#### STATE OF MINNESOTA OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS

#### FOR MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES



Appendix 16.15 Geotechnical Data Package Volume 1 - Flotation Tailings Basin Version 8.

## **Appendix B**

**Geotechnical Data Package Volume 1** - **Flotation Tailings Basin** 



## **NorthMet Project**

# **Geotechnical Data Package Volume 1 - Flotation Tailings Basin**

**Version 8** 

**Issue Date: May 15, 2017** 

This document was prepared for Poly Met Mining Inc. by Barr Engineering Co.



NorthMet Project Date: May 15, 2017 Geotechnical Data Package Volume 1 - Flotation Tailings Basin Version: 8 Page i

#### **Certification**

I hereby certify that this report was prepared by me or under my direct supervision and that I am a duly Licensed Professional Engineer under the laws of the state of Minnesota.

Thomas J. Zadue

05/15/2017

Date

Thomas & Radue, P.E. MN PE #: 20951 Senior Geotechnical Engineer



## **Table of Contents**

























## **Acronyms**













## **1.0 Introduction**

The proposed NorthMet Project (Project) will produce Flotation Tailings throughout 20 years of ore processing. Flotation Tailings will be deposited in the Flotation Tailings Basin (FTB), which will be placed on Cells IE and 2E of the existing former LTV Steel Mining Company (LTVSMC) tailings basin.

In this Geotechnical Data Package-Volume  $1 -$ Version 8 (Data Package), the FTB is the proposed NorthMet Flotation Tailings impoundment, and the Tailings Basin is the existing LTVSMC tailings basin as well as the combined LTVSMC tailings basin and the FTB. Coarse tailings are LTVSMC coarse tailings, fine tailings are LTVSMC fine tailings, slimes are LTVSMC slimes, and Flotation Tailings are the NorthMet bulk flotation tailings.

Geotechnical modeling and design of the FTB has progressed through seven (7) previous versions of Geotechnical Data Package - Volume I (Data Package). Updated versions of the Data Package have been prepared:

- as new subsurface exploration and in-laboratory material testing has been performed
- as new NorthMet Geotechnical Modeling Work Plans have been agreed to with the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR)
- in response to workshops held with the DNR to discuss development of the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement content regarding the FTB
- as PolyMet has made design revisions to the FTB

The geotechnical modeling and design also reflect agreements between PolyMet and the DNR, reached through development of the NorthMet Geotechnical Modeling Work Plan Version 3 (Attachment A).

The approved Geotechnical Modeling Work Plan has been applied to Cross-Section F (north side of Cell 2E, Figure B-2 in Attachment B), Cross-Section G (north side of Cell 2E, Figure B-3 in Attachment B) and Cross-Section N (south side of Cell IE, Figure B-4 in Attachment B). FTB design is based on existing conditions along these cross-sections and material strength design parameters presented in Attachment C.

This Geotechnical Data Package – Vol.  $1$  – Version 8 presents the current (as of the writing of Version 8) geotechnical exploration and material testing data and associated geotechnical analysis. Version 8 supersedes and replaces all prior versions of Geotechnical Data Package - Vol. 1, as it incorporates any new data, analysis approaches, Work Plan requirements, or other factors affecting the content and analysis outcomes presented in this version of the Data Package that may not be contained in or current in prior versions of the Data Package.





## **1.1 Scope**

This Data Package presents the geotechnical data and analyses to support the FTB design as referenced in the Flotation Tailings Management Plan (Reference (1)). The Data Package contains background information, historical data, modeling methods, and analysis of the proposed design. The information has been developed for use in preparing the Environmental Impact Statement for the Project and to support future phases of the project.

#### **1.2 Data Package Participants**

The analyses presented in this Data Package are those analyses deemed critical by PolyMet's geotechnical engineering team, as affected by discussions with the DNR and the DNR' s subcontracted geotechnical engineering team. The members of PolyMet's geotechnical engineering team through this Version 8 Geotechnical Data Package  $-$  Vol. 1  $-$  Version 8 generally include:

- Barr Engineering Co. multiple geotechnical engineering personnel, including but not limited to registered professional engineers with Bachelor of Science in Geological Engineering, Master of Science in Geotechnical Engineering, and/or Ph.D. in Geotechnical Engineering, with individual experience levels from less than one decade to greater than three decades  $-$  Minneapolis, MN
- Scott M. Olson, Ph.D., P.E. Consulting Geotechnical Engineer and Associate Professor, University of Illinois - Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL
- Richard R. Davidson, P.E. Senior Principal Geotechnical Engineer, AECOM (formerly URS Corporation)-Denver, CO



## **1.3 Outline**

The outline of this Data Package is as follows:



As agreed by PolyMet and the DNR, this Data Package is intended to evolve through the environmental review, permitting, operating, reclamation and postclosure maintenance phases of the project. A Revision History is included at the end of the document.



## **2.0 Regulatory Basis**

The FTB dams must be constructed in accordance with applicable requirements of Minnesota Rules, parts 6115.0300 through 6115.0520 - Dams. Portions of the rules are applied universally, while applicability of some rule requirements is dependent on the hazard classification of the dams. The following rule excerpt aids in establishing the hazard classification of the FTB dams:

## 6115.0340 CLASSIFICATION OF DAMS

All existing and proposed dams shall be classified by the DNR Commissioner into the following three hazard classes: those dams where failure, mis-operation, or other occurrences or conditions would probably result in:

- A **Class** I: any loss of life or serious hazard, or damage to health, main highways, highvalue industrial or commercial properties, major public utilities, or serious direct or indirect, economic loss to the public;
- B. **Class** II: possible health hazard or probable loss of high-value property, damage to secondary highways, railroads or other public utilities, or limited direct or indirect economic loss to the public other than that described in Class III; and
- C. **Class** III: property losses restricted mainly to rural buildings and local county and township roads which are an essential part of the rural transportation system serving the area involved.

Any dam whose failure, mis-operation, or other occurrences or conditions would result only in damages to the owner and would not otherwise affect public health, safety, and welfare as described in Classes I, II, and III, shall not be subject to this hazard classification. A dam which is not classified as a hazard Class I, II, or III dam, and those which are not included in the definition of dam in part 6115.0230, subpart 5, definition of dam, shall be subject to applicable provisions of parts 6115.0200 to 6115.0260, and shall not be subject to these dam safety rules. Changes in development in the vicinity of the dam may result in future reclassification.

There is a large, sparsely populated land area to the north of the FTB (the nearest resident is separated from the FTB by a buffer zone of roughly 4,000 feet). PolyMet property and infrastructure are located immediately south, west, and east of the basin. The DNR Commissioner has established the hazard classification for the existing LTVSMC tailings basin dams as Class II – Significant Hazard. The classification of the Tailings Basin dams may change through future phases of the project. The classification partially defines FTB dam permitting, inspection and reporting requirements, notwithstanding requirements of other rules, such as the Permit to Mine. In particular, the stability of the dams must be evaluated, including consideration of liquefaction, shear failure, seepage failure, and overturning, sliding, overstressing, and excessive deformation. The FTB dams have been evaluated for those geotechnical conditions that are relevant as defined by the DNR-approved NorthMet Geotechnical Modeling Work Plan (Attachment A). This document presents the analysis and results.





## **3.0 Existing Facilities and Site Conditions**

This section describes the existing Tailings Basin, reviews the seismic history of the area, and references site hydrogeology. In this Data Package, "upstream" refers to upstream of the dam (i.e., within the basin) and "downstream" refers to downstream of the dam (i.e., near the toe or below the dam). This differs from references that may relate upstream and downstream to the tailings deposition flow direction, where "upstream" indicates the crest of the dam and downstream refers to the interior of the basin.

## **3.1 Tailings Basin Layout**

The Tailings Basin was configured as a combination of three adjacent cells, identified as Cell IE, Cell 2E, and Cell 2W. The proposed FTB will be constructed above existing Cells IE and 2E (Figure B-1 of Attachment B). Flotation Tailings will be deposited upstream of the dams over the Tailings Basin. Details regarding deposition timing are provided in Reference (1).

The geometry at the existing Tailings Basin is formed by perimeter dams up to 200 feet high (in Cell 2W) with side slopes of approximately 3.5H:1V, and 30-foot wide benches every 40 feet vertically (Drawings – Reference (1)). Including the benches, Cell 2W dams were constructed at an approximate overall slope of 4H: IV. Interior dams separate the Tailings Basin into the three cells, as noted previously. The perimeter and interior dams consist of coarse tailings materials from previous taconite processing operations. Shallow gradient beaches extend from the perimeter and interior dams into the center of each cell. The existing cells and the dams do not have a core or cutoff other than the fine tailings or slimes that were deposited upstream of the coarse tailings perimeter dams.

Cell 2E will initially be used for deposition of Flotation Tailings. Cell 2E is located east of Cell 2W and north of Cell IE. It is the lowest of the three cells and covers approximately 620 acres. The average Cell 2E dam height is currently about 95 feet above the surrounding ground; approximately 1,575 feet above mean sea level (AMSL). Cell 2E includes approximately 17,700 linear feet of perimeter dams, including the north and part of the east perimeters. Undisturbed natural high ground forms a portion of the east perimeter. The west perimeter is formed by an interior dam separating Cell 2E from Cell 2W. The south perimeter is formed by an interior dam separating Cell 2E from Cell IE.

Cell IE will be used for deposition of Flotation Tailings beginning in approximately Mine Year 7. Cell IE is east of Cell 2W and south of Cell 2E. Cell IE currently covers approximately 980 acres with an average dam height of about 125 feet above the surrounding ground. It includes approximately 22,500 linear feet of perimeter dams, including portions of the south and east sides of the cell. Undisturbed natural high ground forms a portion of the perimeter on the southeast corner. The west edge is formed by an interior dam between Cells 2W and IE. The north edge is formed by an interior dam between Cells 2E and IE.





Cells IE and 2E are bounded on the west by Cell 2W. An interior dam comprising the eastern edge of Cell 2W separates Cell 2W from Cells IE and 2E. Cell 2W is the largest and highest of the three cells, covering approximately 1,450 acres in surface area with an average dam height of 200 feet above the surrounding ground. Cell 2W, which has previously been constructed to approximately the elevation proposed for Cells IE and 2E, is not proposed for storing Flotation Tailings.

## **3.2 Tailings Basin Development**

The existing north perimeter dam in Cell 2E is of particular interest because it includes the section previously identified as critical for stability modeling due to the layer of peat on which portions of Cell 2E was constructed. The critical section is marked as Cross-Section F (Section F) on Figure B-1 of Attachment B. Cell 2E' s north perimeter dam is constructed of a rock, sand, and gravel starter dam underlain by a layer of peat, overlying a deposit of glacial till. Subsequent dam lifts were constructed using the upstream method with hydraulic filling. Tailings were discharged upstream of the crest to alternate portions of the tailing basin by means of portable spigotting systems. The coarsest tailings settled out nearest the point of discharge, providing a zone of coarse tailings surrounding the rock starter dam and along the face of the dam. These coarse materials were periodically pushed up with a dozer on the dam crest to progressively raise the perimeter dams. Finer tailings and slimes settled out at greater distances from the point of discharge and are generally located near the center of the cells, though they are also less often located nearer the downstream toe in certain areas where spigot discharge did not occur for extended periods of time. The fine tailings and slimes layers are of variable thicknesses and lateral extent due to changing tailings deposition points and durations. Large Figure I identifies the grain size classifications of the LTVSMC coarse tailings, fine tailings, and slimes. Similar methods were used to construct and fill Cell IE, which will eventually be combined with Cell 2E for Flotation Tailings deposition.

In summary, the geometry of the existing tailings basin dams consists of a shell of LTVSMC coarse tailings above the rock, sand, and gravel starter dams, with intermingling fingers of LTVSMC fine tailings and slimes. The shell material, coarse tailings, and inclusions of fine tailings and slimes are incorporated into the stability analysis presented herein. The interior of the cells consists primarily of variable layers of LTVSMC fine tailings and slimes. A relatively thin layer of peat underlies several hundred feet of the north perimeter of Cell 2E and extends north beyond the toe of the dam into a nearby wetland.

Because new dams will be constructed on LTVSMC tailings, the geotechnical characteristics of the Tailings Basin have been investigated. Future perimeter dams will be constructed of mechanically-placed and compacted LTVSMC coarse tailings borrow, and Flotation Tailings will be spigotted into the basin as described in Reference (1). Future dams are not proposed to be constructed of spigotted tailings.





## **3.3 Local Seismicity and Ground Motion**

Northern Minnesota is not an active seismic zone. Historically, Minnesota has one of the lowest rates of earthquake occurrence in the United States. Only 20 small to moderate quakes have been documented in Minnesota since 1860.

Table 3-1 tabulates historical earthquakes in the State of Minnesota as documented by the Minnesota Geological Survey (Reference (2)). The table provides the location of the earthquake epicenter, date, approximate area impacted, maximum intensity, and earthquake magnitude. The maximum intensity measures the strength of shaking produced by the earthquake at a certain location. It is determined from effects on people, human structures, and the natural environment. The intensity is measured on a scale of one (I) through twelve (XII), with one being the least intense and twelve signifying total damage. The magnitude of an earthquake measures the energy released at the source determined by seismographs. The magnitude is measured on a scale ranging from less than 2.0 (Micro quakes) to greater than 9.0 (Great quakes), signifying increased damage with increasing magnitude. The earthquakes listed in Table 3-1 are associated with minor reactivation of ancient faults in response to stress changes. As noted below, only 9 out of the 20 earthquakes were recorded, while moment magnitudes were estimated for the remaining 11 based on Modified Mercalli intensities derived from felt reports.



#### **Table 3-1 Historic Seismicity of Minnesota**







(1) Asterisks denote earthquakes that were recorded instrumentally. All others and their associated magnitudes are based solely on intensity data from felt reports.

According to the data in Table 3-1, the strongest documented earthquakes were associated with the 1960 Long Prairie earthquake  $(M_w = 5.0)$  and the 1975 Morris earthquake  $(M_w = 4.6-4.8)$ . Near their epicenters, these earthquakes caused objects to fall, cracked masonry, and damaged chimneys. A more recent, though less dramatic event was the 1993 Dumont earthquake  $(M_w = 4.1)$ . This earthquake impacted an area of approximately 27,000 square miles with associated intensity of V-VI near the epicenter (Reference  $(2)$ ). The most recent earthquake occurred in Alexandria in April, 2011. This minor earthquake  $(M_w = 2.5)$  resulted in no damage or injury, and went largely unnoticed as most residents were sleeping at the time.

In summary, current knowledge indicates that a severe earthquake is unlikely in Minnesota. Weak to moderate earthquakes do occasionally occur, though the threat to the proposed FTB from seismic events is very small, as described in Section 6.4.3.

## **3.4 Hydrogeology**

Studies have been performed to investigate the hydrogeology of the site and those results will not be reproduced again in this document, though active communication has occurred between Project geotechnical engineers and hydrogeologists to share data and results and maintain consistency between analyses, as appropriate. A separate report has been prepared to discuss the FTB hydrogeology (Reference (3)).





## **4.0 Available Geotechnical Information**

Available geotechnical information for the FTB includes data gathered during the 2007 and 2014 geotechnical investigations as well as historical data. Available historical geotechnical data and reports are provided as Attachment D. The cumulative site data are described in these subsections. Results separated by material type are presented in Section 5.0. The approaches used to select material strength parameters for slope stability analyses using field and laboratory test results are detailed in Attachment C and summarized in Section 5.0.

## **4.1 History of Tailings Basin Geotechnical Investigations and Stability Analyses**

The geotechnical parameters used for slope stability analysis and design of the Tailings Basin have varied throughout historical evaluations as more geotechnical test results have become available. A map presenting all known geotechnical test locations is provided in Figure B-1 of Attachment B. A summary table of the historically-reported properties used for previous analyses is also included as Table B-1 in Attachment B.

The earliest available stability analysis was conducted for Erie Mining Company (predecessor to LTVSMC) in 1977 by Ebasco Services, Inc. Ebasco presented a limited set of drained and undrained shear strength data for bulk tailings and slimes (Reference (4)). Ebasco used the term bulk tailings to refer to existing LTVSMC combined fine and coarse tailings. In 1978, Ebasco presented updated geotechnical design parameters, separating the bulk tailings into coarse and fine portions and including strength parameters for the native peat and till (Reference (5)). This Data Package uses the term 'bulk tailings' differently than the Ebasco reports. For the geotechnical analysis described herein, the phrase 'LTVSMC bulk tailings' is used to describe a mixture of tailings that will be used in future dam construction. LTVSMC bulk tailings will predominately consist ofLTVSMC coarse tailings, but may have occasional inclusions of LTVSMC fine tailings and a small amount of slimes recovered incidentally during coarse tailings excavation.

In 1986, additional investigations were conducted by Katsoulis for the DNR (Reference (6)). Ebasco reported supplementary geotechnical investigations, engineering parameters, and stability analyses in 1978 (Reference (5)). A liquefaction analysis and additional triaxial testing on the slimes were conducted by Barr in 1994 (Reference (7)).

Sitka Corporation conducted a large multi-phase geotechnical assessment and analysis of the Tailings Basin stability between 1995 and 1997 (Reference (8), Reference (9), Reference (10)). This included a review of existing data, a geotechnical exploration program with field and laboratory testing, and analysis of the stability of the Tailings Basin. In 2000, Barr performed further seepage and stability analyses on existing dams located in Cells 2W and 2E, which included additional strength and permeability testing (Reference (11)).

A preliminary geotechnical site exploration was conducted in 2005 to obtain updated information on the stratigraphy of the tailings in the central portion of Cell 2W and the southern portion of





Cell IE. Since closure in 2001, the basin has undergone changes due to non-use, natural dewatering, and tailings consolidation. Natural dewatering made access possible to portions of Cells 2E and 2W which had been under water during basin operation. With larger portions of the basin dewatered (including all of Cell 2W), access was possible with tracked and rubber-tired vehicles. The intent of the 2005 exploration was to provide more data for interpretation of stratigraphy at select cross-sections around the dams, to obtain preliminary design information for future lined hydrometallurgical residue cell design in Cell 2W, and to evaluate the piezometric conditions in Cells IE and 2E.

## **4.2 2007 Geotechnical Investigation**

A geotechnical field investigation was performed in the fall of 2007 and included examination of the central and southern portions of Cell 2W, the northern portion of Cell 2E, and the eastern and southern dams of Cell IE. Field work included rotary wash borings with standard penetration tests (SPT), piezocone penetrometer test (CPTu) soundings, CPTu dissipation testing, dilatometer tests (DMT), field vane shear tests (FVST), and shear wave velocity tests. Laboratory testing was performed on bulk, undisturbed, and disturbed tailings and soil samples to determine index properties, permeability, and strength parameters. The resulting data were used to develop more comprehensive dam cross-sections for seepage and stability analysis, while further determining the impact on the tailings' geotechnical properties of any consolidation and dewatering that had occurred since 2001.

The 2007 geotechnical tests were performed in a particular order to allow for collection of targeted samples and performance of specific tests. In particular, the results of the CPTu and DMT testing were utilized to identify zones of slimes and fine tailings suitable for attempting undisturbed sampling and/or field vane shear testing.

Several bulk samples of LTVSMC tailings were collected from shallow test pits throughout Cell 2W to obtain information on typical in-situ conditions at shallow depths. Bulk samples were obtained from Cell 2W due to ease of access (no ponded water in Cell 2W at the time that sampling was performed) and the assumption that tailings material types in Cell 2W are the same as material types in Cells IE and 2E. Test pit samples were submitted for laboratory testing of index properties, hydraulic conductivity, and shear strength.

All 2007 laboratory testing of materials outlined above and described hereafter was conducted by Soils Engineering Testing, Inc. of Bloomington, Minnesota. Results of all tests performed during and subsequent to the 2007 geotechnical investigation are provided in Attachment E.

#### **4.3 2014 Geotechnical Investigation**

The most recent geotechnical field investigation, which commenced in the winter of 2013/2014, had two objectives:

• provide additional detail on conditions along the Tailings Basin toes, to support design of the FTB Containment System



• provide additional detail on stratigraphy in Tailings Basin Cells IE and 2E, to support stability modeling and FTB design

Results of the 2014 Geotechnical Investigation are presented in Attachment F. The FTB Containment System will be installed approximately 200 feet from the toe of Tailings Basin Cell 2W and Cell 2E dams. The potential effects of the FTB Containment System on the FTB stability are presented in Attachment G and discussed briefly in Section 6.8.

The 2014 FTB Containment System Investigation was conducted along the northern and western edges of the Tailings Basin. It consisted of two separate field studies: the first study included Rotasonic borings and installation of standpipe piezometers. The second field study included SPT, collection of undisturbed samples in surficial deposits, rock coring, packer testing in bedrock, and in-laboratory testing of materials. Field study results along the FTB Containment System alignment are summarized below and detailed in Attachment F:

- The surficial deposits along the northern and western toe of the Tailings Basin vary in thickness by test location but are generalized as follows, from the top down:
	- o Peat; 0 to 20 feet thick,
	- o Tailings in isolated areas; 0 to 17 feet thick,
	- o Silty sand; 0 to 6 feet thick, fine to coarse grained, with various amounts of clay, and
	- o Glacial Till; 5 to 36.5 feet thick. Cobbles and boulders were interspersed in the till, varying in size from <I foot to approximately 4 feet in diameter.
- Depth to bedrock ranges from 2 to 47 feet with an average depth of approximately 20 feet. Bedrock was competent, with a near surface fracture zone.
- Groundwater levels were at or just below the ground surface.
- Hydraulic conductivity of the glacial till ranged from  $1.5x10^{-3}$  ft/s  $(4.6x10^{-2}$  cm/s) to  $1.7x10^{-6}$  ft/s (5.2x10<sup>-5</sup> cm/s) with a geometric mean of 5.1x10<sup>-5</sup> ft/s (1.5x10<sup>-3</sup> cm/s).
- Hydraulic conductivity of the upper portion of the bedrock ranged from effectively zero (the borehole produced no water) to  $2.4 \times 10^{-5}$  ft/s (7.3 $\times 10^{-4}$  cm/s), with a geometric mean (excluding the zero inflow locations) of  $1.9 \times 10^{-6}$  ft/s (5.8 x  $10^{-5}$  cm/s)

These results support the following findings:

• Soils suitable for installation of a seepage cutoff wall exist along the proposed system alignment.



- At isolated locations (e.g., B-14-44 and B-14-65) deep pockets of tailings and peat may need to be excavated prior to construction. Stability will be maintained by simultaneous placement of engineered fill upon tailings removal.
- When selecting construction methods, the containment system construction contractor will need to consider the presence of cobbles and boulders in the till.

The Cell IE/ 2E investigation included cone penetration test (CPT) soundings. Field study results within the existing Tailings Basin are summarized below, and detailed in Attachment F:

- There has been little to no strength increase of the tailings in Cell IE and 2E since 2007.
- Additional stratigraphic information confirmed existing information and filled data gaps.
- The phreatic surface in Cell 2E has decreased approximately 5 feet since 2007. In Cell 1E the phreatic surface has increased approximately 25 feet since 2007 due to pumping of water from surface seep collection systems into this basin.

Results of the 2014 geotechnical investigation were used to update the cross-section models with depth to bedrock, bedrock seepage parameters, phreatic surface location within the dams, and permeability of the glacial till, all of which have been updated since Version 4 of this Data Package. The CPT results were used to update stratigraphy along Cross-Sections F, G, and N as well as provide approximate phreatic surface in Cells IE and 2E in order to perform model verifications, confirming that appropriate hydraulic conductivity values are being used for seepage and stability modeling.

## **4.4 Future Geotechnical Exploration and Material Testing**

Future geotechnical exploration and material testing will be carried out at the Tailings Basin for a variety of reasons, typically including:

- During installation of performance monitoring systems including piezometers for monitoring of phreatic surface within the basin dams, and during installation of inclinometers for monitoring horizontal movement of the basin dams
- As precursor to major construction events such as significant dam raises
- As periodic confirmation of consistency of modeling parameters with in-field operating conditions

The data obtained from in-field material testing performed during geotechnical explorations and obtained from in-laboratory material testing (that frequently accompanies geotechnical explorations) will be added to the extensive geotechnical database for the Tailings Basin. The geotechnical database will be updated as new geotechnical data is obtained. In the event that new





data affects material strength parameters utilized to date, then designs will be confirmed and adjustments made as needed.

## **4.5 Field Testing Analysis Methods**

## **4.5.1 Cone Penetrometer Tests**

CPTu was performed in all cells of the Tailings Basin in 2007 and in cells IE and 2E in 2014. 2014 CPTu data were used to confirm cross-section stratigraphy and phreatic surface location. Since 2014 strength results were similar to those from 2007, only the results from the 2007 CPT investigation were used to determine material strengths and establish contractive/dilative behavior of the LTVSMC coarse tailings, LTVSMC fine tailings, and LTVSMC slimes. A total of 37 soundings were performed in 2007, including shallow refusals and offsets. Six soundings were pushed in Cell IE, 19 soundings in Cell 2E, and 12 soundings in Cell 2W to approximate depths ranging from 40 to 160 feet. All 2007 CPTu soundings were conducted by American Engineering Testing, Inc. (AET) of Duluth, Minnesota. The CPTu testing was performed with a 20-ton truck-mounted rig with an enclosed work space. Testing was performed in general accordance with ASTM D5778, though one significant change was made during one phase of testing. For the standard CPTu sounding, a cylindrical cone is pushed vertically into the ground at a constant rate of penetration of 20 millimeters per second (0.79 inches per second). During penetration, measurements are made of the cone tip resistance  $(q_c)$ , the side friction of the cylindrical shaft  $(f_s)$  immediately above the tip, and porewater pressure generated by penetration (u2). However, at two locations during the 2007 investigation, the rate of advancement was increased to over 130 millimeters per second (5.1 inches per second). This test method is described later in this section.

The cones used in the investigation have a 15 cm<sup>2</sup> (2.3 in<sup>2</sup>) projected cone surface area and a 60-degree apex angle. The friction sleeve area of the cones is  $225 \text{ cm}^2 (34.9 \text{ in}^2)$ . The fluid used to saturate the filter was glycerin. AET provided Barr with complete records of tip resistance, sleeve friction, porewater pressure, and friction ratio for each CPTu sounding, along with results of dissipation tests (Attachment H). CPTu data were also available from field investigations performed by ConeTec in 2005 in Cell 2W and in 1996 across the Tailings Basin.

Based on Barr's experience at this site and with other tailings deposits in Northern Minnesota, penetration-induced porewater pressure often dissipates quickly in fine tailings due to stratification (inclusion of coarser tailings) and layering in the tailings deposit. This experience includes staged construction over taconite tailings, wherein the porewater pressure dissipates fairly quickly, as the tailings typically classify as silts or sands. This is also reflected in CPT work and dissipation testing (discussed more in Section 4.5.2), where *tso* values of less than 10 minutes are often observed, with a significant number of *tso* values below 3 minutes (the significance of *tso* is also explained further in Section 4.5.2). Many researchers have found that true undrained response is difficult to measure in intermediate silty materials such as tailings (Reference (12), Reference (13), and Reference (14)). Therefore, the undrained strength typically cannot be measured directly in these materials. However, available empirical correlations





between SPT blow count or CPTu tip resistance and shear strength implicitly incorporate the prevailing drainage conditions during penetration. As a result, these correlations can be utilized to assess shear strength without an explicit knowledge of the drainage conditions during a particular in-situ test.

As noted earlier, accelerated advancement of the piezocone penetrometer (on the order of 130 mm/s, in excess of **ASTM** standards) was performed at sounding locations 07-03 and 07-09 (with, for example, the fast push at 07-03 denoted as 07-03F in Attachment **H).** These fast pushes were performed in an attempt to measure the true undrained response of the fine tailings. To most effectively ensure measurement of an undrained response in the fine tailings, the cone should have been pushed at a rate of at least 170 mm/s (Reference (14)). However, limitations with the CPT rig precluded advancement rates beyond 130 mm/s.

Relatively minimal difference was observed between the data from the fast and standard cone advancement rates. This shows that the rate of advancement was either not high enough to induce undrained behavior, the material was not fully saturated, or the material behaves similarly at both push rates. For this site, the results from the current fast push soundings can be combined with the standard push rate data to estimate drained shear strengths. Fast cone advancement should be re-visited during operations when materials are resaturated.

The CPTu data interpretation was performed using an in-house program designed by Barr. The in-house program has been cross-checked with CPTINT version 5.2 (commercially-available software) for quality assurance and has been deemed comparable. The program uses the soil behavior type classification system from CPTu data proposed in Reference (15).

Published relationships relate CPTu parameters to soil behavior type, unit weight (for finegrained soils) or relative density (for coarse-grained soils), over-consolidation ratio, strength, deformation moduli, and contractive/dilative behavior (Reference (13), Reference (16)). The CPTu data were used in this evaluation for determining stratigraphy, strength parameters, and behavior of the soils. The raw CPTu profiles are in Attachment H. The data were divided by material type, as determined through CPTu soil behavior relationships and SPT boring logs, and used along with other test data to estimate soil shear strength.

## **4.5.2 Dissipation Tests**

Dissipation tests were conducted at various depths in nearly all 2007 and 2014 CPTu soundings. The dissipation tests measure the penetration-induced porewater pressure decay over time until the porewater pressure measurements equilibrate to the in-situ porewater pressure. The equilibrium porewater pressure distribution obtained from CPTu dissipation tests were used to determine the porewater pressure distribution at each test location for the 2007 investigation (Attachment H) and 2014 investigation (Attachment F).

The 2007 CPTu dissipation tests were used to calculate the hydraulic conductivity values for LTVSMC fine tailings and LTVSMC slimes. While it is difficult to estimate porewater pressure conditions when a deposit is partially saturated, dissipation testing provides a method to verify





equilibrium conditions within a given soil layer and is the only in-situ permeability testing that was performed at the Tailings Basin. To evaluate the soil permeability from 2007 CPTu dissipation test data, the evaluation of the decay of the penetration-induced porewater pressure is plotted against time. The pressure at which half of the penetration-induced porewater pressure has dissipated is known as the *uso,* as described by the following equation:

$$
u_{50} = \frac{(u_i - u_0)}{2}
$$
 Equation 4-1

Where:

 $u<sub>o</sub>$  = final, equilibrated porewater pressure  $u_i$  = peak penetration-induced porewater pressure

The time relating to the *uso* value is termed *tso.* Published relationships exist to correlate the *tso* in seconds to permeability. The average correlation of *tso* in seconds to permeability in centimeters per second used in these analyses was obtained from Reference (17), and is:

$$
k = 1.0 \times 10^{-6} \times t_{50}^{-1.0666}
$$
 **Equation 4-2**

This method was used to evaluate the in-situ permeability of the LTVSMC tailings (Section 5.2.2). The *tso* values for all dissipation tests performed within saturated zones are plotted against depth as Large Figure 2.

The dissipation test typically provides a better characterization of the horizontal permeability than the vertical permeability if a material is anisotropic or if there is significant horizontal layering. Differences between laboratory data and dissipation test estimates may be due to anisotropy or layering or other in-situ variations.

Pore pressure dissipation tests performed in 2014 were used to provide the approximate phreatic surface within Cells IE and 2E, which was then applied to the existing conditions seepage models to verify that the porewater pressures in the models match the field results. The 2014 verification models are discussed in greater detail in Section 7.2.2.

## **4.5.3 Shear Wave Velocity Tests**

The cone used in the 2007 CPTu investigation was equipped with geophones that measure the arrival time of shear waves generated at the ground surface. Shear wave testing was performed at each CPTu location; and arrival times were measured at depth intervals of approximately IO feet to determine the interval shear wave velocity. The results of shear wave testing are in Attachment H.

Compression wave testing was performed at select locations; arrival times were measured at depth intervals of approximately 10 feet to determine the interval compression wave velocity. However, compression wave data are compromised below the groundwater table; therefore,





compression wave results were poor due to the high variability of the water conditions at the site, and were therefore not utilized in this report. Compression wave data would have been used to better define the Poisson's ratio of the tailings (the ratio of transverse deformation to axial deformation). Because the data collected were of poor quality, Poisson's ratio was estimated for deformation analyses. A Poisson's ratio of 0.5 indicates perfect incompressibility, while a Poisson's ratio closer to zero indicates very little lateral expansion occurs when the material is compressed. The Poisson's ratio values utilized ranged from 0.33 to 0.40 which, based on a literature review, generally fall within the published range of 0.30 to 0.40 for tailings (Reference (18)).

The shear wave velocity of a soil provides the small-strain (maximum) shear modulus ( $G<sub>o</sub>$  or *Gmax)* of a soil (Reference (17)) as follows:

$$
G_o = \rho V_s^2
$$
 **Equation 4-3**

Where:

 $\rho$ = mass density =  $\gamma/g$  $\gamma$  = unit weight *g* = gravitational force  $V_s$  = shear wave velocity

The small-strain shear modulus is approximately the maximum shear wave modulus that can be measured and is likely to occur in the field under small strain. In addition, the shear wave velocity itself has been related to contractive-dilative behavior of soils. The shear wave velocities (and hence the small-strain shear moduli) varied greatly over the site, particularly in different material types. The small-strain shear wave velocities varied from 37 ft/sin LTVSMC slimes to 117 ft/s in LTVSMC coarse tailings, while the subsequent  $G<sub>o</sub>$  values varied from 470 kips per square foot (ksf) to 5,891 ksf, respectively.

## **4.5.4 Dilatometer Tests**

Traditionally, soil compressibility parameters are obtained by performing a soil boring, taking an undisturbed Shelby tube sample, and performing a consolidation test on the undisturbed sample in the laboratory. The DMT has the advantage of providing quasi-continuous, in-situ soil compressibility information (constrained modulus of deformation) as part of the field investigation while minimizing the effects of sample disturbance on the results of the test as typically found in laboratory testing. DMT was conducted by Barr personnel in conjunction with the 2007 CPTu work and was performed in general accordance with ASTM D6635. The DMT was pushed within approximately 10 feet of the 2007 CPTu soundings.

The Marchetti, or flat-plate, dilatometer consists of a 95-millimeter (3.74-inch) wide stainless steel blade, 15 millimeters (0.59 inches) thick, with a thin, flat, expandable steel membrane (60 millimeters, or 2.36 inches, in diameter) on the side. Performing a test involves pushing the dilatometer blade vertically into the ground to the desired test depth while measuring the thrust





required for penetration, then using gas pressure to expand the circular steel membrane against the soil. The test operator obtains three readings: (1) the A-pressure required to initiate movement of the membrane against the soil; (2) the B-pressure required to move the center of the membrane one millimeter (0.039 inches) into the soil; and (3) the C-pressure during deflation of the membrane, which is related to the in-situ porewater pressure in sands and penetrationinduced porewater pressure in clays. The operator then pushes the blade to the next depth and repeats the test.

DMT-correlated parameters generally include the measured material index  $(I_d)$ ), dilatometer modulus ( $E_d$ ), horizontal stress index ( $K_d$ ), constrained modulus of soil compressibility ( $M<sub>DMT</sub>$ ), and undrained shear strength  $(s_u)$ . The constrained modulus ( $M<sub>DMT</sub>$ ) is determined from the test results and can be used to estimate settlement. M<sub>DMT</sub> values varied greatly at the site, ranging from 4 ksf in LTVSMC slimes to 3,074 ksf in LTVSMC coarse tailings (Attachment I).

The DMT results were primarily used for preliminary settlement estimates of Cell 2W for the initially proposed Hydrometallurgical Residue Facility; the location of which has since moved off and to the south of Cell 2W. As construction of the FTB will be fairly continuous, any settlement that occurs in the existing and future tailings during the 20-year construction phase will occur during the continual dam raising process. For this evaluation, therefore, the dilatometer values were only utilized to verify weak or loose zones relating to fine tailings and slimes identified with other testing methods.

## **4.5.5 Standard Penetration Tests (SPT)**

SPT borings were drilled by AET in July and August of 2007 near the CPTu soundings (Attachment J). A total of 27 SPT borings were performed (6 in Cell IE, 11 in Cell 2E, and 10 in Cell 2W) to depths ranging from approximately 50 to 215 feet. More recently, SPT borings were drilled by Braun Intertec in the spring of 2014 to confirm subsurface conditions along the proposed FTB Containment System to be located approximately 200 feet from the toe of the existing basin along the western and northern sides of Cell 2W and Cell 2E (Attachment F). A total of 12 SPT borings were conducted, terminating at bedrock which, per 2014 geotechnical explorations, ranged in depth from approximately 2 to 47 feet.

The borings were advanced using 4-1/4 inch inside-diameter and 6-5/8 inch inside-diameter hollow-stem augers, as well as 5 inch and 3-7/8 inch mud-rotary drilling techniques. Drilling was generally initiated with hollow-stem augers and completed with mud-rotary drilling to minimize sample disturbance. After drilling was complete, all boreholes were abandoned following Minnesota Department of Health guidelines.

In addition to standard 2-inch outer-diameter split spoon sampling performed during **SPT,**  undisturbed or partially disturbed soil samples were obtained at multiple locations and depths. Sampling methods included direct push and sampling with 3-inch outside-diameter thin-walled tubes (in accordance with **ASTM** Dl587), use of an Osterberg hydraulic sampler, and use of a mechanical piston sampler and denison sampler. During Osterberg sampling, the hydraulic sampler is lowered to the bottom of the hole at the depth at which the sample of undisturbed soft





soil is to be collected. Once the sampler has been placed at the bottom of the hole, hydraulic pressure is applied to the ram, which advances the thin-wall tube into the soft soil. Because the head of the sampler is designed to prevent air or water pockets from developing above the sample, and either pushing soft soil ahead of it or allowing the sample to drop from the tube on recovery, Osterberg sample recovery is often better in soft soils such as the slimes. The mechanical piston sampler is similar in design to the Osterberg sampler, with the exception that a mechanical rod is used to position the head of the sampler. At this site, samples of tailings, glacial till, and peat were collected using the direct push, Osterberg, and mechanical samplers.

In the 2007 investigation glacial till and LTVSMC coarse tailings samples were collected using a 2-1/2-inch outside-diameter California modified split-spoon sampler with brass ring liners. Due to the density and coarse-grained nature of the glacial till, a 3-inch outside-diameter Pitcherbarrel sampler was used to sample dense gravelly till located below the existing tailings dams. The Pitcher-barrel sampler and Denison sampler both utilize a rotating carbide cutting head which follows immediately behind the cutting edge of the thin-wall tube to cut an undisturbed sample, which is collected in a 36-inch long tube. Denison samples were attempted several times during the 2014 investigation in the glacial till but due to difficult sampling conditions and high gravel content, no samples were obtained. For this reason, all laboratory tests performed on till material were on disturbed or remolded samples.

The direct push thin-wall, Osterberg hydraulic thin-wall, California split-spoon, and Pitcherbarrel sampling techniques were used with various levels of success to obtain undisturbed samples of the materials encountered across the site at various depths. Success was determined both by the amount of material that could be collected and by the behavior of the samples in the laboratory during testing, as described in Section 4.6. The till was sampled best with the Pitcher sampler, though the ability to collect a sample in till was dependent on whether a cobble was encountered. The fine and coarse tailings were sampled with most success using the Osterberg samplers. Direct push thin-walls were sufficient to gather samples of the slimes from within the basin as well as undisturbed tailings and peat samples from along the toe of the basin.

The peat below the existing dam, where the sampling occurred, has been subjected to consolidation and therefore is quite thin. Thin soil layers such as the peat layer are difficult to successfully target for sampling (easily missed during sampling). Attempts were made to sample thin peat layers but were unsuccessful.

The 2007 SPT drilling and sampling verified that LTVSMC coarse tailings are the dominant material in the shell of the Tailings Basin. Some borings confirm that upstream construction methods were used in the past, such that portions of the slope include zones of finer tailings. The central portion of the basin is made up of varying layers of LTVSMC coarse tailings, fine tailings, and slimes. In general, however, the uppermost layer of tailings comprising the beach at the Tailings Basin at the 2007 drilling locations is dominated by LTVSMC coarse tailings of variable thickness. While there is a desiccated layer at the ground surface, this layer will become resaturated during operations so it is not modeled as a separate layer.





The 2014 SPT drilling and sampling resulted in a limited number of thin-wall samples that were collected in the peat and tailings deposits 200 feet from the toe of the existing Cell 2W and 2E basins. Five of the nine thin-wall sample attempts were successful and resulted in acceptable sample recovery for testing. Tests performed on undisturbed peat samples included moisture content **(MC),** organic content, Atterberg Limits, and dry density. A total of five laboratory consolidated-undrained (CU) triaxial compression tests were performed providing the drained and undrained shear strength of the peat. Hydraulic conductivity testing was performed on undisturbed samples of peat in general accordance with the falling head method **(ASTM** D5084). The laboratory testing results are presented in Attachment F and described in Section 5.0.

## **4.5.6 Flight Auger Borings**

Flight auger borings were drilled by AET in general accordance with ASTM Dl452 near the western, northern, and eastern crests of the dams around Cell 2W to approximately 30 feet below ground surface. The borings were advanced using 6-inch-diameter solid-stem flight augers. The stratigraphy provided by these borings was used to estimate volumes of LTVSMC coarse tailings available around the crest of Cell 2W for use as construction borrow material. Samples collected while performing the flight auger borings were also used as bulk samples for further testing of available borrow material.

Field classification of the LTVSMC tailings involved separating the material visually by gradation into coarse tailings, fine tailings, and slimes. The conventions used for this classification were initially set forth by Ebasco Inc. in 1977, then refined in 1978 to include a gradation range for the three classifications used in studies by Sitka from 1996-1998 and this study. The grain size ranges for each classification are provided in Large Figure 1.

## **4.5.** 7 **Field Vane Shear Tests (FVST)**

Three field investigations to obtain FVST data were performed; one in 1977 by Ebasco Services, one in 1999 by Barr, and one in 2007 by AET under Barr's supervision. The FVST field data is provided in Attachment H. In-situ FVST were performed in general accordance with ASTM D2753, however for the 2007 geotechnical investigation the FVST method was modified as a means to measure undrained shear strength. The rotational shear rate was increased from the standard 0.1 degrees per second to rates that ranged from 2.6 to over 58 degrees per second. The rotational rate was increased in an attempt to measure undrained shear strength by allowing only minimal pore pressure dissipation during vane rotation within the non-cohesive, higher permeability tailings. The tests were typically continued through yield shear strength, such that remolded shear strength was recorded. Results of the 1977 Ebasco and 1999 Barr FVST tests suggest that those tests may not have measured undrained conditions. For more details on the 2007 FVST procedures see Section 2.5.3 of Attachment C.

FVST used in the analysis was performed in LTVSMC interior fine tailings/slimes and LTVSMC slimes within Cells IE and 2E (depths and locations are provided in Attachment C). The field vane results were used to estimate in-situ undrained yield (i.e., peak) and remolded (i.e., large displacement) shear strengths for the fine tailings and slimes. The field vane shear





testing was performed using a RocTest model M-1000 mechanical plotting vane shear torquehead device. The vane was rotated using a gear reduction driven by an electric motor. The vane sizes used were in general accordance with **ASTM** D2753 and were selected for each test based on the penetration resistance and the type of material encountered during CPTu or SPT testing. Vane-specific calibrations were used to determine yield and residual strengths in the tailings. Analysis and use of this data for estimation of shear strength parameters are described in Attachment C.

## **4.6 In-Laboratory Material Testing Methods**

In-laboratory material testing was conducted on samples collected during SPT and on samples obtained from test pits.

SPT undisturbed samples, obtained via either direct push or piston sampling methods in 3-inch thin-wall tubes (Section 4.5.5), were tested to obtain information on in-situ conditions at various depths. Ideally all the samples would be undisturbed, but due to the soft nature of the deposit, this was not always the case. Disturbed split-spoon soil samples were also tested, primarily to determine soil type and stratigraphy.

Tailings samples from test pits were reconstituted in the laboratory to a range of MCs and dry densities. In general, laboratory samples were reconstituted at very loose to loose densities when simulating hydraulically-placed tailings or were compacted to reflect likely conditions following construction when simulating the LTVSMC bulk tailings proposed for use in dam construction.

#### **4.6.1 General Material Characterization Tests**

General geotechnical testing includes both index property testing, which describe the physical characteristics of a soil, and state property testing, which provides existing and past conditions to which a soil has been subjected.

Index properties are unique to a given soil, and they include gradation, percent fines (amount of material passing the #200 sieve or 0.075 mm), Atterberg limits, and specific gravity  $(G<sub>s</sub>)$ . Corresponding American Society for Testing Materials **(ASTM)** Test Methods are:

- Sieve and hydrometer analysis in accordance with **ASTM** Cl36 and **ASTM** D422, "Standard Test Method for Particle-Size Analysis of Soils"
- Atterberg Limit determinations in accordance with **ASTM** D4318, "Standard Test Methods for Liquid Limit, Plastic Limit, and Plasticity Index of Soils"
- Specific gravity tests in accordance with **ASTM** D854, "Standard Test Methods for Specific Gravity of Soil Solids by Water Pycnometer"





The gradation and Atterberg limits help determine the classification of the soil with respect to the Unified Soil Classification System (USCS). The classifications of tested samples for each of the various existing materials at the site are described in Table 4-1.

#### **Table 4-1 USCS Material Classification**



The Atterberg limits assess the behavior of a fine-grained soil over a range of water contents. The results are useful when characterizing the behavior of fine-grained materials to assess whether they are clays or silts. Atterberg limits are provided in terms of the MC of the soil. The MC at the point of transition from semisolid to plastic state is the Plastic Limit (PL) and from plastic to liquid state is the Liquid Limit (LL).

The *Gs* is directly impacted by the mineralogy of the soil and describes the unit weight of the solids in the soil as a ratio to the unit weight of water.

Additional common soil properties, such as MC and dry density, are dependent on the state of the material, particularly when assessed relative to other similar soils. Corresponding **ASTM**  Test Methods are:

- **MC** tests in accordance with **ASTM** D2216, "Standard Test Method for Laboratory Determination of Water (Moisture) Content of Soil and Rock by Mass"
- ASTM D7263-09 Standard Test Methods for Laboratory Determination of Density (Unit Weight) of Soil Specimens

Samples obtained from test pits and collected during SPT were submitted for general material characterization tests. Undisturbed samples ( obtained via either direct push or piston sampling methods in 3-inch thin-wall tubes as discussed in Section 4.5.5) were tested for:

- Atterberg Limits
- Hydrometer and Sieve Analysis for Grain Size
- Specific Gravity





• Moisture Content

Disturbed split-spoon soil samples were used to determine soil type and stratigraphy based on the USCS in the field and on samples analyzed in the laboratory.

## **4.6.2 Permeability Tests**

The main parameter associated with seepage analysis is the saturated hydraulic conductivity of the tailings and foundation materials. In geotechnical practice, the term permeability is often used to describe hydraulic conductivity. The term permeability will be used in the remainder of this text.

Two laboratory test methods were used to measure permeability. The constant-head rigid-wall method is typically employed for coarse-grained soils, while the falling-head flexible-wall test is more suitable for fine-grained soils. For both tests, a hydraulic gradient is established in the soil causing water to flow through the sample. Either the change in head (flexible-wall test) or the volume of water added to maintain the head (rigid-wall test) is monitored against time and used to compute the vertical saturated permeability of the soil. Corresponding **ASTM** Test Methods are:

- Permeability of cohesionless soils in accordance with **ASTM** D2434, "Standard Test Method for Permeability of Granular Soils (Constant Head)"
- Permeability of cohesive or fine-grained soils in accordance with **ASTM** D5084, "Standard Test Methods for Measurement of Hydraulic Conductivity of Saturated Porous Materials Using a Flexible Wall Permeameter"

Grain size estimation can also be used to estimate the permeability of soils. With grain size data, Hazen's equation (typically applied to granular material) roughly estimates the permeability of a soil based on the particle diameter at which 10% of the sample is smaller:

$$
k = cD_{10}^2
$$
 **Equation 4-4**

where:

- $k =$  hydraulic conductivity (permeability), cm/sec  $c =$  unitless constant (taken equal to 1.0; [Reference (18)])
- $D_{10}$  = diameter at which 10% of the sample by weight is smaller, mm

Samples obtained from test pits and collected during SPT were submitted for permeability testing. Test pit samples were tested for constant head permeability ( coarse tailings and bulk tailings mixes). SPT undisturbed samples were tested for falling head permeability (fine tailings and slimes), and constant head permeability (coarse tailings and bulk tailings mixes).



## **4.6.3 Triaxial Compression and Direct Shear Tests**

The shear strength was assessed in the laboratory using triaxial compression and direct shear tests. Consolidation and moisture-density relationships of materials were assessed using inlaboratory material testing. Triaxial compression tests, consolidation tests, and Proctor tests were performed per the following **ASTM** Test Methods:

- Triaxial compressive strength in accordance with **ASTM** D2850, "Standard Test Method for Unconsolidated-Undrained Triaxial Compression Test on Cohesive Soils"
- Consolidation test in accordance with ASTM D2435, "Standard Test Methods for One Dimensional Consolidation of Soil Using Incremental Loading"
- Standard Proctor Density determinations in accordance with ASTM D698, "Standard Test Methods for Laboratory Compaction Characteristics of Soil Using Standard Effort  $(12,400 \text{ ft-lbf/ft}^3 \ (600 \text{ kN-m/m}^3))$ "

Triaxial shear tests (isotropically-consolidated undrained or drained) were performed on test pit samples and undisturbed thin-wall samples from **SPT** boreholes. One-dimensional consolidation tests were performed on undisturbed thin-wall samples from **SPT** boreholes. Attachment C provides additional detail on triaxial testing methods.

## **4.** 7 **Tailings Mineralogy**

Tailings particle shape (morphology), which can be influenced by mineralogy, is a factor in estimating material strength. Existing data regarding mineralogy and shape of the LTVSMC tailings were reviewed and additional testing was performed on both LTVSMC tailings and Flotation Tailings.

Scanning electron microscope (SEM) photographs of the LTVSMC tailings were supplied in both the 1996 Tailings Dam Investigations Report (Reference (19)) and 2000 LTVSMC Tailings Dam Field Exploration and Analyses Report (Figure 1 of Reference (11)). Neither report documents the mineralogy associated with the SEM images, but there are notations of "kaolinitesize platy particles with sharp angles" (Reference (19)) or "platy-shaped particles" with and without "significant amount of edge-face interaction" present (Reference (11)).

## **4.7.1 Mineralogical Composition**

The mineralogy of the Flotation Tailings and the LTVSMC tailings was characterized using petrographic analysis or X-ray diffraction, respectively (Reference (20)). Results are summarized in Table 4-2. Mineralogical composition is markedly different between the two types of tailings and appears to reflect the ore mineralogy. The Flotation Tailings are comprised predominantly of plagioclase with lesser amounts of olivine and pyroxenes (consistent with a Duluth Complex source); while the LTVSMC tailings are quartz-rich with lesser amounts of carbonate minerals and iron oxides (consistent with Biwabik Iron Formation source).





#### **Table 4-2 Mineralogical Composition of Flotation Tailings (determined by petrographic analysis) and L TVS MC Tailings (by X-ray diffraction)**



Results summarized from SRK ((Reference (20))

#### **4.** 7 **.2 Particle Morphology**

The Flotation Tailings could potentially be more tabular than the LTVSMC tailings because they contain plagioclase, which generally has a tabular crystal habit. However, it may also be the case that, because of potential cumulate growth restriction of crystals during formation and/or the milling/flotation process itself, the individual Flotation Tailings may be rather equant, and not reflective of plagioclase' s tabular habit. To resolve this question, a side-by-side comparison of the morphology of the two types of tailings was performed. Morphologies exhibited by particles in the Flotation Tailings and LTVSMC tailings were evaluated using data collected by a SEM at the University of Minnesota Duluth's Research Instrumentation Laboratory (Attachment K).

Three types of tailings were used: (1) Flotation Tailings produced from a pilot plant for the Project, (2) slimes from LTVSMC, and (3) fine tailings from LTVSMC. The fine tailings and slimes from LTVSMC were combined at a 1: 1 ratio to create one representative sample with a similar size distribution to the flotation tailings. Images of the tailings were collected by a SEM and energy dispersive x-ray spectroscopy was used for chemical analysis of selected particles. Samples were prepared for SEM analysis following the Bern et al. (2009) procedure wherein each sample was suspended in isopropanol at a concentration of approximately 10mg/ml and briefly placed in an ultrasonic bath to thoroughly mix the sample. A 10  $\mu$ L drop of the resulting





suspension was placed on a  $0.2 \mu m$  pore size polycarbonate membrane filter affixed to an aluminum SEM sample stub. The drop was allowed to dry and the resulting particulate dispersion was coated with a conductive carbon film approximately 20 nm thick in order to make the sample electrically conductive (Attachment K).

The above sample preparation method results in individual particles distributed on the filter, with some variation in particle density across the filter to be expected. Scanning electron images were collected at magnifications ranging from 100X to 2000X.

Particles in both the Flotation Tailings and the LTVSMC tailings exhibit a wide range of morphologies. Qualitatively comparing the Flotation Tailings in Figure 4-1 and the LTVSMC tailings in Figure 4-2, both types of tailings appear to be dominated by equant to subequant particles. Additional images can be found in Attachment **K.** 



(Attachment K)

**Figure 4-1 SEM Images of Flotation Tailings at 1 00x and 500x Magnification** 



(Attachment K)




#### **Figure 4-2 SEM Images of L TVS MC Fine Tailings/Slimes at 1 00x and 500x Magnification**

In the Flotation Tailings, the particles are smaller than the original plagioclase crystal in the ore. Plagioclase crystals in the waste rock and lean ore have been observed to range in size from 100  $\mu$ m to over 2,000  $\mu$ m (Attachment K), while Flotation Tailings particles appear to range in size from approximately 0.5 µm to 100 µmin the SEM images. Plagioclase has characteristic perfect cleavage on the (001) plane, good cleavage on the (010) plane, poor cleavage on the (110) planes, and displays an uneven fracture surface on all other planes (Attachment K). Both cleavage and fracture surfaces can be observed in the SEM images of Flotation Tailings.

Therefore, plagioclase particle morphology in the Flotation Tailings reflects forms created during crystal breakage, not crystal growth. It appears that liberation of the minerals during milling and flotation sufficiently crushed the individual crystals, such that they no longer retain a tabular crystal habit.

#### **4.7.3 Long-term Weathering of Flotation Tailings**

The Flotation Tailings are expected to slowly weather, as described in Attachment L. The dominant mineral in the Flotation Tailings is plagioclase (50% to 80% by volume), making up the bulk of the tailings. Microprobe work shows that composition of the plagioclase in the NorthMet Deposit is labradorite. As described in Attachment L, labradorite is expected to weather at a relatively slow rate under conditions at the earth's surface and is susceptible to the primary agent of chemical weathering that takes place at the surface of the mineral: water, oxygen, and carbonic acid. The weathering results in the formation of new stable minerals. Published weathering rates for plagioclase indicate that labradorite is estimated to weather at a maximum rate of 0.1% by mass in 20 years,  $0.9%$  by mass in 200 years, and 9.1% by mass in 2,000 years. These published rates were assumed for weathering rates of the Flotation Tailings. However, in the FTB the kinetics are such that the dissolution rate will likely be even slower, because the cover will limit exposure of plagioclase to fresh solvent (rainwater). For the very small amount of dissolution that does occur, some of the material could leave the basin in seepage, but more typically will build up on other plagioclase surfaces with time.

The weathering will result in the formation of secondary minerals that could increase or decrease tailings deposit strength in the long-term. The slow weathering of primary silicate minerals (for example, plagioclase) is expected to produce a relatively minor amount of clay and other secondary products in the basin and dissolved weathering products that will be flushed out. In addition, the weathering of ferrous iron-containing minerals, including iron sulfide minerals, will produce iron oxide/oxyhydroxide coatings and cement. The tailings are projected to weather at a very slow rate.

A discussion on how the long-term weathering was applied to the slope stability models and the long-term weathering strength values are presented in Section 6.7.



## **4.8 Overview of Stratigraphy and Material Types**

Data from geotechnical investigations were used to group materials into units for definition of stratigraphy and determination of material properties. Ten material types have been defined at the Project Site for the geotechnical analysis:

- LTVSMC coarse tailings existing material typically located in the shell of the Tailings Basin, comprised of larger particles of tailings that settled out closer to the dam crest during hydraulic deposition, the outer/upper zone of which was reworked to form subsequent lifts for the LTVSMC dams.
- LTVSMC slimes existing material typically located toward the center of the Tailings Basin, comprised of finer tailings particles.
- LTVSMC fine tailings existing material typically located upstream of the slimes, comprised of mid-size particles that commonly settled out in between the slimes and coarse tailings.
- Interior LTVSMC fine tailings/slimes existing material, referring to tailings zones within the central portion of the Tailings Basin where fine tailings and slimes are so thoroughly interbedded they cannot be individually distinguished.
- LTMSMC fine tailings/slimes material category used only in stability modeling to represent the overall mass of fine tailings and slimes.
- Till existing native material comprising the thick consolidated foundation layer for the existing Tailings Basin.
- Peat  $-$  a discontinuous layer of existing native material overlying the native till.
- Rock dam/buttress existing material representing the rock starter dam under the initial lift of the Tailings Basin, and imported material used as a future material for the proposed buttress at the toe of the dam.
- LTVSMC bulk tailings future material to be comprised of borrowed LTVSMC coarse tailings (which may have occasional inclusions of finer tailings) used to construct the FTB dams.
- Flotation Tailings future material to be impounded in the FTB upstream of the LTVSMC tailings dams.
- Granitic Bedrock native rock underlying the native till and peat. The upper 10 feet of bedrock was modeled as fractured and bedrock below 10 feet was considered to be impermeable (Reference (21)).





The general stratigraphy along Cross-Sections F, G, and N (as discussed in greater detail in Section 7.1) is based on the field data and presented in detailed cross-sections on Figures B-2, B-3, and B-4, respectively, in Attachment B.



# **5.0 Physical Properties of Materials**

The FTB design involves modeling the seepage conditions and slope stability anticipated as a result of the proposed FTB construction, operation, and closure. The analyses require inputs of hydraulic and strength parameters of all material zones incorporated into the seepage and stability models. Material strength characterization, including descriptions of how results of field and laboratory tests were used to select material strength parameters, is presented in Attachment C. Results of both field and laboratory testing are presented for each of the following material types:

- LTVSMC tailings (including coarse tailings, fine tailings, slimes, interior fine tailings/slimes, and bulk tailings)
- Flotation Tailings
- Native soils

## **5.1 Material Strength Parameter Selection Approach**

The method used to select design parameters is based on Barr's experience and peer review discussions with Mr. Richard Davidson and Dr. Scott Olson, as described in Attachment C. The methodology for selection of design material strength parameters developed in consultation with Dr. Olson is detailed in Attachment M. This method provides a systematic approach that is not reliant on statistical analysis of data that are often difficult to fit to typical data distributions (i.e., normal distribution, log normal distribution, generalized extreme distribution, triangular distribution, and possibly others). For complete details, see Attachment C, but generally, design values **(DV)** were selected based on the following:

- Both laboratory data and field data are included in the analysis.
- 33rd percentile drained and yield undrained shear strength is used for the Effective Stress Stability Analysis (ESSA) and Yield Undrained Strength Stability Analysis (USSA<sub>vield</sub>), respectively (i.e., on cumulative data plots, 33% of the data yields lower strengths and 67% of the data yields higher strengths than the selected design value).
- For drained and undrained yield shear strengths, the design value was determined by averaging the individual 33rd percentile value from various types of field tests, then adding the average of the 33rd percentile laboratory test results and finding the overall average.
- Material liquefied strength analyses include only the laboratory and field test results for samples that presented contractive or quasi-steady state behavior during shear. Results for samples which dilated during shear (strain-hardening behavior) are not included in



material liquefied strength analyses. The effect of this approach is that the shear strength calculation discounts stronger materials that are present in the tailings.

- For undrained liquefied shear strengths, the design value was determined by averaging the individual 50th percentile value from various types of field tests, then adding the average of the 50th percentile laboratory test results and finding the overall average. Dr. Olson recommended the use of average liquefied shear strength (rather than 33rd percentile) due to the conservative nature of the sample set being tested (i.e., LTVSMC slimes and fine tailings and Flotation Tailings samples with higher strengths are not included).
- Engineering judgment was required to select an appropriate percentile value of strength (i.e., 33rd percentile, average), to weight the values appropriately that are used to assess strengths (e.g., combining averages of field and laboratory data), and to select final material strength parameter **DV** for liquefied shear strength.

The field and laboratory testing results used for material strength design value selection are presented in Attachment C and summarized in Section 5.2.3 for the LTVSMC tailings, Section 5.3.3 for the Flotation Tailings, and Section 5.4.3 for the native materials (the till, peat, and rock starter dam). Bedrock strength is summarized in Section 5.5.2.

# **5.1.1 Contractive-Dilative Behavior and Liquefation**

Liquefaction refers to post-yield undrained behavior of saturated, contractive silts and sands. The potential for LTVSMC coarse tailings, fine tailings, slimes, fine tailings/slimes, and NorthMet Flotation Tailings to liquefy was evaluated using laboratory and field data available at the time of the analysis in 2013 (Attachment C).

Reference (22) presents a relationship to assess the tendency for relatively clean sands to contract or dilate, based on corrected SPT blow counts (or CPT tip resistance) and effective vertical stress. Olson (Reference (16)) updated the relationship to account for variable compressibility for tailings. Contractive-dilative behavior is further discussed in Attachment C (with additional references cited), which also describes how this behavior has been identified with laboratory testing, SPT blow counts, and CPTu tip resistance. The laboratory data included some triaxial tests that displayed contractive behavior and quasi-steady state behavior. SPT and CPTu data were analyzed for contractive-dilative behavior, and only contractive data points were used to evaluate liquefied shear strength. Remolded strength was also determined from field vane shear testing.

# **5.2 LTVSMC Tailings**

This section presents the results of field and laboratory tests available for analysis through 2013 on LTVSMC tailings. It describes general geotechnical properties, permeability, and shear strength of five types of LTVSMC tailings: coarse tailings, fine tailings, slimes, interior fine tailings/slimes, and LTVSMC bulk tailings.





Geotechnical modeling of the FTB uses material properties of the LTVSMC tailings in several contexts. First, LTVSMC tailings comprise the foundation for the new FTB dams. Second, portions of the proposed dams for the FTB will be constructed using LTVSMC bulk tailings (selectively LTVSMC coarse tailings, with incidental inclusions of fine tailings and slimes).

The following discussion to describe the LTVSMC tailings is subdivided into three sections:

- (1) The results of laboratory testing for general geotechnical properties of the tailings;
- (2) A discussion of permeability values utilized in past evaluations and data analyzed for this geotechnical evaluation, providing the DV selected for seepage modeling; and
- (3) A description of shear strength parameters utilized in past evaluations and a summary of the DV selected for stability modeling.

This subsection organization is also applied to the discussion of subsequent material types. Detailed information on the analysis of data for shear strength determination is provided in Attachment C.

## **5.2.1 General Geotechnical Properties of LTVSMC Tailings**

Multiple in-laboratory material tests were conducted on LTVSMC tailings samples to determine material index properties and strength parameters (Section 4.6). Key test results include the percent passing the #200 sieve (P<sub>200</sub>, also known as the percent fines), the dry unit weight ( $y_{\text{dry}}$ ), the MC, the PL, the LL, and the  $G_s$ . Laboratory test results are provided in Attachment E. The maximum, minimum, and average values of the key test results are provided in Table 5-1 for LTVSMC coarse tailings, Table 5-2 for LTVSMC fine tailings, and Table 5-3 for LTVSMC slimes. These tables also include the standard deviation and the number of tests analyzed.

Parameter	<b>Minimum</b>	<b>Maximum</b>	Average	<b>Standard</b> <b>Deviation</b>	No. of <b>Tests</b>
$P_{200}$	3.0	19.0	13.0	3.8	38
$\gamma_{\text{dry}}$ (pcf)	104.2	125.0	116.1	5.1	11
MC (%)	2.2	17.5	7.1	3.2	42
PL		--	<b>NP</b>		
LL	--	--	<b>NP</b>	--	
Gs	2.69	2.93	2.80	0.12	3

Table 5-1 Summary of Index Properties of LTVSMC Coarse Tailings

NP = non-plastic response









#### Table 5-3 Summary of Index Properties of LTVSMC Slimes



## **5.2.2 Permeability of L TVSMC Tailings**

The permeability values used for analysis and design of the Tailings Basin have varied throughout historical evaluations as more test results have become available (see Table B-1 of Attachment B for values from individual historic reports). Table 5-4 summarizes the LTVSMC tailings permeabilities used by previous investigators for seepage analysis. The data were compiled through a review of reports discussing the stability of the Tailings Basin.









In Table 5-4, the historical permeability value for coarse tailings was estimated from grain size distribution (Hazen's method), and the historical permeability values for fine tailings and slimes were estimated by previous investigators. In fact, many previous studies (pre-2000) used monitoring data from piezometers to create a phreatic surface for stability analyses to calculate pressure heads, rather than incorporating permeability into the seepage models to estimate the seepage conditions for stability analysis.

The following sections present the laboratory and field permeability test results for each type of LTVSMC tailings, and describe how the model input parameters for permeability were chosen for the current geotechnical evaluation.

## **5.2.2.1 Permeability of L TVSMC Coarse Tailings**

No evidence of previous permeability testing in support of historic LTVSMC coarse tailings design parameters was uncovered in the review of available published data (Attachment D). The permeability of the LTVSMC coarse tailings was evaluated by Barr in the laboratory using remolded tailings samples, due to the inherent difficulty in obtaining an undisturbed sample of granular material. The coarse-grained nature of these tailings also generally results in rapid dissipation of CPT penetration-induced porewater pressure and makes interpretation of the insitu permeability difficult. Therefore, CPT test data was not used for determination of LTVSMC coarse tailings permeability.

LTVSMC coarse tailings permeability used in the current modeling is based on six reconstituted laboratory specimens created from bulk samples obtained from test pits. The specimens were reconstituted to dry unit weights ranging from approximately 104 to 125 pcf and tested using the constant-head rigid-wall permeability test method. Standard Proctor testing indicated that the maximum dry unit weight of the LTVSMC coarse tailings is 124.7 pcf. The maximum dry density, which occurred at an optimum MC of 11.7%, was rounded to 125 pcf. Portions of the existing LTVSMC coarse tailings were compacted in the field by rubber-tired dozers in thin lifts, so some dry densities are likely above 124.7 pcf. It was assumed that the LTVSMC coarse tailings around the perimeter may exhibit a unit weight greater than the Standard Proctor maximum dry density because the shell of the dam has and will continue to undergo compaction and consolidation. The relative density, indicating in-situ density for granular soil, for LTVSMC





coarse tailings (as approximated from CPTu testing) varied from 70% to 100%, with the majority of the data plotting above the 80% line (as presented in Attachment N). The permeability tests were therefore performed on samples with densities ranging from 84% to 95% of the standard Proctor maximum dry density. Table 5-5 shows the range in coarse tailings permeability values interpreted from the test results.



#### **Table 5-5 Range of Saturated Permeability of L TVSMC Coarse Tailings**

(1) The geometric mean was selected as the design value for seepage modeling.

The geometric mean is used as the seepage analysis input permeability for the LTVSMC coarse tailings for this evaluation. The geometric mean is used rather than the arithmetic average because parameters that vary over several orders of magnitude, such as permeability, are typically plotted on a log-scale. The geometric mean is computed as the average of the natural log of the permeability values. Using the log-scale and the geometric mean helps to reduce bias caused by wide variation in values.

These permeability values were compared to estimations using Hazen's equation (Reference (23)), as described in Section 4.6.2.

Based on the LTVSMC coarse tailings grain size  $D_{10}$  range of 0.20 – 0.027mm (Large Figure 1), the permeability range is estimated to be  $4.0 \times 10^{-2}$  cm/sec (1.31 x 10<sup>-3</sup> ft/sec) to 7.29 x 10<sup>-4</sup> cm/sec (2.39 x  $10^{-5}$  ft/sec); a range which encompasses the values obtained by laboratory testing.

## **5.2.2.2 Permeability of L TVSMC Fine Tailings**

Determination of the permeability of LTVSMC fine tailings has been constrained by several circumstances. First, no evidence of historical permeability testing in support of previous LTVSMC fine tailings design parameters was uncovered while reviewing available published data (Attachment D). Second, during the geotechnical explorations, the LTVSMC fine tailings were tested for permeability by in-situ dissipation testing performed during CPTu soundings. However, similar to the LTVSMC coarse tailings, the interpretation of the dissipation testing was found to be difficult at the locations tested. The relative coarseness of the fine tailings inhibits the ability to measure porewater pressure dissipation because the fine tailings are fairly permeable and any penetration-induced porewater pressure dissipates fairly quickly. Also, field investigations were unable to obtain representative undisturbed samples of the LTVSMC fine tailings (based on the Ebasco grain size distribution classifications, Large Figure 1 ).





Upon review of all of the materials encountered on the site, the average  $P_{200}$  grain size distributions of the LTVSMC fine tailings and Flotation Tailings were found to be similar, as can be seen by comparing Table 5-2 with Table 5-11. The measured hydraulic conductivity of the Flotation Tailings (Section 5.3.2) was therefore used as the basis for the hydraulic conductivity of the LTVSMC fine tailings. The measured grain size distribution of the LTVSMC fine tailings shown in Table 5-2 depicts these materials slightly differently than the text of Ebasco's historical reports on LTVSMC fine tailings, which indicate a range of gradations which may include "up to 95% fines" (as reported in Attachment D). While the maximum  $P_{200}$  observed from tests on LTVSMC fine tailings was 95.7%, the average  $P_{200}$  of the samples tested was 66.1%. However, the LTVSMC fine tailings samples collected as part of the supporting geotechnical investigations and tested for grain size distributions were typically on the coarser end of the range if they classified as fine tailings. Because a limited amount of fine tailings sample was collected, this material has been identified as a material that should be targeted for future testing and whose parameters may need to be updated in future analyses.

Permeability of the fine tailings was set at  $2.00 \times 10^{-5}$  cm/sec (6.56 x  $10^{-7}$  ft/sec) which was used for proposed conditions seepage analyses. This value is near the lower bound of the Flotation Tailings data (Large Figure 3), where the relationship between stress imposed by overburden and permeability becomes increasingly asymptotic toward  $1.00 \times 10^{-5}$  cm/sec as depth increases. This value was obtained from a sample tested at a confining pressure related to approximately 80 feet of overburden. While the LTVSMC fine tailings will be under a greater overburden pressure than this at final dam height, the flow is primarily horizontal within the LTVSMC tailings, owing to the bedding that occurs during hydraulic deposition. Unlike vertical flow tested in the laboratory in a small confined soil cylinder, horizontal flow can find and follow more permeable pathways, and therefore the lower bound from the permeability testing of Flotation Tailings is considered appropriate for use in the current seepage modeling of the LTVSMC fine tailings. While anisotropy could be incorporated in an effort to account for increased horizontal flow, because of the complexity of the deposit, an isotropic permeability was used for the tailings.

## **5.2.2.3 Permeability of L TVSMC Slimes**

The LTVSMC slimes are generally located within the interior portion of the Tailings Basin or in isolated areas under the existing dams. Permeability of the slimes was measured by two methods: 1) in-situ dissipation testing performed during CPTs; and 2) laboratory permeability testing on undisturbed samples. Over 40 in-situ dissipation tests were performed at various locations and depths within Cells IE and 2E. The time necessary for dissipation of 50% of the peak penetration-induced porewater pressure, *tso,* was determined, as described in Section 4.5.2. Published correlation charts for piezocone analyses were used to obtain the estimated horizontal permeability values (Reference (17)). The dissipation  $(k_h)$  and laboratory data  $(k_v)$  are plotted and presented as Large Figure 4.

Falling-head flexible-wall laboratory permeability testing of 13 undisturbed samples obtained from thin-wall (Shelby) tubes from six boring locations showed permeability values within the same range as those determined from dissipation testing. However, the laboratory values are





skewed slightly lower than the field data, possibly due to potential anisotropy (the variability between horizontal permeability, as measured by dissipation testing, and vertical permeability, as measured in the laboratory). As shown in Large Figure 4, the data indicate that there is little to no sensitivity to effective overburden pressures, as the data show significant scatter with no discernible trends in either the in-situ or laboratory testing.

The geometric mean of the saturated permeability is  $9.63 \times 10^{-7}$  cm/sec (3.16 x 10<sup>-8</sup> ft/sec), as presented in Table 5-6 and in Large Figure 4. This value is closer to the lower bound, but within the range used by Barr in January and March, 2000, for which laboratory testing was used to determine the permeability. This geometric mean was considered mildly conservative, as flow through the LTVSMC slimes is likely more horizontal than vertical. In horizontal flow, water will tend to follow the paths of least resistance (e.g., will seek out more permeable "fingers" of fine tailings or less clayey layers of slimes).



## **Table 5-6 Range of Saturated Permeability of L TVSMC Slimes**

While anisotropy could be incorporated in an effort to account for increased horizontal flow, because of the complexity of the deposit, an isotropic permeability was used for the tailings. To better reflect the available data and to increase conservatism in the geotechnical seepage model because the model represents three-dimensional conditions in a two-dimensional section, the geometric mean of  $9.63 \times 10^{-7}$  cm/sec (3.16 x 10<sup>-8</sup> ft/sec) is used in the proposed conditions (future construction) modeling. Conservatism from a geotechnical standpoint is increased by using a less permeable material as it confines flow and leads to increased porewater pressure.

# **5.2.2.4 Permeability of L TVSMC Interior Fine Tailings/Slimes**

To simplify the seepage model, the material in the interior portion of the basin where fine tailings and slimes are finely interbedded is treated as a single unit and assigned a single permeability. The interior fine tailings/slimes region is separated from the region with individual fine tailings layers and slimes layers based on CPT analyses indicating few if any coarse tailings in the interior fine tailings/slimes region relative to the fine tailings and slimes regions. This unit, used in seepage modeling, is referred to as LTVSMC interior fine tailings/slimes.

This simplification allows a reduction in the number of elements within the model and better accounts for uncertainty regarding the continuity of layers within the central portion of the section. Furthermore, this approach was recommended by Dr. Peter Robertson in his review





comments on Version 1 of this report; comments that were provided to Barr by the DNR. Earlier modeling had included relatively thin LTVSMC fine tailings and slimes layers throughout the entirety of the Tailings Basin. However, there is uncertainty regarding the stratigraphy of these thin layers. Very little boring data is available toward the center of the Tailings Basin, due to the presence of ponded water in the cells. Data were limited to two test locations that were over 500 feet apart. The simplified unit better represents this uncertainty.

The LTVSMC interior fine tailings/slimes region was modeled with a saturated permeability of  $3.05 \times 10^{-6}$  cm/s (1.00 x 10<sup>-7</sup> ft/s). This value is the geometric mean of all the permeability test data for the LTVSMC fine tailings and slimes (provided in Sections 5.2.2.2 and 5.2.2.3). This value was assumed appropriate based on the stratigraphy shown on Figure B-2 and Figure B-3 in Attachment B, which indicates that the interior in Cell 2E is a mixture of both fine tailings and slimes. Analysis of the cross-sectional area represented by each material type along Cross-Section F indicates slightly more slimes exist than fine tailings, but amounts are similar. A limited sensitivity analysis was performed and in comparison to assigning a higher permeability (to simulate that stringers of fine tailings would dominate the response of this combined region), the selected permeability above the native soils limits vertical seepage and encourages more horizontal flow to the dam face. This is likely a conservative approach that produces a higher phreatic surface in seepage models.

# **5.2.2.5 Permeability of L TVSMC Bulk Tailings**

The LTVSMC bulk tailings are taken as a conservative (finer grain size) representation of the coarse tailings to be excavated for use in construction of the shell along the downstream slope of the FTB dams. While the goal is to excavate only coarse tailings for use in FTB dam construction, it is impractical to assume that only coarse tailings will be excavated for construction. In reality, the excavated tailings will be mostly LTVSMC coarse tailings with some inclusions of LTVSMC fine tailings and a small amount of slimes. To investigate the effects of the inclusion of slimes and fine tailings within the coarse tailings, four mixtures of tailings with various proportions of coarse tailings, fine tailings, and slimes were prepared from samples obtained during test pitting in the Tailings Basin. For conservatism, the blends focused on slightly finer blends than the predominantly coarse tailings material that will be utilized for FTB construction. The four mixes are described in Table 5-7.



窦	Date: May 15, 2017	NorthMet Project Geotechnical Data Package Volume 1 – Flotation Tailings Basin
LYMET MINING	Version: 8	Page 40

**Table 5-7 L TVSMC Bulk Tailings Blends** 



(1) The fines content of each blend was obtained by grain size analysis, data in

Each of the mixtures was tested for permeability using the constant head, rigid wall method **(ASTM** D5856) with the resulting range of values shown in Table 5-8. The geometric mean value of 8.02 x 10<sup>-5</sup> cm/sec (2.63 x 10<sup>-6</sup> ft/sec) was used for design and is similar to the hydraulic conductivity of Blend 2 (7.0 x 10<sup>-5</sup> cm/sec); the blend assumed to be most representative of what will be obtained when the LTVSMC coarse tailings are targeted for excavation and use in construction.



#### **Table 5-8 Range of Saturated Permeability of L TVS MC Bulk Mixtures**

Note that the LTVSMC fine tailings were assumed to be more permeable than the LTVSMC bulk tailings due largely to differences in deposition. The fine tailings were hydraulically deposited and subjected to consolidation only from self-weight and pressure from subsequent overlying material. The LTVSMC bulk tailings will be compacted as a construction material, resulting in lower void ratios than would be expected in the LTVSMC fine tailings. Further, as stated previously, the LTVSMC bulk tailings may have occasional inclusions of fine tailings and slimes. For these reasons and based on engineering judgment, a lower hydraulic conductivity was assigned to the LTVSMC bulk tailings than to the fine tailings.





# **5.2.3** Shear Strength of LTVSMC Tailings

Both the undrained and drained conditions were examined for this design. The undrained case relates to short-term conditions, typically immediately after construction, where excess porewater pressures exist in the tailings. The drained case relates to long-term conditions, where no excess porewater pressure exists in the tailings. Evaluation of the drained and undrained yield shear strengths of the LTVSMC tailings was performed during this design and included, as appropriate, data from laboratory triaxial testing with pore pressure measurements, SPT, CPTu, and field vane shear testing (Attachment C).

The LTVSMC tailings shear strength parameters previously used for analysis and design of the Tailings Basin have varied throughout historical evaluations as more test results have become available and as basin configuration and drainage conditions have changed. A summary of the previously calculated strength parameters used in stability analyses are presented in Table 5-9 (see Table B-1 of Attachment B for values from individual historic reports). The table includes the high and low values previously assigned to the various tailings, as well as both ESSA and USSA parameters. Strengths have been characterized with an effective friction angle  $(\phi)$  and cohesion  $(c<sup>n</sup>)$  for ESSA conditions. For USSA conditions, the LTVSMC slimes and fine tailings have, at various times, been characterized with either Mohr-Coulomb parameters (undrained friction angle,  $\phi_{cu}$ , and undrained cohesion,  $c_u$ ) or undrained shear strength ratios (USSR). The **USSR** is defined as the ratio of the undrained shear strength, *Su,* divided by the effective overburden stress, *a'v.* Previously assigned liquefied strength values are included in Table 5-9, where appropriate.









Further analysis was performed which included data collected in the 2007 geotechnical investigation and review of available and applicable historical data. The testing results, data analysis, and rationale for selected shear strength parameters are discussed in detail in Attachment C and are summarized in Table 5-10.

For seepage and stability modeling, the term 'fine tailings/slimes' has two connotations. For seepage modeling, the interior fine tailings/slimes unit has a given permeability, and the remaining fine tailings or slimes are modeled as separate layers with their own permeabilities. For stability modeling, the fine tailings/slimes unit encompasses the individual fine tailings and slimes layers from the seepage model. This fine tailings/slimes unit and the interior fine tailings/slimes unit are assigned the same liquefied strength value.



#### **Table 5-10 L TVSMC Tailings Shear Strength Parameters**

It is important to note that significantly more data were used for determination of shear strengths of the LTVSMC fine tailings/slimes than for the determination of shear strength for the fine tailings or slimes individually. This was because there were SPT and CPT logs in the Tailings Basin with significant zones of intermittent and interbedded layers of fine tailings and slimes, where it was not feasible to filter data for only slimes or only fine tailings. Data from these regions were used in addition to the individual data sets for the combined fine tailings/slimes shear strength determination. The resulting fine tailings/slimes shear strength parameters are within the range of values established for the fine tailings and slimes individually.

## **5.3 Flotation Tailings**

This section presents the results of field and laboratory tests on Flotation Tailings. It describes their general geotechnical properties, permeability and shear strength. Geotechnical modeling of the FTB uses material properties of the Flotation Tailings for seepage and stability analysis of future conditions.





Flotation Tailings were produced during the pilot-plant processing of a bulk sample (approximately 43 tons) of ore at the SGS Lakefield facility in Lakefield, Ontario, Canada. Samples were collected for laboratory testing to determine geotechnical parameters. The pilot plant's bulk tailings are expected to be similar to the material that will be produced from the commercial plant. Mineralogy and shape of the Flotation Tailings is described in Section 4.7, with a comparison to LTVSMC tailings.

Two different grinds have been tested from the pilot plant. The first grind was obtained for laboratory testing in 2005 and the second grind was tested in 2009 and reported on in 2010. The second grind is slightly finer than the 2005 grind. However the grinds are relatively similar and the differences between the two are very likely within the anticipated range of gradations that could be expected from the plant. Therefore, testing has been performed on both samples and the data has been combined for determining properties of the Flotation Tailings. All in-laboratory 2007 test results are provided in Attachment E.

# **5.3.1 General Geotechnical Properties of Flotation Tailings**

Several tests were conducted on samples of pilot plant Flotation Tailings in the laboratory to determine the materials' index properties. The results of the index testing are summarized in Table 5-11. These samples were often left sitting for some period of time or shipped dry; hence dry unit weight and MC were not tested. Two Atterberg Limits tests had previously indicated that the material was non-plastic and a test on the cycloned fines-only portion indicated that the finest material has a Plasticity Index **(PI)** of 4.3, which is slightly plastic behavior. Recent Atterberg Limits testing was performed on a sample of Flotation Tailings reporting a **PI** of 1.1, indicating very little cohesion. This is also supported by the triaxial test strength results that generally report zero cohesion.

<b>Parameter</b>	<b>Minimum</b>	<b>Maximum</b>	Average	<b>Standard</b> <b>Deviation</b>	No. of <b>Tests</b>
$P_{200}$	52.00	68.2	60.3	6.07	8
PL	16.4	16.4	16.4	$\blacksquare$	
LL	17.5	17.5	17.5	$\overline{\phantom{a}}$	
G <sub>s</sub>	2.97	3.03	3.00	0.02	6

**Table 5-11 Summary of Index Properties of Flotation Tailings** 

## **5.3.2 Permeability of Flotation Tailings**

The in-situ permeability of the Flotation Tailings will depend on depositional conditions. St. Anthony Falls Laboratory (SAFL) conducted a physical model study (Attachment B of Reference (1)) which shows that, while there is some segregation of Flotation Tailings particles by grain size associated with hydraulic deposition, some fine particles are captured within the





tailings matrix even close to the deposition point. Further, for the Project the deposition points will include multiple spigot locations around the basin perimeter as is common at other tailings basin facilities, but will also include deposition in interior portions of the basin (Reference (1 )). Deposition of tailings within the interior of the FTB differs from the more routine perimeter spigotting of tailings. Tailings are more typically deposited only by perimeter spigotting and, if of a different gradation than Flotation Tailings, might show more pronounced segregation by particle size during hydraulic deposition. Based on the proposed method of deposition (Reference (1)), the Flotation Tailings are expected to undergo less hydraulic segregation than the LTVSMC tailings spigotted from the basin perimeter only. While some segregation will occur during sub aerial flow from the spigots, significant amounts of fines will be captured within the soil matrix. Therefore, the Flotation Tailings were treated as a single material, rather than defining parameters for coarser and finer portions of the tailings.

The vertical permeability of the Flotation Tailings was determined from falling-head, flexiblewall laboratory permeability testing. Six specimens were reconstituted to dry densities ranging from 89.3 to 100.7 pcf and tested at confining stresses of 0.25 to 7.0 tsf. The results of the laboratory testing for permeability of the Flotation Tailings are shown in Table 5-12.



#### **Table 5-12 Range of Permeability for the Flotation Tailings**

Plotting the permeability against consolidation stress reveals a strong correlation (Large Figure 3). The permeability becomes relatively constant for effective confining pressure greater than or equal to approximately 2 tsf. Accordingly, three representative values of permeability were selected for use in modeling:  $6.23 \times 10^{-6}$  ft/sec (1.90 x 10<sup>-4</sup> cm/sec) for Flotation Tailings under less than 0.45 tsf effective overburden stress (equivalent to approximately 10 feet of soil with a unit weight of 90 pcf);  $1.84 \times 10^{-6}$  ft/sec (5.61 x  $10^{-5}$  cm/sec) for tailings under 1.35 tsf effective overburden stress (equivalent to approximately 30 feet of overburden); and  $6.56 \times 10^{-7}$  ft/sec (2.00 x  $10^{-5}$  cm/sec) for tailings under 2.29 tsf effective overburden stress (equivalent to approximately 50 feet of overburden). Beyond this stress range, the permeability appears to not vary significantly with increasing confinement.

It was observed that the average Flotation Tailings permeability is greater than the maximum permeability testing results on LTVSMC bulk tailings (consisting predominantly of coarse tailings). However, these are two entirely different materials. The LTVSMC bulk tailings are comprised of existing material that will be blended and compacted to a higher density during





construction. Conversely, the Flotation Tailings will be hydraulically deposited and therefore will not be subjected to compaction beyond self-weight consolidation. The void ratios reported in the laboratory were also significantly different between the two materials. Additionally, only a small number of tests were performed on both of these materials, as they do not currently exist at the Project. Additional permeability testing is recommended for both during future explorations to verify selected parameters.

Flotation Tailings permeability values were applied to different portions of tailings within the models, such that the uppermost layer in any model used the highest permeability, the underlying layer used the middle permeability, and any layers below that used the lowest permeability. The three effective overburden pressures were selected to represent the average overburden pressure within a lift (e.g., the depth at the center of the respective layer).

The established permeabilities are for Flotation Tailings at initial and operating conditions, but these values were also used for long-term, post-closure modeling. The percent of mass weathered will still be relatively small, even at 2,000 years (Section 4.7.3). Long-term, plagioclase dissolution could cause the Flotation Tailings' permeability to be fractionally higher or lower, though this effect might occur over thousands to tens of thousands of years.

## **5.3.3 Shear Strength of Flotation Tailings**

The shear strength of the Flotation Tailings was evaluated through testing on bulk samples as described in Attachment C. In brief; triaxial tests were performed on several samples of pilot plant Flotation Tailings (similar gradation to LTVSMC fine tailings). The data collected through triaxial testing was processed and used in selection of shear strength parameters. Similar to the LTVSMC tailings triaxial testing, the Flotation Tailings triaxial sample preparation and test methods have been varied (wet, moist, or dry sample preparation on reconstituted bulk samples; slow and fast saturation) in an attempt to replicate the anticipated in-situ behavior of the tailings.

Isotropically-consolidated undrained triaxial testing was performed on Flotation Tailings, as well as on undersized and oversized samples resulting from a 2005 study of the 2005 sample from the pilot plant. The oversize and undersize portions were mechanically sieved from the Flotation Tailings to create samples for testing. During triaxial testing, both the flotation tailings oversized (similar gradation to LTVSMC coarse tailings) and undersized (similar gradation to LTVSMC slimes) samples exhibited dilative behavior. While a majority of the samples exhibited quasisteady state behavior, one triaxial series performed on the Flotation Tailings exhibited contractive behavior, and was the only triaxial test conducted for the Project to behave as such. Sample preparation for these loose materials is very challenging and this behavior (only one contractive sample) could be the result of many aspects of sample preparation and consolidation prior to shear strength testing.

For the current evaluation, it has been conservatively assumed that all Flotation Tailings are contractive and therefore strength estimates are conservative (as discussed in greater detail in Attachment C). The strength estimates are conservative because it is possible that some portion





of the deposit will not be contractive and thus would not liquefy, and would mobilize higher strengths.

The Flotation Tailings were characterized by an approximate drained friction angle of 33.0 degrees. For undrained shear strength, the Flotation Tailings were assigned a USSR<sub>yield</sub> value of 0.26 and a  $\text{USSR}_{\text{liq}}$  value of 0.12.

# **5.3.4 Flotation Tailings Filter Criteria**

Filter criteria for the Flotation Tailings was evaluated to determine the performance of LTVSMC bulk tailings in preventing piping. As previously stated, a variety of LTVSMC bulk tailings blends were prepared and grain size analyses were performed on the blends (provided in Attachment C). Based on filter criteria suggested in Reference (24), it was determined the DIS ( or the sieve diameter at which 15% of the protective material by weight will pass) of the LTVSMC bulk tailings must be greater than 0.056 mm and less than 0.48 mm, as presented in Large Figure 5. Of the blends tested and discussed in Section 5.2.2.5, a material like LTVSMC Blend 2 (15 parts coarse tailings to 4 parts fine tailings to I part slimes) or coarser will satisfy this requirement. This matches well with the LTVSMC material borrow plan which will focus on preferentially borrowing the LTVSMC coarse tailings as determined by visual evaluation of grain size and material MC. Zones of fine tailings and slimes, if encountered, will be preferentially excluded. A construction specification will be provided for filter material and the contractor will be required to place material that meets the specification.

## **5.4 Native Soils**

This section presents the results of field and laboratory tests on native soils. The native soils include glacial till and peat, as well as the rock starter dam. It describes the native soils' general geotechnical properties, permeability and shear strength. Geotechnical modeling of the FTB uses material properties of the native soils for seepage model verification and proposed conditions modeling.

## **5.4.1 General Geotechnical Properties of Native Soils**

Multiple historical and more recent 2007 and 2014 tests were conducted on native soil samples in the laboratory (as described in Attachment C and Attachment F) to determine the materials' index properties, which describe the physical characteristics of the material. The maximum, minimum, and average values are provided in Table 5-13 for the glacial till. The maximum, minimum, and average index property values for peat are provided in Table 5-14. These tables also include the standard deviation and the number of tests analyzed. The tabulated results presented below are for test results available in 2013 and do not include the results from the 2014 geotechnical investigation. Instead, the 2014 results, presented in Attachment F, were only used to validate previously selected values.









#### **Table 5-14 Summary of Index Properties of Peat**



The index properties of the peat collected during the 2014 investigation represent undisturbed virgin peat, while some of the values presented in Table 5-14 are results for compressed peat obtained from beneath the basin, explaining why the laboratory results on 2014 peat reported higher MCs, PL, and LL compared to the values presented in Table 5-14. Five peat samples were tested in 2014; having an average MC of 512% and a dry unit weight of 11 pcf and saturated unit weight of 67 pcf. PL values ranged from 198 to 536 and LLs ranged from 411 to 612, generally much higher than the values in Table 5-14.

## **5.4.2 Permeability of Native Soils**

The permeability values previously used for analysis and design of the Tailings Basin have varied throughout historical evaluations as more test results have become available (see Table B-1 of Attachment B for values from individual historic reports). The FTB drainage is impacted by the permeability of the foundation materials. Table 5-15 summarizes the





permeabilities for native soils used by previous investigators for seepage analysis. The data were compiled through a review of reports discussing the stability of the Tailings Basin.

	<b>Historical</b>	<b>Barr Engineering Co.</b>	
<b>Material</b>	<b>Permeability (cm/s)</b>	<b>Permeability (cm/s)</b>	
Virgin Peat	1.00 x 10 <sup>-2</sup> to 1.00 x 10 <sup>-7</sup>	1.01 x 10 <sup>-3</sup> to 1.0 x 10 <sup>-7</sup>	
<b>Compressed Peat</b>			
	$5.00 \times 10^{-3}$ to 4.30 x 10 <sup>-4</sup>	$4.3 \times 10^{-7}$ to 5.03 x 10 <sup>-3</sup>	

**Table 5-15 Native Soils Permeabilities Postulated by Previous Investigators** 

Based on the historical data review, these values appeared to be estimates based on grain size distribution for granular soil and/or experience of previous investigators. The following sections describe the updated design parameters and how they were developed through the testing program.

# **5.4.2.1 Glacial Till**

Prior to 2007, to better evaluate the seepage characteristics of the foundation till, a sampling program was implemented to retrieve till samples on which laboratory testing could be performed. Although the sampling program used Pitcher-barrel sampling methods, which uses a cutting head and retractable thin-wall sampling tube for relatively undisturbed sampling, and has been successfully used on many other sites in the region with similar till materials, a sufficient number of samples could not be obtained due to the nature of the formation. The till contained not only varying amounts of clay and sand, but also cobbles and boulders that could not be penetrated, even with the cutting teeth of the sampling device. An alternate method, falling-head field permeability testing in standpipe piezometers, was then employed to estimate the permeability of the formation.

A total of four in-situ falling-head tests were performed in standpipe piezometers (locations 07-01, 07-07C, 07-10 and 07-13) installed in August 2007 along the north perimeter dam of Cell 2E. The in-situ falling-head tests consisted of preparing a standpipe piezometer by flushing it of all soils and then flooding it with a volume of water. The water was allowed to flow from the piezometer into the till and the depth to water in the piezometer was recorded over a measured period of time until equilibrium was reached. The range of values obtained from the testing program is reported in Table 5-16.









More recently, in the spring of 2014, ten standpipe piezometers were installed 200 feet from the toe of Cells IW and 2E along the proposed alignment of the FTB Containment System, and screened in the glacial till. Slug tests were performed in the ten piezometers as well as in two wells installed previously in 2008. Details of the results and analysis are provided in Attachment F.

Three slug tests—each with slug-in and slug-out—were performed sequentially in all ten piezometers and in the two wells. A slug test consists of rapid displacement of the static water level in a piezometer or well by adding or removing a slug. The slugs used to perform these tests consisted of a solid piece of circular polyvinyl chloride **(PVC)** pipe that was I-inch in diameter. A 5-foot and 2.5-foot long PVC slug was used to complete three sets of tests (slug-in and slugout for each test) in each piezometer. The first and third test was performed with the 5-foot slug and the second test was performed with the 2.5-foot slug to confirm repeatability. A slug test in which the displacement is initiated by rapidly lowering a slug below the water level is referred to as a slug-in or falling-head test; a slug-out or rising-head test is one in which the slug is rapidly removed. The resulting water-level recovery to static, pre-test conditions, was monitored using a data-logging pressure transducer (InSitu - LevelTroll 700). Test results ranged from  $1.5x10^{-3}$  ft/s  $(4.6x10^{-2}$  cm/s) to  $1.7x10^{-6}$  ft/s  $(5.2x10^{-5}$  cm/s) with a geometric mean permeability of  $5.1x10^{-5}$ ft/s  $(1.55 \times 10^{-3} \text{ cm/s})$ , which was chosen as the representative permeability of the glacial till for the seepage analyses.

This permeability value is higher than the 2007 test result; however, it appears to support previously performed water balance studies which indicated that not enough water was leaving the model to account for observed declines in pond level within the Tailings Basin. The nonhomogeneous nature of the till, with variable layers of clay, sand, and gravel, likely cause more variation in the permeability of the till layer than what was measured in a limited number of discrete tests. Concurrent to discussions with hydrogeologists working on the Project, a sensitivity analysis was conducted with the existing conditions model to assess which material had the greatest impact on flux out of the system, and it was determined that the permeability of the till had the greatest impact, as discussed in Section 7.2. Based on the findings of this sensitivity analysis and verification model results simulating 2014 tailings basin conditions, the 2014 geometric mean permeability value of  $5.1x10^{-5}$  ft/s (1.55x10<sup>-3</sup> cm/s) appears to be a good representation of the glacial till permeability. The geometric mean hydraulic conductivity value was calculated based on all the piezometers that had screens installed in glacial till. Out of the six





output plots generated from the slug tests performed at each piezometer location, the two data outputs that were considered to have the least amount of noise and that would provide the widest range in permeability were selected for analysis. Therefore, 12 piezometer locations, for a total of 24 permeability results, were used to calculate the geometric mean permeability value of the glacial till.

# **5.4.2.2 Peat**

Organic matter consisting of peat exists in the tailing basin area and immediately north of the toe of the existing north perimeter dam of Cell 2E. Additionally, a significant portion of the western half of the foundation for Cell 2E consists of peat deposits covered by years of tailings deposition. In areas outside the toe of the Tailings Basin, natural or "virgin" peat, relatively unaltered by the construction of the Tailings Basin, still exists.

Permeability of the peat below the Tailings Basin was evaluated using two methods to determine two different permeabilities. The vertical permeability was determined from falling-head, flexible-wall permeability tests performed on four relatively undisturbed peat samples tested at confining stresses ranging from 1.5 to 6.0 tsf, while the horizontal permeability was measured using in-situ pore pressure dissipation testing during CPTu. The difference in permeability between the horizontal and vertical directions is attributed to the way in which peat is formed and varies highly with confining pressure, with horizontal to vertical permeability ratios as high as 15 reported at less than 1.9 tsf (180 kPa) confining pressure (Reference (25)). The confining pressures at the Project site are significantly higher, however.

The permeability of the unaltered peat, or virgin peat, which is located north of the dam, was tested on two samples collected during the 2014 investigation, yielding vertical permeability values of 2.13 x  $10^{-6}$  cm/s (7.0 x  $10^{-8}$  ft/s) and 1.07 x  $10^{-6}$  cm/s (3.5 x  $10^{-8}$  ft/s). Peat permeabilities ranging from  $1 \times 10^{-2}$  to  $1 \times 10^{-4}$  cm/sec (3.28 x  $10^{-4}$  to 3.28 x  $10^{-6}$  ft/s) were previously recommended by Sitka (Reference (8)). A permeability of  $1.0 \times 10^{-3}$  cm/s (3.3 x  $10^{-5}$ ) ft/s) was selected for the virgin peat using isotropic permeability (Reference (25)), as the peat at the toe of the dam are surficial deposits and have little to no confinement.

The range in measured permeability for the peat material below the Tailings Basin, referred to as compressed peat, is shown in Table 5-17. The seepage modeling indicates that flow within the peat layer is much more horizontal such that the geometric mean horizontal permeability of  $3.60 \times 10^{-6}$  cm/s (1.18 x 10<sup>-7</sup> ft/s) was used for the compressed peat. In SEEP/W, anisotropic flow can be entered as a ratio of ky to kx, with the saturated permeability value entered for kx. Two anisotropic ratio values were used; 0.067 (representing the upper bound of data referenced in Reference (25)), and 0.0077 (the ratio of the measured geometric means of  $k_y$  to  $k_h$  in Table  $5-17$  – to assess the impact of anisotropy on the model. The model with the very low ky/kx ratio essentially establishes the peat as the most impermeable layer in the model for vertical flow, creating a cutoff between the till and the tailings. This case is obviously not accurate, as the ponds have dropped and more water has left the Tailings Basin than has been





observed flowing out of seeps. Therefore, the peat below the dams was modeled with a ky/kx ratio of 0.067.



#### **Table 5-17 Range of Permeability for Compressed Peat Material**

## **5.4.2.3 Rock Starter Dam**

On the north side of Cell 2E, a rock starter dam constructed over the peat deposit was utilized to facilitate initial dam construction. Due to the size of the material, samples of the rock could not be obtained in any manner that would allow permeability testing. Therefore, the permeability of the rock starter dam was based on the published grain size distribution (Large Figure 6, Reference (4)) and estimated using Hazen's equation.

The resulting permeability was found to range from 0.034 to 2.865 cm/sec (1.3 x  $10^{-3}$  to 9.4 x  $10^{-3}$  ft/sec), based on the historic range of grain size distribution, with  $D_{10}$  ranging from approximately 0.2 to 2 mm and within the acceptable range for use of the Hazen equation (Reference (24)). Based on the seepage model sensitivity analysis (described in more detail in Section 7.2), a value of 1.52 cm/sec  $(5.0 \times 10^{-2} \text{ ft/sec})$  was chosen for the design.

## **5.4.3 Shear Strength of Native Soils**

The shear strength of the native materials at the Tailings Basin have been explored and analyzed multiple times for various analyses of the LTV SMC site completed since the late 1960s. The shear strength parameters previously used for analysis and design of the Tailings Basin have varied throughout historical evaluations as more test results have become available. A summary





of the previously calculated strength parameters used in stability analyses are presented in Table 5-18 (see Table B-1 of Attachment B for values from individual historic reports). The table includes the high and low values previously assigned to the various soils, as well as both ESSA and USSA parameters. For USSA conditions, the peat has, at various times, been characterized with either Mohr-Coulomb parameters or USSR values.





**DV** for the current evaluation are presented in Table 5-19. A discussion of the test data analysis and selected values are provided in Attachment C. In-laboratory material tests performed on samples collected during the 2014 investigation were used to validate the strength values for the glacial till and peat. Three remolded direct shear tests were performed on samples of glacial till, resulting in friction angles ranging from approximately 38 to 47 degrees, with a 33rd percentile value of 43 degrees; above the selected design value of 37 degrees for glacial till. Five laboratory CU triaxial compression tests were performed on undisturbed samples of peat collected during the 2014 geotechnical investigation. The undrained shear strength tests resulted in a 33rd percentile value of 0.27; above the selected design value of 0.23 for virgin and compressed peat. Drained strength values from the tests resulted in a drained cohesion of 637 psf and a drained friction angle of 30 degrees, indicating that the shear/normal function (drained friction angle design value of 27 degrees) for peat is an acceptable and conservative value.

#### **Table 5-19 Native Soils Shear Strength Parameters**



(1) Refer to Attachment C for Shear/Normal Function values,  $\varphi' = \sim 27^{\circ}$ 





# **5.5 Bedrock**

The bedrock on site, evaluated along the alignment of the FTB Containment System, consists of granitic rock encountered at depths ranging from approximately 2 to 47 feet during the spring 2014 geotechnical investigation (Attachment F). Occasionally a zone of weathered bedrock was encountered above competent bedrock, ranging in thickness from one to nine feet. Rock cores were collected to confirm depth to bedrock and provide qualitative information used to validate appropriate shear strength values of the bedrock (Reference (21)).

## **5.5.1 Permeability of Bedrock**

Packer tests were performed in five of the bedrock borehole locations at various depths across the site and at various elevations at each location, providing approximate bedrock permeability. The bedrock cores obtained during the investigation reported horizontal fractures, vertical fractures, and fractures ranging in slope from 45 to 65 degrees from the horizon. The goal of the packer tests were to perform repetitive tests that would yield reliable information on where and at what rate water flows through the rock to help evaluate a method for controlling subsurface seepage. Packer testing readings were performed by Barr personnel in accordance with guidelines provided in **USBR** 7310-89 (Reference (26)). Depending on test location, a single or double packer was used. All packer tests were performed at pressure increments of 15, 30, and 45 psi for I-minute intervals. Observations of flow were made every minute until three consecutive, consistent readings were taken, representing steady-state flow. The pressure was then increased for three equal increments, followed by two decreasing pressures.

A summary of the packer test results is provided in Attachment F. The results are based on the value resulting from the first three pressure increments as these values are most likely to represent in-situ conditions. The prevalence of fractures often decreased with increasing core depth and as such the overall bedrock hydraulic conductivity will also likely decrease with depth. Therefore the seepage model uses two bedrock zones; an upper IO-foot zone of Fractured Bedrock with K = 2.36 x 10<sup>-5</sup> ft/sec (7.2 x 10<sup>-4</sup> cm/sec), and underlying Bedrock with K = 6.3 x  $10^{-7}$  ft/sec (1.9 x 10<sup>-5</sup> cm/sec). Per the site-specific geotechnical rock coring investigation and the data reported in Reference  $(21)$ , the frequency of fractures in the bedrock is high in the upper 10foot zone, with fracture frequency declining but fractures still present with greater depth. On this basis, and to achieve a conservative but not overly conservative seepage model calibration (modeled head higher than measured head), the upper IO-foot zone of bedrock was assigned the high hydraulic conductivity from packer tests and the underlying bedrock was assigned the geometric mean hydraulic conductivity from packer tests.

## **5.5.2 Shear Strength of Bedrock**

Rock cores from the 2014 geotechnical evaluation provided qualitative information, including Rock Quality Designation **(RQD)** values and fracture characteristics. **RQD,** given as a percentage, is defined as the sum of the length of core pieces greater than IO cm in length divided by the total length of the core run, multiplied by 100. The RQD values obtained during the evaluation indicate that bedrock is of poor to good quality at shallow depths, and is of good





to excellent quality below a depth of about 40 feet. Results from the geotechnical evaluation showed that fractures were most prevalent in the upper 5 to 10 feet of bedrock. For this reason a 10-foot fractured bedrock zone was modeled, with a unit weight of 140 pcf and drained friction angle of 45 degrees. The more competent bedrock below the more highly fractured zone was modeled as impenetrable. As part of the slip surface wedge method, the slope stability analyses also evaluated the fractured bedrock zone as "impenetrable" to evaluate the possible scenario that could result in a lower factor of safety (FOS) value where the failure surface is forced to truncate along the interface of the till and fractured bedrock. This methodology is discussed further in Section 6.3.1.

## **5.6 Buttress**

Based on the understanding of likely construction materials (Area 5 waste rock), the buttress material was assumed to be similar to the rock starter dam: free-draining cohesionless rock or compacted soil.

#### **5.6.1 Permeability of Buttress**

Based on the permeability of the rock starter dam, a value of 1.52 cm/sec (5.0 x 10<sup>-2</sup> ft/sec) was chosen for the design. At the time of borrow source selection for the buttress, the selected material should be confirmed to have a permeability equal to or greater than this design value.

#### **5.6.2 Shear Strength of Buttress**

Based on the gradation of the rock starter dam (Large Figure 6, Reference (4)), the buttress material was assumed to have a unit weight of 140 pcf and a friction angle of 40 degrees. At the time of borrow source selection for the buttress, the selected material should be confirmed to have a unit weight of at least 140 pcf and a minimum friction angle of 40 degrees.

#### **5.** 7 **Seismic Deformation Properties**

Seismic deformation properties utilized in seismic models are summarized in Table 5-20. The shear modulus reduction functions were estimated in the computer program based on soil consistency, maximum depth, overconsolidation ratio (OCR), void ratio (e), PI, and at-rest earth pressure coefficient  $(k_0)$ . The functions are included in Large Figure 7.









NP = Non-Plastic

Shear modulus reduction functions were estimated in GeoStudio 2007, based on mean principle effective confining stress, cyclic shear strains, and **Pl** The relationship used in GeoStudio for estimating the shear modulus reduction ratios was developed by Ishibashi and Zhang in 1993 (Reference (27)). The input data used to aid in establishment of the shear modulus reduction ratios is presented in Table 5-21.

#### **Table 5-21 Shear Modulus Reduction Function Data**









#### **5.8 Volumetric Water Content Functions**

In addition to a saturated hydraulic conductivity, the volumetric water content and hydraulic conductivity functions were also input in seepage models within the GeoStudio program based on material gradation, Atterberg limits, and saturated water contents. These functions are presented in Large Figure 8 and Large Figure 9. Permeability and volumetric water content functions were estimated in GeoStudio 2012 for unsaturated flow modeling. The permeability function is estimated using the Van Genuchten and Fredlund and Xing methods and the volumetric water content functions are based largely on grain size, using a Modified Kovacs method (Reference (28)). The input data used in establishment of the unsaturated flow functions is presented in Table 5-22.











(1) Maximum value that can be applied as a SEEP/W input parameter

#### **5.9 Effects of Stringers on Modeling Parameters**

Within the LTVSMC tailings deposit there are stringers of alternate tailings types (i.e., intermittent and discontinuous zones of finer or coarser tailings of differing strength and/or permeability), as described in Section 3 .2. The effects of stringers in the LTVSMC tailings is taken into account in the approach used for selection of modeling parameters, developed in consultation with Dr. Olson (Section 5.1 and Attachment C). The appropriate approach hinges on the extent, composition and continuity of stringers within the deposit as subsequently described. Several types of evidence support the conclusion that heterogeneity within the deposits is localized, so widespread and continuous stringers of the weakest material (slimes) are unlikely and isotropic parameters are appropriate. Furthermore, introducing anisotropy in liquefied shear strengths in slope stability analysis is not standard practice.

Experimental evidence of tailings deposition patterns is provided by a physical model study of tailing deposition by SAFL (Attachment B of Reference (1)). This study used Flotation Tailings, but it is possible that the LTVSMC tailings deposited in a similar manner. Results show complex heterogeneity within the tailings deposits (i.e., fluvial braided channelized regime, multiple channels, and rapid channel migration). The SAFL study documented that grain size range generally decreased toward the center of the pool, as would be expected, but noted that "the larger particles interacted with the smaller particles strongly, and both are deposited together" (page 57 of Attachment B of Reference (1)). Results of this study suggest that the areal extent of stringers is likely limited, and that even the finer-grained component of the tailings do not deposit without the presence of higher strength materials.

Field data from five CPT soundings along Cross-Section F indicate that the in-situ materials would be expected to be stronger than their DV selected using the method outlined in Section 5.1. These results reflect the presence of stringers of coarser material within LTVSMC fine tailings/slimes, which would help to limit the liquefied response and contribute to overall strength. The stringers are generally more dilative than the finer tailings. The presence of





stringers, if any are continuous, would provide drainage paths through the finer tailings. Introducing stringers in the strength model without including the effect on drainage would not be appropriate.

The method used to select **DV** discounts the contribution of these coarser stringers and hence slope stability models utilizing the recommended USSR<sub>liq</sub> values are likely to be conservative. See Attachment C for additional details on how material strength parameters are selected, including consideration of the effects of stringers.

## **5.10 Summary of Material Shear Strength Parameters**

The selected drained and undrained strength inputs for the various materials used in the FTB design are summarized in Table 5-23. The strength values were reviewed by Dr. Olson (whose comments are provided in Attachment M) and were presented in Geotechnical Workshops. A full summary of strength, seepage, and unit weights used for modeling is provided in Large Table 1.









## **6.0 Engineering Models to Assess Dam Safety**

Dam safety analysis and design requirements are based on Minnesota Rules (summarized in Section 2.0) and on the NorthMet Geotechnical Modeling Work Plan (Attachment A). The Work Plan requires analysis of Cross-Section F, located on the north side of Cell 2E, Cross-Section G, located on the northeast side of Cell 2E, and Cross-Section N, a section through the south perimeter dam of Cell IE. Cross-Section F, Cross-Section G, and Cross-Section N analysis methods and outcomes are reported in Sections 6.0, and 7.0, respectively.

All three cross-sections were analyzed in a sequential manner consisting of development of the dam cross-section stratigraphy for analysis, application of the material strength and permeability characteristics, modeling of seepage conditions at the dam cross-section, followed by performance of stability analyses.

#### **6.1 Geotechnical Modeling Work Plan**

The stability analyses are consistent with the requirements of Version 3 of the NorthMet Geotechnical Modeling Work Plan (Attachment A) required by the DNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources, Dam Safety Unit. The following steps were used to develop the FTB design:

- 1. Gather existing conditions data (i.e., basin topography, stratigraphy, soil and tailings strength and hydraulic characteristics, and other data as needed to support geotechnical modeling and FTB design).
- 2. Develop FTB slope cross-sections (i.e., geometry and stratigraphy for existing and planned conditions) for seepage and stability modeling.
- 3. Develop seepage and stability models of the FTB using Geo-Slope International, Inc. modeling software.
- 4. Using available geotechnical data, establish design data for use in ESSA and USSA. Also utilize established criteria (Olson and Stark - 2003 "Yield Strength Ratio and Liquefaction Analysis Slopes and Embankments" as updated by Olson 2009) to determine which materials behave in a contractive manner and could transition from nonliquefied strengths to liquefied (steady state) strengths.
- 5. Utilize design data to design slopes to achieve the following:
	- a. ESSA FOS > 1.5 for effective shear strength conditions using drained parameters for:
		- 1. Existing conditions
		- ii. Normal operating conditions at incremental lifts and ultimate height



- b. Undrained Strength Stability Analysis  $(USSA_{yield}) FOS \ge 1.3$  for yield undrained shear strength conditions for non-statically liquefiable soils (i.e., end of construction case per dam raise) for:
	- 1. Normal operating conditions at incremental lifts and ultimate height
	- ii. Veneer stability computing infinite slope FOS
- c. Liquefaction Triggering and Post-Liquefaction Analysis (USSA $_{liq}$ ) FOS  $\geq 1.1$  for post-triggering slope stability considering liquefied shear strengths ( computed from design liquefied strength ratios) applied to segments of materials in the triggering stability analysis with  $FOS_{\text{triggering}}$  < 1.1; design drained strengths applied to materials above the capillary zone; and yield undrained shear strength ( computed from design yield strength ratios) for all other materials.
	- 1. From the February 2013 workshop, analyze the following credible triggering scenarios:
		- 1. Baseline Lift 8
		- 2. Elevated Phreatic Surface (i.e., drain ineffective) Lift 8
		- 3. High Construction Rate of Loading- Lift I
		- 4. Local Erosion/Scour of Slope (pipe break) Lift 8
		- 5. Elevated Phreatic Surface (drain ineffective) w/High Pond Lift I
		- 6. Long-Term Case (20, 200, and 2,000 years after closure)
- d. Lift 8 Baseline Conditions assuming Unknown Triggering Mechanism  $-$  FOS  $\geq 1.1$ for post-triggering slope stability applying design liquefied shear strengths to all LTVSMC fine tailings and slimes and all Flotation Tailings below top of capillary zone.
- e. Seismic Liquefaction (i.e., induced by seismic event)
	- 1. Perform a screening analysis for triggering of liquefaction based on Boulanger and Idriss (Reference (12)). If the FOS against triggering is greater than or equal to 1.2 for a seismic event with a 2,475-year return period, no additional analyses are required.
	- ii. If the FOS against triggering is less than 1.2 for a seismic event with a 2,475-year return period, perform further seismic triggering analyses as described in the Work Plan.



6. Report final design and operating requirements necessary to maintain required slope stability safety factors and deformation requirements for the critical slope cross-section.

## **6.2 Seepage Analysis**

The main objective of the seepage analysis is to develop a comprehensive understanding of the groundwater conditions within the Tailings Basin and FTB and assess how the groundwater conditions relate to stability of the basin dams. Groundwater porewater pressure plays a major role in the stability and construction sequence of the dam. A special emphasis was placed on calibrating the seepage model (LTVSMC end-of-operations conditions) and verifying 2014 basin condition seepage model results to observed field conditions. Subsequently, simulations were made to estimate groundwater conditions for dam elevations representing later stages of FTB development.

The seepage simulations presented in this Data Package modeled groundwater flow under steady-state conditions. The seepage analysis was conducted using SEEP/W, part of the GeoStudio 2012 Version 8.30 software package, a computer modeling program developed by GEO-SLOPE International Ltd. SEEP/W uses the finite-element analysis technique to model the water movement and porewater pressure distribution within porous materials such as tailings. This method was chosen because comprehensive formulation allows evaluation of highly complex seepage problems. It can analyze saturated and unsaturated flow, steady-state and transient conditions, and a variety of boundary conditions.

SEEP/W generates an output file containing the calculated pressure head at all nodes in the finite element mesh. Product integration of GEO-SLOPE programs allows stability or deformation models to incorporate the SEEP/W results into the slope stability program for computation of effective stresses. Therefore, it allows a more realistic evaluation of the seepage impact on future stability than simply adding a phreatic surface. SEEP/W results were used to evaluate stability under steady-state conditions of the dams.

The porewater pressures at each node of the finite element mesh were computed in SEEP/W based on the section geometry and the permeabilities assigned to each region. The permeabilities used in these analyses are presented in Large Table 1. As noted in Section 5.0, unsaturated material properties were assigned for seepage modeling, though suction was not taken into account during stability modeling.

## **6.2.1 Hydraulic Boundary Conditions**

Plant Site water balance modeling results (Section 6.0 of Reference (3)) were used to define conditions in the tailings basin seepage models. In brief, hydrologic models were utilized to estimate infiltration due to precipitation and due to placement of tailings in the FTB.

• Infiltration through dams and beaches due to precipitation was computed as the remainder of Precipitation minus Evapotranspiration and Runoff. The hydrologic model calculates evapotranspiration and runoff based on soil moisture characteristics and





hydraulic conductivity parameters of the Tailings Basin dams and beaches, including consideration of bentonite amendments. Calculations assume average annual precipitation at the Plant Site and no surface storage of precipitation in depressions.

Infiltration on beaches due to spigotting of tailings was computed based on the overall length of dam along which tailings discharge will occur, the estimated discharge time at each spigot location, the length of beach between discharge point and FTB Pond, and the active flow area from end of spigot to edge of pond.

The total infiltration was then added as a unit flux to the surface of the seepage model along the different regions (bentonite-amended dam soils, non-bentonite-amended dam soils, and beach infiltration) as the respective average annual values in feet per second. The unit flux conditions are also set as potential seepage faces.

The finite element mesh of the seepage model was created to conform as closely as possible to the above conditions. An example of Cross-Section Fis shown in Large Figure 10. These same boundary conditions were applied to Cross-Section G and Cross-Section N. Triangular isoparametric elements were used to build the mesh in accordance with the geometry of the dam. Boundary conditions were defined by setting the following:

- A unit flux of 8 inches per year  $(2.0 \times 10^{-8}$  ft/s) across the existing dam and the LTVSMC dams and the beach to represent infiltration from precipitation. Infiltration values from precipitation were based on rates reported in Reference (3).
- A unit flux of 6.0 inches per year  $(1.59 \times 10^{-8} \text{ ft/s})$  across the proposed FTB dams exterior slopes, which will be amended with bentonite to reduce infiltration as each lift is constructed, to represent infiltration from precipitation. Infiltration values from precipitation were based on rates reported in Reference (3).
- A unit flux of 6.5 inches per year  $(1.72 \times 10^{-8}$  ft/s) below the FTB Pond in closure. The bottom of the FTB Pond will be amended with bentonite during reclamation to reduce infiltration long-term. Infiltration values through the bentonite amended pond bottom were based on rates reported in Reference (3).
- A unit flux of 115 inches per year  $(3.04 \times 10^{-7}$  ft/s) was applied to the Flotation Tailings to represent infiltration due to precipitation plus hydraulic deposition of the tailings. Infiltration values from precipitation and spigotting were based on rates reported in Reference (3).
- The wetlands at the toe of the dam were modeled with groundwater at the ground surface because groundwater is relatively shallow in this area.
- The tailings basin pond was modeled with its outermost edge located 625 feet beyond the inside crest of the dam (i.e., beach length). This is the same pond edge location used in the water balance and geochemical analyses. The pond is modeled as a constant total



head. This total head elevation changes for each lift. For Lift 8, the total head boundary condition was 1722.8 feet AMSL.

- For the probable maximum precipitation (PMP) event at Lift 8, the pond was modeled at 1726.8 feet AMSL, or a bounce of 4 feet, which temporarily shrinks the beach length to approximately 150 feet. A discussion of the total head value for the PMP can be found in Reference (1).
- Seepage modeling assumes the bedrock acts as a no-flow boundary.

# **6.2.2 Groundwater Modeling**

A three-dimensional groundwater model of the Tailings Basin area was developed using MODFLOW, which is reported in the NorthMet Project Water Modeling Package Volume 2 (Reference (3)). The groundwater model utilized similar data as the geotechnical seepage model and it was calibrated to 2002-2013 conditions. Seepage parameters determined from the MODFLOW calibration were considered during development of geotechnical modeling parameters. However, the groundwater model encompasses a relatively large area in plan view, including large areas outside the Tailings Basin footprint, and is three-dimensional and, as such, the groundwater model is inclusive of and is calibrated to a greater number of piezometers than is possible for the two-dimensional SEEP/W models. The geotechnical seepage modeling focuses on more discrete layers in a two-dimensional section, which must be calibrated to the piezometers or water level data located very near and/or intersected by the SEEP/W models. Because the geotechnical seepage model and the groundwater model were designed to examine different aspects of seepage and groundwater flow, there are differences in the seepage input parameters between the two models. The differences in inputs and setup reflect the different goals of the modeling – overall water balance and groundwater flow for MODFLOW versus cross-section specific piezometric head and seepage for the SEEP/W models.

## **6.3 Stability Analysis and FTB Design**

The slope stability of the existing and proposed FTB dams was analyzed for three strength conditions - the drained condition (through an ESSA), the yield undrained condition (through USSA) and, for specified scenarios, post-liquefaction undrained conditions. Schematics of Cross-Section F (which also apply to Cross-Section G and Cross-Section N) were created, identifying the different materials used in the various stability models, and are presented as Large Figure 11 for ESSA conditions, Large Figure 12 for USSA conditions, and Large Figure 13 for liquefied conditions.

The drained condition generally applies to long-term, steady-state hydraulic conditions. Under the drained condition no excess porewater pressure exists in the tailings basin dams and, in many scenarios and material types, the drained condition represents the most common and stable condition. The undrained condition typically applies to short-term conditions, for example during or immediately after dam construction (if such construction occurs rapidly) or immediately after




filling of the lift with tailings if filling occurs rapidly, representing a case where excess porewater pressure produced in response to the rapid loading has not had time to dissipate. As the dams will be constructed and tailings will be placed slowly and in thin layers, the undrained condition may but will not always apply to the period immediately after filling a lift. The posttriggering case refers to post-yield or steady-state strength conditions for contractive materials when loading occurs in an undrained manner, shearing the material beyond its yield strength to its steady-state strength (Reference (29)).

Each strength condition has unique strength parameters (Attachment C) and specific minimum required slope stability factors of safety, as detailed in the Work Plan (Attachment A). The FTB was designed to achieve the required slope stability safety factors:

- for ESSA modeled using drained strengths  $-$  a minimum FOS of 1.5
- for USSA modeled using yield undrained strengths  $-$  a minimum FOS of 1.3
- for USSA modeled using fully liquefied strengths or where liquefied strengths are applied to zones where liquefaction is triggered  $-$  a minimum FOS of 1.1

The proposed FTB design was developed iteratively, by modeling various combinations of slope angles, lift heights, bench widths, and buttress zones to determine potential configurations that achieve at least the minimum required factors of safety. From these potential configurations, the proposed FTB design was selected as the configuration that best meets Project objectives.

#### **6.3.1 Stability Analysis Method**

FTB stability analyses modeled the north perimeter dam of FTB Cell 2E (Cross-Section F and Cross-Section G) and south perimeter dam of FTB Cell IE (Cross-Section N) using a limit equilibrium approach. In the limit equilibrium approach, the soil is assumed to be at the state of limiting equilibrium and a FOS is computed. Spencer's method was used to calculate the FOS. This method is considered an adequate limit equilibrium method because it provides a FOS based on both force and moment equilibrium, while other methods only take into account force or moment.

The use of analysis criteria in stability modeling is required to achieve realistic factors of safety. The following criteria were applied to these stability analyses:

- A minimum failure surface thickness (depth) of 20 feet. This precludes low FOS results due to shallow surface slumping, which does not place the dam at risk and can be controlled by operation and maintenance procedures. This primarily affects the existing slopes of coarse tailings where acceptable performance with regard to stability has been observed historically.
- For the worst-case model, the contractive saturated (soils below the top of the capillary zone, which is taken as the zone starting 10 feet above the phreatic surface) LTVSMC





fine tailings/slimes and the Flotation Tailings are assumed to liquefy, whether or not liquefaction is shown to trigger in these materials. This is considered a conservative approach to the stability modeling.

SLOPE/W, part of the GeoStudio 2012 Version 8.30 software package, uses limit equilibrium theory to compute the FOS of earth and rock slopes. It is capable of applying a variety of methods to compute the FOS of a slope while analyzing complex geometry, stratigraphy, and loading conditions. The slope stability analyses were conducted using both the grid and radius and entry and exit slip surface search method in SLOPE/W. Both methods will result in a similar FOS value, although the search approach is unique for each with the advantage of the entry and exit method providing a way to visually show the extents and/or range of trial slip surfaces. In the grid and radius technique, the grid of the center of slip circles (or center of blocks) and radii (or ends of blocks) are established by the user, and the computer program then searches for the circle or block yielding the lowest FOS. The entry and exit search method allows the location of the trial slip surfaces along the ground surface to be chosen manually with a selected number of entry and exit points. This method was used to search for location-specific failure surfaces; for example, slip surfaces located in just the buttress, and slip surfaces above the extents of the buttress.

In SLOPE/W, the critical failure surface can be circular, pseudo-wedge (wedge), or userspecified. To account for possible wedge failures, the native materials below the FTB (which includes fractured bedrock; fractured bedrock and till; and fractured bedrock, till, and peat) were evaluated as possibly impenetrable (or significantly stronger than the overlying tailings). Applying impenetrable strengths to each of these layers forces the circular failure surface to truncate along these layers and create a wedge failure, forcing the program to identify failures that progress along possible weak soil layers that might not otherwise have been evaluated. If the stability result with the lowest factor of safety occurred when impenetrable properties were applied to the peat layer, then a weaker fine tailings/ slimes material overlying the peat was determined to be the critical path for that analysis. This analysis approach identifies failures that may progress along relatively weak soil layers.

For the analyses performed in this study, the critical circular and pseudo-wedge slip surfaces were further evaluated using the optimization technique to confirm that the lowest FOS was identified. This uses the solution of the circular and pseudo-wedge slip surface and iteratively modifies the surface (for circular, usually idealized into multiple linear segments; hence a noncircular surface) to seek out the surface with the lowest FOS value. Optimization can sometimes generate unrealistic or kinematically inadmissible failure surfaces; therefore, engineering judgment is used to determine whether the optimized slip surface is realistic and, in cases where it is deemed unreasonable, the result for the circular slip surface (without optimization) is reported (Reference (30)). Criteria for slip surface acceptance evaluated the base angle of each slice along the slip surface. To be kinematically acceptable, for a given soil layer the base angle of each slip surface slice, from the entry slice or exit slice within the soil layer to the slip surface low point, must be smaller than the base angle of the preceding slice. Base angle should monotonically decrease as a function of distance when the obtained failure surface is admissible.





If there are changes in base angle direction when the slip surface is within the same material of the slope, then the surface is not valid and the movement cannot be realized at the limiting state (Reference (31)).

SLOPE/W reports the critical failure surface as the slip surface with the lowest computed FOS. At times, and despite the minimum depth criterion applied to the slip surface discussed above, this critical failure surface may relate only to a relatively small or shallow slip in the buttress material. If SLOPE/W reported a slip surface only through the buttress material as the critical failure, this value was reported in a note on the results tables in Section 7.3. However, to provide a more global (and therefore truly more critical) outcome, the slip surface corresponding to a failure through the dam materials was also presented and is considered more representative of the overall stability of the FTB.

As previously mentioned, the porewater pressures produced by SEEP/W during seepage analysis are incorporated into SLOPE/W to compute effective stress, resulting in a more accurate calculation of FOS than traditional limit equilibrium software, which uses a phreatic line to simulate groundwater. As a result, this approach incorporates the calculation of seepage forces when computing the FOS.

The critical slip surface method of analysis for liquefaction triggering scenarios, along with a description of the various scenarios evaluated, are presented in Section 6.4. Liquefaction triggering was analyzed per the requirements of the Geotechnical Modeling Work Plan and results are reported in Section 7.3.4.

# **6.3.2 FTB Design**

The primary objective of the FTB geotechnical design is to provide safe permanent storage of Flotation Tailings with efficient and effective recovery of process water for reuse in the Beneficiation Plant. In addition, the geotechnical design must provide adequate storage for the volume of tailings produced over the proposed 20-year operating life of the project, accommodate the planned wet cover system, and meet project regulatory requirements (Section 2.0).

The proposed FTB incorporates construction of new dams over the existing LTVSMC Cells IE and 2E. The dams will be constructed using routine earthwork techniques consisting of borrowing nearby LTVSMC coarse tailings (with incidental inclusion of fine tailings and slimes), and placing the tailings in lifts with compaction to specified density to yield the desired dam lift height, geometry and strength.

The proposed FTB design was developed by iteratively modeling various combinations of slope angles, lift heights, bench widths, and buttresses to determine potential configurations that achieve at least the minimum required factors of safety. The design is flexible and can be updated during construction or retrofitted. Stability can be modified by: (1) adding or reducing buttressing to modify resisting force at the toe of the FTB; (2) including free-draining underdrain layers or horizontal drains to reduce the phreatic surface in the FTB; (3) adjusting the overall





slope angle to modify driving force at the toe; or (4) some combination of the preceding items. As part of design these items were amended, individually and together, until slope geometry producing adequate factors of safety was achieved. Based on requirements for the site, the most appropriate configuration for the Project was determined from these preliminary configurations for Cross-Sections F, G, and N.

To achieve the stability required for the liquefied undrained condition along Cross-Section F, an underdrain, a toe-of-dam buttress, and a mid-slope setback were incorporated into the preliminary design. Cross-Section G required a toe-of-dam buttress, and a mid-slope setback. For Cross-Section F and G, a conservative assumption was made not to account for the active groundwater collection system along the toe of Cell 2E. In the event of a power outage (no pumping) and a triggering event, the dam will be stable. The effect of the FTB Seepage Containment System is discussed in Section 6.8 and results are presented in Attachment G. At Cross-Section N a toe-of-dam buttress was the only feature incorporated into the preliminary design. The slope designs are intended to provide options for additional mitigation features, were they to become necessary due to changes in operations and/or materials, and can be updated during initial construction and/or subsequently retrofitted (buttress addition, drainage feature addition, slope geometry modifications) if necessary. Current estimates of buttress material quantity are reported in Reference (1).

An ultimate dam crest elevation of 1732 feet **AMSL** was selected on the basis of tailings storage capacity requirements. Construction assumes eight lifts, the first seven being 20 feet high with the final lift 10 feet in height for a total height of 150 feet. Each lift has exterior slopes of 4.5H: 1V. The exterior face of each lift will be amended with bentonite to reduce infiltration. There is a 60-foot bench between lifts and there is a 625-foot beach extending from the interior crest of dam to the edge of the FTB Pond.

#### **6.3.2.1 Cross-Section F Underdrain**

To achieve the required stability along Cross-Section F, an underdrain, comprised of higher permeability material, will be placed between the existing LTVSMC tailings and the first lift of the FTB dam. Between Lifts 4 and 5 there is a 200-foot offset (yielding a 260-foot total bench) to position the driving force from the upper lifts farther upstream from the existing toe. The downstream toe is reinforced by the addition of a buttress to crest elevation of approximately 1574 to 1575 feet AMSL. This design results in an overall dam slope of approximately 8 degrees  $(7H:1V)$  and an FTB dam slope of approximately 6.6 degrees  $(8.6H:1V)$ . The proposed dam geometry with dimensions is presented in Large Figure 14.

The underdrain will provide a path for porewater pressure release if the phreatic surface is higher than expected. The presence of the coarse underdrain also provides additional stability by creating a stronger layer farther inside the basin than would normally be created by hydraulic deposition of tailings.





The performance of the underdrain (in this case a high permeability foundation layer or mat below the Flotation Tailings – Large Figure 14) was evaluated through modeling. The length and thickness of the mat were varied to determine how much coarse material will be required to sufficiently lower the phreatic surface. The material was modeled both as gravel, with a unit weight of 140 pcf and a friction angle of 40 degrees, and as LTVSMC coarse tailings. The LTVSMC coarse tailings and the coarser bulk tailings blend both provide acceptable filtration for the Flotation Tailings, as discussed in Section 5.3.4. The LTVSMC coarse and bulk tailings were tested at unit weights intended to simulate in-situ density (Sections 5.2.2.1 and 5.2.2.5) and thereby long-term drain performance. Both the coarse and bulk tailings are permeable enough to significantly lower the phreatic surface and either material could be used, provided adequate filtration is included. Further analysis and design of the underdrain will be performed as part of final design.

Results show the underdrain will need to be 250 feet long (farther upstream of the initial raise of the FTB, over the Tailings Basin, and measured perpendicular to the axis of the slope) and 4 feet thick to adequately maintain a lowered phreatic surface within the new dam. As part of monitoring instrument installation new data may be collected and additional modeling may be conducted to ascertain if this underdrain needs to be continuous along the length of the dam (as currently assumed), or if narrow segments of underdrain material will be just as effective. It will be necessary to construct the underdrain at the start of operations in places where the layer is needed but does not already exist via the presence of LTVSMC coarse tailings at the surface of the Tailings Basin. Test trenching and/or auger borings will be performed prior to bidding for construction and will be used to confirm underdrain requirements. If underdrain design is modified then the underdrain location and configuration will be updated with future drawing updates (Reference (1)) to provide details of the design modification.

Modeling also evaluated the effect of the underdrain on seepage flow in the dam. In the seepage and stability modeling, the seepage in the underdrain flows into the LTVSMC coarse tailings shell in the existing dam, then out through the toe of the dam. Cell 2W serves as an analog to demonstrate that seepage-induced internal erosion with incremental pond raises will not be problematic. This potential failure was evaluated and is discussed in Section 7.2.3 .1. Further, the toe of the Cell 2E dam is proposed to be embedded in a rock buttress, providing further resistance to erosion. Any seepage due to underdrain flow could be collected with perforated piping and conveyed back into the basin or downslope (Section 6.6 of Reference (32)) to prevent saturation of the coarse tailings shell. However, current modeling does not indicate such seepage is likely, so collection features are not incorporated into this design.

#### **6.3.2.2 Buttress Design**

The proposed buttress at the toe of the existing dam for Cells IE and 2E was designed to provide a counterweight to the driving forces modeled in worst-case liquefaction scenarios (Section 7.3.6). The thickness and width of the buttress were altered to assess whether a reasonable amount of rock could be used to sufficiently increase the FOS. The material was modeled as gravel with a unit weight of 140 pcf and a friction angle of 40 degrees. Buttress





material will likely consist of available waste rock from a nearby stockpile. The modeled buttress at Cross-Section F has an approximate top elevation of 1574 to 1575 feet AMSL. Due to a higher ground surface elevation, at Cross-Section G the buttress has an approximate top elevation of 1559 feet AMSL. Each buttress has an approximate width (dimension perpendicular to the face of the dam) of 215 feet.

The model also assumes that any peat that exists at the toe of the north dam of Cell 2E below the proposed location of the buttress will be removed prior to construction, allowing the buttress to key into the stronger underlying glacial till. This also helps the buttress essentially act as a large toe drain, relieving pressures within the downstream slope of the embankment.

The blanket buttress at the toe of the existing dam for Cross-Section N has a proposed top elevation of 1665 feet and an approximate length of 390 feet. Although called a buttress at Cross-Section N, construction here will consist of filling an existing low area rather than constructing a zone of increased embankment thickness.

Future analysis incorporating new field data collected during pre-construction investigations may include optimization of the size of the underdrain relative to the size of the buttress or assess the impact of varying the underdrain length, size, and spacing (continuous or strips). A material source will be identified, including performing laboratory testing to verify that the material properties are consistent with assumptions made to set modeling parameters. Once the source is finalized, a filter analysis will be performed to determine if a filter layer or layers are needed between the buttress and the embankment dam. However, review of current modeling outcomes which did not include filter layers between dam and buttress material indicate low exist gradients at the toe of slope and, provided appropriate gradation of the buttress material is achieved, the need for stand-alone filter layers or toe drains is not anticipated.

#### **6.3.2.3 Mid-slope Set-back**

For Cross-Section F and Cross-Section G, a bench of 260 feet was designed between Lift 4 and Lift 5; in effect, the 60-foot bench plus a 200-foot offset. This mid-slope setback flattens the overall slope angle and pushes the driving forces due to the higher lifts farther from the toe of the Tailings Basin. The setback bench surface between Lifts 4 and 5 was modeled as covered with LTVSMC bulk tailings. This layer provides a construction base for Lift 5, while also supplying additional shear strength along the ground surface to help prevent shear surfaces from daylighting through the setback. This mid-slope setback also provides flexibility for potential future modifications, if needed, such as room to construct an additional upper buttress overlying the mid-slope setback to prevent failures from daylighting through the setback as the dam reaches its ultimate height, should the strength and permeability properties of the operational Flotation Tailings differ from the pilot plant sample. While adding mass to a slope may induce a decrease in slope stability safety factor for some failure surfaces, those safety factors remain at acceptable levels while safety factors for other failure surfaces simultaneously increase. If future modifications are required over the mid-slope setback, the bentonite-amended layer will be removed and then reconstructed once primary slope construction is complete.





#### **6.3.3 Veneer Stability**

Stability of the bentonite-amended layer of soil along the slope of each lift was evaluated with an infinite slope stability analysis. This type of analysis applies when failures are expected to be very shallow and parallel to the slope and is often used when assessing stability over a liner or when a weak plane (i.e., the bentonite-amended tailings layer) exists parallel to the slope which could promote sloughing. The evaluation was performed with and without seepage along the slope (Reference (18)).

The infinite slope stability FOS without seepage is determined as:

$$
FOS = \frac{c'}{\gamma H \cos^2 \beta \tan \beta} + \frac{\tan \phi'}{\tan \beta}
$$
 Equation 6-1

Where:

 $\gamma$ = moist unit weight, pcf  $H =$  slope height, feet

 $\beta$ = slope angle, degrees

 $\phi'$  = drained friction angle, degrees

 $c'$  = drained cohesion, psf

The infinite slope stability FOS with seepage, where groundwater level is assumed to coincide with the ground surface, is determined as:

$$
FOS = \frac{c'}{\gamma_{\text{sat}}H\cos^2\beta \tan\beta} + \frac{\gamma'}{\gamma_{\text{sat}}\tan\beta}
$$
 Equation 6-2

Where:

 $\gamma$  = buoyant unit weight, pcf  $\gamma_{sat}$  = saturated unit weight, pcf

Modeling used a 20-foot slope height and 12.5-degree slope angle. A literature review was performed to estimate the shear strength of bentonite-amended sandy soils (References (33), Reference (34), Reference (35), and Reference (36)). Based on 3% bentonite addition, the effective friction angle was found via the literature search to range from 36 to 47 degrees with drained cohesion ranging from 130 to 430 psf. Average moist unit weight was 132 pcf and average saturated unit weight was 137 pcf. Samples of flotation tailings mixed with 3% bentonite were subsequently tested, with a resulting effective friction angle of 40 degrees and effective cohesion of 40 to 80 psf, and an undrained friction angle ranging from 29 to 33 degrees and undrained cohesion ranging from 400 to 1,200 psf. Test results are provided in Attachment 0. Unit weights of the bentonite-amended flotation tailings were somewhat higher than for the sandy soils reported in the literature. On the basis of reported literature values and project-





specific test data, an effective friction angle of 30 degrees was used in the infinite slope analysis with drained cohesion of 100 psf. The cohesion value of 100 psf is of the same order of magnitude as the effective cohesion from tests in the lab, but less than the undrained cohesion value found from testing of the compacted soil-bentonite mixes. This affords the opportunity to place and compact the tailings-bentonite mix at a density required to achieve the desired hydraulic conductivity, while easily achieving the modeled cohesion. Vegetation root penetration and reinforcement is assumed to be insignificant. With no seepage, the infinite slope stability safety factor is 2.78. Assuming seepage occurs; the FOS is reduced to 1.59. As noted, a minimum FOS of 1.5 is recommended for design of drained conditions.

The bentonite-amended soil layer will be located below a vegetated soil surface for which erosion is anticipated to be no less and no greater than for other vegetated slopes at the facility. The bentonite-amended zone will be located approximately 3 feet below the surface; below the primary root zone of the vegetated surface. Deep rooted plants are not proposed for use in reclamation of the flotation tailings basin dams but may be beneficial to minimization of erosion potential on dam side slopes. Therefore, on the exterior face of the dams the bentonite-amended zone may be located deeper if necessary to avoid the root zone of the specific vegetation types anticipated to be utilized and to self-establish on site. Placement of the bentonite-amended zone at greater depth would also reduce the potential for freeze-thaw impacts on the bentoniteamended layer. Preliminary geometry of the bentonite amended cover is provided on Drawing FTB-024 of the Flotation Tailings Basin Permit Application Support Drawings contained in Attachment A of Reference (1). Final geometry will be adjusted once final vegetation types and corresponding root zone depths are considered. This type of bentonite layer is atypical in a tailings basin dam and a limited data search has not identified articles describing its use at other facilities. However, clay barrier layers have very frequently been used for various landfill cover systems, worldwide for many dozens of years, as a means of reducing rainwater infiltration.

As with all slopes at the facility, those that include the bentonite-amended tailings layer will require periodic inspection (Reference (1)) to identify any areas where erosion has occurred, thereby requiring repair. If erosion does occur, the eroded area will require regrading and revegetation. The frequency of any required erosion repair will likely diminish over time as the vegetative cover layer becomes well established. The cohesion provided by addition of the bentonite to the bentonite-amended soil layer should be beneficial in limiting the depth of erosion if it does occur, such that overall stability due to surface erosion will not affect overall slope stability.

#### **6.4 Liquefaction Triggering Analyses**

Liquefaction can potentially be triggered statically or seismically. Static versus seismic liquefaction represent very different scenarios from a stability standpoint. A static triggering event (for example, creating excess porewater pressures by constructing too quickly or due to erosion locally causing a steeper slope angle) is likely to be limited to a small area, impacting soils only around the event. A seismic triggering event (earthquake) occurs globally and instantly impacts all soils. Global static liquefaction could also be induced by high porewater pressures





associated with a large storm event or if the entire slope was unintentionally steepened during construction.

The potential for LTVSMC fine tailings and slimes and the Flotation Tailings to liquefy in response to triggering events is due to the fact that some of these materials are hydraulically deposited and come to equilibrium under very loose to loose conditions. This very loose to loose condition can result in contractive behavior during undrained shearing. Figure 6-1 illustrates the behavior of saturated, contractive tailings during undrained loading. The yield strength, Su(yield), is defined as the peak strength available during undrained loading (Reference (24)). Steady-state (liquefied) undrained strength can be triggered by either static or dynamic loads, by additional strain, or under static shear stress that is larger than the liquefied shear strength,  $S<sub>u</sub>(i<sub>0</sub>)$ .



#### **Figure 6-1 Undrained Response of Saturated Contractive Sandy Soil**

Point A or Point A' on Figure 6-1 represents the prevailing stress and strain conditions in a soil element (such as the tailings). The static shear stress on the soil element at Point A or Point A' is greater than the soil's liquefied strength (Point C). The conditions that lead to the stress state represented by Point A or Point A' could have been caused by drained, partially drained, or completely undrained loading conditions during dam construction.

Stress path A-B-C considers the change in stress and strain of an element of soil within a saturated layer underlying a dam during construction which triggers static liquefaction. During placement of the next dam lift or other stress inducing loading, the stress and strain conditions in the soil element moves from Point A to Point B. This step assumes that the drainage boundaries and permeability of that element of soil result in a temporary undrained condition in the element. Point Bis located on the yield strength envelope; therefore it represents the maximum shear resistance that the soil element can mobilize under undrained monotonic loading conditions. When the shear stress in the soil element exceeds Point B (the yield shear strength), the structure of the soil yields and collapses, and liquefaction is triggered. The element then moves from Point B to Point C, the liquefied strength. Note that the liquefied strength is low but is not zero.





Stress-strain and stress path A-D-C again considers the change in stress and strain of a soil element starting at Point A in Figure 6-1. Referring to this stress path, in a deformation-induced (undrained creep) failure, the static shear strain increases due to dam construction under undrained conditions, causing a drop in effective stress, shown by the element moving horizontally from Point A to Point D. This stress path also represents a constant shear stress (or constant-q) path that develops as a result of a rising water table. While this stress path can be drained as the effective stress approaches the yield strength envelope, as noted by Sasitharan et al. (Reference (37)), who first thoroughly documented this stress path, there is a slight increase in porewater pressure immediately prior to yield ( or collapse). This suggests that the small load increment (or decrement) immediately before collapse was partially drained or undrained. Furthermore, Reference (37) indicated that the collapse process was essentially undrained. At Point **D,** which is located on the yield strength envelope, liquefaction is triggered and the soil element moves from Point **D** to Point C, the liquefied shear strength.

For seismically induced flow failures, consider a soil element with stress and strain conditions represented by Point A' in Figure 6-1. The element is then subjected to seismic or dynamic loading. If the duration and intensity of the seismic/dynamic load is sufficient to cause porewater pressure increases large enough to shift the element from Point A' to Point E, which is located on the yield strength envelope, liquefaction is triggered and the element moves to Point C, the liquefied shear strength.

Liquefaction triggering analyses were conducted for the FTB design along Cross-Section F for the triggers identified in the Work Plan (Attachment A), as described in the subsequent sections. Additionally, an unknown trigger was evaluated for all cross-sections by performing a stability analysis assuming all saturated, contractive tailings would liquefy.

#### **6.4.1 Evaluating Liquefaction Triggering**

Both static and seismic liquefaction triggers were evaluated for Cross-Section F. Static triggering was based on limit equilibrium stresses from integrated SEEP/W and SLOPE/W analyses. Seismic triggering included a triggering screening of site-specific soil and tailings data, with an ensuing dynamic modeling analysis required if the screening indicated seismic liquefaction would be triggered.

The basic steps of the liquefaction triggering analyses for both static and seismic liquefaction, consistent with Olson and Stark's methodology (Reference (22)) prescribed by the work plan, are described below:

1. Perform a strength reduction analysis to determine the critical failure surface using limit equilibrium theory by incrementally reducing liquefied undrained shear strength values simultaneously with consistent percent reductions for the contractive undrained materials until the factor of safety equals 1.0. The triggering screening – see Attachment  $C$  – indicated that portions of the LTVSMC fine tailings and slimes layers tested were found to be contractive and subject to liquefaction and the future Flotation Tailings are assumed to deposit in a contractive state.



- 2. Analyze a USSA<sub>yield</sub> model with the identified critical failure surface input as a fully specified failure surface (FSFS) found in Step 1.
- 3. Use resulting stresses from the USSAyield model with the FSFS to assess liquefaction triggering in each slice of the failure surface. For seismic triggering, these stresses are evaluated against an increase of driving forces and for static triggering, the stresses are evaluated against either an increase in driving forces or a reduction of shear strength, depending on the static triggering mechanism.

Static liquefaction triggering scenarios and detailed analysis procedures are described in Section 6.4.2. Seismic liquefaction screening and triggering analyses are described in Section 6.4.3.

# **6.4.2 Static Liquefaction Triggering Analysis**

The static triggering analysis used the results of the SEEP/W models, the critical failure surface identified in the SLOPE/W model for the strength reduction analysis, and the computed slice stresses to assess for liquefaction due to a load change. The method is based on procedures outlined by Olson and Stark (Reference (16), Reference (22), and Reference (38)). With their procedures, the steady-state ( or liquefied) strength may be presented as a ratio by normalizing the strength to the effective overburden pressure (USSR<sub>liq</sub> =  $s_{u(iiq)} / \sigma'_{v}$ ).

#### **6.4.2.1 General Procedure**

The Olson and Stark (Reference (22), Reference (38)) procedures can generally be summarized in the following steps:

- Step 1 Perform a limit equilibrium analysis (SLOPE/W) to determine  $\tau_{driving}$  and  $\sigma'_{v}$  for each slice along the FSFS.
- Step 2 Calculate the average static shear stress ratio  $\tau_{\text{driving}} / \sigma_{v, \text{ave}}$  for each slice using the limit equilibrium results.
- Step 3 Estimate the average seismic shear stress  $\tau_{\text{seismic,ave}}$  either using published relationships (such as in Reference (31)) or using a deformation site response analysis model.
- Step 4 Compute  $s_{u(\text{yield})}/\sigma'$  v using corrected mean CPT and SPT penetration resistance.
- Step 5 Determine the values of  $s_{u(\text{yield})}$  and  $\tau_{\text{driving}}$  along the base of each slice.
- Step 6 Calculate the FOS against liquefaction triggering as:





 $\tau_{driving}$  +  $\tau_{seismic,av}$ 

*Note: Tother relates to external driving stresses, such as surcharges, that would not be included within the static driving shear stress. This Tother accounts for the induced change in stress due to changing conditions of the dam section, i.e., the specific triggers identified in the following section, and is*  determined with a limit equilibrium analysis (SLOPE/W model).

Because only static liquefaction triggering is being evaluated, there is no average seismic shear stress (Step 3,  $\tau_{\text{seismic,ave}}$ ) in these analyses. An example triggering computation for one slice along the slip surface is provided in Attachment P to show Olson's liquefaction analysis as outlined in Steps 1 through 6 above. In static events, liquefaction is triggered by application of additional stress beyond the yield undrained shear strength (following points A-D-C in Figure 6-1).

#### **6.4.2.2 Static Liquefaction Triggering Scenarios**

Static liquefaction analyses were performed with results from SLOPE/W models. Liquefaction is triggered statically when stresses are increased rapidly ( or effective stress is decreased rapidly) such that the aggregate driving shear stress exceeds the yield undrained shear strength of saturated, contractive material. Per the Work Plan (Attachment A), analyses were performed to evaluate six potential static triggering events, including:

- 1. Baseline  $-Lift 8$
- 2. High Construction Rate of Loading- Lift 1
- 3. Local Erosion/Scour of Slope (pipe break)- Lift 8
- 4. Elevated Phreatic Surface (drain ineffective) w/High Pond Lift 1
- 5. Elevated Phreatic Surface (i.e., drain ineffective) Lift 8
- 6. Long-Term Case (20, 200, and 2,000 years after closure)

More detail of these cases is provided in Large Table 2. Cases 2 through 6 were performed as full triggering analyses and results are provided in Section 7.3.4. For the Baseline – Lift 8 case, the strength is locked in along the fully specified failure surface for the stress conditions due to Lift 7 and immediately before placing Lift 8. Therefore cohesion equals zero at the surface and no strength increase is attributed to placement of Lift 8. The long-term case was treated as an unknown triggering event because post-closure triggering mechanisms cannot be accurately projected. Long-term cases were analyzed with fully liquefied long-term conditions, and results are presented in Section 7.3.7.





As shown in Large Table 2, the procedure for each triggering scenario varied slightly with regards to determination of the FSFS from pre-loading slope stability models and the FOS against triggering (FOS<sub>triggering</sub>) determined from the post-loading slope stability outputs. The analysis is detailed further in the following section and specific procedural variations for each scenario are discussed in Section 7.3.4 with their individual results for liquefaction triggering.

#### **6.4.2.3 Determining Factor of Safety (FOS) Against Triggering**

To evaluate static liquefaction triggering, results from pre-loading slope stability models are compared to results from post-loading slope stability models after there has been a load change applied (when the scenario pertains to a sudden change in conditions), as described below:

I. A slope stability model is prepared with fully liquefied strength parameters for contractive, saturated soils (soils below the top of the capillary zone, which is assumed as the zone 10 feet above the phreatic surface) to determine the FSFS. The model used to determine the FSFS for each case is described in Large Table 2, as it varies by the triggering mechanism and may use pre- or post-loading geometry. All liquefied strength ratios are incrementally altered until the overall slope stability factor of safety  $(FOS<sub>overall</sub>)$  is approximately 1.0. The corresponding computed failure surface identified by the search routine of SLOPE/Wis then traced and set as the FSFS for use in subsequent models.

Note that for certain triggering scenarios, such as Baseline and the plugged drain cases, there are no pre- and post-loading models, as the act of plugging the drain would occur over a significant amount of time and there would be no immediate change in conditions to analyze.

11. A pre-loading model with USSAyield strengths and the FSFS (determined in Step I) is then run to compute the pre-loading slope stability FOS<sub>overall</sub>. From this USSA model, the mobilized shear stress and shear strength are exported from SLOPE/W as a function of distance along the FSFS or as a function of the x-coordinate (if the preand post-loading failure surfaces are different lengths, due to differing model geometry). The porewater pressure along the FSFS is also plotted to determine where saturated material exists. Saturated materials are defined by porewater pressures equaling or exceeding hydrostatic water pressure.

In cases where undrained shear strength  $(s<sub>u</sub>)$  values need to be locked in for the immediate change analysis (i.e., where  $s_u$  values do not have time to change in response to a rapid change in conditions such as rapid loading or unloading), a profile of the undrained shear strength is plotted along the pre-loading FSFS, as described further subsequently. This method sets the strength of the soil layers without the benefit of consolidation occurring, which would lead to an unrealistic increase in strength from a load application. The shear strength from the pre-loading model is used to assess the FOStriggering.





- III. Depending on the triggering mechanism, the shear strength may need to be locked in along the FSFS for the post-loading model. This needs to occur if the triggering event would occur rapidly enough that effective stresses would not be redistributed (i.e., pond bounce associated with the **PMP** or rapid construction). To lock in the Su, the preloading shear strength profile (from Step II) is subdivided into "sections", as needed, to estimate representative shear strengths for input into the post-loading model. This is an iterative process, where these "sections" are incorporated into a version of the preloading model, and the  $s_u$  values are revised as needed to achieve the same slope stability FOSoverall as the pre-loading model without the locked-in strength sections.
- IV. When needed, a separate slope stability model is then created to model post-loading conditions (i.e., rapid load from subsequent dam raise, erosion, etc.). The FSFS is used to evaluate overall slope stability  $FOS<sub>overall</sub>$  and for direct comparison of stresses to the pre-loading model for FOS<sub>triggering</sub> computation of each slice. Depending on the loading mechanism, the FSFS may need to be extended up past the pre-loading ground surface (like the rapid construction case). If required based on the triggering mechanism, the post-loading model will need to include the "sections" along the FSFS to lock the Su to the pre-loading strength values.
- V. From the post-loading model, the shear strength and/or mobilized shear stress are exported from SLOPE/W as a function of distance along the failure surface or as a function of the x-coordinate (if the pre- and post-loading failure surfaces are different lengths, when model geometry differs).
- VI. The  $FOS_{\text{triggering}}$  is then computed as defined in Large Table 2. The pre-loading shear strength is divided by post-loading mobilized shear stress to compute FOStriggering. Although the failure surface is fully specified, the slices may differ between the preand post-loading cases (especially if the pre- and post-loading slope geometry differs) and linear interpolation was required at times to compute the  $FOS_{trigerring}$  at all points along the FSFS.
- VII. If the FOStriggering is below 1.1 for a given slice within the saturated zone of liquefiable materials, the region at the base of that slice is reassigned the appropriate liquefied strength ratio in SLOPE/W and a post-liquefaction slope stability  $FOS<sub>overall</sub>$  is computed, which must also be equal to or greater than 1.1.

#### **6.4.2.4 Determining Post-Loading Stability**

Segments or slices where the computed  $FOS_{\text{triggering}} \geq 1.1$  are unlikely to liquefy, and if all segments have a  $FOS_{\text{triggering}} > 1.1$ , a post-loading stability analysis is not necessary (Reference (38)). Olson and Stark recommend that slices with a  $FOS_{\text{triggering}}$  < 1.1 have their strength values reduced to the liquefied shear strength ratio during a post-triggering analysis for the same failure surfaces. Therefore, segments of the failure surface with  $FOS_{\text{triggering}}$  < 1.1 were reassigned their liquefied shear strength (Reference (38)). The post-loading model was





reanalyzed with the liquefied shear strengths updated for triggered slices to determine a new FOSoveran. This procedure accounts for potential deformation-induced liquefaction and progressive failure of the structure. The minimum allowable overall FOS<sub>overall</sub> of 1.1 was set in the Work Plan (Appendix A) as the safety factor performance criteria for the triggering analysis outcomes.

To determine the FOS<sub>overall</sub>, yield undrained shear strength ratios (USSR<sub>yield</sub>) are applied to materials not prone to liquefaction, but expected to behave in an undrained manner (i.e., peat). Drained strengths are applied to materials above the capillary zone and any materials that are expected to behave in a drained manner (i.e., LTVSMC coarse tailings). The capillary zone is defined as a 10-foot layer above the modeled phreatic surface.

If liquefaction is triggered in a slice of Flotation Tailings or LTVSMC fine tailings/slimes within or below the capillary zone, the strength at the base of that slice is reassigned the corresponding  $USSR_{liq}$  value in SLOPE/W and the model is re-analyzed for post-loading  $FOS<sub>overall</sub>$  using the reassigned strength parameters.

# **6.4.2.5 Local Erosion Analysis**

To better align with what is being done for long-term analysis, the local erosion/scour of slope analysis (triggering Case  $3$  – Section 6.4.2.2) was evaluated for the fully liquefied case (as discussed in Section 6.5), rather than reviewing the triggering steps outlined above. This is considered a conservative analysis of this event, but also more appropriate than strictly following the triggering steps because the length of time and the spatial area over which erosion occurs impacts the shear strength of the material below the erosion. Rather than making assumptions about the resulting shear strength in the dam, the fully liquefied case was analyzed to consider the worst-case scenario for the assumed erosion event.

In this instance, 76 CY of material (per linear foot of dam) above the proposed buttress was assumed to be removed by an erosion event. The eroded material includes existing LTVSMC coarse tailings as well as a portion of the planned LTVSMC bulk tailings comprising the Lift I dam. In accordance with other fully liquefied analyses, the liquefiable materials (saturated LTV SMC fine tailings and slimes, as well as those in the capillary zone) were assumed to liquefy and were assigned the post-liquefaction shear strength ( $\text{USSR}_{\text{liq}}$ ). The post-liquefaction FOS was then analyzed and was assumed to be acceptable if the resulting value remained above 1.05. This is a more conservative approach than the triggering analysis, which (from past analyses) indicates only a portion of the saturated, contractive material liquefies. Previous versions of this Geotechnical Data Package presented the erosion triggering case, yielding a FOS of 1.99, with only a small portion of the tailings along the critical slip surface being found to liquefy on the basis of the approved analysis approach.

#### **6.4.3 Seismic Liquefaction Triggering Analysis**

The potential for seismic triggering of liquefaction is assessed in two steps. The first step is to determine whether the potential for seismic triggering exists. This evaluation is performed using





site-specific data including the anticipated seismic events (the potential driver for liquefaction) and in-situ soil data (the soils' resistance to liquefaction). The screening analysis is based on procedures laid out by Boulanger and Idriss (Reference (12)) and a summary report from the 1996 NCEER and 1998 NCEER/NSF Workshop (Reference (39)) that discusses the evaluation of liquefaction resistance of soils using data from in-situ testing, such as SPT and CPT.

If this screening procedure indicates that the design seismic event at the Project site could trigger liquefaction, then an analysis using a geomechanical model such as QUAKE/W would be used as part of further evaluations of stability.

# **6.4.3.1 Site-Specific Seismic Hazard**

A site-specific probabilistic seismic hazard analysis (PSHA) was prepared for the Project site (Attachment Q). A PSHA is a quantitative estimate of the hazards for ground-shaking at the site analyzed probabilistically to consider uncertainties in earthquake location, size, and frequency of occurrence. The PSHA was used to develop acceleration-time histories for dynamic stability analyses for the FTB. This site-specific analysis assesses the potential local and regional seismic sources that could affect the site, models their attenuation to the site, and provides an estimate of seismic impact at the site.

Seismicity at the site is likely to be governed by one of two conditions: (1) nearfield events, which are low magnitude earthquakes with epicenters in the Midwest (like those discussed in Section 3.3), and (2) farfield events, which are higher magnitude earthquakes caused by the New Madrid Seismic Zone. The New Madrid Seismic Zone contains the nearest active fault and is approximately 760 miles south of the site. The zone is named after New Madrid, Missouri, which is close to the northern boundary of the seismic zone.

U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) data was used to evaluate potential earthquake frequency and ground acceleration at the Project site (Reference (40)). Table 6-1 summarizes the ground motions for earthquakes with 50-year probability of exceedance of 10%, 5% and 2%. There is a 2% probability that the Peak Ground Acceleration (PGA) at the site will exceed 0.024g in 50 years. This corresponds to a 0.0004 probability of exceedance per year, or a return period of 2,475 years, which means that there is a 63.2% likelihood that this earthquake will occur in a period of 2,475 years.









The results of the **PSHA** include 3 earthquake records, based on a 2% probability of exceedance in 50 years, related to nearfield sources, farfield sources, and a record that aggregates these two sources. The acceleration records determined from the **PSHA** for the nearfield, farfield, and combined events are applied to Cross-Section Fin QUAKE/W. The accelerations can be tracked throughout the duration of the shaking and along the slip surface. The input acceleration records are provided and discussed in detail in Attachment Q. The PHSA results are summarized in Table 6-2.

#### **Table 6-2 Summary of PSHA Results**



A Deterministic Seismic Hazard Analysis (DSHA) was not performed as part of this project. The DSHA has a number of drawbacks as follows: (1) it provides no indication of the likelihood of exceeding an estimated ground motion; (2) the spectrum obtained from a DSHA is not a uniform





hazard response spectrum; (3) a **DSHA** forces the engineer to assume that all future earthquakes which occur within the "area source" are located at the minimum distance between the site and the "area source", which in some cases is an overly conservative assumption; and (4) a **DSHA**  does not consider the uncertainty associated with the location of earthquakes on an area source or on a fault (Reference (41)). In contrast, a PSHA considers all the uncertainties in ground motion estimation, and thus was used in this analysis.

Considerations for seismic stability are incorporated into the FTB dam design via the fully liquefied evaluation where an unknown trigger induces liquefaction.

# **6.4.3.2 Seismic Liquefaction Screening Evaluation**

Evaluation of the potential for seismic liquefaction requires estimation of the cyclic shear stresses and the soil's ability to resist liquefaction. The analysis used the estimation method determined in workshops jointly held by the National Center for Earthquake Engineering Research (NCEER) and National Science Foundation (NSF) (Reference (39)). This evaluation used the 2,475-year return period event from the PSHA and CPT data to determine a FOS against liquefaction triggering. Several parameters were computed.

The CSR is the cyclic stress ratio, which represents the seismic demand on a soil layer. The CSR is computed as:

$$
CSR = 0.65 * \frac{a_{max}}{g} * \frac{\sigma_{vo}}{\sigma'_{vo}} * r_d
$$
 **Equation 6-4**

Where:

- $a_{max}$  = peak horizontal ground acceleration at the bedrock surface due to the design earthquake (2,475-year return period)
- *g* = acceleration due to gravity
- $Y_d$  = stress reduction coefficient, which accounts for flexibility of the soil profile
- *0.65* = reduction factor from Reference (39) to produce a *CSR* representative of the most significant cycles over the full loading duration

In Reference (39), the depth reduction factor (rd) is a shear stress reduction coefficient ( or shear mass participation factor), computed as a function of depth  $(z)$  in meters by:

$$
r_d = \frac{1.000 - 0.4113z^{0.5} + 0.04052 z + 0.001753 z^{1.5}}{1.000 - 0.4177z^{0.5} + 0.05792z - 0.006205z^{1.5} + 0.001210z^2}
$$
 **Equation 6-5**

The CRR is the cyclic resistance ratio, indicating the capacity of the soil to resist liquefaction. The CRR is computed using the normalized clean-sand cone penetration resistance  $(q_{c1N,CS})$  from CPT data as:

*If* 
$$
(q_{c1N})_{cs} < 50
$$
, *CRR* = 0.833 \*  $\frac{(q_{c1N})_{cs}}{1000} + 0.05$  **Equation 6-6**





If 
$$
50 < (q_{c1N})_{cs} < 160
$$
,  $CRR = 93 * (\frac{(q_{c1N})_{cs}}{1000})^3 + 0.08$  **Equation 6-7**

In 1982, Seed and Idriss (Reference (42)) analyzed multiple level-ground sites where seismically induced liquefaction did or did not occur. From these analyses, relationships were proposed to identify when materials would or would not liquefy. However, because all of the earthquakes involved different magnitudes (i.e., differences in duration of shaking and frequency content), it is necessary to adjust the earthquake demand (i.e.,  $\tau_{\text{seismic}}$ ) for earthquake magnitudes higher or lower than 7.5. This adjustment is accomplished using a Magnitude Scaling Factor (MSF). Since then, multiple scaling factors have been proposed. Based on the results of the NCEER/NSF workshops, Reference (39) recommends the following MSF relationship:

$$
MSF = \left(\frac{M_w}{7.5}\right)^{-2.56}
$$
 Equation 6-8

Reference (12) and Reference (39) suggest that when the FOS against liquefaction triggering is less than 1.0, triggering will occur. The FOS against triggering is determined as:

$$
FOS_{triggering} = \frac{CRR_{7.5}}{CSR_{7.5}} * MSF * K_{\sigma}
$$
 **Equation 6-9**

Where:

 $K_{\sigma}$  = a correction factor to extrapolate the simplified procedure to larger overburden pressure conditions.

#### **6.4.3.3 Screening Results**

The factors of safety obtained at each CPT point for the test locations along Cross-Section F were plotted versus depth to determine if any points are susceptible to triggering based on the design earthquake presented in the PSHA. The design event corresponds to a 2,475-year return period with a probability of exceedance of 2% in 50 years ( $M_w = 5.92$ ,  $a_{max} = 0.026g$ ). The lowest FOS against triggering computed for all fifteen CPT locations along Cross-Section F was 1.3, triggered in CPT14-20 at a depth of approximately 3 feet in coarse tailings. All other CPT locations along Cross-Section F reported factors of safety greater than 2.5. The applied seismic event was then scaled up to determine what event would trigger liquefaction in contractive materials. It was determined that an earthquake with  $M_w = 5.0$  and  $a_{max} = 0.2g$  would be required to trigger liquefaction. For the location of the tailings basin this event corresponds to a 100 million-year return period.

Large Figure 15 shows an example of the triggering potential at CPT location 07-06 located along Cross-Section F. The CPT tip resistance is plotted showing the material separation profile. The first triggering plot shows that no CPT data points trigger based on the design event. The second triggering plot shows that liquefaction will be triggered when an earthquake with greater PGA (and a much longer return period) is applied. Additional figures of the remaining fourteen CPT locations along Cross-Section F are provided in Attachment R.





Results indicate that the seismic design event would not trigger liquefaction in any FTB materials. Therefore, the secondary seismic liquefaction triggering analysis using QUAKE/Wis not needed and Sections G and N, which are more stable than Section F, are not analyzed.

# **6.5 Fully Liquefied Analysis**

The worst-case scenario for flow liquefaction was modeled by assigning all contractive, saturated soils below the top of the capillary zone their liquefied strengths and then completing the overall slope stability analysis. This analysis simulates an unknown liquefaction trigger.

A IO-foot offset above the phreatic surface was established as a capillary zone. All materials within and below the capillary zone with potential to liquefy were assigned USSR<sub>lig</sub> DV and all materials above the phreatic surface offset were assigned drained DV. Any other saturated materials not expected to liquefy (i.e., peat) were assigned the USSR<sub>yield</sub> design value.

#### **6.6 Sensitivity Analysis**

Stability modeling uses the material strength DV for each of the materials that make up the Tailings Basin layers ( detailed in Attachment C) to identify critical slip surfaces and calculate factors of safety (a deterministic approach). However, in geologic and geo-engineered systems, the properties of a material may vary from location to location due to variation in mineralogical composition, deposition conditions, stress history, as well as physical and mechanical decomposition (Reference (43); Reference (44); Reference (45)). Along the critical slip surface, multiple material types are present (Section 7.1), and shear strengths within each material type (Section 5.0) can vary vertically and horizontally.

The purpose of the sensitivity analyses is to quantify the uncertainty in the deterministically modeled FOS due to uncertainty and variability in the input material strength DV. Two sensitivity analyses were performed to evaluate the effect of variability in materials' strengths on calculated factors of safety:

- Analysis I assessed how variations in the yield undrained shear strength values  $(USSR<sub>yield</sub>)$  could affect the FOS under normal operating conditions.
- Analysis 2 assessed how variations in the liquefied shear strength  $(USSR_{liq})$  could affect the FOS in the case of the occurrence of an unknown liquefaction triggering event.

An overview of the two sensitivity analyses is presented in Table 6-3, showing the FTB configuration, loading condition, material strength, and layers for which the material strengths were varied. Sensitivity analysis was conducted in accordance with the methods in the approved NorthMet Geotechnical Modeling Work Plan - Supplement dated 08/30/2013 (Attachment A).



5 LYMET MINING	Date: May 15, 2017	NorthMet Project Geotechnical Data Package Volume $1$ – Flotation Tailings Basin
	Version: 8	Page 84

**Table 6-3 Sensitivity Analyses Overview** 



Sensitivity analyses were performed using the probabilistic analysis function in SLOPE/W, part of the GeoStudio 2012 software package. This function uses the Monte Carlo method to randomly select and apply material strengths, from the user-specified range of material strengths, to the slope stability model to quantify the uncertainty in the computed slope stability FOS. In the Monte Carlo simulation, the entire modeled system is simulated 20,000 times. In each individual simulation, all variable inputs (in this case material shear strength) are randomly sampled from user-defined probability distributions, and assigned to segments along the critical slip surface. The slope stability factors of safety are computed and the thousands of results (from the thousands of simulations) are then assembled into a cumulative probability distribution of the model outcome. The cumulative probability distribution represents the uncertainty in the computed FOS resulting from the uncertainty and variability in the model input parameters (the material strengths). The probabilistic analysis function of SLOPE/W requires three inputs:

- the probability distribution of the material strength values, from which values will be randomly sampled (Section 6.6.1)
- the geometry of the critical slip surface:
	- $\circ$  Sensitivity Analysis 1 evaluated the critical slip surface for maximum dam height with normal pool conditions (Section 7.3.3.1).
	- o Sensitivity Analysis 2 evaluated the critical slip surface for the fully liquefied worst-case (Section 7.3.6).
- a specified segment distance along the critical slip surface, which dictates where the Monte Carlo algorithm will apply the strength values randomly selected from the appropriate probability distribution (Section 6.6.2)

Results of the sensitivity analyses are described in Section 7.3.8.





#### **6.6.1 Range and Distribution of Shear Strength Values**

Sensitivity analysis requires assumptions about the range and the distribution function of the shear strength values, which together determine the probability distribution of the values. The range in values for the yield and liquefied undrained shear strengths was determined by setting realistic lower bound values **(RLB)** and realistic upper bound **(RUB)** values that account for most to all of the field and laboratory strengths measured for each material as presented in Attachment C and discussed in Geotechnical Workshops.

The strength data are assumed to be normally distributed; a reasonable assumption for the data sets. Baecher and Christian (Reference (43)) documented that **USSR** for fine-grained soils can be either normally or log-normally distributed. The laboratory- and field vane-measured liquefied shear strength ratios for the slimes were approximately normally distributed. While the CPT and SPT penetration resistances in the slimes are log-normally distributed, the liquefied shear strength ratios estimated via empirical correlations are being treated as a single estimate of strength, as discussed during the previous Geotechnical Workshops and described in this Data Package. This process of averaging the thousands of individual CPT readings (or dozens of SPT blow counts) to obtain a single estimate of strength is consistent with current practice for defined soil formation units, soil friction angles, etc. Therefore, normal variability distributions are assumed to best reflect the data.

Having established the RLB and the RUB, and determined that it is reasonable to assume that the values are normally distributed, a probability distribution was calculated for the undrained shear strengths of each of the materials included in the analysis by using the "Three-Sigma Rule" (Reference (44)). The Three-Sigma Rule relies on the fact that 99.73% of all values of a normally distributed parameter fall within plus or minus three standard deviations  $\sigma$  of the mean. The spread between the **RLB** and **RUB** is therefore divided by six to calculate the standard deviation. The range and distribution of the shear strength values for Sensitivity Analysis 1 and 2 are summarized in Table 6-4 and Table 6-5, respectively. The maximum value is set as the design value plus  $3\sigma$ , and except as noted in Table 6-5, the minimum value is set as the design value minus  $3\sigma$ . Note that the minimum and maximum values encompass the RLB and RUB values. Further, for this analysis the minimum and maximum values are computed in reference to the DV rather than to the mean of the **RLB** and RUB. This typically produced a conservative estimate of the minimum value.





#### Table 6-4 Range of Yield Undrained Shear Strength Ratio (USSR<sub>vield</sub>) Values for Sensitivity **Analysis 1**



(1) Design value for yield strengths based on 33rd percentile values

StDev = standard deviation, calculated based on the Three-Sigma Rule

±3 St Dev accounts for 99.73% of the data set

RUB = realistic upper bound

RLB = realistic lower bound

#### Table 6-5 Range of Liquefied Undrained Shear Strength Ratio (USSR<sub>lig</sub>) Values for Sensitivity **Analysis 2**



(1) Design value for liquefied strengths based on average values

 $(2)$  USSR<sub>lig</sub> based on Section F average LTVSMC Slimes strength

The probability distribution was then generated within SLOPE/W, using inputs of design value, standard deviation, and the maximum and minimum values for each material. The shear strength probability distributions for each material are presented in Figures 1 through Figures 3 of Attachment S for the yield strengths and Figures 4 and 5 of Attachment S for the liquefied strengths. As shown on Figure 4 of Attachment S, the lower end of the probability distribution for LTVSMC fine tailings/slimes is truncated at a  $\text{USSR}_{liq}$  value of 0.04, a conservative lowerbound value (Reference (45)). This is equal to the **RLB** value as shown in Table 6-5, and was selected because it is the lowest value estimated by the empirical relationships and is supported as the lowest back-calculated strength ratio in research supporting the empirical relationships. This value is also the suggested minimum strength to use in preliminary design when no data is available (Reference ( 45)). Truncating the function at this value eliminates unreasonably low  $USSR_{liq}$  values. Upper tails were not truncated, but were assigned maximum values of the  $DV+3\sigma$ .

The minimum and maximum ±3 standard deviation values used for Sensitivity Analysis 1 are plotted with the measured USSRyield values in the following figures:

• LTVSMC fine tailings/slimes (Figure 1 of Attachment S),



- NorthMet flotation tailings (Figure 2 of Attachment S), and
- Peat (Figure 3 of Attachment S).

The minimum and maximum ±3 standard deviation values used for Sensitivity Analysis 2 are plotted with the measured USSR<sub>liq</sub> values in the following figures:

- LTVSMC fine tailings/slimes (Figure 4 of Attachment S) and
- NorthMet flotation tailings (Figure 5 of Attachment S).

#### **6.6.2 Segment Length Along Critical Slip Surface**

The GeoStudio sensitivity analysis program allows material strengths to be varied within segments along the critical slip surface. The segment length should be based on the thickness of the various units intersected by the critical slip surface and their material properties. When stratigraphy is complex, and the length of the critical slip surface within different materials varies, then the segment length should represent the system overall as well as possible, with particular consideration of the length of the critical slip surface as it passes through the weaker layers in the system.

For this analysis the segment length is based on the lengths of the critical slip surface as it passes through layers ofLTVSMC slimes, which range from 28 to 234 feet. A summary of the segment lengths in each contractive material is provided in Table 1 of Attachment S. The upper end of this range was selected as the segment length for the sensitivity analysis (rather than an average or minimum value) for two reasons. First, this length is also representative of the expected length of the critical slip surface as it passes through zones of Flotation Tailings ( as explained in a note on Table 1 of Attachment S), so it is appropriate to the overall characteristics of the system. Second, use of shorter segment lengths can have the effect of pushing results toward the mean, and might not as fully capture the potential effects of uncertainty and variability. For these reasons, the segment length was set at 234 feet, the maximum length of the critical slip surface through LTVSMC slimes.

#### **6.6.3 Monte Carlo Analysis**

The probabilistic analysis in SLOPE/W, part of the GeoStudio 2012 software package, runs the stability model thousands of times. Each run uses a Monte Carlo algorithm to sample from the material strength probability distribution. The number of required Monte Carlo runs is dependent on the desired level of confidence and number of variables. Theoretically, the more runs, the more accurate the solution will be; however the solution is no longer sensitive to the number of runs after a few thousand have been completed. The number of Monte Carlo runs appropriate for the analysis was based on the minimum number of runs that resulted in the maximum, stable probability value (Reference (46)). The liquefied probabilistic analysis was performed for 20,000 runs. This is considered to be appropriate because >5,000 runs is the suggested industry standard  $(Reference (47)).$ 



Probabilistic analyses were run two ways:

- Simultaneously and randomly varying all variable material strength parameters these results quantify the uncertainty in the Factor of Safety for the system as a whole.
- Sequentially varying only one variable material strength parameter and holding all others constant at their DV - these results indicate which material most influences the calculated Factor of Safety.

Results, presented as probability distributions, are described in Section 7.3.8.

#### **6.6.4 Likelihood of Occurrence of an Unknown Trigger**

The design objective for the FTB is a configuration that produces an acceptably low probability of undesirable performance; an acceptably low P(Failure). The P(Failure) is based on the combined probability that the FOS will be less than  $1.0$  [P(FOS $\leq$ 1.0)] and the likelihood that a triggering event will occur [P(Occurrence)]. The relationship between the probability of failure, the probability that the FOS is less than 1.0, and the probability of occurrence can be described by the following:

$$
P(Failure) = P(FOS < 1.0) * P(Occurrence)
$$

The probability of undesirable performance cannot be quantified without knowing P(Occurrence) of the "unknown trigger" discussed in the Work Plan. P(Occurrence) is difficult to define because the trigger to induce liquefaction is, by definition, unknown. It can be assumed that this unknown trigger is less likely to occur than many known triggers, such as seismic events, etc. Known triggers, including piping, overtopping from a PMP event, or earthquakes, have been back-calculated from case histories to have a P(Occurrence) of around  $1x10^{-4}$  to  $1x10^{-6}$  or less, assuming modem dam construction and design techniques are employed such as those proposed for the project (Reference (48)). These likelihoods of occurrence are often incorporated into event tree failure analyses to evaluate the combined P(Failure) from various triggers and intervention steps. The probability of an unknown trigger may be greater than that of a seismic event causing liquefaction of the tailings P(seismic triggering)  $\sim 1x10^{-8}$  but is likely less than that for a piping failure at  $P(piping) \sim 1x10^{-4}$  because properly designed and constructed filters will be used and intervention is possible on the onset of seepage.

So, while the probability of occurrence is unknown, and Sensitivity Analysis results (presented in Section 7.3.8) cannot be used to quantify the probability of failure, it is reasonable to assume that the calculated P(FOS< 1.0) would be divided by something on the order of 1,000,000 or more. So, for example if there was a 1% probability that the Factor of Safety is less than 1.0, there would be at most a 0.000001% probability of undesirable performance or failure.

#### **6.7 Postclosure Stability Inputs**

The stability analysis used the SEEP/W input parameters provided in Large Table 1 to determine long-term seepage conditions. The infiltration rate applied to the postclosure stability analysis





(with bentonite amendments in place) was 6 inches per year  $(1.59 \times 10^{-8}$  ft/s) on all dams of the FTB and the flotation tailings beach extending from the final dam lift to the start of the normal pond edge. An infiltration rate of 6.5 inches per year  $(1.72 \times 10^{-8}$  ft/s) was applied to the bottom of the pond under normal pool conditions.

The SLOPE/W input parameters for the Flotation Tailings and LTVSMC fine tailings and slimes were amended to reflect weathering and secondary compression to compute the postclosure FOS. The long-term strength of the Flotation Tailings and LTVSMC fine tailings and slimes was assumed to change based on (1) dewatering of the basin after bentonite amendment is completed in the pond area, (2) weathering of the tailings, and (3) secondary compression of the tailings.

- 1. The FTB will dewater after operations cease. While a pond will remain as part of the closure plan, the pond bottom will receive bentonite amendment, minimizing the water seepage into the underlying tailings. The seepage models for long-term scenarios show that the phreatic surface lowers and effective stresses increase in the Flotation Tailings, which will increase the stability of the FTB. The drop in the phreatic surface in the FTB also allows for more material to behave in a drained manner, thereby mobilizing higher drained strength which increases stability.
- 2. The Flotation Tailings may undergo some weathering (Section 4.7.3). The strength could increase or decrease in the long-term. While some of the Flotation Tailings mass may be lost due to weathering, some cementation of particles could also occur. Weathering was taken into account by assuming a reduction in strength equal to the average of the estimated range of original mass weathered, as summarized in Table 6-6. The plagioclase in the Flotation Tailings is likely to be the most susceptible to weathering. Estimates for strength reduction based on weathering of the Flotation Tailings have also been applied to the LTVSMC fine tailings and slimes. As indicated by estimates in Table 6-6, the tailings are projected to weather at a very slow rate.



#### **Table 6-6 Assumed Strength Reduction of Tailings Due to Long-term Weathering**

3. Secondary compression is the process by which there is slight, continuing re-arrangement and improved interlocking of soil particles over time under constant effective stress (after essentially all excess porewater pressure has dissipated), causing a slow, continued decrease in void ratio. This decrease in void ratio results in an increase in shear strength, regardless of whether the material is saturated or unsaturated, and applies to drained,





yield undrained, and liquefied shear strengths. Secondary compression is taken into account by using the consolidation data from laboratory testing and increasing the strength in relation to the anticipated continued change in void ratio over time  $(Reference (49))$ .

Based on weathering and secondary compression, the estimated long-term liquefied strengths are described in Table 6-7. The strength of the Flotation Tailings and LTVSMC fine tailings and slimes were amended because, as discussed in Section 4.7.3 and Attachment L, smaller particles are much more susceptible to weathering, relative to their mass, because their specific surface area is significantly larger than for coarse particles. These materials represent the finest materials at the FTB. Additionally, these materials will only be subjected to self-weight consolidation, whereas most other materials will be or have been compacted, either by natural processes (like the glacial till) or mechanically ( existing coarse tailings by truck traffic and the bulk tailings during dam construction).



#### **Table 6-7 Estimated Long-term Liquefied Strengths**

The drained and undrained strengths of the Flotation Tailings and LTVSMC fine tailings and slimes were also amended using the same approach as laid out for the liquefied strengths in Table 6-7. The long-term drained strengths are summarized in Table 6-8. Only drained strengths were computed, as the long-term scenario assumes a significant amount of time has passed and excess pore-water pressures at the end of operations have dissipated.



Date: May 15, 2017	NorthMet Project Geotechnical Data Package Volume 1 – Flotation Tailings Basin
Version: 8	Page 91

**Table 6-8 Long-term ESSA Strengths** 



#### **6.8 FTB Containment System Effects on Slope Stability**

Additional slope stability analyses were performed to determine the potential effects of the FTB Seepage Containment System on the factors of safety for the proposed FTB design. The purpose of the containment system is to capture water that seeps from the FTB so that it can be treated. The FTB Seepage Containment System will be installed along the northern and western sides of the FTB before the first lift of the FTB north dam is constructed; therefore, safety factors calculated in the containment system stability analysis represent FTB dam stability during and after construction of the FTB Seepage Containment System.

Three models were developed for the FTB Seepage Containment System stability analysis for Cross-Section F and Cross-Section G; the existing conditions configuration under drained conditions, and the future dam configuration under drained and liquefied conditions. The FTB Seepage Containment System stability analysis was performed based on the stratigraphy of the native soils, the existing tailings basin and the planned FTB dams along Cross-Section F and Cross-Section G, taken as also representative for modeling potential slope stability impacts along the north and west side of Cell 2W. For USSAyield and ESSA analyses, Cross-Section G sometimes yields factors of safety lower than determined at Cross-Section F; however, results for these cases are significantly above the target design factors of safety. The USSA<sub>lig</sub> analysis at Cross-Section F yields the lowest factor of safety and controls the design. The same boundary conditions and seepage and strength parameters were used for the FTB Seepage Containment System stability analysis as used in other stability models presented in this Data Package. Two operating conditions were modeled:

- the containment system operating with active extraction of water from the collection system
- the containment system temporarily inactive (e.g., such as in the event of an abnormally long power outage), simulated with the water table at ground surface from the toe of the dam to the containment system cutoff wall





Greater detail on the slope stability analyses performed to determine the effects of the FTB Seepage Containment System on the slope stability and modeling results is provided in Attachment G.





#### 7.0 **Results of Seepage and Stability Modeling**

Seepage and stability modeling was conducted on the proposed design FTB along critical Cross-Section F for Cell 2E, Cross-Section G for Cell 2E, and Cross-Section N for Cell IE. Development of the proposed design for all cross-sections involved an iterative approach, whereby various combinations of slope angles, lift heights, bench widths, and buttresses were modeled to determine configurations resulting in adequate slope stability safety factors. Based on requirements for the site, the most appropriate configuration for the Project was determined from these preliminary configurations, as described in Section 6.3.2.

The proposed FTB dams have been configured to have safety factors equal to or greater than 1.5 for drained (ESSA) conditions, equal to or greater than 1.3 for undrained (USSA<sub>yield</sub>) conditions, and equal to or greater than 1.1 for liquefied (USS $A_{liq}$ ) conditions. The seepage and stability modeling were performed using the FTB design that meets these factors of safety as described in Reference (1). The results of the stability modeling for worst-case fully liquefied material strength conditions control the design of the FTB. The designs for the FTB at Mine Year 20 along Cross-Sections F, G, and N are summarized in Table 7-1.





The proposed dam geometry for Cross-Section F with dimensions is presented in Large Figure 14. The proposed dam geometry for Cross-Section Gwith dimensions is presented in Large Figure 16. The proposed dam geometry for Cross-Section N with dimensions is presented in Large Figure 17.

Seepage and stability modeling was conducted using the permeability and design shear strength parameters detailed in Attachment C and summarized in Section 5.0. As additional data are gathered in future operations-phase geotechnical investigations and material testing programs,





the design strength and permeability parameters may be altered to reflect the outcomes of the additional investigations and material testing. As most **DV** selected for these seepage and slope stability analyses were chosen to be reasonably conservative, it is possible that future evaluation of the FTB may lead to an increase in FOS values and/or design optimization, reducing the need for buttresses, underdrains, and/or offsets.

# **7.1 Stratigraphy**

Stratigraphy for the three cross-sections was initially determined using historical boring and CPTu logs and data from the 2005 and 2007 CPT investigations. The previously identified soil layers were confirmed and new layers identified based on CPTu logs from the 2014 CPT investigation. Therefore, stratigraphy for Cross-Sections F, G and N were updated to also reflect the most-recent CPT data collected in 2014. For Cross-Section N, historical reports were reviewed to determine the location of the starter dam, confirm alternating layers of fine tailings and slimes, and confirm the construction material of the existing railroad embankment. A material to represent the railroad embankment was used in modeling Cross-Section N and was referred to as rail grade, having a unit weight of 140 pcf and a friction angle of 45 degrees. All field data and stratigraphy information have been plotted in section view for Cross-Sections F, G and N (Figures B-2, B-3, and B-4 of Attachment B).

Multiple material types were identified from the boring and CPTu logs, including till, peat, LTVSMC coarse tailings, fine tailings, and slimes. Material types were generally consistent across the three cross-sections. At the locations of all three sections, the shell consists primarily of LTV SMC coarse tailings and the interior of the basin consists of intermittent and interbedded layers of fine tailings and slimes. A layer of peat, of varying thickness and continuity, was encountered above the till along all sections. Along Cross-Section F, the layer of peat generally varies from 2 to 10 feet thick at tested locations, although a 20-foot peat layer was encountered at the toe of the initial dam. Along Cross-Section G the peat layer varied from 1 to 8.5 feet thick. Peat was encountered at three locations along Cross-Section N, ranging from 1 to 4 feet in thickness.

Depth to bedrock below the tailings basin for all three sections was based on data from top of bedrock contour maps prepared by Barr using historical maps and bedrock depths confirmed from wells and borings in the area. The 2014 geotechnical investigation performed 200 feet from the toe of Cell 2E provided depths to bedrock along Cross-Sections F and G which was used to aid in approximation of bedrock elevations for modeling. The bedrock at the toe of Section F, confirmed during the 2014 geotechnical investigation, starts at an average elevation of 1456 feet **AMSL,** 30-feet below the top of the till. Bedrock along Cross-Section **G** was modeled as 25 feet below the top of the till at an elevation of 1474 feet AMSL at the toe and increases in elevation towards the center of the basin. No borings have been extended to bedrock along Cross-Section N, therefore depth to bedrock was assumed as 20 feet below the top of the till and increases in elevation towards the center of the basin.





Modeling used the unique stratigraphy of each cross-section along with consistent material types, physical properties, and Das presented in Section 5.0. Layers of materials thinner than 1 foot were not included in the cross-sections. Cross-section F is considered the most critical due to the 20-foot peat layer at the toe of the initial dam and the presence of LTVSMC fine tailings and slimes closer to the toe of the dam.

#### 7 **.2 Seepage Modeling**

# **7.2.1 Historical Seepage Analyses**

Prior to submittal of Version 3 of the Data Package, seepage calibration and sensitivity modeling was conducted for Cross-Section F. Calibration and sensitivity analyses was conducted with a 2001 end-of-operations seepage model and were attempted concurrently, though it was understood that certain materials affected the flux or phreatic surface differently.

The sensitivity analysis was performed to assess which materials had the greatest impact on the phreatic surface and flux out of the Tailings Basin system. It was determined through this analysis that the permeability of the till had the greatest impact on the flux, followed by the permeability of the LTVSMC fine tailings and slimes. The phreatic surface was found to be more dependent on the permeability of the tailings (particularly the finer tailings, which do limit seepage), the rock starter dam, and the peat.

The calibration analysis was performed as an attempt to align the model with measured water levels at the Tailings Basin. The total heads generated by the SEEP/W model could only be compared to two measured piezometric heads along Cross-Section F, and of these, one piezometer was installed in 1999, leaving a small dataset for calibration during operations. The calibration analysis resulted in a somewhat large variation in measured to estimated heads. The total heads in the model were lower at the toe of the basin and much higher within the basin than field measurements suggested. This provided conservatism from a stability standpoint, but did not provide confidence in either the piezometer data or the initial permeability values. For this reason, seepage verification models were performed for Version 5 of the Data Package, as described in Section 7.2.2.

The calibration model was reviewed by GEO-SLOPE prior to submittal of Version 3 of the Data Package. GEO-SLOPE staff recommended altering methods slightly to improve efficiency in seepage model convergence. Because of the complexity of the model, both with regards to geometry and boundary conditions, per recommendations from GEO-SLOPE, a single transient analysis was run out until convergence was obtained for a steady state solution. Transient analyses allow the user to input an initial suggested water table in the first transient run which then serves as a starting point for seepage conversion to a steady state. The amount of transient computation time over which models were allowed to solve was varied to assess at what point a steady state solution is achieved and all convergence criteria are met. Also per the recommendation of GEO-SLOPE, to reduce system memory requirements and model run time, data from interim time steps are no longer saved and convergence tolerances were modified.





Specifically, when using the Head Vector Norm solver, the model tolerance was changed from 0.01 to 0.05 (computations come to a halt when the change in the Vector Norm from one elevation to the next is less than the specified tolerance) and the conductivity was allowed to change more quickly over a larger range (in orders of magnitude, the default is a rate of change of 1.02, with a max change of 0.1 and a minimum change of  $0.0001 -$  this was modified to a rate of change of 1.1, with a max change of 1 and a minimum change of 0.0001). The result of the model changes is a more efficient seepage model that significantly improves computational speed.

# 7 **.2.2 Seepage Verification**

The 2014 geotechnical CPT and SPT investigation provided an additional set of data that allowed an evaluation of the design value permeabilities and provided field readings to compare with model heads. Version 5 of the Geotechnical Data Package includes seepage verification models for Cross-Sections F, G, and N that represent the 2014 existing basin conditions.

# **7.2.2.1 Cross-Section F Seepage Verification**

In the 2014 seepage verification model, which replaces in its entirety the 2001 end-of-operations seepage model, total heads generated by the model were matched as closely as possible to the measured piezometric heads (at nodes representing the screened intervals of the piezometers) recorded in the field and the 2014 phreatic surface based on the CPT-estimated water levels using pore pressure dissipation tests performed during the 2014 geotechnical investigation (Attachment F). Constant head conditions were not set within the dam section. Boundary conditions (i.e., constant head, unit flux, or seepage face) were assigned only to nodes on the surface of the seepage model.

The phreatic surface in the seepage model representing existing conditions was verified with data obtained for Cell 2E from CPTu dissipation tests performed during the 2014 geotechnical investigation (Attachment F) and using data from the two permanent standpipe piezometers along Cross-Section F. The geometry of the facility in 2014 was based on 2011 LIDAR data and measurements in the facility pond recorded in July of 2014.

Due to the complex stratigraphy of the Tailings Basin, the field hydrologic conditions can be difficult to match precisely in a model. Sensitivity and verification analysis of the SEEP/W model is difficult because the model was simplified; the model cannot take into account every tailings layer that may be impacting flow in the basin. However, a reasonable approach was taken, such as neglecting coarser stringers and utilizing larger zones of only fine tailings or slimes instead. This is reasonable from a geotechnical seepage modeling standpoint, as it is likely to increase the phreatic surface within the dam. This approach also works for the stability (SLOPE/W) models, where larger zones were modeled only as the finer tailings or slimes with lower strength parameters, rather than attempting to take into account the presence of any coarser stringers with higher shear strengths.





Total heads estimated in the SEEP/W verification model using the design permeability values for Cross-Section F to represent 2014 existing conditions were compared with those measured in the field at two instrumentation locations and six CPT locations to check the accuracy of the seepage analysis models. The pond elevation of 1555 feet, measured in July 2014, was applied as a boundary condition. A unit flux of 8 inches per year  $(2.0 \times 10^{-8}$  ft/s) was applied to the existing dam slopes to represent infiltration from precipitation. Potential seepage face nodes were applied to the nodes at the toe of the basin. Measured heads in the model compared to the field values are shown in Table 7-2. Also provided is the difference between the measured and estimated head values where a positive  $(+)$  difference value indicates that the phreatic surface in the model is above the phreatic surface measured in the field and a negative(-) value indicates that the phreatic surface in the model is below the phreatic surface measured in the field.



#### **Table 7-2 Comparison of Measured and Estimated Total Heads (Cross-Section F)**

The head near the toe and mid-slope of the existing basin measured 11.2 feet and 21.4 feet higher in the model than the field measurements at locations CPT14-04 and CPT14-20, respectively. However, the model total head for piezometer F-2 (1513 .4 feet), at approximately the same location as CPT14-20, was only 3.4 feet higher than the field measurement (1510 feet, Large Figure 18) matching relatively well with the model head. The water levels in the model are generally consistent with field measurements under the tailings beach with a head difference of +6.8 feet at CPT14-05 and +7.7 feet at PNlF-99. This is considered a reasonable outcome because the modeled phreatic surface in the weaker material is higher than measured, which provides some conservatism from a stability modeling standpoint. At CPT locations within the basin, heads measured in the model are just above and below the heads in the field, having a range of  $+2.0$  to  $-2.7$  for CPT14-06 and CPT14-17, respectively.

The measured head for piezometers F-2 and PNlF-99 (see model outputs in Attachment T for locations and Attachment D for installation logs (Reference (19); Reference (50)) along Cross-Section F were not constrained by piezometer elevations. The piezometer data along





Cross-Section Fis plotted as Large Figure 18. Annual averages are plotted for 1997 through 2001, when operations at LTVSMC ceased. Averages between installation of the second piezometer in 1999 and end of operations in 2001 did not vary significantly. Since 2001, the current pond levels in Cell 2E are lower than during past LTVSMC operations and the existing standpipe piezometric heads along Cross-Section F have fallen in the range of 4 to 10 feet.

The installation log's ground surface elevation for Piezometer F-2 is 1545.5 feet with the bottom of piezometer at approximately -40 feet (approx. elevation 1505.5 feet). The phreatic surface elevation at piezometer F-2 in the model is at elevation 1513.4 feet, above the tip elevation ofF-2. Piezometer PNlF-99 installation log's ground elevation is 1547.0 feet with bottom of piezometer at approximately -60 feet (approx. elevation 1487.0 feet), placing the tip below the model head of 1519.0 feet.

While the modeled versus measured head difference for CPT14-04 and CPT14-20 is 11.2 feet and 21.4 feet, respectively, divergence is positive ( estimated is higher than measured), so is conservative for seepage and stability modeling. As the remaining piezometer and CPT location heads match field measurements, design permeability values appear to be appropriate parameters that accurately represent current conditions. An Instrumentation and Monitoring Plan will be implemented for the basin (Reference (1)) in the future. The plan will require installation of additional piezometers to monitor the dam raises. Data from these piezometers will be used throughout FTB operations to evaluate seepage model results.

#### 7 **.2.2.2 Cross-Section G Seepage Model Verification**

For Cross-Section G, total heads in the 2014 existing condition seepage verification model, using the design permeability values, were compared with those measured in the field at one instrumentation location (G-2, see model outputs in Attachment T for locations and Attachment D for installation logs; Ebasco, 1990 and Sitka, 1996) and three CPT locations to check the accuracy of the seepage model. The total heads generated by the model could only be compared to one measured piezometric head along Cross-Section G, at piezometer G-2, as piezometer G-3 is no longer in operation. The piezometer data along Cross-Section G is plotted as Large Figure 19. Annual averages are plotted for 1997 through 2001, when operations at LTVSMC ceased. Relative to 2001, the pond level in Cell 2E is lower than during past LTVSMC operations and the existing standpipe piezometric head at G-2 has fallen approximately 2 feet.

The phreatic surface in the seepage model representing existing conditions was verified with data obtained for Cell 2E from CPTu dissipation tests performed along Cross-Section G during the 2014 geotechnical investigation (Attachment F). The geometry of Cross-Section G was based on 2011 LIDAR data. The pond elevation of 1555 feet, measured in July 2014, was applied as a boundary condition to the model. A unit flux of 8 inches per year  $(2.0 \times 10^{-8}$  ft/s) was applied to the existing dam slopes to represent infiltration from precipitation. Potential seepage face nodes were applied to the nodes at the toe of the basin.





Measured heads in the model as compared to the field values are shown in Table 7-3. Also provided is the difference between the measured and estimated head values where a positive  $(+)$ difference value indicates that the phreatic surface in the model is above the phreatic surface measured in the field and a negative (-) value indicates that the phreatic surface in the model is below the phreatic surface measured in the field. The head near the mid-slope of the existing basin along Cross-Section G measured 1 foot higher in the model than the field measurements at locations CPT14-07. The water levels in the model are generally consistent with field measurements under the tailings beach with a head difference of +4.1 feet at piezometer G-2 and +4.4 feet at CPT14-08. This is considered a reasonable outcome because the modeled phreatic surface in the weaker material is higher than measured, which provides some conservatism from a stability modeling standpoint. At CPT locations within the basin, CPT14-09 resulted in a model head just below the field measured head.

The measured head for piezometer G-2 was not constrained by piezometer tip elevation. The installation log's ground surface elevation for Piezometer G-2 is 1550 feet with the bottom of piezometer at approximately -50 feet (approx. elevation 1500 feet). The phreatic surface elevation at piezometer G-2 in the model is at elevation 1515.4 feet, above the tip elevation of G-2.

The differences in modeled head compared to field measurements are small for the three CPT locations and one piezometer location. The divergence is generally positive (estimated is higher than measured), so is conservative. As the modeled heads match well with field measurements, design permeability values appear to be appropriate parameters that accurately represent current conditions along Cross-Section G.





#### 7 **.2.2.3 Cross-Section N Seepage Model Verification**

For Cross-Section N, the total heads generated by the seepage model (at nodes representing the screened intervals of the piezometers) were matched as closely as possible to the estimated 2014 phreatic surface based on pore pressure dissipation results, as no piezometers have been installed along Cross-Section N. Total heads estimated in the SEEP/W verification model using the design permeability values for Cross-Section N existing conditions were compared with those measured in the field at three CPT locations to check the accuracy of the seepage analysis models. The




measured heads in the model compared to the field values are shown in Table 7-4. Also provided is the difference between the measured and estimated head values where a positive  $(+)$  difference value indicates that the phreatic surface in the model is above the phreatic surface measured in the field and a negative (-) value indicates that the phreatic surface in the model is below the phreatic surface measured in the field.

The modeled head at the CPT14-19 location, measured at the toe of the existing basin, was 17 feet higher than the field measurement. The mid-slope model head was 11.1 feet higher than the measured head at CPT14-15. The phreatic surface below the existing basin remained high within the more permeable coarse tailings and dropped in elevation starting at the toe of the basin into less permeable fine tailings and slimes, dropping the head significantly before entering the railroad embankment. This is considered a reasonable outcome because the phreatic surface in the weaker material is higher, which provides some conservatism from a stability modeling standpoint. Total head in the model within Cell IE at CPT14-14 location was 5.4 feet higher than the measured head in the field placing the phreatic surface in a thick region of coarse tailings. The difference in modeled head compared to field measurements for the three CPT locations along Cross-Section N were positive and are therefore conservative.

<b>Piezometer</b>	<b>Measured Head in</b> the Field (ft)	<b>Estimated Head</b> from the Model (ft)	Difference (ft)
CPT14-19	1611.0	1628.0	$+17.0$
CPT14-15	1632.5	1643.6	$+11.1$
CPT14-14	1640.2	1645.6	$+5.4$

**Table 7-4 Comparison of Measured and Estimated Total Heads (Cross-Section N)** 

# **7.2.3 Seepage Analysis Results**

For each cross-section, seepage analyses were performed for each stage or lift of development and the ultimate dam height. Selected SEEP/W output figures are presented in Attachment T for the existing conditions and selected lifts for the proposed design at Cross-Sections F, G, and N. The outputs show the estimated phreatic surface with total head contours for each lift. The resulting porewater pressure distributions and phreatic surfaces were imported into SLOPE/W for the stability modeling. The phreatic surface and the porewater pressures at each node of the finite element mesh were computed in SEEP/W based on the section geometry and the permeabilities assigned to each region.

Exit gradients at the toe of the dam sections were also reviewed. Based on the assumed parameters for the buttress, this region essentially acts as a large toe drain, leading to hydraulic gradients near zero at the toe of the buttress. Additional analysis regarding the need for a filter or filters between the buttress and the existing dam will be performed once a buttress material source is selected.





# **7.2.3.1 Cross-Section F Seepage Analysis Results**

The seepage modeling results for Cross-Section F indicates that seepage from the pond initially travels in a primarily vertical direction, flowing down through the Flotation Tailings. At the location of Cross-Section F, an underdrain layer will be installed upstream of the first FTB lift, following the slope of the existing LTVSMC tailings into the basin. The underdrain layer will not daylight along the dam face or act as a "pipe" which could funnel seepage out to the face of the dam, but rather will reduce high pressure heads within the Flotation Tailings. The underdrain will provide a route for high porewater pressures to dissipate easily into the coarser LTVSMC tailings ( or drainage piping if included in final design). The underdrain will help pull flow down and then out through the LTVSMC coarse tailings shell, pulling the phreatic surface back from the slope face.

Modeling results show that inclusion of the underdrain layer at Cross-Section F does not increase the potential for surface seeps, as flux out of the basin is concentrated around the toe of the existing basin with or without the underdrain layer. Modeling indicates that the global phreatic surface within the Tailings Basin is not overly sensitive to the presence of the underdrain layer, as the presence of the underdrain layer primarily influences the phreatic surface within the Flotation Tailings.

# 7 **.2.3.2 Cross-Section G Seepage Analysis Results**

The seepage modeling results for Cross-Section G indicates that seepage from the pond initially travels in a primarily vertical direction, flowing down through the Flotation Tailings. As the water percolates down towards the LTVSMC FT/Slimes region, the flow tends to become less vertical, with the water traveling into the freely draining LTVSMC coarse tailings. Unlike Cross-Section F, no underdrain layer is required along Cross-Section G because there is a thick layer of LTVSMC coarse tailings upstream of the first FTB lift that will provide a route for high porewater pressures to dissipate, and help direct flow down and then out through the LTVSMC coarse tailings shell, pulling the phreatic surface back from the slope face. The till is also a relatively permeable material, which aids in pulling water down and out of the dam.

# 7 **.2.3.3 Cross-Section N Seepage Analysis Results**

Cross-Section N seepage modeling results show that seepage from the pond initially travels in a primarily vertical direction, flowing down through the Flotation Tailings. At all cross-sections, the flotation tailings were assigned a higher permeability near the crest of the FTB and a decreasing permeability with depth. The Flotation Tailings located above the existing basin have the same permeability as the LTVSMC Fine Tailings. LTVSMC slimes are the least permeable material in the dam, and therefore have a significant impact on the phreatic surface location. As the water percolates down into the lower Flotation Tailings region, the flow tends to become less vertical, with the water traveling towards the freely draining existing basin consisting of LTVSMC coarse tailings. The existing basin acts as an underdrain layer which funnels the



seepage through the existing basin, through the rock buttress at the toe of the basin, and down to the upstream face of the railroad embankment.

# 7 **.3 Slope Stability Analysis Results**

The design of the FTB dams is based on slope stability analyses of:

- The existing Tailings Basin in year 2014 (Section 7.3.1)
- FTB dams during construction (Section 7.3.2)
- FTB dams at maximum height (Section 7.3.3)
- FTB dams subject to static liquefaction triggering events (Section F only; Section 7.3.4)
- FTB dams subject to seismic liquefaction triggering events (Section F only; Section 7.3.5)
- The fully liquefied worst-case scenario (Section 7.3.6)
- Long-term conditions (Section F only; Section 7.3.7)
- Sensitivity analyses (Section F only; Section 7.3.8)

The following subsections describe the model results for each component of the stability analysis, and document the slope stability safety factors computed for the proposed design. Stability analysis results include estimated safety factors calculated using the methods described in Section 6.3.1; the circular method and wedge method.

For Cross-Sections F and G, the failure surface yielding the lowest FOS value for most ESSA conditions consisted of minor, localized sloughing failures occurring in the buttress. The Cross-Section N failure surfaces yielding the lowest FOS values for some ESSA and USSA conditions consisted of minor, localized sloughing failures occurring on the downstream face of the dam. These slough failures, which are cosmetic rather than structural and easily repaired, were reported in the notes below the tables of stability analysis results, whereas global failures impacting the existing or proposed lifts were reported within the tables of results as the lowest factors of safety that intersect the overall slope of the dam.

# **7.3.1 Existing Conditions Results**

Stratigraphy, water levels from the 2014 CPTu investigation, and the calibrated SEEP/W model were used to model stability of existing slopes. Because there has been no new loading at the site since operations stopped in 2001, the drained condition was deemed appropriate and an ESSA model was used. The estimated factors of safety for the 2014 current conditions model at Cross-Sections F, G, and N are presented in Table 7-5.





For Cross-Section F, the wedge slip surface with impenetrable fractured bedrock resulted in the lowest FOS value. For Cross-Section G, the wedge slip surface runs along the interface of the peat and impenetrable till layer, and for Cross-Section N, the wedge slip surface along impenetrable till resulted in the lowest FOS value. All safety factors are above the target safety factor of 1.5 for ESSA conditions. The SLOPE/W outputs for these analyses are provided in Attachment U.





# **7.3.2 Interim Dam Heights Results**

Of particular importance for the FTB tailings dam design is the stability of the dam during construction and operation when undrained conditions may develop. Slope stability was modelled for drained and undrained conditions for Lifts 2, 4, and 6. Only Lift 6 was modeled for Cross-Section N as Cell IE elevation is higher than Cell 2E and depositing of tailings into this cell would not occur until Lift 5.

Interim lift modeling assumed the following configurations:

- beach length of 625 feet
- buttresses fully constructed (as described in Section 6.3 .2.2)
- dam crest elevation:
	- $O$  Lift 2 1622 ft
	- $O$  Lift 4 1662 ft
	- $O$  Lift  $6 1702$  ft

For modeling purposes, the maximum tailings elevation must also be specified. Sufficient freeboard will be maintained at all times during interim lifts to accommodate a **PMP** 





precipitation event, so the maximum tailings elevation will be below the dam crest, but the exact relationship between the dam crest elevation and the maximum tailings elevation will depend on operational factors. As a simplifying and conservative assumption, the system was modeled with the maximum tailings elevation set equal to the dam crest (no freeboard). This assumption results in calculated Factors of Safety that are lower than would be calculated if the model configuration included freeboard, and is therefore conservative.

The slope stability model results for Lifts 2, 4, and 6, for ESSA and USSAyield conditions are shown in Table 7-6. The critical failure surface (the surface yielding the lowest slope stability FOS) for all of the ESSA models was identified as a minor, localized sloughing failure of the buttress material. If a buttress-slough was the critical failure surface, then, in order to present the estimated global FOS, the reported value provided in Table 7-6 was replaced by the slip surface with the lowest FOS that intersects the dam material. The value for the buttress-slough failure is reported as a note to the table, though the outputs provided in Attachment U reflect the values reported in the table.

Factors of safety for all ESSA and USSAyield conditions exceed the recommended minimum values, even for the buttress-slough values provided as notes. As expected, the ESSA condition for the proposed design produces higher safety factors than existing conditions due to the addition of the buttress. Also as expected, the ESSA condition resulted in higher factors of safety than the USSAyield conditions. The SLOPE/W outputs for these analyses are provided in Attachment U.







#### **Table 7-6 Modeled Factors of Safety for Interim Lifts**

(2) Buttress slough FS = 2.33 (3) Buttress slough FS = 2.36  $(4)$  Buttress slough FS = 2.35  $(5)$  Buttress slough FS = 2.40

(9) Buttress slough FS = 2.32 (10) Buttress slough FS = 2.39

(11) Buttress slough FS = 2.38

#### (6) Buttress slough FS = 2.29

# **7.3.3 Maximum Dam Height Results**

The stability of the FTB dams at maximum height is increased by the use of the buttresses and the mid-slope setback. These additional design features move the driving forces and the pond farther upstream. The following sections present the results for normal pool and PMP conditions once all 8 lifts have been constructed. The SLOPE/W outputs for these analyses are provided in Attachment U.

# **7.3.3.1 Slope Stability for Normal Pool Conditions**

Slope stability at the maximum FTB dam height with the pool at normal condition ( elevation 1722.8 feet) was modeled for both drained and undrained conditions. The resulting factors of safety are summarized in Table 7-7. Again, where appropriate, the ESSA results relate to global failures, with localized buttress-slough failures reported as notes. Factors of safety for all ESSA and USSAyield strength conditions are above the DNR recommended minimum values.

<sup>(7)</sup> Buttress slough FS = 2.30









(1) Buttress slough FS = 2.33 (3) Buttress slough FS = 2.37

(2) Buttress slough  $FS = 2.36$  (4) Buttress slough  $FS = 2.38$ 

For Cross-Section F, the critical failure surface for Lift 8 ESSA conditions is the wedge failure with a slip surface running along the interface of the till and impenetrable fractured bedrock. For the USSAyield conditions, the critical wedge failure surface resulted in the lowest FOS with a slip surface running along the interface of the peat and impenetrable till layer.

For Cross-Section G, the critical failure surface for Lift 8 ESSA conditions is the wedge failure with a slip surface running along the interface of the till and impenetrable fractured bedrock. For the USSAyield conditions, the critical failure surface resulted in the lowest FOS with a slip surface running along the interface of the peat and impenetrable till layer.

For Cross-Section N, the critical failure surface for Lift 8 resulting in the lowest FOS is the wedge failure for both USSAyield and ESSA conditions where the failure surfaces entered through Lift 8 and exited at the toe of the existing dam through the blanket buttress.

# 7 **.3.3.2 Slope Stability for PMP Pool Conditions**

Slope stability at the maximum dam height was also analyzed for the **PMP** event. The seepage modeling conservatively assumed that **PMP** conditions, with the pond level elevated by 4 feet to an elevation of 1726.8 feet (therefore temporarily shrinking the beach length from 625 feet to approximately 150 feet). The model assumes the **PMP** pond remained high long enough for steady-state seepage conditions to apply. Stability model outputs with the **PMP** conditions are provided in Attachment U, where it can be observed that the 4-foot pond bounce has a relatively small effect on the phreatic surface within the dam and hence a small effect on slope stability. The computed factors of safety for ESSA and USSAyield strength parameters for Lift 8 PMP conditions are listed in Table 7-8. Again, where appropriate, the ESSA results relate to global failures, with localized buttress-slough failures reported as notes. All factors of safety exceed the minimum factors of safety required by the DNR.









(1) Buttress-slough  $FS = 2.27$  (3) Buttress-slough  $FS = 2.34$ (2) Buttress-slough  $FS = 2.26$  (4) Buttress-slough  $FS = 2.38$ 

For Cross-Section F, the critical failure surface for the PMP ESSA condition is a wedge failure resulting in a slip surface running along the interface of till and impenetrable fractured bedrock. The USSAyield wedge failure resulted in a slip surface along the interface of the peat and impenetrable till.

For Cross-Section G the critical failure surface is identified by a circular failure for ESSA that enters in the existing coarse tailings dam just above the buttress and exits through the virgin peat. For the USSA<sub>yield</sub> conditions, the critical failure surface is identified by the wedge failure resulting in a slip surface running along the interface of peat and impenetrable till.

For Cross-Section N, the critical failure surface for Lift 8 under PMP conditions having the lowest FOS is the wedge failure for both USSA<sub>yield</sub> and ESSA conditions where the failure surfaces entered through Lift 8 and exited at the toe of the existing dam through the blanket buttress.

# **7.3.4 Static Liquefaction Triggering Results**

Static liquefaction triggering was evaluated for Cross-Section F using SLOPE/W, as described in Section 6.4.2. Spreadsheets and modeling outputs are provided in Attachment P. Using the results of the USSAyield stability analyses, the critical slip surface was analyzed for static liquefaction triggering for five loading scenarios specified in the work plan (Large Table 2). Results are presented in Table 7-9. Results of the sixth liquefaction triggering case specified in the Work Plan, long-term conditions, are presented in Section 7.3.7.

Liquefaction was triggered for portions of the critical failure surface in only one of the five credible scenarios; the case of fast construction of Lift 1 (Rapid Load). Following the procedure described in Section 6.4.2, the slices where liquefaction was triggered were reassigned liquefied shear strengths and the same critical failure surface was re-analyzed. The post-loading FOS value is reported as the FOS<sub>overall</sub> for the Rapid Load scenario in Table 7-9.

The FOS<sub>triggering</sub> represents the average of values computed for slices with the base in saturated, contractive (i.e., liquefaction susceptible) tailings. The  $FOS<sub>overall</sub>$  relates to  $USSA<sub>yield</sub>$  slope





stability (which requires a minimum FOS of 1.3) for all cases (because no liquefaction was triggered) other than the Rapid Load case. The resulting factors of safety for the liquefaction triggering scenarios are all above the required minimum post-liquefaction value of 1.1.

#### **Table 7-9 Results of Liquefaction Triggering Analyses**



 $^{(1)}$  Simplified analysis approach used in Geotechnical Data Package – Vol. 1 – Ver. 8; detailed analysis approach yields FOS>1.10.

# **7.3.4.1 Baseline Case**

The Baseline triggering analysis was based on a single model, as noted in Large Table 2, because no immediate change in conditions was being analyzed. Rather, this allowed a review of each slice to evaluate whether the yield shear strength would be exceeded. Liquefaction was not triggered in any slice in the Baseline model.

#### 7 **.3.4.2 Rapid Load**

The Rapid Load case assumes that Lift I is constructed so rapidly that excess porewater pressures are generated causing a decrease in effective stress, which could trigger static liquefaction. The strength profile along the FSFS was locked-in based on the pre-construction model. The Lift I dam was then added in one instantaneous time step, which resulted in liquefaction being triggered in slices along the FSFS. The post-liquefaction FOS<sub>overall</sub> FOS value is below the average FOS<sub>triggering</sub> value, which is computed based only on the slices with bases in saturated Flotation Tailings or LTVSMC fine tailings and slimes. As shown in Table 7-9, both the FOS<sub>overall</sub> and the average FOS<sub>triggering</sub> factors of safety are above the target safety factor of 1.1 for liquefied conditions.

#### 7 **.3.4.3 Erosion**

The Erosion case assumes that a portion (76 cubic yards) of the LTVSMC coarse tailings and proposed compacted LTVSMC bulk tailings above the proposed buttress erodes. In prior





versions of this data package, previously completed and reported triggering analysis for rapid erosion of the LTVSMC coarse tailings have yielded FOSoverall of nearly 2.0 (well above a target minimum FOSoverall of 1.1 for triggering analyses). Triggering of liquefaction by erosion would likely be very time-dependent, with triggering more likely to be caused by a rapid erosion event. Rather than assuming erosion rates and because some erosion has a reasonable probability of occurring, the fully liquefied case (representing the worst-case scenario) was assumed for this iteration of the erosion case for a more conservative analysis. In accordance with other fully liquefied analyses (as described in Section 7.3.6), the liquefiable materials (saturated LTVSMC fine tailings and slimes and NorthMet flotation tailings, as well as those contractive materials in the capillary zone) were assumed to liquefy and were assigned the post-liquefaction shear strength ( $>USSR<sub>liq</sub>$ ) for the erosion case. Because this represents a more conservative analysis than the triggering analysis approach, the post-liquefaction FOS for this case was analyzed and was taken to be acceptable if the resulting value remained above 1.05. The analysis of local erosion resulted in a FOS of 1.07 as shown in Table 7-9. Although dam erosion, if it occurs during operations, would be routinely and proactively be repaired per the Flotation Tailings Management Plan (Reference (1), this modeling indicates that a sizeable erosion event could occur while assuming full liquefaction, and the design still maintains a FOS of nearly 1.1.

# 7 **.3.4.4 Plugged Drain, Lift 1**

The Plugged Drain at Lift I case assumes that after Lift I is filled, finer particles plug the underdrain layer and the underdrain becomes ineffective over time. The plugged underdrain was modeled with the same permeability as the lowest permeability Flotation Tailings  $(6.56 \times 10^{-7})$ ft/sec or  $2.00 \times 10^{-5}$  cm/sec) and the phreatic surface was then computed. The phreatic surface was not greatly changed by plugging of the drain, as the pond is much closer to the Lift I and LTVSMC dams, allowing for seepage to flow above the plugged drain into the LTVSMC bulk tailings and then into the underlying coarse tailings. Liquefaction was not triggered in any slice in the Plugged Drain, Lift 1 model and factors of safety for both the  $FOS<sub>overall</sub>$  and the average FOStriggering were above the target safety factor of 1.1 for liquefied conditions (Table 7-9).

# 7 **.3.4.5 Plugged Drain, Lift 8**

The Plugged Drain at Lift 8 case assumes that finer particles plug the underdrain layer and it becomes ineffective over time. The plugged underdrain was modeled with the same permeability as the lowest permeability Flotation Tailings (6.56 x  $10^{-7}$  ft/sec or 2.00 x  $10^{-5}$  cm/sec) and the phreatic surface was then computed. A small increase in the phreatic surface was only noted close to the underdrain, which therefore did not have a significant impact on the slope stability and the results were identical to the Baseline case. As stratigraphy was updated based on CPTu data from the 2014 CPT investigation, a layer of coarse tailings approximately 5 feet thick was determined to be located underneath the proposed underdrain layer, which was not modeled in versions prior to this submittal. Therefore, plugging the underdrain layer had only a small impact on the phreatic surface as the existing coarse tailings layer beneath the drain continued to provide a route for porewater pressures to dissipate, helping to pull flow down and then out through the LTVSMC coarse tailings shell.





Liquefaction was not triggered in any slice in the Plugged Drain, Lift 8 model. As shown in Table 7-9, both the FOS<sub>overall</sub> and the average FOS<sub>triggering</sub> values are above the target safety factor of 1.1 for liquefied conditions.

# **7.3.5 Seismic Liquefaction Triggering Results**

Results of the seismic liquefaction screening evaluations for Cross-Sections F, G, and N (Section 6.4.3.3) indicate that seismic triggering will not occur (Attachment **R).** As the seismic design event (2,475-year return period) would not trigger liquefaction in any FTB materials, per the Work Plan (Attachment A), no additional seismic triggering analyses were necessary.

Calculations were also performed to determine the potential for seismic deformation. Swaisgood performed an extensive review of case studies of embankment dam behavior during seismic events to assess if there is a trend of seismic deformation that can be used for predictive purposes (Reference (51)). Swaisgood determined relationships between the estimated percent of crest settlement (based on the total dam height), the PGA experienced, and the earthquake magnitude (Figure 2 of Reference (51)). The relationships presented on this figure range from 0.01% to 12% crest settlement, with these deformations for seismic events with  $M_w = 5$  to 9 and  $a_{max} =$ O. lg to lg. The smallest event is approximately an order of magnitude larger than the Project's design event. Using the design event parameters and the stated relationship, a crest settlement of 0.01 % or 0.024 feet is computed. This amount of settlement is considered minimal and will not affect the stability or pond containment capability of the dam.

# **7.3.6 Fully Liquefied Worst-Case Results**

The fully liquefied worst-case represents conditions at the end of operations with normal pool, when the pond bottom has not yet received bentonite amendment, the spigots are still discharging to the beaches, and the Flotation Tailings have not aged ( combined effects of weathering and secondary compression), under the assumption that all saturated contractive (i.e., liquefaction susceptible) materials are reduced to their liquefied strength values. This is a hypothetical case where an unknown trigger occurs. This configuration generates the steady-state phreatic surface under normal pool conditions with the lowest USSR<sub>liq</sub> values.

No buttress-slough failures were identified as the critical failure surface; only global failures were reported in the modeling and provided in Table 7-10 for Cross-Sections F, G, and N. Contours of the failure surfaces were analyzed to verify that no additional critical slip surfaces exist for the model and the safety map was reviewed to verify that similar FOS<sub>overall</sub> values do not apply to other slip surfaces (such as a smaller surface that exits or enters through the mid-slope setback). The SLOPE/W outputs for these analyses are provided in Attachment U.









Published required factors of safety for flow liquefaction generally range from 1.0 to 1.1 as recommended by the Natural Resources Conservation Service (as cited in Reference (52)) for seismic loading conditions, as well as the United States Department of Agriculture (Reference (53). The Federal Emergency Management Agency (Reference (54)), the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (as cited in Reference (52)), and the Federal Register and D' Appolonia Consulting Engineers (as cited in Reference (55)) suggest that the FOS for liquefied cases be above 1.0. The Work Plan (Attachment A) requires a  $FOS \ge 1.1$  for this worstcase scenario. All slope stability FOS results for the flow liquefaction worst-case model are equal to or greater than 1. 1.

The fully liquefied baseline case ( end of operations Mine Year 20) results in a model with  $FOS<sub>overall</sub> = 1.10$  for Cross-Sections F. This is the lowest  $FOS<sub>overall</sub>$  computed in all stability analyses. Achieving a  $FOS<sub>overall</sub> \ge 1.1$  for the Cross-Section F fully liquefied Baseline case requires a buttress at the toe of the basin. As discussed in Section 6.3.2, the buttress has an ultimate crest elevation of 1574 feet. The long-term analyses of fully liquefied Cross-Section F scenarios (Section 7.3.7.2) show that the FOS will increase over time during reclamation and postclosure maintenance.

For Section G, the critical circular failure surface resulted in a FOS along a slip surface that enters through lift 8 and exits through the mid-slope set-back. The critical wedge failure surface occurred along the interface of the LTVSMC fine tailings/slimes and impenetrable peat. Achieving a FOS<sub>overall</sub>  $\geq 1.1$  for Cross-Section G requires a buttress at the toe of the basin. The required buttress dimensions are discussed in Section 6.3.2.2. The geometry of these features may be optimized during final design.

Section N fully liquefied conditions resulted in an acceptable FOS value for the circular and wedge failure with a slip surface that enters through the bench of Lift 6 and exits through the blanket buttress. Achieving a  $FOS_{overall} \geq 1.1$  for Cross-Section N requires a blanket buttress at the toe of the basin. The required buttress dimensions are presented in Table 7-1.

Poly Met, through the course of future operations monitoring and geotechnical instrumentation installation and material testing, will routinely be reviewing and potentially refining geotechnical modeling parameters. PolyMet is committed to the Observational Approach for basin





development. Therefore, incremental changes in dam and buttress design may be implemented throughout the operation of the FTB. .

# 7 **.3.** 7 **Postclosure Stability Results**

The FTB is designed to provide storage for Flotation Tailings produced during a 20-year operating period. After the FTB has been filled to its maximum height and all 8 lifts constructed, the dam will be prepared for reclamation by amending the 625-foot beach of Flotation Tailings and the bottom of the pond with bentonite. The postclosure FTB will be effectively covered with a bentonite-amended surface on the exterior face of the dam lifts, the Flotation Tailings beach, and the pond bottom to limit seepage into the FTB.

# **7.3.7.1 Drained Conditions (ESSA) Long-Term Scenarios**

The slope stability of the postclosure FTB was analyzed along Cross-Section F for drained conditions (ESSA) at 20, 200, and 2,000 years beyond end-of-operations to evaluate the change ifFOS after closure. The FOS results of the stability models for FTB postclosure conditions at 20, 200, and 2,000 years are provided in Table 7-11. The postclosure slope stability safety factors are well above the target value, as dewatering and strength gain (assumed to occur due to secondary compression) increases stability after operations end. Again, where appropriate, the ESSA conditions relate to global failures, with localized buttress-slough failures reported as notes. All critical failure surfaces meet the minimum factors of safety required by the DNR. The Slope/W outputs for these analyses are provided in Attachment U. FOS increases can be expected at the other cross-sections analyzed as well; they are subject to the same mechanisms that produce strength gains at Cross-Section F.

#### **Table 7-11 Modeled Factors of Safety for Postclosure Conditions (Cross-Section F)**



(1) Buttress-slough FS = 2.33

 $(2)$  Buttress-slough FS = 2.37

 $(3)$  Buttress-slough FS = 2.34 (4) Buttress-slough FS = 2.39

It should be noted that, in addition to the difficulty in estimating weathering and material strength for long-term analysis, modeling complications also arise when attempting to estimate conditions many years after operations. Seepage conditions must be modeled over very large time steps. Estimation of long-term conditions should therefore be viewed as an assessment of





potential conditions based on currently available information. Monitoring and testing will be used throughout operations to continue to update long-term analyses and the closure design will be confirmed at the end of operations.

# 7.3.7.2 Fully Liquefied (USSA<sub>lig</sub>) Long-Term Scenarios

Because Cross-Section F is the critical section based on the critical design case (fully liquefied), it is expected that this analysis would yield the lowest factors of safety for fully liquefied longterm, post-closure conditions. The long-term fully liquefied analysis evaluated conditions at 20, 200, and 2,000 years after the end of operations. The fully liquefied condition was selected to analyze the long-term scenarios as it best represents an unknown triggering event. The results of the fully liquefied long-term scenarios are summarized in Table 7-12. The SLOPE/W outputs for these analyses are provided in Attachment U.

#### **Table 7-12 Modeled Factors of Safety for Fully Liquefied Long-Term Conditions (Cross-Section** F)



The long-term models indicate that fully liquefied FOS will continue to increase over time. The estimated aggregate effects of dewatering, weathering, and secondary compression result in a decrease in material susceptibility to liquefaction, as well as an increase in liquefied strengths and effective stress in material that remains susceptible to liquefaction; thereby increasing slope stability. FOS increases can be expected at the other cross-sections analyzed as well; they are subject to the same mechanisms that produce strength gains at Cross-Section F.

# 7 **.3.8 Sensitivity Analysis Results**

# **7.3.8.1 Analysis 1 -Yield Strength Sensitivity Analysis Results**

Analysis 1 assessed how statistical variations in the yield undrained shear strengths (USSRyieid) affect the FOS under normal operating conditions. Probabilistic material strength parameters were assigned to the LTVSMC fine tailings/slimes, NorthMet flotation tailings, and peat for this analysis.





Using the yield shear strength probability distribution assigned to key materials, the sensitivity analysis (performed as described in Section 6.6) yielded a cumulative distribution function for the FOS (Figure 7 of Attachment S). The cumulative distribution function indicates that there is a 0% probability that the FOS will be less than 1.0. There is also a 0% probability that the FOS will be below 1.3, which is the minimum FOS value for USSA models using yield undrained strengths.

The sensitivity analysis included an analysis that sequentially varied the values of one material shear strength while holding the others at their DV. The results of this analysis are shown in Figure 8 of Attachment S, and illustrate that the calculated FOS is most sensitive to variations in the USSRyield value for the compressed peat.

# **7.3.8.2 Analysis 2** - **Liquefied Strength Sensitivity Analysis Results**

Analysis 2 assessed how statistical variations in the liquefied shear strength (USS $R_{liq}$ ) affect the post-liquefaction FOS for an unknown triggering event. Probabilistic material strength parameters were assigned to the LTVSMC fine tailings/slimes and NorthMet flotation tailings for this analysis.

Using the liquefied shear strength probability distribution applied to key materials, the sensitivity analysis (performed as described in Section 6.6) yielded a cumulative distribution function for the post-liquefaction FOS. The cumulative distribution function (Figure 9 of Attachment S) indicates that there is about a 1.94% probability that the post-liquefaction FOS value will be less than 1.0 in the unlikely event that liquefaction is triggered by an unknown event.

The sensitivity analysis included an analysis that sequentially varied the values of one material shear strength while holding the other at its design value. The results of this analysis are shown in Figure 10 of Attachment S, and illustrate that the calculated FOS is most sensitive to variations in the USSR<sub>liq</sub> value for the LTVSMC fine tailings/slimes.

It is important to understand that the probability ( or likelihood) associated with a computed post-liquefaction FOS being less than 1.0 is not the same as the probability of failure of the FTB. The probability of failure of the FTB involves a series of events, each with an associated probability ( or likelihood) of occurrence. In this case, the series of events involves an unknown event triggering liquefaction followed by a post-liquefaction FOS falling below one. As discussed previously, the combined probability of an unknown triggering event occurring and the FOS being less than 1.0 is very low. The probability (or likelihood) of failure of the FTB (for this case) can be estimated as the product of the likelihood of occurrence of each event (unknown trigger and post-liquefaction FOS<1.0), keeping in mind that an unknown triggering event is no more likely to occur than the known triggering events described and modeled in previous sections of this report. The results of the known triggering events show that the dams are stable under those conditions and that a fully liquefied failure does not occur. Additionally, Section 7.3.7 indicates that the strengths of the fine tailings and slimes will increase over time as a result of several mechanisms, thereby decreasing the





likelihood of an unknown triggering event causing liquefaction and increasing the postliquefaction FOS. Therefore, the probability that the FOS value will be less than 1.0 as a result of an unknown triggering event will decrease over time.



## **8.0 Summary of Stability Modeling Results**

The stability modeling determined that the design meets required factors of safety for all expected conditions:

- Existing condition (before the FTB is constructed)
- Interim conditions (while the FTB is under construction), with normal operating conditions
- Maximum height, with normal operating conditions
- Maximum height, with normal postclosure conditions

The modeling then determined that the design meets required factors of safety for a series of possible but increasingly less likely conditions:

- Maximum height, with a plugged drain, a rapid load, or erosion
- Maximum height, with an unknown triggering event causing all contractive materials to liquefy
- Maximum height, with a seismic event

To assess how these results might be affected by uncertainty and variability in the soil strength values, a sensitivity analysis was conducted. Sensitivity analysis results show the following:

- Cumulative probability that the FOS is less than the required value when the dam is at maximum height, with normal operating conditions, is 0%.
- Cumulative probability that the FOS is less than the required value when the dam is at maximum height, with an unknown triggering event causing all contractive materials to liquefy, is less than 5%.
- The probability of dam failure is unknown, because the likelihood of an unknown triggering event occurring is, by definition, unknown, however it would likely be many orders of magnitude smaller than the probability that the factory of safety is less than the required value.

A summary of slope stability safety factors computed for each component of the stability analysis, as required by the Work Plan, is provided in Table 8-1. The lowest FOS for each case is presented, whether determined by the circular method or wedge method. The design of the FTB is based on the slope stability results meeting or exceeding factors of safety of 1.5 for drained  $(ESSA)$  conditions, 1.3 for undrained  $(USSA_{yield})$  conditions, and 1.1 for liquefied  $(USSA_{liq})$ conditions.





# **Table 8-1 Summary of Stability Modeling Results**













## **9.0 Operation and Maintenance Requirements**

Information on FTB management and facility inspection and maintenance required to maintain specified slope stability safety factors, consistent with industry practice, is presented in Reference (1).

The average angle of the existing Tailings Basin slopes is approximately 14 degrees (4H:1V), though isolated areas of the slopes do contain small, localized areas with steeper slope angles up to 25 degrees. It is recommended that routine maintenance be performed to maintain typical slope angles in the LTVSMC dams at 14 degrees. The LTSMC Tailings Basin is already in place, which represents a large portion of the FTB, and similar to other existing tailings basins, there is no practicable approach to tailings basin modification that would allow this existing basin to be left unmonitored or unmaintained forever. However, the proposed addition of the rock buttress will reduce maintenance requirements on the north side of Cell 2E.

During construction, the LTVSMC coarse tailings will be placed and compacted for each lift, and will be amended with bentonite. These lifts will also be regularly inspected and maintained to control erosion. Individual lift slopes for the FTB are proposed at 4.5H: 1V (12.5 degrees). The average overall angle of the proposed FTB dams is approximately 6.6 degrees (8.6H:1V) and routine maintenance will be performed to maintain these slopes.

Prior the initiation of the Project, a comprehensive review of existing conditions will be conducted to identify any areas recommended for slope angle modification. Slope angle modification, if required, will be accomplished by adding material to the slope toe and/or cutting back the slope crest. Location-specific conditions will determine the most appropriate slope angle modification approach if modifications are required. The Contingency Action Plan for the Flotation Tailings Basin (Attachment F of Reference (1)) outlines mitigations for over-steepened side slopes.

The Contingency Action Plan (CAP) further includes other visual warning signs, including expected instrumentation indicators, as well as potential or actual consequences, planned notification procedures, and required actions. The CAP defines several adverse conditions and events that may lead to dam instability (i.e., static liquefaction triggering and seismic liquefaction triggering).

As the dams are constructed and operation of the basin begins, monitoring data and additional testing will become available allowing for periodic updates of the models in accordance with the observational approach. This observational approach to performance monitoring and analysis update is standard for large earthen structures that are developed incrementally over long periods of time. Additional geotechnical investigations will routinely be performed during operations. These investigations will include testing of the LTVSMC tailings and Flotation Tailings.

The observational approach requires planning for potential mitigation in case future data show that design assumptions were violated. Where model updates show that adjustments to the design are needed to maintain desired slope stability safety factors, approaches typically used for





modifying stability of dams are applicable to the FTB and will be utilized (as described in Section 6.3.2). These include but are not limited to: modification of bench widths between lifts of dam, modification of lift offsets, modification of lift heights, and modification of slope angles. Other modifications could include additional measures like buttresses, underdrains, mid-slope setbacks, and modification of materials used for dam construction to achieve higher strengths.





# **10.0 Future Analysis**

Because of the potential stability issues associated with liquefaction of upstream tailings dams, it was deemed prudent at this time to retain the buttress and mid-slope setback in the design of Cross-Section F and Cross-Section G, each serving to increase long-term stability of the FTB. Future analyses of all cross-sections may be used to evaluate how the buttress geometry could be optimized while still maintaining a triggering-analysis  $FOS_{Flow} > 1.1$ .

The locations for future investigations will particularly focus in areas where re-saturation is associated with Flotation Tailings deposition and where testing has been performed in the past to allow for comparison of past conditions to conditions at the time of future testing. Future investigations will also aim to target materials identified by the sensitivity analysis (i.e., LTVSMC Fine Tailings/Slimes, Flotation Tailings, and Peat) and evaluate the strength of the bentonite-amended material. Additionally, further work will be done to verify the properties of the LTVSMC Bulk Tailings and the buttress material as they are obtained prior to construction. The investigations may include a combination of the following:

- SPT drilling
- CPTu
- Rapid CPTu (with an advancement rate over 170 mm/s)
- Dissipation testing
- **DMT**
- Field vane shear testing
- Laboratory testing, including index properties, permeability, and strength testing

Data gathering will occur in conjunction with installation of new monitoring equipment (i.e., inclinometers, piezometers) and at other times as may be recommended by the basin engineers. The data gathered will be compiled with the existing information and the updated data will be used to re-analyze the design sections. When appropriate, the design may be optimized using the updated data, provided that the FOS remains above the minimum values set forth in Section 6.1.





# **Revision History**





#### **References**

1. **Poly Met Mining, Inc.** NorthMet Project Flotation Tailings Management Plan (v7). May 2017.

2. **Chandler, Val W.** Minnesota at a Glance - Earthquakes in Minnesota. s.l. : Minnesota Geological Survey, 1994.

3. **Poly Met Mining Inc.** North Met Project Water Modeling Data Package Volume 2 - Plant Site (vll). March 2015.

4. **Ebasco Services Inc.** Erie Mining Company Tailing Dam Investigation and Analysis Engineering Report. 1977.

5. -. Erie Mining Company Tailing Dam Investigations and Analysis Engineering Report, Supplement No. 1. 1978.

6. **Katsoulis, M.** Hydromechanical Adequacy of the Erie Tailings Dams with Post-Operational Permanent Pools. 1986.

7. **Barr Engineering Co.** Response to Dam Stability Issues. 1994.

8. **Sitka Corporation.** Geotechnical Assessment of Tailings lmpoundment Phase I. 1995.

9. - Phase II Geotechnical Assessment of Tailings Impoundment. 1995.

10. - Phase 3 Geotechnical Assessment of Tailings Basin [for LTV Steel Mining Company]. February 1997.

11. **Barr Engineering Co.** LTVSMC Tailings Dam Field Exploration and Analyses. 2000.

12. **Boulanger, R.M. and I.M. Idriss.** Evaluating the potential for liquefaction or cyclic failure of silts and clays. s.l. : University of California - Davis, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Center for Geotechnical Modeling, 2004. Vols. Report no. UCD/CGM-04/01.

13. **Robertson, P.K. and R.G. Campanella.** Interpretation of Cone Penentration Tests - Part I: Sand, and Part II: Clay. Canadian Geotechnical Journal. 1983, Vol. 20, 4, pp. 718-733, 734-745.

14. Evaluation of CPT Response under Fast Penetration Rate in Silty Soils. **Contreras, I. and A.T. Grosser.**  Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 2009. 57th Annual Geotechnical Engineering Conference. pp. 107-120.

15. Use of Piezometer Cone Data. **Robertson, P.K., R.G. Campanella, D. Gillespie, J. Greig.** [ed.] S P Clemence. Blacksburg : ASCE, 1986. Specialty Conference: Use of In Situ Tests in Geotechnical Engineering. pp. 1263-1280. Geotechnical Special Publication No. 6.





16. Strength Ratio Approach for Liquefaction Analysis of Tailings Dams. **Olson, Scott M.** [ed.] J. F. & K. H. Kwong Labuz. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 2009. Proceedings of the UMN 57th Annual Geotechnical Engineering Conference. pp. 37-46.

17. **Lunne, T, P.K. Robertson, J.J.M. Powell.** Cone Penetration Testing in Geotechnical Practice. New York: Routledge, 1997.

18. **Das, Braja M.** Principles of Geotechnical Engineering. 5 [Text book]. Pacific Grove, California : Brooks/Cole, 2002.

19. **Sitka Corporation.** Data Report for 1996 Tailings Dam Investigations. 1996.

20. **SRK Consulting.** RS54/RS46 Waste Water Modeling - Tailings - NorthMet Project - DRAFT. 2007.

21. **Barr Engineering Co.** Hydrogeology of Fractured Bedrock in the Vicinity of the North Met Project. December 2014.

22. **Olson, Scott M and Timothy D Stark.** Yield Strength Ratio and Liquefaction Analysis of Slopes and Embankments. August 2003, Vol. 129, 8, pp. 727-737.

23. **Das, Braja M.** Fundamentals of Geotechnical Engineering. Pacific Grove : Brooks/Cole, 1999.

24. **Terzaghi, Karl, Robert Peck and G. Mesri.** Soil Mechanics in Engineering Practice. New York : John Wiley & Sons, 1996.

25. **Ajlouni, M.A.** Geotechnical Properties of Peat and Related Engineering Problems - PhD Thesis. s.l. : University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2000.

26. **United States Bureau of Reclamation.** Procedure for Constant Head Hydraulic Conductivity Tests in Single Drill Holes. USBR 7310-89. 1989.

27. **Ishibashi, I and Zhang, X.** Unified dynamic shear moduli and damping ratios of sand and clay. Soils. Found. 1993, 33, pp. 182-191.

28. **GEO-SLOPE International Ltd.** Seepage Modeling with SEEP/W 2007, An Engineering Methodology. 4th 2010.

29. Empirical Methods in Liquefaction Evaluation. **Castro, Gonzalo.** Mexico City: Primer Cicio de Conferencias lnternacionales, November 1995.

30. **GEO-SLOPE, International Ltd.** Stability Modeling with SLOPE/W: An Engineering Methodology. Calgary, Alberta, Canada : s.n., May 2014.

31. **Tan, Ding.** Thesis paper: Seismic slope safety - determination of critical slip surface using acceptability criteria. s.l. : Imperial College - University of London, November 2006.



32. **Poly Met Mining Inc.** North Met Project Water Management Plan - Plant (v6). May 2017.

33. **Chalermyanont, Tanit and Surapon Arrykul.** Compacted Sand-Bentonite Mixtures for Hydraulic Conductivity Liners. 2005, Vol. 27, 2.

34. **Chen, Vueru.** An Experimental Investigation of the Behavior of Compacted Clay/Sand - Master's Thesis. Newark, DE : University of Delaware, 2010.

35. **Gueddouda, M. K., Md. Lamara, Nabil Aboubaker, Said Taibi.** Hydraulic Conductivity and Shear Strength of Dune Sand-Bentonite Mixtures. 2008, Vol. 13, H.

36. **Ada, Mahir.** Performance Assessment of Compacted Bentonite/Sand Mixtures Utilized as Isolation Material in Underground Waste Disposal Respositories. July 2007.

37. **Sasitharan, Sand al., et.** Collapse Behavior of Sand. Canadian Geotechnical Journal. 1993, Vol. 30, pp. 569-577.

38. **Olson, Scott Mand Timothy D Stark.** Use of Laboratory Data to Confirm Yield and Liquefaction Strength Ratio Concepts. Canadian Geotechnical Journal. November 2003, Vol. 40, pp. 1164-1184.

39. **Youd, T. IM Idriss, RD Andrus, I Arango, Gonzalo Castro, JT Christian, R Dobry, WD Liam Finn, LF Harder, Jr., ME Hynes, Klshihara, JP Koester, SSC Liao, WF Marcusen Ill, GR Martin, JK Mitchell, V Moriwaki, MS Power, PK Robertson, RB Seed, and KH Stokoe** II. Liquefaction Resistance of Soils: Summary Report from 1996 NCEER and 1998 NCEER/NSF Worskhops on Evaluation of Liquefaction Resistance of Soils. Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering. October 2001, Vol. 127, 10, pp. 817-833.

40. **United States Geological Survey.** Hazard Mapping Images Data, 2008 Hazard Map (PGA, 2% in 50 years). Earthquake Hazards Program. [Online] 2012. http:/ /earthquake.usgs.gov/hazards/products/graphic2pct50.pdf.

41. **Malhotra, Praveen K.** Earthquake-Induced Ground Motions. ASCE Course Notes. Minneapolis: American Society of Civil Engineers, 2011.

42. **Seed, H.B. and I.M. Idriss.** Ground Motions and Soil Liquefaction Durign Earthquakes. Oakland : Earthquake Engineering Research Institute, 1982.

43. Reliability and Statistics in Geotechnical Engineering. **Baecher, G. B. and Christian, J. T.** West Sussex, England : John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, 2003. ISBN 0-471-49833-5.

44. Factors of Safety and Reliability in Geotechnical Engineering. **Duncan, J. M.** 4, s.l. : ASCE Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering, 2000, Vol. 126.





45. **U.S. Department of Labor: Mine Safety and Health Administration.** Engineering and Design Manual Coal Refuse Disposal Facilities. s.l. : D'Appolonia Engineering, May 2009.

46. Probabilistic slope stability analysis for practice. **EI-Ramly, H., Morgenstern, N. R. and Cruden, D. M.**  s.l. : Canadian Geotechnical Journal, 2002, Vol. 39.

47. **The British Dam Society; Henry Hewlett.** Long-term Benefits and Performance of Dams. Great Britain : MPG Books, 2004. 0727732684.

48. The Status fo Methods for Estimation of the Probabiltiy of Failure of Dams for Use in Quantitative Risk Assessment. **Fell, R., et al.** Beijing, China : International Commission on Large Dams, 20th Congress, 2000. Q76-R.

49. Fourth Law of Soil Mechanics: The Law of Compressibility. **Mesri, G.** Mexico City: s.n., 1987. Proceedings of the International Symposiumon Geotechnical Engineering of Soft Soils. Vol. 2, pp. 179- 187.

50. **EBASCO.** LTV Steel 2-E Tailing Basin: Site Investigation and Stability Analysis. Hoyt Lake, Minnesota: s.n., June, 1990.

51. Embankment Dam Deformation Caused by Earthquakes. **Swaisgood, J.R.** Christchurch, New Zealand : s.n., 2003. 2003 Pacific Conference on Earthquake Engineering. Vol. Paper 014.

52. **United States Society on Dams.** Strength of Materials for Embankment Dams. February 2007.

53. **United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service Engineering Division.** Earth Dams and Reservoirs: Technical Release 60. October 1990.

54. **Federal Emergency Management Agency.** Federal Guidelines for Dam Safety - Earthquake Analyses and Design of Dams. s.l. : FEMA, 2005.

55. **Huang, V.H.** Stability Analysis of Earth Slopes. [Text Book]. New York, New York : Van Nostrand Reinhold Company, 1983.





# **List of Tables**









# **List of Figures**



# **List of Large Tables**







# **List of Large Figures**







# **List of Attachments**



**Large Tables** 



# Large Table 1 Summary of Seepage and Stability Modeling Parameters



(1) Permeability of the peat below the dam was altered for anisotropy, applying a ratio of ky/kx = 0.067.

(2) Drained strength of the peat was included as a shear/normal function, as detailed in Attachment C, with  $\phi' \approx$  27 degrees.

(3) Permeability of the Flotation Tailings was varied based on effective overburden pressure, as detailed in Section 5.3.2.

# Large Table 2 Static Liquefaction Triggering Scenarios



**Large Figures**


Large Figure 1. LTVSMC Tailings Grain Size Classifications (Ebasco, 1978)

P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369862\WorkFiles\Geotechnical lnvestigations\2009 analysis\ebasco tailings classifications



**Large Figure 2. Summary of Dissipation Testing Results 2007 NorthMet Geotechnical Investigation** 

P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369862\WorkFiles\Geotechnical lnvestigations\2011 data & analysis\basin properties\Dissipation Testing t50.xlsx



Large Figure 3. NorthMet Bulk Tailings 2005 Permeability Test Results

P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369862\WorkFiles\Geotechnical Investigations\2008 analysis\PolyMet tailings\PolyMet Permeability vs Eff Confining Pres.xls

0253946



**Large Figure 4. LTVSMC Slimes 2007 Permeability Test Results (Dissipation test kh based on Figure 5.42 in Lunne, Robertson, and Powell)** 

P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369862\WorkFiles\Geotechnical Investigations\2011 data & analysis\basin properties\LTV tailing permeabilities.xlsx



**Large Figure 5. Filtration Criteria for NorthMet Bulk Flotation Tailings** 

P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369862\WorkFiles\Geotechnical lnvestigations\2009 analysis\bulk tailings - filter criteria.xis

## **GRAIN SIZE DISTRIBUTION**



## **Figure 12. Rock Starter Dam Gradation**

如此类型

0253949



# Large Figure 7. Shear Modulus Functions<br>NorthMet Flotation Tailings Basin Design

P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369862\WorkFiles\022A GeoStudio models\2011 re-analysis\Section F\FINAL\SEEP-QUAKE curves.xlsx



**Large Figure 8. Volumetric Water Content Functions for Seepage Modeling** 

P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369862\WorkFiles\022A GeoStudio models\2014\Version 5 modeling design values.xlsx 5/15/2017



Large Figure 9. Permeability Functions for Seepage Modeling

P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369862\WorkFiles\022A GeoStudio models\2014\Version 5 modeling design values.xlsx

0253952

5/15/2017



## **Large Figure 10. Cross-Section F with Finite Element Mesh** - **Proposed Conditions Lift 8 (GeoStudio)**



**Large Figure 11. Cross-Section F Schematic of ESSA Conditions** 



Large Figure 12. Cross-Section F Schematic of USSA Conditions

\* Only saturated material beneath the phreatic surface and 10-foot capillary zone will liquefy. Material above the phreatic surface and capillary zone was modeled with drained strengths.



**Large Figure 13. Cross-Section F Schematic of Liquefied Conditions** 



## **Large Figure 14. Cross-Section F Proposed FTB Design Mine Year 20**



## Large Figure 15 Sounding 07-06 Triggering Potential

P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369862\WorkFiles\WO 022A Tailings Basin Permitting\2013 v4 Data Package Vol 1\Att C- Material Strength Characterization\Att C-V4\_CPT\Section F\CPT\_07-06.xlsm



## **Large Figure 16. Cross-Section G Proposed FTB Design Mine Year 20**



## **Large Figure 17. Cross-Section N Proposed FTB Design Mine Year 20**



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369862\WorkFiles\Geotechnical Investigations\Monitoring Data\Polymet Piezometer Data.xlsx



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369862\WorkFiles\022A GeoStudio models\2014\Section G\Version 5\Section G Piezometer Data.xlsx

#### **Attachments**

**Attachment A** 

**DNR Geotechnical Work Plan** 

Version 3 4/11/2013

This document is the Work Plan for geotechnical modeling of the NorthMet Project as requested by the Geotechnical Stability Impact Assessment Planning Summary Memo, NorthMet Project EIS, dated May 18, 2011. The findings from the geotechnical modeling will be incorporated into a 3-Volume Geotechnical Data Package - and summarized and referenced as needed. NorthMet Project Geotechnical Data Package Volumes 1 through 3 will consist of:

- Volume  $1 -$  Flotation Tailings Basin
- Volume 2 Hydrometallurgical Residue Facility
- Volume  $3 -$  Stockpiles

#### **Project:**

The project that will be evaluated is the project described in the Co-lead Agency Draft Alternative Summary as amended 03/04/11. This Work Plan will be reviewed and amended as necessary in response to project changes in the event such changes require substantive changes to previously analyzed facility designs.

#### **Background:**

The NorthMet Project includes two material disposal facilities that include dams, consisting of the Flotation Tailings Basin for final deposition of flotation tailings, and the Hydrometallurgical Residue Facility for final deposition of the hydrometallurgical residue. The Flotation Tailings Basin and Hydrometallurgical Residue Facility are designed using an iterative process whereby facility capacity requirements and geotechnical requirements are utilized to determine the facility geometry and overall sizing requirements to contain the tailings and residue expected to be generated through the life of the project. A third type of material disposal facility, which does not require dams but does entail foundation and slope construction, is the waste rock stockpiles at the Mine Site (a.k.a. Stockpiles).

An important input parameter to the facility designs are the slope stability Factors of Safety. Applicable slope stability Factors of Safety are selected and then the facilities (Flotation Tailings Basin and Hydrometallurgical Residue Facility) are configured to achieve these Factors of Safety as computed by modeling performed during facility design. In the case of Stockpiles, MDNR-mandated design requirements have been developed that result in acceptable Factors of Safety.

The slope stability analysis methods that are used to compute slope stability Factors of Safety are not required universally. In other words, some types of analysis are appropriate to some facility configurations while not applicable to other configurations. For example, undrained strength stability analysis (USSA) for slope stability is appropriate for the upstream construction approach planned for the Flotation Tailings Basin. It is not necessary for the Hydrometallurgical Residue Facility which will utilize downstream construction with a liner system. Within this context the Geotechnical Modeling Work Plans for the Flotation Tailings Basin, Hydrometallurgical Residue Facility, and Stockpiles are outlined below.

Version 3 4/11/2013

#### **Flotation Tailings Basin Geotechnical Model for SDEIS, FEIS and Permitting:**

The objective of the Flotation Tailings Basin Geotechnical Modeling for the SDEIS, FEIS and Permitting is to demonstrate the ability of the Critical Cross-Section (i.e., Cross-Section F; that cross-section anticipated to yield the lowest slope stability Factors of Safety as indicated in the Preliminary Geotechnical Evaluation – March 2009) to comply with the required global slope stability Factors of Safety. The information content of the November 21, 2012 Geotechnical Data Package - Volume 1 - Version 3, Flotation Tailings Basin (which now supersedes and entirely replaces the Preliminary Geotechnical Evaluation – March 2009) will be updated and formatted to accommodate the Co-lead Agency Comments and to incorporate updated slope stability analysis for scenarios derived from the February 25 and 26, 2013 Geotechnical Workshop (February Workshop) with the Co-lead Agency geotechnical team .. This will be Geotechnical Data Package – Volume 1 – Version 4, Flotation Tailings Basin. The following is a step-by-step summary of the planned Flotation Tailings Basin geotechnical modeling process. Descriptions of previously completed process steps, outcomes of which are reported in Geotechnical Data Package – Volume 1 – Version 3, are preserved below to maintain Work Plan continuity. Work Plan updates derived specifically from the February Workshop are noted as such.

The following paragraphs describe the work that will be included in Geotechnical Data Package - Volume 1 - Version 4, Flotation Tailings Basin which is expected to provide information for the SDEIS.

- 1. Gather existing conditions data (i.e. basin topography, stratigraphy, soil and tailings strength and hydraulic characteristics), and other data as needed to support geotechnical modeling and Flotation Tailings Basin design. Note - this data has previously been compiled and presented in the Preliminary Geotechnical Evaluation - March 2009. This information will be incorporated into the Geotechnical Data Package – Volume 1, which will present the analyses outlined in this Work Plan. Results of in-laboratory testing of liquefied shear strength of NorthMet flotation tailings, completed subsequent the March 2009 evaluation, will be incorporated into the work prescribed in this Geotechnical Modeling Work Plan.
- 2. Develop Flotation Tailings Basin slope cross-sections (i.e., geometry and stratigraphy for existing and planned conditions) for the Flotation Tailings Basin for seepage and stability modeling. Models will utilize surveyed cross-sections of the existing basin and proposed cross-sections of future dam raises; existing models will be reconfigured as needed to accommodate the modeling approach outlined in this Work Plan. This information will then be incorporated into the Geotechnical Data Package - Volume 1.
- 3. Develop seepage and stability models of the Flotation Tailings Basin using Geo-Slope International, Inc. modeling software (i.e., SLOPE/W, SEEP/W, SIGMA/Wand QUAKE/Was necessary).
- 4. Using geotechnical data from Step 1, establish design data for use in Effective Stress Stability Analysis and Undrained Strength Stability Analysis. Also utilize established criteria (Olson and Stark - 2003 "Yield Strength Ratio and Liquefaction Analysis of

Version 3 4/11/2013

Slopes and Embankments" as updated by Olson 2009) to determine which materials behave in a contractive manner and could transition from non-liquefied strengths to liquefied (steady state) strengths.

Produce graphical representations of each strength data set and basis for selection of design parameters. Plots should include the number of data used to develop each plot.

- 5. Utilize design data to design slopes to achieve the following:
	- a. Effective Stress Stability Analysis  $(ESSA)$  Factor of Safety  $> 1.5$  for conditions using drained (i.e., effective-stress based) shear strength parameters. Analyze the following effective stress stability scenarios:
		- i. Existing conditions.
		- ii. Normal operating condition at incremental lift heights up to maximum dam height for normal pool elevation with steady-state seepage conditions and including reduced infiltration rates for bentonite amended exterior face of new dams.
	- b. Undrained Strength Stability Analysis (USSA) Factor of Safety  $\geq 1.3$  for conditions using undrained yield shear strengths for materials that are expected to behave in an undrained manner (i.e., end of construction case per dam raise). Analyze the following undrained strength stability scenarios:
		- i. Normal operating condition at incremental lift heights up to maximum dam height for normal pool elevation and including reduced infiltration rates for bentonite amended exterior face of new dams.
		- 11. Veneer stability to evaluate the stability of the bentonite amended exterior face of new dams. Veneer stability will be evaluated by computing the infinite slope Factor of Safety (using the no-seepage formulation where tailings seepage is not emerging on the slope, and the parallel-seepage formulation where tailings seepage is emerging on the slope), with the soil friction angle chosen as a conservative value based on literature review. Laboratory direct shear testing will be performed to measure a friction angle for site-specific bentonite amended tailings and the Factor of Safety will then be recomputed. Slope design will be adjusted as needed to achieve Factor of a Safety  $> 1.3$  for veneer stability.
	- c. Liquefaction Triggering and Post-Triggering Analysis Factor of Safety  $> 1.1$  for post-triggering slope stability considering liquefied shear strengths (computed from design liquefied strength ratios) applied to segments of materials in the triggering stability analysis with  $FS_{triggering}$  < 1.1; design drained strengths applied to materials above the capillary zone; and yield shear strength ( computed from design yield strength ratios) for all other materials. From the February 2013 workshop, analyze the following credible triggering scenarios:
		- i. Baseline Lift 8

Version 3 4/11/2013

- Realistic phreatic surface from seepage analysis including capillarity.
- Normal pool steady-state seepage.
- Capillarity  $-10$ ' above computed steady-state phreatic line.
- Liquefied shear strengths applied below top of capillary zone to materials triggered to liquefy (i.e., design liquefied shear strength utilized for flotation tailings and LTVSMC fine tailings/slimes in materials that are triggered to liquefy).
- ii. Elevated Phreatic Surface (i.e., drain ineffective) Lift 8
	- Permeability of plugged drain set to permeability of flotation tailings.
	- Normal pool steady-state seepage.
	- Capillarity  $-10$ ' above computed steady-state phreatic line.
	- Liquefied shear strengths applied below top of capillary zone to materials triggered to liquefy (i.e., design liquefied shear strength utilized for flotation tailings and LTVSMC fine tailings/slimes in materials that are triggered to liquefy).
	- Consideration of baseline effective vertical stresses (prior to rise in phreatic surface).
- iii. High Construction Rate of Loading Lift 1
	- 15' of construction fill placed rapidly.
	- Baseline phreatic surface including capillarity.
	- Normal pool steady-state seepage.
	- Capillarity  $-10$ ' above computed steady-state phreatic line.
	- Liquefied shear strengths applied below top of capillary zone to materials triggered to liquefy ( design liquefied shear strength utilized for flotation tailings and LTVSMC fine tailings/slimes in materials that are triggered to liquefy).
	- Consideration of baseline effective vertical stresses (prior to new fill placement).
- iv. Local Erosion/Scour of Slope (pipe break) Lift 8
	- Incrementally remove material above buttress (retrogressive).
	- Baseline phreatic surface including capillarity.
	- Normal pool steady-state seepage.
	- Capillarity  $-10$ ' above computed steady-state phreatic line.
	- Liquefied shear strengths applied below top of capillary zone to materials triggered to liquefy ( design liquefied shear strength utilized for flotation tailings and LTVSMC fine tailings/slimes in materials that are triggered to liquefy).

Version 3 4/11/2013

- Consideration of baseline effective vertical stresses (prior to erosion).
- v. Elevated Phreatic Surface (drain ineffective) w/High Pond Lift 1
	- Elevated Pond (drain ineffective).
	- Permeability of plugged drain set to permeability of flotation tailings.
	- Steady-state seepage with elevated pond set at overflow elevation.
	- Capillarity  $-10$ ' above computed steady state phreatic line.
	- Liquefied shear strengths applied below top of capillary zone to materials triggered to liquefy ( design liquefied shear strength utilized for flotation tailings and LTVSMC fine tailings/slimes in materials that are triggered to liquefy).
	- Consideration of initial effective vertical stresses (prior to placement of  $1<sup>st</sup>$  lift).
- vi. Long-Term Case (20, 200, and 2000 years after closure)
	- Final geometry including surf ace erosion of material above buttress.
	- Impoundment phreatic surface drained down (as determined by analysis) reflecting bentonite cover.
	- Surcharge load from surficial pond.
	- Pond set at overflow elevation.
	- Liquefied shear strengths applied to materials triggered to liquefy ( design liquefied shear strength utilized for flotation tailings and LTVSMC fine tailings/slimes in materials that are triggered to liquefy).
	- Design liquefied shear strength with aging factors included for decomposition and secondary compression.
- d. Lift 8 Baseline Conditions assuming Unknown Triggering Mechanism Factor of Safety  $\geq 1.1$  for post-triggering slope stability applying design liquefied shear strengths to all LTVSMC fine tailings and slimes and all Flotation Tailings below top of capillary zone.
	- i. Lift 8
	- ii. Realistic phreatic surface from seepage analysis including capillarity.
	- iii. Normal pool steady-state seepage.
	- iv. Capillarity  $-10$ ' above computed steady-state phreatic line.
	- v. Design liquefied shear strengths applied below top of capillary zone to all LTVSMC fine tailings and slimes and all Flotation Tailings.
- e. Seismic Liquefaction (i.e., induced by seismic event).

Version 3 4/11/2013

- 1. Perform a screening analysis for triggering of liquefaction based on Boulanger and Idriss (2004 ). If the factor of safety against triggering is less than 1.2 for a seismic event with a 2475-year return period, perform further seismic triggering analyses as described below.
- ii. Develop material damping coefficients for LTVSMC and NorthMet tailings.
- iii. Use Geo-Slope software to compute initial stresses and steady-state pore-water pressure distribution.
- iv. Apply earthquake loads via appropriate geomechanical models (such as QUAKE/W, FLAC, Plaxis, or others; earthquake loads to be obtained from probabilistic seismic hazard analysis [PSHA]) and compare results to a SLOPE/W yield undrained model (or other appropriate model) to identify the elements within the model that liquefy as a result of the seismic loading.
- v. Use published triggering relationships and model results to determine segments along the slip surface where liquefaction will be triggered (Olson  $\&$ Stark, 2003, Yield Strength Ratios and Liquefaction Analysis of Slopes and Embankments).
- vi. Perform slope stability analysis in SLOPE/W or other appropriate geomechanical model (using liquefied shear strengths applied to elements shown to liquefy) to compute FS for the entire cross section.
	- If  $FS > 1.2$  no further action is needed.
	- If  $FS < 1.0$  modify or redesign cross section.
	- If  $FS > 1.0$  and  $< 1.2$ , perform deformation modeling in SIGMA/W or other suitable geomechanical model to predict the magnitude of deformation. If the level of deformation is acceptable to Dam Safety, no further action is needed. If the level of deformation is unacceptable to Dam Safety, modify or redesign cross section.
- 6. Reporting:

Volume 1 - Version 4 will present the background/supporting information and results of the Flotation Tailings Basin geotechnical analyses described in this Work Plan. It will contain the pertinent content previously presented in the Preliminary Geotechnical Evaluation – March 2009 and Geotechnical Data Packages – Volume  $1 - V$ ersions 1 through 3. However, analysis methods and results will supersede contents of the previously published Geotechnical Evaluation and Data Packages. Included in Volume 1 - Version 4 (and/or the Flotation Tailings Management Plan) will be descriptions and drawings depicting existing conditions and what will be built, results of geotechnical analyses for operating and post-closure conditions, and presentation of all model input parameters and model outputs. Where model input parameters are derived from multiple data points, the approach utilized for input parameter selection will be described. Included will be a description of how stability is anticipated to vary over time following Flotation Tailings Basin closure. Include design and operating requirements necessary to maintain required slope stability Factors of Safety for the critical slope cross-section (assumed to be Cross-Section F for SDEIS modeling). This detail shall be included in Volume 1 - Version 4 and/or the Flotation Tailings Management Plan.

Version 3 4/11/2013

The following paragraphs describe the work that will be included in a future Geotechnical Data Package  $-$  Volume  $1 -$  Version 5, Flotation Tailings Basin, which is expected to provide information for the FEIS and Dam Safety permitting.

- 1. After MDNR publication of the SDEIS and prior to Final EIS (FEIS) publication and Permitting, execute a supplement to this Work Plan to include:
	- a. For normal operation conditions with maximum lift height perform a sensitivity analysis using the USSA slope stability model with yield undrained shear strength values. The Flotation Tailings Basin designer's engineering judgment shall be used to establish a range for these data inputs and the basis for the range shall be described. Evaluate the impact of data variability on computed slope stability Factors of Safety for the purpose of focusing operational-phase data gathering on the most critical stability model data inputs.
	- b. Prepare and execute a second Sensitivity Analysis the intent of which is to evaluate the variation in Factor of Safety (and the probability of  $FS < 1.0$ ) for an unknown triggering case, using the ESSA and yield USSR strengths utilized for the current Work Plan, but with  $\text{USSR}_{(L)q}$  varied within the range identified during liquefied strength design parameter evaluation.
- 2. Following **MDNR** Dam Safety review and approval of Critical Cross-Section modeling process/procedures and outcomes, proceed with modeling cross-sections G (north side of Cell 2E) and N (south side of Cell lE) for final Flotation Tailings Basin design (for input to FEIS or Permitting as determined by MDNR).

#### **Hydrometallurgical Residue Facility Geotechnical Models for SDEIS, FEIS and Permitting:**

The objective of the Hydrometallurgical Residue Facility Geotechnical Modeling for the SDEIS, FEIS and Permitting is to:

- demonstrate the ability of the most sensitive slope cross-section to comply with the required slope stability Factors of Safety for global stability,
- demonstrate the ability of the composite liner system to comply with infinite slope stability Factor of Safety requirements, and to
- demonstrate the capability of the composite liner system to withstand the strain anticipated due to differential settlement that may occur in the facility foundation materials.

The following is a step-by-step summary of the planned Hydrometallurgical Residue Facility geotechnical modeling process.

- 1. Gather existing conditions data (i.e. facility foundation material stratigraphy and strength data, hydrogeologic data and other data as needed to support geotechnical modeling of the Hydrometallurgical Residue Facility). Note - portions of this data have previously been compiled and presented in the Preliminary Geotechnical Evaluation – March 2009. This information will be incorporated into the Geotechnical Data Package Volume 2 and will be supplemented with additional facility location-specific data. Data on existing baseline water sources at the site, including surface discharges from the surrounding highlands, will be gathered for consideration during hydrometallurgical residue facility design. The facility will be designed to accommodate any such surface discharges and hence these discharges will not impact geotechnical modeling of the hydrometallurgical residue facility.
- 2. Gather additional residue strength and hydraulic conductivity data and/or representative published data for use in facility design. This information will be incorporated into the Geotechnical Data Package Volume 2 to the extent needed to facilitate the modeling outlined herein.
- 3. Develop residue facility layout and slope cross-sections (i.e., geometry and stratigraphy for existing and planned conditions) for proposed residue facility stability and deformation modeling. Note – seepage through the residue facility embankments will be inhibited by the composite liner system and seepage modeling will be an unnecessary component of this analysis.
- 4. Develop global and infinite slope stability models and deformation models of the facility using Geo-Slope International, Inc. modeling software (i.e., SLOPE/W, SEEP/W and SIGMA/Was necessary). Model the following:
	- a. Deformation of hydromet residue facility foundation and liner system.

Page 8 of 10

- b. Infinite slope stability of hydromet residue facility liner system (if necessary/applicable).
- c. Global stability of hydromet residue facility embankments.

Model maximum residue facility dam height with minimum and maximum pond elevation, and post closure – cover effective with minimum pond elevation. Model for effective shear stress conditions. Modeling for undrained shear strength conditions will not be necessary due to lined facility design with imported and mechanically placed dam fill and lack of seepage through the dam.

- 5. Configure geotechnical data for model input. Model input parameters will be based on data collected for and presented in the Preliminary Geotechnical Evaluation – March 2009. For materials to be imported for construction, engineering judgment will be used to select conservative shear strength parameters for input to the slope stability analysis and liner deformation analysis.
- 6. Use SLOPE/W to calculate the Factor of Safety for the following conditions:
	- a. Effective Stress Stability Analysis (ESSA) Factor of Safety  $\geq 1.5$
	- b. Slope failures on external face and internal face of residue facility embankments.
- 7. Perform infinite slope stability analysis to confirm that load from residue deposition will be transferred to facility foundation soils and will not induce excess strain in facility liner materials.
- 8. Perform deformation modeling to predict magnitude of deformation and resulting strain in the facility liner system for comparison to allowable strain in liner system. Allowable strains are material-specific and will be determined from manufacturers specifications for the materials selected for the facility liner.
- 9. Report final basin design and operating requirements necessary to maintain required slope stability Factor of Safety and deformation requirements.
- 10. Reporting the Geotechnical Data Package Volume 2 will present the background/supporting information and results of the Hydrometallurgical Residue Facility geotechnical analyses described in this Work Plan. Included will be descriptions and drawings depicting existing conditions and what will be built, results of geotechnical analyses for operating and post-closure conditions, and presentation of all model input parameters and model outputs. Where model input parameters are derived from multiple data points, the approach utilized for input parameter selection will be described. Included will be a description of how stability is anticipated to vary over time.

Version 3 4/11/2013

#### **Stockpile Geotechnical Models for SDEIS, FEIS and Permitting:**

The objective of the Stockpile Geotechnical Modeling for the SDEIS, FEIS and Permitting is to comply with Mn Rule 6132.2400 (stockpile slopes will be as required by 6132.2400 Subp. 2. B. and stockpile foundations will be as required by 6132.2400 Subp. 2. A. (1)). These are design requirements that have been established to insure acceptable slope stability Factors of Safety for global stability and acceptable foundation stability, the latter of which relates to the capability of the geomembrane liner system to withstand the strain anticipated due to differential settlement that may occur in the stockpile foundation materials.

The following is a step-by-step summary of the planned Stockpile geotechnical modeling process.

- 1. Gather existing conditions data (i.e. facility foundation material stratigraphy and strength data and other data as needed to support foundation design). Existing site information will be utilized for analysis performed in support of the SDEIS and FEIS, with additional data gathered and designs updated as needed for final design in conjunction with permitting. Existing information will be incorporated into the Geotechnical Data Package Volume 3.
- 2. Configure stockpile slopes to meet or exceed minimum dimensional requirements established by Mn Rule 6132.2400.
- 3. Perform stockpile subgrade settlement analysis to predict magnitude of deformation and resulting strain in the stockpile liners for comparison to allowable strain in the liner system. Allowable strains are material-specific and will be determined from manufacturers specifications for the materials selected for the stockpile liners.
- 4. Report final stockpile design and operating requirements necessary to maintain required slope stability Factors of Safety and liner performance requirements.
- 5. Reporting the Geotechnical Data Package Volume 3 will present the background/supporting information and results of the Stockpile geotechnical analyses described in this Work Plan. Included will be descriptions and drawings depicting existing conditions and what will be built, results of geotechnical analyses for operating and post-closure conditions, and presentation of all model input parameters and model outputs. Where model input parameters are derived from multiple data points, the approach utilized for input parameter selection will be described. Included will be a description of how stability is anticipated to vary over time.

**Attachment B** 

**Oversized Figures and Maps** 

Table B-1 **PolyMet Tailings Basin 23/69-862-022A** 

**Summary of seepage and strength parameters used in previous analyses** 



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369862\WorkFiles\Geotechnical Investigations\2008 analysis\Properties Comparison (from old reports & 2007 data).xls

FNP0003368



0253977

Permit to Mine Application





FNP0003368


Attachment C

Material Strength Characterization

(last updated during preparation of Geotechnical Data Package - Volume 1 - Version 4; retained without further edits for Geotechnical Data Package - Volume 1 - Versions 5 through 8)



# **NorthMet Project**

# **Geotechnical Data Package - Volume 1 - Version 4 Attachment C** - **Material Strength Characterization**

April 12, 2013



# **Table of Contents**



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369862\WorkFiles\WO 022A Tailings Basin Permitting\2013 v4 Data Package Vol 1\Attachment C - Material Strength Characterization\Material Strength Characterization\_3-31-2013.docx





P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369862\WorkFiles\WO 022A Tailings Basin Permitting\2013 v4 Data Package Vol 1\Attachment C - Material Strength Characterization\Material Strength Characterization\_3-31-2013.docx





P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369862\WorkFiles\WO 022A Tailings Basin Permitting\2013 v4 Data Package Vol 1\Attachment C - Material Strength Characterization\Material Strength Characterization\_3-31-2013.docx





# **1.0 Introduction**

This document presents material strength data, analyses, and resulting design parameters used as inputs for stability modeling of the Flotation Tailings Basin (FTB) for the Poly Met Mining Inc. (PolyMet) NorthMet Project (Project). The design strength parameters are selected using available field and laboratory data, which includes data collected in the most recent geotechnical investigation, and where available, applicable historical data. Design strength values were determined for peat, glacial till, LTVSMC coarse tailings, LTVSMC fine tailings, LTVSMC slimes, LTVSMC bulk tailings and Flotation Tailings. These strength values were then used as inputs to the overall assessment of slope stability of FTB Cross-Section F. Results of the Cross-Section F slope stability analysis are presented in Geotechnical Data Package  $-$  Volume  $1 -$  Version 4.

The approach used to select design parameters has evolved over the four versions of this document. A brief summary of this evolution is presented in Table 1-1. The current approach retains the basic analysis methods for drained and undrained strengths used in Geotechnical Data Package - Volume  $1$  - Version 3 (Version 3), but updates the approach for selecting the design parameters for liquefied strengths.

Liquefied strength analyses have been updated for Geotechnical Data Package – Volume 1 – Version 4 (Reference (1)), based on guidance from Mr. Richard Davidson and Dr. Scott Olson. The updated methods reflect agreements reached at the geotechnical workshop held on February 25-26, 2013 attended by the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (MDNR), Knight Peisold, Environmental Resources Management (ERM), PolyMet, Barr Engineering Co. (Barr), Mr. Richard Davidson, and Dr. Scott Olson (Reference (2)). Mr. Davidson is a consultant employed by URS. Dr. Olson is a recognized expert in the fields of static and seismic slope stability and liquefaction engineering and has published over 85 peer-reviewed journal articles and conference papers on related topics. Some professional judgment is still required to account for potential data gaps, but the guidance provided by Dr. Olson and Mr. Davidson serves as a basis for the analysis and material strength design values presented in Version 4.

Mr. Davidson independently reviewed the methodology used in Version 3, and provided guidance on selection and analysis of data to determine liquefied strengths. Mr. Davidson suggested that CPT data be used to identify LTVSMC fine tailings/slimes zones ( consistent with the approach previously used by Barr). Barr used the characteristic signatures of LTVSMC fine tailings/slimes within each CPT sounding to identify the depths and thicknesses of LTVSMC fine tailings/slimes zones at each sounding location.

Where liquefied strengths ( $USSR_{liq}$ ) are required in the stability analysis, Mr. Davidson and Dr. Olson recommended use of the average liquefied shear strengths. This recommendation is based on the conservative nature of the material strength data on which the corresponding stability analysis is based (the lowest material strength condition anticipated; the liquefied strength) and based on the factor of safety requirements set in the Work Plan (Attachment A





of Reference (1)). Liquefied strength values, based on field data and laboratory testing, were then assigned to these zones in the model. The procedure and results are presented in Section 5.0.

This version of Attachment C includes changes due to data screening to remove outliers and confirm inclusion of only contractive test results for estimation of liquefied strengths; incorporation of professional judgment in selection of design parameters in lieu of a strictly statistical approach; and updates to analytical methods in response to input provided by Dr. Olson and Mr. Davidson. These updates result in some changes in test-counts, data-counts and shear strengths from previous versions of Attachment C.





(1) For more detail on earlier versions, see Section 1 of Attachment C of Geotechnical Data Package - Volume 1 - Version 3

In this document coarse tailings are LTVSMC coarse tailings, fine tailings are LTVSMC fine tailings, slimes are LTVSMC slimes, and Flotation Tailings are the NorthMet bulk flotation tailings. The Tailings Basin is the existing former LTVSMC tailings basin and the Flotation Tailings Basin (FTB), refers to the Tailings Basin with the Flotation Tailings impounded atop it.

The outline of this document is:





# **2.0 Data Analysis Methodology**

To document the data and methods used in material strength analyses, this section:

- gives an overview of drained, undrained and liquefied conditions
- presents the available geotechnical data
- describes the screening procedures to select which data to include in material strength calculations
- details the analytical methods used to interpret each type of laboratory and field data
- documents the approach used to integrate laboratory and field results into a design value for use in stability modeling

# **2.1 Overview of Drained, Undrained and Liquefied Conditions**

## **2.1.1 Drained Conditions**

If shear stress is applied to a soil at such a rate and/or the drainage conditions are such that excess pore water pressure is zero when failure occurs, failure is said to occur under drained conditions, or the drained shear strength of the soil has been mobilized. This case is typically applied to long-term, steady-state seepage conditions, when any excess pore water pressures generated due to loading have dissipated. The drained condition also applies to granular materials for short-term conditions. When such materials have a high enough permeability, any excess pore water pressure is nearly immediately dissipated. The drained strength is most often described in terms of a failure envelope. The failure envelope may be linear, using the Mohr-Coulomb model to provide a drained friction angle  $(\phi)$  or it may be represented as a non-linear failure envelope.

## **2.1.2 Undrained Conditions**

If shear stress is applied to a soil quickly and/or if the drainage conditions are such that no shear-induced pore water pressure can dissipate when failure occurs, failure is said to occur in an undrained condition, or the undrained shear strength of the sample has been mobilized. The undrained shear strength is typically applied to short-term conditions for saturated soils, for example during or immediately after construction when construction proceeds at a fast enough rate that excess pore water pressure develops. Failure in undrained conditions may also occur for permeable, granular soils during seismic events or other events where shearing occurs so quickly that shear-induced excess pore water pressures cannot dissipate. It has been observed in soft soils that the undrained yield strength is often a function of consolidation stress. When the undrained yield strength increases linearly with pressure, the Undrained Shear Strength Ratio *(USSRyield)* is generally preferred to model the material strength. The *USSRyield* is defined as the ratio of the undrained shear strength, *Su(yield),* divided by the effective overburden stress,  $\sigma'_{\nu o}$ .





# **2.1.3 Liquefied Conditions**

It is anticipated that most of the time, loading or change in loading within the LTVSMC tailings and Flotation Tailings at the FTB will be slow enough for the LTVSMC tailings and Flotation Tailings to be sheared under drained conditions. However, there are circumstances in the field during which rapid changes in load and/or local stress may occur, that can lead to undrained loading. As a result, liquefaction potential needs to be evaluated. Liquefaction has been observed in saturated mine tailings, which are hydraulically deposited and often exhibit contractive response (Reference (3)). Therefore the state of the LTVSMC tailings and Flotation Tailings and their potential to liquefy should be analyzed.

The state of a soil dictates how a soil will respond to undrained loading. If the soil is in a compacted or dense state, it will exhibit dilative behavior and the particles will have to roll over each other thereby increasing the volume of the soil mass when sheared. If drainage is not permitted, negative porewater pressures will develop. A contractive soil is in a loose state, and when loaded and sheared, the particles will compress and become more compacted, decreasing the volume of the soil mass. If drainage is not permitted, positive porewater pressures will develop. Flow liquefaction can only be triggered in contractive soils.

To assess whether the soil at a given test location will behave in a contractive or dilative manner, the method advocated by Fear and Robertson (Reference (4)) was utilized. Olson and Stark (Reference (5)) converted the shear wave velocity-based contractive-dilative boundaries (Reference (4)) to boundaries based on overburden stress-normalized Standard Penetration Tests (SPT) blow count and Cone Penetration Test (CPT) tip resistance. In this method, as subsequently described, SPT and CPTu data are analyzed to determine whether the soil will behave in a contractive or dilative manner when sheared in undrained conditions.

When testing a typical loose soil in triaxial compression under undrained conditions, as shown in Figure 2-1, the stress-strain curve reaches a peak stress known as the yield point. Quasi-steady state **(QSS)** behavior occurs when soils exhibit a limited strain-softening response followed by strain-hardening (Reference (5)), also shown in Figure 2-1. This behavior is considered a temporary condition, where the sample moves from contractive to dilative behavior (Reference (6)). The initial peak observed relates to the yield shear strength or peak shear strength despite the strain-hardening observed with quasi-steady state behavior. Bobei et al. (Reference (7)) refer to anything following the initial peak as post-peak behavior. According to Robertson et al. (Reference (8)), the quasi-steady state is associated with limited strain-softening because the sample reaches peak strength and then strain softens to a QSS or minimum strength during which a certain amount of strain occurs. However, the sample then strain hardens to its ultimate state (although this commonly occurs at strains larger than can be achieved in conventional laboratory tests). For selection of material strength parameters for use in FTB stability analysis, any material strength tests that exhibited an unintended result (e.g., strain-hardening rather than anticipated strain-softening or flow response) were not used.



**Figure 2-1 Steady state and quasi-steady state behavior (Reference (7))** 

The liquefied condition is a special case within the undrained condition where a contractive soil is sheared beyond the yield strength to a minimum shear stress known as the liquefied strength. The liquefied shear strength is the shear strength mobilized at large deformation by a saturated contractive soil following the triggering of a strain-softening response. The terms "steady state" **(SS)** or "residual" are also used to describe this case. This strength reduction can be induced in the laboratory with either cyclic triaxial (followed by monotonic loading) or undrained monotonic triaxial testing. However, preparing a contractive specimen is challenging for some soils. Many triaxial tests must be conducted to obtain one that is contractive.

The liquefied strength has also been correlated to various field data. The liquefied shear strength is presented herein either in terms of undrained shear strength or when appropriate as a function of overburden *(USSRliq).* The *USSRliq* is defined as the ratio of the liquefied undrained shear strength,  $S_{u(iq)}$ , divided by the effective overburden stress,  $\sigma'_{vo}$ .

## **2.2 Available Geotechnical Data**

Multiple testing programs have been performed throughout the history of the Tailings Basin. For details see Sections 4.1 and 4.2 of the Geotechnical Data Package - Volume 1 Version 4. The geotechnical data available for material strength analyses are summarized in Table 2-1.





#### **Table 2-1 Data Analyzed from Geotechnical Investigations**



(1) DS = Direct Shear Test, TX= Triaxial Test, SPT = Standard Penetration Test, CPT = Cone Penetration Test, FVST = Field Vane Shear Test



# **2.3 Geotechnical Data Screening**

Data selection depends on the type of strength being evaluated: drained, undrained, or liquefied. For drained shear strengths, results of field and laboratory tests on both dilative and contractive specimens were used.

For undrained strength estimates, results of field and laboratory tests were used. Undrained shear strengths were calculated using mostly data from contractive specimens. Because it is quite difficult to prepare all laboratory specimens to be contractive, some percentage of tests inevitably will be dilative, but some material strengths can be derived from these tests.

Liquefied strength estimates include only the laboratory test results for samples that contracted or exhibited quasi-steady state behavior during shear. Field testing (e.g., CPT and SPT) results were used to determine the location and depths of potentially contractive layers, and data (CPT, SPT and FVST) from those layers was then also used in liquefied strength calculations. Only the contractive data from SPT and CPT samples and residual strengths from FVST were used in determination of material liquefied strengths.

# **2.4 Laboratory Data Analysis**

This section addresses the evaluation and interpretation of material strength data collected through laboratory testing. Laboratory strength testing that has been performed includes direct shear and triaxial testing.

## **2.4.1 Direct Shear**

For direct shear test results, the ultimate stress measured in the test was used to determine the drained strength of the material. The results for the direct shear tests were plotted as shear stress versus normal effective stress to provide a drained friction angle for each appropriate material type. The drained shear strengths from direct shear tests were also plotted with triaxial test results, when possible.

## **2.4.2 Triaxial Shear Test**

Triaxial shear testing includes isotropically-consolidated undrained (CIU) testing and consolidated-drained **(CD)** testing. CD triaxial testing is performed under drained conditions. The test is run at a slow enough shearing rate so that no excess pore water pressure is generated during the test. CIU triaxial testing is performed under undrained conditions. Pore water pressure must be monitored throughout the test. The pore water pressure, strain, and stress measured throughout the test can be processed to provide both drained and undrained strengths of materials. If the test is sheared to sufficient displacement and the specimen exhibits contractive behavior, the liquefied shear strength may be determined as well.

The pore water pressure was monitored throughout newer CIU tests, such that those data could be processed to determine the drained, undrained, and liquefied shear strength values.





Older CIU tests from historical investigations may not have had all pore water pressure data provided and therefore older CIU data were not always used to derive strength values.

Some tested specimens were undisturbed, while others were reconstituted in the laboratory. The reconstituted specimens in particular were used to determine the undrained shear strength parameters, especially for the liquefied strength case. Large strain failure criterion were used for determination of drained strength. This was selected to ensure that the drained strength was being determined along the failure plane identified in p-q space. The maximum deviatoric stress condition was used as the failure criterion to determine the failure envelope for undrained conditions. The shear stress at the initial yield point was used for samples exhibiting contractive QSS behavior. The minimum shear stress following the initial yield point for QSS samples or the residual stress for contractive samples was used to determine the liquefied shear strength.

The drained strength was determined from the CD triaxial tests and the applicable CIU triaxial tests. The results for these tests were processed and plotted as the shear stress versus the normal effective stress to provide a drained friction angle for each material type tested.

Undrained shear strength was determined from CIU tests. The results were plotted as the undrained shear strength versus the effective consolidation stress to provide an undrained shear strength ratio *(USSRyield)* or a failure envelope, if appropriate.

Liquefied undrained shear strength ( *USSRliq)* was calculated from the tests that sheared sufficiently past the yield point and exhibiting steady state **(SS)** or quasi-steady state behavior. Results were plotted as the undrained shear strength versus the effective normal stress to provide a liquefied undrained shear strength ratio ( *USSRliq).* 

# **2.5 Field Data Analysis**

This section addresses the evaluation and interpretation of different data collected through field testing. Field strength testing performed includes SPT, CPT, and Field Vane Shear Tests (FVST).

The field data in combination with laboratory data (as described in Sections 1.0 and 2.6), were used to estimate drained, undrained, and liquefied strengths. In-situ SPT and CPT strength correlations are independent of drainage conditions during penetration. When determining the liquefied strengths, correlations were used to filter out data for materials that are expected to exhibit a dilative response during shearing, as described in Section 2.1.3.

## **2.5.1 Standard Penetration Test**

The SPT data were compiled, corrected using industry standard procedures, and correlated to shear strengths, as appropriate.



The concept showing the relationship between "standard" blow counts and soil properties was introduced by Skempton (Reference (9)). Blow counts obtained in the field are typically corrected based on overburden pressure and energy. For liquefaction potential evaluation, the raw SPT blow counts (N) must be corrected to  $(N_l)_{60}$ -values. A number of site-specific factors are taken into account to improve repeatability. This is represented in the following equation:

$$
N_{60}=E_m C_B C_S C_R N / 0.60
$$

Where:

 $E_m$  = hammer efficiency  $C_B$  = borehole diameter correction *Cs=* sample barrel correction  $C_R$  = rod length correction  $N =$  raw SPT N-value recorded in the field, blows per foot

A correction was lacking in situations where samples were taken near the bottom of uniform soil deposits, thus exhibiting higher blow counts due to stiffer material below. The overburden correction was then termed  $(N_l)_{60}$  and  $N_{60}$  is corrected using vertical effective stress, using the following equation:

 $(N_1)_{60} = N_{60}$  SQRT(2000 psf /  $\sigma_v$ )

#### **2.5.1.1 Drained Shear Strength**

Schmertmann's (Reference (10)) drained friction angle is calculated from  $N_{60}$  values and effective overburden stress. This calculation applies to non-plastic or coarse-grained materials as:

$$
\phi' = \tan^{-1}(N_{60}/(12.2+20.3*\sigma'_{\text{vo}}))^{0.34}
$$

#### **2.5.1.2 Undrained Shear Strength**

Olson and Stark's yield strength ratio analysis (Reference  $(11)$ ) is a procedure that chiefly applies to non-plastic and low-plasticity materials. The undrained shear strength ratio was calculated for  $(N_l)_{60}$  less than and equal to 12 blows per foot (BPF) as:

$$
USSR_{yield} = 0.205 + 0.0075[(N_1)_{60}]
$$

SPT tests with  $(N_l)_{60}$  greater than 12 BPF generally are dilative. These soils were filtered out and not assigned an *USSRyield* value. This equation provides a lower-bound of 0.205 and an upper-bound of 0.295.





# **2.5.1.3 Liquefied Shear Strength**

Fear and Robertson (Reference (4)) presented a relationship to assess the tendency for clean Ottawa sand to contract or dilate, based on overburden stress-normalized shear wave velocity and effective vertical stress. Olson and Stark (Reference (5)) converted this relationship to SPT and CPT-based contractive-dilative boundaries, and found that the converted Ottawa sand boundaries enveloped available liquefaction flow failure case histories. This relationship has been updated to account for the compressibility of the soil (Reference (12)).

With SPT data, corrected blow counts  $(N_l)_{60}$  are plotted against overburden pressure with the updated boundary from Olson (Reference (12)) dividing contractive and dilative behavior. Data points plotting below or to the left of the boundary are considered contractive and those values plotted above or to the right of the boundary are considered dilative.

Olson and Stark's liquefied strength ratio analysis (Reference (13)) applies to contractive soils. For the contractive points plotting below or to the left of the converted Fear and Robertson (Reference (4)) boundary as amended by Olson (Reference (12)) for medium compressible soils, the liquefied undrained shear strength ratio was calculated for  $(N_l)_{60} \leq 12$ BPF as:

$$
USSR_{liq} = 0.03 + 0.0075[(N_1)_{60}]
$$

This equation provides a lower-bound of 0.03 and an upper-bound of 0.12. SPT tests with  $(N_l)_{60}$  greater than 12 BPF generally are dilative. These soils were filtered out and not assigned an *USSRliq* value.

## **2.5.1.4 SPT Data Reporting**

For the drained case, the data are generally presented as a friction angle .. For the undrained case, the data are plotted as the *USSR* value (yield or liquefied) versus effective overburden stress.

## **2.5.2 Cone Penetration Test**

Cone Penetration Testing with pore water pressure measurement (CPTu) was performed in the Tailings Basin in 1996, 2005, and 2007. Zones of materials were identified by visual observations made during SPT sampling and logging and by relating measured CPT tip and sleeve resistance to density and soil behavior and analyzing them against the corresponding soil boring data. Data from zones where the material type was verified by visual observation were isolated to determine the shear strength envelopes for different material types.

The field cone penetration resistance measured at the tip is  $q_c$  for fine-grained soils, which may also be converted to a total cone resistance,  $q_t$ , by:



$$
q_t = q_c + (1 - a)u
$$

Where:

- *a=* unequal end area ratio of the cone
- $u =$  pore water pressure measured between the tip and the friction sleeve

The total cone resistance is corrected to a standard effective overburden pressure of one atmosphere *(pa,* typically 1 tsf) by:

$$
q_{t1} = q_t \left(\frac{p_a}{\sigma'_{vo}}\right)^{0.5}
$$

# **2.5.2.1 Drained Shear Strength**

Robertson and Campanella (Reference (14)) proposed an empirical relationship to evaluate the drained shear strength of uncemented sands based on tip resistance. This method presents boundaries for drained friction angle values ( $\phi'$ ) ranging from 28 to 48 degrees on a plot of measured tip resistance  $(q_c)$  against vertical effective stress  $(\sigma'_{\nu\rho})$ . The method applies to granular normally-consolidated soils only.

# **2.5.2.2 Undrained Shear Strength**

The CPT data were analyzed to estimate an undrained shear strength ratio ( *USSRyield).*  Undrained response was somewhat difficult to verify with the 2005 and 2007 data, as the Tailings Basin had been undergoing natural drainage and desaturation since operations ceased in 2001 and perched water conditions appear to have existed in some shallower, finer layers when the most recent investigations were performed.

*USSRyield* was determined using Olson's Method, developed by Olson and Stark (Reference (5)), which uses the corrected cone penetration tip resistance  $(q_{c1})$  for  $q_{c1}$  values less than 6.5 **MPa.** Olson (Reference (12)) recommends that *qc1* should be replaced by *qtl*  where pore pressure develops within the materials during penetration (Reference (5)). The *USSRyieldis* calculated as:

$$
USSR_{yield} = \frac{s_u}{\sigma'_{vo}} = 0.205 + 0.0143(q_{t1})
$$

# **2.5.2.3 Liquefied Shear Strength**

The liquefied strength calculation for each material type uses only data from points that exhibited contractive behavior. With CPT data, the corrected tip resistance  $(q_{c1})$  is plotted against overburden pressure, with a boundary converted from the Fear and Robertson



correlation (Reference (4)) dividing contractive and dilative behavior. Olson (Reference (12)) developed an approach to incorporate soil compressibility into the CPTbased contractive-dilative boundary. For the Tailings Basin materials, the medium soil compressibility boundary was used (Reference (12)); values plotting below the boundary are contractive and those values plotted above the boundary are dilative.

The liquefied undrained shear strength ratio ( $USSR_{liq}$ ) was determined by analyzing the CPT data using a correlation initially developed by Olson and Stark (Reference (11)) and herein being referred to as the Olson Method. The relationship was developed based on back analysis of data from case histories of failed slopes comprised of sands, silty sands, and tailings. Olson (Reference (12)) has updated the correlation such that it utilizes the corrected tip resistance,  $q_{t}$ , rather than  $q_{c}$  as was originally proposed by Olson and Stark (Reference (11)). The Olson method filters out data from materials that should not be characterized with a  $USSR_{liq}$ , specifying that the calculation should include only data from soils that are classified as contractive using the Olson contractive/dilative screening criteria (Reference (12)) which corresponds to a tip resistance of about 6.5 **MPa** for many sites. The  $USSR_{lia}$  is calculated as:

$$
USSR_{liq} = \frac{s_{u(liq)}}{\sigma'_{vo}} = 0.03 + 0.0143(q_{i1}) \pm 0.03
$$

# **2.5.2.4 CPT Data Reporting**

For the drained friction angle, measured tip resistance  $(q_c)$  was plotted against vertical effective stress ( $\sigma'_{\nu\rho}$ ) and strength values were assigned based on Robertson and Campanella's boundaries (Reference (14)).

Similar to SPT data, the CPT data processed with both methods for undrained shear strength were plotted as the USSR values versus depth. Because of the nearly continuous data recording, however, thousands of data points (an average every two centimeters) were analyzed and these plots can become difficult to read. Cumulative normalized frequency plots and plots of the undrained shear strength versus the overburden pressure were prepared to further clarify natural variations.

# **2.5.3 Field Vane Shear Test**

Three field investigations to obtain FVST data were performed; one in 1977 by Ebasco Services (Reference (15)), one in 1999 by Barr (Reference (16)), and one in 2007 by AET under Barr's supervision, provided in Attachment E of Reference (1 ).

For the 2007 investigation, FVST was conducted adjacent to locations where stratigraphy was determined on a near continuous basis using CPT. Stratigraphy was confirmed at a number of these locations using SPT and laboratory testing. Zones of interest for FVST were identified using the CPT logs; focusing on zones where low tip resistances and positive pore





pressure response were reported during advancement of the cone, indicating loose or soft conditions. Once zones of interest were defined in the CPT logs, an adjacent borehole (approximately 10 feet away) was advanced and FVST was conducted at the depths of interest. Availability of CPT and SPT data supports the interpretation of FVST results.

The testing program addressed possible mechanical compaction of sediments during original dam construction by (1) sampling at distances typically hundreds of feet from perimeter dams, and (2) testing only the layers of LTVSMC fine tailings and slimes; materials which were least subject to compaction. The testing locations from the 2007 investigation are located in Cells IE and 2E. Six of the eight locations were tested within the basin at 07-02, 07-03, 07-06, 07-08, 07-09 and 07-10. One of the tests was performed below the crest of the basin dam at 07-15, and one of the test locations was near the toe of the basin at 07-07C. The intent of the FVST was to test zones with low tip resistance indicating weaker layers within the basin. Based on the SPT logs the materials tested using the vane shear apparatus are fine tailings and slimes. Due to their position inside the perimeter of the dams, fine tailings and slimes were not intentionally compacted during Tailings Basin development.

In-situ FVST were performed in general accordance with ASTM D2753, however for the 2007 geotechnical investigation the FVST method was modified as a means to measure undrained shear strength. Results of the 1977 Ebasco (Reference (15)) and 1999 Barr (Reference (16)) FVST tests suggest that those tests may not have measured undrained conditions. This conclusion is based on the time factor  $(T<sub>v</sub>)$  calculated for each field vane test performed.  $T<sub>v</sub>$  values of less than approximately 0.04 indicate undrained conditions, and the  $T<sub>v</sub>$  values calculated for the earlier FVST tests were in the range of 0.0487 to 0.3574.

Time factor  $(T_v)$  values were calculated using the rate of vane rotation recorded during acquisition of the raw field data, the diameter of the vane, and  $c<sub>v</sub>$ , the average coefficient of vertical consolidation determined from laboratory consolidation data, using the following relationship (Reference (17)):

$$
T_{\nu} = \frac{c_{\nu}t_f}{d^2}
$$

where:

 $T<sub>v</sub>$  = dimensionless time factor ( $\leq$  0.02 to 0.04 for undrained conditions)  $t_f$  = time to failure in seconds, calculated from vane rotation rate  $d$  = vane diameter

To increase the likelihood of inducing undrained conditions, the 2007 investigation increased the rotational shear rate to minimize pore water pressure dissipation. The modified FVST method involved increasing the rate of shear from the standard rate of approximately 0.1 degrees/sec to rates that ranged from 2.6 to over 58 degrees per second. FVST performed following ASTM D2753 "Standard Test Method for Field Vane Shear Test in Cohesive Soil





typically rotate a hand crank at a specified rate to shear the soils around the vane location(). Normal rates of shear for the vane apparatus are on the order of 0.1 degrees/sec or two to five minutes to failure which is consistent with test procedures designed for clays soils. For this project the FVST equipment was modified to obtain the highest rate of shear possible, within the confines of the equipment capabilities. The equipment was modified by removing the hand crank handle on the drive unit and mounting a motor to the shearing device. At each location, the rotational shear rate was increased from the standard 0.1 degrees per second to a location-specific rate calculated to induce undrained conditions.

The rotational rate needed to induce undrained conditions was calculated based on results of CPT dissipation testing and laboratory consolidation testing. Dissipation test results were used to calculate the time to 50% consolidation,  $t_{50}$  (Section 4.3.2 and Large Figure 2 of Reference (1)). Values of  $t_{50}$ , in the range of about 8.4 to 170 seconds (0.14 to 2.83 minutes) were calculated for the FVST locations. Laboratory consolidation test data indicated that the coefficient of consolidation is in the range of 540 to 30,000  $\text{cm}^2\text{/second}$ . Coefficient of consolidation and  $t_{50}$  values were interpreted using guidelines from Blight (Reference (17)) and Morris and Williams (Reference (18)) to evaluate the pore pressure dissipation and the time to failure to achieve undrained behavior. The estimated time to failure value for each location determined the appropriate FVST rotational rate.

Tests were typically continued through yield response so residual strength was recorded. A summary table of all FVST data is provided as Table 2-2. Table 2-2 includes FVST data gathered for Barr by AET in 2007 using the modified testing method, and data gathered in previous field investigations ((Reference (15)) and (Reference (16)). Only the 2007 data is used for the material strength analysis, as the high time factor values associated with the data from the previous investigations indicate that the tests were not performed in undrained conditions.

Location	Depth (ft.)	<b>Material</b>	Yield $s_{\rm u}$ (psf)	<b>Remolded</b> $S_{\rm u}$ (psf)	Rate (deg/sec)	Average T,
$07 - 10$	17.7	fine tailings	1200	427	52.6	0.0006
$07-10$	26.8	fine tailings	1310	409	51.6	0.0006
$07-10$	39.6	fine tailings	1620	360	44.1	0.0012
07-02 $(1)$	61.7	fine tailings/slimes	1390		3.1	0.0164
$07-08$ <sup>(1)</sup>	67.5	fine tailings/slimes	2380	950	54.4	0.0009
$07-03$ $(1)$	24.8	slimes	1050	152	3.1	0.0105
$07-03$ $(1)$	25.2	slimes	670	140	40.3	0.0006
$07-03$ <sup>(1)</sup>	35.1	slimes	540	160	3.1	0.0062

**Table 2-2 Summary Table of Available Field Vane Shear Test Data** 



 $\overline{\phantom{a}}$ 











 $\rm ^{(1)}$  Denotes field vane test results that were used for strength analysis

The increased strain rate associated with the faster rotational rates has been shown to not adversely affect FVST results for the types of materials present at the site. Numerous studies show that material strengths are not strain-rate dependent for non-plastic, coarser grained soils. (e.g., Novasad 1964 (Reference (19)); Schimming et.al. 1966 (Reference (20)); Scarlett and Todd 1969 (Reference); Savage 1982 (Reference (21)); Hungr and Morgenstern 1984 (Reference (22)); Lemos 1986 (Reference (23)); Vaid and Negussy 1988 (Reference (24); Sassa 1984, 1985, 2000 (References (25) (26) (27)); Fukuoka 1991 (Reference (28)); Tika et.al. 1996 (Reference (29); Infante-Sednao 1998 (Reference (30)); Sandrekarimi and Olson 2009 (Reference (31)). In contrast, plastic soils have shown increases in peak shear resistance of about 5 to 15% for every order of magnitude increase in strain rate (Lefebrve et.al.(Reference (32); Terzaghi et.al. (Reference (33)). Idriss and Boulanger (Reference (34)) suggest that soils with a Plasticity Index (PI) <7 generally exhibit sand-like shear behavior, so would not be strain-rate dependent. The PI of the LTVSMC tailings is generally about 2 to 7, so most of the LTVSMC tailings should exhibit sand-like behavior and show no strain-rate dependent strength increase. The strength values calculated using the data from the 2007 FVST tests conducted using increased rotation rates should therefore accurately represent the strengths of the materials tested.

The 2007 FVST results were used to estimate the in-situ undrained yield and remolded or liquefied shear strength ratios for LTVSMC fine tailings and slimes. Results from tests on





material classified as LTVSMC fine tailings (third column in Table 2-2) were used with other test data described herein to determine the LTVSMC fine tailings strengths and results from tests on material classified as LTVSMC slimes was used with other test data described herein to determine the strength of LTVSMC slimes. To determine the combined LTVSMC fine tailings/slimes strength, results from tests on all material identified as LTVSMC slimes, LTVSMC fine tailings, and LTVSMC fine tailings/slimes were used. To determine undrained and liquefied undrained shear strength ratios from the field vane tests, the yield and residual strengths were divided by the effective overburden pressure (determined assuming a saturated unit weight specific to each material and assumed water depths based on CPT data). To provide corresponding undrained shear strength ratios ( *USSR)* the results were plotted as the undrained shear strengths versus the effective vertical stresses.

## **2.6 Design Strengths**

The drained, undrained yield, and liquefied shear strengths determined by each of the laboratory and field testing methods were integrated to determine design strengths for each material type.

The method used to select design parameters is based on Barr's experience and guidance from Mr. Richard Davidson and Dr. Scott Olson, as described in Section 1.0. The consistent methodology for selection of design material strength parameters developed in consultation with Dr. Olson is detailed in Attachment D. This technique for selection of material strength parameters provides a systematic approach that is not reliant on statistical analysis of data sets that often are difficult to fit to typical data distributions (i.e., normal distribution, log normal distribution, generalized extreme distribution, and possibly others). Design values were selected as follows:

- Both laboratory data and field data are included in the analysis.
- Material liquefied strength analyses include only the laboratory and field test results for samples that contracted or presented quasi-steady state behavior during shear. These samples, which exhibit strain-softening behavior, are a subset of the full sample set. Results for samples that dilated during shear (strain-hardening behavior) are not included in material liquefied strength analyses. The effect of this approach is that the calculation is conservative because it discounts stronger materials that are present in the tailings.
- Laboratory testing, particularly of man-made materials, is included because it has long provided reliable estimates of shear strength. While laboratory depositional techniques often cannot mimic natural (geomorphic) depositional conditions, they can reasonably reproduce artificial deposition procedures. Laboratory methods of reconstituting specimens can be tailored to mimic artificial deposition procedures used in the field such as deposition from a spigot. Furthermore, the mode of shear and stress conditions can be carefully-controlled in the laboratory and tailored to mimic particular failure mechanisms. Careful sample preparations and controlled testing conditions can measure



yield and liquefied strengths when contractive specimens are obtained. However the method of loose sample preparation to replicate contractive conditions is very difficult (in Barr's experience usually only one of eight tests are successful). Third, and most importantly, laboratory testing can be performed on site-specific materials.

- In-situ SPT and CPT testing, which use empirical correlations, is used and is important on two levels. First, in-situ penetration resistance testing provides a measure of the actual soil state (i.e., whether a soil will contract or dilate during shear). Furthermore, it provides an estimate of shear strength based on field experience (i.e., strengths backcalculated from failures in the field).
- For the FVST test locations, the material behavior was evaluated through the use of CPTbased assessments of contractive/dilative behavior. FVST then provides a direct measure of in-situ material shear strength and were used to estimate the in-situ undrained yield and remolded shear strength ratios for LTVSMC slimes.
- 33rd percentile drained and yield undrained shear strength is used for the Effective Stress Stability Analysis (ESSA) and Yield Undrained Shear Strength Analysis (USSAyield) (i.e., on cumulative data plots 33% of the data yields lower strengths and 67% of the data yields higher strengths than the selected design value).
- For drained and undrained yield shear strengths, the design value was determined by averaging the individual 33rd percentile values of any field tests, then adding the average of the 33rd percentile laboratory test results and finding the overall average. The 33rd percentile and average values were calculated using Excel.
- The liquefied shear strengths were determined from the average of all contractive test data. Dr. Olson recommended the use of average liquefied shear strength due to the conservative nature of the sample set being tested (i.e., samples with higher strengths are not included) and the material type (LTVSMC slimes and Flotation Tailings).
- Engineering judgment was required to select an appropriate percentile value of strength (i.e., 33rd percentile), and to weight the values appropriately that are used to assess strengths (e.g., averaging field and laboratory data).



# **3.0 Drained Shear Strength Parameters**

Drained shear strength is typically used in Effective Stress Stability Analysis (ESSA), which generally relates to long-term conditions. Drained shear strength properties are also referred to as effective stress parameters. Drained strength parameters were determined for all modeled materials. Figures related to the development of drained shear strength parameters are provided in Exhibit A.

# **3.1 LTVSMC Coarse Tailings**

As the LTVSMC coarse tailings have a relatively high permeability which allows for rapid dissipation of excess pore water pressure and because the dams will be raised slowly over time, the drained response was assumed to be applicable for the LTVSMC coarse tailings for both short-term and long-term conditions. Additionally the coarse tailings that generally comprise the shell of the perimeter dams have been subjected to greater compaction than typical hydraulically placed tailings due to construction traffic and placement methodology and should not be susceptible to strength loss associated with liquefaction.

# **3.1.1 Laboratory Data**

Triaxial tests were performed by Ebasco Services in 1977 and by Barr in 2008. Direct shear testing was performed in 1976 by Braun Engineering Testing. Effective friction angles determined from triaxial and direct shear testing were plotted together to determine the drained shear strength. The results are presented in Figure A-1 in Exhibit A in terms of the failure envelope. Values range from about 28 to 47 degrees. The 33rd percentile value of the laboratory data for LTVSMC coarse tailings is 36.5 degrees.

## **3.1.2 Field Data**

Field data for the LTVSMC coarse tailings included SPT and CPT results. Data from CPT performed in 1996, 2005, and 2007 were analyzed. Data from SPT performed in 1990, 1996, 1999, and 2007 were analyzed. The resulting drained friction angles are plotted separately on Figures A-2 and A-3 for SPT and CPT, respectively. The SPT data ranges from about 26 to 50 degrees with a 33rd percentile value of 37.9 degrees. Any values higher than 50 degrees were removed from the SPT data set to prevent skewing the analysis. The CPT data generally range from about 39 to greater than 46 degrees, with a few outliers below 39 degrees, and with a 33rd percentile value of 43.0 degrees (based on the Robertson & Campanella analysis procedure described in (Reference (35)).

## **3.1.3 Design Value**

Table 3-1 summarizes the drained shear strength testing of the LTVSMC coarse tailings, and presents the selected design value.









(1) Design value is reported to nearest 0.5 degrees.

## **3.2 L TVSMC Fine Tailings**

Based on historical definitions, the LTVSMC fine tailings can contain between 25% and 95% passing the No. 200 sieve. Because of this fines content, they have a lower permeability than the LTVSMC coarse tailings and are expected to develop excess pore water pressures during shear. As such, the fine tailings have been defined with drained strength parameters for longterm modeling and undrained strength parameters for short-term and liquefied conditions.

## **3.2.1 Laboratory Data**

Triaxial testing was performed in 2007 and 1997 on thin-wall samples of LTVSMC fine tailings. A limited number of tests were performed as it has been difficult to identify and collect representative samples of fine tailings in the field due to inter-bedding of fine tailings and slimes.

Effective friction angles determined from isotropically consolidated undrained **(CIU)** triaxial compression tests and consolidated drained **(CD)** tests were analyzed to determine the drained shear strength. The results are presented in Figure A-4. Values range from about 32 to 40 degrees, with the 33rd percentile value of 33 .0 degrees.

## **3.2.2 Field Data**

Field data analysis methods for drained strength only apply to coarse-grained soils. Schmertmann's method for SPT analysis only applies to coarse-grained soils (Reference (10)), and Robertson and Campanella's method for CPT analysis only applies to coarse-grained soils (Reference (14)). As a result, field data are not included in analysis of the drained strength of the LTVSMC fine tailings.

## **3.2.3 Design Value**

Table 3-2 summarizes the drained friction angle testing of the LTVSMC fine tailings and presents the selected design value.





### **Table 3-2 L TVSMC Fine Tailings Tests for Drained Strength**



#### **3.3 L TVSMC Slimes**

The LTVSMC slimes have a minimum of 95% particles passing the No. 200 sieve, but because they are tailings with clay-size particles without clay mineralogy, the slimes have low plasticity. Similarly, the permeability of the slimes is not as low as would be expected for a naturally occurring soil with a comparable gradation. The slimes were characterized with a drained strength for long-term conditions and undrained strengths for short-term and liquefied conditions.

#### **3.3.1 Laboratory Data**

The LTVSMC slimes were evaluated in the laboratory with isotropically-consolidated, undrained (CIU) and consolidated-drained (CD) triaxial testing. While CIU triaxial testing has been performed extensively on LTVSMC slimes since 1986 (a total of 68 tests), only 14 of the available triaxial tests exhibited contractive behavior, with nine of those developing quasi-steady state **(QSS)** behavior. Nineteen direct shear tests were also performed by Ebasco in 1977 (Reference (15)) on the slimes.

Effective friction angles determined from triaxial and direct shear testing were plotted together to determine the drained shear strength. The results are presented in Figure A-5. Values range from about 25 to 43 degrees, with a 33rd percentile value of 34.3 degrees.

## **3.3.2 Field Data**

Field data analysis methods for drained strength only apply to coarse-grained soils. Schmertmann's method for SPT analysis only applies to coarse-grained soils (Reference (10)), and Robertson and Campanella's method for CPT analysis only applies to coarse-grained soils (Reference (14)). As a result, field data are not included in analysis of the drained strength of the LTVSMC slimes.

#### **3.3.3 Design Value**

Table 3-3 summarizes the drained shear strength testing and the derivation of the design value for the LTVSMC slimes. Based on the material and typical behavior, a design value of



33 degrees was chosen as an appropriate representation of the drained strength for LTVSMC slimes.

#### **Table 3-3 L TVSMC Slimes Tests for Drained Strength**



(1) Design value based on engineering judgment.

## **3.4 LTVSMC Fine Tailings/Slimes**

Previously the LTVSMC fine tailings and slimes had been combined only in the interior of the Tailings Basin to simplify the slope stability model. The LTVSMC fine tailings and LTVSMC slimes were analyzed together for the entire basin, hereafter called LTVSMC fine tailing/slimes. After reviewing the available CPT data for the site, Robertson suggested that fine tailings and slimes should be treated as the same material for stability analysis purposes (Reference (36)). Furthermore, some areas of slimes can be distinguished from fine tailings but due to the highly inter-bedded layering in the fine tailings and slimes, for stability analysis purposes these regions have been combined into one fine tailings/slimes region.

#### **3.4.1 Laboratory Data**

The laboratory data from LTVSMC slimes and fine tailings were combined in order to determine an effective friction angle for LTVSMC fine tailings/slimes. The triaxial and direct shear test results from fine tailings and slimes were plotted together to determine the drained shear strength. The results are presented in Figure A-6. Values range from about 25 to 43 degrees, with a 33rd percentile value of 34.1 degrees.

## **3.4.2 Field Data**

Field data analysis methods for drained strength only apply to coarse-grained soils. Schmertmann's method for SPT analysis only applies to coarse-grained soils (Reference (10)), and Robertson and Campanella's method for CPT analysis only applies to coarse-grained soils (Reference (14)). As a result, field data are not included in analysis of the drained strength of the LTVSMC fine tailings/slimes.

## **3.4.3 Design Value**

Table 3-4 summarizes the drained friction angle testing of LTVSMC fine tailings/slimes, and presents the selected design value. Based on the material and typical behavior, a design value



of 3 3 degrees was chosen as an appropriate representation of the drained strength for L **TVSMC** slimes.

## **Table 3-4 L TVSMC Fine Tailings/Slimes Tests for Drained Strength**



(1) Design value based on engineering judgment.

## **3.5 LTVSMC Bulk Tailings**

Future FTB dam lifts will be constructed with LTVSMC coarse tailings, with the potential for occasional inclusions of some LTVSMC fine tailings and slimes (hence the name bulk LTVSMC tailings is used). While LTVSMC coarse tailings will be preferentially borrowed, some mixing of LTVSMC fine tailings and slimes may occur during excavation, transport, and placement of the dam building materials. To evaluate the sensitivity of bulk tailings strength to various blend ratios (ratio of coarse tailings to fine tailings and slimes), four tailings mixtures were prepared from bulk samples obtained during test pitting in the Tailings Basin and the blending ratios and fines content are presented in Table 3-5.





Because the LTVSMC bulk tailings will be comprised primarily of LTVSMC coarse tailings, it is expected that they will be relatively free-draining and excess pore water pressures will dissipate quickly. During lift construction, the bulk tailings will be well-compacted, which means they will exhibit a dilative behavior when loaded. Therefore the bulk tailings were only characterized for drained strength conditions. The expected blend is Blend 2 or better





(preferential borrowing of LTVSMC coarse tailings will be performed to achieve Blend 2 or a blend with even greater coarse tailings content). Blend 2 conforms with the filter criteria and matches well with the selected design value.

# **3.5.1 Laboratory Data**

The shear strength of the LTVSMC bulk tailings was evaluated through CIU triaxial testing. Each of the four blends was tested. Eleven of the tests displayed dilative behavior and one test displayed quasi-steady state behavior. The results of the triaxial tests were analyzed for the drained friction angle by plotting the shear strength versus the confining pressure using the peak values from all triaxial tests. As shown on Figure A-7, the LTVSMC bulk tailings were characterized with a drained friction angle ranging from about 36.7 to 39.4 degrees. The 33rd percentile value is 38.3 degrees. Data from tests on all four blends were analyzed together (rather than averages from each 3-point series per blend type); however, the anticipated LTVSMC bulk tailings material is best represented by Blend 2 which has a friction angle of 38.5 degrees. All blends were analyzed to better understand how the finer material can impact the shear strength and to add a degree of conservatism for a material that has not yet been created in the field.

# **3.5.2 Field Data**

While the LTVSMC bulk tailings do not exist in the field, LTVSMC coarse and fine tailings have been tested with CPT and SPT. Based on these field tests, the LTVSMC bulk tailings were previously assumed to have a minimum drained friction angle of 3 3. 0 degrees based on the value determined for fine tailings (Table 3-2). The LTVSMC coarse tailings, which were not subjected to rigorous compaction methods performed during construction but were compacted by construction vehicle traffic, exhibited an average drained friction angle of approximately 38.5 degrees from field testing (Table 3-1). Because the LTVSMC bulk tailings will be subjected to mechanical compaction and comprised primarily of LTVSMC coarse tailings, as anticipated the LTVSMC bulk tailings warrant a shear strength similar to LTVSMC coarse tailings.

## **3.5.3 Design Value**

Table 3-6 summarizes the drained friction angle testing of the LTVSMC bulk tailings, and presents the selected design value.





#### **Table 3-6 L TVSMC Bulk Tailings Tests for Drained Strength**



(1) Design value is reported to nearest 0.5 degrees.

#### **3.6 Flotation Tailings**

The Flotation Tailings were generated in a pilot plant from processing of roughly 43 tons of ore. The Flotation Tailings have a similar gradation to the LTVSMC fine tailings. Therefore, the Flotation Tailings are defined with drained strength parameters for long-term modeling and undrained strength parameters for short-term and seismic modeling. No field data are available for the Flotation Tailings.

#### **3.6.1 Laboratory Data**

Only six of the 19 triaxial CIU tests performed on Flotation Tailings in 2005 and 2008 exhibited contractive behavior The remainder of the tests exhibited dilative behavior or behavior similar to quasi-steady state **(QSS),** though without a clear initial yield point. Of the 19 tests, 15 were used to determine the drained friction angle based on maximum deviator stress failure criterion. Results from the remaining four tests appear to represent high and low (outlier) values. Shear strength values were plotted together for the triaxial results to evaluate the difference in strength with each triaxial response. The test results ranged from about 19.5 to 47 degrees, as shown in Figure A-8. The 33rd percentile value is 35.7 degrees. However due to the limited amount of triaxial data, a design value of 33 degrees was chosen as an appropriate representation of the drained strength for Flotation Tailings based on the influence from triaxial test values performed under low effective normal stresses.

#### **3.6.2 Design Value**

Table 3-7 summarizes the drained friction angle testing for Flotation Tailings and presents the selected design value.





### **Table 3-7 Flotation Tailings Tests for Drained Strength**



(1) Design value based on engineering judgment.

#### **3.7 Peat**

A portion of the Tailings Basin was founded on wetlands. Extensive field and laboratory testing has been conducted during previous investigations. Past testing included CPT, FVST, direct shear, and triaxial testing. However, much of the past testing did not include detailed data for particular tests. Only summary results were reported in many of the historical investigation reports.

#### **3.7.1 Laboratory Data**

Several triaxial tests were performed on peat samples in 1979, 1980, 1990, and 1996. Direct shear testing was performed in 1979, 1980 and 1990 on peat samples. The direct shear results were plotted on Figure A-9 in terms of the failure envelope. Values of effective normal stress and shear stress associated with the drained shear/normal function are tabulated on Figure A-9. The selection of the drained Peat strength is consistent with the 33rd percentile approach; one-third of the data are below the design value and two-thirds of the data are above the design value.

#### **3.7.2 Design Value**

Table 3-8 summarizes the drained friction angle testing for peat and presents the selected design value.

#### **Table 3-8 Peat Tests for Drained Strength**







# **3.8 Glacial Till**

The glacial till comprises the foundation for the majority of the Tailings Basin, except where peat is present. In the critical design section, Cross-Section F, the glacial till exists below the peat. In general, in-situ testing or sampling of the glacial till has been very difficult, as the till is highly over-consolidated and often contains gravel, cobbles, and boulders. Therefore, limited data are available. Most samples collected of the glacial till are classified as silty sand with gravel, though varying amounts of clay, cobbles, and boulders are present.

# **3.8.1 Laboratory Data**

Only one CIU triaxial test has been performed on the glacial till for this site, which exhibits a drained friction angle of 35.0 degrees.

# **3.8.2 Field Data**

SPT data collected during drilling were analyzed for glacial till to determine the drained friction angle. There is a limited data set, as many borings terminated within the LTVSMC tailings or at the till interface. In the borings that penetrated the glacial till, depth to till ranged from 23 to 146 feet and the till had  $N_{60}$ -value of blow counts ranging from 14 to 68 blows per foot. As shown on Figure A-10, the 33rd percentile drained friction angle was calculated as 37.6 degrees, with results ranging from 35.7 to 51.6 degrees.

# **3.8.3 Design Value**

Table 3-9 summarizes the drained friction angle analysis for glacial till, and presents the selected design value used to characterize the till for both drained and undrained slope stability models.



## **Table 3-9 Glacial Till Tests for Drained Strength**

(1) Design value is reported to the nearest 0.5 degrees.

# **3.9 Summary of Design Values for Drained Shear Strength**

Table 3-10 summarizes the drained friction angle design values.





#### **Table 3-10 Drained Design Values**





# **4.0 Undrained Yield Shear Strength Parameters**

The undrained shear strength is often used to represent short-term conditions, typically immediately after construction where excess pore water pressures exist in fine-grained soils. Undrained shear strength parameters were determined for the LTVSMC fine tailings, LTVSMC slimes, LTVSMC fine tailings/slimes, Flotation Tailings, and peat. Undrained parameters were not adopted for the LTVSMC coarse tailings, LTVSMC bulk tailings, or the glacial till, as these materials are understood to behave in a drained matter under typical loading conditions. Figures related to the development of undrained shear strength parameters are provided in Exhibit B.

## **4.1 LTVSMC Fine Tailings**

The LTVSMC fine tailings can be characterized by undrained shear strength ratio for shortterm and seismic modeling.

#### **4.1.1 Laboratory Data**

Insufficient laboratory data was available for use in the analysis. Of the six triaxial CIU tests performed since 1986 on LTVSMC fine tailings, only three samples exhibited a quasi-steady state behavior where the stress-strain curve showed a peak. The results from the 1997 testing were not used to determine the undrained shear strength ratio of LTVSMC fine tailings, because they exhibited dilative behavior. Only second-hand data results were available and no raw data was provided in historical reports.

## **4.1.2 Field Data**

Field vane tests have been performed in the LTVSMC fine tailings. Only soundings from 2007 were used when analyzing the FVST design purposes, as they were the only CPT tests available with companion soil borings to verify the LTVSMC fine tailings classifications. Two field investigations to obtain FVST data were performed; one in 1977 by EBASCO (these test data were disregarded because it was determined that testing may have been conducted under drained conditions), and one in 2007 by AET under Barr's supervision (where vane shear tests were continued through yield response so residual strength was recorded). The field data from EBASCO is provided in Attachment D of Reference (1) and AET field data is provided in Attachment F of Reference (1). The undrained shear strength ratio from in-situ vane shear testing had *USSRyield* values ranging from 0.52 to 0.74. Due to the high *USSRyield* values, the FVST strength was not used in the design strength calculation of LTVSMC fine tailings.

During geotechnical investigations, CPT and SPT have been performed in the LTVSMC fine tailings. The computed *USSRyield* values ranged from approximately 0.21 to 0.30 for CPT data and from 0.22 to 0.29 for SPT data (defined by the bounds of Olson and Stark's (Reference (11)) equation, see Section 2.5.1.2). 33rd percentile values are 0.24 and 0.25 from CPT and SPT data respectively, as shown on Figures B-1 and B-2.



Table 4-1 summarizes the undrained strength analysis of the LTVSMC fine tailings, and presents the selected design value.



# **Table 4-1 L TVSMC Fine Tailings Tests for Undrained Strength**

SPT and CPT data were weighted equally in determining the LTVSMC fine tailings design value. Due to the nature of CPT testing, data is collected approximately every two centimeters during penetration and provides an indication of the trend in strength through a formation. The CPT and SPT data are correlated to strength via an empirical correlation proposed in Olson and Stark (Reference (11)).

# **4.2 L TVSMC Slimes**

# **4.2.1 Laboratory Data**

A total of 68 triaxial CIU tests have been performed since 1986 on LTVSMC slimes. Fourteen of the tests displayed contractive behavior, nine of which developed a quasi-steady state stress-strain curve. The *USSR<sub>vield</sub>* values ranged from approximately 0.16 to 0.33. The slimes were found to have a 33rd percentile *USSRyield* value of 0.20. Figure B-3 presents strength envelope plot of the triaxial data.

# **4.2.2 Field Data**

CPT and SPT data were collected during investigations performed in 1996, 2005, and 2007 to characterize the LTVSMC slimes. Slimes located at depths between O and 130 feet were tested. The computed *USSRyieldvalues* ranged from approximately 0.21 to 0.30 for CPT data, and from 0.21 to 0.29 for SPT values data (defined by the bounds of Olson and Stark's (Reference (5), Reference (11) equation, see Section 2.5.1.2). A strength envelope plot of the *USSRyield* results from CPT data is presented in Figure B-4 displaying the 33rd percentile value of 0.22. A strength envelope plot of the *USSRyield* results from SPT data is presented in Figure B-5 displaying the 33rd percentile value of 0.22.

In-situ vane shear testing was performed at various depths in borings historically. The FVST directly measures the in-situ strength for the LTVSMC tailings at discrete locations covering a zone about 10 cm in height. However, after determining which tests were likely performed in undrained conditions, the data was limited to 14 tests from 2007. The *USSRyield* data range from 0.06 to 0.47 (Figure B-6). The 33rd percentile value is an *USSRyield* of 0.26.


# **4.2.3 Design Value**

A summary of the triaxial tests, FVST, SPT, and CPT tests analyzed to determine yield shear strength for the LTVSMC slimes is provided in Table 4-2.

**Table 4-2 L TVSMC Slimes Tests for Undrained Strength** 

<b>Tests</b>	<b>SPT</b>	<b>CPT</b>	<b>FVST</b>	<b>Triaxial</b>
Number of Tests	14 borings	16 soundings	14	14
33rd Percentile	0.22	0.22	0.26	0.20
Combined 33rd Percentile USSR <sub>vield</sub>	0.23			0.20
Design Value $\mathit{USSR}_{\mathit{vield}}^{(1)}$	0.22			

(1) Design value is reported to nearest 0.01.

## **4.3 LTVSMC Fine Tailings/Slimes**

The LTVSMC fine tailings and slimes were also analyzed as a combined data set (LTVSMC fine tailings/slimes) using results of CPT, SPT, and FVST tests, using the approach described in Section 2.6.

### **4.3.1 Field Data**

The undrained shear strength ratio of the LTVSMC fine tailings/slimes was estimated by analyzing CPT data from 1996, 2005, and 2007 using the method described in Section 2.0. Combining the two types of tailings allowed for incorporation of additional field data beyond the individual data sets for fine tailings and slimes. Test results from areas where the fine tailings and slimes were interlayered such that it was not possible to differentiate distinct zones of one material or the other were excluded from the individual data sets, but could be included here. These results are particularly relevant to the interior portion of the Tailings Basin.

Olson's method provided *USSRyieldvalues* ranging from approximately 0.21 to 0.30. The data resulted in a 33rd percentile value of 0.22 as shown on Figure B-7.

The undrained shear strength ratio *(USSRyield)* based on SPT data for fine tailings and slimes ranged from approximately 0.205 to 0.295 as shown in Figure B-8 with a 33rd percentile value of 0.23.

There were 52 FVST performed on LTVSMC fine tailings and slimes in previous investigations; however, only 16 tests were analyzed after eliminating tests not considered to have been performed under undrained conditions. The *USSRyield* values for LTVSMC fine tailings/slimes ranged from 0.06 to 0.47 as shown on Figure B-9, with a 33rd percentile *USSRyieldvalue* of 0.26.





# **4.3.2 Design Value**

Table 4-3 summarizes the *USSRyield* testing of LTVSMC fine tailings/slimes, and presents the selected design value.





(1) Design value is rounded to the nearest 0.01.

## **4.4 Flotation Tailings**

The Flotation Tailings triaxial tests are used to determine undrained shear strength of the material that will be produced at the plant during operations. Yield strength values were plotted together for the contractive and quasi-steady state (QSS) triaxial results to evaluate the difference in strength.

### **4.4.1 Laboratory Data**

A total of 16 triaxial CIU tests have been performed since 2005 on Flotation Tailings. All of the yield strength values were plotted for the contractive and quasi-steady state triaxial results. While the dilative test results were omitted from this analysis, 14 test results remained for the strength analysis – six of which exhibited quasi-steady state behavior and five of which behaved in a contractive manner. For the triaxial undrained shear strength analysis of all tests, the Flotation Tailings were found to have a 33rd percentile *USSRyield*  value of 0.26, with values varying between 0.21 and 0.36, as presented on Figure B-10.

# **4.4.2 Design Value**

Table 4-4 summarizes the undrained strength testing of the Flotation Tailings, and presents the selected design value.





#### **Table 4-4 Flotation Tailings Tests for Undrained Strength**



As mentioned previously, the Flotation Tailings have a similar gradation to the LTVSMC fine tailings and the new design value is in line with the LTVSMC fine tailings, slimes and combined fine tailings/slimes design values.

#### **4.5 Peat**

#### **4.5.1 Laboratory Data**

Triaxial testing on peat was performed in 1979, 1980, 1990, and 1996. The undrained shear strength ratio ranged from approximately 0.10 to 0.56 with a 33rd percentile value of 0.23, as shown on Figure B-11.

### **4.5.2 Design Value**

On the basis of the laboratory data, a design value of 0.23 undrained shear strength ratio was selected. The selection of the undrained peat strength is consistent with the 33rd percentile approach used throughout for undrained shear strength determination; one-third of the data are below the design value and two-thirds of the data are above the design value. Therefore, the lower strength test data was taken into account when selecting the design value of peat. The undrained shear strength ratio is summarized in Table 4-5 along with the selected design value.

#### **Table 4-5 Peat Tests for Undrained Strength**





## **4.6 Summary of Design Values for Undrained Shear Strength**

Table 4-6 summarizes the undrained design values of the materials, selected based on the 33rd percentile values.

#### **Table 4-6 Summary of Undrained Design Values**





## **5.0 Liquefied Shear Strength Parameters**

Liquefied shear strengths are mobilized only if liquefaction is triggered by static loading, dynamic loading, or a deformation event. Regardless of the triggering mechanism, flow failure can occur if the static shear stress exceeds the net shearing resistance, including the liquefied shear strength.

Only contractive materials are susceptible to liquefaction; dilative materials are not. Dilative materials in the proposed FTB design, including glacial till, peat, and LTVSMC coarse tailings placed with compactive effort (such as those in the dam shell), are not considered subject to liquefaction so they were not evaluated for liquefied shear strength. While analyses show that some of the LTVSMC fine tailings or slimes can be dilative, it is conservative to assume that they will behave in a contractive manner. Contractive behavior is generally exhibited by loose, fine grained, hydraulically deposited sediments such as the LTVSMC tailings and the future Flotation Tailings.

Liquefied shear strength parameters were determined using a two-step analysis. The first step was material behavior evaluation. The material behavior evaluation used in-situ and laboratory data to identify zones of contractive materials and zones of dilative materials. The second step was to calculate the liquefied shear strength, including only test results from contractive zones. Figures related to the development of liquefied shear strength parameters are provided in Exhibit C and Exhibit D.

### **5.1 Material Behavior Evaluation**

The material behavior evaluation used data from in-situ testing and laboratory testing to (1) characterize the stratigraphy at each boring location; (2) determine which materials are susceptible to liquefaction; and, (3) identify dilative layers within generally contractive zones so that those results could be excluded from liquefied shear strength calculations.

Field testing included CPT, SPT and FVST. CPT soundings were used to develop an understanding of stratigraphy in the Tailings Basin, to measure material properties to assess the potential for liquefaction and to estimate liquefied strength. The CPT soundings collected nearly continuous data streams, measuring tip resistance  $(q_t)$  sleeve friction  $(f_s)$ , and pore water pressure  $(u_2)$  over the entire depth of the sounding.

Soil borings were conducted adjacent to the CPT sounding locations, performing SPT and gathering relatively undisturbed thin-wall samples. The SPT drilling and thin-wall sampling corroborated the CPT stratigraphic information and provided physical samples to evaluate material properties. Samples were characterized in the field and sent to the laboratory for index properties tests such as grain-size distributions and Atterberg Limits. Triaxial compression strength tests were also performed.

FVST testing targeted contractive zones. It was performed from behind the drill rig, at depths





where the CPT testing showed low tip resistances, characteristic of contractive materials. Additional details on the field and laboratory sampling programs is provided in Section 4.0 of Geotechnical Data Package Volume I Version 4.

Characteristic signature plots were created to identify the stratigraphic layers at each boring location and show which materials were targeted for FVST and laboratory testing. For each boring location, the characteristic signature plot combines CPT tip resistance, SPT corrected blow counts (N-values), boring log information, field vane testing results, and some index properties available from laboratory testing. Figure C-1 shows the characteristic signature plot for the 07-06 boring/sounding which is located within the interior of the basin along the existing dam at Cross-Section F. Similar plots created for other CPT/SPT test locations along Cross-Section F are provided in Exhibit D1.

Figure C-1 shows that at location 07-06 there is an approximately 10-foot-thick layer of slimes ( $q_t$ <10 tsf) present between depths of approximately 22 and 32 feet. This characteristic signature plot also shows that the FVST and index property testing was conducted on material from this slimes layer. Zones of LTVSMC fine tailings and slimes are identified by their CPT tip resistances. Apparent on Figure C-1, fine tailings  $(q_t)$  from 50 to 100 tsf) are distinguishable from slimes  $(q_t$  less than 10 tsf), with interbedded zones exhibiting a wider range  $(q_t$  from about 10 to 100 tsf). The plot shows a thin layer of peat at the bottom of the boring above the native glacial till. The peat exhibited tip resistance similar to fine tailings, but higher pore water pressure  $(u_2)$ , and sleeve friction  $(f_s)$ . Finally, the native glacial till had high SPT N-values and high CPT tip resistance and indicated a dense or hard layer where the probe was terminated to prevent damage to the equipment.

CPT behavior plots were created to gather further detail on stratigraphy and assess which materials are susceptible to liquefaction. For each boring location, the CPT behavior plot combines CPT tip resistance  $(q_t)$  sleeve friction  $(f_s)$  dynamic pore water pressure  $(u_2)$ , and normalized pore pressure difference. Figure C-2 shows the CPT behavior plot for the 07-06 sounding. Similar plots created for other CPT locations along Cross-Section F are provided in Exhibit D2.

The dynamic pore pressure, included on the CPT behavior plots, represents the pore pressure as the cone is advanced through the tailings. Dissipation tests are presented as purple dots on Figure C-2. They indicate an "equilibrium" water level reading at the probe depth. At some locations the dissipation tests show water levels above or below assumed hydrostatic conditions. Figure C-2 shows the variability of the dynamic pore pressure at this location, and how in certain zones the pore pressures exceed the hydrostatic conditions. These zones correspond to depths where low tip resistances were measured; they are generally identified as slimes. Zones where minimal pore pressure response is observed correspond to depths where higher tip resistances were observed, consistent with fine tailings.

The normalized pore excess pressure difference, also shown on the CPT behavior plots (e.g., Figure C-2), aids identification of contractive and dilative layers. The normalized excess





pore pressure difference is the difference between the dynamic pore pressure developed during cone advancement and the estimated hydrostatic conditions interpreted from the dissipation tests normalized by dividing by the effective overburden stress  $(\sigma_{\text{vo}})$ . Where the normalized pore pressure difference is positive, which is the result of dynamic pore pressure response above hydrostatic conditions, that material has a potential for contractive behavior and is susceptible to liquefaction. Where the normalized pore pressure difference is negative, dynamic pore water pressure is below the existing groundwater conditions, that soil is considered potentially dilative and will not liquefy. Figure C-2 shows that the normalized pore pressure difference is positive in the slimes and negative in LTVSMC fine tailings layers. Fine tailings zones with thin inter-bedded slimes layers show positive normalized pore pressures (e.g., Figure C-2 zone from approximately 50- to 60-foot depth). Overall, analysis of the CPT behavior plot at location 07-06 indicates that about 86% of saturated fine tailings and slimes points are potentially contractive and susceptible to liquefaction, and about 14% of the fine tailings and slimes points are potentially dilative and not susceptible to liquefaction.

The CPT behavior plots are one way to determine which materials are susceptible to liquefaction; another way is to plot CPT tip resistance relative to the medium compressibility boundary as developed by Fear and Robertson (Reference (4)) and updated by Olson (Reference (12)) for medium compressibility materials. CPT tip resistance plots show corrected tip resistance  $(q_{c1})$  versus calculated pre-failure effective stress. Points that plot to the left of the medium compressibility boundary are potentially contractive, and points that plot to the right are potentially dilative. Figure C-3 shows the CPT tip resistance plot for CPT location 07-06. This method of analysis indicates that 94% of the fine tailings and slimes at location 07-06 are potentially contractive (100% of the slimes and 90% of the fine tailings). Comparing the two methods of analysis, we see that the CPT tip resistance plot produces a higher estimate of the amount of material susceptible to liquefaction, compared to the analysis based on normalized pore pressure difference. The CPT tip resistance plots for each CPT sounding along Cross-Section F are provided in Exhibit D3.

The material behavior evaluation used the characteristic signature plots (Exhibit D1) and the CPT behavior plots (Exhibit D2) to establish the stratigraphy and assign each data point to a material category: LTVSMC coarse tailings, LTVSME fine tailings, or LTVSMC slimes. Then, for each material type, a CPT tip resistance plot and a SPT corrected N-values plot were created using data available CPT and SPT data. These CPT and SPT plots for each material type were used to: (1) establish which material types are contractive and susceptible to liquefaction; and (2) identify tests that may have evaluated more dilative layers within generally contractive zones so that those results could be excluded from liquefied shear strength calculations.

### **5.1.1 LTVSMC Coarse Tailings**

The vast majority of the LTVSMC coarse tailings display dilative behavior, as shown on Figure C-4. This is reasonable as the higher permeability of the coarse tailings facilitates





drainage and the coarse tailings have been subjected to some amount of compaction during dam construction from rubber-tired dozers. It is probable that any points plotting to the left or below the medium compressibility boundary represent thin layers of finer tailings interbedded within the coarse tailings zone. Because these small, variable zones are surrounded by free-draining material, they are also much less prone to liquefaction. Therefore, the LTVSMC coarse tailings are considered dilative and not susceptible to liquefaction. They were not assigned a liquefied strength.

# **5.1.2 LTVSMC Fine Tailings and Slimes**

Some of the LTVSMC fine tailings exhibit contractive behavior while some exhibit dilative behavior. Contractive data points represent 52% of all the CPT fine tailings data (Figure C-5) and 26% of all the SPT fine tailings data (Figure C-6). The percentage of contractive points on the CPT plot may be higher because CPT tip resistance is influenced by inter-bedded slimes layers above and below the cone tip as the cone is advanced. The result is that CPT tests may over represent the volume of fine tailings that are contractive. This effect has been documented by Lunne (Reference (37)) and other literature for cases where thin, interbedded layers exist. The conclusion of the material behavior evaluation is that the fine tailings are potentially contractive and susceptible to liquefaction.

The majority of the slimes are contractive in nature. Contractive data points represent 71% of all the CPT slimes data (Figure C-7) and 67% of the SPT slimes data (Figure C-8).

For the fully liquefied modeling and the liquefaction triggering analyses the individual layers of LTVSMC fine tailings, slimes, and inter-bedded fine tailings and slimes are modeled as a single unit, referred to as LTVSMC fine tailings/slimes. This approach is used because it is conservative to assume all of the materials will be reduced to the liquefied strength with the understanding that there is data showing that some materials are dilative. Therefore a single liquefied strength value for fine tailings/slimes was calculated, using only the contractive data from the fine tailings and the slimes.

### **5.1.3 Flotation Tailings**

Flotation Tailings will be hydraulically deposited and are expected to behave in a contractive manner. Therefore, a liquefied shear strength was determined for the Flotation Tailings.

### **5.2 Liquefied Strength Evaluation**

Liquefied strength values were calculated for LTVSMC fine tailings/slimes, and for Flotation Tailings, using the method described in Section 2.6.

A single design liquefied strength value was chosen for the combined LTVSMC fine tailings/slimes because they are modeled as a single unit for the fully liquefied modeling and the liquefaction triggering analyses. The LTVSMC fine tailings/slimes unit includes all layers of LTVSMC fine tailings, slimes, and inter-bedded fine tailings and slimes. This





approach is consistent with the material behavior evaluation which showed that within the Tailings Basin there are deposits where fine tailings and slimes are so interbedded that they cannot practically be distinguished as separate layers. Because the LTVSMC fine tailings and the LTVSMC slimes were individually determined to behave in generally a contractive manner, the significantly interbedded intervals and the unit combined for modeling purposes are also expected to exhibit contractive behavior.

The liquefied strength calculations use only contractive data points for each material type. This approach is used because it is conservative to assume all of the materials will be reduced to the liquefied strength with the understanding that there is data showing that some materials are dilative. Excluding the dilative data from liquefied strength calculations may have the effect of underestimating the true strength of the material. In fact, stringers of coarse material will help to redistribute excess pore-water pressures and limit the liquefied response. This is a conservative approach for the LTVSMC fine tailings, portions of which display dilative behavior. The contribution of these materials to the overall strength is being ignored and hence, slope stability models utilizing the design  $USSR_{liq}$  values are likely to be conservative.

## **5.2.1 LTVSMC Fine Tailings/Slimes**

The liquefied strength design value for LTVSMC fine tailings/slimes is based on the laboratory and field tests of LTVSMC fine tailings, slimes, and interbedded zones where results showed contractive behavior.

### **5.2.1.1 Laboratory Data**

Triaxial testing was conducted on relatively undisturbed thin-wall field samples of slimes and on samples remolded from representative materials using the moist-tamping or slurry methods to achieve very low initial densities and then consolidated to stresses expected within the FTB. Liquefied strength calculations used only the triaxial test results from samples that exhibited contractive or quasi-steady state behavior. Figure C-9 presents the results of the triaxial testing program. The inset figure shows the stress path for one sample of the test program. The stress paths for all of the samples used in the analysis are shown on Figure C-10.

The results of the testing presented on Figure C-9 show that for the nine samples where quasi-steady state and contractive behavior was observed, the liquefied strength ratio ranges from about 0.05 to 0.22 with an average  $USSR_{liq}$  of about 0.15. Further triaxial testing on remolded slimes samples is ongoing.

# **5.2.1.2 Field Data**

Field data collected in 2005 and 2007 have been used to evaluate the LTVSMC fine tailings/slimes. Field data inputs to the calculation of liquefied strength ratios included CPT,





SPT, and FVST results. The strengths are based only on the test results of LTVSMC fine tailings, slimes, and interbedded zones where results showed contractive behavior.

Slimes CPT results which showed contractive behavior on the plot of corrected CPT tip resistance (Figure C-7) were used as inputs. The raw CPT data for contractive slimes samples was processed using the Olson and Stark (Reference (5)) average correlation. Figure C-11, representing all contractive data, shows the slimes liquefied strength ratio ( $\text{USSR}_{lia}$ ) ranges from about 0.03 to 0.12 with an average of about 0.06. This is slightly higher than the value of0.04 based on just CPT data along Cross-Section F.

Determining which fine tailings CPT data to include in liquefied strength calculations is less straightforward, and requires engineering judgment. The decision on which fine tailings data to include in liquefied strength calculations was made on the basis of their liquefied strength ratio, using the CPT data from location CPT 07-06 as a guide. Figure C-12 shows that at CPT location 07-06, the contractive fine tailings not influenced by the thin layers of interbedded slimes exhibit liquefied strength ratios from about 0.09 to 0.13 A liquefied strength ratio of 0.13 represents the upper bound strength for the LTVSMC fine tailings and approaches the boundary where the strength correlations are limited by a maximum corrected tip resistance of 6.5 MPa. Based on this analysis, contractive LTVSMC fine tailings CPT data exhibiting liquefied strength ranging from about 0.09 to 0.13 were included in the calculation of the liquefied strength of LTVSMC fine tailings/slimes. The representative average CPT correlation value for the LTVSMC fine tailings is interpreted as approximately 0.115.

SPT results which showed contractive behavior on the plot of corrected blow counts (Figure C-6) were used as inputs. The raw SPT data for contractive materials were analyzed using the SPT-based correlation presented in Olson and Stark (Reference (5)). Figure C-13, representing all contractive data, shows that the liquefied strength ratio ( $\text{USSR}_{liq}$ ) based on SPT testing ranges from about 0.03 to 0.08 with an average of about 0.05. This is equal to the value of 0.05 based on just SPT data along Cross-Section F.

FVST results from 2007 which showed contractive behavior are presented in Figure C-14. The plot shows direct measurements of the remolded strength. These measurements were normalized with respect to the effective overburden stress and result in liquefied strength ratios ( $USSR_{liq}$ ) ranging from 0.05 to 0.19 with an average of about 0.095.

# **5.2.1.3 Design Value**

Determining the design value for liquefied strength of the LTVSMC fine tailings/slimes requires integrating and interpreting the results obtained from the various laboratory and field tests. To illustrate the procedure used to assign a design value, a series of figures are provided showing how the data from the various types of tests are brought together to create an understanding of reasonable upper and lower bounds for liquefied undrained shear strength, and how a design value is selected between these bounds.





Figures C-15 through C-20 illustrate the liquefied shear strength analysis along Cross-Section F. Figure C-15 presents the liquefied strength from correlations of the CPT data in the slimes. The resulting liquefied strength ratio ranged from about 0.03 to 0.11. This range varies from what was reported previously in Figure C-11 and the maximum value is slightly less because it represents only the data collected along Cross-Section F. Figure C-16 presents the SPT data correlation plotted along with the CPT. The data shows relative agreement between both methods of analyses. The SPT data has an average liquefied strength ratio of about 0.05 and ranges from about 0.03 to 0.10.

The strength values from FVST for all tests performed in slimes are presented with the CPT and SPT correlations on Figure C-17. The average remolded or *USSRliq* of FVST values is 0.095, with values ranging from 0.05 to 0.19.

Figure C-18 combines the results of the triaxial testing program for the slimes with the CPT, SPT and FVST results, and Figure C-19 adds lines showing reasonable upper and lower bounds of the strength envelope expected for the LTVSMC fine tailings/slimes based on all four types of tests. An upper-bound liquefied strength ratio of 0.22 corresponds to the triaxial quasi-steady state samples. This is appropriate because it represents the highest strength ratio observed for materials that are still considered contractive and susceptible to liquefaction. A lower-bound liquefied strength ratio of about 0.045 falls along the strength envelope consisting of CPT and SPT data when also considering the FVST data.

Finally, Figure C-20 adds results of LTVSMC fine tailings/slimes residual FVST results to the slimes data. The combined plot shows the variability in the materials while reducing the clutter from the data points.

Selection of a design value combines the evidence from all testing methods with engineering judgment. Figure C-21 presents the overall results of the analysis, plotting the average liquefied undrained shear strength correlation for each of the various types of laboratory and field tests, and showing their relation to the chosen Design Value USSR $_{liq}$  of 0.10. Flotation Tailings

# **5.2.2 Flotation Tailings**

Triaxial tests were used to determine an *USSRliq* for the Flotation Tailings and the results are plotted as stress paths on Figure C-22. Seven samples were tested as part of the initial program. Of the seven samples tested, five samples were contractive and two exhibited quasi-steady state behavior. The results of the triaxial testing of Flotation Tailings are shown on Figure C-23. The average *USSRliq* of all the triaxial tests (five contractive and two quasisteady state tests) is 0.12 as shown on Figure C-23. Additional testing on remolded samples is ongoing for use in further stages of the project. Table 5-1 presents a summary of the liquefied strength ratio for the Flotation Tailings.





#### **Table 5-1 Liquefied Strength of Flotation Tailings**



### **5.3 Summary of Design Values for Liquefied Shear Strength**

Table 5-2 summarizes the selected design values for use in slope stability analysis requiring use of liquefied strengths. Derivation of these values was described in the preceding sections.

#### **Table 5-2 Summary of Liquefied Strength Design Values**







## **6.0 Summary of Material Strength Properties**

This document presents a summary of the available strength data for the FTB and explains the derivation of the drained, undrained, and liquefied shear strength parameters selected for the various materials included in the slope stability models. The design values for the drained, undrained, and liquefied shear strength parameters are summarized in Table 6-1. Future site exploration and material testing programs may result in updated design values, as described in Section 5 of Reference (38).

#### **Table 6-1 Summary of Design Values**





## **References**

1. **Poly Met Mining Inc.** NorthMet Project Geotechnical Data Package Vol I - Flotation Tailings Basin (v4). April 2013.

2. **Barr Engineering Company.** Technical Memorandum: NorthMet Geotechnical Data Package - Volume I (Flotation Tailings Basin) - Version 4 Modeling Outcomes Summary. April 2, 2013.

3. *Dynamic properties of cohesive soil in foundation of an embankment dam in Kansas.*  **Castro, G., Walberg, F. C. and Perlea, V.** Montreal : 20th Congress of Large Dams, 2003.

4. *Estimating the Undrained Strength of Sand: A Theoretical Framework.* **Fear, Catherine E. and Robertson, PK.** 4, 1995, Canadian Geotechnical Journal, Vol. 32, pp. 859-870.

5. *Yield Strength Ratio and Liquefaction Analysis of Slopes and Embankments.* **Olson, Scott Mand Stark, Timothy D.** 8, s.1. : ASCE, August 2003, Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering, Vol. 129, pp. 727-737.

6. **Jefferies, Mike and Ken Been.** Soil Liquefaction. [Text book]. New York, New York: Taylor & Francis Group, 2006. pp. 62-63.

7. **Bobei, D.C., S.R. Lo, D. Wanataowski, C.T. Gnanendran, and M.M. Rahman.**  Modified State Parameter for Characterizing Static Liquefaction of Sand with Fines. *Canadian Geotechnical Journal.* 2009, Vol. 46, pp. 281-295.

8. **Robertson, P.K., et al.** The CANLEX Project: Summary and Conclusions. *Canadian Geotechnical Journal.* 2000, Vol. 37, pp. 563-591.

9. **Skempton, A.W.** Standard Penetration Test Procedures and the Effects in Sands of Overburden Pressure, Relative Density, Particle Size, Aging and Overconsolidation. *Geotechnique.* 1986, Vol. 6, 3, pp. 425-447.

IO. *Measurement of In-Situ Shear Strength, Keynote Lecture, Proceedings of the Conference on In-situ Measurement of Soil Properties.* **Schmertmann, J. H.** s.1. : Vol. II, American Society of Civil Engineers, June 1-4, 1975.

11. *Use of Laboratory Data to Confirm Yield and Liquefaction Strength Ratio Concepts.*  **Olson, Scott Mand Stark, Timothy D.** November 2003, Canadian Geotechnical Journal, Vol. 40, pp. 1164-1184.

12. *Strength Ratio Approach for Liquefaction Analysis of Tailings Dams.* **Olson, Scott M.**  [ed.] J. F. & K. H. Kwong Labuz. Minneapolis : University of Minnesota, 2009. Proceedings of the UMN 57th Annual Geotechnical Engineering Conference. pp. 37-46.



13. **Olson, Scott M., Timothy D. Stark.** Liquefied strength ratio from liquefaction flow failure case histories. *Canadian Gotechnical Journal.* May 9, 2002, Vol. 39, pp. 629-647.

14. *Interpretation of Cone Penentration Tests -Part I: Sand, and Part II: Clay.* **Robertson, PK and Campanella, R G.** 4, 1983, Canadian Geotechnical Journal, Vol. 20, pp. 718-733, 734-745.

15. **Ebasco Services Inc.** *Erie Mining Company Tailing Dam Investigation and Analysis Engineering Report.* 1977.

16. **Barr Engineering Co.** *LTVSMC Tailings Dam Field Exploration and Analyses.* 2000.

17. **Blight, G.E.** A Note on Field Vane Testing of Silty Soils. *Canadian Geotechnical Journal.* 1968, Vol. 5, 3, pp. 142-149.

18. **Morris, P.H. and Williams, D.J.** A revision of Blight's model of field van testing. *Canadian Geotechnical Journal.* 2000, Vol. 37.

19. **Novosad, J.** Studies on Granular Materials. 11. Apparatus for Measuring the Dynamic Angle of Internal and External Friction of Granular Materials. *Collect. Czech. Chem. Commun.* 1964, Vol. 29, pp. 2697-2701.

20. **Schimming, B., et. al.** Study of dynamic and static failure envelopes. *Journal of Soil Mechanics Foundations Division.* 1996, Vol. 92, pp. 105-124.

21. **Savage, S.B. and M. Sayed.** Stresses Developed by Dry Cohesionless Granular Materials. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics.* 1984, Vol. 142, pp. 391-430.

22. **Hungr, 0 and N.R. Morgenstern.** Experiments in high velocity open channel flow of granulat materials. *Geotechnique.* 1984, Vol. 34, pp. 405-413.

23. **Lemos, L.J.L.** The effect of rate on residual strength of soil. *PhD dissertation.* s.1. : Imperial College London (University of London), 1986.

24. **Vaid, Y. P., D. Negussy.** *Advanced Triaxial Testing of Soil and Rock* - *Chapter: Preparation of Reconstituted Sand Specimen.* [ ed.] R.C. Chaney, M.L. Silver R. T. Baltimore : American Society for Testing and Materials, 1988.

25. **Sassa, K.** Mechanism of flows in granular soils. *GeoEng 2000.* 2000, Vol. 1. Invited Papers, pp. 1671-1702.

26. *The mechanism of debris flows.* Sassa, K. San Francisco, CA: s.n., 1985. 11th International Conference on Soild Mechanics and Foundation Engineering. Vol. 3, pp. 1173- 1176.



27. *The mechanism starting liquefied landslides and debris flow.* **Sassa, K.** Toronto, Canada : s.n., 1984. 4th International Symposium on Landslide. Vol. 2, pp. 349-354.

28. **Fukuoka, H.** Variation of the friction angle of granular material in the high-speed highstress ring shear apparatus – Influence of re-orientation, alignment and crushing of grains during shear. *Bulletin of the Disaster Prevention Research Institute.* 1991.

29. **Tika, T.E., P. Vaughan, and L.J. Lemos.** Fast Shearing of pre-existing shear zones in soil. *Geotechnique.* 1996, Vol. 46, 2, pp. 197-233.

30. **Infante-Sedano, J. A.** Constant Volume Ring Shear Tests. *MSc. thesis.* Ottawa: University of Ottawa, 1998.

31. **Sadrekarimi, A. and S.M. Olson.** A new ring shear device to measure the large displacement shearing behavior of sands. *Geotechnical Testing Journal.* 2009, Vol. 32, 3.

32. **Lefebvre, G., et al., et al.** Report of the testing committee. *Committee of Specialists on Sensitive Clays on the NBR Complex.* Montreal, Annexe I : SEBJ : s.n., 1983.

33. **Terzaghi, Karl, Robert Peck and G. Mesri.** *Soil Mechanics in Engineering Practice.*  New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1996.

34. **Idriss, I.M. and R.W. Boulanger.** *Soil-liquefaction during earthquakes.* MNO-12. s.1. : Earthquake Engineering Research Institute, 1984.

35. *Use of Piezometer Cone Data.* **Robertson, PK, R.G. Campanella, D. Gillespie, J. Greig.** [ed.] SP Clemence. Blacksburg: ASCE, 1986. Specialty Conference: Use of In Situ Tests in Geotechnical Engineering. pp. 1263-1280. Geotechnical Special Publication No. 6.

36. **Robertson, P.K.** Correspondence from Dr. Robertson dated December 2, 2011 to Jeff Coffin Knight Piesold and Co. detailing his Geotechnical Review for NorthMet Mining. 2011.

37. **Lunne, T, Robertson, PK and Powell, J J.M.** *Cone Penetration Testing in Geotechnical Practice.* New York: Routledge, 1997.

38. **Poly Met Mining Inc.** NorthMet Project Flotation Tailings Management Plan (v3). April 2013.





# **List of Tables**







# **List of Figures**



# **List of Exhibits**



**Exhibits** 

**Exhibit A** 

**Figures of Drained Strength Tests** 



**FIGURE A-1** 

P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369862\WorkFiles\WO 022A Tailings Basin Permitting\2013 v4 Data Package Vol 1\Att C - Material Strength Characterization\Att C - V4\_Triaxial Tests\Coarse Tailings\_TX.xlsm

# **FIGURE A-2 LTVSMC Coarse Tailings SPT Correlated Drained Shear Strength Envelope**



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369862\WorkFiles\WO 022A Tailings Basin Permitting\2013 v4 Data Package Vol 1\Attachment C- Material Strength Characterization\Attachment C-V4\_SPTspreadsheet.xlsx

3/12/2013



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369862\WorkFiles\WO 022A Tailings Basin Permitting\2013 v4 Data Package Vol 1\Att C - Material Strength Characterization\Att C - V4\_CPT\Coarse Tailings\_CPTSummary\_2008 analysis.xls

# **FIGURE A-4 LTVSMC Fine Tailings Triaxial Drained Shear Strength Envelope**



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369862\WorkFiles\WO 022A Tailings Basin Permitting\2013 v4 Data Package Vol 1\Attachment C - Material Strength Characterization\Att C - V4\_Triaxial Tests\Fine Tailings\_TX drained.xlsm

3/12/2013

# **FIGURE A-5 LTVSMC Slimes Triaxial and Direct Shear Drained Shear Strength Envelope**



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369862\WorkFiles\WO 022A Tailings Basin Permitting\2013 v4 Data Package Vol 1\Att C - Material Strength Characterization\Att C - V4\_Triaxial Tests\Slimes\_TX drained.xlsm

# **FIGURE A-6 LTVSMC Fine Tailings/Slimes Triaxial and Direct Shear Drained Shear Strength Envelope**



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369862\WorkFiles\WO 022A Tailings Basin Permitting\2013 v4 Data Package Vol 1\Att C - Material Strength Characterization\Att C - V4\_Triaxial Tests\Fine Tailings-Slimes\_TX drained.xlsm

# **FIGURE A-7**  LTVSMC Bulk Tailings Triaxial Drained Shear Strength Envelope



P:Wpls\23 MN\69\2369862\WorkFiles\WO 022A Tailings Basin Permitting\2013 v4 Data Package Vol 1\Att C - Material Strength Characterization\Att C - V4\_Triaxial Tests\Bulk Tailings\_TX drained.xlsm

# **FIGURE A-8 NorthMet Flotation Tailings Triaxial Drained Shear Strength Envelope**



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369862\WorkFiles\WO 022A Tailings Basin Permitting\2013 v4 Data Package Vol 1\Att C - Material Strength Characterization\Att C - V4\_Triaxial Tests\Flotation\_TX drained.xlsm

4/9/2013

**FIGURE A-9 Compressed and Virgin Peat Direct Shear Drained Shear Strength Envelope** 



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369862\WorkFiles\WO 022A Tailings Basin Permitting\2013 v4 Data Package Vol 1\Att C - Material Strength Characterization\Att C - V4\_Triaxial Tests\Peat\_TX Drained.xlsm

FNP0003368 0254044



**Exhibit B** 

**Figures of Undrained Strength Tests** 



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369862\WorkFiles\WO 022A Tailings Basin Permitting\2013 v4 Data Package Vol 1\Att C - Material Strength Characterization\Att C - V4\_CPT\Fine Tailings CPT.xlsm 4/5/2013



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369862\WorkFiles\WO 022A Tailings Basin Permitting\2013 v4 Data Package Vol 1\Attachment C- Material Strength Characterization\Attachment C- V4\_5PT spreadsheet.xlsx 3/12/2013

**FIGURE B-3 LTVSMC Slimes Triaxial Undrained Shear Strength Envelope** 



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369862\WorkFiles\WO 022A Tailings Basin Permitting\2013 v4 Data Package Vol 1\Att C - Material Strength Characterization\Att C - V4\_Triaxial Tests\Slimes\_TX undrained.xlsm



**FIGURE B-4 LTVSMC Slimes** 

P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369862\WorkFiles\WO 022A Tailings Basin Permitting\2013 v4 Data Package Vol 1\Att C- Material Strength Characterization\Att C- V4\_CPT\Slimes CPT Summary.xlsm



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369862\WorkFiles\WO 022A Tailings Basin Permitting\2013 v4 Data Package Vol 1\Att C- Material Strength Characterization\Attachment C-V4\_5PT spreadsheet.xlsx
**FIGURE B-6 L TVSMC Slimes FVST Peak Undrained Shear Strength Envelope** 





P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369862\WorkFiles\WO 022A Tailings Basin Permitting\2013 v4 Data Package Vol **1\Att** C- Material Strength Characterization\Att C-V4\_CPT\Slimes CPT Summary.xlsm



**FIGURE B-9 L TVSMC Fine Tailings/Slimes FVST Peak Undrained Shear Strength Envelope** 



#### **FIGURE B-10 NorthMet Flotation Tailings Triaxial Undrained Shear Strength Envelope**



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369862\WorkFiles\WO 022A Tailings Basin Permitting\2013 v4 Data Package Vol 1\Att C - Material Strength Characterization\Att C - V4\_Triaxial Tests\Flotation\_TX Undrained.xlsm

3/28/2013

### **FIGURE B-11 Compressed and Virgin Peat Triaxial Undrained Shear Strength Envelope**



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369862\WorkFiles\WO 022A Tailings Basin Permitting\2013 v4 Data Package Vol 1\Att C - Material Strength Characterization\Att C - V4\_Triaxial Tests\Peat\_TX Yield.xlsm

**Exhibit C** 

**Figures of Liquefied Tests** 

# **FIGURE C-1**  Section F\_07-06 Characterization Signature NorthMet Flotation Tailings Basin

P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369862\WorkFiles\WO 022A Tailings Basin Permitting\2013 v4 Data Package Vol 1\Att C- Material Strength Characterization\Att C-V4\_CPT\Section F\CPT\_07-06.xlsm



4/4/2013

A 18-1952



**FIGURE C-2 CPT 07-06 Behavior Plot** 

P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369862\WorkFiles\WO 022A Tailings Basin Permitting\2013v4 Data PackageVol 1\Att C- Material Strength Characterization\Att C-V4\_CPT\Section F\CPT\_07-06.xlsm

...... .... **a,** 

**C: 0**  .... **n,**  >

**w** 

**Corrected CPT Tip Resistance, q<sub>c1</sub> [MPa]**<br>7.5 10.0 12.5 15.0 0.0 2.5 5.0 7.5 10.0 12.5 15.0 17.5 20.0 **o-,--- ... ==.r------,,----,------,------,,----,------,-----,**  ■ Fine Tailings por cho ♦ Slimes 50 -Olson (2009)  $\Box$ **Francis**  $\Box$ 100 **Te.M. Prosto** ده واتن<br>مرد<sub>ان</sub> 150 ັ້<br>ທີ່  $\frac{200}{200}$  -10-- $\frac{100}{200}$  -10-- $\frac{100}{200}$  -11-- $\frac{1000}{200}$  -11-- $\frac{$ Olson (2009) medium **('CS**  0 **:e**  compressibility 250 Effective **f!:!** 300 5. . **'iij LL**  ~ 350 **CONTRACTIVE | DILATIVE** 400 **90% of FT, 100% of Slimes, and**  450 **94% FT/Slimes are potentially contractive** 



Contractive/Dilative Behavior (Olson, 2009)

P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369862\WorkFiles\WO 022A Tailings Basin Permitting\2013 v4 Data Package Vol 1\Att C- Material Strength Characterization\Att C-V4\_CPT\Section F\CPT\_07-06.xlsm 4/4/2013

 $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ 

**FIGURE C-4 LTVSMC Coarse Tailings Contractive/Dilative Behavior**  Based on CPT Data (Olson, 2009)



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369862\WorkFiles\WO 022A Tailings Basin Permitting\2013 v4 Data Package Vol 1\Att C - Material Strength Characterization\Att C - V4\_CPT\Coarse Tailings\_CPTSummary\_2008 analysis.xis 4/4/2013

**FIGURE C-5 LTVSMC Fine Tailings Contractive/Dilative Behavior**  Based on CPT Data (Olson, 2009)



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369862\WorkFiles\WO 022A Tailings Basin Permitting\2013 v4 Data Package Vol 1\Att C- Material Strength Characterization\Att C-V4\_CPT\Fine Tailings CPT.xlsm 4/4/2013

**FIGURE C-6 LTVSMC Fine Tailings Contractive/Dilative Behavior**  Based on SPT Data (Olson, 2009)



**FIGURE C-7 LTVSMC Slimes Contractive/Dilative Behavior** 





P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369862\WorkFiles\WO 022A Tailings Basin Permitting\2013 v4 Data Package Vol 1\Att C- Material Strength Characterization\Att C-V4\_CPT\Slimes CPT Summary.xlsm 4/4/2013

0 1000 2000 3000 **C.**  <mark>.</mark><br>ኮ Stress, **QI** 4000 ... ertica > 5000 **QI**  Efefctive<br>-**QI**  e Efefcti **w QI** 6000 ...  $\Rightarrow$ Pre-Fa 7000 8000 9000 0 5  $\blacktriangle$ ■ \· 1 •• **Corrected Blow Counts, {N1) <sup>60</sup>[blows/ft]**  10 15 20 25 30 35 • Section F Section G **Section N** Section J 40 45 -Olson Medium Compressibility (2009)  $\begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \text{-} \ \text{-} \ \text{-} \ \text{-} \ \end{array} \end{array}$ •• ■ ♦ ■ - .... .~ **..** II ■ ~ ◄ • ♦ •■ ♦ • **A** ♦ ◄► **4111 A** • ♦ **<sup>A</sup>**• ·-• ... **<sup>A</sup>**.. - ♦ •• **<sup>A</sup>**◄►  $\bullet$ <sup>A</sup>**A**  Olson (2009)<br>medium **r**<br>**redium** compressibility **and the compressibility and the compressibility** compressibility  $\blacksquare$ ♦ ■ 1• CONTRACTIVE | | | | DILATIVE • 50 - •



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369862\WorkFiles\WO 022A Tailings Basin Permitting\2013 v4 Data Package Vol 1\Att C- Material Strength Characterization\Attachment C- V4\_5PT spreadsheet.xlsx

10000

**FIGURE** C-9 LTVSMC Slimes along Section F Triaxial Liquefied Undrained Shear Strength Envelope



**FIGURE C-10 Stress Path for LTVSMC Slimes** 



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369862\WorkFiles\Geotechnical lnvestigations\2013 data & analysis\URS Triaxial Data\Triax\_Slimes\_Quasi-steadystate.xlsm

4/4/2013



# **FIGURE C-11 LTVSMC Slimes**

P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369862\WorkFiles\WO 022A Tailings Basin Permitting\2013 v4 Data Package Vol 1\Att C - Material Strength Characterization\Att C - V4\_CPT\Slimes CPT Summary.xlsm

**FIGURE C-12 CPT 07-06 Fine Tailings Strength Ratio** 



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369862\WorkFiles\WO 022A Tailings Basin Permitting\2013 v4 Data Package Vol 1\Att C- Material Strength Characterization\Att C-V4\_CPT\Section F\CPT\_07-06.xlsm



**FIGURE C-14 LTVSMC Slimes 2007 FVST Residual Undrained Shear Strength Envelope** 



**FIGURE C-15 LTVSMC Slimes along Section F Liquefied Undrained Shear Strength** 



**FIGURE C-16 LTVSMC Slimes along Section F Liquefied Undrained Shear Strength**  CPT and SPT Tests



**FIGURE C-17 LTVSMC Slimes along Section F Liquefied Undrained Shear Strength**  CPT, SPT, and FVST Tests



**FIGURE C-18 LTVSMC Slimes along Section F Residual or Liquefied Undrained Shear Strength** 

CPT, SPT, FVST, and Triaxial Tests



## **FIGURE C-19 LTVSMC Slimes along Section F**

**Liquefied Undrained Shear Strength** 

Upper and Lower Bounds of CPT, SPT, FVST, and Triaxial Tests



**FIGURE C-20 LTVSMC Fine Tailings/Slimes along Section F Liquefied Undrained Shear Strength** 

CPT, SPT, FVST, and Triaxial Tests



### **FIGURE C-21 LTVSMC Slimes along Section F Liquefied Undrained Shear Strength**  Design Value with Test Averages



**FIGURE C-22 Stress Path for FlotationTailings** 



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369862\WorkFiles\Geotechnical Investigations\2013 data & analysis\URS Triaxial Data\Triax\_Polymet\_Quasi-steadystate.xlsm 4/4/2013

#### **FIGURE C-23**  NorthMet Flotation Tailings Triaxial Liquefied Undrained Shear Strength Envelope



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369862\WorkFiles\WO 022A Tailings Basin Permitting\2013 v4 Data Package Vol 1\Att C - Material Strength Characterization\Att C - V4\_Triaxial Tests\Flotation\_TX LIQ.xlsm

#### **Exhibit D**

#### **Figures of Section F CPT Tests**

- D1: Characterization Signature Plots
- D2: CPT Behavior Plots
- D3: Contractive/Dilative Plots

#### **Section F \_07-04B Characterization Signature NorthMet Flotation Tailings Basin**



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369862\WorkFiles\WO 022A Tailings Basin Permitting\2013 v4 Data Package Vol 1\Att C - Material Strength Characterization\Att C -V4\_CPT\Section F\CPT\_07-04B.xlsm

#### **Section F \_07-05 Characterization Signature NorthMet Flotation Tailings Basin**



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369862\WorkFiles\WO 022A Tailings Basin Permitting\2013 v4 Data Package Vol 1\Att C - Material Strength Characterization\Att C -V4\_CPT\Section F\CPT\_07-05.xlsm

#### **Section F \_DH96-49 Characterization Signature NorthMet Flotation Tailings Basin**



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369862\WorkFiles\WO 022A Tailings Basin Permitting\2013 v4 Data Package Vol 1\Att C - Material Strength Characterization\Att C -V4\_CPT\Section F\CPT\_DH96-49.xlsm

FNP0003368 0254085

**CPT 07-04B Behavior Plot NorthMet Flotation Tailings Basin** 



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369862\WorkFiles\WO 022A Tailings Basin Permitting\2013v4 Data PackageVol 1\Att C- Material Strength Characterization\Att C-V4\_CPT\Section F\CPT\_07-04B.xlsm

**CPT 07-05 Behavior Plot NorthMet Flotation Tailings Basin** 



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369862\WorkFiles\WO 022A Tailings Basin Permitting\2013v4 Data PackageVol 1\Att C- Material Strength Characterization\Att C-V4\_CPT\Section F\CPT\_07-05.xlsm
**CPT 07-27 Behavior Plot NorthMet Flotation Tailings Basin** 



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369862\WorkFiles\WO 022A Tailings Basin Permitting\2013v4 Data PackageVol 1\Att C- Material Strength Characterization\Att C-V4\_CPT\Section F\CPT\_07-27.xlsm

**CPT DH96-46 Behavior Plot NorthMet Flotation Tailings Basin** 



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369862\WorkFiles\WO 022A Tailings Basin Permitting\2013v4 Data PackageVol 1\Att C- Material Strength Characterization\Att C-V4\_CPT\Section F\CPT\_DH96-46.xlsm

**CPT DH96-48 Behavior Plot NorthMet Flotation Tailings Basin** 



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369862\WorkFiles\WO 022A Tailings Basin Permitting\2013v4 Data PackageVol 1\Att C- Material Strength Characterization\Att C-V4\_CPT\Section F\CPT\_DH96-48.xlsm

**CPT DH96-49 Behavior Plot NorthMet Flotation Tailings Basin** 



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369862\WorkFiles\WO 022A Tailings Basin Permitting\2013v4 Data PackageVol 1\Att C- Material Strength Characterization\Att C-V4\_CPT\Section F\CPT\_DH96-49.xlsm

**CPT 07-04B LTVSMC Fine Tailings/Slimes** 

Contractive/Dilative Behavior (Olson, 2009) North Met Flotation Tailings Basin



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369862\WorkFiles\WO 022A Tailings Basin Permitting\2013 v4 Data Package Vol 1\Att C - Material Strength Characterization\Att C - V4\_CPT\Section F\CPT\_07-04B.xlsm

**Corrected CPT Tip Resistance, q<sub>c1</sub> [MPa]**<br>7.5 10.0 12.5 0.0 2.5 5.0 7.5 10.0 12.5 15.0 17.5 20.0  $\overbrace{ }^{0}$   $\overbrace{ }^{0}$   $\overbrace{ }^{0}$   $\overbrace{ }^{1}$ ■ Fine Tailings 50 ----------j--------,O--------t----------t--------t-----t----------j ♦ Slimes Olson (2009) -Olson (2009) medium compressibility 100 +------+-----~,------+------+------+-----+-----------jf--------1 ....., **('CS a..**  150 **\_\_**s 1:<br>b Tess, c **Effective Vertical Stress** 200 250 **CONTRACTIVE DILATIVE 10000 0000000** 300 Ξ **e:!**  ::::, **'iij LL** <sup>I</sup> **e:! a..**  a Cas 350 **96.3% of FT,**  400 **100% of Slimes, and 96.8% FT/Slimes are potentially contractive**  450

**CPT 07-05 LTVSMC Fine Tailings/Slimes** 

Contractive/Dilative Behavior (Olson, 2009) NorthMet Flotation Tailings Basin

P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369862\WorkFiles\WO 022A Tailings Basin Permitting\2013 v4 Data Package Vol 1\Att C - Material Strength Characterization\Att C - V4\_CPT\Section F\CPT\_07-05.xlsm

 $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ 

**Corrected CPT Tip Resistance, q<sub>c1</sub> [MPa]**<br>7.5 10.0 12.5 15.0 0.0 2.5 5.0 7.5 10.0 12.5 15.0 17.5 20.0  $\overbrace{ }^{0}$   $\overbrace{ }^{0}$   $\overbrace{ }^{0}$   $\overbrace{ }^{1}$ ■ Fine Tailings Slimes 50 -Olson (2009) o a ,,,,,,,,,, n D n 100 ....., **('CS a..**   $\overline{\mathbf{x}}$ 150 200 Olson (2009) medium compressibility 250 **e:!**  <sup>~</sup>300 **--------+-----+-----------+-----+------+-----+-------+---------11**  '**i LL**  <sup>~</sup>**a..**  350 **CONTRACTIVE | DILATIVE** 400 **97.4% of FT,**  450 **100% of Slimes, and 97.9% FT/Slimes are potentially contractive** 

**CPT 07-27 LTVSMC Fine Tailings/Slimes** 

Contractive/Dilative Behavior (Olson, 2009) NorthMet Flotation Tailings Basin

P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369862\WorkFiles\WO 022A Tailings Basin Permitting\2013 v4 Data Package Vol 1\Att C - Material Strength Characterization\Att C - V4\_CPT\Section F\CPT\_07-27.xlsm

 $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ 

**CPT DH96-46 LTVSMC Fine Tailings/Slimes**  Contractive/Dilative Behavior (Olson, 2009) North Met Flotation Tailings Basin



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369862\WorkFiles\WO 022A Tailings Basin Permitting\2013 v4 Data Package Vol 1\Att C - Material Strength Characterization\Att C - V4\_CPT\Section F\CPT\_DH96-46.xlsm



#### **CPT DH96-48 LTVSMC Fine Tailings/Slimes**

Contractive/Dilative Behavior (Olson, 2009) NorthMet Flotation Tailings Basin

P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369862\WorkFiles\WO 022A Tailings Basin Permitting\2013 v4 Data Package Vol 1\Att C - Material Strength Characterization\Att C - V4\_CPT\Section F\CPT\_DH96-48.xlsm



**CPT DH96-49 LTVSMC Fine Tailings/Slimes** 

Contractive/Dilative Behavior (Olson, 2009)

P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369862\WorkFiles\WO 022A Tailings Basin Permitting\2013 v4 Data Package Vol 1\Att C - Material Strength Characterization\Att C - V4\_CPT\Section F\CPT\_DH96-49.xlsm

#### Attachment D

#### Historical Geotechnical Reports

*(previously posted electronically* - *not posted with report, CDs available upon request)* 

#### **Attachment E**

### 2007 **Geotechnical Investigation Laboratory Test Results**



### FNP0003368 0254100 A 18-1952









### FNP0003368 0254104 A 18-1952



### FNP0003368 0254105 A 18-1952



### FNP0003368 0254106 A 18-1952

















Bloomington, Minnesota 55420-3436



FNP0003368 0254114 A 18-1952



**FNP0003368 0254115 A 18-1952** 





FNP0003368 0254117 A 18-1952

#### **PolyMet Triaxial Testing Data**



#### **Note: Percent Strains will not match across rows, due to different sample sizes, and collapse of some specimens before 30% strain.**

**Job No. 5434** Date: 11-6-04 PolyMet Tailings Characterization











# Permeability Test Data



9301 Bryant Ave. South Suite 107 **POIL**<br>Part **Bloomington. Minnesota. 55420-3436**  $\int_{\rm F}^{\rm NGINEERING}$ 

# Permeability Test Data



9301 Bryant Ave. South Suite 107 **POIL**<br>Part **Bloomington. Minnesota. 55420-3436**  $\int_{\rm F}^{\rm NGINEERING}$






9301 Bryant Ave. South, Suite 107



J.



0254127



 $\mathbb{Z}_2$ 

ł,









Job No.: 6250<br>Test Type: CU w/pp

## Project: Polymet - #23/69-862-015-028 Boring No.: 07-0?C, Depth (ft.): 52.2-55.2 (Mid-Bot)




















































































































**Project: Polymet** #23/69-862-022B Location: Project No.: 6250 Boring No.: 07-04B **Tested** By: SO Checked By: JW<br>Depth: 56.7-57. Sample No.: **Test** Date: 9-4-07 Test No.: 1 Sample Type: **3T**  Elevation: Soil Description: Peat (PT) Remarks: Piston Area: 0.19 in^2 Filter Strip Correction: 0.00 tsf Specimen Height: 4.93 in Piston Friction: 0.00 lb Specimen Area: 3.12 in<sup>2</sup> Membrane Correction: 4.20 lb/in Specimen Volume: 251.98 cc Piston Weight: 0.00 **lb**  Correction Type: Uniform Liquid Limit: --- Plastic Limit: Measured Specific Gravity: 1.66 Before Test Before Test After Test After Test Trimmings Specimen Specimen Trimmings Container ID 278.16  $\,$ 313.61 Wt. Container + Wet Soil, gm 99.06  $\hspace{0.1em}---\hspace{0.1em}$  $\hspace{0.1cm}---$ 163. 2 9 Wt. Container + **Dry**  Soil, gm Wt. Container, gm 8. 9  $\sim$   $\sim$   $\sim$  $\sim$   $\sim$   $\sim$ 73.13 269.26 269.26 240.48 240.48 Wt. Wet Soil, gm 90 .16 Wt. **Dry** Soil, gm 90.16 90.16 90 .16 150.32 150.32 179.l 179. l Wt. Water, gm Water Content, % 166.73 198.65 198.65 166.73 Void Ratio 3.64 2. 77  $\frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{2} \right) = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{2} \right)$ 90.61 Degree of Saturation, % 100.00  $\frac{1}{2}$  $\frac{1}{2}$  $\frac{1}{2}$ Dry Unit Weight, pcf 22.337 27.505 Initial Height: 4.934 in Moisture: 198.65 % Area: 3.1165 in<sup>2</sup> Void Ratio: 3.64 Volume: 251.98 cc **Dry** Unit Weight: 22.337 **pcf**  Saturation: 90.61 % End of Initialization Time: 4. 616 min Total Vertical Stress: 0.14703 tsf Height Change: -0.014553 in Height: 4.9486 in Moisture: 200.39 % Total Horizontal Stress: 0.14459 tsf Void Ratio: 3.68 Area Change: 0 inA2 Area: 3.1165 inA2 Volume Change: -2.2297 cc Water Change: -1.5756 cc Pore Pressure: 0.070789 tsf Volume: 254.21 cc **Dry** Unit Weight: 22.141 **pcf**  Effective Vertical Stress: 0.076239 tsf Saturation: 90.38 % Effective Horizontal Stress: 0.073798 tsf Correction: 0 cc End of Consolidation/A Time: 4. 616 min Total Vertical Stress: 0.14703 tsf Height Change: -0.014553 in Height: 4.9486 in Moisture: 200.39 % Total Horizontal Stress: 0.14459 tsf Pore Pressure: 0.070789 tsf Effective Vertical Stress: 0.076239 tsf Area Change: 0 inA2 Area: 3.1165 inA2 Volume Change: -2.2297 cc Water Change: -1.5756 cc Volume: 254.21 cc Void Ratio: 3.68<br>Dry Unit Weight: 22.141 pc: Saturation: 90.38 % Effective Horizontal Stress: 0.073798 tsf Correction: 0 cc End of Saturation Time: 456.17 min Total Vertical Stress: 4.5487 tsf Height Change: -0.0583 in Height: 4.9923 in Moisture: 223.39 % Total Horizontal Stress: 4.5437 tsf Area Change: 0 in^2 Area: 3.1165 in^2 Void Ratio: 3.80 Pore Pressure: 4.4714 tsf Volume Change: -8.9322 cc Volume: 260.91 cc **Dry** Unit Weight: 21.572 **pcf**  Saturation: 97.48 % Effective Vertical Stress: 0.077288 tsf Water Change: -22.304 cc Effective Horizontal Stress: 0.072245 tsf Correction: 0 cc End of Consolidation/B Time: 1796.8 min<br>Total Vertical Stress: 10.502 ts Height: 4.1777 in Height Change: 0.7563 in Moisture: 166.73 % Area Change: 0.12738 in^2 Total Horizontal Stress: 6.3279 tsf Area: 2.9891 in<sup>2</sup> Void Ratio: 2.77 Pore Pressure: 4.4708 tsf Volume Change: 47.345 cc Volume: 204.64 cc **Dry** Unit Weight: 27.505 **pcf**  Effective Vertical Stress: 6.0313 tsf Saturation: 100.00 % Water Change: 21.649 cc Correction: 7.1278 cc Effective Horizontal Stress: 1.857 tsf End of Shear Time: 1998.8 min Total Vertical Stress: 12.128 tsf Height Change: 1.5919 in Height: 3.3421 in Moisture: 166.73 % Total Horizontal Stress: 6.3285 tsf Void Ratio: 2.77 Area Change: -0.61994 in^2 Area: 3.7365 in^2 Volume Change: 47.345 cc Volume: 204.64 cc **Dry** Unit Weight: 27.505 **pcf**  Pore Pressure: 5.5514 tsf<br>Effective Vertical Stress: 6.5768 ts Saturation: 100.00 % Effective Vertical Stress: 6.5768 tsf Water Change: 21.649 cc<br>Effective Horizontal Stress: 0.77707 tsf Correction: 7.1278 cc At Failure Time: 1821.3 min<br>Total Vertical Stress: 12.708 ts Height: 4.0777 in Height Change: 0.85631 in Moisture: 166.73 % Total Horizontal Stress: 6.3285 tsf<br>Total Horizontal Stress: 6.3285 tsf<br>Pore Pressure: 5.9416 tsf Void Ratio: 2.77 Area Change: -0.33049 in^2 Area: 3.447 in^2 Volume Change: 47.345 cc **Dry** Unit Weight: 27.505 **pcf**  Volume: 204.64 cc Pore Pressure: 5.9416 tsf<br>Effective Vertical Stress: 6.7667 ts Saturation: 100.00 % Effective Vertical Stress: 6.7667 tsf Water Change: 21.649 cc<br>Effective Horizontal Stress: 0.38685 tsf Correction: 0 cc

**TRIAXIAL TEST** 

Location:

**Tested** By: SO **Test** Date: 9-4-07 Sample Type: **3T** 

Plastic Limit: ---



Soil Description: Peat (PT) Remarks:

Liquid Limit: ---



Project No.: 6250 Checked By: JW Depth: 56.7-57.2 Elevation:

Filter Strip Correction: 0.00 ts<br>Membrane Correction: 4.20 lb/in<br>Correction Type: Uniform



Location: **Tested** By: SO **Test** Date: 9-4-07 Sample Type: **3T** 

Plastic Limit: ---

Project: Polymet #23/69-862-<br>Boring No.: 07-04B<br>Sample No.: Test No.: 1

Soil Description: Peat (PT) Remarks:

Liquid Limit: ---



Project No.: 6250 Checked By: JW Depth: 56.7-57.2 Elevation:

Filter Strip Correction: 0.00 ts<br>Membrane Correction: 4.20 lb/in<br>Correction Type: Uniform



**Project: Polymet** #23/69-862-022B Location: Project No.: 6250 Boring No.: 07-05 **Tested** By: SO Checked By: JW Sample No.: **Test** Date: 9-10-07 Depth: 98 .5-99 Test No.: 1 Sample Type: **3T**  Elevation: Soil Description: Peat (PT) Remarks: Specimen Height: 4.93 in Piston Area: 0.19 in^2 Filter Strip Correction: 0.00 tsf Piston Friction: 0.00 lb Specimen Area: 3.12 in<sup>2</sup> Membrane Correction: 4.20 lb/in Specimen Volume: 251.98 cc Piston Weight: 0.00 **lb**  Correction Type: Uniform Liquid Limit: --- Plastic Limit: Measured Specific Gravity: 1.70 Before Test Before Test After Test After Test Trimmings Specimen Specimen Trimmings Container ID 202. 71  $\,$ 307.2 Wt. Container + Wet Soil, gm 157.12 93.93  $\hspace{0.1em}---\hspace{0.1em}$  $\hspace{0.1cm}---$ Wt. Container + **Dry**  Soil, gm Wt. Container, gm 8. 9  $\frac{1}{2}$  $\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{$ 72. 09 193.81 193.81 235 .11 235.11 Wt. Wet Soil, gm Wt. **Dry** Soil, gm 85.03 85.03 85.03 85.03 108.78 108.78 150.08 150.08 Wt. Water, gm Water Content, % 127. 93 17 6. 50 127. 93 176.50 Void Ratio 4.04 3.00  $\frac{1}{2}$ Degree of Saturation, % 53. 8 6 100.00  $\frac{1}{2}$  $\frac{1}{2}$  $\frac{1}{2}$ Dry Unit Weight, pcf 21. 066 26.529 Initial Height: 4.934 in Moisture: 127.93 % Area: 3.1165 in<sup>2</sup> Void Ratio: 4.04 Volume: 251.98 cc **Dry** Unit Weight: 21.066 **pcf**  Saturation: 53.86 % End of Initialization Time: 5.2869 min Total Vertical Stress: 0.14721 tsf Height Change: -0.020524 in Height: 4.9545 in Moisture: 129.79 % Void Ratio: 4.10 Total Horizontal Stress: 0.144 tsf Pore Pressure: 0.070789 tsf Effective Vertical Stress: 0.076423 tsf Area Change: 0 inA2 Area: 3.1165 inA2 Volume Change: -3.1446 cc Volume: 255.13 cc Water Change: -1.5832 cc **Dry** Unit Weight: 20.806 **pcf**  Saturation: 53.81 % Effective Horizontal Stress: 0.073213 tsf Correction: 0 cc End of Consolidation/A Time: 5.2869 min Total Vertical Stress: 0.14721 tsf Height Change: -0.020524 in Height: 4.9545 in Moisture: 129.79 % Void Ratio: 4.10 Total Horizontal Stress: 0.144 tsf Pore Pressure: 0.070789 tsf Effective Vertical Stress: 0.076423 tsf Area Change: 0 inA2 Area: 3.1165 inA2 Volume Change: -3.1446 cc Volume: 255.13 cc Water Change: -1.5832 cc **Dry** Unit Weight: 20.806 **pcf**  Saturation: 53.81 % Effective Horizontal Stress: 0.073213 tsf Correction: 0 cc End of Saturation Time: 436.28 min Total Vertical Stress: 4.3471 tsf Height Change: -0.05047 in Height: 4.9845 in Moisture: 153.90 % Total Horizontal Stress: 4.3435 tsf Void Ratio: 4.19 Area Change: 0 inA2 Area: 3.1165 inA2 Volume Change: -7.7326 cc Volume: 259.71 cc Pore Pressure: 4.2719 tsf **Dry** Unit Weight: 20.439 **pcf**  Saturation: 62.40 % Effective Vertical Stress: 0.075201 tsf Water Change: -22.077 cc Effective Horizontal Stress: 0.071544 tsf Correction: 0 cc End of Consolidation/B Time: 5439.6 min<br>Total Vertical Stress: 11.16 ts Height Change: 0.96579 in Height: 3.9682 in Moisture: 176.50 % Area Change:  $0.039407$  in<sup>2</sup> Area:  $3.0771$  in<sup>2</sup> <br>Nolume Change:  $51.886$  cc Volume: 200.1 cc Total Horizontal Stress: 6.4613 tsf Void Ratio: 3.00 Pore Pressure: 4.2737 tsf Volume Change: 51.886 cc **Dry** Unit Weight: 26.529 **pcf**  Effective Vertical Stress: 6.8864 tsf Saturation: 100.00 % Water Change: 31.799 cc Correction: -73.097 cc Effective Horizontal Stress: 2.1877 tsf End of Shear Time: 5641.5 min Total Vertical Stress: 11.543 tsf Height Change: 1.7595 in Height: 3.1745 in Moisture: 176.50 % Total Horizontal Stress: 6.4619 tsf Void Ratio: 3.00 Area Change: -0.72992 in^2 Area: 3.8464 in^2 Volume Change: 51.886 cc Volume: 200.l cc **Dry** Unit Weight: 26.529 **pcf**  Pore Pressure: 5.3484 tsf<br>Effective Vertical Stress: 6.1945 ts Saturation: 100.00 % Water Change: 31.799 cc Correction: -73.097 cc Effective Horizontal Stress: 1.1135 tsf At Failure Time: 5467.9 min<br>Total Vertical Stress: 13.275 ts Height Change: 1.0758 in Height: 3.8582 in<br>Area Change: -0.36603 in^2 Area: 3.4825 in^2 Moisture: 176.50 % Total Horizontal Stress: 6.4619 tsf Area Change: -0.36603 inA2 Area: 3.4825 inA2 Void Ratio: 3.00 Volume Change: 51.886 cc **Dry** Unit Weight: 26.529 **pcf**  Pore Pressure: 5.9878 tsf Effective Vertical Stress: 7.2872 tsf Effective Horizontal Stress: 0.4741 tsf Water Change: 31.799 cc Correction: 0 cc Saturation: 100.00 %

**TRIAXIAL TEST** 

Location:

**Tested** By: SO **Test** Date: 9-10-07 Sample Type: **3T** 

Plastic Limit: ---



Soil Description: Peat (PT) Remarks:

Liquid Limit: ---



Filter Strip Correction: 0.00 ts<br>Membrane Correction: 4.20 lb/in<br>Correction Type: Uniform



Location: **Tested** By: SO **Test** Date: 9-10-07 Sample Type: **3T** 

Plastic Limit:

Project: Polymet #23/69-862-<br>Boring No.: 07-05<br>Sample No.: Test No.: 1

Soil Description: Peat (PT) Remarks:

Liquid Limit: ---



Project No.: 6250 Checked By: JW Depth: 98 .5-99 Elevation:

Filter Strip Correction: 0.00 ts<br>Membrane Correction: 4.20 lb/in<br>Correction Type: Uniform






## Permeability Test Data



9301 Bryant Ave. South Suite 107 **COIL** MINITED TNIX Bloomington, Minnesota 55420-3436













Job No.: 6250 Type: CU w/pp

Project: Polymet - #23/69-862-015-028 Boring No.: 07-02, Depth (ft.): 59 - 61,

Soil Type: Fine Tailings ( Sand w/Silt (ML) )







**FNP0003368 0254206 A 18-1952** 



FNP0003368 0254207 A 18-1952



FNP0003368 0254208 A 18-1952



20.11 22.70 -6.15







9301 Bryant Ave. South, Suite 107 **NGINEERING** Bloomington, Minnesota 55420-3436







9301 Bryant Ave. South, Suite 107 **NGINEERING** Bloomington, Minnesota 55420-3436







FNP0003368 0254216 A 18-1952







6 tsf

Bulk Composite LTV Slimes  $Job:$  6250





FNP0003368 0254221 A 18-1952



**FNP0003368 0254222 A 18-1952** 





**FNP0003368 0254224 A 18-1952** 











## FNP0003368 0254229 A 18-1952














## Permeability Test Data









## Permeability Test Data





9301 Bryant Ave. South Suite 107 EVIL Bloomington, Minnesota 55420-3436





## Permeability Test Data



9301 Bryant Ave. South Suite 107 **COIL** MINITED TNIX Bloomington, Minnesota 55420-3436

 $\int_{\rm F}^{\rm NGINEERING}$ 





**FNP0003368 0254242 A 18-1952** 





**FNP0003368** 

Job No.: 6250

## Project: Polymet - #23/69-862-015-028 Boring No.: 07-03, Depth (ft.): 30.7-32.7 (Top) Soil Type: Slimes ( Silt (ML) )











Job No.: 6250

Project: Polymet - #23/69-862-015-028 Boring No.: 07-06, Depth (ft.): 27.5 - 29.5 (M-T), Soil Type: Slimes ( Silt (ML) )

















**FNP0003368 0254257 A 18-1952** 



FNP0003368 0254258 A 18-1952













FNP0003368 0254263 A 18-1952



Boring #: 07-09 Depth (ft): 27.5-29.5

Job No. 6250<br>Date: 10/19/07







**FNP0003368 0254267 A 18-1952**


FNP0003368 0254268 A 18-1952



**FNP0003368 0254269 A 18-1952** 























































































































































# Permeability Test Data



9301 Bryant Ave. South Suite 107 **COIL** MINITED TNIX Bloomington, Minnesota 55420-3436

 $\int_{\rm F}^{\rm NGINEERING}$ 





9301 Bryant Ave. South, Suite 107 **NGINEERING** Bloomington, Minnesota 55420-3436





## FNP0003368 0254348 A 18-1952













# FNP0003368 0254354 A 18-1952













#### FNP0003368 0254360 A 18-1952





**FNP0003368 0254362 A 18-1952** 



0254363



**0254364** 

Job: 6251









0254368









Sample#: Mix #4

Job: 6251-A








## FNP0003368 0254376 A 18-1952



## FNP0003368 0254377 A 18-1952





FNP0003368 0254379 A 18-1952



## FNP0003368 0254380 A 18-1952











9301 Bryant Ave. South, Suite 107 **NGINEERING** Bloomington, Minnesota 55420-3436





























FNP0003368 0254397 A 18-1952







## Permeability Test Data



9301 Bryant Ave. South Suite 107 **COIL** MINITED TNIX Bloomington, Minnesota 55420-3436

 $\int_{\rm F}^{\rm NGINEERING}$ 













29.82

21.53 7.20 -0.85 27.85 9.10 -0.49 22.80 7.25 -0.88 29.12 9.14 -0.48

25.34 7.38 -0.93 30.04<br>27.87 7.55 -0.96 27.87 7.55 -0.96



26.36 9.86 0.46








## Project: Polymet - #23/69-862-024B

Boring No.: SB-23, Depth (ft.): 26 - 28



























































































































































































## **DIRECT SIMPLE SHEAR TEST**





### **DIRECT SIMPLE SHEAR TEST**





### **DIRECT SIMPLE SHEAR TEST**





# Permeability Test Data



9301 Bryant Ave. South Suite 107 **COIL** MINITED TNIX Bloomington, Minnesota 55420-3436



# Permeability Test Data



9301 Bryant Ave. South Suite 107 **COIL** MINITED TNIX Bloomington, Minnesota 55420-3436















Job: 6428










### **Triaxial Shear Data**

Job: 6428

















LTV Slimes 6449

**Attachment F** 

## **2014 Geotechnical Investigation Report**



# **Winter 2013/2014 Geotechnical Investigation**

Prepared for Poly Met Mining Inc.

December 2014



# Winter 2013/2014 Geotechnical Investigation Poly Met Mining Inc.

# Hoyt Lakes, Minnesota

# December 2014

# Contents



 $\ddot{\rm I}$ 



## List of Tables

- Table 2-1 Flotation Tailings Basin Containment System SPT Borehole and Rotasonic Borehole Installation Summary
- Table 2-2 Piezometer Summary
- Table 3-1 Blow Count Summary
- Table 3-2 Rock Quality Designation Summary
- Table 3-3 Packer Test Summary
- Table 4-1 CPT Investigation Summary
- Table 5-1 Water Depth Summary
- Table 5-2 Consolidation Data Summary

## List of Large Figures

- Large Figure 1 Project Location
- Large Figure 2 2014 Geotechnical Investigation Locations
- Large Figure 3 Rotasonic Investigation Locations
- Large Figure 4 SPT Investigation Locations
- Large Figure 5 Blow Counts Versus Depth
- Large Figure 6 Rock Quality Designation versus Depth in Drillhole
- Large Figure 7 2014 CPT Investigation Locations
- Large Figure 8 Flotation Tailings Basin Seepage Capture System Cutoff Wall Profile
- Large Figure 9 Hydraulic Conductivity Testing Results of Glacial Till
- Large Figure 10 Atterberg Limits Results
- Large Figure 11 Sieve and Hydrometer Results
- Large Figure 12 Triaxial Undrained Shear Strength Envelope for Compressed and Virgin Peat
- Large Figure 13 Drained Shear Strength Envelope for Compressed and Virgin Peat
- Large Figure 14 Drained Shear Strength Envelope for Glacial Till

#### List of Exhibits

- Exhibit A Rotasonic Logs
- Exhibit B Piezometer Logs
- Exhibit C Slug Testing Results
- Exhibit D SPT Boring Logs
- Exhibit E Packer Testing Results
- Exhibit F Laboratory Test Results
- Exhibit G Cone Penetration Test Results
- Exhibit H Pore Pressure Dissipation Test Results

**Certifications** 

I hereby certify that this report was prepared by me or under my direct supervision and that I am a duly licensed Professional Engineer under the laws of the State of Minnesota.

Draft

Thomas J. Radue, P.E. PE #20951

December 30, 2014

# **Executive Summary**

During winter 2013/2014, Barr Engineering Co. (Barr) under authorization and contract with Poly Met Mining Inc. (PolyMet) completed a geotechnical investigation at the NorthMet Plant Site with two objectives:

- to provide additional detail on existing conditions along the Tailings Basin toe of dam, to support design of the Flotation Tailings Basin (FTB) Seepage Containment System
- to provide additional detail on stratigraphy in Tailings Basin Cells 1E and 2E to support stability modeling and FTB design

Investigation for the FTB Containment System consisted of two separate field studies: the first study included Rotasonic borings and installation of standpipe piezometers, then performing slug tests in the standpipe piezometers. The second study included standard penetration test (SPT) drilling, collection of undisturbed samples in surficial deposits, rock coring, packer testing in bedrock, and in-laboratory testing of materials. Field study results along the FTB Containment System alignment are summarized below.

- The surficial deposits along the northern and western toe of the Tailings Basin vary in thickness by test location but stratigraphy is generalized as follows, from the top down:
- peat.; 0 to 20 feet thick
- tailings; 0 to 17 feet thick, in isolated locations
- silty sand; 0 to 6 of feet thick, fine to coarse grained, with various amounts of clay
- glacial till; 5 to 36.5 feet thick, with cobbles and boulders interspersed, varying in size from <l foot to approximately 4 feet in diameter
- Depth to bedrock ranges from 2 to 47 feet with an average depth of approximately 20 feet.
- Groundwater levels were at the surface or just below.
- Hydraulic conductivity of the glacial till ranged from  $1.5x10^{-3}$  ft/s (4.6x10<sup>-2</sup> cm/s) to  $1.7x10^{-6}$  ft/s (5.2x10<sup>-5</sup> cm/s) with a geometric mean of  $5.1x10^{-5}$  ft/s (1.5x10<sup>-3</sup> cm/s).
- Hydraulic conductivity of the upper portion of the bedrock ranged from effectively 0 (the borehole produced no water) to  $2.4x10^{-5}$  ft/s (7.3x10<sup>-4</sup> cm/s), with a geometric mean (excluding the zero inflow locations) of  $1.9 \times 10^{-6}$  ft/s (5.8  $\times$  10<sup>-5</sup> cm/s).

These results support the following findings:

• Soils suitable for installation of a cutoff wall exist along the proposed FTB Containment System alignment.

- At isolated locations (e.g., B-14-44 and B-14-65) deep pockets of tailings and peat may need to be excavated prior to construction.
- When selecting construction methods, the FTB Containment System construction contractor will need to consider the presence of cobbles and boulders in the till.

The Cell lE/ 2E investigation consisted of cone penetration test (CPT) soundings. Field study results within the existing Tailings Basin are summarized below.

- There has been little to no strength increase of the tailings in Cell lE and 2E since 2007.
- Additional stratigraphic information confirmed existing information and filled data gaps.
- The phreatic surface in Cell 2E has decreased approximately 5 feet since 2007. In Cell 1E the phreatic surface has increased approximately 25 feet since 2007 due to recent pumping of excess water into this basin.

# **1.0 Introduction**

This report describes the Geotechnical Investigation performed during the winter of 2013/2014 at the former LTV Steel Mining Company (LTVSMC) Tailings Basin located at Poly Met Mining Inc.'s (Poly Met) NorthMet Plant Site. PolyMet plans to build the Flotation Tailings Basin (FTB) atop the existing Tailings Basin Cells 1E and 2E to store future NorthMet Flotation Tailings. In this report, the FTB is the newly constructed North Met Flotation Tailings impoundment, and the Tailings Basin is the existing LTVSMC tailings basin as well as the combined LTVSMC tailings basin and the FTB.

In order to manage potential water quality impacts from the Tailings Basin, PolyMet plans to install the FTB Containment System along the northern, western, and portions of the eastern sides of the Tailings Basin. The FTB Containment System will consist of a cutoff wall and a collection trench to capture seepage from the Tailings Basin, installed approximately 200 feet downstream from the toe of the Tailings Basin.

This document summarizes methods and results of the 2014 geotechnical investigation, which had two objectives:

- provide additional detail on existing conditions along the Tailings Basin toes to support design of the FTB Containment System
- provide additional detail on stratigraphy in Tailings Basin Cells 1E and 2E to support stability modeling and FTB design

# **1.1 Site Description**

The North Met Project (Project) is located approximately five miles north of Hoyt Lakes, Minnesota, in St. Louis County as shown in Large Figure 1. Large Figure 2 shows the general site layout, including the existing Tailings Basin consisting of Cells lW, 1E and 2E.

Native unconsolidated deposits at the Plant Site are a relatively thin mantle of glacial till and associated reworked sediments. In places the glacial deposits are overlain by a varying thickness of peat.

The uppermost bedrock unit is the Precambrian Giant's Range granite. Depth to bedrock is generally less than 50 feet, although the thickness of the native sediments beneath the existing Tailings Basin is unknown. There are two outcrops of bedrock that abut the southeastern corner of Cell lE at the Tailings Basin that consist of schist of sedimentary and volcanic origin.

Much of the area between the Tailings Basin and the Embarrass River, to the north of Cells 2W and 2E, is covered by wetlands that are groundwater fed and represent surficial expressions of the water table.

# **1.2 Investigation Overview**

The investigation targeted locations that are only accessible to heavy equipment when the ground is frozen, so the fieldwork was scheduled for winter and early spring when there was deep snowpack and below-freezing temperatures. Barr assisted PolyMet with the development of winter roads to provide

access to proposed geotechnical drilling locations. Geotechnical drilling locations and access routes were chosen to avoid wetlands, open water, and areas too steep to allow safe drill rig descent. Existing ramps and trails were used as much as possible. The geotechnical field test locations are shown on Large Figure 2.

Two separate field studies were performed along the FTB Containment System alignment. The first included Rotasonic borings and installation of standpipe piezometers, with subsequent slug testing of the new piezometers installed in glacial till, as described in Section 2.0. The second included standard penetration test (SPT) drilling, collection of undisturbed samples in surficial deposits, rock coring and packer testing in bedrock, and laboratory testing, as described in Section 3.0. The field investigations were performed to evaluate:

- soil type and thickness
- presence of cobbles and boulders within the glacial till
- depth to bedrock
- groundwater levels
- hydraulic conductivity of the soils and bedrock

Field work performed in Tailings Basin Cells 1E and 2E included cone penetration test (CPT) soundings, as described in Section 4.0, to:

- confirm the strength, compressibility, stiffness, and density characteristics of the existing tailings
- evaluate if consolidation has occurred since the close of the LTVSMC mine in 2001 and since previous testing was performed in 2007
- fill stratigraphy gaps along three previously identified cross-sections analyzed for slope stability of the proposed FTB

# **2.0 Rotasonic Work**

As part of the FTB Containment System investigation, the Rotasonic work consisted of Rotasonic coring and collection of soil and rock samples, installation of standpipe piezometers, and slug testing. The Rotasonic work began on March 10, 2014 and was completed on March 18, 2014. During this time, ground conditions remained frozen and temperatures remained below freezing. A total of 22 Rotasonic borings were performed as part of the work including: R14-02, 04, 05, 06, 07, 08, 09, 10, l0A, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 20, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, and 30 (Large Figure 2). The Rotasonic logs are provided in Exhibit A.

Large Figure 2 shows the overall project layout. Large Figure 3 shows the locations of only the Rotasonic borings completed for the project and identifies which Rotasonic locations had instrumentation installed in the hole once drilling was complete. Boring coordinates, depth of bedrock, depth of water table, stationing, and piezometer installation information are included in Table 2-1.

# **2.1 Field Work**

### **2.1.1 Rotasonic Cores**

There were 30 proposed Rotasonic locations; however, due to open water conditions, some of the proposed locations were not accessible and therefore a total of 22 Rotasonic cores were completed. The naming convention for the Rotasonic locations begins with a capital R, the year (14 for 2014), and the location number. For example, R14-01 is a Rotasonic hole that was performed in 2014 and is identified as location 01. Each location was drilled to the assumed top of bedrock, and usually extended an additional 3 to 8.5 feet into competent rock to confirm that bedrock, rather than a boulder, was encountered. If rock was encountered shallower than anticipated, offset holes were performed as needed to confirm bedrock depth. Water levels were also recorded during the investigation, providing an approximate depth to groundwater (described in Section 5.1.3). Note that these water levels are not actual phreatic surface values and thus locations R14-15, 20, 24, and 27 reported a water level deeper than is expected to be encountered during construction.

All locations were cored along the proposed FTB Containment System alignment, approximately 200 feet downstream from the toe ofthe Tailings Basin. The Rotasonic drilling was performed by Cascade Drilling out of Little Falls, Minnesota. Soil sampling and classification was performed by a Barr representative on site during the entire field investigation. Samples were collected representing the core and also any unusual or unique soils. All work was performed in accordance with ASTM D5092 and soil samples were classified based on the United States Classification System (USCS). All samples were sealed in bags in the field in order to preserve the in-situ moisture content.







(1) Borehole station location is shown (±25 feet). Actual station location may *vary* due to offsets.

Estimated depth to bedrock was based on previously available GIS maps and boring logs.

(3) Ground surface elevations are based on 2010 LIDAR data.

7

## **2.1.2 Piezometer Installation**

Standpipe piezometers were installed in ten (10) Rotasonic boreholes (R14-04, 06, 08, 12, 13, 15, 16, 26, 27, and 28) to depths ranging from 10 to 35 feet. The piezometers consist of a PVC riser with a 5-foot screened tip at the bottom. Sand pack was placed in the annulus around the screened interval and a bentonite seal was placed above the sand pack to isolate the porewater pressure in the screened interval. The piezometers were then backfilled with bentonite grout to prevent unwanted vertical migration of water. The screened zone was installed in glacial till at depths that were determined at the time of drilling and typically corresponded to zones assumed to have a higher permeability than the surrounding soil, usually located just above bedrock. Table 2-2 summarizes the piezometer installations. Piezometer logs are provided in Exhibit B.



#### **Table 2-2 Piezometer Summary**

The piezometers were bailed three times during the geotechnical investigation by Barr field staff in order to develop the wells and establish flow through the screens. Water level readings were recorded using a water level indicator. Readings were taken just before the wells were bailed and approximately 12 hours later to allow the levels to stabilize. Once water levels were stabilized, slug tests were performed in the wells shortly after.

# **2.2 Slug Testing**

After the wells were fully developed, Barr staff performed slug testing in all ten of the standpipe piezometers, and in several monitoring wells (GW00l, GW006, GW007, and GW012) that were accessible and had been installed in 2008.

The slug tests used a solid piece of PVC pipe to rapidly displace the static water level in the piezometer or well. The slug testing was performed with 5-foot or 2.5-foot long, 1-inch diameter PVC slugs. Three sets of tests (slug in and slug out for each test) were performed in each piezometer. The first and third test was performed with the 5-foot slug and the second test was performed with the 2.5-foot slug to confirm repeatability. A slug test in which the displacement is initiated by rapidly lowering a slug below the water level is referred to as a slug-in or falling-head test; a slug-out or rising-head test is one in which the slug is rapidly removed. The resulting water-level recovery to static, pre-test conditions was monitored using a data-logging pressure transducer (InSitu - LevelTroll 700). Slug testing results are provided in Exhibit C.

# **3.0 SPT Work**

The SPT work was performed by Braun Intertec (Braun) out of their Duluth, Minnesota, office. An allterrain drill rig was mobilized to the site to conduct the borings utilizing hollow-stem auger methods at shallow depths and via mud rotary at greater depths below the water table.

Soil sampling and material classification was performed at 2.5-foot intervals to a depth of 10 feet and at 5-foot intervals thereafter. All split spoon sampling and standard penetration testing was performed in accordance with ASTM D1586. Soft clay and organic soil samples were collected with 3-inch thin-wall samplers, when feasible, in accordance with ASTM D1587. All soil samples were sealed in the field in order to preserve the in-situ moisture content. Samples were transported to the Soil Engineering Testing Inc. (SET) laboratory in Richfield, Minnesota, for testing.

Coring was performed when apparent bedrock was encountered, typically indicated by SPT results in excess of 50 blows for less than one-half foot of penetration. Packer testing was also performed in the bedrock. Copies of the boring logs are provided in Exhibit D.

The SPT work began on March 26, 2014 and was completed on May 20, 2014. The highest priority locations were completed first in order to avoid wetland disturbance. Ground conditions remained frozen until approximately April 17, 2014. The locations completed before April 17 included B14-44, B14-65, B14- 69, B14-72, B14-76, and B14-80. These were priority locations; most of them were located in documented wetlands. The next three borings (B14-52, B14-55, and B14-62) were located on high ground, where there were no open water concerns or wetlands disturbance issues. However; because of the thawed conditions, access limitations required that the last three borings (B14-46, B14-40, and B14-48) be offset from their initial staked locations to higher ground so that no drilling occurred in known wetlands locations.

Large Figure 2 shows the overall project layout, including the SPT investigation locations. Large Figure 4 shows the plan location of all SPT locations completed for the project and which SPT boreholes had packer testing performed in the bedrock. Boring coordinates, depth of bedrock, depth of water table, stationing, and whether packer testing was performed is included in Table 2-1.

# **3.1 Field Work**

## **3.1.1 SPT Soil Borings**

A total of 12 soil borings were performed. Where possible, soil borings were completed along the proposed FTB Containment System alignment. Due to wetlands access issues because of spring thaw, two of the proposed locations were offset towards the Tailings basin. Soil borings were drilled to the top of bedrock, except where noted. B14-62 was abandoned in a boulder field at 27 feet due to difficult drilling conditions and time and resource constraints. B14-69 was abandoned when artesian flow was encountered in weathered bedrock.

### **3.1.2 In situ Testing**

#### **3.1.2.1 Standard Penetration Tests**

Standard Penetration Tests (SPT) were performed on soils at the site to supplement the suite of laboratory tests performed on soil samples, to aid in material classification, and to estimate strength properties. SPTs were performed in accordance with ASTM D1586. The number of blow counts, or the N-value, required to advance the sampler 1 foot into the ground is the standard penetration resistance of the soil. A summary of corrected N-values is provided in Table 3-1. These N-values were not corrected for overburden stress, hammer efficiency, borehole diameter, sampling method, and rod length. The average N-value for all of the SPT samples is 35 blows/foot.



#### **Table 3-1 Blow Count Summary**

(1) WH = weight of hammer

Large Figure 5 plots the blow counts versus depth for each boring location. The varying amount of sand, clay, and gravel within each sample led to high variability in the blow count values within each boring and between boring locations, as would be expected in variable soil types. Note that some N-values in excess of 100 blows/foot were reported, however these are not shown on Large Figure 5 to maintain a readable scale on the x-axis at lower N-values.

#### **3.1.2.2 Undisturbed Samples**

A limited number of thin-wall samples were collected in the peat. Five of the nine thin-wall sample attempts were successful and resulted in acceptable sample recovery for testing. Thin-wall samples are important because they provide a soil sample that is relatively undisturbed by the sampling technique. An undisturbed sample provides ideal laboratory strength testing material because it is representative of the in-situ soil, whereas split-barrel samples from SPTs are considered "disturbed" samples and are used primarily for index testing of moisture contents and Atterberg limits.

Retrieval of undisturbed samples was attempted several times in the glacial till but due to difficult sampling conditions and high gravel content, no samples were successfully obtained. For this reason, all laboratory tests performed on glacial till material are on disturbed or remolded samples.

## **3.1.3 Rock Cores**

The bedrock encountered was strong to very strong with zones that appear to have previously been highly fractured, but are now filled in with green and red cohesive sediment. Fractures were present in most of the cored bedrock from the site and the rock cores were considered to be slightly to moderately fractured. Bedrock contained horizontal fractures, vertical fractures, and fractures ranging from 45 to 65 degrees from the horizontal plane. The fractures are slightly decomposed and occasionally were in-filled with non-cohesive sediment. The fracturing was most prevalent in the upper 5 to 10 feet of bedrock. A summary of the rock quality designation (RQD) is provided in Table 3-2.



#### **Table 3-2 Rock Quality Designation Summary**



13

The Duluth Complex rock at North Met is massive with fractures being observed near the surface. RQD data from this coring indicate that rock quality is good to excellent, with an average RQD for the Duluth Complex starting 40 feet below ground surface of 84%. At depths less than 40 feet, rock quality is fair to excellent, with an average RQD of 62%. The 10-foot moving average of RQD with depth within the Duluth Complex is shown in Large Figure 6.

## **3.1.4 Packer Testing**

Packer testing was performed in five of the 12 boring locations. Several testing intervals were performed in bedrock so there ranged from one to three packer tests per boring location. The packer testing interval was determined in the field with the intent to obtain the most representative data possible and provide hydraulic conductivity values of the bedrock.

Calibration of the flow meter, gages, and head loss was initially conducted before any of the packer testing began. All calibration was performed according to the standard methods in USBR 7310-89 (Reference (1)). Calibration of the flow meter and pressure gages confirmed that the parts being used were accurate. For data analysis purposes, a typical head loss value of 0.10 ft/ft was assumed based on the pipe diameter, pipe material, and pressure readings.

Packer testing methods outlined in Reference (1) were followed in order to obtain results that could be replicated and were consistent for each testing interval. Packer testing readings were performed by Barr personnel in accordance with the USBR 7310-89 guidelines. For appropriate situations, a single- or double-packer was used. All packer tests were performed at the same pressure increments of 15, 30, and 45 psi for 1-minute intervals. Observations of flow were made every minute until three consecutive, consistent readings were taken representing steady-state flow. The pressure was then increased for three equal increments, followed by two decreasing pressures.

Packer tests are summarized in Table 3-3 and results are provided in Exhibit E. The results presented are the lowest permeability values from the first three pressure increments for each test location. This is a conservative value most likely to represent in-situ, or laminar flow through a porous media, for steadystate conditions. Packer testing in zones containing factures had a higher average hydraulic conductivity than tests in bedrock without fracturing.



#### **Table 3-3 Packer Test Summary**

(1) Indicates no flow accepted into formation during packer testing.

# **3.2 Laboratory Testing**

The following tests were performed by Soil Engineering Testing (SET) on undisturbed peat samples collected during the investigation:

- Moisture content tests were performed in accordance with ASTM D2216, "Standard Test Method for Laboratory Determination of Water (Moisture) Content of Soil and Rock by Mass."
- Atterberg Limit determinations were made in accordance with ASTM D4318, "Standard Test Methods for Liquid Limit, Plastic Limit, and Plasticity Index of Soils".
- Organic content tests were performed in accordance with ASTM D2974, "Standard Test Methods for Moisture, Ash, and Organic Matter of Peat and Other Organic Soils".
- Consolidated-Undrained triaxial compressive strength tests were performed in accordance with ASTM D4767, "Standard Test Method for Consolidated-Undrained Triaxial Compression Test for Cohesive Soils".
- Consolidation tests were performed in accordance with ASTM D2435, "Standard Test Methods for One-Dimensional Consolidation Properties of Soils Using Incremental Loading".
- Hydraulic Conductivity tests were performed in accordance with ATSM D5084, "Standard Test Methods for Measurement of Hydraulic Conductivity of Saturated Porous Material Using a Flexible Wall Permeameter".

The following tests were performed by Soil Engineering Testing (SET) on jar samples collected during the investigation:

- Moisture content tests were performed in accordance with ASTM D2216, "Standard Test Method for Laboratory Determination of Water (Moisture) Content of Soil and Rock by Mass".
- Atterberg Limit determinations were made in accordance with ASTM D4318, "Standard Test Methods for Liquid Limit, Plastic Limit, and Plasticity Index of Soils".
- Sieve and hydrometer analysis were performed in accordance with ASTM D422, "Standard Test Method for Particle-Size Analysis of Soils".
- Dry density tests were performed in accordance with ASTM D7263, "Standard Test Methods for Laboratory Determination of Density (Unit Weight) of Soil Specimens".
- Direct shear testing was performed in accordance with ASTM D3080, "Standard Test Method for Direct Shear Test of Soils Under Consolidated Drained Conditions".
- Standard Proctor Density determinations were in accordance with ASTM D698, "Standard Test Methods for Laboratory Compaction Characteristics of Soil Using Standard Effort (12,400 ft-lbf/ft<sup>3</sup>  $(600 \text{ kN-m/m}^3)$ ".
- Consolidation tests were performed in accordance with ASTM D2435, "Standard Test Methods for One-Dimensional Consolidation Properties of Soils Using Incremental Loading".

All laboratory test results are provided in Exhibit F.

# **4.0 CPT Work**

The CPT work, conducted in April of 2014, consisted of 14 CPT soundings in Cells 1E and 2E. Porewater pressure dissipation testing (PPD) was also performed in 11 ofthe 14 CPT locations. The CPT investigation was performed by Twin Ports Testing Inc. (TPT) of Superior, Wisconsin. CPT soundings were performed to evaluate the strength, compressibility, stiffness, and density characteristics of the tailings impounded in the FTB and to fill stratigraphy gaps along three previously identified cross-sections analyzed for slope stability of the proposed FTB. Large Figure 7 shows the CPT investigation locations. A summary of the CPT investigation is provided in Table 4-1.



#### **Table 4-1 CPT Investigation Summary**

# **4.1 Field Work**

## **4.1.1 Cone Penetration Test**

All equipment was in accordance with ASTM D-5778. For the CPT test, a cylindrical cone is pushed vertically into the ground at a constant rate of penetration of 20 mm/sec. During penetration, measurements are made of the cone tip resistance (qc), the side friction of the cylindrical shaft *(fs)* just above the tip, and porewater pressure generated by cone penetration  $(u_2)$ . The cones used in the investigation have a 15  $cm<sup>2</sup>$  base area and a 60-degree apex angle. The sleeve area of the cones is 300 cm2. The fluid used for saturation of the filter was glycerin. CPT data have been related empirically to soil behavior types (to estimate stratigraphy) and multiple geotechnical parameters. TPT provided Barr with complete records of tip resistance, sleeve friction, pore pressure, and friction ratio of all CPT soundings. CPT logs are included in Exhibit G.

## **4.1.2 Pore Pressure Dissipation Testing**

A total of 28 pore pressure dissipation (PPD) tests were performed in 11 of the 14 CPT soundings. The PPD test is performed by monitoring dissipation of excess porewater pressures generated as the cone advances through a soil and then stops. The results can be used to estimate hydraulic conductivity of the soil by means of empirical methods (Reference (2)) and theoretical methods through the calculation of the coefficient of consolidation (Reference (3)). The PPD plots are included in Exhibit H.

# **5.0 Results**

Sections 2.0 through 4.0 describe the field and laboratory investigation procedures. Section 5.1 presents the results of the FTB Containment System investigation (Rotasonic and SPT work), and Section 5.2 presents the results of the Cell 1E/2E investigation.

# **5.1 FTB Containment System Investigation**

The results of the Rotasonic and SPT soil borings (Exhibit A and Exhibit D) and laboratory tests (Exhibit F) were compiled to obtain an understanding of the lithology, stratigraphy, and water levels along the FTB Containment System alignment. A stratigraphy profile along the FTB Containment System alignment is shown in Large Figure 8.

### **5.1.1 Unconsolidated Deposits**

The surficial deposits generally consist of Rainy Lobe Till (glacial till), which functions as the surficial aquifer, glacial outwash deposits, and peat. LTVSMC tailings were also encountered. The surficial deposits along the northern and western toes of the Tailings Basin include the following layers, from the ground surface down:

- peat; 0 to 20 feet thick, dark brown, saturated, sapric, with low blow counts
- tailings; 0 to 17 feet thick, fine- to coarse-grained, with low blow counts
- silty sand; 0 to 6 of feet thick, fine- to coarse-grained, with variable blow counts
- glacial till (Rainy Lobe Reference (4)); 5 to 36.5 feet thick, silty sand, brown to gray in color, with weathered granite fragments throughout, with cobbles and boulders interspersed and varied in size from <1 foot to approximately 4 feet in diameter

The overburden soils tend to be non-cohesive silty to gravelly sands with minimal amounts of clay. The material appears to be suitable for mass earthwork and grading projects. However, peat is considered unsatisfactory as a foundation for the FTB Containment System and should be removed if encountered areas along the alignment.

#### **5.1.1.1 Topsoil**

Due to the varying topography along the toe of the FTB, the topsoil was generally Oto 30 inches thick, with little to no topsoil in high ground areas and up to 30 inches in lowland areas. Where present, the topsoil generally consisted of a root zone with varying amounts of organics, roots, and gravel. Localized zones of thicker topsoil should be expected, particularly in lowland locations.

#### **5.1.1.2 Peat**

The peat encountered in the subsurface exploration performed along the FTB Containment System alignment was characterized as sapric with wood and root inclusions. Sapric peat is highly decomposed with low fiber content and a massive or solid appearance. Occasional layers of gray silt (possibly tailings) were usually observed directly overlying the peat. At some locations the peat overlies organic silt and clay. The thickness ofthe peat ranged from approximately 0.3 feet up to 20 feet. The thickest areas of peat were located on the north side of the Tailings Basin directly north of Cell 2E; however several locations on the northwest side were not accessible due to open water so the extent of the peat in this region is uncertain. Undisturbed samples were collected and SSPTs conducted in the peat ranged from 0 to 4 blows per foot. These results indicate that the peat has a very soft to soft consistency.

### **5.1.1.3 Organic Silt**

Organic silt was encountered in five (5) of the SPT and Rotasonic boring locations. At three (3) of the locations it was observed below a layer of peat and ranged in thickness of 1 to 5 feet. The organic silt was saturated with average blow counts of 1 blow per foot indicating it has a very soft consistency. Higher blow counts were observed but are contributed to frozen conditions.

### **5.1.1.4 Tailings**

Tailings were encountered mainly on the west side of the site at SPT location B14-36 and B14-44. It is possible that the rotasonic investigation encountered tailings as well, but materials were not classified as such. The tailings ranged from thickness of 7 to 17 feet with blow counts ranging from 2 to 38 blows per foot. Blow counts of 6 to 22 were reported from the B14-36 location which was offset from the cutoff wall alignment due to wetland access issues.

### **5.1.1.5 Glacial Till**

Glacial Till comprised most of the soil on site. The till was identified as the Rainy Lobe Till and was classified as silty sand (SM) or silty gravel (GM) with the gravel consisting of weathered granite fragments. The silty sand was almost always encountered above the silty gravel and the gravel content consistently increased with depth. The till was reported as moist to wet and contained various amounts of sand and clay. Till was encountered from Oto 20 feet with a thickness ranging from 5 to 36.5 feet. The till resulted in blow counts ranging from 4 to 50 blows for 2 inches indicating the native soil is a very loose to very dense relative density. The silty sand resulted in blow counts of 4 to 50 blows for 3 inches with an average of 40 blows per foot. The silty gravel resulted in blow counts of 11 to 50 blows for 2 inches with an average of 72 blows per foot.

#### **5.1.1.6 Cobbles and Boulders**

Cobbles and boulders were frequently encountered on the surface and within the till at various depths. The largest boulder encountered during the investigation was 4 feet in diameter. All boulders were composed of granite with coloring and quality similar to the underlying bedrock.

## **5.1.2 Bedrock**

Along the FTB Containment System alignment, the depth to bedrock ranges from 2 to 47 feet with an average depth of approximately 20 feet, as reported in the site boring logs (Exhibit A and Exhibit D) and Table 2-1. There were individual locations that reported bedrock at greater depths, such as B14-44 (36.5 feet), B14-69 (34 feet), and B14-76 (27 feet) indicating that the bedrock surface undulates across the site. Bedrock was the deepest on the northwest side of the Tailings Basin, an area which is believed to be one of the few areas in the region with significant quantities of outwash (Reference (5)). On the northwest side of the Tailings Basin the average bedrock depth is 35 feet based on the 2014 Investigation.

The bedrock encountered during the investigation was granite mottled red, white, and black. Occasionally a zone of weathered bedrock ranging in thickness of one to nine feet was encountered above competent bedrock. Bedrock fractures were generally in-filled, with hydraulic conductivity of bedrock fracture zones two orders of magnitude less than hydraulic conductivity of overlying glacial till. The SPT borings indicated that the bedrock is strong to very strong with zones that appear to previously have been fractured. Fractures were present in most of the cored bedrock from the site and the rock cores were considered to be slightly to moderately fractured. Bedrock contained horizontal fractures, vertical fractures, and fractures ranging from 45° to 65° from the horizontal. The fracture faces are slightly decomposed and fractures occasionally are in-filled with non-cohesive sediment or weathered rock. Packer testing zones containing factures had a higher average hydraulic conductivity than bedrock without fracturing. The fracturing was most prevalent in the upper 5 to 10 feet of bedrock. Rock cores were collected to confirm depth to bedrock and provide qualitative information, including Rock Quality Designation (RQD) values and fracture characteristics. The RQD values obtained during the exploration were plotted versus depth in the borehole as shown on Large Figure 6. The plot indicates that bedrock is of poor to good quality at shallow depths, and is of good to excellent quality below a depth of 40 feet.

## **5.1.3 Groundwater Conditions**

Groundwater along the FTB Containment System alignment was usually encountered at the surface or just below. The water level depths measured during the investigations and water level readings in the ten piezometers installed during the Rotasonic investigation are summarized in Table 5-1.






(1) Negative value indicates water level above ground surface.

(2) Reported depth does not appear to accurately represent groundwater depths.

Groundwater levels range from a depth of Oto 20 feet below ground surface. Piezometer water level readings were all shallower than those reported during the Rotasonic investigation (except for R14-16) indicating a water table stabilizing slightly below ground surface. At one piezometer location, R14-12, the groundwater stabilized 0.3 feet above ground surface. During the Rotasonic investigation, artesian flow was encountered in R14-20 with a head of 3 feet above ground surface. During the SPT work, localized artesian flow was encountered at B14-69, where a head of up to 1 foot above ground surface was observed. In general, water levels are relatively shallow along the proposed FTB Containment System alignment and should be a factor in the design and construction of the cutoff wall. It was also noted that even during cold winter months, there was still open water that did not freeze due to seepage at some locations, particularly along the northwest corner of the Tailings Basin.

#### **5.1.4 Slug Testing**

Slug testing data, collected during the Rotasonic work in piezometers installed in glacial till, was analyzed using methods appropriate for an unconfined aquifer. The data was processed by normalizing and plotting the head versus time. Out of the six output plots generated from the three tests performed at each location, the two data outputs that were considered to have the least amount of noise and that would provide the widest range in permeability were selected for analysis. The selected outputs were analyzed using the Hvorslev method or the KGS model. The KGS model, which usually resulted in the best-fit for the data, was used to analyze tests performed in partially penetrating wells. The Hvorslev model was used to analyze R14-04 and R14-06 to meet the requirements of the translation method, using a straight-line to account for significant storage effects.

The slug tests performed in the standpipe piezometers located in the glacial till showed hydraulic conductivity ranging from  $1.5x10^{-3}$  ft/s  $(4.6x10^{-2}$  cm/s) to  $1.7x10^{-6}$  ft/s  $(5.2x10^{-5}$  cm/s) with a geometric mean of  $5.1x10^{-5}$  ft/s (1.5x10<sup>-3</sup> cm/s) based on the KGS and Hvorslev models. These values for the glacial till were considered to be the best representation of in-situ conditions, as the results showed the data had not been impacted by insufficient development and the analyses used a fully transient solution for overdamped slug tests that accounts for elastic storage in the unconfined aquifer. The slug testing results for horizontal flow from the 2007 and 2014 investigations are plotted on Large Figure 9. The slug testing results including normalized plots and a summary table of hydraulic conductivities is provided in Exhibit C.

# **5.1.5 Packer Testing**

Packer testing readings and analyses were performed by Barr personnel in accordance with Reference (1). Data were plotted as flow rate versus pressure for each pressure step in order to assess the test results. The resulting curves indicated that the bedrock packer testing exhibited:

- ideal results where flow is laminar
- tight fractures
- variable permeability
- increase in permeability with increased pressure at some test locations, indicating that fracture fill material was forced out of fracture due to test pressure
- decrease in permeability with increased pressure at some test locations, indicating that fracture fill material further blocked fractures due to test pressure

The packer results were analyzed to determine the relative potential for groundwater flow through bedrock fractures. The selected permeability from each test was based on the lowest permeability values from the first three pressure increments for each test location. This is a conservative value most likely to represent in-situ, or laminar flow through a porous media, for steady-state conditions. A total of ten (10) packer tests were performed in five (5) of the 22 SPT borings ranging from a depth of 14 to 50.5 feet. The testing intervals were 4.5 to 8 feet in length. There does not appear to be a relationship between packer depth and hydraulic conductivity or RQD. Hydraulic conductivity results were fairly consistent across the site with slightly lower hydraulic conductivity observed in B14-36 and B-55 located on the west side of the site. At three locations the formation did not take any water. This very low hydraulic conductivity indicates that the tested bedrock zone is unfractured or has infilled fractures. The prevalence of fractures often decreased with increasing core depth, so it is reasonable to expect that bedrock hydraulic conductivity may also decrease with depth.

From the packer test results the geometric mean hydraulic conductivity of the bedrock, excluding the zero inflow locations, is 1.9 x 10<sup>-6</sup> ft/s (5.8 x 10<sup>-5</sup> cm/s), a value that is low and typical of poor-draining soils and impervious sections of earth dams and dikes (Reference (6)). For reference, a hydraulic conductivity value of 3.3 x 10<sup>-9</sup> ft/s (1.0 x 10<sup>-7</sup> cm/s) is considered practically impervious. The geometric mean hydraulic conductivity of the bedrock was also calculated including the zero inflow locations, by assuming that the hydraulic conductivity at those locations is equal to the lowest measured value (B14-36 from 20.5 to 26.5). Including the zero inflow locations, the geometric mean hydraulic conductivity of the bedrock is  $6.3 \times 10^{-1}$  $7$  ft/s (1.9 x 10<sup>-5</sup> cm/s); a value that is a representative measurement of potential flow through bedrock joints or fractures.

## **5.1.6 General Soil Laboratory Testing**

All laboratory test results are included in Exhibit F.

#### **5.1.6.1 Moisture Content**

A total of 23 moisture content tests were conducted on soil samples collected from the soil borings performed as part of the geotechnical investigation - 18 on till samples and 5 on peat samples. The soils tested included silty sand with gravel, silt, organic silt, and peat. The peat exhibited a moisture content ranging from 413% to 616%, with an average of 512%, indicating the peat was in a saturated condition and has a very high liquid limit. The silty soils typically exhibited moisture contents ranging from 7% to 19% with an average of 12%, indicating the sand was generally in a moist to wet condition. The silt exhibited moisture contents ranging from 10% to 25%, indicating the sand was generally in a moist to wet condition. The organic silt exhibited a moisture content of 73%. Moisture content test results are summarized in Exhibit F.

#### **5.1.6.2 Organic Content**

A total of five (5) organic content tests were conducted on undisturbed peat samples. The organic content ranged from 76% to 84%, with an average of 80%. The organic content test results are summarized in Exhibit F.

#### **5.1.6.3 Atterberg Limits**

Atterberg limits testing was performed on selected samples and used to classify the material encountered in the soil borings. A total of 23 Atterberg limits tests were conducted on selected samples from the borings. The majority of samples tested at the site were classified as silty sand with gravel (SM) and were classified as non-plastic. Several silt samples were tested having liquid limits ranging from 13% to 24% and plastic limits ranging from 12% to 18%. Plasticity indices varied between 2% and 7%. Atterberg limits tests on organic silt indicate a liquid limit of 68% with a plastic limit of 46% and plasticity indices of 22%. Five samples were tested on peat having liquid limits ranging from 411% to 612% (approximately the same values as the moisture content) and plastic limits ranging from 198% to 536%. This results in plasticity indices varying between 17% and 396%. Atterberg limits test results are plotted in Large Figure 10.

#### **5.1.6.4 Grain Size Analysis**

Grain size analyses were performed on 23 soil samples collected at various depths from the soil borings. Based on the results of the grain size analyses, the samples were classified as silty sand with gravel (SM), sandy silt (ML), and clayey sand (SC). The percent fines (percent by weight passing the number 200 sieve) ranged from approximately 7% to 72% in the silty sand soil samples and from 20% to 95% in silt and organic/clay silt soils. Gradation test results are plotted in Large Figure 11. In general, most of the soils on site can be classified at silty sand (SM) with weathered granite. Fine-grained soils were observed to be concentrated on the northwest side of the Tailings Basin in R14-12, B14-52, and R14-13 which also happens to be the locations that encountered the deepest bedrock.

#### **5.1.6.5 Dry Unit Weight Testing**

Dry unit weight values were reported for two (2) peat samples and three till samples. The dry unit weight of peat ranged from 10 pound per cubic foot (pcf) to 12.5 pcf with an average of 11 pcf. The dry unit weight of till ranged from 122 pcf to 125 pcf with an average of 124 pcf. Dry unit weight results are provided in Exhibit F.

#### **5.1.6.6 Standard Proctor Density Testing**

One (1) laboratory compaction test was conducted on a remolded sample comprised of disturbed glacial till samples collected from across the site. Standard Proctor density testing indicated a soil maximum dry density of 132 pcf, with a corresponding optimum moisture content of 7.6%. The results of the compaction test can be found in Exhibit F.

#### **5.1.6. 7 Shear Strength**

#### **Undrained Shear Strength of Peat**

A total of five (5) laboratory consolidated-undrained (CU) triaxial compression tests were performed on selected 3-inch diameter undisturbed samples of peat collected during the geotechnical investigation. The undrained shear strength values from the tests ranged from 594 to 3300 psf. The triaxial tests performed in 2014 were plotted with previous triaxial results and are displayed on Large Figure 12. The yield undrained shear strength ratio of the peat samples collected in 2014 resulted in a 33<sup>rd</sup> percentile value of 0.27 and an average value of 0.28, above the  $33<sup>rd</sup>$  percentile design value of 0.23 for virgin and compressed peat.

#### **Drained Friction Angle of Peat**

A total of 5 laboratory consolidated-undrained (CU) triaxial compression tests were performed on selected 3-inch diameter undisturbed samples of peat collected during the geotechnical investigation. Drained strength values from the tests resulted in a drained cohesion of 637 psf and a drained friction angle of 30 degrees. The triaxial test results performed in 2014 were plotted with previous triaxial and direct shear results and are displayed on Large Figure 13. The 2014 investigation results indicate that the drained friction angle for the non-linear failure envelope design value of 27 degrees for peat is a reasonable value.

#### **Drained Friction Angle of Glacial Till**

Three remolded direct shear tests were performed on samples of silty sand and silty gravel (glacial till) encountered during the investigation to better understand the friction angle of the material through laboratory testing. The results of the testing indicated that the soil has an internal friction angle ranging from approximately 38 to 47 degrees with a 33<sup>rd</sup> percentile value of 43 degrees. These values are above the design value for glacial till of 37 degrees. The direct shear test results are plotted with a previously performed test on Large Figure 14.

#### **5.1.6.8 Hydraulic Conductivity Testing**

The results of the hydraulic conductivity tests can be found in Exhibit F.

#### **Hydraulic Conductivity of Peat**

Hydraulic conductivity testing was performed in general accordance with the falling head method (ASTM D5084) on thin-wall samples of peat collected from the borings performed along the cutoff wall alignment. The results indicate that virgin peat has a vertical permeability ranging from  $3.5x10^{-8}$  ft/s  $(1.06x10^{-6}$  cm/s) to 7.0x10<sup>-8</sup> ft/s  $(2.12x10^{-6}$  cm/s) with a geometric average value of 4.95x10<sup>-8</sup> ft/s  $(1.50x10^{-6}$ cm/s).

#### **Hydraulic Conductivity of Glacial Till**

Hydraulic conductivity testing was also performed on remolded samples of glacial till soils collected in the borings. Permeability values were recorded at various pressure levels during consolidation testing performed on three (3) remolded glacial till samples. The results indicate that the till on-site has a vertical permeability ranging from  $1.3x10^{-5}$  to  $1.8x10^{-7}$  ft/s  $(4.1x10^{-4}$  to  $5.5x10^{-6}$  cm/s), with a geometric mean of  $2.5x10^{-6}$  ft/s (7.6x10<sup>-5</sup> cm/s). The vertical hydraulic conductivity for glacial till is plotted with the horizontal flow from the 2007 and 2014 slug testing investigations on Large Figure 9.

#### **5.1.6. 9 Consolidation Testing**

Laboratory consolidation testing was performed on three (3) samples of remolded glacial till obtained from the SPT soil borings. The results of the laboratory testing are summarized in Table 5-2.



#### **Table 5-2 Consolidation Data Summary**

The results of the laboratory consolidation testing indicate that the glacial till (SM) soils are very slightly to slightly compressible due to the low compression index value  $(C_c)$ . The consolidation testing on the peat samples indicate that this material is highly to very highly compressible.

# **5.2 Cell 1 E/2E Investigation**

Results of the CPT investigation (Exhibit G and Exhibit H) have been related empirically to soil behavior types (to estimate stratigraphy) and multiple geotechnical parameters. Graphs of the CPT results with depth, including interpreted material classification, are presented in Exhibit G.

### **5.2.1 CPT Data Interpretation**

The following describes the procedures used to interpret the CPT data and the stratigraphy inferred from the CPT soil behavior type. The CPT data interpretation was performed using an in-house program designed by Barr specifically for use on CPT projects. The in-house program has been cross checked with CPTINT Version 5.2 for quality assurance and has been found to be compliant.

Cone Penetration Testing with porewater pressure measurement (CPTu) was performed in the Tailings Basin in 1996, 2005, and 2007. Zones of materials were identified by visual observations made during SPT sampling and logging and by relating measured CPT tip and sleeve resistance to density and soil behavior and analyzing them against the corresponding soil boring data. Data from zones where the material type was verified by visual observation were isolated to determine the shear strength envelopes for different material types.

The field cone penetration resistance measured at the tip is  $q_c$  for fine-grained soils, which may also be converted to a total cone resistance,  $q_t$ , by:

$$
q_t = q_c + (1 - a)u_2
$$
 **Equation F1**

Where:

 $a =$  unequal end area ratio of the cone (a = 0.859)  $u_2$  = porewater pressure measured between the tip and the friction sleeve

### **5.2.2 Stratigraphy and Material Properties**

Results of the 2014 CPT investigation were compared to CPT soundings previously performed in 2007 where applicable. Exhibit G shows the results of the investigation including plots of tip resistance, sleeve friction, and pore pressure readings with dissipation results. The comparison of tip resistance indicates that there has been little to no strength increase of the tailings in Cell 1E and 2E since 2007. Where tip resistance  $(q_i)$  increase was observed, it occurred in the coarse tailings regions. Slimes and fine tailings zones occasionally reported a tip resistance increase of up to 20 tsf in soundings located beneath or close to the existing coarse tailings dam and beach. Soundings performed towards the center of the basins generally observed no increase in tip resistance. The 2014 CPT data were also used to confirm stratigraphy in the basins and fill data gaps.

### **5.2.3 Pore Pressure Dissipation Results**

CPT PPD tests were used to estimate the water level at each sounding location. Porewater pressures recorded during the soundings were analyzed with dissipation data and water levels were interpreted. These water levels are shown on the plots in Exhibit G and were used to verify seepage parameters used in the FTB modeling.

Results show that water levels in Cell 2E have decreased approximately 5 feet since 2007 and water levels in Cell 1E have risen approximately 25 feet since 2007. The Cell 1E pond level has risen because seepage

from the Tailings Basin's southern dam is being pumped into Cell lE. The PPD curves are provided in Exhibit H. PPD tests were performed at depths ranging from 20.5 to 85 feet.

Hydraulic conductivity can also be interpreted from PPD results. These calculations were not performed on the data from the 2014 PPD tests, although data provided in Exhibit H could be used for that purpose in future analyses.

# **6.0 Limitations of Analysis**

The analysis and conclusions provided are based on the results of field work from recent investigations. Using generally accepted engineering methods and practices, the investigations performed have made every reasonable effort to characterize the site. However, the likelihood that conditions may vary from any specific location tested is still possible, and careful attention to soil conditions should be undertaken during the time of construction by qualified personnel.

# **7.0 References**

1. **U.S. Department of the Interior.** Procedure for Constant Head Hydraulic Conductivity Tests in Single Drill Holes, USBR 7310-89. 3rd Earth Manual, Part 2, A Water Resources Technical Publication. Denver, Colorado: Bureau of Reclamation, 1990.

2. **Robertson, P. K., Woeller, D. J. and Finn, W. D. L.** Seismic cone penetration test for evaluating liquefaction potential under cyclic loading. Canadian Geotechnical Journal. 1992, Vol. 29, 4, pp. 686-695.

3. Analysis of the piezocone in clay. Proceedings International Symposium on Penetration Testing. **Hou Isby, G. T. and Teh, C. I.** Rotterdam, Netherlands: s.n., 1988. Vol. 1, pp. 777-783.

4. **Jennings, C. E. and Reynolds, W. K.** M-164 Surficial geology of the Mesabi Iron Range, Minnesota. s.l.: Minnesota Geological Survey. Retrieved from the University of Minnesota Digital Conservancy, http://purl.umn.edu/58160, 2005.

5. **Olcott, P. G. and Siegel, D. I.** Physiography and Surficial Geology of the Copper-Nickel Study Region, Northeastern Minnesota: U.S. Geological Survey Water-Resources Investigations Open-File Report 78-51. 1978.

6. **Holtz, Robert, William D. Kovacs, Thomas C Sheehan.** An Introduction To Geotechnical Engineering. 2nd Edition s.l. : Prentice Hall, October 2010.

**Large Figures** 

### FNP0003368



0254566

- Rotasonic Location with a Piezometer
- $\bigoplus$  Boring Locations
- $\bullet$ Boring Locations with Packer
- **O** CPT Locations



Feet

**The Contract** 

1,500 3,000

Large Figure 2 2014 GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION LOCATIONS NorthMet Project PolyMet Mining Inc. Hoyt Lakes, Minnesota



- **O** Rotasonic Location
- Rotasonic Location with a Piezometer
- **Wetlands**



## FNP0003368 0254568

Large Figure 3 **ROTASONIC INVESTIGATION LOCATIONS**  NorthMet Project PolyMet Mining Inc. Hoyt Lakes, Minnesota







## FNP0003368 0254569

Large Figure 4 SPT INVESTIGATION LOCATIONS NorthMet Project PolyMet Mining Inc. Hoyt Lakes, Minnesota



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369(29 PolyMet North Met Engineering\Work Authorization 13\Other Costs\Soil Borings\Geotech lnvestigations\Winter Geotechnical Explorations 2013\_2014\Report\Geotech Data Package Vol 1 Ver 5 Content\spreadsheets\SPTtable.xlsx 12/29/2014



**Large Figure 6 Rock Quality Designation Versus Depth in Drillhole**  PolyMet Winter 2013/2014 Geotechnical Investigation

P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369(29 PolyMet North Met Engineering\Work Authorization 13\Other Costs\Soil Borings\Geotech lnvestigations\Winter Geotechnical Explorations 2013\_2014\Report\Geotech Data Package Vol 1 Ver 5 Content\spreadsheets\RQD summary.xlsx 12/29/2014







FNP0003368 0254572

Large Figure 7 2014 CPT INVESTIGATION LOCATIONS NorthMet Project PolyMet Mining Inc. Hoyt Lakes, Minnesota





P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369C29 PolyMet NorthMet Engineering\Work Authorization 13\Other Costs\Soil Borings\Geotech Investigations\Winter Geotechnical Explorations 2013\_2014\SOW<br>12/23/2014 12/23/2014 12\_Part 2\_SPT\Laboratory\Lab Results Summary.xls



**Large Figure 10 Atterberg Limits Results PolyMet Winter 2013/2014 Geotechnical Investigation** 

P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369C29 PolyMet NorthMet Engineering\Work Authorization 13\Other Costs\Soil Borings\Geotech Investigations\Winter Geotechnical Explorations 2013\_2014\SOW 12\_Part 2\_SPT\Laboratory\Lab Results Summary.xls 12/30/2014



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369C29 PolyMet NorthMet Engineering\Work Authorization 13\Other Costs\Soil Borings\Geotech Investigations\Winter Geotechnical Explorations 2013\_2014\SOW 12\_Part 2\_SPT\Laboratory\Lab Results Summary.xls 12/23/2014



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369862\WorkFiles\WO 022A Tailings Basin Permitting\2014 v5 Data Package Vol 1\Strength Data\Att C - V4\_Triaxial Tests\Peat\_TX and DS.xlsm 12/23/am





PolyMet 2013/2014 Winter Geotechnical Investigation

P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369862\WorkFiles\WO 022A Tailings Basin Permitting\2014 v5 Data Package Vol 1\Strength Data\Att C-V4\_Triaxial Tests\Peat\_TX and DS.xlsm

12/29/2014



**PolyMet 2013/2014 Winter Geotechnical Investigation** 

P:\Mpls\23 MN\6912369862\WorkFiles\WO 022A Tailings Basin Permitting\2014 v5 Data Package Vol 1\Strength Data\Att C - V4\_Triaxial Tests\Till\_TX peak.xlsm

# **Exhibit A**

**Rotasonic Logs** 












































# **Exhibit B**

**Piezometer Logs** 



 $\frac{\text{e}}{\text{e}}$  The stratification lines represent approximate boundaries. The transition may be gradual.





~..,,,,-.,....,,,,,,.....,,......,,-----,---...,,...,........,..\_..,....,,.....\_\_,,,,,.....,........,,.,---,-----,....,,..------------------------' The stratification lines represent approximate boundaries. The transition may be gradual. ft

#### Barr Engineering Company **LOG OF PIEZOMETER R14-12**  4700 West 77th St. Suite 200 Minneapolis, MN 55435 **BARR**  Telephone: 952-832-2600 Sheet 1 of 1 Project: Winter 2013/2014 Piezometers Location: Hoyt Lakes, MN Client: PolyMet Barr Project Number: 23690C29.13 | Surface Elevation: 1480.3 ft Top of Casing Elevation: 1482.6 ~  $STRATA$ PTH, <del>1</del><br>|
|
|ATION, 1 PIEZOMETER PIEZOMETER CONSTRUCTION DETAILS ~ \_J  $\begin{bmatrix} 1 \ 2 \ 0 \ 0 \ \infty \end{bmatrix}$  DETAILS FOR DESCRIPTION ti: 2:  $\mathbb{E}$   $\vert$   $\vert$   $\mathbb{E}$ STANDPIPE PIEZOMETER  $\overline{\phantom{a}}$  =  $\overline{\phantom{a}}$  $\vec{\mathsf{u}}$ PROTECTIVE CASING **-2.5** TPC **1482.8**  I I **-2.3** TRC **1482.6**  Diameter: **6 inches**  n--7 Type: **Steel**   $\frac{1}{\text{TPSSOL (OL): dark}}$  0  $\frac{1}{\text{TPSSOL (OL)}$ : dark  $\frac{1}{\text{TPSSOL}}$  0  $\frac{1}{\text{TPSSOL}}$  1 Interval: **-2.5-4.5 0.0** GS **1480.3**  O <del>Time (</del>KZZ <sup>\*</sup> KZ brown; moist; with **RISER CASING**  wood and leaf debris.  $+$  .  $\pm$   $\pm$ 4.0 1476.3 Diameter: **2inches**  1479.8 ft Type: **PVC**  5 SILT (ML): brown; Interval: **-2.3-15**  moist; with sand.  $\perp$  . 1478.3 ft -  $\top$  .  $\mathbb{R}^n$ **GROUT** POORLY GRADED  $10$ Type: **Cement**  SAND WITH SILT (SP-SM): fine to<br>coarse grained; gray to - Interval: **0-4**  13.5 | BS | 1466.8 brown; wet; some<br>weathered granite SEAL wealliefed granite<br>fragments to 13 feet;  $\parallel$  15 Type: **Bentonite Chips**  i ~~~<br>[Till].<br>1467.3 ft Interval: **4-13.5**   $SLTY$  SAND  $(SM):$   $||$  20 20.0 | BSC | 1460.3 SANDPACK  $\lim_{\text{I}}$  grained; gray; wet ··:==:===··  $21.0$  TD 1459.3 Type: **Silica Sand**  Interval: **13.5-21**  1465.3 ft  $\frac{10}{100}$   $\frac{10000 \text{ m}}{10000 \text{ s}}$ <br>  $\frac{1000 \text{ m}}{1000 \text{ s}}$  SILT (ML): gray; moist;  $\frac{1000 \text{ m}}{1000 \text{ s}}$   $\frac{1000 \text{ m}}{1000 \text{ s}}$   $\frac{1000 \text{ m}}{1000 \text{ s}}$ **SCREEN** with sand; little clay at 25<br>18 feet; [Till]. Diameter: **2 inches**   $1462.3$  ft Type: **Continuous 0.01" slotted PVC**  SILTY SAND (SM): Interval: **15-20**  <sup>0</sup> finetomedium 30 flv\ :i1.:1..~~ ~ ~ ~ grained; gray; wet;<br>[Till]. 1 , , -'Ii <sup>~</sup>  $\frac{1}{2}$   $\begin{array}{ccc} \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} \end{array}$  $1451.3$  ft POORLY GRADED  $\frac{1}{35}$ ,  $\frac{1}{25}$ ,  $\frac{1}{100}$ ,  $\$ POORLY GRADED | 35<sup>1</sup> - <del>1225,255,255</del> 35.0 | 1445.3<br>GRAVEL WITH SAND | 35<sup>1</sup> <u>ײ</u>ַן (GP): gray; wet; some  $\overline{\circ}$  cobbles with weathered granite<br>fragments; [Till].<br>1449.3 ft GRANITE; mottled red, black, and white; <sup>~</sup>[Bedrock].  $\frac{2}{5}$ 1445.3 ft Bottom of Boring at 35.0 feet ::J Remarks: ৰ flu :a, : ا∑ 0  $\mathfrak a$ —— Completion Depth: 35.0 ft LEGEND **WATER LEVELS(ft)**  gi.  $\rm \sim$ TPC TOP OF PROTECTIVE CASING<br>TRC TOP OF RISER CASING u Date Started: 3/13/14  $\subseteq$ m Date Completed: 3/13/14 TRC TOP OF RISER CASING<br>**BPC BASE PROTECTIVE CASING 1**<br>GS GROIND SURFACF co **FILTER PACK**  $\sim$ Logged By: BJL2 প়। GS GROUND SURFACE BS BENTONITE SEAL .!' After Install -0.3 f- $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}$  BENTONITE ō. Drilling Contractor: Cascade w FP FILTER PACK<br>TSC TOP OF SCRE 3 Drilling Method: Sonic EMENT GROUT TSC TOP OF SCREEN<br>BSC BOTTOM OF SCR O:'. Datum: NAD83 Minnesota State Plane<br>Coordinates: N 742,311.8 ft E 2,858,500.4 BSC BOTTOM OF SCREEN<br>TD TOTAL DEPTH ~ CUTTINGS/ BACKFILL N 742,311.8 ft E 2,858,500.4<br>ft TOTAL DEPTH  $\le$   $\frac{1}{2}$   $\frac{1}{$

The stratification lines represent approximate boundaries. The transition may be gradual.



The stratification lines represent approximate boundaries. The transition may be gradual.



 $\frac{ft}{}$  The stratification lines represent approximate boundaries. The transition may be gradual.



 $\overline{ }$ 

<u> The Common State of the Common Sta</u>



 $\frac{1}{2}$  The stratification lines represent approximate boundaries. The transition may be gradual.

 $\overline{\phantom{a}}$ 



 $\frac{6}{5}$ <br>The stratification lines represent approximate boundaries. The transition may be gradual.

匠



~..,,,,-..,.....,.,,,,....,.,.-,,....---..,....--.,......,.....,.....\_,....,.\_-=..,....-...,,.,.---,-----,...,.,.------------------------' The stratification lines represent approximate boundaries. The transition may be gradual. ft



~..,,,,-..,.....,.,,,,....,.,.-,,....---..,....--.,......,.....,.....\_,....,.\_-=..,....-...,,.,.---,-----,...,.,.------------------------' The stratification lines represent approximate boundaries. The transition may be gradual. ft

Е

П

# **Exhibit C**

**Slug Testing Results** 





Shaded values were not included in the hydraulic conductivity analysis due to the screen being installed in tailings and not glacial till

#### **R14-04 Normalized Displacement Chart**

**PolyMet Mining Corporation** 

April 2014 Slug Tesing Data



### **R14-06 Normalized Displacement Chart**



April 2014 Slug Test Data



#### **R14-08 Normalized Displacement Chart**

**PolyMet Mining Corporation** 

April 2014 Slug Test Data





#### **R14-13 Normalized Displacement Chart**

**PolyMet Mining Corporation** 

April 2014 Slug Test Data



#### **R14-15 Normalized Displacement Chart**

**PolyMet Mining Corporation** 

April 2014 Slug Test Data



# **R14-16 Normalized Displacement Chart**



April 2014 Slug Test Data



### **R14-26 Normalized Displacement Chart**



April 2014 Slug Test Data



### **R14-27 Normalized Displacement Chart**



April 2014 Slug Test Data



## **R14-28 Normalized Displacement Chart**



April 2014 Slug Test Data



#### **GW00l Normalized Displacement Chart**

**PolyMet Mining Corporation** 

April 2014 Slug Test Data


## **GW00G Normalized Displacement Chart PolyMet Mining Corporation**  April 2014 Slug Test Data 1 P. ~W006\_Test 1- Slug In 0.9 ~W006\_Test 1- Slug Out 0.8 ~W006\_Test 2 - slug in -D-W006 Test 2 - slug out 0.7 £  $0.6$ placem 0.5 alized D **<sup>E</sup>**0.4 ... **0 z**  0.3 0.2 0.1 terrormando **POOOPPTPO** 0 10 1000  $0.1$  1

**Time [seconds]** 

P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369C29 PolyMet NorthMet Engineering\Work Authorization 13\Other Costs\Soil Borings\Geotech Investigations\Winter Geotechnical Explorations 2013\_2014\Slug Testing\results\Slug Testing Results-08-28-2014.xl



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369C29 PolyMet NorthMet Engineering\Work Authorization 13\Other Costs\Soil Borings\Geotech Investigations\Winter Geotechnical Explorations 2013\_2014\Slug Testing\results\Slug Testing Results-08-28-2014.xl

## **GW012 Normalized Displacement Chart**

**PolyMet Mining Corporation** 

April 2014 Slug Test Data



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369C29 PolyMet NorthMet Engineering\Work Authorization 13\Other Costs\Soil Borings\Geotech Investigations\Winter Geotechnical Explorations 2013\_2014\Slug Testing\results\Slug Testing Results-08-28-2014.xl

# **Exhibit D**

**SPT Boring Logs** 



eering Company<br>: 77th St. Suite 200 **BARR** Minneapolis, MN 55435<br>
Telephone: 952-832-2600

# 4700 West 77th St. Suite 200 **LOG OF BORING B14-36**





Barr Engineering Company



co.









Barr Engineering Company

co.



 $\blacksquare$ 









f-I u

f-

f-

I

f-

 $\overline{\phantom{0}}$ 



# **Exhibit E**

**Packer Testing Results** 



### **PolyMet 2014 Packer Test Data Summary - FTB Seepage Containment System Borings**

<sup>1</sup> Based on the lowest permeability value resulting from the first three pressure increments as the value most likely to represent in-situ conditions. Geomean excludes values where zero inflow is observed during testing.

 $2$  For Packer Test Results where zero inflow is observed during testing, permeability values are selected based on inference from lowest packer test result obtained. Geomean includes all test intervals.

The resulting permeability is not a true permeability since the rock is not a true porous media. Instead, the packer test provides a relative measurement of potential leakage through bedrock joints or fractures.



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369C29 PolyMet NorthMet Engineering\Work Authorization 13\0ther Costs\Soil Borings\Geotech lnvestigations\Winter Geotechnical Explorations 2013\_2014\SOW 12\_Part

2\_SPT\Fieldwork\Packer Testing\Results\Packer Results.xlsx

8/25/2014

## **Performed: 5/13/2014**

**Analyzed: 5/21/2014** 



## **B14-36, 14** - **18.5ft**







## **Performed: 5/13/2014**

#### **Analyzed: 5/21/2014**











## **Performed: 5/2/2014**

#### **Analyzed: 5/21/2014**



### **B14-55, 37** - **41.5ft**







## **Performed: 5/2/2014**

### **Analyzed: 5/21/2014**

#### **Notes:** Double Packer Test Packer length  $(ft) =$  2 Screened interval  $(\text{ft}) =$  3<br>
Screened interval  $(\text{ft}) =$  50.5 Total depth of boring  $(ft) =$  50.5<br>Test interval top  $(ft) =$  41.5 Test interval top  $(ft) =$  41.5<br>t interval bottom  $(ft) =$  46 Test interval bottom  $(ft) =$  46<br>Original GWT  $(ft) =$  0 Original GWT (ft) = GWT before inflation  $(ft) = 0$ GWT after inflation (ft) =  $\vert$  0 GWT during test  $(ft) = 0$ <br>WT at end of test  $(ft) = 0$ GWT at end of test  $(ft) =$  0<br>of pressure gauge  $(ft) =$  3 Height of pressure gauge (ft) =  $\begin{array}{|l} \hline 3 \\ \hline 3 \end{array}$ <br>Packer inflation pressure (psi) =  $\begin{array}{|l} \hline 140 \end{array}$ Packer inflation pressure (psi) =  $\frac{140}{RQD}$  for test interval  $\frac{1}{2}$  =  $\frac{100}{RQD}$ RQD for test interval  $(\%) =$ Borehole radius (inches) =  $1.5$ Total testing interval (ft)= **4.5**  Length of pipe above ground  $(ft) =$  **3** Length of pipe below ground  $(ft) =$  39.5 Total length for losses (ft) = **42.5**

## **B14-55, 41.5** - **46.5ft**







## **Performed: 5/2/2014**

### **Analyzed: 5/21/2014**



## **B14-55, 46** - **50.5ft**







## **Performed: 4/3/2014**

#### **Analyzed: 5/21/2014**



## **B14-44, 34** - **42ft**







## **Performed: 4/3/2014**

#### **Analyzed: 5/21/2014**



### **B14-44, 42** - **46ft**







## *Performed: 4/18/2014*

*Analyzed: 5/21/2014* 



## **B14-65, 24** - **30ft**







### *Performed: 4/18/2014*

*Analyzed: 5/21/2014* 

#### **Notes:** Double Packer Test Packer length  $(ft) =$  2 Screened interval (ft) =  $\frac{5}{37}$ Total depth of boring  $(ft) =$  37<br>Test interval top  $(ft) =$  27.5 Test interval top  $(ft) =$  27.5<br>t interval bottom  $(ft) =$  33.5 Test interval bottom  $(ft)$  = Original GWT  $(ft) = 0$ GWT before inflation  $(ft) = 0$ GWT after inflation (ft) =  $\vert$  0 GWT during test  $(ft) = 0$ <br>VT at end of test  $(ft) = 0$ GWT at end of test  $(ft) =$  0<br>of pressure gauge  $(ft) =$  3 Height of pressure gauge (ft) =  $\begin{array}{|l} \hline 3 \\ \hline 3 \end{array}$ <br>Packer inflation pressure (psi) =  $\begin{array}{|l} \hline 140 \end{array}$ Packer inflation pressure (psi) =  $140$ <br>RQD for test interval (%) =  $74$ RQD for test interval  $(\%) =$  74<br>Borehole radius (inches) = 1.5 Borehole radius (inches) = Total testing interval (ft)= **6**  Length of pipe above ground  $(ft) =$  **5** Length of pipe below ground  $(ft) =$  25.5 Total length for losses (ft) = **30.5**

## **B14-65, 27.5** - **33.5ft**







### **Performed: 4/3/2014**

**Analyzed: 5/21/2014** 



## **B14-76, 37** - **42ft**







# **Exhibit F**

**Laboratory Test Results** 





2401 W 66th Street OIL NGINEERI ESTING, INC. Richfield. Minnesota 55423-2031














































**0254682** 



**0254683** 





18.24 4.23 3.84 19.38 4.28 3.97 20.52 4.31 4.02 21.66 4.36 4.12 22.80 4.39 4.19

 $25.00$ 

13.90 0.86 0.81 22.00 2.18 2.47 14.77 0.87 0.82 24.45 2.20 2.55 15.64 0.87 0.84 25.00 2.21 2.56

16.51 0.88 0.85 17.38 0.88 0.86 19.55 0.89 0.88 21.72 0.90 0.90 23.89 0.91 0.91

 $25.00$ 













## **FNP0003368 0254691 A 18-1952**











## **Exhibit G**

**Cone Penetration Test Results** 



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369(29 PolyMet North Met Engineering\Work Authorization 13\Other Costs\Soil Borings\Geotech lnvestigations\Winter Geotechnical Explorations 2013\_2014\SOW 14\_Part l\_CPT\processed results\Section F\CPT\_07-04B & 14-04.xlsm

**Sleeve Friction, f<sub>s</sub> [tsf]** 



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369(29 PolyMet North Met Engineering\Work Authorization 13\Other Costs\Soil Borings\Geotech lnvestigations\Winter Geotechnical Explorations 2013\_2014\SOW 14\_Part l\_CPT\processed results\Section F\CPT\_07-04B & 14-04.xlsm


P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369(29 PolyMet North Met Engineering\Work Authorization 13\Other Costs\Soil Borings\Geotech lnvestigations\Winter Geotechnical Explorations 2013\_2014\SOW 14\_Part let the processed results\Section F\CPT\_07-04B & 14-04.xlsm 11/3/2014

**FIGURE G-ld CPT14-04 Behavior Plot** 



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369C29 PolyMet NorthMet Engineering\Work Authorization 13\Other Costs\Soil Borings\Geotech Investigations\Winter Geotechnical Explorations 2013\_2014\SOW 14\_Part 1\_CPT\processed results\Section F\CPT\_07-04

**FNP0003368 0254701** 



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369(29 PolyMet North Met Engineering\Work Authorization 13\Other Costs\Soil Borings\Geotech lnvestigations\Winter Geotechnical Explorations 2013\_2014\SOW 14\_Part l\_CPT\processed results\Section F\CPT\_07-05 & 14-05.xlsm

Sleeve Friction, f<sub>s</sub> [tsf]



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369C29 PolyMet NorthMet Engineering\Work Authorization 13\Other Costs\Soil Borings\Geotech Investigations\Winter Geotechnical Explorations 2013\_2014\SOW 14\_Part 1\_CPT\processed results\Section F\CPT\_07-05 & 14-05.xlsm

# Pore Pressure, u<sub>2</sub> [ft]



**Figure G-2c. CPT 07-05/CPT14-05 Pore Pressure vs. Depth** 

P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369(29 PolyMet North Met Engineering\Work Authorization 13\Other Costs\Soil Borings\Geotech lnvestigations\Winter Geotechnical Explorations 2013\_2014\SOW 14\_Part l\_CPT\processed results\Section F\CPT\_07-05 & 14-05.xlsm

11/3/2014

**FIGURE G-2d CPT14-05 Behavior Plot** 



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369C29 PolyMet NorthMet Engineering\Work Authorization 13\Other Costs\Soil Borings\Geotech Investigations\Winter Geotechnical Explorations 2013\_2014\SOW 14\_Part 1\_CPT\processed results\Section F\CPT\_07-05

11/3/2014

0254705



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369(29 PolyMet North Met Engineering\Work Authorization 13\Other Costs\Soil Borings\Geotech lnvestigations\Winter Geotechnical Explorations 2013\_2014\SOW 14\_Part l\_CPT\processed results\Section F\CPT\_07-06 & 14-06.xlsm

Sleeve Friction, f<sub>s</sub> [tsf]



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369C29 PolyMet NorthMet Engineering\Work Authorization 13\Other Costs\Soil Borings\Geotech Investigations\Winter Geotechnical Explorations 2013\_2014\SOW 14\_Part 1\_CPT\processed results\Section F\CPT\_07-06 & 14-06.xlsm



### **Figure G-3c. CPT 07-06/CPT14-06 Pore Pressure vs. Depth**

P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369(29 PolyMet North Met Engineering\Work Authorization 13\Other Costs\Soil Borings\Geotech lnvestigations\Winter Geotechnical Explorations 2013\_2014\SOW 14\_Part l\_CPT\processed results\Section F\CPT\_07-06 & 14-06.xlsm

**FIGURE G-3d CPT14-06 Behavior Plot** 



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369C29 PolyMet NorthMet Engineering\Work Authorization 13\Other Costs\Soil Borings\Geotech Investigations\Winter Geotechnical Explorations 2013\_2014\SOW 14\_Part 1\_CPT\processed results\Section F\CPT\_07-06

0254709



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369C29 PolyMet NorthMet Engineering\Work Authorization 13\Other Costs\Soil Borings\Geotech Investigations\Winter Geotechnical Explorations 2013\_2014\SOW 14\_Part 1\_CPT\processed results\Section F\CPT\_07-27 & 14-17.xlsm

**Sleeve Friction, f<sub>s</sub>[tsf]** 





P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369(29 PolyMet North Met Engineering\Work Authorization 13\Other Costs\Soil Borings\Geotech lnvestigations\Winter Geotechnical Explorations 2013\_2014\SOW 14\_Part l\_CPT\processed results\Section F\CPT\_07-27 & 14-17.xlsm



### **Figure G-4c. CPT 07-27/CPT14-17 Pore Pressure vs. Depth**

P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369(29 PolyMet North Met Engineering\Work Authorization 13\Other Costs\Soil Borings\Geotech lnvestigations\Winter Geotechnical Explorations 2013\_2014\SOW 14\_Part l\_CPT\processed results\Section F\CPT\_07-27 & 14-17.xlsm

**FIGURE G-4d CPT 14-17 Behavior Plot** 



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369C29 PolyMet NorthMet Engineering\Work Authorization 13\Other Costs\Soil Borings\Geotech Investigations\Winter Geotechnical Explorations 2013\_2014\SOW 14\_Part 1\_CPT\processed results\Section F\CPT\_07-27

11/3/2014

0254713



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369(29 PolyMet North Met Engineering\Work Authorization 13\Other Costs\Soil Borings\Geotech lnvestigations\Winter Geotechnical Explorations 2013\_2014\SOW 14\_Part l\_CPT\processed results\Section F\CPT14-18.xlsm

**Sleeve Friction, f<sub>s</sub> [tsf]** 



**Figure G5-b. CPT14-18 Sleeve Friction vs. Depth** 

P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369(29 PolyMet North Met Engineering\Work Authorization 13\Other Costs\Soil Borings\Geotech lnvestigations\Winter Geotechnical Explorations 2013\_2014\SOW 14\_Part l\_CPT\processed results\Section F\CPT14-18.xlsm



### **Figure G-5c. CPT14-18 Pore Pressure vs. Depth**

P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369(29 PolyMet North Met Engineering\Work Authorization 13\Other Costs\Soil Borings\Geotech lnvestigations\Winter Geotechnical Explorations 2013\_2014\SOW 14\_Part l\_CPT\processed results\Section F\CPT14-18.xlsm

**FIGURE G-Sd CPT14-18 Behavior Plot** 



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369C29 PolyMet NorthMet Engineering\Work Authorization 13\Other Costs\Soil Borings\Geotech Investigations\Winter Geotechnical Explorations 2013\_2014\SOW 14\_Part 1\_CPT\processed results\Section F\CPT14-18.

11/3/2014



## **Figure G-6a. CPT 14-20 Tip Resistance vs. Depth**

P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369(29 PolyMet North Met Engineering\Work Authorization 13\Other Costs\Soil Borings\Geotech lnvestigations\Winter Geotechnical Explorations 2013\_2014\SOW 14\_Part 1\_ CPT\processed resu lts\Section F\CPT14-20.xlsm

Sleeve Friction, f<sub>s</sub> [tsf]



Figure G-6b. CPT14-20 Sleeve Friction vs. Depth

P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369C29 PolyMet NorthMet Engineering\Work Authorization 13\Other Costs\Soil Borings\Geotech Investigations\Winter Geotechnical Explorations 2013\_2014\SOW 14\_Part 1\_CPT\processed results\Section F\CPT14-20.xlsm



### **Figure G-6c. CPT14-20 Pore Pressure vs. Depth**

P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369(29 PolyMet North Met Engineering\Work Authorization 13\Other Costs\Soil Borings\Geotech lnvestigations\Winter Geotechnical Explorations 2013\_2014\SOW 14\_Part 1\_ CPT\processed resu lts\Section F\CPT14-20.xlsm

**FIGURE G-Gd CPT14-20 Behavior Plot** 



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369C29 PolyMet NorthMet Engineering\Work Authorization 13\Qther Costs\Soil Borings\Geotech Investigations\Winter Geotechnical Explorations 2013\_2014\SOW 14\_Part 1\_CPT\processed results\Section F\CPT14-20.

**FNP0003368 0254721 A 18-1952** 



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369(29 PolyMet North Met Engineering\Work Authorization 13\Other Costs\Soil Borings\Geotech lnvestigations\Winter Geotechnical Explorations 2013\_2014\SOW 14\_Part l\_CPT\processed results\Section F\CPT14-21.xlsm

Sleeve Friction, f<sub>s</sub> [tsf]





P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369C29 PolyMet NorthMet Engineering\Work Authorization 13\Other Costs\Soil Borings\Geotech Investigations\Winter Geotechnical Explorations 2013\_2014\SOW 14\_Part 1\_CPT\processed results\Section F\CPT14-21.xlsm



## Figure G-7c. CPT14-21 Pore Pressure vs. Depth

P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369C29 PolyMet NorthMet Engineering\Work Authorization 13\Other Costs\Soil Borings\Geotech Investigations\Winter Geotechnical Explorations 2013\_2014\SOW 14\_Part 1\_CPT\processed results\Section F\CPT14-21.xlsm

**FIGURE G-7d CPT14-21 Behavior Plot** 



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369C29 PolyMet NorthMet Engineering\Work Authorization 13\Other Costs\Soil Borings\Geotech Investigations\Winter Geotechnical Explorations 2013\_2014\SOW 14\_Part 1\_CPT\processed results\Section F\CPT14-21.

**FNP0003368 0254725** 



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369(29 PolyMet North Met Engineering\Work Authorization 13\Other Costs\Soil Borings\Geotech lnvestigations\Winter Geotechnical Explorations 2013\_2014\SOW 14\_Part l\_CPT\processed results\Section F\CPT14-22.xlsm

**Sleeve Friction, f<sub>s</sub> [tsf]** 



### **Figure G-8b. CPT14-22 Sleeve Friction vs. Depth**

P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369(29 PolyMet North Met Engineering\Work Authorization 13\Other Costs\Soil Borings\Geotech lnvestigations\Winter Geotechnical Explorations 2013\_2014\SOW 14\_Part l\_CPT\processed results\Section F\CPT14-22.xlsm



### **Figure G-8c. CPT14-22 Pore Pressure vs. Depth**

P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369(29 PolyMet North Met Engineering\Work Authorization 13\Other Costs\Soil Borings\Geotech lnvestigations\Winter Geotechnical Explorations 2013\_2014\SOW 14\_Part l\_CPT\processed results\Section F\CPT14-22.xlsm

11/3/2014

**FIGURE G-8d CPT14-22 Behavior Plot** 



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369C29 PolyMet NorthMet Engineering\Work Authorization 13\Other Costs\Soil Borings\Geotech Investigations\Winter Geotechnical Explorations 2013\_2014\SOW 14\_Part 1\_CPT\processed results\Section F\CPT14-22.

0254729



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369(29 PolyMet North Met Engineering\Work Authorization 13\Other Costs\Soil Borings\Geotech lnvestigations\Winter Geotechnical Explorations 2013\_2014\SOW 14\_Part l\_CPT\processed results\Section G\CPT \_07-07C & 14-07.xlsm

**Sleeve Friction, f<sub>s</sub>[tsf]** 



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369(29 PolyMet North Met Engineering\Work Authorization 13\Other Costs\Soil Borings\Geotech lnvestigations\Winter Geotechnical Explorations 2013\_2014\SOW 14\_Part l\_CPT\processed results\Section G\CPT \_07-07C & 14-07.xlsm



### **Figure G-9c. CPT 07-07C/CPT14-07 Pore Pressure vs. Depth**

P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369(29 PolyMet North Met Engineering\Work Authorization 13\Other Costs\Soil Borings\Geotech lnvestigations\Winter Geotechnical Explorations 2013\_2014\SOW 14\_Part l\_CPT\processed results\Section G\CPT \_07-07C & 14-07.xlsm

11/3/2014

**FIGURE G-9d CPT 14-07 Behavior Plot** 



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369C29 PolyMet NorthMet Engineering\Work Authorization 13\Other Costs\Soil Borings\Geotech Investigations\Winter Geotechnical Explorations 2013\_2014\SOW 14\_Part 1\_CPT\processed results\Section G\CPT\_07-07



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369(29 PolyMet North Met Engineering\Work Authorization 13\Other Costs\Soil Borings\Geotech lnvestigations\Winter Geotechnical Explorations 2013\_2014\SOW 14\_Part l\_CPT\processed results\Section G\CPT \_07-08 & 14-08.xlsm

**Sleeve Friction, f<sub>s</sub> [tsf]** 



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369(29 PolyMet North Met Engineering\Work Authorization 13\Other Costs\Soil Borings\Geotech lnvestigations\Winter Geotechnical Explorations 2013\_2014\SOW 14\_Part l\_CPT\processed results\Section G\CPT \_07-08 & 14-08.xlsm


P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369(29 PolyMet North Met Engineering\Work Authorization 13\Other Costs\Soil Borings\Geotech lnvestigations\Winter Geotechnical Explorations 2013\_2014\SOW 14\_Part l\_CPT\processed results\Section G\CPT \_07-08 & 14-08.xlsm

**FIGURE G-lOd CPT14-08 Behavior Plot** 



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369C29 PolyMet NorthMet Engineering\Work Authorization 13\Other Costs\Soil Borings\Geotech Investigations\Winter Geotechnical Explorations 2013\_2014\SOW 14\_Part 1\_CPT\processed results\Section G\CPT\_07-08



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369(29 PolyMet North Met Engineering\Work Authorization 13\Other Costs\Soil Borings\Geotech lnvestigations\Winter Geotechnical Explorations 2013\_2014\SOW 14\_Part l\_CPT\processed results\Section G\CPT \_07-09 & 14-09.xlsm

**Sleeve Friction, f<sub>s</sub> [tsf]** 



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369(29 PolyMet North Met Engineering\Work Authorization 13\Other Costs\Soil Borings\Geotech lnvestigations\Winter Geotechnical Explorations 2013\_2014\SOW 14\_Part l\_CPT\processed results\Section G\CPT \_07-09 & 14-09.xlsm



#### **Figure G-11c. CPT 07-09/CPT14-09 Pore Pressure vs. Depth**

P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369(29 PolyMet North Met Engineering\Work Authorization 13\Other Costs\Soil Borings\Geotech lnvestigations\Winter Geotechnical Explorations 2013\_2014\SOW 14\_Part l\_CPT\processed results\Section G\CPT \_07-09 & 14-09.xlsm

**FIGURE G-lld CPT14-09 Behavior Plot** 



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369C29 PolyMet NorthMet Engineering\Work Authorization 13\Other Costs\Soil Borings\Geotech Investigations\Winter Geotechnical Explorations 2013\_2014\SOW 14\_Part 1\_CPT\processed results\Section G\CPT\_07-09



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369(29 PolyMet North Met Engineering\Work Authorization 13\Other Costs\Soil Borings\Geotech lnvestigations\Winter Geotechnical Explorations 2013\_2014\SOW 14\_Part l\_CPT\processed results\Section N\CPT07-14.xlsm

**Sleeve Friction, f<sub>s</sub> [tsf]** 



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369(29 PolyMet North Met Engineering\Work Authorization 13\Other Costs\Soil Borings\Geotech lnvestigations\Winter Geotechnical Explorations 2013\_2014\SOW 14\_Part l\_CPT\processed results\Section N\CPT07-14.xlsm



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369(29 PolyMet North Met Engineering\Work Authorization 13\Other Costs\Soil Borings\Geotech lnvestigations\Winter Geotechnical Explorations 2013\_2014\SOW 14\_Part lacencessed results\Section N\CPT07-14.xlsm 11/3/2014

**FIGURE G-12d CPT14-14 Behavior Plot** 



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369C29 PolyMet NorthMet Engineering\Work Authorization 13\Other Costs\Soil Borings\Geotech Investigations\Winter Geotechnical Explorations 2013\_2014\SOW 14\_Part 1\_CPT\processed results\Section N\CPT07-14.



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369(29 PolyMet North Met Engineering\Work Authorization 13\Other Costs\Soil Borings\Geotech lnvestigations\Winter Geotechnical Explorations 2013\_2014\SOW 14\_Part l\_CPT\processed results\Section N\CPT07-15.xlsm



#### **Figure G-13b. CPT 07-15/CPT14-15 Sleeve Friction vs. Depth**

P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369(29 PolyMet North Met Engineering\Work Authorization 13\Other Costs\Soil Borings\Geotech lnvestigations\Winter Geotechnical Explorations 2013\_2014\SOW 14\_Part l\_CPT\processed results\Section N\CPT07-15.xlsm



#### **Figure G-13c. CPT 07-15/CPT14-15 Pore Pressure vs. Depth**

P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369(29 PolyMet North Met Engineering\Work Authorization 13\Other Costs\Soil Borings\Geotech lnvestigations\Winter Geotechnical Explorations 2013\_2014\SOW 14\_Part l\_CPT\processed results\Section N\CPT07-15.xlsm

**FIGURE G-13d CPT14-15 Behavior Plot** 



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369C29 PolyMet NorthMet Engineering\Work Authorization 13\Other Costs\Soil Borings\Geotech Investigations\Winter Geotechnical Explorations 2013\_2014\SOW 14\_Part 1\_CPT\processed results\Section N\CPT07-15.



#### **Figure G-14a. CPT14-19 Tip Resistance vs. Depth**

P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369(29 PolyMet North Met Engineering\Work Authorization 13\Other Costs\Soil Borings\Geotech lnvestigations\Winter Geotechnical Explorations 2013\_2014\SOW 14\_Part l\_CPT\processed results\Section N\CPT14-19\_0804.xlsm



#### **Figure G-14b. CPT14-19 Sleeve Friction vs. Depth**

P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369(29 PolyMet North Met Engineering\Work Authorization 13\Other Costs\Soil Borings\Geotech lnvestigations\Winter Geotechnical Explorations 2013\_2014\SOW 14\_Part l\_CPT\processed results\Section N\CPT14-19\_0804.xlsm

Pore Pressure, u<sub>2</sub> [ft]



**Figure G-14c. CPT14-19 Pore Pressure vs. Depth** 

P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369(29 PolyMet North Met Engineering\Work Authorization 13\Other Costs\Soil Borings\Geotech lnvestigations\Winter Geotechnical Explorations 2013\_2014\SOW 14\_Part l\_CPT\processed results\Section N\CPT14-19\_0804.xlsm

**FIGURE G-14d CPT14-19 Behavior Plot** 



P:\Mpls\23 MN\69\2369C29 PolyMet NorthMet Engineering\Work Authorization 13\Other Costs\Soil Borings\Geotech Investigations\Winter Geotechnical Explorations 2013\_2014\SOW 14\_Part 1\_CPT\processed results\Section N\CPT14-19\_

**FNP0003368 0254753** 

# **Exhibit H**

**Pore Pressure Dissipation Test Results** 

## **CPT14-05 @ 72. 7ft**







**CPT14-06 @ 28.3ft** 



**CPT14-06 @ 66ft** 



**CPT14-07 @ 50ft** 



**CPT14-08 @ 38ft** 



**CPT14-08 @ 63ft** 



**CPT14-09@ 21ft** 



**CPT14-15 @ 34ft** 



**CPT14-15 @ 35ft** 



#### **CPT14-15 @ 56ft**



#### **CPT14-15 @ 69ft**



**CPT14-17** @ **37 .2ft** 



**CPT14-17 @ 60ft** 



#### **CPT14-18@ 20.5ft**



**CPT14-18 @ 64ft** 



## **CPT14-19 @ 21ft**



**CPT14-19 @ 28ft** 



## **CPT14-19 @ 29ft**



**CPT14-19 @ 39ft** 



**CPT14-19 @ 63ft** 



**CPT14-20 @ 69ft** 



**CPT14-20 @ 85ft** 



**CPT14-22 @ 25ft** 



**CPT14-22 @ 32ft** 



**CPT14-22 @ 46ft** 



## **CPT14-22 @ 73ft**

