

**STATE OF NEW MEXICO  
BEFORE THE WATER QUALITY CONTROL COMMISSION**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**In the Matter of:** )  
 )  
 )  
 )  
**PROPOSED AMENDMENT** )  
**TO 20.6.2 NMAC (Copper Rule)** )  
 )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

**No. WQCC 12-01(R)**

**EXHIBIT SCOTT – D-36**

# **INVESTIGATION AND DESIGN OF MINE DUMPS INTERIM GUIDELINES**

**Prepared for the:**

**British Columbia Mine Dump Committee with funding provided from  
the Provincial Sustainable Environment Fund**

**Prepared by:**

**Piteau Associates Engineering Ltd.  
215 - 260 West Esplanade  
North Vancouver, B.C. V7M 3G7**

**MAY 1991**

**TABLE 6.4**  
**INTERIM GUIDELINES FOR MINIMUM DESIGN FACTOR OF SAFETY <sup>1</sup>**

STABILITY CONDITION	SUGGESTED MINIMUM DESIGN VALUES FOR FACTOR OF SAFETY	
	CASE A	CASE B
<b>STABILITY OF DUMP SURFACE</b>		
-Short Term (during construction)	1.0	1.0
-Long Term (reclamation - abandonment)	1.2	1.1
<b>OVERALL STABILITY (DEEP SEATED STABILITY)</b>		
-Short Term (static)	1.3 - 1.5	1.1 - 1.3
-Long Term (static)	1.5	1.3
-Pseudo-Static (earthquake) <sup>2</sup>	1.1 - 1.3	1.0
<b>CASE A:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Low level of confidence in critical analysis parameters</li> <li>-Possibly unconservative interpretation of conditions, assumptions</li> <li>-Severe consequences of failure</li> <li>-Simplified stability analysis method (charts, simplified method of slices)</li> <li>-Stability analysis method poorly simulates physical conditions</li> <li>-Poor understanding of potential failure mechanism(s)</li> </ul>		
<b>CASE B:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-High level of confidence in critical analysis parameters</li> <li>-Conservative interpretation of conditions, assumptions</li> <li>-Minimal consequences of failure</li> <li>-Rigorous stability analysis method</li> <li>-Stability analysis method simulates physical conditions well</li> <li>-High level of confidence in critical failure mechanism(s)</li> </ul>		

**NOTES:** 1. A range of suggested minimum design values are given to reflect different levels of confidence in understanding site conditions, material parameters, consequences of instability, and other factors.

2. Where pseudo-static analyses, based on peak ground accelerations which have a 10% probability of exceedance in 50 years, yield F.O.S. < 1.0, dynamic analysis of stress-strain response, and comparison of results with stress-strain characteristics of dump materials is recommended.