

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: BACKGROUND8

1.1. Introduction.....8

1.2. Hypothesis.....9

1.3. Thesis Objectives10

1.2.1. General Objectives10

1.2.2. Specific Objectives.....10

1.4. Methodology10

1.5. Thesis Contents11

CHAPTER 2: ARTICLES12

2.1. Article 2:12

3.2 Materials influence.....18

CHAPTER 3: CONCLUSIONS.....35

3.1. Future Work36

CHAPTER 4: BIBLIOGRAPHY37

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure a Representation of induced seismicity that impacts the wall of an excavation. (Villaescusa et al., 2010)8

Figure b Types of rockburst damage product of induced seismicity. (Kaiser et al., 1996).....9

Figure 1 (a) Set-up of the dynamic testing facility at CanMet-MMSL (After Yi and Kaiser, 1994b; 1992). (b) Set-up of the dynamic testing facility at WASM (After Player et al., 2008; 2004)15

Figure 2 Sample configurations for the dynamic test. (a) Continuous tube (conventional). (b) Split-tube (Crompton et al., 2018)15

Figure 3 (a) Two step problems of the model at different moments of time. (b) Free-body diagram of the model (After St-Pierre, 2007).....16

Figure 4 (a) Model built in FLAC^{3D} Software. (b) Reinforcement element represented by segments joined by nodes17

Figure 5 Scheme of application of the equivalent radial compression to the grid in FLAC^{3D} Software 21

Figure 6 Diagram of the calibration of the numerical model process22

Figure 7 Model implemented in FLAC^{3D} Software. (a) Continuous tube configuration. (b) Split-tube configuration. From left to right three temporal stages of the numerical model simulation23

Figure 8	Model response comparison with test results. (a) 2.3 m rockbolt length. (b) 3.2 m rockbolt length. (c) 3.0 m rockbolt length. (d) Comparison between continuous tube and split-tube configurations for a 3.2 rockbolt length (Tests results after Player et al., 2009; Player and Cordova, 2009).....	25
Figure 9	Example of final force (N), displacement (m), grout state and cable state profiles for a 3.2 m rockbolt length: (a) Continuous tube configuration. (b) Split-tube configuration	25
Figure 10	Parametric analysis results from the simulations of the calibrated numerical model. (a) Response to changes in the loading mass. (b) Response to changes in the rockbolt length. (c) Response to changes in the rockbolt diameter. (d) Response to changes in the water-cement ratio of the grout	27
Figure 11	Verification of the model performance with an additional test result from an impact test facility. The figure also includes the comparison between the model response with the tests results for 3.2 m length rockbolts.....	29
Figure 12	Dissipated energy as a function of the maximum displacement obtained from numerical simulations and laboratory-scale tests results from the literature. The performance of threadbar and D-bolt are included in the analysis (Tests results from Doucet and Voyzelle, 2012; Li and Doucet, 2012; Player and Cordova, 2009; Player et al., 2009; Villaescusa, 2012)	29

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Calibrated parameters of the model for three different dynamic tests (Tests results after Player et al. 2009; Player and Cordova, 2009).....	26
Table 2	Parameters used for the simulations of the numerical model for the parametric analysis	28
Table 3	Parameters considered for the simulations of the numerical model for the verification, calibration and quantification of the loading mass effect.....	30