

**GEOTECHNICAL CHARACTERISATION AND STABILITY
ANALYSIS OF COAL MINE OVERBURDEN DUMPS IN INDIA**

SRAVAN KUMAR GARA



**DEPARTMENT OF CIVIL ENGINEERING
INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY DELHI**

JULY 2021

© Indian Institute of Technology Delhi (IITD), New Delhi, 2021

**GEOTECHNICAL CHARACTERISATION AND STABILITY
ANALYSIS OF COAL MINE OVERBURDEN DUMPS IN INDIA**

by

SRAVAN KUMAR GARA

Department of Civil Engineering

Submitted

in the fulfillment of the requirement of the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

to the



INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY DELHI

JULY 2021

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the thesis entitled, “**Geotechnical Characterization and Stability Analysis of Coal Mine Overburden Dumps in India**”, being submitted by **Mr. Sravan Kumar Gara** to the Indian Institute of Technology Delhi, for the award of ‘**Doctor of Philosophy**’ is a record of the bonafide research work carried out by him under my supervision of this thesis, which to the best of my knowledge has reached the requisite standard. The material contained in this thesis has not been submitted in part or fully to any other university or institute for the award of any degree or diploma.

July, 2021

Prof. K.S.Rao
Department of Civil Engineering
Indian Institute of Technology Delhi
Hauz Khas, New Delhi – 110016
India

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is a great pleasure to express my regards and profound sense of gratitude to my supervisor, **Prof. K. S. Rao**, for his inspiring guidance, constant encouragement, and immense help throughout the research program. Without his understanding, untiring enthusiasm and great care, this work would not have been possible. Moreover, during the most difficult times, while writing this thesis, he provided me the moral support, care, and the freedom I needed to move on. Besides my supervisor, I would like to thank the members of my SRC committee: Prof. A. K. Gosain, Prof. Manoj Datta and Prof. S.N. Singh for their critical comments, valuable suggestions, and contribution to my research work. I am also sincerely thankful to Prof. G. V. Ramana for supporting me during my academic journey and I am also thankful to Dr. R. Ayothiraman, Dr. B. Manna, Dr. J. T. Shahu and Dr. T. Chakraborty for their direct or indirect help in my research work.

I am sincerely thankful to the Management of Central Mine Planning and Design Institute (CMPDIL), Ranchi and Coal India Ltd, Kolkata, for granting permission to pursue the Ph.D. and provide the needful resources for the research work. Development of the LDSM at the CMPDIL, Ranchi and the data produced in this thesis were made possible with Research and Development funding from Coal India Ltd, are gratefully acknowledged. Thanks are due to my seniors and colleagues at CMPDIL for their encouragement.

I want to acknowledge the constant help rendered by HEICO Pvt. Limited, New Delhi, in designing and fabricating the test setup.

I wish to thank research scholar Mr. Nirbhay Narayan Singh for his constant support and feedback at various stages of this work. I also thank my friends and fellow research

scholars, Mr. Venkatewarulu, Mr. Ankit Singh, Ms. Shipra Sinha, Mr. Arpan Nandy, Dr. Ankesh Kumar and all the GRG members for their valuable inputs.

Thanks are due to my close friends Dr. Ravi Gadepalli, Mr. Lakshmi Deep for providing vital inputs when I needed them most. I would also sincerely thank my friends Mr. Prabhath, Mr. Srinivas Gantreddi, Mr. Lakshman Pola, Mr. Chandra Mohan, Dr. Sumanth Chintala, Dr. Janaki Ramaiah, Mr. Harshvardhan, Mr. Nirbhay Bhatnagar, Mr. Bhaskar Tiwari for their constant help and lively discussions at various stages of work. Thanks are due to Mr. Alok Kumar, Rock lab and Geotech lab for their assistance in experimentation.

Most importantly, my research work is a gift to my family, my parents Sri. Venugopal Rao and Smt. Saraswati, who have always believed in me. I would like to thank my sister Dr. Rama Devi for believing in me and backing me when I needed to make this possibility a reality. I would also like to thank my brother-in-Law Dr. Sreekanth Matcha, niece Anwitha, Hamsitha and my cousins Rajesh, Prasad, Harish, Praveen and my mother-in-law Late Smt. Badi. Parvati for the love, care and support they gave to me in my academic journey.

And finally, I wish to thank my wonderful wife, Vijaya Lakshmi, who has always encouraged me and supported me by putting her dreams on hold to pursue mine and manage things at home during my absence. Thanks also to my two wonderful little kids, Joshnav Aditya and Lekhana Aravindhya, for providing the space to complete this work.

Lastly, I would like to thank all those directly or indirectly associated with the entire research program.

Date: July, 2021

Sravan Kumar Gara

ABSTRACT

India is the third largest producers of coal in the world with 89% of production coming from opencast coal mines. Opencast mining operation involves excavation of overburden (OB) material comprise of waste rock and barren materials that must be excavated to access the coal seams. The heavy earthmoving machineries such as draglines, shovels and dumpers are used to excavate the overburden materials. For the year 2019-20, the opencast coal production and OB removal was about 572.092MT and 1154.327Mm³ respectively with stripping ratio (ratio of OB material quantity to coal quantity) of 2.02. Majority of OB material is backfilled to the de-coaled area as internal dump and remaining is dumped outside of the mine as external dump.

Materials forming these dumps vary from silt and clay size ($<75\mu\text{m}$) to coarse grained soil particles ($>75\mu\text{m}$) including sands and gravels as well as large size cobbles (150-300mm) and boulders ($>300\text{mm}$). The OB dumps in most of the opencast coal mines are usually formed by end dumping method which results in formation of dumps with relatively low density and where the outer slope is just stable under the static loading conditions at angle of repose of 37-38°. The materials are subjected to wide range of environmental and climatic changes including erosion, ageing, wet dry cycles, seasonal temperature fluctuations and cyclic loading due to earthquakes, machine movement. These process results in degradation of strength properties of geomaterials and fragment sizes resulting in generation of fines.

The preparation of large-sized dumps is becoming a challenging task for the mine management from two important perspectives. First, the limited availability of surface leasehold land for dumping materials and the second, associated problems of slope stability with the increasing heights of dumps due to increase in stripping ratio. Any instability in the dump can affect the production rate and safe mining operations. Hence, slope stability study of dump needs to be carried out.

For the design and stability analysis of dumps, reliable and direct measurement of shear strength of OB materials has always been limited by the scale of the available testing equipment. There is lack of available data on representative OB materials and mine planners could no longer rely on experience-based models to establish design criteria with confidence. These necessitates a detailed geotechnical characterization of the dump materials forming the

dumps and assessment of the shear strength properties by testing representative samples under field load conditions.

Therefore, the objective of the research was to resolve uncertainties regarding shearing behaviour of existing and planned high dumps and to provide advice on determining reliable shear strength parameters for geotechnical design. To achieve this, a large scale sampling and testing was carried out from a wide range of 165 pits locations across 3 large coal fields, namely Ib valley, Talcher area of Mahanadi Coalfields Ltd. and North Karanpura area of Central Coalfields Ltd.

The geotechnical characterizations indicates that there is extreme spatial variation of particles in a dump mass. Younger dumps have comparably lesser fine contents ($<75\mu\text{m}$) than aged dumps. It is also found out that presence of coarse gravel (20-80mm) contributes approximately 50% of the mass of dump material which classifies the dump material as coarse-grained gravel (IS 1498-1970). Testing the coarse gravel material in conventional small direct shear machine doesn't yield actual strength properties and scalping OB materials to match the constraints of standardised laboratory equipment, will result in an inaccurate estimation of strength properties.

The scale effects on apparatus size implies that there will be a minimum direct shear machine (DSM) size, in terms of specimen, shear box volume and load capacity that can be considered for the representation of in-situ state. To address these scale affects, a large direct shear machine (LDSM) of normal and shear load capacity of 2500kN each and box size of 1000mm $\times$ 1000mm $\times$ 1000mm is designed and developed at CMPDI, Ranchi. Using LDSM, maximum particle size (D_{max}) up to 80mm can be tested for direct shear as per ASTM D3080(98).

A total of 119 direct shear tests were performed on LDSM to assess the shear behaviour of representative OB materials. For these tests, test conditions were varied to acknowledge the scale effect arose due to size of the particle, shear box size and high stresses. Hence, in these tests, two separate specimens of $D_{\text{max}} \leq 25\text{mm}$ and $D_{\text{max}} \leq 80\text{mm}$ and two different shear box size of 1000mm $\times$ 1000mm $\times$ 1000mm and 300mm $\times$ 300mm $\times$ 300mm were considered. In accordance with insitu stresses, normal stresses were also varied from 108kPa to 6000kPa during testing. Tests results show that for similar materials (i.e., $D_{\text{max}} \leq 25\text{mm}$) when tested in DSM and LDSM, DSM tend to overestimate the shear strength upto 7%. However, when

comparing $D_{\max} \leq 25\text{mm}$ results of DSM with LDSM results on representative materials (i.e., $D_{\max} \leq 80\text{mm}$) at insitu normal stress, shear strength parameters improve by as high as $\sim 33\%$. This indicates that there will be a minimum test specimen size and a minimum test normal stress, that should be considered technically acceptable for simulating a shear surface within a high dump constructed of coarse OB materials.

Tests conducted under high normal stresses shows a non-monotonic pattern with three distinctively identified linear zones referred as tri-linear shear strength envelope. Depending on the normal stresses, the cause of shearing failure in these zones are rearrangement and sliding in Zone 1, rubbing and rolling over in Zone 2 and chipping and sliding in Zone 3. A regression analysis was performed to describe this behaviour of OB material under high stresses and a relationship between applied normal stress and shear stress based on particle shape and gradation is proposed using power law.

The strength parameters obtained from the DSM and LDSM are used in the stability analysis and probabilistic modeling for internal and external dumps of the coal mines to find out the factor of safety variance and suggest optimal dump height. Invariably for all cases, the LDSM test results has reported higher FoS when compared to that of DSM by a factor of 1.5 times approximately. Thereby it is evident that DST underestimates the stability of the dumps due to load and scaling limitations.

The probability analysis was carried out for different bench angles 37.5° to 40° and heights of external dumps (90m, 120m and 150m) and internal dumps (150m, 180m, 210m and 240m), the results indicate that the height of external dumps can be safely enhanced upto 150m from ground level and whereas for internal dumps the height can be enhanced upto 210m safely.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CERTIFICATE	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
ABSTRACT	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	ix
LIST OF TABLES	xv
LIST OF FIGURES	xvii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xxv
LIST OF NOTATIONS	xxvii
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	1
1 General	1
1.1 Objectives	5
1.2 Organisation of Thesis	5
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW	9
2 Introduction	9
2.1 Coal Mine Overburden Dump	9
2.2 Types of Overburden Dumps	10
2.2.1 External Dump	10
2.2.2 Internal Dump	12
2.3 Methods of Dumping	12
2.4 Material Segregation	13
2.5 Recent Overburden Dump Stability Failures in Opencast Mines	16
2.6 Nature of Coal Mine Overburden Material	18
2.7 Shearing Behaviour	20
2.7.1 Failure Mechanisms	20
2.7.1.1 Circular Failures	23
2.7.1.2 Wedge Failures	23
2.7.2 Stress-Path to Failure and Significance of Test Apparatus	27
2.7.3 Strength Mobilisation Mode	28

2.7.4	Assessment of Stability Conditions	31
2.8	Framework for Shear Strength Estimation	35
2.9	The Direct Shear Test for Shear Strength Measurement	36
2.9.1	Apparatus and Method	36
2.9.2	Limitations	39
2.10	Considerations for LDSM Tests on Mine OB	42
2.11	Role of Water in the Stability of OB Dumps	43
2.11.1	Degradation	44
2.11.2	Consideration for Partially Saturated OB Material	46
2.12	Models for Describing Shear Strength	50
2.12.1	Linear Models	51
2.12.2	Non-Linear Models	52
2.13	Failure Envelopes Relevant to Coal Mine OB Material	56
2.13.1	Linear Mohr-Coulomb Criteria	56
2.13.2	Non-Linear	57
2.13.3	Non-Linear With Consideration of Index Properties	57
2.14	Scale Effects on Shear Strength	59
2.14.1	Size Effect Theories	60
2.14.2	Effect of Particle Size on Shear Strength	63
2.14.3	Effect of Apparatus Size on Shear Strength	68
2.14.3.1	Shear Box Size	68
2.14.3.2	Aspect Ratio	72
2.15	Studies Into the Effect of Normal Stress on Measured Shear Strength	73
2.15.1	Shear Strength Envelopes	73
2.15.2	Extrapolation of Failure Envelopes	75
2.16	Resolving Limitations Associated with Shear Strength Estimation for High Dumps	77
2.16.1	Large-Scale Apparatus for Measuring Shear Strength of OB	77
2.16.1.1	Existing large-scale testing equipment	77
2.16.1.2	Summary of the Existing Machine	79
2.16.1.3	Requirement for Purpose-Built Equipment	80
2.17	Slope Stability Analysis of OB Dumps	80

2.17.1	Probabilistic Analysis of Slopes	81
2.18	Conclusions from Literature Review	82
2.18.1	Shearing Behaviour of Coal Mine Dumps	82
2.18.2	Models Describing Shear Strength	83
2.18.3	Scale Effects	85
CHAPTER 3	GEOTECHNICAL CHARACTERISATION OF OB DUMP MATERIALS	89
3	General	89
3.1	Coalfields Considered in the Study	89
3.2	Sample Collection from the Coalfields	93
3.3	Geotechnical Characterization of OB Dumps	95
3.3.1	Specific Gravity	102
3.3.2	Particle Size Distribution	104
3.3.3	In-Situ Density and Moisture Content	111
3.3.4	Atterberg's Limits	114
3.3.5	Standard Proctor Compaction	115
3.3.6	Permeability	118
3.3.7	Shear Parameters	119
CHAPTER 4	DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT OF LARGE DIRECT SHEAR MACHINE	121
4	General	121
4.1	Purpose to Set-Up LDSM Equipment	121
4.2	Estimation of Stress States for Very High Dumps	122
4.2.1	Limit Equilibrium Analysis	122
4.2.2	Mohr Circle Analysis	124
4.3	Design and Development of LDSM	125
4.3.1	Loading Frame	127
4.3.2	Split Shear Box	130
4.4	Components of Large Direct Shear Machine	133
4.4.1	Loading System	133
4.4.2	Shear Box Assembly	138
4.4.3	Two Servo Hydraulic Actuators for Normal and Shear Loads	139
4.4.4	Top Loading Pad with Spherical Setting	141

4.4.5	PC-Based Data Acquisition, Control and Display System	141
4.4.6	Load Cells	143
4.4.7	Horizontal and Vertical LVDTs	143
4.4.8	Push-Pull Arrangement for Shear Box Assembly.	144
4.5	Calibration and Model Tests	144
4.5.1	Calibration for Load Cells and LVDTs	144
4.5.2	LDSM Calibration for Shearing	147
4.6	Conclusions	149
CHAPTER 5	EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS OF LARGE DIRECT SHEAR MACHINE	151
5	General	151
5.1	Magadh Open Cast Project	151
5.1.1	Geology	153
5.1.2	Coal Winning and OB Removal	154
5.1.3	OB Dump Management	155
5.2	Bulk Sample Collection	156
5.3	Geotechnical Characterisation of OB Samples	157
5.3.1	Mineralogy	157
5.3.2	Particle Shape and Size	162
5.3.3	Index Properties	170
5.4	Experimental Considerations for Performing LDST on OB Dump Soil	171
5.4.1	Preparation of Specimens	171
5.4.1.1	Quantity of OB Dump Soil	171
5.4.1.2	Specimen Thickness	172
5.4.1.3	Maximum Particle Size	172
5.4.1.4	Moisture Content	172
5.4.1.5	Compaction Efforts	173
5.4.2	Test Conditions	175
5.4.2.1	Shear Plane Separation	175
5.4.2.2	Load and Displacement	175
5.4.2.3	Strength Mobilisation Mode	175
5.4.2.4	Displacement Rate	176

5.4.2.5	Scale Effect Consideration	176
5.4.3	Data Outputs, Calculations and Plotting	177
5.5	Comments on Stress-Strain Data	182
5.6	Conclusion	184
CHAPTER 6	CRITICAL EVOLUTION OF SHEAR STRENGTH FOR OB MATERIAL	185
6	General	185
6.1	Critical Evaluation on Shear Strength	185
6.2	Scale Effects	188
6.2.1	Effect of Box Size	190
6.2.2	Effect of Particle Size	196
6.2.3	Effect of Normal Stress	201
6.3	Variation of Current Practice with Proposed Design Practice	213
6.4	Regression Analysis and Empirical Relation	218
6.5	Conclusion	225
CHAPTER 7	STABILITY ANALYSIS FOR OB DUMPS	227
7	General	227
7.1	Existing Design Parameters of Dumps as Per Mining Plan/Project Report	227
7.2	Scheme of Stability Analysis	227
7.3	Slope Stability Analysis System - GALENA	230
7.4	Methods of Analysis	231
7.4.1	Searching for Failure Surface	232
7.5	Probabilistic Analysis	233
7.6	Considerations for the Analysis	234
7.7	Seismic Forces	235
7.7.1	Seismic Coefficient Method	235
7.7.2	Response Spectrum Method	236
7.8	Strength Properties	237
7.9	Phreatic Surface	237
7.10	Numerical Errors - Limit Equilibrium Methods of Analysis	238
7.11	Stability Analysis Results	238
7.12	Summary of Analysis for External Dump	239
7.12.1	Summary of Analysis for Internal Dump	240

7.12.2	Model 31: Internal Dump, Height 210, Bench Angle 39, Analysis Using DST Data	244
7.12.3	Model 32: Internal Dump, Height 210, Bench Angle 39, Analysis Using LDST Data	247
7.13	Comparison of Stability Analysis Results	250
7.14	Conclusions	252
CHAPTER 8	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	255
8	General	255
8.1	Conclusions	256
8.1.1	Geotechnical Characterisation of OB Dump Material	256
8.1.2	Design and Development of LDSM	257
8.1.3	Testing of Representative OB Dump Materials	258
8.1.4	Scale Effects	259
8.1.5	Stability Analysis of OB Dumps	260
8.2	Future Scope	261
REFERENCES		263
APPENDIX A	Solid Works Analysis of Loading Frame of LDSM	282
APPENDIX B	Index and Engineering Properties of Coalfields	287
APPENDIX C	Stress vs Strain Plots of Shear Test on LDSM	304
APPENDIX D	Mohr Failure Envelope of Shear Test on LDSM	318
APPENDIX E	GALENA Slope Stability Models of OB Dumps (Models 1-42)	328

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1 Reported Shear Strength Parameters (Drained Conditions) for a Range of OB Materials	33
Table 3.1 Brief Details of Projects Selected for Sampling (Annual Report 2019-20, Ministry of Coal).	91
Table 3.2 Details of Sampling Pits	95
Table 3.3 Geotechnical Properties/Parameters of OB Dump at G2-L1	96
Table 3.4 Details of All Samples Collected from G2 and G3.	97
Table 3.5 Statistical Analysis of Specific Gravity for All Locations.	103
Table 3.6 On-way Anova Test for Bulk Density and Specific Gravity.	112
Table 3.7 Statistical Analysis of Field Moisture Content Results	113
Table 3.8 Statistical Analysis of MDD and OMC	116
Table 3.9 Shear Strength Parameters of OB Dump Material for all Locations.	119
Table 4.1 Technical specification of LDSM	150
Table 5.1 Mining and Geological Characteristics.	154
Table 5.2 Major Parameters of the OB dumps.	155
Table 5.3 Shape and Sphericity of Particles >4.75mm for Each OB Dumps Material	163
Table 5.4 The Index and Engineering Properties of Magadh OCP (G1-L1).	170
Table 5.5 Test Conditions and Results of all Tests.	179
Table 6.1 Shear Strength Parameters for All Tests Conducted.	186
Table 6.2 Shear Strength Parameters for All OBs in DST ($D_{max} \leq 25$) and LDST ($D_{max} \leq 25$).	195
Table 6.3 Shear Strength Parameters for all OBs in LDST ($D_{max} \leq 25$) and LDST ($D_{max} \leq 80$).	200
Table 6.4 Summary of shear strength parameters of current and proposed design practice.	217
Table 6.5 Shape Factor Constants A and b for Various Power Law Curves.	220
Table 6.6 Shape Factor Constants A and b for OB Materials.	225
Table 7.1 Cases Considered for Stability Analysis.	230
Table 7.2 Strength Parameters Considered for Analysis	237
Table 7.3 External Dump with 37.5° Bench Angle	239
Table 7.4 External Dump with 39° Bench Angle	239

Table 7.5 External Dump with 40° Bench Angle	240
Table 7.6 Internal Dump with 37.5° Bench Angle	240
Table 7.7 Internal Dump with 39° Bench Angle	240
Table 7.8 Internal Dump with 40° Bench Angle	241

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1 Location of Coalfields and Coal India (CIL) Production Companies (Annual Report 2019-20, Ministry of Coal).	2
Figure 1.2 Coal Production Trend in India (Annual Report 2019-20, Ministry of Coal).	2
Figure 1.3 Coal Production vs Over Burden removal in Opencast Mines over the last decade (Annual Report 2019-20, Ministry of Coal)	3
Figure 2.1 Lithology of Nighahi OCP at Singrauli Coalfield Area (Sengupta et al., 2016)	10
Figure 2.2 Typical Elements of Opencast Coal mine, Lakhanpur OCP	11
Figure 2.3 Typical View of Material Components of the Dump at Krishnasila OCP.	11
Figure 2.4 External OB Dump at Nigahi OCP with Approximate Height 100m.	12
Figure 2.5 Method of Dumping a) End dumping, b) Push dumping.	14
Figure 2.6 Zones Within an OB Dump Caused by End-Dumping (McLemore et al., 2009).	15
Figure 2.7 Internal OB Dump Failure at Bharatpur OCP	18
Figure 2.8 Circular Failure of External OB Dump near Highwall at Rajmahal OCP	18
Figure 2.9 Close View of Overburden Dump Material at Magadh OCP.	20
Figure 2.10 Cross-Section Through a OB Dump Foundation-Type Failure (Gonano, 1980).	22
Figure 2.11 Cross-Sections Through Two-Wedge-Type Spoil Failures (Mallett et al., 1983).	22
Figure 2.12 Types of Circular Failures (Rizkalla, 1983).	24
Figure 2.13 (1, 2, 3, 4) Sequence of Development of Wedge Failure (Mallett et al., 1983).	24
Figure 2.14 Deep-Seated Multi-Wedge Failure mechanism.(Simmons and McManus 2004).	26
Figure 2.15 Typical Types of Failures in Poorly designed OB Dumps (a) Circular Failure (b) Failure along an Irregular Surface (Carter, 1983.).	26
Figure 2.16 Idealised Strength Mobilisation Modes and Stress-Strain Diagrams Used in Practice for (a) Traditional Soil Mechanics Theory (Terzaghi Et Al.,1996); and (b)Variation Commonly Used by Mine Geotechnical	

Practitioners for Loose-Tipped Coal Measures OB (Simmons and Mcmanus, 2004).	30
Figure 2.17 Conventional Direct Shear Apparatus.	37
Figure 2.18 Schematic Diagram of Conventional Shear Box.	38
Figure 2.19 : Hydrostratigraphy of Spoil Dumps (Smith et al., 1995).	46
Figure 2.20: Moisture Conditions in OB Dumps (Simmons and McManus, 2004).	47
Figure 2.21 3-Zone Model for Moisture Conditions within OB Dump (Simmons et al., 2015).	48
Figure 2.22 Some Simple Shear Strength Models described in the Literature for Soils, Rockfills and Rock Joints.	55
Figure 2.23 Barton's Empirical Methods for Estimating the Equivalent Roughness, R and Strength of Contact Points, S, for Rockfill. (Barton 2008).	58
Figure 2.24 Large-Scale Triaxial Data for Norway Rockfill Dams performed at NGI (Barton 2008).	64
Figure 2.25 Measured Effect of Particle Size on ϕ' using Test Data from Marachi et al., (1969); Barton and Kjaernsli (1981).	65
Figure 2.26 Assembly of Peak Shear Strength Data for Rockfills (Leps, 1970).	68
Figure 2.27 Angle of Internal Friction vs Peak Normal Stress (Hribar et al., 1987).	71
Figure 2.28 Results of Large-Scale Triaxial Tests performed on Hard-Rock Mine OB Material demonstrate Stress-Dependent Friction Angles,(Linero et al., 2006).	74
Figure 2.29 Conceptual Model demonstrating an Overestimation of Shear Strength when Extrapolating Laboratory Data (Simmons and McManus, 1995; 2004).	76
Figure 2.30 Large Scale Direct Shear Testing Device. (Xu et al., 2011).	78
Figure 2.31 Large Triaxial Device at IDIEM laboratory (left); Assembly of a Specimen in the Triaxial Chamber (right), (Linero et al., 2006).	79
Figure 3.1 Flow Chart of Research Program for Experimental and Numerical Studies on OB Dumps Materials	90
Figure 3.2 Map Showing Location of Selected Major Coal Fields for Sourcing Samples.	93
Figure 3.3 On Site Sieving and Collection of Samples for Characterization and Testing.	94
Figure 3.4 Different Sample Collected and Seived for less than 4.75mm (G1-L1)	96

Figure 3.5 Frequency Distribution Graph of Specific Gravity G2 Samples.	104
Figure 3.6 Frequency Distribution Graph of Specific Gravity G3 Samples.	104
Figure 3.7 The Sieve Analysis Results of Talcher Coalfields (G2) of Ananta OCP (L1).	105
Figure 3.8 The Sieve Analysis Results of Talcher Coalfields (G2) of Balram OCP (L2).	105
Figure 3.9 The Sieve Analysis Results of Talcher Coalfields (G2) of Bharatpur OCP (L3).	106
Figure 3.10 The Sieve Analysis Results of Talcher Coalfields (G2) of Bhuvaneswari OCP (L4).Hingula OCP	106
Figure 3.11 The Sieve Analysis Results of Talcher Coalfields (G2) of Hingula OCP (L5).	107
Figure 3.12 The Sieve Analysis Results of Talcher Coalfields (G2) of Jagannath OCP (L6).	107
Figure 3.13 The Sieve Analysis Results of Talcher Coalfields (G2) of Kaniha OCP (L7)	108
Figure 3.14 The Sieve Analysis Results of Talcher Coalfields (G2) of Lingaraj OCP (L8).	108
Figure 3.15 The Sieve Analysis Results of IB Vally Coalfields (G3) of Sambaleswari OCP (L1).	109
Figure 3.16 The Sieve Analysis Results of IB Vally Coalfields (G3) of Basundhara OCP (L2).	109
Figure 3.17 The Sieve Analysis Results of IB Vally Coalfields (G3) of Belphar OCP (L3).	110
Figure 3.18 The Sieve Analysis Results of IB Vally Coalfields (G3) of Lajkura OCP (L4)	110
Figure 3.19 Statistical Analysis of Particle Size Distribution	111
Figure 3.20 Statistical Representation of in-situ Density.	112
Figure 3.21 Moisture Content vs Percent Fines	113
Figure 3.22 Plasticity Chart for all Soils from Various Coal Fields.	115
Figure 3.23 Comparison Chart of Max. Dry Density and In-situ Dry Density.	117
Figure 3.24 Comparison Chart of OMC and Field Moisture Content	117
Figure 4.1 Multi-Wedge Instability Mechanism and Approximation of Maximum Normal Stress.	123

Figure 4.2 2D Limit Equilibrium Analysis of a Simplified Geometry for a 250m OB Dump	124
Figure 4.3 Mohr-Circle Analysis for a 250m High Dump ($\gamma = 18\text{kN/m}^3$).	125
Figure 4.4 Design for Left Column Showing Stiffening Plate With Respect to Actuator.	128
Figure 4.5 Design for Right Column Showing Stiffening Plate With Respect to Load Cell.	129
Figure 4.6 Design of Upper Beam Showing Stiffening Plate	129
Figure 4.7 Design of Lower Beam Showing Stiffening Plate.	130
Figure 4.8 Common End Plate with Threaded Holes.	130
Figure 4.9 Wall Thickness of Top Shear Box.	134
Figure 4.10 (a) Scheme and Machining Details of Upper Shear Box (b) Plate 1 (c) Plate 2 (d) Plate 3	134
Figure 4.11 (a) Scheme and Machining Details of Upper Shear Box (b) Plate 1 (c) Plate 2 (d) Plate 3 (e) Plate 4	135
Figure 4.12 Fabrication and Installation of LDSM.	136
Figure 4.13 SolidWorks Drawing of Final Design of LDSM.	136
Figure 4.14 SolidWorks Conceptual Drawing of LDSM Assembly.	137
Figure 4.15 Line Diagram of LDSM.	138
Figure 4.16 Shear Box Assembly with all it's components	139
Figure 4.17 Hydraulic Jack Assembly	140
Figure 4.18 Hydraulic Power Pack with Air Cooler.	141
Figure 4.19 (a) Spherical Setting for equal stress (b) spherical setting for equal strains.	141
Figure 4.20 Interface of Controlling Software of LDSM	142
Figure 4.21 Load Cell of 2500 kN Capacity Fitted on the Right Column	143
Figure 4.22 Hydraulic Cylinder with 1650mm Stroke for Push and Pull Assembly.	144
Figure 4.23 Calibration plot of vertical load cell.	145
Figure 4.24 Calibration Plot of Horizontal Load Cell.	145
Figure 4.25 Calibration Plot of Horizontal LVDTs	146
Figure 4.26 Calibration Plot of Horizontal LVDTs	146
Figure 4.27 Sand Specimen for Calibration after Filling Two Layers.	148
Figure 4.28 Stress vs Strain plot for Sand in DSM and LDSM	149
Figure 4.29 Failure Envelope of Calibration Test for DSM and LDSM.	149

Figure 5.1 Location of the Magadh OCP.	152
Figure 5.2 Collection and Packing of Samples from OB dump.	156
Figure 5.3 Photograph of OB-5 Showing Composition of Various Particle Size.	157
Figure 5.4 Complete Set Up of XRD Apparatus (Ringaku, Min flax600) Used for the Analysis.	159
Figure 5.5 Identified Peaks of Soil Minerals of OB-1, OB-2, OB-3, OB-4 through XRD	160
Figure 5.6 Identified Peaks of Soil Minerals of OB-5, OB-6, OB-7 through XRD	161
Figure 5.7 All OB Materials Passed Through 4.75mm.	162
Figure 5.8 Shape and Sphericity Comparator Charts, Modified from Pettijohn et al., (1973)	163
Figure 5.9 Shapes of the OB particles retained on 4.75mm and 25mm sieve	165
Figure 5.10 Shapes of the OB-7 particles retained on 4.75mm and 25mm sieve	166
Figure 5.11 Particle Size Distribution of OB Material from G1-L1 having $D_{max} \leq 25\text{mm}$	167
Figure 5.12 Particle Size Distribution of OB Material from G1-L1 having $D_{max} \leq 80\text{mm}$	167
Figure 5.13 Sieving of Material Through 30mm Sieve	169
Figure 5.14 Amount of Material Retained and Passed Through 30mm Sieve.	169
Figure 5.15 Compaction of Single Layer of Soil	174
Figure 5.16 Testing Sequence for Estimating Scale Effects on Strength Parameters	176
Figure 5.17 A Representation of Typical Shear Stress vs Shear Strain Plots	183
Figure 6.1 Variation of ϕ_s of all OB Material in DST, $D_{max} \leq 25\text{mm}$.	188
Figure 6.2 Variation of ϕ_s of all OB Material in LDST, $D_{max} \leq 25\text{mm}$.	189
Figure 6.3 Variation of ϕ_s of all OB Material in LDST, $D_{max} \leq 80\text{mm}$.	189
Figure 6.4 Failure Envelope for OB-1 in DST ($D_{max} \leq 25$) and LDST ($D_{max} \leq 25$).	191
Figure 6.5 Failure Envelope for OB-2 in DST ($D_{max} \leq 25$) and LDST ($D_{max} \leq 25$).	191
Figure 6.6 Failure Envelope for OB-3 in DST ($D_{max} \leq 25$) and LDST ($D_{max} \leq 25$).	192
Figure 6.7 Failure Envelope for OB-4 in DST ($D_{max} \leq 25$) and LDST ($D_{max} \leq 25$).	192
Figure 6.8 Failure Envelope for OB-5 in DST ($D_{max} \leq 25$) and LDST ($D_{max} \leq 25$).	193
Figure 6.9 Failure Envelope for OB-6 in DST ($D_{max} \leq 25$) and LDST ($D_{max} \leq 25$).	193
Figure 6.10 Failure Envelope for OB-7 in DST ($D_{max} \leq 25$) and LDST ($D_{max} \leq 25$).	194
Figure 6.11 Variation of ϕ_s for OB-1 in DST ($D_{max} \leq 25$) and LDST ($D_{max} \leq 25$).	194

Figure 6.12 Failure Envelope for OB-1 in LDST ($D_{\max} \leq 25$) and LDST ($D_{\max} \leq 80$).	197
Figure 6.13 Failure Envelope for OB-2 in LDST ($D_{\max} \leq 25$) and LDST ($D_{\max} \leq 80$).	197
Figure 6.14 Failure Envelope for OB-4 in LDST ($D_{\max} \leq 25$) and LDST ($D_{\max} \leq 80$).	198
Figure 6.15 Failure Envelope for OB-5 in LDST ($D_{\max} \leq 25$) and LDST ($D_{\max} \leq 80$).	198
Figure 6.16 Failure Envelope for OB-6 in LDST ($D_{\max} \leq 25$) and LDST ($D_{\max} \leq 80$).	199
Figure 6.17 Failure Envelope for OB-7 in LDST ($D_{\max} \leq 25$) and LDST ($D_{\max} \leq 80$).	199
Figure 6.18 Variation of ϕ_s for OB-1 in LDST ($D_{\max} \leq 25$) and LDST ($D_{\max} \leq 80$).	200
Figure 6.19 Failure Envelope and Change in Height at Failure for OB-1 in DST ($D_{\max} \leq 25$).	202
Figure 6.20 Failure Envelope and Change in Height at Failure for OB-2 in DST ($D_{\max} \leq 25$).	202
Figure 6.21 Failure Envelope and Change in Height at Failure for OB-3 in DST ($D_{\max} \leq 25$).	203
Figure 6.22 Failure Envelope and Change in Height at Failure for OB-4 in DST ($D_{\max} \leq 25$).	203
Figure 6.23 Failure Envelope and Change in Height at Failure for OB-5 in DST ($D_{\max} \leq 25$).	204
Figure 6.24 Failure Envelope and Change in Height at Failure for OB-6 in DST ($D_{\max} \leq 25$).	204
Figure 6.25 Failure Envelope and Change in Height at Failure for OB-7 in DST ($D_{\max} \leq 25$).	205
Figure 6.26 Variation of ϕ_s of All OB Material in DST, $D_{\max} \leq 25$ mm.	208
Figure 6.27 Dominant Shearing Mechanism for σ_n Zone 1.	209
Figure 6.28 Dominant Shearing Mechanism for σ_n Zone 2.	210
Figure 6.29 Dominant Shearing Mechanism for σ_n Zone 3.	211
Figure 6.30 Failure Envelope for OB-1 in DST ($D_{\max} \leq 25$) and LDST ($D_{\max} \leq 80$).	214
Figure 6.31 Failure Envelope for OB-2 in DST ($D_{\max} \leq 25$) and LDST ($D_{\max} \leq 80$).	214
Figure 6.32 Failure Envelope for OB-4 in DST ($D_{\max} \leq 25$) and LDST ($D_{\max} \leq 80$).	215
Figure 6.33 Failure Envelope for OB-5 in DST ($D_{\max} \leq 25$) and LDST ($D_{\max} \leq 80$).	215
Figure 6.34 Failure Envelope for OB-6 in DST ($D_{\max} \leq 25$) and LDST ($D_{\max} \leq 80$).	216
Figure 6.35 Failure Envelope for OB-7 in DST ($D_{\max} \leq 25$) and LDST ($D_{\max} \leq 80$).	216
Figure 6.36 Variation of ϕ_s for OB-1 in DST ($D_{\max} \leq 25$) and LDST ($D_{\max} \leq 80$).	217
Figure 6.37 Shear Strength vs. Normal Effective Stress Data Points for OB-3.	218

Figure 6.38 Mohr-Coulomb Failure Data for OB-1 Tests, Compared with Barton's Empirical Failure Envelope.	219
Figure 6.39 OB-1 Test Data, Compared with Power-Law Failure Envelopes for Similar Rocks.	221
Figure 6.40 OB-2 Test Data, Compared with Power-Law Failure Envelopes for Similar Rocks.	221
Figure 6.41 OB-3 Test Data, Compared with Power-Law Failure Envelopes for Similar Rocks.	222
Figure 6.42 OB-4 Test Data, Compared with Power-Law Failure Envelopes for Similar Rocks.	222
Figure 6.43 OB-5 Test Data, Compared with Power-Law Failure Envelopes for Similar Rocks.	223
Figure 6.44 OB-6 Test Data, Compared with Power-Law Failure Envelopes for Similar Rocks.	223
Figure 6.45 OB-7 Test Data, Compared with Power-Law Failure Envelopes for Similar Rocks.	224
Figure 7.1 Individual Bench Angles of External OB Dump at NCL.	229
Figure 7.2 Mechanism of Circular Failure Predominant in Indian OB Dumps.	233
Figure 7.3 Parameters for Probability Analysis in GALENA.	234
Figure 7.4 M10 : A1: Analysis for Local Failure.	241
Figure 7.5 M10: R1: Critical FoS for Local Failure.	242
Figure 7.6 M10: P1: Probability Analysis for Local Failure.	242
Figure 7.7 M10 : A2: Analysis for Global Failure.	243
Figure 7.8 M10: R2: Critical FoS for Global Failure.	243
Figure 7.9 M10: P2: Probability Analysis for Global Failure.	244
Figure 7.10 M31: A1: Analysis for Local Failure.	244
Figure 7.11 M31: R1: Critical FoS for Local Failure.	245
Figure 7.12 M31: P1: Probability Analysis for Local Failure.	245
Figure 7.13 M31: A2: Analysis for Global Failure.	246
Figure 7.14 M31: R2: Critical FoS for Global Failure.	246
Figure 7.15 M31: P2: Probability Analysis for Global Failure.	247
Figure 7.16 M32: A1: Analysis for Local Failure.	247
Figure 7.17 M32: R1: Critical FoS for Local Failure.	248
Figure 7.18 M32: P1: Probability Analysis for Local Failure.	248

Figure 7.19 M32: A2: Analysis for Global Failure.	249
Figure 7.20 M32: R2: Critical FoS for Global Failure.	249
Figure 7.21 M32: P2: Probability Analysis for Global failure.	250
Figure 7.22 Variation of FoS w.r.t Dump Height and Slope Angle of External Dumps for Local Failure on DST and LDST.	250
Figure 7.23 Variation of FoS w.r.t Dump Height and Slope Angle of Internal Dumps for Local Failure on DST and LDST.	251
Figure 7.24 Variation of FoS w.r.t Dump Height and Slope Angle of External Dumps for Local and Global Failure on LDST.	251
Figure 7.25 Variation of FoS w.r.t Dump Height and Slope Angle of Internal Dumps for Local and Global Failure on LDST.	251

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ASTM	American Society for Testing and Materials
BMAC	Billiton Mitsubishi Alliance Coal
CCL	Central Coalfields Limited
CIL	Coal India Limited
CMPDI	Coal Mine Planning and Design Institute
CMR	Coal Mine Regulations
CNL	Constant Normal Load
CNS	Constant Normal Stiffness
CSIRO	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization
DAQ	Data Acquisition System
DEM	Discrete Element Method
DFSI	Differential Free Swell Index
DGMS	Director-General of Mine Safety
DGMS	Director General of Mines Safety
DSA	Direct Shear Apparatus
DSM	Direct Shear Machine
DST	Direct Shear Test
ECL	Eastern Coalfields Limited
ED	External Dump
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EMP	Environment Management Plan
FEM	Finite Element Method
FSI	Free Swelling Index
GSD	Grain Size Distribution
GSI	Geological Survey of India
HEICO	Hydraulic Engineering Instruments Co.
ICDD	International Centre for Diffraction Data
ID	Internal Dump
IPD	In-Pit Dumping
IS	Indian Standard

ISO	International Organization for Standardization
JCS	Joint Wall Compressive Strength
JRC	Joint Roughness Coefficient
LDSM	Large Direct Shear Machine
LDST	Large Direct Shear Test
LEM	Limit Equilibrium Method
LVDT	Linear Variable Differential Transformer
MCL	Mahanadi Coalfields Limited
MDD	Maximum Dry Density
MECL	Mineral Exploration Corporation Limited
MoEF&CC	Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change
MS	Mild Steel
MTPA	Million Ton Per Annum
NC	Normally Consolidated
NCL	Northern Coalfields Limited
OB	Overburden
OBD	Overburden Dumps
OBM	Overburden Material
OCM	Opencast Mine
OCF	Opencast Project
OMC	Optimum Moisture Content
QTMR	Queensland Transport and Main Roads
SCCL	Singareni Collieries Company Limited
SD	Standard Deviation
SECL	South-Eastern Coalfields Limited
SWCC	Soil-Water Characteristic Curve
TS	Technical Specification
UCS	Unconfined Compressive Strength
UM	Underground Mining
WCL	Western Coalfields Limited
XRD	X-Ray Diffraction

LIST OF NOTATIONS

$D_{\max}$	Maximum particle size
FoS	Factor of safety
P_f	Probability of failure
P	Probability of event
L	Length
D	Diameter or edge size of shear box
u_a	Pore air pressure
u_w	Pore water pressure
i	Average angle of deviation of particle displacements from the direction of the applied shear stress (saw-tooth angle)
c	Cohesion
c'	Effective cohesion
$2c$	Initial crack length (according to Griffith's theory)
A, b	Shape factors
R	Equivalent particle Roughness
S	Equivalent particle strength
n	Porosity
d	Horizontal displacement
d_{50}	Particle size equivalent to 50% passing
D_{50}	Mean particle size
D_{60}	Particle size corresponding to 60% passing
D_{30}	Particle size corresponding to 30% passing
C_u	Uniformity coefficient
C_c	Coefficient of gradation
T	Specimen thickness
W	Direct shear box width
E	Young's modulus of intact geo-material
V	Specimen volume
G	Specific gravity
CL/ML/OL	Clayey / silty / organic material with low plasticity
CI/MI/OI	Clayey / silty / organic material with intermediate plasticity

CH/MH/OH	Clayey / silty / organic material with high plasticity
I_p	Plasticity index
W_L	Liquid limit
k	Permeability
I	Moment of inertia
I	Factor depending upon the importance of structures
SW	Well graded sand
SP	Poorly graded sand
GP	Poorly graded gravel
A_c	Corrected cross sectional area
ΔV	Change in volume of the material
ΔH	Change in horizontal displacement
R^2	Correlation coefficient
F_o	Seismic zone factor for average acceleration spectra
S_a/g	Average acceleration coefficient for an appropriate natural period and damping of structure
T	Natural period of vibration for earth fill structure
G	Modulus of rigidity
τ	Available shear strength
τ_a	Actual shear stress
τ_p	Peak shear strength
τ_f	Shear stress at failure
ϕ	Angle of shearing resistance
ϕ'	Angle of effective shearing resistance
ϕ_b	Angle indicating the rate of strength increase with respect to matric suction
ϕ_s	Secant friction angle for the applied normal stress
ϕ'_s	Secant friction angle for a given effective normal stress
ϕ'_u	Angle of interparticle sliding friction
ϕ'_g	Angle of geometric interference
ϕ'_r	Residual friction angle
ϕ'_b	Mobilized angle of friction of OB dump material
ϕ'_a	Mobilized angle of friction of laboratory specimen

$\Delta\phi$	Difference in friction angles
σ_n	Normal stress
σ'_n	Effective normal stress
σ_c	Unconfined compressive strength
σ_f	Normal stress at failure
σ_t	Uniaxial tensile strength
σ_1	Major principal stress
σ'_3	Effective minor principal stress
γ	Unit weight
γ_{bulk}	Bulk unit weight
γ'	Effective unit weight
α	Surface energy per unit area of the crack surface
μ_w	Pore water pressure
μ_a	Pore air pressure
δ	Deflection
$\text{\AA}$	Angstrom
λ	Wavelength
θ	Glancing angle of X-ray beam or diffraction angle
ε	Shear strain
ε_f	Failure horizontal strain
α_0	Basic horizontal seismic coefficient
β	Coefficient depending on the soil foundation system
α_h	Horizontal seismic coefficient
ρ	Mass density