

CERTIFICATE

It is certified that the work contained in the thesis titled **Design of CM Depillaring Panel Using Numerical Simulation Techniques** by **Shailendra Chawla** has been carried out under our supervision and that this work has not been submitted elsewhere for a degree.

It is further certified that the student has fulfilled all the requirements of Comprehensive Examination, Candidacy and SOTA for the award of Ph.D. Degree.

Supervisor

Prof. B. K. Shrivastva

Department of Mining Engineering

IIT (BHU)

Varanasi – 221005

Co-Supervisor

Dr. Ashok Jaiswal

Department of Mining Engineering

IIT (BHU)

Varanasi - 221005

DECLARATION BY THE CANDIDATE

I, **Shailendra Chawla**, certify that the work embodied in this thesis is my own bona fide work and carried out by me under the supervision of **Prof. B.K. Shrivastva** and **Dr. Ashok Jaiswal** from July – 2015 to April – 2021, at the **Department of Mining Engineering**, Indian Institute of Technology (BHU), Varanasi. The matter embodied in this thesis has not been submitted for the award of any other degree/diploma. I declare that I have faithfully acknowledged and given credits to the research workers wherever their works have been cited in my work in this thesis. I further declare that I have not willfully copied any other's work, paragraphs, text, data, results, etc., reported in journals, books, magazines, reports dissertations, theses, etc. or available at websites and have not including them in this thesis and have not cited as my own work.

Date:

Place: Varanasi

(**Shailendra Chawla**)

CERTIFICATE BY THE SUPERVISOR(S)

It is certified that the above statement made by the student is correct to the best of our knowledge.

Supervisor

Prof. B. K. Shrivastva

Department of Mining Engineering

IIT (BHU)

Varanasi – 221005

Co-Supervisor

Dr. Ashok Jaiswal

Department of Mining Engineering

IIT (BHU)

Varanasi - 221005

Signature of Head of the Department

COPYRIGHT TRANSFER CERTIFICATE

Title of the Thesis: **Design of CM Depillaring Panel Using Numerical Simulation Techniques**

Name of Student: **Shailendra Chawla**

Copyright Transfer

The undersigned hereby assigns to the Institute of Technology (Banaras Hindu University) Varanasi all rights under copyright that may exist in and for the above thesis submitted for the award of the Doctor of Philosophy.

Date:

Place: Varanasi

(Shailendra Chawla)

Note: However, the author may reproduce or authorize others to reproduce material extracted verbatim from the thesis or derivative of the thesis for author's personal use provided that the source and the Institute's copyright notice are indicated.

Dedicated to my mother

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Time has given me immense pleasure to express and pour the deep sense of my profound gratitude cherished in the depth of my heart for my revered teacher and supervisor, **Prof. B. K. Shrivastva**, Department of Mining Engineering, Indian Institute of Technology (Banaras Hindu University). His readiness in guidance, stupendous moral support, oratory teachings, amicable behavior, and the grip he is having over the topic radically changed the have not mode of my cognizance to the have one, for which the thesis itself is a mute testimony. He is and always will be a huge source of inspiration to me, and I sincerely thank him for all the blessings and enthusiasm for completing the research work.

I am deeply indebted to my reverend teacher and Co-Supervisor, **Dr. Ashok Jaiswal**, Associate Professor, Department of Mining Engineering, Indian Institute of Technology (Banaras Hindu University). His able guidance, intellectual sharpness, continuous encouragement, constructive criticism, and cordial behavior made me able to bring the present work to a conclusion. I am thankful to him for inspiring me through enlightened heart and honesty and illuminating me through his wisdom and knowledge.

I am very thankful to **Prof. P. Rai**, Head of the Department, Mining Engineering, for providing the departmental facilities during the study. I would like to thank **Dr. Amrendra Kumar**, Convenor, DPGC, for his support during the study. I express my thanks to **Prof. Aarif Jamal**, **Prof. S. Gupta**, **Dr. Rajesh Rai**, **Dr. Nawal Kishore**, **Dr. S. K. Palei** for their valuable suggestions and continuous motivation during my research work. The help and support received from other faculty members and staff of the Department of Mining Engineering is highly acknowledged.

I would like to thank **Mr. S. K. Jena**, Chief Manager (Mining), MCL, for his enormous support during the field visits.

I would like to express my special gratitude to my seniors, colleagues, and friends, with special mention to **Mr. Rizwan Hasim, Mr. Vivekanand Kumar, Dr. Bablesh Kumar Jha, Mr. Manish Kumar Mandal, Mr. Rahul Singh, and Mr. Nilesh Pratap Singh.**

I am forever indebted to my parents **Mrs. Pushpa Devi Chawla, and Mr. Madan Lal Chawla** for their blessings, love, and support at each difficult step in my life. This journey would not be possible without their care, love, support, encouragement, and belief in my endeavors.

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to all those who have contributed directly or indirectly to my research work. Finally, all praises for God Almighty, the faith in whom led to the successful completion of my Ph.D. thesis.

Shailendra Chawla

Table of Contents

Certificate	iii
Declaration by the Candidate	v
Copyright Transfer Certificate	vii
Acknowledgement	xi
Table of Contents	xiii
List of Figures	xvii
List of Tables	xxiii
List of Abbreviations	xxv
List of Symbols	xxvii
List of Illustrations	xxix
Abstract	xxxix
Chapter 1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. General.....	1
1.2. Motivation for the study.....	3
1.3. Objective of the study.....	5
1.4. Outline of the thesis.....	5
Chapter 2 LITERATURE REVIEW	9
2.1. General.....	9
2.2. Strata behavior.....	10
2.2.1. Caving phenomena.....	10
2.2.2. Roof assessment techniques.....	12
2.2.3. Strata monitoring instruments.....	15
2.3. Pillar extraction schemes.....	17
2.3.1. Modified Navid.....	18
2.3.2. Fish-bone.....	19
2.3.3. Split and fender.....	20
2.3.4. One-third split and fender.....	22

2.3.5. Double split and fender.....	23
2.4. Panel designing techniques.....	24
2.4.1. Pillar design techniques.....	25
2.4.2. Remnant pillar design techniques.....	30
2.5. Concluding remarks.....	31
Chapter 3 NUMERICAL SIMULATION METHODOLOGY	33
3.1. General.....	33
3.2. Analyses tool.....	33
3.3. Design approach.....	34
3.3.1. Panel design approach.....	36
3.3.2. Remnant pillar design approach.....	38
3.4. Coal mass strength parameters.....	43
3.5. Concluding remarks.....	46
Chapter 4 FIELD STUDY	49
4.1. General.....	49
4.2. Case A.....	49
4.2.1. Depillaring operation in ‘Case A’.....	53
4.2.2. Numerical simulation for ‘Case A’.....	54
4.2.3. Simulation results for ‘Case A’.....	56
4.2.4. Field observations in ‘Case A’.....	59
4.3. Case B.....	62
4.3.1. Depillaring operation in ‘Case B’.....	64
4.3.2. Numerical simulation for ‘Case B’.....	65
4.3.3. Simulation results for ‘Case B’.....	67
4.3.4. Field observations in ‘Case B’.....	68
4.4. Case C.....	72
4.4.1. Depillaring operation in ‘Case C’.....	72
4.4.2. Numerical simulation for ‘Case C’.....	74
4.4.3. Simulation results for ‘Case C’.....	76
4.4.4. Field observations in ‘Case C’.....	78
4.5. Concluding remarks.....	81
Chapter 5 DESIGN PARAMETERS FOR CM PANEL	83

5.1. General.....	83
5.2. Design of the panel.....	83
5.2.1. Design parameters for panel.....	84
5.2.2. Numerical simulation for panel design.....	85
5.3. Design of the remnant pillar.....	86
5.3.1. Design parameters for remnant pillar.....	87
5.3.2. Numerical simulation for remnant pillar design.....	88
5.4. Concluding remarks.....	91
Chapter 6 RESULTS AND ANALYSIS	93
6.1. General.....	93
6.2. Panel design.....	93
6.2.1. Simulation results for pillar width of 26 m.....	94
6.2.2. Simulation results for pillar width of 35 m.....	97
6.2.3. Simulation results for pillar width of 45 m.....	102
6.2.4. Simulation results for pillar width of 48 m.....	112
6.2.5. Analysis for panel design.....	119
6.2.6. Guidelines for panel design.....	124
6.3. Remnant pillar design.....	127
6.3.1. Simulation results for pillar width of 26 m.....	129
6.3.2. Simulation results for pillar width of 35 m.....	133
6.3.3. Simulation results for pillar width of 45 m.....	137
6.3.4. Simulation results for pillar width of 48 m.....	144
6.3.5. Analysis for remnant pillar design.....	151
6.3.6. Guidelines for remnant pillar design.....	157
6.4. Concluding remarks.....	160
Chapter 7 CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS	161
References	167
Appendix – A	173
Appendix – B	176
Appendix – C	181

List of figures

2.1	Main and periodic distances in the caving process.....	12
2.2	Typical layout of the bord and pillar panel.....	12
2.3	Strata monitoring instruments.....	16
2.4	Extraction schemes adopted during depillaring operation.....	18
2.5	Modified Navid pattern of pillar extraction.....	19
2.6	Fish-bone pattern of pillar extraction.....	20
2.7	Split and fender pattern of pillar extraction.....	21
2.8	One – third split and fender pattern of pillar extraction.....	22
2.9	Double split and fender pattern of pillar extraction.....	23
2.10	Typical layout of vertical stress.....	28
3.1	Typical layout of the panel showing critical depillaring stage and focused pillars.....	37
3.2	Failure mechanism of the immediate strata.....	39
3.3	Typical layout of the panel showing focused remnant pillar.....	41
3.4	Flow chart showing designing sequence adopted for optimum remnant pillar design.....	42
3.5	Typical discretized view of the model for the coal pillar.....	44
3.6	Numerical pillars strength and stress.....	46
4.1	Borehole log of the strata in ‘Case A’.....	51
4.2	Layout of the panel in ‘Case A’.....	52
4.3	Typical layout of the depillaring panel and extraction pattern in ‘Case A’.....	53
4.4	Discretized view of the model in ‘Case A’.....	54
4.5	Vertical stress and yield profile of the panel in ‘Case A’.....	58
4.6	Time interval between flashing of AWTT and roof fall in ‘Case A’.....	60
4.7	Natural roof falls in the panel during depillaring in ‘Case A’.....	61
4.8	Area of overhang before and after roof fall in ‘Case A’.....	61
4.9	Borehole log of the strata in ‘Case B’.....	63

4.10	Layout of the panel in ‘Case B’	64
4.11	Discretized view of the model in ‘Case B’	66
4.12	Vertical stress and yield profile of the panel in ‘Case B’	68
4.13	Time interval between flashing of AWTT and roof fall in ‘Case B’	70
4.14	Natural roof falls in the panel during depillaring in ‘Case B’	71
4.15	Area of overhang before and after roof fall in ‘Case B’	71
4.16	Borehole of the strata in ‘Case C’	73
4.17	Layout of the panel in ‘Case C’	73
4.18	Discretized view of the model in ‘Case C’	75
4.19	Vertical stress and yield profile of the panel in ‘Case C’	77
4.20	Induced stress on a pillar no. 13 during the depillaring operation.....	79
4.21	Area of overhang before and after roof fall in ‘Case C’	80
5.1	Discretized view of the model for panel design.....	85
5.2	Discretized view of the model for remnant pillar design.....	90
6.1	Vertical stress and yield profile of the panel with a pillar width of 26 m at a depth of 90 m.....	96
6.2	Vertical stress and yield profile of the panel with a pillar width of 35 m at a depth of 150 m.....	99
6.3	Vertical stress and yield profile of the panel with a pillar width of 35 m at a depth of 180 m.....	101
6.4	Vertical stress and yield profile of the panel with a pillar width of 45 m at a depth of 240 m.....	104
6.5	Vertical stress and yield profile of the panel with a pillar width of 45 m at a depth of 270 m.....	106
6.6	Vertical stress and yield profile of the panel with a pillar width of 45 m at a depth of 300 m.....	108
6.7	Vertical stress and yield profile of the panel with a pillar width of 45 m at a depth of 330 m.....	111
6.8	Vertical stress and yield profile of the panel with a pillar width	

	of 48 m at a depth of 360 m.....	113
6.9	Vertical stress and yield profile of the panel with a pillar width of 48 m at a depth of 390 m.....	115
6.10	Vertical stress and yield profile of the panel with a pillar width of 48 m at a depth of 420 m.....	117
6.11	Average vertical stress on the selected pillars at different depth of cover.....	120
6.12	Average vertical stress on the selected pillars.....	121
6.13	Stress ratio for the pillar with different FOS during development.....	123
6.14	Vertical stress and yield profile of the panel with a pillar width of 26 m and snook width of 4.5 m at a depth of 90 m during 'Stage I'.....	131
6.15	Vertical stress and yield profile of the panel with a pillar width of 26 m and snook width of 4.5 m at a depth of 90m during 'Stage II' through 'Stage IV'.....	132
6.16	Vertical stress and yield profile of the panel with a pillar width of 35 m and snook width of 4.5 m at a depth of 180m during 'Stage 0'.....	135
6.17	Vertical stress and yield profile of the panel with a pillar width of 35 m and snook width of 4.5 m at a depth of 180 m during 'Stage I' through 'Stage V'.....	136
6.18	Vertical stress and yield profile of the panel with a pillar width of 45 m and snook width of 5.5 m at a depth of 330 m during 'Stage 0'.....	139
6.19	Vertical stress and yield profile of the panel with a pillar width of 45 m and snook width of 5.5 m at a depth of 330 m during 'Stage I' through 'Stage IV'.....	140
6.20	Vertical stress and yield profile of the panel with a pillar width of 45 m and snook width of 5.5 m at a depth of 330 m during 'Stage V' through 'Stage VIII'.....	142
6.21	Vertical stress and yield profile of the panel with a pillar width of 45 m and snook width of 5.5 m at a depth of 330 m during 'Stage IX'	

	through 'Stage XI'	143
6.22	Vertical stress and yield profile of the panel with a pillar width of 48 m and snook width of 5.5 m at a depth of 420 m during 'Stage 0'	146
6.23	Vertical stress and yield profile of the panel with a pillar width of 48 m and snook width of 5.5 m at a depth of 420 m during 'Stage I' through 'Stage IV'	147
6.24	Vertical stress and yield profile of the panel with a pillar width of 48 m and snook width of 5.5 m at a depth of 420 m during 'Stage V' through 'Stage VIII'	149
6.25	Vertical stress and yield profile of the panel with a pillar width of 48 m and snook width of 5.5 m at a depth of 420 m during 'Stage IX' through 'Stage XI'	150
6.26	Graphical representation of the SF of the remnant pillar for the selected pillars	154
6.27	Graph showing reaction provided by the remnant pillar for different areas	155
B.1	Vertical stress and yield profile of the panel with a pillar width of 26 m at a depth of 120 m	175
B.2	Vertical stress and yield profile of the panel with a pillar width of 35 m at a depth of 210 m	176
B.3	Vertical stress and yield profile of the panel with a pillar width of 45 m at a depth of 360 m	177
B.4	Vertical stress and yield profile of the panel with a pillar width of 48 m at a depth of 450 m	178
C.1	Vertical stress and yield profile of the panel with a pillar width of 26 m and snook width of 5.5 m at a depth of 90 m during 'Stage I'	180
C.2	Vertical stress and yield profile of the panel with a pillar width of 26 m and snook width of 5.5 m at a depth of 90 m during 'Stage II' through 'Stage IV'	181

C.3	Vertical stress and yield profile of the panel with a pillar width of 26 m and snook width of 6.5 m at a depth of 90 m during ‘Stage I’.....	182
C.4	Vertical stress and yield profile of the panel with a pillar width of 26 m and snook width of 6.5 m at a depth of 90 m during ‘Stage II’ through ‘Stage IV’.....	183
C.5	Vertical stress and yield profile of the panel with a pillar width of 35 m and snook width of 5.5 m at a depth of 180 m during ‘Stage 0’.....	184
C.6	Vertical stress and yield profile of the panel with a pillar width of 35 m and snook width of 5.5 m at a depth of 180 m during ‘Stage I’ through ‘Stage V’.....	185
C.7	Vertical stress and yield profile of the panel with a pillar width of 35 m and snook width of 6.5 m at a depth of 180 m during ‘Stage 0’.....	186
C.8	Vertical stress and yield profile of the panel with a pillar width of 35 m and snook width of 6.5 m at a depth of 180 m during ‘Stage I’ through ‘Stage V’.....	187
C.9	Vertical stress and yield profile of the panel with a pillar width of 45 m and snook width of 4.5 m at a depth of 330 m during 'Stage 0'.....	188
C.10	Vertical stress and yield profile of the panel with a pillar width of 45 m and snook width of 4.5 m at a depth of 330 m during 'Stage I' through 'Stage IV'.....	189
C.11	Vertical stress and yield profile of the panel with a pillar width of 45 m and snook width of 4.5 m at a depth of 330 m during 'Stage V' through 'Stage VIII'.....	190
C.12	Vertical stress and yield profile of the panel with a pillar width of 45 m and snook width of 4.5 m at a depth of 330 m during 'Stage IX' through 'Stage XI'.....	191
C.13	Vertical stress and yield profile of the panel with a pillar width of 45 m and snook width of 6.5 m at a depth of 330 m during ‘Stage 0’.....	192
C.14	Vertical stress and yield profile of the panel with a pillar width of 45 m	

	and snook width of 6.5 m at a depth of 330 m during ‘Stage I’ through ‘Stage IV’	193
C.15	Vertical stress and yield profile of the panel with a pillar width of 45 m and snook width of 6.5 m at a depth of 330 m during ‘Stage V’ through ‘Stage VIII’	194
C.16	Vertical stress and yield profile of the panel with a pillar width of 45 m and snook width of 6.5 m at a depth of 330 m during ‘Stage IX’ through ‘Stage XI’	195
C.17	Vertical stress and yield profile of the panel with a pillar width of 48 m and snook width of 4.5 m at a depth of 420 m during ‘Stage 0’	196
C.18	Vertical stress and yield profile of the panel with a pillar width of 48 m and snook width of 4.5 m at a depth of 420 m during ‘Stage I’ through ‘Stage IV’	197
C.19	Vertical stress and yield profile of the panel with a pillar width of 48 m and snook width of 4.5 m at a depth of 420 m during ‘Stage V’ through ‘Stage VIII’	198
C.20	Vertical stress and yield profile of the panel with a pillar width of 48 m and snook width of 4.5 m at a depth of 420 m during ‘Stage IX’ through ‘Stage XI’	199
C.21	Vertical stress and yield profile of the panel with a pillar width of 48 m and snook width of 6.5 m at a depth of 420 m during ‘Stage 0’	200
C.22	Vertical stress and yield profile of the panel with a pillar width of 48 m and snook width of 6.5 m at a depth of 420 m during ‘Stage I’ through ‘Stage IV’	201
C.23	Vertical stress and yield profile of the panel with a pillar width of 48 m and snook width of 6.5 m at a depth of 420 m during ‘Stage V’ through ‘Stage VIII’	202
C.24	Vertical stress and yield profile of the panel with a pillar width of 48 m and snook width of 6.5 m at a depth of 420 m during ‘Stage IX’ through ‘Stage XI’	203

List of tables

2.1	Cavability index vs. caving behavior of strata.....	14
3.1	Material properties used in the model for coal.....	44
3.2	Material properties used in the model for roof and floor.....	45
4.1	Strength parameter for coal used in the model for ‘Case A’.....	56
4.2	FOS of the next intact pillar (‘N’) in ‘Case A’.....	58
4.3	Strength parameter for coal used in the model for ‘Case B’.....	66
4.4	FOS of the working pillar in ‘Case B’.....	68
4.5	Strength parameters for coal used in the model for ‘Case C’.....	76
4.6	FOS of the working pillar in ‘Case C’.....	78
5.1	Parameters used for designing the panel.....	84
5.2	Parameters used for designing the remnant pillar.....	88
6.1	Simulation results of the panel with a pillar width of 26 m at a depth of 90 m.....	97
6.2	Simulation results of the panel with a pillar width of 35 m at a depth of 150 m.....	99
6.3	Simulation results of the panel with a pillar width of 35 m at a depth of 180 m.....	102
6.4	Simulation results of the panel with a pillar width of 45 m at a depth of 240 m.....	105
6.5	Simulation results of the panel with a pillar width of 45 m at a depth of 270 m.....	107
6.6	Simulation results of the panel with a pillar width of 45 m at a depth of 300 m.....	109
6.7	Simulation results of the panel with a pillar width of 45 m at a depth of 330 m.....	111
6.8	Simulation results of the panel with a pillar width of 48 m at a depth of 360 m.....	114

6.9	Simulation results of the panel with a pillar width of 48 m at a depth of 390 m.....	116
6.10	Simulation results of the panel with a pillar width of 48 m at a depth of 420 m.....	118
6.11	Average vertical stress on the pillars during development and depillaring.....	122
6.12	Stress ratio of the focused pillars during depillaring.....	123
6.13	Nomograph showing the optimum width of the pillar for a mechanized depillaring panel.....	127
6.14	Simulation results of the remnant pillars for a pillar width of 26 and snook width of 4.5 m at a depth of 90 m.....	133
6.15	Simulation results of remnant pillars for a pillar width of 35 and snook width of 4.5 m at a depth of 180 m.....	137
6.16	Simulation results of remnant pillars for a pillar width of 45 and snook width of 4.5 m at a depth of 330 m.....	144
6.17	Simulation results of remnant pillars for a pillar width of 48 m and snook width of 5.5 m at a depth of 420 m.....	151
6.18	<i>SF</i> of the focused remnant pillars for pillar width of 26 m.....	153
6.19	<i>SF</i> of the focused remnant pillar for pillar width of 35 m.....	153
6.20	<i>SF</i> of the focused remnant pillars for pillar width of 45 m.....	153
6.21	<i>SF</i> of the focused remnant pillars for pillar width of 48 m.....	153
6.22	<i>SF</i> of the optimum remnant pillar design for the selected pillars.....	154
6.23	Average vertical stress on the focused remnant pillars for the selected pillars.....	156
6.24	Percentage of extraction in optimum cases of remnant pillars for the selected pillars.....	156
6.25	Optimum area and percentage of the snook for different pillar sizes.....	157
A.1	Failed cases of pillar from Indian coal mines.....	172
A.2	Stable cases of pillar from Indian coal mines.....	172

A.3	Factor of safety (<i>FOS</i>) of failed cases of pillars.....	173
A.4	Factor of safety (<i>FOS</i>) of stable cases of pillars.....	173

List of Abbreviations

<i>AWTT</i>	Auto – warning Tell-tale
<i>CIL</i>	Coal India Limited
<i>CM</i>	Continuous Miner
<i>CMR</i>	Coal Mine Regulations
<i>CMRI</i>	Central Mining Research Institute
<i>DHTT</i>	Dual Height Tell–tale
<i>FISH</i>	FLAC – ISH (language of FLAC)
<i>FLAC^{3D}</i>	Fast Lagrangian Analysis of Continua in three dimension
<i>FOS</i>	Factor of Safety
<i>GSI</i>	Geological Strength Index
<i>LTD</i>	Load Transfer Distance
<i>MOC</i>	Ministry of coal
<i>RBE</i>	Roof Bolt Extensometer
<i>RMR</i>	Rock Mass Rating
<i>RQD</i>	Rock Quality Designation
<i>RTT</i>	Rotary Tell–tale
<i>SCCL</i>	Singareni Collieries Company Limited
<i>SECL</i>	South Eastern Coalfields Limited
<i>SF</i>	Strength Factor
<i>SR</i>	Stress Ratio
<i>UCS</i>	Uniaxial Compressive Strength
<i>US</i>	United States

List of Symbols

I	Cavability Index
σ	Uniaxial Compressive Strength
l	Average length of core
t	Thickness of strong bed
s_p	Strength of pillar
w	Width of pillar
h	Height of pillar
s_{cube}	Strength of cubical pillar
D	Depth of cover
$^{\circ}$	Degree
c	Cohesion
ϕ	Friction angle
D_{max}	Maximum depth of cover
SR_W	Stress ratio of working pillar
SR_B	Stress ratio of barrier pillar
$FOS_{Development}$	Factor of safety of pillar during development
L	Load-bearing capacity of remnant
A	Area of remnant
L_P	Load-bearing capacity of previously extracted pillar
L_W	Load-bearing capacity of working pillar
SF_W	Strength Factor of working pillar/remnant
SF_P	Strength Factor of previously extracted pillar/remnant

List of Illustrations

6.1	Panel design for mechanized depillaring.....	125
6.2	Remnant pillar design during mechanized depillaring.....	158

Coal is a primary source of energy and plays an essential role in economic development of a country. India is a country having abundant coal deposits (about 155.61 BT of proven coal). The current trend of coal mining tends towards underground practices as opencast mines arise several environmental and health hazards. The bord and pillar is the most commonly used method of underground coal mining in India. Development and depillaring are the two phases of the bord and pillar system. The coal is extracted by driving galleries in the development phase. The depillaring operation has been commenced in the panel by the extraction of the pillars. Mechanization is proving to be an effective way to increasing underground coal production. The *CM* technology introduces in India in the year 2003 at Anjan Hill mine, *SECL*. Afterward numbers of mines have adopted *CM* technology to increase underground coal production. Strata issues have arisen in few Indian coal mines which deploy *CM* in an already developed panel for the depillaring operation. The widening and heightening of the galleries in an already developed panel (for easy maneuvering of the machine) reduces the designed factor of safety (*FOS*) of the pillars and may raise the strata issues. The intact pillars and remnant pillars (ribs/snook) are the critical elements of a depillaring panel, and the stability of these elements dictates the success of the depillaring operation. The *CM* is mass production technology; thus, a holistic design approach considering pillars (including barriers) and remnant pillars may help in achieving safe and productive mining operations. Numerical techniques are widely used nowadays in the field of geotechnical to deal with complex geo-mining conditions. An attempt has been made in the study to design the bord and pillar panel for mechanized depillaring using numerical techniques.

An extensive literature survey has been carried out in the study concerning the strata behavior, extraction patterns adopted during final coal extraction using *CM*, and the designing techniques. The bord and pillar panels are generally surrounded by goaf from one and developed pillars on the other. The barrier pillars, which are surrounded by the goaf from both sides, are the critical pillars, as the failure of these pillars may break the continuity of the strata and result in extreme loading conditions in the

working area. The pillars nearby goaf show high-stress conditions before the occurrence of the main roof fall. The main roof fall area generally varies from mine to mine, depending on the nature of the overlying strata. The maximum stress conditions arise in the panel at a depillaring stage in which the advancement length is equivalent to the panel width considering no main roof fall until that stage. The working and barrier pillars are required to be stable until the main roof fall occurs for maintaining the global stability in the panel. The optimum panel design is considered to be the one in which the working and barrier pillars are stable at the critical depillaring stage, where advancement length is equivalent to the panel width.

Numbers of extraction patterns have been adopted during the mechanized depillaring operation considering the pillar size. Fish-bone and split, and fender are the commonly used pattern adopted during final coal extraction using *CM*. The slices are taken out at an angle of about 70° while adopting *CM* technology considering the machine maneuverability. Rhomboidal-shaped remnant pillars (ribs/snooks) are left in the goaf during final coal extraction using *CM*. The overlying strata in underground coal mines are present in the form of layers or beds. The immediate strata separate from the main strata during the final coal extraction and impose their load on the remnant pillars. The required stability of the remnant pillars is to bear the load of the immediate strata until the depillaring advances to a safe distance and fails afterward to enable the caving process.

A smooth mechanized depillaring operation can only be achieved if the intact pillars (including barriers) and remnant pillars (ribs/snook) of the panel are wisely designed. The factor of safety (*FOS*) approach has been adopted in the study for designing the pillars. The design criterion for the pillars states that the *FOS* of the barrier pillars (which are surrounded by the goaf from both sides) should be greater than 1.0, and the *FOS* of the working pillars should not be less than 1.3 (preferably more than 1.5) at the critical depillaring stage. The term '*Strength factor (SF)*' has been coined in the study to assess the stability of the remnant pillars. The ratio of residual strength of the remnant pillars and the weight of the overhang is termed as *SF*. The design criteria for the remnant pillars states that the *SF* of the working pillar 'W' should be greater than 1.0 until last slice has been taken out from the pillar, and at that depillaring stage the *SF* of the previously extracted pillar 'P' should be less than 1.0.

Numerical techniques have been used in the study to design the panel for mechanized depillaring. Numerical modeling software, *FLAC^{3D}*, has been used in the study for this purpose. The numerical model has been prepared in the study using brick elements. Coal is a strain-softening material; thus, assigning appropriate material properties is the prime requirement of a numerical model. The published cases of failed and stable pillars from Indian coal mines have been used in the study to calibrate the material properties for the coal. A linear expression has been observed between the peak cohesion value and the *UCS* of coal.

The derived properties of the model have been validated with three field cases of Indian coal mines where *CM* technology has been adopted in an already developed panel. The depillaring stage at which the strata issues emerge in the model has been identified using simulation results. The models have been validated using field observations and the instrumentation records during the depillaring operation. The analysis of the simulation results shows that the *FOS* of the working pillar should not be less than 1.3 for safe depillaring operation. The analysis of the rock instruments records shows that the stand-up time of the remnant pillars is about 45 hours.

The designing of the mechanized depillaring panel has been carried out in two phases, i.e., designing the panel (concerning working/barrier pillars), and designing the remnant pillars (ribs/snook). Four different pillar sizes have been selected from Indian *CMR, 2017*, i.e., having pillar widths of 26 m, 35 m, 45 m, and 48 m. The width and height of the galleries have been chosen as 6.0 m and 4.5 m, respectively. Numerical models of sufficiently large size have been prepared for each selected pillars and simulated for different depths of cover ranging from 90 m – 450 m (with an interval of 30 m). The derived material properties have been incorporated in the model, considering the *UCS* as 40 MPa. The prepared models for different combinations of pillar width and depth of cover have been simulated until attaining the equilibrium conditions. The simulation results have been obtained in terms of vertical stress profile and yield profile. The average vertical stress on the working/barrier pillars has been determined for each case of the panels using the *FISH* function of *FLAC^{3D}*. The stable cases of the panels satisfying the design criteria have been identified and chosen for the analysis. The ‘*Stress ratio (SR)*,’ (i.e., the ratio of average vertical stress on the pillars during depillaring and development), has been calculated for all the stable cases of the panels. The simulation results show a wide range of *SR* values

for different depths of cover. The analysis of the results shows that *SR* is linearly related to the *FOS* of the pillars during development. An expression has been developed to determine the *SR* of a pillar using its *FOS* during development. A nomograph has also been developed in the study, depicting the optimum width of the pillar for a mechanized depillaring panel for different depths of cover and extraction heights.

The panels formed by the selected pillars (i.e., having a width of 26 m, 35 m, 45 m, and 48 m) has been further simulated at a critical depillaring stage by incorporating the remnant pillars such that splitting/slicing of the working pillar can be performed at different stages. The models for each selected pillar have been simulated at the critical depth of cover (determined through panel design exercise). The design of the remnant pillars has been optimized for selected pillars by varying the size of the final snook (i.e., 4.5 m, 5.5 m, and 6.5 m). The simulation results have been obtained in terms of vertical stress profile and yield profile. The residual strength of the remnant pillars has been determined for each case of selected pillars at different stages of splitting/slicing using *FISH* function of *FLAC*^{3D}. The last stage of slicing for each selected pillars, satisfying the design criteria, has been chosen for the analysis. The analysis of the results shows that the load-bearing capacity of the remnant pillar is exponentially related to its area. An expression has been developed from the analysis to determine the load-bearing capacity of the remnant pillar based on its area. It has also been analyzed from the results that during the last stage of slicing, the residual strength of the working pillar/remnant 'W' is about 0.6 MPa, and the residual strength of the previously extracted pillar/remnant 'P' is about 0.4 MPa for safe mine workings. The analysis shows that the percentage of extraction is about 80% for an optimum remnant pillar design. It has been concluded from the analysis that the final snook is about 5% of the pillar area for a smaller pillar and about 8% for larger pillars. Guidelines have been provided in the study to design the remnant pillars for different pillar sizes.