ENG. 2 0070625.0043



#### **DISCLAIMER**

The calculations contained in this document were developed by Bechtel SAIC Company, LLC (BSC) and are intended solely for the use of BSC in its work for the Yucca Mountain Project.

# **CONTENTS**



# **FIGURES**

# **Page**



# **FIGURES (Continued)**

# **Page**



# **TABLES**

# **Page**



# **ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS**



#### **1.0 PURPOSE**

During transport from the repository surface facilities to the emplacement drifts, waste packages will be placed inside a Transport and Emplacement Vehicle (TEV) steel shielded enclosure to provide radiation protection and to protect the waste packages from the potential impact of rockfalls. The size, quantity, and distribution of the potential rockfalls need to be estimated in order to evaluate the potential impact of rockfalls on integrity of the steel waste package transporter shield.

The purpose of this calculation is to predict the size, quantity, and distribution of the potential rockfalls in the nonemplacement drifts, specifically in the area of access mains and turnouts, due to seismic ground motions, and to assess the overall stability of the excavations. This calculation is intended to provide input to the evaluation of the potential event sequences of the preclosure period and to the evaluation of rockfall impact on the waste package transporter shield (Reference 2.2.14) as specified in *Project Design Criteria Document* 000-3DR-MGR0-00100- 000-006 (Reference 2.2.7, p. 78, Section 4.5.2.1), and *Basis of Design for the TAD Canister-Based Repository Design Concept* 000-3DR-MGR0-00300-000-000 (Reference 2.2.8 p.98, Section 8.2.3.1.1, and p.99, Section 8.2.3.1.4).

The scope of this calculation is limited to the prediction of rockfalls in the nonemplacement drifts during the preclosure period. The seismic event that triggers the rockfalls analyzed in this calculation corresponds to an annual probability of exceedance equal to  $10^{-5}$ . The justification for selecting such a magnitude for this mean exceedance probability is addressed in the calculation succeeding Reference 2.2.6 currently under the development by the Preclosure Safety Analysis (PCSA) Group, and the results from this analysis should be used in the context of the PCSA interpretation.

The potential for damage to waste container and/or TEV shielded enclosure is highest for the nonemplacement drifts with largest spans. While the potential for a rockfall is present both in lithophysal and nonlithophysal strata, the potential for forming larger rock blocks is greater in nonlithophysal rock mass units because the rock blocks are relatively strong and the rock mass behavior is governed by the presence of discontinuities. Therefore, the nonlithophysal stratum is considered more representative for analysis since it is capable of producing larger blocks than the lithophysal strata encountered at the repository host horizon.

This analysis is a further refinement of the methodology presented in *Prediction of Rockfalls in Non-emplacement Drifts Due to Preclosure Seismic Ground Motions,* Revision A (Reference 2.2.13). It should be noted that Revision A accounted for seismic ground motions corresponding to a  $10^{-4}$  annual probability of exceedance. Since this initial Revision A, rock mass strength properties have been revised and summarized in the *Subsurface Geotechnical Parameter Report (SGPR), Rev 00* (Reference 2.2.20). Work continued also on the further refinement of Design Basis Ground Motion, which resulted in revision of the ground motion waveforms, and consequently in revision of the ground motion input.

The current analysis includes results considering these new input refinements. Since there are two domains that involve changes, namely, rock mass strength properties and ground motion input, it was considered prudent to provide an assessment of the impact these changes may cause to the previously determined results.

### **2.0 REFERENCES**

#### **2.1 PROCEDURES/DIRECTIVES**

- 2.1.1 BSC (Bechtel SAIC Company) 2007. *Quality Management Directive.* QA-DIR-10, Rev. 1. Las Vegas, Nevada: Bechtel SAIC Company. ACC: DOC.20070330.0001. [DIRS 180474]
- 2.1.2 EG-PRO-3DP-G04B-00037 Rev 008. *Calculations and Analyses*. Las Vegas, Nevada: Bechtel SAIC Company. ACC: ENG.20070420.0002
- 2.1.3 IT-PRO-0011 Rev 005. *Software Management*. Las Vegas, Nevada: Bechtel SAIC Company. ACC: DOC.20070521.0001.

#### **2.2 DESIGN INPUTS**

- 2.2.1 3DEC V. 2.01. 2002. WINDOWS 2000/NT 4.0. STN: 10025-2.01-00. [DIRS 161930]
- 2.2.2 BSC (Bechtel SAIC Company) 2002. *Software Implementation Report for 3DEC Version 2.01*. Document Number: 10025-SIR-2.01-00. Las Vegas, Nevada: Bechtel SAIC Company. ACC: MOL.20021105.0252. [DIRS 168822]
- 2.2.3 BSC 2003. *Input Parameters for Ground Support Design*. 800-K0C-TEG0-00500-000- 00A. Las Vegas, Nevada: Bechtel SAIC Company. ACC: ENG.20030515.0002, ENG.20050816.0016. [DIRS 163439]
- 2.2.4 BSC 2003. *Subsurface Geotechnical Parameters Report*. 800-K0C-WIS0-00400-000- 00A. Las Vegas, Nevada: Bechtel SAIC Company. ACC: ENG.20040108.0001; ENG.20050816.0020. [DIRS 166660]
- 2.2.5 BSC 2003. *Underground Layout Configuration.* 800-P0C-MGR0-00100-000-00E. Las Vegas, Nevada: Bechtel SAIC Company. ACC: ENG.20031002.0007; ENG.20050817.0005. [DIRS 165572].
- 2.2.6 BSC 2004. *Bounding Characteristics of Credible Rockfalls of Preclosure Period.* 800- 00C-MGR0-00200-000-00A. Las Vegas, Nevada: Bechtel SAIC Company. ACC: ENG.20040315.0009; ENG.20050811.0007. [DIRS168508]
- 2.2.7 BSC 2006. *Project Design Criteria Document.* 000-3DR-MGR0-00100-000-006. Las Vegas, Nevada: Bechtel SAIC Company. ACC: ENG.20061201.0005. [DIRS 178308]
- 2.2.8 BSC 2006. *Basis of Design for the TAD Canister-Based Repository Design Concept.* 000- 3DR-MGR0-00300-000-000. Las Vegas, Nevada: Bechtel SAIC Company. ACC: ENG.20061023.0002. [DIRS 177636]
- 2.2.9 BSC 2004. *D&E / PA/C IED Emplacement Drift Configuration and Environment [Sheet 1 of 2].* 800-IED-MGR0-00201-000-00B. Las Vegas, Nevada: Bechtel SAIC Company. ACC: ENG.20040326.0001. [DIRS 168489]
- 2.2.10 BSC 2004. *Drift Degradation Analysis*. ANL-EBS-MD-000027 REV 03. Las Vegas, Nevada: Bechtel SAIC Company. ACC: DOC.20040915.0010; DOC.20050419.0001; DOC.20051130.0002, DOC.20060731.0005. [DIRS 166107]
- 2.2.11 BSC 2004. *Evaluation of Emplacement Drift Stability for KTI Resolutions*. 800-KMC-SSE0-00200-000-00A. Las Vegas, Nevada: Bechtel SAIC Company. ACC: ENG.20040520.0001, ENG.20050816.0023. [DIRS 168889]
- 2.2.12 BSC 2004. *Ground Control for Non-Emplacement Drifts for LA*. 800-KMC-SSD0- 00700-000-00A. Las Vegas, Nevada: Bechtel SAIC Company. ACC: ENG.20040302.0022, ENG.20050816.0022. [DIRS 168178]
- 2.2.13 BSC 2004. *Prediction of Rockfalls in Non-Emplacement Drifts due to Preclosure Seismic Ground Motions*. 800-K0C-SSD0-00200-000-00A. Las Vegas, Nevada: Bechtel SAIC Company. ACC: ENG.20041020.0003. [DIRS 172730]
- 2.2.14 BSC 2004. *Rockfall Impact on Waste Package Transporter Shield*. 800-K0C-SSD0- 00100-000-00A. Las Vegas, Nevada: Bechtel SAIC Company. ACC: ENG.20040601.0050, ENG.20050816.0014, ENG.20050817.0034. [DIRS 168963]
- 2.2.15 BSC 2005. *Q-List*. 000-30R-MGR0-00500-000-003. Las Vegas, Nevada: Bechtel SAIC Company. ACC: ENG.20050929.0008. [DIRS 175539]
- 2.2.16 BSC 2007. *IED Geotechnical and Thermal Parameters.* 800-IED-MGR0-00401-000- 00G. Las Vegas, Nevada: Bechtel SAIC Company. ACC: ENG.20070601.0020
- 2.2.17 BSC 2007. *IED Geotechnical and Thermal Parameters II [Sheet 1 of 1].* 800-IED-MGR0-00402-000-00A. Las Vegas, Nevada: Bechtel SAIC Company. ACC: ENG.20070108.0001. [DIRS 178277]
- 2.2.18 BSC 2007. *IED Geotechnical and Thermal Parameters IV [Sheet 1 of 1].* 800-IED-MGR0-00404-000-00A. Las Vegas, Nevada: Bechtel SIAC Company. ACC: ENG.20070125.0018. [DIRS 179808]
- 2.2.19 BSC 2007. *IED Seismic Data.* 800-IED-MGR0-00701-000 REV 00A. Las Vegas, Nevada: Bechtel SAIC Company. ACC: ENG.20070216.0003. [DIRS 179278]
- 2.2.20 BSC 2007. *Subsurface Geotechnical Parameters Report.* ANL-SSD-GE-000001 REV 00. Las Vegas, Nevada: Bechtel SAIC Company. ACC: ENG.20070115.0006. [DIRS] 178693].
- 2.2.21 Hoek, E. and Brown, E.T. 1982. *Underground Excavations in Rock*. London, England: The Institution of Mining and Metallurgy. TIC: 217577. [DIRS 120981]
- 2.2.22 Itasca Consulting Group. [2002]. *Itasca Software–Cutting Edge Tools for Computational Mechanics*. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Itasca Consulting Group. TIC: 252592. [DIRS 160331]
- 2.2.23 MO0301SPASIP27.004. *Sampling of Stochastic Input Parameters for Rockfall Calculations and for Structural Response Calculations Under Vibratory Ground Motions*. Submittal date: 01/15/2003. [DIRS 161869]
- 2.2.24 MO0306SDSAVDTH.000. *Seismic Design Spectra and Acceleration, Velocity, and Displacement Time Histories for the Emplacement Level at 10-4 Annual Exceedance Frequency*. Submittal date: 06/26/2003. [DIRS 164033]
- 2.2.25 MO0402AVDTM105.001. *Acceleration, Velocity, and Displacement Time Histories for the Repository Level at 10-5 Annual Exceedance Frequency*. Submittal date: 02/09/2004. [DIRS 168890]
- 2.2.26 MO0408MWDDDMIO.002. *Drift Degradation Model Inputs and Outputs*. Submittal date: 08/31/2004. [DIRS 171483]
- 2.2.27 MO0410MWDPRNDP.000. *Predicted Rockfalls in Non-emplacement Drifts due to Preclosure Seismic Ground Motions.* Submittal date: 10/18/2004. [DIRS 176213]
- 2.2.28 SNF37100195002.001. *Hydraulic Fracturing Stress Measurements in Test Hole: ESF-AOD-HDFR1, Thermal Test Facility, Exploratory Studies Facility at Yucca Mountain.* Submittal date: 12/18/1996. [DIRS 131356]
- 2.2.29 SNL (Sandia National Laboratories) 1996. *Hydraulic Fracturing Stress Measurements in Test Hole ESF-AOD-HDFR#1, Thermal Test Facility, Exploratory Studies Facility at Yucca Mountain*. WA-0065. [Albuquerque, New Mexico]: Sandia National Laboratories. ACC: MOL.19970717.0008. [DIRS 163645]
- 2.2.30 SNL02030193001.027. Summary of Bulk Property Measurements Including Saturated Bulk Density for NRG-2, NRG-2A, NRG-2B, NRG-3, NRG-4, NRG-5, NRG-6, NRG-7/7A, SD-9, and SD-12. Submittal date: 08/14/1996. [DIRS 108410]

It should be noted that the use of Data Tracking Numbers (DTNs): MO0301SPASIP27.004. (Reference 2.2.23) and MO0402AVDTM105.001 (Reference 2.2.25) have been approved by their inclusion on the information exchange drawing, *IED Seismic Data,* 800-IED-MGR0-00701- 000 REV 00A (Reference 2.2.19). Similarly, DTNs: SNF37100195002.001 (Reference 2.2.28) and SNL02030193001.027 (Reference 2.2.30) are included in *IED Geotechnical and Thermal Parameters II [Sheet 1 of 1],* 800-IED-MGR0-00402-000-00A (Reference 2.2.17), and DTNs: MO0306SDSAVDTH.000. (Reference 2.2.24) and MO0408MWDDDMIO.002 (Reference 2.2.26) are included in *D&E / PA/C IED Emplacement Drift Configuration and Environment [Sheet 1 of 2],* 800-IED-MGR0-00201-000-00B (Reference 2.2.9), and *IED Geotechnical and Thermal Parameters IV [Sheet 1 of 1],* 800-IED-MGR0-00404-000-00A (Reference 2.2.18), respectively. Data from Reference 2.2.20 Subsurface Geotechnical Parameters Report are owned by the BSC Subsurface organization and are not required to be included on an information exchange drawing. These data are qualified data and therefore are appropriate for use in this calculation.

#### **2.3 DESIGN CONSTRAINTS**

None

#### **2.4 DESIGN OUTPUTS**

This calculation is intended to provide inputs to the categorization of the potential event sequences of the preclosure period and to the evaluation of rockfall impact on the waste package transporter shield. The results will be used in the document succeeding the Reference 2.2.6 currently under the development.

# **3.0 ASSUMPTIONS**

This section contains assumptions used in this calculation and the rationale for use.

## **3.1 ASSUMPTIONS THAT REQUIRE VERIFICATION**

None.

## **3.2 ASSUMPTIONS NOT REQUIRING VERIFICATION**

#### **3.2.1 Average Depth of Openings Considered in Current Calculation**

*Assumption:* A depth of 295 m for the nonemplacement openings is used in the current calculation.

*Rationale:* This value is based on the information of the depth near the center of emplacement drifts in Panel 1 (Reference 2.2.3, Table 5-2a). Since non-emplacement openings are in the same horizon as the one for emplacement drifts, it is therefore, considered adequate to use this depth for the purpose of this calculation. This assumption does not require verification. This assumption is used in Section 6.3.

#### **3.2.2 In Situ Horizontal-to-Vertical Stress Ratios**

*Assumption:* The horizontal-to-vertical in situ stress ratio  $(K_0)$  is assumed to be 0.5.

*Rationale:* This assumption is according to the in situ stress measurement by hydraulic fracturing in a test hole located in the TSw2 unit (References 2.2.28; 2.2.29, Table 4). The major horizontal principal stress with a direction of N15°E is  $(2.9 \text{ MPa}/4.69 \text{ MPa})*100 = 62$  percent of the vertical stress whereas the minor horizontal principal stress with a direction of N75°W is (1.7  $MPa/4.69 MPa)*100 = 36$  percent of the vertical stress. An initial horizontal-to-vertical stress ratio of 0.5 is assumed in the calculation. The  $K_0$  value selected as being equal to 0.5 is considered an average  $K_0$  value and is adequate for the purpose of this calculation. This assumption does not require verification, and is considered appropriate for this calculation. This assumption is used in Section 6.3.

## **3.2.3 Rock Property Data**

*Assumption:* The data used in the Rev A analysis are adequate for use in the current Rev B calculation.

*Rationale:* This assumption is justified by comparing the data used in Rev A and the data summarized in the Subsurface Geotechnical Parameters Report Rev. 00 (Reference 2.2.20). These two sets of data presented side-by-side in Table 6-2 show that the parameters magnitudes are indeed very similar. Therefore, a valid assessment of the impact of  $10^{-5}$  ground motions can be obtained without going through an intermediate step of first investigating an impact of ground motion using Rev A ground motion input and a new set of rock property data and then evaluating the impact of the new rock property data and a new set of ground motions. This assumption does not require verification, and is considered appropriate for this calculation. This assumption is used in Section 6.4.1.

# **3.2.4 Layout of Turnout Intersection**

*Assumption:* The geometry and dimensions of the turnout intersection used in Rev A can be used in the current Rev B analysis.

*Rationale:* The dimensions of the openings at the turnout intersection are as provided in analyzed in the current calculation are based on the excavation dimensions provided in Reference 2.2.5 (e.g., turnout width 8-m , height 7-m, p. 56, Table 8). A preview of subsurface layout currently under the development indicates that an intersection of 7.62 m main access tunnel and 8.5 m wide turnout bulkhead excavation allowance. These dimensions are in close agreement. The magnitude of rockfall is governed mainly by the orientation, the frequency, and conditions of discontinuities within the rock mass. Small variations in dimensions of the intersecting openings are not expected to alter the overall results of this analysis. This assumption does not require verification, and is considered appropriate for this calculation. This assumption is used in Section 6.3 and in Section 6.5.3.

# **4.0 METHODOLOGY**

# **4.1 QUALITY ASSURANCE**

The calculation is prepared in accordance with EG-PRO-3DP-G04B-00037, *Calculations and Analyses*, and its requirements (Reference 2.1.2).

The Q-List designates some of the nonemplacement openings, such as north portal, north ramp, all access mains and turnouts as 'important to safety' category items and 'not important to waste isolation', and assigns the Safety Category (SC) as 'SC' (Reference 2.2.15, Table A-1, p. A-11). The rockfall results from this calculation are used for assessing the structural adequacy of the TEV that is important to safety. Therefore, this document is subject to the requirements of the *Quality Management Directive* (Reference 2.1.1) and the approved version is designated as QA: QA

## **4.2 USE OF SOFTWARE**

All software documented in this section is appropriate for applications used in this calculation. The software is managed under IT-PRO-0011, *Software Management* (Reference 2.1.3), and was obtained from Software Configuration Management in accordance with IT-PRO-0011.

## **4.2.1 Level 1 Software Usage**

The Level 1 software used in this calculation is identified in Table 4-1.





# **4.2.1.1 3DEC Computer Software**

The commercially available computer program, 3DEC (3 Dimensional Distinct Element Code, Reference 2.2.1, STN: 10025-2.01-00), was used in this calculation. 3 DEC Version 2.01 is a three-dimensional program based on the distinct element method for discontinuum modeling. It is used to simulate the response of discontinuous media (such as a jointed rock mass) subjected to either static or dynamic loading. A detailed discussion on the general features and fields of the 3DEC software applications is presented in the User's Manual (Reference 2.2.22).

3DEC was used to analyze the seismic effects on block movement in the nonemplacement drifts excavated in the nonlithophysal rock unit. The 3DEC analyses were performed on stand-alone personal computers (PC) with a Pentium microprocessor and Microsoft Windows 2000/NT operating system. While the majority of calculations were performed on PCs located in home office, some calculations were performed on PCs located in the office of the Itasca Consulting Group, Inc., Minneapolis, Minnesota. The software was used only within the range of its validation as specified in the software qualification documentation (Reference 2.2.2, Table 2-2)

in accordance with the IT-PRO-0011 procedure. The validation test cases of Test 1 and Test 2 documented in the *Software Implementation Report for 3DEC Version 2.01* (Reference 2.2.2, Table 2-2) support the application of mechanical and quasi-static analyses conducted for this calculation.

Input and output files for the software used in this calculation are archived on DVD discs and submitted to the Records Center. A comparison between the results obtained in Rev A and current results is made utilizing data stored in the TDMS DTN: MO0410MWDPRNDP.000 (Reference 2.2.27). The Rev A data are referenced in the text where appropriate. A listing and relevant information pertaining to the input and output files can be found in the Attachment III. The results are presented graphically and described in Section 6.

## **4.2.2 Level 2 Software Usage**

In addition to the 3DEC software, the standard functions of commercial-off-the-shelf software, including Excel® 2000 SP-3 (STN: 610236-2000-00), Mathcad Version 11.2a (STN: 611161- 11SP2A-00), and WinZip Version 9.0 (STN: 610649-9.0-00), were also used. The Excel was used to support calculation activities and visual presentation of results as presented in Section 6. The results are verified by hand calculation and visual inspection. Mathcad and its standard 'cfft' function were used in Attachment I to support calculation of seismic wave power spectral densities. WinZip was used to group and compress the input and output files and the results were verified by visually comparing the content of DVDs with the content of subdirectories used to store the original uncompressed files. All software in this category was performed on personal computers with a Pentium microprocessor and Microsoft Windows 2000 operating system. The Excel files are included in the Disk CD\_1 submitted with this calculation.

Use of Microsoft® Excel, Mathcad Version 11.2a, and WinZip Version 9.0 are considered Level 2 controlled software that are commercially available and are not required to be qualified per IT-PRO-0011, *Software Management* (Reference 2.1.3, Attachment 12).

Note that few simple hand calculations were performed and documented in the body of this calculation.

#### **4.3 CALCULATION APPROACH**

Analyses of data presented in this calculation were performed using results from two series of computer simulations and quasi-static loading approach, of which validation is presented in Section 6.2.2 and summarized in Table 6-1. Analysis performed on the Series 1 results were based on the rock property data used in the *SGPR* Rev 00A (Reference 2.2.4) and 15 distinct combinations of ground motion velocity data. The ground motion data were paired with one of the fracture patterns generated using FracMan software for the purpose of analyzing emplacement drift stability (Reference 2.2.10, Tables 6-7 and 6-8 and Reference 2.2.23). A comparison of rock property data summarized in Table 6-2, show that the recently updated properties of rock (*SGPR* Rev 00, Reference 2.2.20) are similar to those used in Rev 00A (Reference 2.2.13) (also see Assumption 3.2.3).

The calculation results presented in this analysis were obtained in two series of computer simulations. Both Series 1 and Series 2 in the current calculation were performed using the same rock property data as those used in Revision A.

With the rock property data unchanged, the results obtained in Series 1 for several rock jointing patterns identical to those used in  $10^{-4}$  ground motion study could be used for a direct assessment of the impact of the new seismic input on the magnitude of rockfalls between  $10^{-4}$  and  $10^{-5}$ ground motion cases.

After completing analysis of Series 1 results, the second series of calculations was performed using the same rock property data and the same ground motion set of 15 cases, each paired to an additional unique jointing pattern. In effect, 15 sets of ground motion data were paired to 30 distinct rock fracture patterns, which allowed for the development of larger population of rockfall cases, thus providing basis for a more extensive statistical representation of the rock strata and better quantification of the resulting rockfalls. A correlation between the initially developed ground motion/fracture pattern number combinations and cases analyzed in the current calculation are provided in Table 6-3. Each pair of ground motion and fracture pattern data is assigned an individual realization number. Since in the current analysis each of the two series of computer calculations contains 15 realization data sets, in both sets the number of ground motions remains the same but fracture patterns are not repeated. As a result, the rockfall data calculated from both series is evaluated using a 30 unique fracture and associated rock jointing patterns.

As explained in more detail in Section 6, the problem geometry was based on the layout of intersection between the access main and the turnout near the launch chamber. Considering the facts that the ratio of the wavelength to the maximum span of the opening under evaluation is large and that the  $10^{-5}$  ground motions have a relatively long duration (low frequency), the quasistatic approach was adopted to implement the equivalent seismic loads. Here, the loading pattern for each case analyzed was derived using the most severe combination of stresses calculated for a particular case of seismic ground motion. The resulting rockfalls are presented on a series of plots illustrating the rockfall block elevation versus rockfall volume distribution.

# **5.0 LIST OF ATTACHMENTS**

Table 5-1 lists attachments of this calculation.

#### Table 5-1 List of Attachments



### **6.0 BODY OF CALCULATION**

This section describes the approach and results of the prediction of potential rockfalls in the nonemplacement drifts due to the preclosure seismic ground motions. The initial analyses (Rev A, Reference 2.2.13) were carried out for  $10^{-4}$  annual frequency of occurrence ground motion, hereafter referred to as  $10^{-4}$  ground motion. In the current calculation, a rockfall potential under 10<sup>-5</sup> ground motion is examined.

## **6.1 INTRODUCTION**

*General* - During transport from the surface facilities to the emplacement drifts, the waste packages will be stored inside the TEV shielded enclosure (Reference 2.2.14). The purpose of the TEV shielded enclosure is to protect workers from waste package radiation as well as to protect the waste package from the impacts of rockfall should they occur during transport. The potential for rockfall in the emplacement drifts has been investigated extensively in the *Drift Degradation Analysis* for both pre- and post-closure conditions (Reference 2.2.10). The analysis was carried out considering rock mass both as continuum and discontinuum. The objective of the analysis presented in this calculation is to provide an assessment of the potential rockfall magnitude in the nonemplacement drifts. Here, the most severe case is represented by the access main/turnout intersection, which has a largest roof span.

*Differences Between Rev A and Current Rev B Analyses* - The Rev A analysis was performed where the potential rockfalls were evaluated for a single form of  $10^{-4}$  ground motion data (Reference 2.2.13). In the current (Rev B) analysis ground motion input was revised substantially. It is based on 15 distinct vibratory ground motion patterns with the annual probability of exceedance equal to  $10^{-5}$ . In combination with the stochastically derived rock mass fracture pattern data, the two data sets, set 1 referred to as 3DEC cases including 30, and set 2 including 105 combinations of ground motion/fracture pattern cases (generally referred to as realizations) were determined (Reference 2.2.23) (also see Disk CD\_1, worksheet *Input All – Comparison of Current vs Previous Study.xls*, Tabs: Table I-1 – 3DEC Cases, Table I-2 - 105 cases, and Report Table 6 3). Among those, two series of cases, each based on 15 ground motions (for information graphically presented in Disk CD\_1, *Ground Motion Input Data – Waveforms.xls*) and associated unique rock fracture pattern were evaluated. In addition, since the current report is based on examining effects of ground motions of much higher energy, an attempt was made to provide a link between the current and the previously analyzed ground motion/rock fracture combination cases. Table 6-6 provides a cross-reference between the cases analyzed using  $10^{-4}$  ground motion data and cases analyzed in Series 1 for  $10^{-5}$  ground motion data.

*Intersection Geometry* - As described in more detail in Section 6.3, the intersection between access main and the turnout has the largest active roof span (Reference 2.2.12, Section 6.5.1) and provides natural focal case for the rockfall analysis. Analysis at this location was selected because it is anticipated that there is the largest potential for the rockfall en route from the surface facilities to the waste package final destination in the emplacement drift. Therefore, stability analysis of the intersection between the access main and the turnout, considering rock mass as discontinuum, is performed to estimate the size of blocks that could impact the

transporter shield. The analysis was evaluated for in situ stress conditions and pre-closure seismic ground motions.

*Lithophysal versus Nonlithophysal Rock Strata* – The lithophysal rock strata are characterized by a relatively small joint lengths and joint spacing. In effect, the expected size of blocks during the rockfall in lithophysal rock mass and blocks that can become unstable is relatively small. By comparison, long, persistent joints and relatively larger joint spacing in a nonlithophysal rock mass provide conditions for generating large rock blocks. Therefore, the rockfall in a nonlithophysal rock mass capable of producing large rockfall blocks, potentially of concern in the TEV design, was considered in this calculation.

*Limits of Numerical Modeling* - The size of the rock mass block used in calculations and joint pattern can lead rapidly to the model size that becomes difficult for performing calculations due to excessively long (order of several months) computer runs. During the development of the blocky rock mass, therefore, the size of rock mass sample is limited to dimensions that contain the fractured rock mass blocks in the vicinity of the opening only, while the remaining portion of the rock mass sample contains a smaller number of deformable blocks. These deformable blocks allow for performing calculations within a tolerable (2 to 5 weeks single run duration) timeframe without undue impact on the rockfall analysis.

In effect, an explicit jointing, using the synthetic jointing model of the nonlithophysal rock mass (Reference 2.2.10), is included only in a portion of the model, and the rest of the model does not contain joints explicitly. The region that contains joints explicitly is located around and at some distance away from the openings. The purpose of using a portion of the model with explicit jointing involving smaller rock volume is to reduce the size of the model. This reduction in the model size is such that modeling results are not affected by excluding joints in regions at some distance from the openings. This simplification is justified because the joints that are at some distance from the excavations generally delineate the blocks that do not either participate in the rockfall nor affect the rockfall volume and consequently, are not necessary to be included in the model. The dimensions of the region containing explicit jointing are: length 30-m, width 20-m, and height 15-m. These dimensions are much larger than dimensions of the fractured block size used in the model of the emplacement drift for *Drift Degradation Analysis* (Reference 2.2.10, Section 6.3.1.1).

*Fully Dynamic versus Quasi-Static Approach* - To acquire a sufficient amount of data needed for a meaningful statistical analysis, a number of calculations involving different combinations of fracture patterns paired with ground motion cases are necessary. The use of a fully dynamic analysis, similar to those used in prediction of rockfall in the emplacement drifts (Reference 2.2.10), is possible for predicting rockfall in intersections. Generally, the overall methodology is very computation-intensive, and typically such calculations are of long duration. Large wavelength in comparison to the opening dimensions, low frequency of ground motions and resulting uniform stresses were considered to justify the decision of analyzing the stability of intersection and the rockfall magnitude in the nonlithophysal rock mass using a more efficient quasi-static approach. This method, involving performing a sequence of quasi-static simulations, is described and validated in Section 6.2. The results of simulations are presented in Section 6.4.

## **6.2 QUASI-STATIC ANALYSIS OF DYNAMIC LOADING**

#### **6.2.1 Description of Approach**

The interaction of a seismic ground motion with an underground opening of interest depends on the ratio of the wavelength to the maximum dimension of the opening. If this ratio is large, the transient ground motion caused by seismic waves produces basically quasi-static loading. Therefore, assessment of the effect of dynamic load on stability of the underground opening using the quasi-static analysis is justified.

Preclosure seismic ground motion is based on an event of the annual exceedance probability of  $1\times10^{-5}$  (100,000 years). The time histories of the three corresponding ground motion velocity components are shown in Figure 6-1. Using a fast Fourier transform (FFT) scheme (see Attachment I), the velocity power spectral densities for these three velocity components can be obtained. As an example, shown in Figure I-1 are the spectral densities calculated for the  $10^{-4}$ ground motion. These power density spectra indicate that major portion of the energy of this ground motion is transmitted by the relatively low-frequency (less than 1 Hz) oscillations.

Simple calculation demonstrates that the S-wave length  $(\lambda)$ , using a frequency  $(f)$  of 1 Hz, a shear modulus (*G*) of 13.6 GPa, and a density ( $\rho$ ) of 2410 kg/m<sup>3</sup>, is approximately equal to 2400 m  $[\lambda = C_s/f = 2376/1 \approx 2400 \text{ m}$ , where  $C_s = \text{sqrt } (G/\rho) = \text{sqrt } (13.6 \times 10^9/2410) = 2376 \text{ m/s}$ . This wavelength is much larger than the dimension of the intersection in cross-section or the characteristic size of any block that may potentially become unstable. The favorable consequence of a large wavelength is that the underground opening and a significant portion of the rock mass surrounding it are subjected to almost homogeneous stress change caused by the ground motion. In other words, the large wavelength causes that the opening does not experience significant seismically induced stress or strain gradients.

The analysis of drift stability for seismic loading was carried out by the quasi-static simulation of a series of the loads calculated from the velocity histories. Stress changes corresponding to the free-field velocity histories are estimated based on plane wave propagation (Reference 2.2.22, 3DEC Optional Features, Equation 2.8):

$$
\Delta \sigma_{zz} = C_p \rho v_z
$$
  
\n
$$
\Delta \sigma_{xx} = \Delta \sigma_{yy} = \frac{v}{1 - v} \Delta \sigma_{zz}
$$
  
\n
$$
\Delta \sigma_{xz} = C_s \rho v_x
$$
  
\n
$$
\Delta \sigma_{yz} = C_s \rho v_y
$$
  
\n(Eq. 6-1)

where  $\Delta\sigma_{ij}$  (*i*,  $j = x, y, z$ ) are the stress tensor components,  $C_p$  and  $C_s$  are P- and S-wave velocities,  $\rho$  is the density,  $\nu$  is the Poisson ratio, and  $\nu$  are the components of the incoming velocity vector. The vertical coordinate axis is *z*; and *x* and *y* are the horizontal coordinates axes. (Consequently,  $v_x = v_{H1}$ ,  $v_y = v_{H2}$  and  $v_z = v_y$ .).



Figure 6-1 Modes of Deformation Induced by Seismic Ground Motion



Figure 6-2 Selection of Critical Loads on the Opening

Using the plane wave propagation to estimate seismically induced stress changes is appropriate because for large wavelength (compared to the size of the excavation) the opening does not cause distortion of the incoming wave or the wave does not "see" the opening. In all further analyses, stress changes  $\Delta \sigma_{xx}$  and  $\Delta \sigma_{yy}$  are neglected, which is conservative because the deviatoric part of the stress change is increased. The modes of deformation caused by seismically induced changes of the three component of the stress tensor are shown in Figure 6-1. Modes I and II affect magnitude and orientation of maximum hoop stresses in the plane normal to the tunnel axis. Stress concentrations around the opening for the free-field stress changes (see Equation 6-1) can be estimated from the following relation (Reference 2.2.21, Equations 34 and 35):

$$
\sigma_{t, \max} = 3\sigma_1 - \sigma_2
$$
\n
$$
\sigma_{t, \min} = 3\sigma_2 - \sigma_1
$$
\n(Eq. 6-2)

where  $\sigma_1$  and  $\sigma_2$  are the principal stresses calculated for the stresses acting in the plane normal to the tunnel axis (i.e., in *xz*-plane in Figure 6-1). Compressive stresses are considered positive in this calculation.

Using Equation 6-1, it is possible to calculate the entire stress history ( $v_r(t)$ ,  $v_v(t)$ ) and  $v_z(t)$  are functions of time as shown in Figure 6-5 and Figure 6-6), to which the opening is subjected. Rockfall can occur from different locations in the walls and the tunnel roof. Some stress changes induced by the seismic ground motion could be critical for the stability of the blocks in the roof, while a different stress change might be critical for stability of the blocks in the wall. For this reason, the circumference of the opening is divided into a number of segments,  $n_{\text{sgn}}$ . Eight segments, as indicated in Figure 6-2, are used in the simulations. The closed form applies to the circular opening, where because of symmetry, the segments can be considered on one side of the tunnel only. Using numerical distinct element method this concept can be extended for noncircular openings as the solution for each space segment is obtained as a part of the overall solution, and segments are used to estimate the magnitude of rockfall within the predetermined segments around the opening of arbitrary shape.

For each segment, stress changes caused by ground motion, which cause the extreme, i.e., the maximum and the minimum stresses to be generated on the tunnel circumference, hoop stresses are determined. Although it is expected that a decrease in compressive stresses (i.e., the smallest stress change) is critical from the perspective of block stability, the other extreme (when compressive hoop stresses increase) is analyzed as well. For certain cases, e.g., when joints intersect the tunnel boundary at a small angle, an increase in hoop stresses can be critical to block stability. Two stress changes with extreme values of out-of-plane shear stress,  $\Delta \sigma_{yz}$ , are also determined. All the critical stress changes (for hoop stresses and out-of-plane shear) are superimposed on in situ stresses, and ordered in the sequence in which they occur during ground motions. The number of critical stress states can be, at most,  $2n_{\text{see}} + 2$ ; however, the number is usually smaller, because the critical states for different segments can be the same. The model is quasi-statically simulated for equilibrium for all the critical stress states in the sequence. For some of the critical stress states rockfall may occur before the equilibrium is achieved.

A force is required to move the already destabilized block into the open tunnel and detach it from the rest of the rock mass. The gravitational body force acts permanently vertically downward and certainly affects rockfall from the tunnel roof. For deep tunnels, the gravitational force is small compared to rock mass stresses, but it causes free fall of the blocks that already are destabilized by the action of stress changes caused by stress redistribution due to excavation. During the seismic ground motion additional body forces that contribute to the rockfall are the inertial forces. Orientation of seismically induced inertial forces varies during ground motion. When the inertial forces become horizontal, they can pull out the loose blocks from the tunnel wall and cause their fall. To account for the effect of inertial forces on rockfall during the quasistatic simulations, particularly for the blocks in the drift walls, an additional body force is applied on the loose blocks.

The procedure utilized during the previous  $(10^{-4}$  ground motion) considered the magnitude of the body force corresponding to an acceleration of approximately 1g, and oriented toward the center of the opening. The magnitude and orientation were selected to ensure conservative results. The maximum acceleration during  $10^{-4}$  ground motion is 0.47g (Reference 2.2.24, MatV.ath). In the current  $(10^{-5}$  ground motion) analysis 15 ground motion patterns are used. The procedure similar to one described above was applied. First, each ground motion pattern was scanned for the maximum acceleration. The body force corresponding to this acceleration value was applied

acting toward the center of the opening during the execution of the program for a particular case. The constant, sustained body force acting toward the center of the opening would result, under most circumstances, in more rockfall than inertial forces varying randomly in magnitude and orientation.

## **6.2.2 Validation of Approach**

Application of the quasi-static approach instead of full dynamic analysis requires validation. This validation is accomplished by comparing rockfall predictions obtained using the quasi-static approach against results for cases based on a fully dynamic approach. The fully dynamic approach was used in the *Drift Degradation Analysis* (Reference 2.2.10) to predict potential rockfalls in the emplacement drifts subject to both the preclosure and postclosure seismic ground motions. The analyses were carried out for different realizations of jointing of the rock mass. For the purpose of validation of the quasi-static approach, two cases associated with the preclosure ground motion are considered. Subsequently, these two cases 23 and 38 were reanalyzed using the quasi-static approach. The summary of the rockfall predictions based on dynamic and quasi-static approaches is presented in Table 6-1.

Case No.	Jointing No.	<b>Dynamic<sup>a</sup></b>			Quasi-Static <sup>b</sup>		
		No. of <b>Blocks</b>	<b>Total</b> <b>Volume</b> $(\mathsf{m}^3)$	Max. <b>Volume</b> (m <sup>3</sup> )	No. of <b>Blocks</b>	<b>Total</b> <b>Volume</b> $(m^3)$	Max. <b>Volume</b> $\rm (m^3)$
23	5	22	3.13	0.84	30	1.58	0.41
38	29	62	7.17	0.69	213	19.15	0.96

Table 6-1. Comparison of Rockfall Predictions for Emplacement Drift Using Dynamic and Quasistatic Approaches

Source: <sup>a</sup> Reference 2.2.10, Section 6.3.1.2.6; Reference 2.2.26, file: nonlith rockfall characteristics in emplacement drifts with 1e-4 gm.xls

<sup>b</sup>For Quasi-Static Loading see Cases\_23\_&\_38 – Quasi\_Static\_Summary.xls (Submitted on Attached CD\_1)

Table 6-1 presents a comparison between the results of analysis considering a fully dynamic loading and those obtained using quasi-static approach. The procedure applied to calculate the number of rock blocks and the total rockfall volume involved two stages. During the first stage the entire model rock mass was brought to equilibrium, the access main/turnout intersection was excavated in one step, and the model was cycled to equilibrium again. At the end of this phase a number of rock blocks have fallen and were removed from the model volume. In the second stage the rockfall resulting from ground motion was calculated. The final number of rockfall blocks and the total rockfall volume were calculated as a difference between the final block count and the initial rockfall count due to access main/turnout excavation obtained for the dynamic case.

The quasi-static approach results in predictions that are within 50 percent of the dynamic analysis predictions in terms of different parameters of rockfall listed in Table 6-1 (i.e., a number of blocks, total volume of blocks, and volume of the largest block). For case 38, the quasi-static predictions of rockfall are larger (i.e., conservative) than predictions based on the dynamic analysis. It was concluded that quasi-static analysis yields satisfactory results and that it can be justified for use in predictions of general characteristics of the rockfall from the nonemplacement excavations evaluated in terms of rock volume distribution and the range of block elevations.

# **6.3 MODEL DESCRIPTION**

The predictions of rockfall in the nonemplacement drifts were carried out for the intersection between the access main and the turnout toward the emplacement drift. There are five typical layouts of intersections considered in the analysis of stability of the intersections and ground support. These different layouts were defined as locations A through E shown in Figure 6-1 of Reference 2.2.12. Only location A is considered in this calculation as shown in Figure 6-3, because it has the largest span (Reference 2.2.12, Figure 6-10). The geometry of the intersection for the location A as represented in the 3DEC model is depicted in Figure 6-3 showing the tunnels only, i.e., the surrounding rock mass is hidden. The access main has a circular crosssection with a diameter of 7.62 m. The turnout has a horseshoe shape in the cross-section with dimensions 8-m wide and 7-m high elevation (see Assumption 3.2.4). The floors of the two tunnels are at the same. The dimensions of the entire model are  $100 \text{ m} \times 100 \text{ m}$  in plan and 50 m in height. The geometry of the 3DEC model is shown in Figure 6-4. The region, in which the jointing of the rock mass is represented explicitly, is 30-m long, 20-m wide and 15-m high surrounding the opening. The cross-section of this region is illustrated in Figure 6-4.

The vertical in-situ stress is gravitational and is the major principal stress. Its value is calculated using the average rock density of 2410 kg/m<sup>3</sup> (see Table 6-2), and the average depth of 295 m for the nonemplacement drifts (see Assumption 3.2.1). The initial stress state in the horizontal plane is set to be isotropic, with a magnitude of 50 percent of the vertical in-situ stress (see Assumption 3.2.2). The vertical model boundaries are fixed in the normal direction but free in the tangential direction (i.e., "roller"). The overburden weight is applied as a stress boundary condition at the top of the model.

The simulations were conducted in several steps. First, the model was equilibrated for in-situ conditions (no excavations). Subsequently, the tunnels included in the model were excavated along their entire length. After excavation, the calculations were run to bring the model to equilibrium using elastic properties of rocks only. After a state of equilibrium was attained, the calculations continued considering the actual joint strength and rock strata properties. The purpose of such an approach is to reduce the inertial effects associated with the sudden material removal (i.e., excavation of entire tunnels) on the results. Finally, the model was subjected to a sequence of critical stress states occurring during the seismic ground motion, that were determined as described in Section 6.2.1.



The stress change from one current far-field stress state to the next is superimposed on the current equilibrium stress state for all zones and joints in the model. After superposition of the stress increment, the calculation continues until a new state of equilibrium is attained. The solution is obtained as described above in two phases. During the phase 1 the solution is obtained using elastic material properties only, and then during phase 2, considering the actual joint strength and rock strata properties.

The rock blocks are modeled to behave elastically. Inelastic deformation of joints and joint bridges is controlled by the Coulomb slip criterion. The mechanical properties of blocks and joints used in the model are listed in Table 6-2. 3DEC cannot represent geometry of partially fractured blocks. However, the effect of partial fracturing can be achieved mechanically by increasing the strength (bonding or a "bridge") of a portion of through-going crack. If the strength is exceeded, the fracture can propagate through the bonded portion of its trace, effectively breaking the "rock bridge." Details pertaining to the methodology for generation of joints and rock bridges in the nonlithophysal rock mass can be found in the *Drift Degradation Analysis* (Reference 2.2.10, p. 6-117).





a) isometric view

b) section 1



c) section 2

Figure 6-4 Geometry of the 3DEC Model

# **6.4 INPUT PARAMETERS**

# **6.4.1 Mechanical Properties of Nonlithophysal Rock**

Rock mass properties for non-lithophysal (Tptpmn) rock are listed in Table 6-2. This table contains two sets of rock property data. Listed in column 2 are the "old" properties of nonlithophysal rock used in the previous (Rev A) as well as in the current (Rev B) analyses and are referred to as the Base Case Rock Strata Parameters. Column 4 contains the most recent data available in the SGPR, Rev. 00 (Reference 2.2.20). A comparison of the "old" and "new" values indicates that the rock strength data are very similar. Since the joint property source data have not changed since the previous revision of this report, they are not updated in the current (Rev B) analysis (Assumption 3.2.3). The details associated with the methodology on how these values are estimated for use in 3DEC are available in the SGPR Rev 00 (Reference 2.2.20, Section 6.4.4 and Table 6-76).

## **6.4.2 Synthetic Fracture Patterns in Nonlithophysal Rock**

Three-dimensional synthetic fracture patterns in the nonlithophysal rock are used to predict the potential rockfalls in the nonemplacement drifts. These fracture patterns are obtained based on the DTN: MO0301SPASIP27.004 (Reference 2.2.23). The synthetic fracture patterns are parts of a representative volume of jointed rock mass, which was generated using the FracMan fracture generation program based on the observations made in the exploratory tunnels, Exploratory Studies Facility (ESF), and Enhanced Characterization of the Repository Block (ECRB). Detailed description of the geology and the process for generation of the synthetic fracture patterns is provided in the *Drift Degradation Analysis* (Reference 2.2.10, Section 6.1.6).

## **6.4.3 Seismic Ground Motion Data**

Site-specific seismic ground motions with time histories are used as a source in the quasi-static loading simulation in the current calculation. In contrast to the  $10^{-4}$  ground motion data, which include only one set of ground velocity histories, the  $10^{-5}$  input data include 15 sets of seismic ground motions patterns, each supplied with two horizontal components (H1 and H2) and one vertical component (V) of acceleration, velocity, and displacement. Seismic velocity time histories for the annual exceedance probability of  $1\times10^{-4}$  (10,000 years) used in the previous analysis, are shown in Figure 6-5 (Reference 2.2.24, MatH1.vth, MatH2.vth, and MatV.vth). Figure 6-6 shows an example of the time histories of velocity components of seismic motion for the repository level at  $1\times10^{-5}$  (100,000 years) annual exceedance frequency (Reference 2.2.25, 1e-5h1\_12.vel, 1e-5h2\_12.vel, and 1e-5up\_12.vel). The Excel file *Ground Motion Input Data – Waveforms.xls* (Disk CD 1) presents a set including 15 ground motion velocity waveform combinations of 10-5 ground motion velocity histories used as input in the current calculation. Each ground motion is matched to the two different, unique rock jointing patterns.

The time histories of the velocity data shown in Figure 6-5 and Figure 6-6 are plotted in the same system of coordinates. Although each ground motion is characterized by a unique waveforms, the Case 12 was selected to provide evidence that the  $1 \times 10^{-5}$  (100,000 years) annual exceedance frequency data indeed display much higher amplitudes and the associated energy than the  $1\times10^{-4}$ (10,000 years) seismic events.

In the dynamic model, only the velocity time histories were used. Details on how these seismic velocity time histories are applied in numerical calculations are described in Section 6.1.

		<b>Original Rev A Data Used in Current</b> (Rev B) Calculation	SGPR Rev 00 Data for Comparison and <b>Information Only</b>		
<b>Property</b>	<b>Base Case</b> <b>Rock Strata</b> Parameters <sup>(1)</sup>	<b>Data Source</b>	<b>Parameter</b> <b>Value</b>	<b>SGPR Rev 00 Source</b>	
1	$\overline{2}$	3	4	5	
Density ( $kg/m3$ )	2410	Reference 2.2.11, Section 4.1.7	2410	Reference 2.2.30 (Value for Tptpln RHH Unit Selected as Largest <b>Average Saturated Bulk Density</b> Among Four RHH Units)	
<b>Block Young's</b> Modulus, E (GPa)	33.007	Calculated Using K and G Values $E =$ 9GK/(3K+G)	35.48	Reference 2.2.20, Table 6-76 p. 6- 276, for 26_TSw2_Tptpmn, Rock Mass Cat. 5	
Poisson's Ratio, v	0.21	Calculated Using K and G Values $v = (3K -$ 2G)/[2*(3K+G)]	0.22	Reference 2.2.20, Table 6-76 p. 6- 276, for 26_TSw2_Tptpmn, Rock Mass Cat. 5	
Block bulk modulus, K (GPa)	19.2	Reference 2.2.16, Table 1	21.12	(2) Calculated Using E and v Values K $= E/[3*(1-2 v)]$	
<b>Block shear</b> modulus, G, (GPa)	13.6	Reference 2.2.16, Table 1	14.54	(2) Calculated Using E and v Values $G = E/[2*(1 + v)]$	
Bridge cohesion (MPa)	47.20	Reference 2.2.11, Table 4-4	50.7 (15.8)	Reference 2.2.20, Table 6-13 p. 6-90 for Tptpmn and (Tptpln)	
Bridge friction angle $(\text{deg})$	42	Reference 2.2.11, Table 4-4	34 (63)	Reference 2.2.20, Table 6-13 p. 6-90 for Tptpmn and (Tptpln)	
Bridge tensile strength (MPa)	11.56	Reference 2.2.11, Table 4-4	10.88 (7.92)	Reference 2.2.20, Table 6-12 p. 6-89 for Tptpmn and (Tptpln)	
Joint normal stiffness (GPa/m)	50	Reference 2.2.11, Table 4-7	94	Reference 2.2.20, Table 6-53 p. 6-163 (Mean Rotary Shear Test for Tptpmn and Tptpln)	
Joint shear stiffness (GPa/m)	50	Reference 2.2.11, Table 4-7	97(11)	Reference 2.2.20, Table 6-54 p. 6- 164, Mean Rotary Shear Test, for Tptpmn and Tptpln, (Table 6-55 p. 6- 165 Mean Direct Shear Test for Tptpmn)	
Joint cohesion (MPa)	0.1	Reference 2.2.11, Table 4-7	0.032	Reference 2.2.20, Table 6-50 p. 6-161 (Mean Direct Shear Test for Tptpmn)	
Joint friction angle ( <b>deg</b> )	41	Reference 2.2.11, Table 4-7	33.4	Reference 2.2.20, Table 6-50 p. 6-161 (Mean Direct Shear Test for Tptpmn)	

Table 6-2 Mechanical Properties of Nonlithophysal Rock

**NOTE**: (1) The parameter values used in current analysis are listed in column 2. Rock joints data shown in the last four rows of Column 2 are the interpreted best estimates of parameter values and values ranges based on data shown in column 4 and may display some deviation from the statistics mean or median presented in *Drift Degradation Analysis* (Reference 2.2.10*,* Appendix E, Table E-5). Sensitivity analyses on these input parameters investigating the impact of their magnitudes on rockfall prediction were conducted and the results are discussed in *Drift Degradation Analysis* (Reference 2.2.10*,* Section 6.3.1.6).



Source: Reference 2.2.24, MatH1.vth, MatH2.vth, and MatV.vth





Case 12 - 10<sup>-5</sup> Annual Probability of Exceedance Gr. Motion

Source: Reference 2.2.25, MatH1.vth, MatH2.vth, and MatV.vth

Figure 6-6 An Example of Case 12 Time Histories of Velocity Components of Seismic Motion for the Repository Level at Annual Exceedance Frequency 1×10<sup>-5</sup>

## **6.5 RESULTS OF ROCKFALL PREDICTION**

## **6.5.1 General**

This section presents the results of calculations of rockfall in nonemplacement drifts. The analysis is based on simulations of response of the discontinuous rock strata to ground motions considered representative of those with the  $10^{-5}$  frequency of occurrence. The results obtained during the initial Rev A (Reference 2.2.13),  $10^{-4}$  ground motion study are preserved to provide a link and a reference for comparisons with the current results obtained for much higher energy 10- <sup>5</sup> ground motion input.

For unchanging geometry of intersecting drifts there are two major input entities that contribute to the resulting rockfall, namely: 1) ground motion data, including 15 distinct waveforms, and 2) rock fracturing (105 patterns) representing the rock mass. This calculation maintains the link to the methodology developed to generate the fracturing pattern described in *Drift Degradation Analysis* (Reference 2.2.10, see details in DTN: MO0301SPASIP27.004 (Reference 2.2.23). The 30 3DEC cases 105 rock strata jointing patterns are listed in Table 6-3 (see Disk CD\_1, worksheet *Input All – Comparison of Current vs Previous Study.xls*, Tabs: Table I-1 – 3DEC Cases, Table I-2 and Report\_Table\_6\_3). Cross-referenced in this table are cases analyzed in current study.

# **6.5.2 Cases Analyzed in the Current Analysis With 10-5 Ground Motion**

Computer simulations forming the basis for the current analysis were performed in two series of 15 cases each. Table 6-3 summarizes cases analyzed in the current analysis with the link to the fracture realization patterns developed according to the methodology described in DTN: MO0301SPASIP27.004 (Reference 2.2.23).

The case numbering system adopted in the current analysis evolved from a simple annotation used in Table 6-3, where an individual case number is used to point the match between the rock jointing system and the ground motion pattern number, to a more complex notation depicting the calculation Series 1 and 2 starting with the prefixes A\_ and B\_. Cases A\_Case\_01\_14 to A Case 20 59 are cases analyzed in Series 1. Cases B Case 21 16 to B Case 37 74 are those analyzed in Series 2. Each of the patterns selected is unique and the 15 cases in each series correspond to the two sets, each having the same number of 15 distinct sets of  $10^{-5}$  ground motions.

#### Table 6-3 Rockfall Cases Showing the Synthetic Fracture Pattern and Ground Motion Combinations Analyzed in the Current Calculation







**(1)** BSC 10<sup>-5</sup> case analyzed in Series 1 of fracture pattern/ground motion combinations<br>(2) BSC 10<sup>-5</sup> case analyzed in Series 2 of fracture pattern/ground motion combinations BSC 10<sup>-5</sup> case analyzed in Series 2 of fracture pattern/ground motion combinations  $(3)$  3DEC 10<sup>-4</sup> case omitted from the first BSC 10<sup>-5</sup> series because of redundancy (4) Case not analyzed because of numerical difficulties Case not analyzed Two cases with ground motions 2 and 8 assigned randomly to joint patterns 97 and 31

Source: Sampling of stochastic input parameters for rockfall calculations and for structural response calculations under vibratory ground motions. Reference 2.2.23 DTN MO0301SPASIP27.004 [DIRS 161869].

### **6.5.3 Summary of Results Obtained in Rev A Study with 10-4 Ground Motion**

For  $10^{-4}$  ground motions, simulations were carried out for 13 different realizations of jointing in the nonlithophysal rock mass. An example of model geometry (for simulation case 14) at the end of simulation, indicating a rockfall from the roof, is presented in Figure 6-7. A summary of the rockfall results for all 13 cases is listed in Table 6-4. The histogram of block sizes of the rock mass shaken down by  $10^{-4}$  ground motion (shown in Figure 6-8) is similar to that predicted for the emplacement drift for the same level of ground motion (Reference 2.2.10, Table 6-20).

A statistical summary of sizes (masses) of unstable blocks in the intersection is provided in Table 6-5. The mean and median of block sizes are slightly larger in the intersection than those predicted for the emplacement drift. According to Reference 2.2.10, Table 6-20, 0.22 MT and 0.10 MT are the mean and median block sizes of the rock mass shaken down by  $10^{-4}$  ground motion in the emplacement drift, respectively. However, the largest unstable block (mass of 36.72 MT) predicted in the intersection is much larger than the largest unstable block (2.72 MT) predicted in the emplacement drift (Reference 2.2.10, Table 6-20). It seems that the character of jointing (i.e., number of joint sets, spacing of joints within a set, orientation) controls the mean and median of block size, while the size of the opening affects the size of the block that can become unstable. Several blocks with mass larger than 10 MT are predicted to be shaken down by  $10^{-4}$  ground motion in the intersection.

A complete listing of rockfall information is provided in DTN: MO0410MWDPRNDP.000 (Reference 2.2.27). For the rockfall simulations, the exposed surface area is determined by subtracting the surface area encompassing the intersection of the access main and turnout from the total model area (i.e., the difference leaves the model area exposed by the intersection). The exposed surface area calculation is documented in DTN: MO0410MWDPRNDP.000 (Reference 2.2.27, file: exposed area calculation.xls), resulting in an exposed surface area of 309.61 m<sup>2</sup>. The same tunnel geometry and the resulting surface area are used in all  $10^{-5}$  cases analyzed (also see Assumption 3.2.4).



- Figure 6-7 Vertical Cross-section through Model of the Intersection (case 14) at the End of Simulation Indicating Rockfall from the Roof
- Table 6-4 Summary of the Rockfall Predictions for the Simulated Cases for the Intersection for  $10^{-4}$ Ground Motion



Notes: This Table includes only those blocks resulting from the 10<sup>-4</sup> ground motion and does not include the initial blocks caused by excavation (see Section 6.3). A complete listing of all blocks is provided in the output DTN: MO0410MWDPRNDP.000 (Reference 2.2.27, files: seismic rockfall summary.xls and rockfall characteristics in nonemplacement turnouts with 1e-4 gm.xls). Shaded are the joint realization cases not included in 10-5 ground motion analysis.



Output DTN: MO0410MWDPRNDP.000, file: seismic rockfall summary.xls (Reference 2.2.27).

Figure 6-8 Histogram of Rockfall Block Size Shaken Down by 10<sup>-4</sup> Ground Motion

Table 6-5 Statistical Summary of Rockfall Predictions for the Intersection for 10<sup>-4</sup> Ground Motion



Notes: This statistical summary does not include the initial blocks caused by excavation (see Section 6.3). A complete listing of all rockfall blocks is provided in the output DTN: MO0410MWDPRNDP.000, files: seismic rockfall summary.xls and rockfall characteristics in nonemplacement turnouts with 1e-4 gm.xls (Reference 2.2.27).

#### **6.5.4 Limitations of Computer Simulations**

*Execution of the Program* – Computer simulations are performed considering numerical representation of the real, complex physical system, or a process. In simulations these complexities of the real system are often simplified to allow for isolating, examining and better characterizing a limited number of parameters with the largest impact on the model performance. Understanding of software limitations becomes an important factor assisting in obtaining a meaningful solution. Described below are the limits of solutions carried out in this analysis. Some limits are inherent to the hardware used, e.g., roundoff errors, limits to faithfully replicate the problem geometry caused by the discrete element size, and other limits that are revealed as the initially simple program is developed further to accommodate increasing expectations of users.

One of the common aspects of numerical simulations is the effect of model excitation. This excitation may originate at the beginning of the simulation run when the gravity is applied to the model of a given geometry or when the large portions of the model volume are removed (e.g., one-step excavation of the tunnel). This "information" must be propagated through the model volume in the way such that a buildup of excessive loads is avoided. During this transient numerical stage it is common to assume model to be represented by elastic material until the loads within the model volume attain equilibrium. Once the model is stable, the initial elastic model material properties are replaced by the type of material appropriate for the given location within the model volume.

Sometimes a routine 3DEC program execution is interrupted when the input parameters exceed certain limits built-into the code. The cases analyzed in the current calculation involve complex rock mass blocks geometries that often require more memory than is reserved within the program. During the program execution, a file "transf.pol," containing the coordinates of the polyhedrae defining each model block is generated and subsequently used to implement the model geometry. The scientific notation is used in this file to represent the block vertex coordinates. An example of a number representation for vertex coordinates is 8.8233e+001. Sometimes, a number of characters used for commands in "transf.pol" exceed the amount of characters allocated within the 3DEC program for a single input command, causing interruption of the program execution. This 3DEC limitation is overcome by editing the "transf.pol" file to remove the excessive exponent digits, which results in the above number being stored as - 8.8233e1. This reduces number of characters and the file size making them to fall within the limits acceptable by the 3DEC program. Simulation is continued by calling the "rerun.dat" file included within every set of input data used in the current study. It causes a restart and continuation of the interrupted program execution without affecting results of calculations.

*Distinguishing a Rockfall Block from Moving Block* - The quasi-static loading methodology described earlier was applied in the current analysis to optimize the duration of each simulation. The criteria are applied to distinguish the blocks which just moved under the action of stresses generated by the seismic motion from those that indeed fell off were established by setting a block velocity tolerances after certain number of calculation steps. These tolerances would trigger the logic that considers a block as one that fell off. The need for conservative estimate of the amount of rockfall causes that the tolerances are set very tight. As a result, in addition to the number of blocks that are marked as a part of a particular rockfall, a number of such an apparent,
mostly small blocks, are also included in the rockfall count. In effect, the number of rockfall blocks also includes these additional blocks, a byproduct of the methodology used. Figure 6-9 and Figure 6-10 present a typical example of analysis results.

Shown in Figure 6-9 are a number of rock blocks generated by the stresses associated with the particular ground motion. The blocks adjacent to the opening are the rockfall blocks. There are also a number of blocks that are located at some distance away from the opening, seemingly floating in an open space. Obviously, these blocks located within the rock mass are not a part of a rockfall.

Somewhat different results are presented in Figure 6-10. Here, assessed from several angles, are the relatively large blocks. These are located above the intersection and delineated by the long parallel fractures. These relatively large blocks are terminated at the top by yet another large sub-horizontal discontinuity, clearly identifiable in the model cross-section at the bottom of the figure. These blocks located at the crown of the excavation and adjacent to the opening are a part of rockfall.

It is important to note that similarly as in the case presented in Figure 6-9, there are a number of blocks "levitating" above the tunnel intersection and located within the rock mass. These distant blocks are also a part of a group of apparent rockfall related to the numerical simulation method applied in the current study. As shown in Figure 6-9, the third group of rockfall is illustrated by the moving blocks located at the tip of the pillar remaining between the main tunnel and the turnout. These blocks located close to excavation had moved as a result of stress readjustment during tunnel excavation and were disturbed further by the stresses due to ground motion. They are located within the pillar and as such are of little threat of falling onto the TEV shielded enclosure. Their low elevation can be used as a parameter helpful in distinguishing them from other rockfall blocks.

Yet another group of rockfall blocks can be distinguished after the excavation of tunnels takes place. Here the model is cycled to equilibrium, and a number of rockfall blocks at the tunnel circumference as well as within the rock mass surrounding the tunnel that fell as a result of tunnel excavation can be identified. These rockfall blocks are further referred to as EQ blocks, and are subtracted from the final block count, such that only rockfall blocks due to the ground motion can be accounted for.

*Presentation of Results* - A visual examination of the analysis results makes possible to verify if block location satisfies expected occurrence of the fall. One option of presenting the results of rockfall is to present a number of cross-sections through cavities in rock mass resulting from the rockfall. This technique demonstrated in cross-sections shown at the bottom in Figure 6-9 and 6- 10. Within 3DEC program the post-processor has its limits, as the intersecting other adjacent blocks can obscure the view of the opening size. As a result, it is more advantageous to show the blocks as they occur in the rock mass, with the portion of rock surrounding them removed for clarity. Such presentation is accomplished in several steps.

During the calculation, each block that satisfies criteria of rockfall is deleted or removed. Initially, therefore, the rockfall blocks are identified by searching the rock mass for blocks that were removed during calculation. This is accomplished by using specifically developed function

"*Deleted1.fis*". This step is implemented on the portion of the output representing the stage of calculation, where one can extract information about the number of rockfall blocks. In effect, a list of marked blocks is obtained. This list is used during the post-processing Stage 2, where the file containing the initial, yet undisturbed geometry and all associated rock mass information is restored. The table containing the list of blocks removed during the rockfall is used to mark blocks in this initial, undisturbed model. In the subsequent step, the rockfall blocks are marked, and other unmarked blocks are hidden. The effect of this post-processing procedure is illustrated in the first three images shown in figures (Figure 6-9 and Figure 6-10), where as a result of this "numerical etching" only the excavated parts of the model are visible.

The rockfall criterion is applied consistently in all simulations and to all discrete blocks of the rock mass. As a result, in addition to the real rockfall, an "apparent rockfall" also occurs. This apparent rockfall includes rock blocks that moved sufficiently to be counted as rockfall, however, because of the surrounding rock mass, cannot fall out.

In the current analysis two stages of rockfall are analyzed. The first stage includes the EQ rockfall blocks occurring as a result of tunnel excavation. Here the "EQ" associated with the file name is used to identify the files generated at the state of equilibrium attained after tunnels are excavated but before the ground motion is introduced into the simulation. The second stage includes identifying both EQ blocks as well as those that fell as a result of applied ground motions. The final number of rockfall blocks due to ground motion only is obtained by subtracting the EQ blocks from the final block count.

In general, the blocks belonging to the initial (EQ) rockfall are subtracted from the overall number of the rockfall blocks. To facilitate further processing of results, an additional Stage 3 of analysis is introduced. This stage is initiated by invoking the "*Deleted2.fis*" function (see Attachment II), which allows for identifying all rockfall blocks. In addition this function allows for determining the volume of each individual rockfall block and the elevation of lowermost apex of its geometry. In effect, a pair of rock block volume along with the elevation of its lowermost apex is used to uniquely identify each block. To separate EQ blocks from the entire rockfall population, the process of identifying the EQ and all blocks is repeated twice. This procedure must be repeated for each case simulated. Attachment II presents examples of the two functions and the process used to verify and validate their implementation in post-processing of rockfall data. The final step includes separation of the EQ blocks from the entire rockblock population. This task is accomplished within a worksheet that summarizes the rockfall block data for each particular case simulated.

The block separation is performed by arranging the final rockfall data and the initial EQ data side by side and running a simple macro called "*SelBlkDiff*". The macro selects the subsequent pairs of block volume and the block elevation data from the EQ set and compares it to each pair of the final set of rockfall blocks. If the identical pair is found, the EQ data is written in one set of two columns, otherwise the ground motion rockfall data is written in another two-column set. As a result, a separate, "ground motion only" rockfall data set is obtained. This data extracted from all cases are combined and presented further in this report. The *SelBlkDiff* macro can be found in dataset for each case analyzed in the Excel file of the form e.g., *C\_04\_17\_Blk\_Vol\_&\_Elev Data.xls*. The initial data sets and results of the rockfall block separation are readily visually verifiable in each worksheet.

Figure 6-11 shows the results obtained from the Case 34 58 simulations. Shown in this figure from the top are (a) final results including both EQ and blocks due to ground motions together, (b) EQ blocks due to the tunnel excavation only, and (c) the final product, where EQ blocks were subtracted resulting in rockfall blocks due to ground motion only.

*Mechanical Aspect of the Simulated Rockfall* - A large number of discontinuities can collectively contribute to a large rockfall. During program execution, the subsequent removal of blocks, which exceeded the prescribed displacement, results in an empty space. This space would otherwise still contain a rock volume and provide a partial restraint against the movement of this newly exposed block. Along with the conservative estimate of loads, this procedure causes that the solution tends to be more conservative, i.e., causing more rockfall.

The model geometry determined by the fracture pattern interacting with the ground motion results in rockfall magnitude that cannot be predicted intuitively. In effect, a number of cases each representing a combination of various standardized ground motions and fracturing patterns must be analyzed on the case population large enough that the approximated the in situ conditions are represented realistically.



Source: DVD Disk\_2, A\_Case\_20\_59, Pfil\_1.pcx, Pfil\_2.pcx, Pfil\_3.pcx, Pfil\_4.pcx.

Figure 6-9 An Example of Case 20\_59 showing the Rockfall Blocks Adjacent to the Excavation and a Number of Blocks at Some Distance Away from the Openings, a Byproduct of the Numerical Method Applied.



Source: DVD Disk\_3, B\_Case\_34\_58, Pfil\_1.pcx, Pfil\_2.pcx, Pfil\_3.pcx, Pfil\_4.pcx.

Figure 6-10 An Example of Case 34\_58 showing the Rockfall Blocks Adjacent to the Excavation and a Number of Blocks at Some Distance Away from the Openings, a Byproduct of the Numerical Method Applied.



Source: DVD Disk\_3, B\_Case\_34\_58, Pfil\_1.pcx, Pfil\_1\_EQ.pcx, Pfil\_1\_GMotion.pcx

Figure 6-11 An Example of Case 34\_58 showing the Rockfall Blocks (a) Due the Tunnel Excavation and Ground Motion Combined, (b) Due to Excavation Only, and (c) Blocks Due to Ground Motion Only. A Number of Blocks at Some Distance Away from the Openings, Represents a Byproduct of the Numerical Method Applied.

# **6.5.5 Summary of 10-5 Ground Motion Results**

This section presents results of the current analysis performed under loading conditions resulting from  $10^{-5}$  ground motion. Here an attempt was made to provide a link to the results obtained in the Rev A analysis under  $10^{-4}$  ground motion.

In general, predicting the rockfall size by estimating the combined effect of ground motion and rock mass based on intuition alone is not possible. Each combination presents a unique outcome impacted by the energy of ground motion and a system of fractures, which oriented in a favorable direction (i.e., producing a small rockfall) in one case, can be oriented significantly less favorably in another case. In effect, a number of cases must be analyzed to provide statistically meaningful characterization of the jointed rock strata response to seismic shaking. In the current analysis 30 cases in two series of computer simulations were completed, each containing 15 patterns of the standardized ground motions. In both series each ground motion has been randomly paired to a unique rock jointing pattern. In effect, each ground motion pattern has been used with the two unique rock jointing patterns, together representing a sample population of 30 unique cases.

Table 6-6 provides a summary of rockfall predictions for the simulated cases at the access main/turnout intersection for  $10^{-4}$  ground motion and a correlation to the cases analyzed for  $10^{-5}$ ground motion. During the  $10^{-4}$  ground motion analysis (Rev A) only one pattern of ground motion has been used in combination with 13 different jointing patterns. In the current (Rev B) analysis, 15 ground motion patterns have been used in each series. Table 6-7 summarizes a Series 1,  $10^{-5}$  ground motion cases and provides a link to the  $10^{-4}$  ground motion results listed earlier. As evident in Table 6-7, in Rev B some rock jointing cases analyzed during the  $10^{-4}$ analysis were omitted because of redundancy, while other cases were added, to establish a total of 15 pairs of the ground motion and rock fracturing data in each of two series.

For each case the results of rockfall simulations are analyzed in terms of the three basic parameters; 1) number of rockfall blocks, 2) individual block volume, 3) lowermost elevation of each individual block. The overall results for Series 1 and 2 are based on a combined set of data including the results obtained for all 15 individual cases in each series. The combined results from both series can be found in Disk CD\_1 Excel file *Rockfall Results - All Cases Extract Summary.xls* submitted with this report.

In all cases, the zero elevation at the tunnel springline is used. Springlines are the two lines on the opposite side of the tunnel and determined by the plane parallel to the invert, passing through the circular tunnel center and intersecting the tunnel circumference. The blocks with negative elevations are those blocks that moved towards the opening floor or invert and are located below the zero elevation at the springline level.

Examples provided in Figure 6-7 and Figure 6-8 show that considering the safety of the TEV, a number of rock blocks marked as rockfall can be further sorted according to their elevation. It is evident that the potential impact by blocks with their lowermost point elevation located below the springline pose little danger to the TEV shielded enclosure and the threat increases with an increase in block elevation. Therefore, movements of the rock strata below the tunnel springline, from the perspective of the TEV safety, are of much lesser concern than blocks in the tunnel roof, which are located at higher elevation. A rock block mass in combination with its height can be used to calculate its potential energy and to assess the potential threat each block poses to the TEV passing under such a block. A typical irregularity of the rock block geometry and differences in the block volume caused that the location of the lowest point for each rockfall block was required. As described earlier, a set of two functions and a macro, developed to locate, mark, calculate the block volume, and to obtain its lowermost point elevation were used to extract information from the results of each completed case.

Table 6-6 Summary of Rockfall Predictions for the Simulated Cases at the Access Main/Turnout Intersection for  $10^{-4}$  Ground Motion and Correlation to Cases Analyzed for  $10^{-5}$  Ground **Motion** 

<b>3DEC Case No.</b>	Jointing <b>Realization</b> No.	<b>Number of</b> <b>Rockfall</b> <b>Blocks</b>	(m <sup>3</sup> )	Total Volume Max. Volume (m <sup>3</sup> )	Case Analyzed in <b>Current</b> <b>Study</b> Series 1	Case Number in <b>Current</b> <b>Study</b> Series 1
		10 <sup>-4</sup> Ground Motion			10 <sup>-5</sup> Ground Motion	
14	22	232	59.99	15.24	X	1
15	21	143	15.01	2.07	X	$\overline{2}$
16	30	84	5.69	1.06		3
17	27	144	10.82	0.59	X	4
18	26	132	8.09	0.48	X	5
19	10	285	45.8	3.86	X	6
20	19	86	4.93	0.39	X	$\overline{7}$
21	9					8
22	23	94	7.47	0.88		9
23	5	99	13.32	3.81	X	10
24	$6\phantom{1}$	84	5.12	0.32	X	11
25	17	198	19.14	0.58		12
26	12	125	8.36	0.57		13
27	14	176	17.14	2.09	X	14
33	102				X	15
43	59				X	16
44	65				X	17
45	39				X	18
47	103				X	19
59	74				X	20
	Total:	1882	220.88	31.94		

**Note**: Shaded cells indicate cases not considered either in Rev A or in the current Rev B Series 1 **Calculations** 

Due to limitation of the numerical simulation, the rockfall data include rock mass blocks that can occur not only in the tunnel roof or crown, but also at other locations in the vicinity of the opening. This additional rockfall simply indicates that a movement of the block was large enough to satisfy the criterion that triggered decision for the given block to be marked and counted in the rockfall blocks number.

To facilitate calculations related to an assessment of the potential consequences of rockfall the results from current analysis were evaluated considering block elevations as a discriminating parameter. The results from a combined Series 1 and 2 are presented in Figure 6-12 to 6-17. Each figure shows the rock block elevation versus block volume within the following intervals: 1) all rock blocks data combined for the series of 30 runs, which includes blocks with both positive and negative elevations, i.e., located below the zero springline level (Figures 6-12 and 6- 13), 2) all blocks located below the springline level (Figure 6-14), 3) blocks located at and above the springline and below the tunnel crown (Figure 6-15), blocks located at and above the tunnel crown, i.e., above 3.81 m elevation (Figure 6-16), and 4) blocks located within elevation interval at and above springline, i.e., 3.81 m to 15 m (Figure 6-17), for which statistical are summarized in Tables 6-13 and 6-14.

The results for all cases analyzed including Series 1 and 2 are shown in Figure 6-12 Source: CD\_1 *Rockfall Results – All Cases Extract Summary.xls*, while Figure 6-13 shows the same data with the rockfall block volume limited to 80  $m<sup>3</sup>$ . Also shown in these two figures are the reference locations of the tunnel springline, elevation 0.0 m, and the tunnel crown at elevation 3.81 m. A closer views at the magnitude of rockfall blocks volumes versus their distribution within a range of elevations are presented in Figures 6-14 to 6-17. It is evident that as expected, the largest number and volume of rockfalls occur within elevation of the tunnel crown. The largest rockfall block is located at the elevation above the springline but below the tunnel crown. The second largest rockfall block is located below the springline.

Table 6-8 summarizes the  $10^{-4}$  rockfall prediction results for 9 simulations out of 13 that were performed with fracture patterns identical to those extracted from Series 1 for 10<sup>-5</sup> ground motion results presented in Table 6-9. A direct comparison between these two sets of data must be treated with caution since the Series 1 were obtained using identical rock jointing patterns but each subject to a different case of  $10^{-5}$  ground motion. However, by comparing these two tables it is evident that energy input for  $10^{-5}$  ground motion is substantially higher than its  $10^{-4}$  ground motion counterpart. While the rockfall among the similar cases may vary, on the average,  $10^{-5}$ ground motion produces the total rockfall volume that is approximately 5 times higher than one produced by the  $10^{-4}$  ground motion (1060.27 m<sup>3</sup> versus 188.22 m<sup>3</sup>).

Similar comparison is made between the results from two series of cases, where the  $10^{-5}$  set of fifteen ground motion patterns remains the same in each series but each ground motion pattern is paired with one case of randomly generated fracture patterns as shown for Series 1 and 2 in Table 6-10. The side-by-side comparison of results obtained in Series 1 and 2 as well as the combined results for both series are presented in Table  $6-11$ . Here, the  $10^{-5}$  ground motion results indicate similar number of individual rockfall blocks for Series 1 and 2 (5608 versus 5946). However, the rockfall volume  $(1589.21 \text{ m}^3 \text{ and } 3335.09 \text{ m}^3)$  and the maximum volume of individual blocks predicted in Series 1 and 2 (79.18  $m<sup>3</sup>$  versus 338.4  $m<sup>3</sup>$ ), indicates the rockfall magnitude for Series 2 to be approximately four times higher than the corresponding Series 1 results. It also indicates that Series 1 results alone are not sufficient to characterize the rockfall results associated with  $10^{-5}$  ground motion and additional data are required. This comparison provides further evidence that results from both Series 1 and 2 must be used to characterize rock strata.

Table 6-12 summarizes the total number and volume of rockfall blocks obtained from 30 simulations. It appears that 0.21 percent of the total number of blocks of the volume greater than 20 m<sup>3</sup> comprises approximately 41 percent of the total rockfall volume. This number indicates that the  $10^{-5}$  ground motion at the intersection, which at its larger span equals to approximately

The rockfalls below the tunnel springline are of no practical consequence to the TEV safety, hence further analyses were performed for rockfalls above the springline elevation  $(H > 0.0 \text{ m})$ . Tables 6-13 and 6-14 summarize detailed statistics for all simulation cases performed in the current analysis. Table 6-13 summarizes results pertaining to the rockfall volume. Similar statistics related to the rockfall block elevation are summarized in Table 6-14. In total, the results are based on the volume and elevation of 9836 rockfall blocks, due to ground motion alone, obtained from 30 simulations.

Presented in Figure 6-18 and Figure 6-19 are the histograms of results obtained from all simulation cases carried out in the current study. The results in Figure 6-18 show an overall summary of data and Figure 6-19 shows a closeup of the distribution of the block volume within 0.0  $\text{m}^3$  to 20  $\text{m}^3$  interval. The data summarized in Figure 6-20, where the frequency scale is limited to 10, shows clearly that the volume of the vast majority of rockfalls is less than 20  $m<sup>3</sup>$ .

Analysis performed to determine a minimum number of simulations necessary to represent the rockfall characteristics have shown that for  $10^{-5}$  annual probability of exceedance ground motion the number of simulations indicate that the maximum value of the block size, impact velocity and impact energy occur between the  $20^{th}$  and  $25^{th}$  simulation (Reference 2.2.10, Appendix K, p. 4). Current results suggest that analysis utilizing the results presented in this report should be based on both Series 1 and Series 2 data combined.





## **Key to numbering system Notes:**

C = Case Analyzed

07 = Sequential Number in current analysis

20 = 3DEC number as listed in DTN: MO0301SPASIP27.004 [DIRS 161869], Reference 2.2.23.

19 = Joint Realization Number

05 = Ground Motion Pattern Number as provided in DTN<mark>:</mark> MO0301SPASIP27.004 [DIRS 161869], Reference 2.2.23.

: Example: C\_07\_20\_19\_05

2) Case with numerical difficulties caused by inadmissible block geometry resulting from jointing pattern applied



Source: *CD\_1 Rockfall Results – All Cases Extract Summary.xls*





Source: *CD\_1 Rockfall Results – All Cases Extract Summary.xls* Figure 6-13 Summary of Rockfall Simulations for All Cases Analyzed. Data Shown for the Entire Range of Elevations and for Rockfall Blocks Volume less Than 80.0  $m^3$ .









Figure 6-15 Summary of Rockfall Simulations for All Cases Analyzed. Data Shown for Rockfall Blocks at Elevations (H) Within a Range  $0.0 \text{ m} < H < 3.81 \text{ m}$ .

#### **Block Elevation Versus Block Volume Plot**





Source: *CD\_1 Rockfall Results – All Cases Extract Summary.xls*

Figure 6-16 Summary of Rockfall Simulations for All Cases Analyzed. Data Shown for Rockfall Blocks at Elevations H > 3.81 m.



**Block Elevation Versus Block Volume Plot** 

Source: *CD\_1 Rockfall Results – All Cases Extract Summary.xls*

Figure 6-17 Summary of Rockfall Simulations for All Cases Analyzed. Data Shown for Rockfall Blocks at Elevations  $H > 0.0$  m.

Table 6-8 Summary of the Rockfall Predictions for the Simulated Cases at the Access Main/Turnout Intersection for 10<sup>-4</sup> Ground Motion Correlating to Cases Analyzed for 10<sup>-5</sup> Ground Motion



Source: *CD\_1 Rockfall Results – All Cases Extract Summary.xls*

Note: (1) Only one ground motion pattern was used in  $10<sup>-4</sup>$  ground motion analysis.

Table 6-9 Summary of the Rockfall Predictions for the Simulated Cases at the Access Main/Turnout Intersection for 10<sup>-5</sup> Ground Motion Correlating to Cases Analyzed for 10<sup>-4</sup> Ground Motion



Source: *CD\_1 Rockfall Results – All Cases Extract Summary.xls* **Note:** All rockfall blocks, except those due to excavation included



## Table 6-10 Summary of the Rockfall Predictions for the Simulated Series 1 and Series 2 Cases at the Access Main/Turnout Intersection for 10<sup>-5</sup> Ground Motion and Sorted According to Rockfall Block Elevation

Source: *CD\_1 Rockfall Results – All Cases Extract Summary.xls*

52

Table 6-11 Summary of the Rockfall Predictions Under 10<sup>-5</sup> Annual Exceedance Ground Motion for the Simulated Series 1 and 2 Cases at the Access Main/Turnout Intersection for Selected Rock Block Ranges of Elevations.



Source: CD\_1 *Rockfall Results – All Cases Extract Summary.xls*

Table 6-12 Ratio of the Rockfall Predicted Under 10<sup>-5</sup> Annual Exceedance Ground Motion Between Rock Blocks of Volume Greater than 20  $m<sup>3</sup>$  to the Entire Rockfall Block Population.



Source: CD\_1 *Rockfall Results – All Cases Extract Summary.xls*



### Table 6-13 Rockfall Analysis - Statistics for Each and All Cases for Rockfall Block Volume at and Above Springline

Source: *CD\_1 Rockfall Results – All Cases Extract Summary.xls*

54



## Table 6-14 Rockfall Analysis - Statistics for Each and All Cases for Rockfall Block Elevation at and Above Springline

Source: *CD\_1 Rockfall Results – All Cases Extract Summary.xls*









Figure 6-19 Results for Series 1, 10<sup>-5</sup> Ground Motion Study Showing Rock Block Frequency of Occurrence versus Block Volume. Closeup for Block Volume Range up to 20  $\mathrm{m}^3$ .



Block Frequency of Occurrence versus Block Volume<br>All Cases Included (Block Elevation > 0.0 m)

Source: CD\_1 *Rockfall Results – All Cases Extract Summary.xls*

Figure 6-20 Results for Series 1 and 2, 10<sup>-5</sup> Ground Motion Study Showing Rock Block Frequency of Occurrence versus Block Volume. For Clarity the Scale of Frequency is Limited to 10.

## **7.0 RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS**

The objective of the analysis is to provide input to the PCSA analysis to determine the size and distribution of the rockfall blocks, related to certain probability that can impact the TEV shielded enclosure during the transport of waste packages to the emplacement drifts.

Justification is provided for the number of simulations performed. This number is considered adequate to characterize the rockfall volume and size distribution of caved blocks at the intersection of the access main and turnout as predicted for preclosure ground motions of the annual probability of exceedance equal to  $10^{-5}$ .

Stability of the excavation under seismic loading is assessed by the quasi-static simulation of a sequence of equilibrium states. This approach is justified because of the large wavelength of seismic ground motion compared to the size of excavation, which in effect produces relatively uniform stress and associated strain field. The approach is validated using results of a dynamic stability analysis of the emplacement drifts.

Stability of the intersection between the access main and the turnout is investigated for a total of 30 data sets performed in two series. Each series includes 15 patterns of ground motions paired to the two randomly generated cases of different realizations of rock mass jointing.

The maximum span of the intersection is 15 m, compared to the 5.5-m diameter of the emplacement drift. The statistics of block sizes of the caved rock for  $10^{-4}$  ground motion are very similar for the emplacement drift and the intersection. The main difference in predicted rockfall is that the predicted maximum block size is much larger in the intersection than in the emplacement drift.

A comparison of the similar simulation cases for  $10^{-4}$  and  $10^{-5}$  ground motions indicates that the total number of rockfall blocks for  $10^{-5}$  ground motion is approximately 2.4 times larger and the total rockfall volume is 5.6 times larger. The results also show that for geometrically similar cases, the 10-5 annual exceedance ground motion at the intersection produces rockfall with maximum rockfall block volume 4.6 times larger than  $10^{-4}$  ground motion. The overall results also show the maximum rockfall block to be approximately an order of magnitude larger than one produced by  $10^{-4}$  ground motion (338.4 m<sup>3</sup> versus 36.72 m<sup>3</sup>). The total number and volume of rockfall blocks obtained for  $10^{-5}$  ground motion from 30 simulations indicates that 0.21 percent of the total number of blocks of the volume greater than 20  $m<sup>3</sup>$  comprises approximately 41 percent of the total rockfall volume.

The results of analysis include statistical parameters for the rockfall volume and the rockfall block elevation. Statistical parameters are calculated for each individual realization case as well as for the entire population of rockfalls generated in 30 rockfall simulations.

The distribution and parameters of discontinuities are major factors affecting the location and the size of rockfall. Small variations of tunnel dimensions and geometry, e.g., the local change of tunnel shape to flat roof or a small increase in the roof span is not expected to affect the overall results obtained from this analysis.

The outputs of this calculation are reasonable compared to the inputs. The results are suitable for the intended use.

## **ATTACHMENT I**

DETERMINATION OF SEICMIC VELOCITY SPECTRAL DENSITY FUNCTIONS USING FAST FOURIER TRANSFORM

This attachment presents the calculation of seismic wave spectrum density functions based on the velocity time histories using the fast Fourier transform (FFT) scheme. The FFT is performed using Mathcad software (see Section 4.2.2). The results of Mathcad calculations are presented in the Output DTN: MO0410MWDPRNDP.000 (file: *spectral density-cfft.mcd*, Reference 2.2.27).

The inputs are the three components of ground motion velocities (H1, H2, and V) (DTN: MO0306SDSAVDTH.000 (Reference 2.2.24, MatH1.vth, MatH2.vth, and MatV.vth), as shown in Figure 6-5. There are a total of 15,000 data points in each velocity component, with a time interval of 0.005 second between two adjacent data points. Define the variables as follows:

$$
H1V = H1(3)
$$
  
\n
$$
H2V = H2(3)
$$
  
\n
$$
VV = V(3)
$$
  
\n
$$
n_s = \text{length}(H1(0))
$$
  
\n
$$
n_s = 1.5 \times 104
$$

The first 15 data points of these velocity components are given below (DTN: MO0306SDSAVDTH.000 (Reference 2.2.24, MatH1.vth, MatH2.vth, and MatV.vth).



The FFT is achieved using the following built-in function in Mathcad:

$$
f h 1 := \text{cfft}(H 1 V)
$$

 $fh2 = cfft(H2V)$ 

i<sup>z</sup> K:= c<br>length(fh1)<br>length(fh1) z s  $\stackrel{\textstyle{0.1}}{=}$ 

The first 15 data points of the results are shown below. The first 15 data points of the results are shown below.





 $\blacksquare$ 



The magnitudes of these complex numbers are given as

$$
mfn1_{j} = |fn1_{j}|
$$

$$
mfn2_{j} = |fn2_{j}|
$$

$$
mfv_{j} = |fv_{j}|
$$

or



п

where j is the jth number of data points. The actual frequency,  $f_j$ , corresponding to jth data point is determined based on the original data frequency,  $f_s$ , of  $1/0.005$  and the number of data points of 15000, as follows:

$$
f_j = \frac{j}{N} f_s = \frac{j}{75}
$$

Figure I-1 shows the plot of power spectral densities versus frequency for three velocity components.



Figure I-1 Power Spectral Density versus Frequency for Three Velocity Components

# **ATTACHMENT II**

# POST-PROCESSING RESULTS FROM 3DEC SIMULATIONS

## **POST-PROCESSING RESULTS FROM 3DEC SIMULATIONS**

The results from 3DEC simulations are obtained in a binary file format and the presentation of these results requires post-processing. There are a number of typical commands that can be used to present the results either in a graphical or printed form. The FISH language, an inherent part of the qualified 3DEC software, can be used to extract and present the data in the desired format, and using FISH language for generating scripts, macros or functions written for a specific purpose, can further enhance this standard set of commands.

This attachment presents the description of two functions 1) printDeletedID (deleted1.fis) and 2) printDeletedVolumeID (deleted2.fis), that in this analysis are used during the stage of data post-processing. They were written to facilitate visualization and output of volumes and elevations of blocks that have become unstable during simulation of stability of intersections subjected to seismic ground motions.

The functions are listed below with explanation for their use such, that a reviewer can examine the results presented independently. The use of these functions is limited to the particular applications described in this attachment. The functions are used for identification of rockfall block geometry, calculation of volume and determining the elevation of the lowermost apex of the rock block. The results of functions can be verified visually and manually from the geometry, and printed output of associated parameters. These functions are listed below and the results obtained by applying them can be visually checked and verified and do not require further verification.

As explained in Section 6.5.4 the procedure used during simulation of the rockfall results in deleting the blocks that were found to satisfy a criterion used to determine if the block is considered as rockfall. Block that satisfies the rockfall criterion is deleted and calculations continue to attain a new state of equilibrium. An account of all rock mass blocks is maintained by a list of block identifications. These numbers are required to store and orderly retrieve all data pertaining to a particular rock mass fragment.

The function printDeletedID prints identifications of all blocks that are deleted during simulation. It should be called at the end of simulation to assure that all rockfall blocks are accounted for. The block identifications are written in the form of commands that mark the rockfall/deleted blocks as region 77. One of the function's parameters "volumeThreshold\_," allows for printing only the rockfall/deleted blocks with volumes greater than specified by the "volumeThreshold\_". Upon calling the function, a log file is generated that contains an image of lines printed to the screen and listing of identifications of the rockfall block. This log file of deleted blocks can be used to verify this function. This task can be accomplished by calling the log file with the stored screen printout from the same save ("... .sav) file, from which the function was called. However, this is a file from which all rockfall blocks were deleted, invoking the function will result in no action. No blocks will be marked as region 77, which confirms that those are indeed the deleted blocks. To mark the deleted blocks, the initial save file, which contains all rock mass blocks prior to applying the seismic loading, where the blocks are still part of the model, must be restored. With initial (… .ini) file restored, by calling the log file, the list of stored commands will mark the blocks that became a part of the rockfall as region 77.

The " printDeletedVolumeID" function allows to print volumes, identifications and the minimum elevation of rockfall blocks. This output is obtained on the screen. Here again, the log file can be created to preserve information pertaining to the volume, identification and elevation of the rockfall blocks. By examining the printed log, one can easily verify that no blocks with volume greater than one specified by the "volumeThreshold\_" are included.

```
************** deleted1.fis ************************************** 
def _printDeletedID 
   iPnt_ = listActualBlocks_ 
   loop while iPnt_ # null 
    if mem(iPnt +KADEL) = 1 then
       volume_ = mem(iPnt_+KAVOL_) 
       if volume_ >= volumeThreshold_ 
        jPnt = mem(iPnt +KALIST)loop while jPnt # null
         iBlock = mem(\overline{j}Pnt + KPADD) can_ = out('mark block '+string(iBlock_)+' region 77' ) 
         jPnt = mem(jPnt + KPNEXT) end_loop 
       endif 
     endif 
    iPnt = mem(iPnt +KANEXT) end_loop 
end 
set volumeThreshold 0.0
_printDeletedID 
************** deleted2.fis ************************************ 
def _printDeletedVolumeID 
  iPnt_ = listActualBlocks_ 
   loop while iPnt_ # null 
     jPnt_ = mem(iPnt_+KALIST_) 
    iBlock = mem(jPnt + KPADD)if b region(iBlock ) = 77volume = mem(iPnt + KAVOL)can = out('block volume '+string(volume))yMin = 1.e30loop while jPnt # null
        iBlock = mem(jPnt + KPADD)can = out(' block ID '+string(iBlock))
        iGp = b vertex(iBlock)
        loop while iGp # 0
          yMin = min(yMin_, gp_y(iep))iGp = qp next(iGp)
         end_loop 
         jPnt_ = mem(jPnt_+KPNEXT_) 
       end_loop 
      can = out(' minimum elevation '+string(yMin))
     endif 
    iPnt = mem(iPnt +KANEXT) end_loop 
end 
_printDeletedVolumeID
```
## **BLOCK ELEVATION VERIFICATION**

The elevation and volume are verified directly by visual inspection and by printing block information from 3DEC.

For example, in Case 01 14, there is a rockfall block with the following information:

Block volume 1.4513e+000 block ID 8260441 block ID 8259571 block ID 8274689 minimum elevation **3.2995e+000**

Plotting those three block components with identifications as listed above and inspecting interactively the coordinates displayed on the screen, one can verify a minimum block elevation.

An overall view of the Case 01 14 rockfall is presented in Figure II- 2 shows the block selected in the current example and its position with the lowermost apex located at the tunnel roof elevation. Shown in Figure II- 3 is an enlarged view of the looked upon at different angle. In the right corner of the Figure II- 4, a position of the cursor (here shown symbolically as an arrow) is shown along with the reading of x, y, and z coordinates indicating its location with respect to the opening springline. The plot indicates the y-coordinate of the lowest block point to be 3.32. The difference between the approximate y-coordinate displayed on the screen and equal to 3.321788, and the printed minimum elevation of the lowermost block vertex 3.2995 is small and both numbers are considered practically the same.



Figure II- 1 Case\_01\_14 - Overall View of Rockfall Relative to the Tunnel/Turnout Intersection



Figure II- 2 Case\_01\_14 - Location of the Selected Block Relative to the Tunnel Crown



Figure II- 3 Case\_01\_14 - Location of the Selected Block Relative to the Tunnel Crown



Figure II- 4 Case 01 14 - Location of the Selected Block Apex Used to Estimate Elevation of Each Rockfall Block

### **BLOCK VOLUME VERIFICATION**

The volume is verified by printing the block information, which for three block of interest is as follows:

```
3dec>pr bl 8260441
 block data 
 block mat const region id volume centroid coord. (x,y and z) 
 8260441 1 1 77 9025 7.314E-01 -5.537E+01 5.754E+00 -3.753E+01 
(fdef) 
              This block is slaved to block 8274689 
contact block-1 block-2 code-- unit normal -- x y z z
 4697877 8259571 8260441 m-s 0.310-0.015 0.951 -5.538E+01 5.840E+00 -3.767E+01 
 8261218 8260441 8274689 m-s-0.002-1.000-0.001 -5.491E+01 3.810E+00 -3.771E+01 
 vertex data 
  block 8260441 
 vertex x y z dx dy dz 
 23134107 4 -5.486E+01 4.282E+00 -3.787E+01 1.549E-05 -1.821E-05 1.858E-05 
 18409378 4 -5.493E+01 4.754E+00 -3.783E+01 1.099E-05 -2.053E-05 1.963E-05 
 18409312 4 -5.501E+01 5.226E+00 -3.780E+01 1.085E-05 -2.019E-05 2.388E-05 
 3dec>pr bl 8259571
 block data 
    block mat const region id volume centroid coord. (x,y and z) 
  8259571 1 1 77 9024 6.520E-01 -5.564E+01 6.461E+00 -3.777E+01 
(fdef) 
              This block is slaved to block 8274689 
contact block-1 block-2 code-- unit normal -- x y y z
 4697877 8259571 8260441 m-s 0.310-0.015 0.951 -5.538E+01 5.840E+00 -3.767E+01 
12935542 8259571 8274689 m-s 0.002-1.000 0.004 -5.486E+01 3.810E+00 -3.790E+01 
 vertex data 
  block 8259571 
 vertex x y z dx dy dz 
 52928947 4 -5.585E+01 6.506E+00 -3.809E+01 1.880E-05 -2.109E-05 3.089E-05 
  45236965 4 -5.605E+01 7.369E+00 -3.806E+01 1.767E-05 -1.306E-05 3.164E-05 
  37197513 4 -5.589E+01 8.404E+00 -3.764E+01 1.750E-05 5.005E-06 2.869E-05 
 3dec>pr bl 8274689
 block data 
 block mat const region id volume centroid coord. (x,y and z) 
 8274689 1 1 77 9041 6.852E-02 -5.485E+01 3.593E+00 -3.773E+01 
(fdef) 
contact block-1 block-2 code-- unit normal -- x y
12935542 8259571 8274689 m-s 0.002-1.000 0.004 -5.486E+01 3.810E+00 -3.790E+01 
 8261218 8260441 8274689 m-s-0.002-1.000-0.001 -5.491E+01 3.810E+00 -3.771E+01
```
 vertex data block 8274689 vertex x y z dx dy dz 23964708 4 -5.489E+01 3.810E+00 -3.756E+01 2.003E-05 -1.453E-05 1.946E-05 23964585 4 -5.506E+01 3.810E+00 -3.781E+01 1.871E-05 -1.321E-05 2.070E-05 23964519 4 -5.478E+01 3.810E+00 -3.790E+01 2.007E-05 -1.669E-05 2.124E-05 8275151 7 -5.483E+01 3.329E+00 -3.801E+01 1.580E-05 -1.199E-05 2.196E-05 8275018 7 -5.498E+01 3.810E+00 -3.802E+01 1.975E-05 -1.503E-05 2.156E-05

Adding printed volumes of three blocks gives:  $0.7314+0.652+0.06852 = 1.4513$ , which is identical to the value printed by the function.

\*

# **ATTACHMENT III**

# 4 DVDS AND 1 CD - LIST OF FILES
# **Disk DVD\_1 – List of Files**

6/14/2007 7:34 AM

D:\A\_Case\_01\_14.zip



#### 6/14/2007 7:34 AM

# D:\A\_Case\_01\_14.zip



# 6/14/2007 7:34 AM

# D:\A\_Case\_01\_14.zip









 $\overline{78}$ 78

# 6/18/2007 4:02 PM

# D:\A\_Case\_02\_15.zip

# Page 3



79



 $\sim$  ...

#### 6/14/2007 7:35 AM

# D:\A\_Case\_04\_17.zip



#### 6/14/2007 7:35 AM

D:\A\_Case\_04\_17.zip



Page 3



#### 6/14/2007 7:36 AM

# D:\A\_Case\_05\_18.zip





# 85

1,074,311,670 59% 441,659,112

#### 6/14/2007 7:36 AM

D:\A\_Case\_06\_19.zip





# 6/14/2007 7:36 AM

# D:\A\_Case\_06\_19.zip

# Page 3

 $\sim$ 



#### 6/14/2007 7:36 AM

D:\A\_Case\_07\_20.zip





#### 6/14/2007 7:36 AM

#### D:\A\_Case\_07\_20.zip

Name Type Modified Size Ratio Packed Path Microsoft Excel Worksheet 5/30/2007 5:47 PM 8,280 A\_Case\_07\_20\ C\_07\_20\_Blk\_Vol\_&\_Elev\_Dt\_EQ.xls 26,112 68% C\_07\_20 - Summary.xls<br>C\_07\_20\_Blk\_Vol\_&\_Elev Data.xls 161,792 71% 46,633 A\_Case\_07\_20\<br>85,834 A\_Case\_07\_20\ Microsoft Excel Worksheet 6/2/2007 12:35 PM Microsoft Excel Worksheet 6/4/2007 11:04 AM 268,800 68%  $97$  file(s) 989,965,884 59% 403,267,344

#### Page 3

# 91







Page 1

# 6/14/2007 7:37 AM

D:\A\_Case\_11\_24.zip





# 6/14/2007 7:37 AM

# D:\A\_Case\_11\_24.zip



Page 3





Title: Prediction of Rockfalls in Non-emplacement Drifts Due to Preclosure Seismic Ground Motions<br>DI: 800-K0C-SSD0-00200-000B 99 JJ 66



# D:\A\_Case\_14\_27.zip



**Disk DVD\_2 – List of Files** 

# 6/14/2007 7:41 AM

# D:\A\_Case\_15\_33.zip



# 6/14/2007 7:41 AM

# D:\A\_Case\_15\_33.zip



# 6/14/2007 7:41 AM

# D:\A\_Case\_15\_33.zip



#### 6/14/2007 7:41 AM

# D:\A\_Case\_16\_43.zip







Title: Prediction of Rockfalls in Non-emplacement Drifts Due to Preclosure Seismic Ground Motions D1: 800-K0C-SSD0-00200-000-

108 of 168



108
109 of 168



**Bill Cons. 47, 44 plat** 



Page 3

