On the stability of exposed backfill in mine stopes

Falaknaz, N. 1, Aubertin, M.2, Li, L.2
1BGC Engineering Inc, Vancouver, BC, Canada
2Research Institute on Mines and the Environment, RIME UQAT-Polytechnique, École Polytechnique de Montréal, QC, Canada

ABSTRACT
Backfilling of mine stopes provides a safer work place. When exposed, the open face of cemented backfill must remain stable during removal of one of the support walls. The minimum strength of the backfill is a critical issue to avoid safety problems and reduce operational costs. This paper presents 3D numerical simulations results that illustrate the response of exposed backfill during sequential excavation, considering the effect of stope geometry and material strength. Numerical modelling results are then compared with analytical solutions to obtain the required backfill strength.

1 INTRODUCTION
Backfilling is used to reduce ore dilution and the impact of mine wastes disposal on the surface. In addition to the environmental and economic benefits, backfilling can improve the stability of the rock mass around underground mine stopes (Hassani and Archibald 1998).

Some mining operations apply extraction methods that involve primary and secondary stopes in which the primary stopes are excavated and then filled with a cemented backfill. In this case, one of the walls can be removed and the backfill forming a “pillar” in the primary stope must be able to stand on its own. The stability of the exposed backfill face during adjacent mining is thus a critical issue to control the associated costs for the mining operation.

Mitchell et al. (1982) have proposed a limit equilibrium solution to estimate the required strength of cemented backfill placed in primary stopes with an open face. This solution based on the sliding of a wedge toward the exposed face of a vertical opening relies on a number of assumptions that may not all be realistic (e.g. Li and Aubertin, 2012, 2014). The solution proposed by Mitchell et al. (1982) was modified by Zou and Nadarajah (2006) to include the effect of a surcharge load. Dirige et al. (2009) also proposed an analytical solution to estimate the required strength of exposed backfill in an inclined stope, based on the same type of assumptions.

Li and Aubertin (2012) developed modified formulations, based on the Mitchell et al. (1982) model, considering backfilled stopes with a high aspect ratio (i.e. height $H \gg$ width $B$, as in the original solution) and a low aspect ratio, incorporating a surcharge on top of the backfill. This MM (Modified Mitchell) solution is recalled below, together with the original solution.

Numerical simulations have also been used to assess the response of primary backfilled stopes, considering the effect of dynamic loading (Emad and Mitri, 2013; Emad et al. 2014). Li and Aubertin (2014) used 3D simulations results to develop an alternate solution, which will also be presented below.

These numerical investigations have not considered key influence factors such as backfill properties, stope geometry, and excavation sequence. Also, the required backfill strength given by the analytical solutions mentioned above have not yet been compared with results from such 3D simulations.

In this paper, results from numerical calculations are presented to illustrate the effect of important factors, including stope size and fill properties, on the behavior and stability of exposed cemented backfill during mining of a secondary stope. The required strength obtained from numerical results is also compared with values given by the Mitchell et al. (1982) and Li and Aubertin (2012, 2014) solutions.

2 CONCEPTUAL MODEL AND BASIC CHARACTERISTICS

FLAC 3D (Itasca, 2014) is commonly used to analyze the stress state in backfilled stopes. This three-dimensional finite difference program can be used for modelling complex problems, with different constitutive models, material properties, and boundary conditions. The numerical analyses were performed to evaluate the effect of mesh size and boundary locations on the stresses and displacements. A planar symmetry model was built with a coarser mesh for elastic rock mass and a finer mesh inside the backfilled stopes. The number of elements and the global size of the model may vary with the openings geometry. In all cases, the external boundaries are...
located far enough to avoid influence on the results (see details in Falaknaz, 2014).

The stope sidewalls are considered rough and irregular so that shearing tends to occur in the backfill. Therefore, the models do not include interface elements between the backfill and rock mass (as discussed by Li et al. 2003, Li and Aubertin 2009). Figure 1 shows the characteristics of the base model. The rock mass is considered homogeneous, isotropic and linearly elastic, with the following properties: $E_r = 30$ GPa (Young’s modulus), $\nu_r = 0.3$ (Poisson’s ratio), $\gamma_r = 27$ kN/m$^3$ (unit weight). The backfill behaves as an elasto-plastic material and obeys Mohr-Coulomb criterion. A zero tensile strength cut-off was used in the following simulations (with a non-zero cohesion). The input properties for the backfill are the effective internal friction angle $\phi'$, cohesion $c'$ and dilatancy angle $\omega'$ (i.e. with a non-associated flow rule), together with the other backfill characteristics ($E$, $\gamma$, and $\nu$); these are summarized in Table 1 (adapted from Belem et al. 2000).

Table 1. Backfill properties and stope characteristics for the numerical simulations ($E = 300$ MPa, $\nu = 0.3$ and related $\phi' = 35^\circ$, $\gamma = 18$ kN/m$^3$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases (with variants)</th>
<th>$B$ (m)</th>
<th>$L$ (m)</th>
<th>$H$ (m)</th>
<th>$c'$ (kPa)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1$<em>{9,10}$, 1$</em>{30,60}$, 1$_{30,85}$</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9, 30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10, 30, 60, 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2$<em>{25,20}$, 2$</em>{25,30}$</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20, 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3$<em>{25,20}$, 3$</em>{25,24}$</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20, 24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reference stope width is 6 m, and it is filled to a height of 45 m, with 0.5 m of void space left at the top. The natural in-situ vertical stress $\sigma_i$ in the rock mass is based on the overburden weight, for a depth $z$ of 300 m at the base of the stope. The natural in-situ horizontal stress $\sigma_h$ is twice the vertical stress $\sigma_i$, based on a fairly typical situation encountered in the Canadian Shield (Arjang, 2004).

Natural stress state with gravity is the initial equilibrium condition applied for the vertical stress in the model (before creation of the first opening). Displacements are prevented along both axes at the base of the model while only vertical displacements are allowed on the sides of the model. In these simulations, the primary stope is excavated in one step and the rock wall convergence takes place. The backfill is then placed in this stope in four layers and wall displacements are registered. Then, one of the walls is removed in a single or multiple steps to create the secondary stope. The displacements of the front wall, back wall and two side walls are monitored during simulations. The backfill is considered fully drained, or dry (no pore water pressure) upon wall removal. A simulation continues until the model reaches an equilibrium condition or collapse of the fill. The stresses and displacements are determined along four vertical lines (Figure 1) in the primary backfilled stope, i.e. line AA' (vertical central line, VCL), BB' (side wall), CC' (back wall) and DD' (open face). The strength to stress ratio (equivalent to the factor of safety $FS$) is determined using the zone averaged effective shear stress and the yield strength given by the model (based on the Mohr-Coulomb criterion) as supplied by FLAC3D.

3 STRESS STATE IN PRIMARY STOPE

Simulations have been conducted to study the response of primary backfilled stope after front wall removal. The effect of different characteristics including the stope length $L$, width $B$ and height $H$, was investigated by considering different cohesion values (which control backfill strength) to evaluate more specifically the stability of the backfill after removal of the front wall. The results can be presented in terms of normal stresses and total displacements within the primary stope, considering removal of the support wall.

3.1 Stopes with different lengths

The influence of stope length $L$ (m) on the response of an exposed backfill is evaluated for stopes having a width of $B = 6$ m (Case 1, Table 1). The simulations results obtained for stopes with a length $L = 9$ m and $c' = 10$ kPa (Case 1$_{9,10}$, Table 1) or $c' = 30$ kPa (Case 1$_{9,30}$) and for $L= 30$ m and $c' = 60$ kPa (Case 1$_{30,60}$) or $c' = 85$ kPa (Case 1$_{30,85}$) are presented in the following.

Figure 2 shows the isocontours of the horizontal ($\sigma_{xx}$) stresses (see orientations in Figure 1) obtained along vertical plane C'AD'-DAC (center of the stope, Figure 1) within the primary stope before (BWR, left side) and after (AWR, right side) front wall removal. As expected, the results shown in Figure 2a (stable backfill) indicate that the reduction of the horizontal stresses due to arching, observed BWR when the 4 walls are in place, becomes less significant after removal of the front wall. The effect of the four layers used for filling the primary stope can also be seen in this figure. The situation illustrated in Figure
It is seen that the horizontal stress $S_{xx}$, at mid-height, along the back wall (line CC') increases by up to 2 times (i.e. from $S_{xx} = 23$ kPa BWR to $S_{xx} = 54$ kPa AWR); along the side walls (line BB'), it increases by up to 5 times (from $S_{xx} = 15$ kPa BWR to $S_{xx} = 77$ kPa AWR). However, this horizontal stress (at mid-height) tends to decrease along the stope VCL, by up to 45% (from $S_{xx} = 18$ kPa BWR to $S_{xx} = 10$ kPa AWR). These results show that when the exposed backfilled face is stable, the horizontal stresses $S_{xx}$ (and also $S_{yy}$, not shown here; see Falaknaz, 2014) along the walls BWR tend to increase as a result of removing the front wall. Part of the stresses carried along the wall being removed is thus transferred to the remaining walls after creation of the adjacent stope.

Figure 3. Horizontal stresses ($S_{xx}$) along the VCL (line AA'), back wall (line CC'), sidewalls (line BB') and open face (line DD') of the primary backfilled stope before (BWR) and after (AWR) front wall removal (Case $1_{9,30}$, stable backfill).

Other simulations (results not shown here) analyzed the stresses for the same stope, but for a backfill with $c' = 10$ kPa (Case $1_{9,10}$; see Falaknaz, 2014). In this case, the backfill was unstable upon removal of the front wall. The results indicate that the horizontal $S_{xx}$ (normal) stresses decrease significantly (to less than 1 kPa) after the front wall removal, along the back wall (line CC') and along the side walls (line BB'). The horizontal stresses $S_{yy}$ also decrease along the walls.

Figure 4 shows the total displacements of the backfill and the movement (arrows) after removal of the front wall (AWR) for $L = 9$ m, with $c' = 30$ kPa (Figure 4a) and $c' = 10$ kPa (Figure 4b). The effect of the four layers used for filling the primary stope can be also seen in Figure 4a (as was also the case for the stresses shown in Figure 3). These results confirm that the backfill becomes unstable AWR when the cohesion is 10 kPa (Case $1_{9,10}$), with the maximum (total) displacement of the open face $\delta_{max}$ reaching about 5 m (Figure 4b). The backfill remains stable when the cohesion is 30 kPa (Case $1_{9,30}$) with $\delta_{max} = 3.5$ mm (Figure 4a). The angle of the sliding plane $\alpha$ at the base of the unstable backfilled stope, obtained from the simulation results, is about 56° (Figure 4b).
Figure 5 shows the horizontal stresses \( S_{xx} \) along the VCL and the three walls within a primary stope having a length, \( L = 30 \text{ m} \) for \( c' = 85 \text{ kPa} \) (Case 1\(_{30,85} \)) before (BWR) and after (AWR) removal of the front wall. The backfill remains stable in this case, contrary to a backfill with \( c' = 60 \text{ kPa} \) (Case 1\(_{30,60} \)), illustrated in Figure 6; detailed results in Falaknaz, 2014. It can be seen in Figure 5 that the final horizontal (normal) stresses along the VCL and back wall (AWR) are much smaller than those obtained before wall removal (BWR).

Figure 6 presents the total displacements in the backfill for \( L = 30 \text{ m} \) for two cohesion values, i.e. \( c' = 85 \text{ kPa} \) (Case 1\(_{30,85} \), Figure 6a) and 60 kPa (Case 1\(_{30,60} \), Figure 6b). These results confirm that the backfill becomes unstable upon wall removal when the cohesion is 60 kPa; in this case, the maximum total displacement \( \delta_{\text{max}} \) reaches 0.88 m (Figure 6b) near the top of the stope; the angle of the sliding plane at the base is about 53°. The backfill remains stable when the cohesion is 85 kPa (Case 1\(_{30,85} \)), with \( \delta_{\text{max}} = 0.077 \text{ m} \) (Figure 6a).

### 3.2 Stopes with different widths

The effect of stope width \( B \) (m) on the response of an exposed backfill is evaluated for stopes having a length \( L = 9 \text{ m} \) and height \( H = 45 \text{ m} \) (Case 2, Table 1), considering a stope width \( B = 25 \text{ m} \), for \( c' = 30 \text{ kPa} \) (Case 2\(_{25,30} \), Table 1) or \( c' = 20 \text{ kPa} \) (Case 2\(_{25,20} \), Table 1).

Figure 7 shows the total displacements of the backfill after removal of the front wall (AWR) for \( B = 25 \text{ m} \), with \( c' = 30 \text{ kPa} \) (Figure 7a, Case 2\(_{25,30} \)) and \( c' = 20 \text{ kPa} \) (Figure 7b, Case 2\(_{25,20} \)). These results confirm that the backfill is stable when the cohesion equals 30 kPa, with the maximum (total) displacement of the open face \( \delta_{\text{max}} = 9 \text{ mm} \), while it is unstable when the cohesion is 20 kPa with \( \delta_{\text{max}} = 1.4 \text{ m} \) (Figure 7b). The angle of the sliding plane \( \alpha \) at the base of the unstable backfill is about 64° (Figure 7b), which is close to the value postulated by Mitchell et al. (1982) (i.e. \( \alpha = 45^\circ + \phi'/2 = 62.5^\circ \) for \( \phi' = 35^\circ \)). These simulations results confirm that the stability of an exposed backfill face can be sensitive to the stope width, when the cohesion is low.

### 3.3 Stopes with different heights

The effect of stope height, \( H \) (m), on the response of exposed backfilled was also investigated, considering stopes having a length \( L = 9 \text{ m} \), a width \( B = 6 \text{ m} \) and a height \( H = 25 \text{ m} \) (Case 3, Table 1). The simulations
results shown here were obtained for \( c' = 24 \, \text{kPa} \) (Case 3_{25,24}) and \( c' = 20 \, \text{kPa} \) (Case 3_{25,20}).

Figure 8 shows the total displacements of the backfill AWR, for \( H = 25 \, \text{m} \), with \( c' = 24 \, \text{kPa} \) (Case 3_{25,24}, Figure 8a) and \( c' = 20 \, \text{kPa} \) (Case 3_{25,20}, Figure 8b). These results indicate that the backfill remains stable when \( c' = 24 \, \text{kPa} \), with maximum (total) displacement of the open face \( \delta_{\text{max}} = 4 \, \text{mm} \), near the top, while it becomes unstable when cohesion \( c' = 20 \, \text{kPa} \), with \( \delta_{\text{max}} = 0.44 \, \text{m} \). The effect of the four layers used for filling the primary stope can also be seen in this figure. These simulations results tend to confirm that the stability of the exposed backfill decreases with an increase of the stope height, for a given cohesion value.

\[
c = \frac{\gamma H}{2 (\frac{H}{L} + \tan \alpha)} \quad \text{for } FS=1 \quad \phi = 0
\]

4 COMPARISON WITH ANALYTICAL SOLUTIONS

Various analytical solutions have been proposed to estimate the strength of exposed backfill. Mitchell et al. (1982) developed the most commonly used analytical solution, which gives the factor of safety \( FS \) of an exposed backfill in a vertical stope (based on the model shown in Figure 9).

In addition to \( FS \), this solution can also be used to evaluate the required cohesion \( c \) (kPa) for the backfill to be placed in a stope with an open face as follows:

In this equation, \( \alpha \) is the angle of failure plane from the horizontal axis \( (\alpha = 45^\circ + \phi / 2 \) is assumed); \( \phi \) is internal friction angle \(^\circ\) of the backfill material; \( \gamma \) is the fill unit weight (kN/m\(^3\)); \( L \) is the exposed block length (m); \( H \) is the block height (m). This solution applies to backfilled stopes with a high aspect ratio \((H >> B)\) and when the cohesion along the interfaces between the backfill and the two side walls is equal to the cohesion of the backfill.

Li and Aubertin (2012) modified the Mitchell et al. (1982) solution, using many of the same assumptions. However, they postulated that the cohesion along the two lateral interfaces between the backfill and the sidewalls could be smaller than the backfill cohesion. This led to the
Following MM solution for stopes with a high aspect ratio (HAR):

$$c = \frac{(p_0 + \gamma(H - \frac{B \tan \alpha}{2})/2}{\left(\frac{FS}{\tan \alpha} \sin 2\alpha\right)^{-1} + r_b (H - \frac{B \tan \alpha}{2})/L}$$

[2]

Where \(r_b = c_b/c\); from 0 to 1 is the adherence ratio of the fill-rock interface over the backfill cohesion.

More recently, Li and Aubertin (2014) presented numerical simulations results obtained with FLAC3D that illustrate the response of exposed backfill in terms of displacements. The results were used to develop the following solution:

$$c = \frac{D'(p_0 + \gamma(H - H') - G') + \frac{A' \gamma H'}{2} [1 + L/B] \sin \alpha - \gamma \left(\frac{G'}{M} + \frac{H'}{2}\right)}{\left(1 + \frac{1}{B}\right) B' + D'(H - H') \left(\frac{2 c_b}{L} + \frac{G_b}{B'}\right)}$$

[3]

With

$$\rho_1 = p_0 - G' + (H - H') \left\{\gamma - c \left(\frac{2 c_b}{L} + \frac{G_b}{B'}\right)\right\}$$

[4]

$$G' = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{1}{B}} \gamma(H - H') + (p_0 - \frac{G}{M})[1 - \exp\left(-\frac{H}{(H - H')M}\right)]$$

[5]

$$A' = FS \cdot \frac{\tan \alpha}{\tan \alpha} \quad B' = \frac{1}{\cos \alpha} + r_b \frac{H'}{L} \quad C' = \frac{1 - \exp\left(-\frac{H}{MH'}\right)}{MH'} - 1$$

$$D' = A' \left(1 + \frac{1}{B}\right) \sin \alpha + C' \quad H' = B \tan \alpha$$

[6]

$$M = 2K \left(\frac{B^{-1} + L^{-1}}{\tan \delta}\right)$$

[7]

In these equations, the interface cohesion, \(c_{bb}\) along the back wall is proportional to the backfill cohesion, \(c_b = r_{bb} \cdot \gamma\); parameter \(r_{bb}\) controls the interface cohesion along the back wall in the model (0 ≤ \(r_{bb}\) ≤ 1). A similar parameter \(r_{bs}\) is used for the interface cohesion between the backfill and the side walls (i.e. \(c_{bs} = r_{bs} \cdot c\), with 0 ≤ \(r_{bs}\) ≤ 1). In the above equations, \(K\) is an earth reaction coefficient, which is considered equal to Rankine’s active earth pressure \((K_a)\) and \(\delta\) is the friction angle (\(^\circ\)) along the fill-wall interfaces. This solution considers the possibility of having frictionless (\(\delta = 0\)) or fully frictional interfaces (\(\delta = \phi\)) along the walls (or intermediate situations).

A series of numerical simulations have been conducted to evaluate the stability of exposed backfill for different conditions and to assess the validity of the three analytical solutions presented above. In these simulations, the tension cut-off for the backfill strength (Mohr-Coulomb criterion) is considered nil on the tensile stresses side (which is a conservative assumption).

Figure 10 shows the variation of the required backfill cohesion \(c'\) (for FS = 1) obtained from the Mitchell et al. (1982) solution, the MM solution from Li and Aubertin (2012), and the Li and Aubertin (2014) solution when \(r_{bb} = r_{bs} = 1\), (rough walls). The simulations were repeated for different geometries by varying the value of \(c'\) to determine the backfill cohesion required to maintain a stable condition; this critical value is obtained by the strength reduction method, from one simulation to the other, until failure appears. The displacements and stresses are monitored during each simulation to assess the stability of the model. The results shown in Figure 10 illustrate the effect of varying the length \(L\). Other calculations have also been performed to assess the effect of width \(B\) and height \(H\) (details in Falaknaz, 2014). The minimum required cohesion obtained from the three analytical solutions is also shown in Figure 10.

The simulations results indicate that the required backfill strength, \(c'\) (for a fixed internal friction angle \(\phi' = 35^\circ\)), increases with an increase of the stope length \(L\) (and with height \(H\), as shown by other results); additional simulations also show that the required cohesion \(c'\) remains almost constant when stope width \(B\) varies (Falaknaz, 2014). For the base cases (performed with a zero tension cut-off), the cohesion value given by the solution of Li and Aubertin (2014) is the closest to the numerical results (i.e. with the starting value for \(L, B\), and \(H\)). However, the tendencies observed in Figure 10 and in other simulations results do not always agree with those of the analytical solutions.

More specifically, the Li and Aubertin (2014) solution seems to better capture the effect of \(H\) (not shown here), while the effect of \(L\) follows an intermediate trend between this solution and the MM solution (Figure10). The MM and Mitchell et al. (1982) solutions tend to overestimate the required strength, while the cohesion given by that of Li and Aubertin (2014) is underestimated when \(L\) is increased. Other simulations results indicate that the required strength does not change much with the stope width \(B\), hence following the trend given by the Mitchell et al. (1982) solution, which nonetheless tends to overestimate the required cohesion.

It thus appears, based on these numerical simulations, that the three solutions considered here don’t fully capture the variation of the required cohesion as a function of the stope geometry. More work is thus required to better define the critical value of cohesion for various geometrical characteristics of mine stopes with exposed backfill.
5 CONCLUSION

This article presents some of the main results of a numerical and analytical investigation of the behavior of exposed backfill in mine stopes (with an open face). The results from this investigation show that higher backfill strength is required for stopes with a higher length or height, while the stability of the exposed backfill face appears to be little affected by the stope width. The results also indicate that non-negligible contact stresses exist along the fill-wall interfaces, on the three remaining walls, after front wall removal. This observation is not in line with the assumptions behind the development of the analytical solutions proposed by Mitchell et al. (1982) and Li et al. (2012, 2014). The backfill behavior thus needs to be reconsidered to obtain a more representative solution for the required strength of cemented backfill.
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