the Von Mises stress reduces drastically to approximately 16 MPa and after that, its time-dependent reduction follows an asymptotic trend towards an approximate value of 12.8 MPa.

Clearly, these high stress concentrations around the corners of the rooms are the result of the geometry of the adopted geomechanical model which employed rectangular openings with square corners. To minimise the unwanted effect of the square corners, consideration should be given in employing a continuous miner equipped with a rotating drum cutting head system comprising specially designed cutter pick configuration that will allow the rooms to be cut with rounded angles at the corners of the cut.
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Figure 6-10  Distribution of the Von Mises stress, across the width of the pillar at the centre of panel, after 1 year, 5 years and 30 years following the excavation of the panel

Figure 6-11  Reduction with time of the average Von Mises stress that develops at the upper corner of the room at the centre of the panel
6.3.1. Results after one year following the excavation of the rooms

The distribution of the major principal stress after one year, at the centre of the panel, is shown in Figure 6-12 where it is evident that the highest stress concentrations develop at the corners of the excavated rooms. Similar trends are also noticeable when the distribution of the intermediate principal stress at the centre of the panel, is plotted in Figure 6-13.

Figure 6-12  Distribution of major principal stress component $\sigma_1$, at the end of one year

Figure 6-13  Distribution of intermediate principal stress component $\sigma_2$, at the end of one year
With respect to the distribution of the minor principal stress, at the centre of the panel shown in Figure 6-14, the roof of the rooms are primarily in compression with only pockets of insignificant tensile stresses. As for the sides of the pillars, the tensile stresses are absent as is also verified by the green curve shown in Figure 6-16.

The distribution of the Von Mises stress, at the centre of the panel, one year after the panel was excavated is shown in Figure 6-15 where it is evident that the highest stress concentrations develop at the sides of the pillars.
The distribution of $\sigma_1$, $\sigma_2$, $\sigma_3$ and Von Mises stress, across the width of the pillar located at the centre of panel (i.e. the pillar with the most severe load), one year after the excavation of the panel is shown in Figure 6-16.

Moreover, the respective distribution of the Strength Factor against shear failure, is also plotted in the same figure, providing significant evidence that the pillars are capable of accepting the shear stresses that develop as the panel is excavated.

![Figure 6-16](image)

**Figure 6-16** Distribution of the stress components, across the width of the pillar at the centre of panel, after 1 year following the excavation of the panel

### 6.3.2. Results after five years following the excavation of the rooms

The distribution of the major principal stress after five years, at the centre of the panel, is shown in Figure 6-17 where it is evident that, as was the case of one year, high stress concentrations develop at the corners of the excavated rooms.

Furthermore, similar trends are also noticeable when the distribution of the intermediate principal stress at the centre of the panel, is plotted in Figure 6-18.
Figure 6-17  Distribution of major principal stress component $\sigma_1$, at the end of five years

Figure 6-18  Distribution of intermediate principal stress component $\sigma_2$, at the end of five years

Figure 6-19 shows the distribution of the minor principal stress, at the centre of the panel, where the roof of the rooms are essentially in compression with only inconsequential pockets of trivial tensile stresses. Following a similar pattern, to the one we have seen for the year 1, in the sides of the pillars the tensile stresses are absent as is also verified by the green curve shown in Figure 6-21.

The distribution of the Von Mises stress, at the centre of the panel, five years after the panel was excavated is shown in Figure 6-20 where it is evident that the highest stress concentrations develop at the sides of the
pills. Figure 6-21 shows the distribution of $\sigma_1$, $\sigma_2$, $\sigma_3$ and Von Mises stress, across the width of the pillar located at the centre of panel (i.e. the pillar with the most severe load), five years after the excavation of the panel. Furthermore, the respective distribution of the Strength Factor against shear failure, shown also in the same figure, indicates clearly that the pillars are capable of accepting the shear stresses that develop as the panel is excavated. If anything, as a result of the creep deformation of the pillars, the shear stresses have relaxed with time.

**Figure 6-19**  Distribution of minor principal stress component $\sigma_3$, at the end of five years

**Figure 6-20**  Distribution of Von Mises stress component $\sigma_{vm}$, at the end of five years
6.3.3. Results after thirty years following the excavation of the rooms

Figure 6-22 shows the distribution of the major principal stress, at the centre of the panel, after thirty years have elapsed from the excavation of the rooms.
Figure 6-23  Distribution of intermediate principal stress component $\sigma_2$, at the end of thirty years

The distribution of $\sigma_1$ provides evidence that, although high stress concentrations develop in the main body of the pillars, the roof and floor of the rooms have relatively low stress concentrations resulting from the identified creep convergence. Furthermore, Figure 6-23 shows similar trends concerning the distribution of the intermediate principal stress at the centre of the panel, which also shows a relaxed stress regime in the roof and the floor of the rooms.

The distribution of the minor principal stress at the centre of the panel, shown in Figure 6-24, indicates that the roof of the rooms are in low compression. The same applies for the sides of the pillars, where we may see evidence of the stress relaxation that developed at the end of thirty years. The high creep convergence of the rooms that contributed in the relaxation of the stresses, is also evident from the distorted shape of the excavated rooms shown in Figures 6-22 to 6-24.

The distribution of the Von Mises stress at the centre of the panel, thirty years after the panel was excavated, indicates that the highest stress concentrations arise in zones that develop in the pillars approximately 3 m inside from the sides of the excavations (see Figure 6-25).

Figure 6-26 presents the distribution of the principal stresses and the Von Mises stress, across the width of the pillar located at the centre of panel, thirty years after the excavation of the rooms. Moreover, the distribution of the Strength Factor against the potential shear failure of the salt pillars provides evidence that the pillars are capable of accepting the shear stresses that develop as the panel is excavated (the lowest value of the calculated Strength Factor at a depth of approximately 3 m from the sides of the excavation, is 1.4).

Figure 6-27 shows the distribution of the minor principal stress $\sigma_3$ and the Von Mises stress $\sigma_{vm}$, above the centre of the roof of the central room, thirty years after the excavation of the rooms. This figure provides evidence, of the reduction of $\sigma_{vm}$ and of the shift of $\sigma_3$ towards more compression, as we progress from the roof of the room (at 845 m bgl) towards the top of the salt (at 825 m bgl).

Clearly, the 20 m thickness of salt, which is left between the roof of the rooms and the top of the Chandler Halite, provides an adequate buffer that prevents the development of migration paths for potential contaminants (associated with the underground storage operations) towards the non-salt formations.
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Figure 6-24  Distribution of minor principal stress component $\sigma_3$, at the end of thirty years

Figure 6-25  Distribution of Von Mises stress component $\sigma_{vm}$, at the end of thirty years
Figure 6-26  Distribution of the stress components, across the width of the pillar at the centre of panel, after thirty years following the excavation of the panel.

Figure 6-27  Distribution of minor principal stress and Von Mises stress above the roof of the room at the centre of panel, after thirty years following the excavation of the panel.
6.3.4. The need for support of the excavated underground openings

6.3.4.1. Active support provided by rockbolts

To bring under control the development of the identified:
- tensile stresses in the roof of the rooms, and
- high shear stresses near the walls of the pillars,
it is recommended to provide appropriate rock reinforcement by means of post-tensioned, resin grouted rockbolts.

The proposed rock reinforcement should be active (whereby an active force is applied to the Halite formation) by employing 4 m length bolts with a grouted length of 2 m. Since the effectiveness of a post-tensioned rockbolt depends on its free length, the anchor force shall act in ground that is sufficiently distant from the anchored structure such that no additional force is applied on it (British Standard Institution, 2014). It is recommended, therefore, to ensure that each bolt should have a free length of 2 m in accordance with British Standard Institution (2015).

Until such time as we have practical experience from the potential development of localised small scale spalling at the roof of the excavated rooms, it is not recommended to incorporate in the roof support measures the use of mesh. Although mesh provides little structural support, it does however prevent small pieces of rock falling out from the space between rockbolts.

The post-tensioned loadings applied to any bolt shall not exceed 75% of the ultimate tensile strength or 90% of the yield stress of the steel bar. All rockbolt reinforcement should be Dywidag Gewi Steel Grade 500/600 high yield fully threaded bar or approved equivalent. The recommended rockbolt sizes and properties are shown in Table 6-1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6-1 Specifications for the proposed rockbolt active support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominal bar diameter (mm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steel grade (N/mm²)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diameter over threads (mm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass per unit length (kg/m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross sectional area (mm²)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristic yield load (kN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum ultimate tensile load (kN)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All rock bolts are to be galvanized with a 325 g/m² coating in accordance with British Standard Institution (2009).

The density of the rockbolts used in the roof should be approximately 1 rockbolt/4 m² while the configuration of the rockbolts used in the side of the pillars should be approximately equal to 1 rockbolt/10 m².

It is important to take into consideration that the specified dimensioning and properties of the post-tensioned rockbolts are in essence indicative. Consequently, there will be a need at later stage to carry out an appropriate geomechanical analysis in which the timing of the support installation and the Halite-rockbolt structural interaction should be included.
6.3.4.2. Passive support provided by the stored waste acting as backfill material

Hazardous wastes including mercury contaminated solid wastes have been deposited in underground salt mines for several decades in Europe. Therefore, an extensive knowledge base on all repository relevant properties of rock salt and salt formations is available. In the European Union, salt mines are currently authorised for the underground disposal of hazardous waste only in Germany and the UK. Poland is currently considering using specific salt mines for the disposal of hazardous waste (European Commission, 2010).

The stored waste, in confined compression, is expected to exhibit a consolidation resulting from the compaction caused by room creep closure and therefore its behaviour may be expressed by a series of tangential slopes corresponding to stress versus volumetric plastic strain segments. Consequently, modelling of the constitutive response of the stored waste may be undertaken by adopting the classic double yield model (Rizkalla & Mitri, 1969).

Backfilling of the excavated rooms with waste will reduce the convergence rate and prevent long-term convergence, provided that the stored waste is placed in a suitable manner. The tighter the backfill of the waste (to the mine roof), the lower the convergence rate and the faster the rate of the storage operations, the better will be the control of the anticipated room convergence. This suggests that, when flowable waste materials are used they could be hydraulically backfilled in such a way as to minimise void space at the roof level and improve significantly the support provided by the stored waste.

In the absence of any actual backfill parameters, assuming a worst possible case scenario, we may consider that the packaged waste material, which is furthermore expected to have fine salt pneumatically placed around it, has poor compressibility characteristics. In this case, the packaged backfilled waste material will be capable of accepting reasonable compressive loads only once its plastic volumetric strain has exceeded a limit of approximately 15%. As a result, the anticipated reduction of the rate of closure of the excavated rooms is expected to range between 20% and 25%. For the case of well compacted hydraulically backfilled flowable waste materials, the rate of closure of the excavated rooms is expected to improve reaching an anticipated reduction ranging between 35% and 40%. Moreover, taking into consideration that all of the main access roads will be stowed with crushed salt, when they are no longer required for use, there will be a further reduction of the rate of the creep convergence. The identified creep convergence for both types of wastes, will cease to progress as soon as the reaction forces in the waste and the acting compressive loading (exerted by the room closure) reach an equilibrium.

In assessing the positive contribution of the passive support provided by the stored waste, it is important to take into consideration that the quoted anticipated reductions of the rate of closure of the excavated rooms, are indicative. As a result, there will be a need, at a later stage, to carry out an appropriate geomechanical analysis in which the timing of the placement of the waste and the Halite-waste material structural interaction should be included.

6.3.5. Reduction in room width to improve the stability of the roof

The development of the salt mine was modelled by employing an ‘instantaneous’ full excavation of the entire panel (which comprises 16 rooms), whereby the full width of 15 m and the entire height of 6 m of each room was generated suddenly. As a result, the identified stresses after one year remain at a relatively high level, corresponding to the lowest Strength Factor being 1.1 in the pillar sidewalls (see Figures 6-15 and 6-16). However, taking into consideration that each panel will require at least three years for its full development, the creep deformation of the Chandler Halite is expected to increase the Strength Factor in the pillars by approximately 35%, which will reduce accordingly the identified high stress concentrations in the pillars’ walls thus preventing the development of potentially unacceptable sidewall spalling.

To ensure that the required stress relaxation occurs, it will be necessary to determine the appropriate sequencing of the excavations by means of geomechanical modelling incorporating a series of a parametric analyses in which the timing of the excavations should correspond to the expected rate of development.

The roof span of the rooms, currently set at 15 m, encourages the development of relatively large rate of vertical creep converge mid-width of the excavated room, which is expected to have an undesirable influence on the respective serviceability limit state conditions and may have a negative effect on the long term stability of the roof.
In considering the reduction of the maximum permissible roof span of the rooms, it is suggested that at least two adjacent rooms located near each edge of the panel, should have their width reduced down to 12 m. In reducing the width of the rooms by 3m, although the resulting convergence mid-width of the excavated room will be reduced accordingly, the loading of the respective pillars is not expected to change in any appreciative manner. On the other hand, the proposed change in the room geometry will reduce slightly the overall span of the panel by more than 2.5%, which is expected to have a marginal positive effect on the loading of all the pillars.

6.3.6. Deductions derived from the assessment of the geomechanical numerical analysis

On the basis of the assumed properties of the geological materials and the anticipated geostatic loading conditions, the roof of the excavated rooms is expected to converge at relatively high rate but will remain intact and provide an appropriate geological barrier. Concerning the identified high stress concentration in the walls of the pillars, the expected stress relaxation associated with the creep deformation of the Chandler Halite is expected to contribute in the prevention of the development of potentially unacceptable sidewall spalling.

The width of the rooms, away from the edges of the panels, is acceptable at 15m wide, but there is a need to narrow down to 12 m at least two adjacent rooms located near each edge of the panels.

Concerning the barrier pillars (i.e. the inter-panel pillars) that provide support at the edges of the panels, there is a requirement to increase their width to improve the overall stability of the panels and to reduce the potential structural interaction of adjacent panels by providing appropriate load isolation conditions.

The benefit of the active support, provided by the proposed post-tensioned resin grouted rockbolts, and also by the passive support, exerted both by the packaged and the hydraulically backfilled waste materials, is important since it is expected that these measures will bring under control the development of the identified tensile regime in the roof of the rooms and the shear stresses near the walls of the pillars. Another positive measure that is expected to contribute to the overall stability of the underground excavations is the plan to stow, with crushed salt, all the main access roads when they are no longer required for use.
7. Conclusions and recommendations

The objective of the geomechanical studies of the planned Chandler mine was achieved by employing:

- engineering judgement in analysing the results of the geomechanical modelling;
- established experience and knowledge in utilising appropriate parameters concerning the strength and the constitutive response of the Chandler Halite; and
- realistic modelling of the geometry, the \textit{in situ} geostatic stresses and the boundary conditions that characterise the room and pillar mine layout.

7.1. Conclusions

The following conclusions outline the results generated from the geomechanical numerical analysis:

1. The finite difference method was successfully used for the numerical simulation of the planned Chandler mine in investigating the development of the subsurface stress concentrations and creep response of the Chandler Halite that surrounds the room and pillar mine layout.

2. With respect to the geomechanical response of the planned Chandler mine, a significant element is the Jay Creek Limestone strata that overlay the Chandler formation, which have an average thickness of more than 250 m. Provided that no major faults or prevalent systems of significant discontinuities exist, the Jay Creek Limestone will act as an enormous thick plate, with built-in-ends, that is expected to contribute significantly to the stability of the planned excavations.

3. Examination of the distribution of the minor principal stresses, determined in the numerical modelling for the first 23 years, indicates that \( \sigma_1 \) is essentially very close to the compressive regime. Consequently, during the first 23 years following the excavation of the panels, the possibility of developing in the roof of the rooms tensile stresses that may exceed the tensile strength of the Chandler Halite is almost unlikely. However, the excessive creep closure that has been identified in the roof of the rooms next to edge of the panels will, in all probability, result in the development of tensile cracks.

4. Calculation of the \textit{Strength Factor} against shear failure for the salt pillars has shown that, even at the early life of the mine, the \textit{Strength Factor} values indicate no shear failure. The identified \textit{Strength Factor} values demonstrate that the Chandler Halite of the pillars, when subjected to the stress concentrations caused by the excavations, is able to endure shear stresses over a period of thirty years.

5. Assessment of the distribution of the minor principal stress and the Von Mises stress above the salt mine provided evidence that the 20 m thickness of salt, which is left between the roof of the rooms and the top of the Chandler Halite, prevents the establishment of a pathway to the biosphere. Essentially, the roof salt above the underground excavations constitutes an adequate barrier that prevents the development of migration paths for potential contaminants (associated with the underground storage operations) towards the non-salt formations.

6. Practical experience from \textit{in situ} measurements and observations concerning underground openings in salt formations, suggests that the identified order of magnitude of the rates of creep displacements, both along the vertical and horizontal directions, are excessive and they are expected to have a long term negative effect on the serviceability limit state of the underground excavations. An encouraging sign, but not significant enough to ameliorate the identified excessive creep convergence, is the very slightly concave nature of the creep convergence displacement curves. This behaviour indicates that the creep closure is decelerating, providing evidence that the creep response remains within the primary creep stage, implying that the creep closure has not entered the constant strain rate stage. Nevertheless, the identified rates of room creep convergence are very high, indicating that the roof of the rooms (especially those rooms located near the edges of the panel) may be unstable in the long term.

7. Backfilling of the excavated rooms with waste will reduce the convergence rate and prevent long-term convergence, provided that the stored waste is placed in a suitable manner. The tighter the backfill of the waste (to the mine roof), the lower the convergence rate and the faster is the rate of the storage operations, the better will be the control of the anticipated room convergence. This suggests that, when flowable waste
materials are used they could be hydraulically backfilled in such a way as to minimise unfilled spaces at the roof level and improve significantly the support provided by the stored waste. For packaged backfilled waste material the anticipated reduction of the rate of closure of the excavated rooms is expected to range between 20% and 25%. For the case of well compacted hydraulically backfilled waste materials, the rate of closure of the excavated rooms is expected to improve reaching an anticipated reduction ranging between 35% and 40%.

8. The benefit of the active support, provided by the proposed post-tensioned resin grouted rockbolts, and also by the passive support, exerted both by the packaged and the hydraulically backfilled waste materials, is important since it is expected that these measures will bring under control the development of the identified tensile regime in the roof of the rooms and the shear stresses near the walls of the pillars. Moreover, taking into consideration that all of the main access roads will be stowed with salt when they are no longer required for use, the anticipated reduction in the creep convergence will further increase accordingly.

9. In summary, on the basis of the assumed properties of the geological materials and the anticipated geostatic loading conditions, the roof of the excavated rooms is expected to converge at relatively high rate but will remain intact and provide an appropriate geological barrier. Moreover, the preliminary assessment of the geomechanical conditions of the planned Chandler mine indicates that, although the 15 m wide rib pillars are expected to accept the high stress concentrations while maintaining their long term stability, the 15 m width of the roof span of the rooms is considered to be too large and will potentially result in unacceptable creep convergence of the rooms. It is suggested therefore, to narrow down to 12 m at least two adjacent rooms located near each edge of the panels. Concerning the identified high stress concentration in the walls of the pillars, the expected stress relaxation associated with the creep deformation of the Chandler Halite is expected to contribute in the prevention of the development of potentially unacceptable sidewall spalling.

10. It is important to take into consideration that the derived preliminary conclusions are based on the use of assumed material parameters for the Chandler Halite which clearly have an effect both on the creep convergence of the rooms and the shear strength of the pillars. Although the assumed material parameters are based on well-established practical experience derived from designing and monitoring underground openings in salt formations, once laboratory test results from the Chandler Halite will be made available, there will be a need to re-evaluate the investigated geomechanical conditions.

11. The following practical limitations of the resources used, must be noted:
   - the assumed mechanical and physical parameters of the modelled geological materials;
   - the assumed simultaneous excavation of all the rooms in the modelled panel;
   - the assumptions made in determining the geostatic components; and
   - the introduced idealised configuration whereby a three-dimensional structure has been analysed by a two-dimensional model.

7.2. Recommendations

1. Taking into consideration that the 15 m width of the roof span of the rooms is considered to be too large, it is recommended to undertake a series of parametric studies to determine the maximum permissible roof span that will provide the requisite long term stability while satisfying the requirements of the serviceability limit state.

2. The barrier pillars that form the boundaries of the panels, should be able to withstand all anticipated loading conditions encountered during panel development and also should provide adequate isolation to minimise the structural interaction of adjacent panels. The configuration of the planned barrier pillars, concerning their proposed width, is considered to be insufficient especially since there are plans to reduce their cross-sectional area by driving ventilation tunnels through them. It is recommended to optimise the required width by investigating (using a numerical model that would comprise at least two panels) the geomechanical conditions of the central barrier pillar (i.e. the one which is in line with the bottom of the shaft) and of the ordinary barrier pillars.

3. Assessment of the stress distribution around the excavated rooms indicates high stress concentrations limited around the corners of the rooms. The adopted geomechanical model employed rectangular
openings and the stress distribution plots are based on square corners. To minimise the effect of the square corners it is recommended to consider using a continuous miner equipped with a rotating drum cutting head system comprising specially designed cutter pick configuration that will allow the rooms to be excavated with rounded angles at the corners of the cut.

4. To bring under control the development of the identified tensile stresses in the roof of the rooms, and the high shear stresses near the walls of the pillars, it is recommended to provide appropriate rock reinforcement by means of post-tensioned, resin grouted rockbolts. It is suggested, as an indicative measure, that the density of the rockbolts used in the roof should be approximately 1 rockbolt/4 m² while the configuration of the rockbolts used in the side of the pillars should be approximately equal to 1 rockbolt/10 m².

5. The identified stress gradients above the mine should be used as guide to decide the particular depths from which we should select core samples to be used for rock testing.

6. Similarly, in planning the future rock mechanics laboratory test programme, the confining pressures that should be used in the triaxial compression tests and the deviatoric stresses that should be used in the required triaxial creep tests, must be determined by considering the identified stress concentrations.

7. Any future geomechanical numerical modelling should incorporate a series or parametric analyses to investigate the influence of the sequence of the excavation operations on the long term stability of the room and pillar layout.
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Appendix E. Empirical salt pillar design equations
The average vertical stress ($\sigma_p$) for a rib pillar, when the conditions are met for tributary loading, is given by Obert & Duvall (1967) as:

$$\sigma_p = \sigma_v \left( \frac{W_p + W_o}{W_p} \right)$$ \hspace{1cm} \text{Equation E1}$$

where, for the Chandler mine, $W_p$ is the width of the rib pillars (equal to 15 m), $W_o$ is the width of the rooms (equal to 15 m) and the vertical geostatic stress ($\sigma_v$), for the investigated room and pillar layout, may be calculated using Equation 1 as being equal to:

$$\sigma_v = -0.025 \times 845 = -21.125 \text{ MPa}$$ \hspace{1cm} \text{Equation E2}$$

Consequently, $\sigma_p$ is equal to -42.25 MPa.

One of the earliest investigations into the design of hard-rock pillars was carried out by Salamon & Munro (1967). They concluded that the pillar strength could be adequately predicted by:

$$\sigma_{ps} = K_p \frac{W_p^a H_p^b}{W_p}$$ \hspace{1cm} \text{Equation E3}$$

where $\sigma_{ps}$ (expressed in MPa) is the pillar strength, $K_p$ is the strength of a unit volume of rock (expressed in MPa for 1 m$^3$), and $W_p$ and $H_p$ are the pillar width and height in m, respectively. The parameters $a$ and $b$ are empirical constants and a review of available data from coal pillars (Greenwald et al., 1939, Steart, 1954, Holland & Gaddy, 1957, Salamon & Munro, 1967 & Bieniawski, 1968) indicated that the average values for the constants $a$ and $b$ are 0.405 and 0.765 respectively.

Equation E3 with $a = 0.5$ and $b = 0.75$ was used by Hedley & Grant (1972) to design pillars in the Elliot Lake uranium mines in Canada until their closure in the late 1990’s and similarly, Passaris (1982) used the same equation with $a = 0.461$ and $b = 0.658$ for the design of bauxite pillars in the 51KM Parnassus bauxite mine in Greece.

However, empirical pillar formulas, such as Equation E3, which were developed from back-analysis of failed hard-rock pillars in operating mines, are not applicable in salt mines where the time-dependent deformational behaviour of salt makes the task of salt mine pillar design more complex.

For this reason, when dealing with salt pillars, the pillar-design equation that calculates the average stresses in salt rib pillars that was developed by Van Sambeek (1996) provides, in the first instance, a more appropriate methodology:

$$\bar{\sigma}_{vmp} = -\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \left[ 1 - \exp \left( -2.94 \frac{H_p}{W_p} \right) \right] \times \sigma_v$$ \hspace{1cm} \text{Equation E4}$$

Where, $\bar{\sigma}_{vmp}$ is the average Von Mises (or effective) stress acting on the salt pillar.

The derivation of Equation E4 was based on a series of plane-strain numerical modelling analyses and although it adequately reproduced the results of extensive modelling efforts, the comprehensive evaluation of the pillar equation was limited by the two-dimensional nature of the analyses.

The limitations of Equation E4 were addressed by Frayne & Van Sambeek (1999) by conducting a series of three-dimensional numerical modelling analyses to examine the behaviour of salt pillars. The results of their three-dimensional modelling confirmed the applicability of the following pillar-design equation:

$$\bar{\sigma}_{vmp} = \left[ 1 - 0.9 \exp \left( -1.862 \frac{H_p}{W_p} \right) \right] \times \exp \left[ -1.5 \left( \frac{H_p}{L_p} \right) \right] \times \sigma_v$$ \hspace{1cm} \text{Equation E5}$$
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Where $L_p$ is the length of the pillar.

By substituting in Equation E5 the dimensions of the Chandler mine rib pillars, i.e. $W_p = 15$ m, $W_o = 15$ m and $L_p = 240$ m, we get:

$$\bar{\sigma}_{vmp} = 12.43 \text{ MPa}$$

which, when combined with Equations 10 and 13, results in a Strength Factor equal with:

$$Strength \ Factor = \frac{\sqrt{3}(k_0 + q_0 \frac{L_p}{3})}{\bar{\sigma}_{vmp}} = 2.35$$