# Innovating Tunnel Design by an Improved Experience-based RMR System.

B. Celada and I. Tardáguila
*Geocontrol S.A., Madrid, Spain.*

P. Varona
*Geocontrol Ltda., Santiago, Chile.*

A. Rodríguez
*CDIAM., Madrid, Spain.*

Z.T. Bieniawski
*Bieniawski Design Enterprises, Arizona, U.S.A.*

ABSTRACT: The Rock Mass Rating (RMR) System was introduced over 40 years ago, and since then has become a worldwide reference, along with the Q system, for design applications involving estimation of rock mass properties and tunnel support. A massive database of experience has been recorded in the process. On the 25th anniversary of the last modification of the RMR System in 1989, known as the RMR89, an update of this index has now been performed to incorporate the innovations introduced in recent decades and to improve its performance. For this purpose a database of 2,298 cases of RMR89's was compiled from tunnel faces. Based on the experience gained in the last decades, a new RMR14 has been developed, which has a new structure comprising five basic parameters and three adjustment factors. Also a clear correlation between RMR89 and RMR14 is provided and shows that the essence of the RMR System has been maintained for practical use.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

The Rock Mass Rating (RMR) System was introduced over 40 years ago (Bieniawski 1973). Since then it has become a worldwide reference, along with the Q system, for design applications involving estimation of rock mass properties and tunnel support (Barton and Bieniawski 2008, De Oliveira 2007).

The RMR classifies rock masses from 0 to 100 points, rating five parameters, according to the criteria presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Standard ratings to determine RMR after Bieniawski (1989).

| | Parameter | | Range of values | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Strengh of intact rock material | Point-load strength index | > 10 MPa | 4-10 MPa | 2-4 MPa | 1-2 MPa | For this low range-uniaxial compressive test is prefered | | |
| | | Uniaxial comp. strength | > 250 MPa | 100-250 MPa | 50-100 MPa | 25-50 MPa | 5-25 MPa | 1-5 MPa | < 1 MPa |
| | | Rating | 15 | 12 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 2 | Drill core Quality RQD | | 90%-100% | 75%-90% | 50%-75% | 25%-50% | < 25% | | |
| | Rating | | 20 | 17 | 13 | 8 | 3 | | |
| 3 | Spacing of discontinuities | | >2 m | 0.6-2 m | 200-600 mm | 60-200 mm | < 60 mm | | |
| | Rating | | 20 | 15 | 10 | 8 | 5 | | |
| 4 | Condition of discontinuities (See E) | | Very rough surfaces Not continuous No separation Unweathered wall rock | Slightly rough surfaces Separation < 1 mm Slightly weathered walls | Slightly rough surfaces Separation < 1 mm Highly weathered walls | Slickensided surfaces or Couge < 5 mm thick or Separation 1-5 mm Continous | Soft gouge > 5 mm thick or Separation >5 mm Continuous | | |
| | Rating | | 30 | 25 | 20 | 10 | 0 | | |
| 5 | Ground water | Inflow per 10 m tunnel length (l/m) | None | < 10 | 10-25 | 25-125 | > 125 | | |
| | | (Joint water press)(Mayor principal σ) | 0 | < 0.1 | 0.1-0.2 | 0.2-0.5 | > 0.5 | | |
| | | General conditions | Completely dry | Damp | Wet | Dripping | Flowing | | |
| | | Rating | 15 | 10 | 7 | 4 | 0 | | |

The criteria shown in Table 1 are used to calculate the basic RMR, that is RMRb, which is an intrinsic property of the rock mass.

To take into account the effect of the orientation of the axis of a tunnel with respect to the most important set of discontinuities in the ground, the RMRb is obtained with the criteria shown in Table 2.

Table 2. $RMR_b$ adjustment with respect to the orientation of the axis of the tunnel versus discontinuities.

| STRIKE PERPENDICULAR TO TUNNEL AXIS | | | | Strike parallel to Tunnel Axis | | Irrespective of Strike Dip 0º-20º |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Drive with dip | | Drive against dip | | | | |
| Dip 45-90 | Dip 20-45 | Dip 45-90 | Dip 20-45 | Dip. 45-90 | Dip 20-45 | |
| Very favorable | Favorable | Medium | Unfavorable | Very unfavorable | Medium | Medium |
| 0 | -2 | -5 | -10 | -12 | -5 | -5 |

In 2000, Geocontrol SA introduced a modification to the criteria for calculating the $RMR_b$, replacing the RQD assessment and the spacing of the discontinuities by the number of joints per meter in the face of the excavation and extending the criteria for assessing the condition of discontinuities, as shown in Table 3 (Geocontrol SA 2012).

Table 3. Criteria for calculating the RMR$_b$ used by Geocontrol since 2000.

| I.- CLASSIFICATION PARAMETERS | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **RMR (1) UNIAXIAL COMPRESSIVE STRENGTH OF INTACT ROCK** | | | | | | | |
| $\sigma_{ci}$ (kg/cm²) | >2.500 | 1.000-2.500 | 500-1.000 | 250-500 | 50-250 | 10-50 | <10 |
| RATING | 15 | 12 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 0 |

| **RMR (2+3) RQD AND SPACING OF JOINTS** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| JOINTS PER METER | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 |
| RATING | 40 | 34 | 31 | 29 | 28 | 27 | 26 | 25 | 24 | 23 | 22 | 21 | 20 | 19 | 16 | 17 |
| JOINTS PER METER | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | |
| RATING | 17 | 16 | 15 | 14 | 14 | 13 | 13 | 12 | 12 | 11 | 11 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 9 | |
| JOINTS PER METER | 31 | 32 | 33 | 34 | 35 | 36 | 37 | 38 | 39 | 40 | 41 | 42 | 43 | 44 | 45 | |
| RATING | 9 | 8 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | |
| JOINTS PER METER | 46 | 47 | 48 | 49 | 50 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| RATING | 1.5 | 1 | 1 | 0.5 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | |

| RMR(4) | DISCONTINUITIES CONDITION | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PERSISTENCE | <1 m | 1-3m | 3-10m | 10-20m | 20m |
| | 6 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| APERTURE | 0 | <0,1 mm | 0,1-1 mm | 1-5 mm | > 5 mm |
| | 6 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 0 |
| ROUGHNESS | Very rough | Rough | Slightly rough | Smooth | Slickenside |
| | 6 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 0 |
| INFILLING | NONE | HARD FILLING <5mm | HARD FILLING >5mm | SOFT FILLING | NONE |
| | 6 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| WEATHERING | UNWEATHERED | SLIGHTLY | MODERATELY | HIGHLY | DECOMPOSED |
| | 6 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 0 |

| RMR (5) | GROUNDWATER CONDITIONS | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| STATE | DRY | DAMP | WET | DRIPPING | FLOWING |
| RATING | 15 | 10 | 7 | 4 | 0 |

These changes eliminated the difficulty to determine the RQD from excavation faces and to obtain a good assessment of the condition of the discontinuities in the ground.

In 2012, Geocontrol started a major R&D Project, partly funded by the Spanish "Centro para el Desarrollo Tecnológico e Industrial (CDTI)" with the aim to improve the accuracy of the RMR System. This project ends in February 2014.

By 2014, 25 years will have passed since the publication of the RMR89 (Bieniawski 1989) and after such a long period of time, it was considered appropriate to update the RMR 89 taking into account the developments over the last decades.

## 2 CURRENT RMR UPDATE

The RMR update described in this paper features establishing the criteria for rating the parameters for calculating the RMRb aimed at improving its accuracy by using two new factors.

Accordingly, the RMR14 update is represented by the expression:

$$RMR14 = (RMR_b + F_0) \cdot F_e \cdot F_s \qquad (1)$$

where RMR$_b$ = RMR basic of the rock mass, without an effect of excavation,

F$_0$ = Adjustment factor for the orientation of tunnel axis with regard to the main set of discontinuities in the rock mass (Table 2). F$_0$ is always negative.

F$_e$ = Adjustment factor to account for an excavation method.

F$_s$ = Adjustment factor taking into account stress-strain behaviour of the rock mass at the tunnel faces.

The following sections present conceptually the rating criteria for the new RMR$_b$ and the adjustment factors proposed.

### 2.1 New RMR structure

The new RMR structure maintains three parameters composing the RMR89: *uniaxial compression strength of intact rock, number of discontinuities per meter and the water effect.*

The ratings for these parameters are the same as those of RMR89, i.e. uniaxial compressive strength has a maximum score of *15 points* and its rating is made by employing the graph presented in Figure 1.

Figure 1. Ratings for strength of intact rock.

The number of discontinuities per meter is evaluated with the graph in Figure 2 and its maximum score is *40 points*; (Lawson and Bieniawski 2013).

Figure 2. Ratings for the density of discontinuities.

Finally, the effect of water, which has a maximum score of *15 points*, is rated according to the data of Table 4.

Table 4. Rating for the presence of water.

| GROUND STATE | Dry | Slightly humid | Humid | Dripping | Water flow |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ratings | 15 | 10 | 7 | 4 | 0 |

The two new parameters included in the updated RMR are the revised joints condition and the rock alterability due to water (swelling).

The revised discontinuities condition, which has a maximum rating of *20 points*, is rated by the following four aspects:

- Persistence (continuity) of discontinuities.
- Roughness of discontinuities measured through the Joint Roughness Factor (JRC).
- Infilling type in the discontinuities.
- Degree of weathering of the planes in the discontinuities.

The intact rock alterability, which has a maximum rating of *10 points*, is rated according to the results of the Slake Durability Test, as defined in standard ASTM D4644-87.

The ratings to assess the two new parameters are listed in Table 5 and explained in paragraph 2.3.2.

Table 5. Ratings for new parameters of $RMR14_b$.

| Discontinuities Condition | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Continuity | < 1 m | 1-3m | 3-10m | > 10m |
| | 5 | 4 | 2 | 0 |
| Roughness | Very rough | Rough | Smooth | Slickensided |
| | 5 | 3 | 1 | 0 |
| Gouge infilling | Hard | | Soft | |
| | < 5mm | > 5mm | < 5mm | > 5mm |
| | 5 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| Weathering | Unweathered | Moderately weathered | Highly | Decomposed |
| | 5 | 3 | 1 | 0 |
| Intact Rock Alterability | | | | |

| Alterability $I_{d2}$ (%) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| > 85 | 60-85 | 30-60 | < 30 |
| 10 | 8 | 4 | 0 |

## 2.2 Adjustment factors

It is proposed that the $RMR_b$ is adjusted by the following three factors.

### 2.2.1 Tunnel axis orientation
To take into account the effect of the tunnel axis orientation with respect to the major set of discontinuities present on the rock mass, it is proposed to continue using the criterion currently employed, in accordance with Table 2. This adjustment factor is called $F_0$.

### 2.2.2 Excavation method
The excavation method, whether mechanical or blasting, modifies the stress-strain behavior of the ground in different ways with respect to the RMR as determined at the faces excavated by conventional methods.

The utilization of mechanical means (TBM's, road headers or hydraulic hammers) is less damaging to the remaining rock than blasting, which implies an improvement in the behavior of the excavated faces.

Regarding the use of blasting in tunnels, we must remember that for RMR < 35 this is practically not used and that for good quality grounds, RMR > 80, the effect of blasting on the remaining rock is not very significant, as long as that the blasting is well planned and executed.

The research carried out by Geocontrol on this project (2012-2014), has revealed that explosives used in tunnels excavated in ground with 35<RMR<80 only affect about 10-20 cm of the surrounding rock.

Therefore, in the design of tunnels this effect can be considered insignificant, especially as that after each blast the excavation perimeter is cleaned up to remove the affected rock fragments.

The positive effect of mechanical excavation was investigated by Alber (1993) and updated by Bieniawski (2011) as shown in Figure 3.



Figure 3. Correlation between $RMR_{D+B}$ and $RMR_{TBM}$.

According to the data from Figure 3, the correlation proposed by Alber is very good for $RMR_{D+B} > 40$, but below this value it is too optimistic. Therefore a new correlation curve is proposed for $RMR_{D+B} < 40$, which is marked with a broken line in Figure 3.

When comparing the values of $RMR_{D+B}$ with the corresponding ones of $RMR_{TBM}$ a new correlation for $RMR_{D+B} < 40$, based on the results obtained and indicated in the Table 6, is proposed.

Table 6. Improvement of $RMR_{D+B}$ when using TBM.

| $RMR_{D+B}$ | 20 | 40 | 60 | 80 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| $RMR_{TBM}$ | 21 | 53 | 70 | 85 |
| $\dfrac{RMR_{TBM}}{RMR_{D+B}}$ | 1.05 | 1.32 | 1.16 | 1.06 |

According to the above, an expression was developed for the adjustment factor related to the excavation method ($F_e$), which is:

$$for\ RMR < 40:\quad F_e = 1 + 2 \cdot \left(\frac{RMR}{100}\right)^2 \quad (2)$$

$$for\ RMR > 40:\quad F_e = 1.32 - \frac{\sqrt{(RMR - 40)}}{25} \quad (3)$$

Figure 4 shows the $F_e$ as a function of RMR.



Figure 4. Representation of $F_e$ as function of RMR.

Note that $F_e = 1$ is used when the excavation is performed by blasting.

### 2.2.3 Stress-Strain behaviour

The RMR should be determined in the design phase of a tunnel using data from boreholes, and during the construction of the tunnel by geological mapping of the excavation surfaces.

Ideally, the RMR values estimated in the project planning phase and those determined during construction should be similar.

However, the reality is that, in addition to operational errors, the effects of yielding of the excavation face and walls causes an RMR at the face to be significantly lower than expected during the design phase.

This circumstance makes it necessary to introduce a new factor ($F_s$) which allows for the diminishing effect of yielding at the face.

To define $F_s$ it is helpful to employ the "*Índice de Comportamiento Elástico*" (ICE) proposed by Bieniawski and Celada (2011), which is defined by the equations:

$$for\ K_0 \leq 1 : ICE = \frac{3704\sigma_{ci} \cdot e^{\frac{RMR-100}{24}}}{(3 - K_0) \cdot H} \cdot F \quad (4)$$

$$for\ K_0 \geq 1 : ICE = \frac{3704\sigma_{ci} \cdot e^{\frac{RMR-100}{24}}}{(3K_0 - 1) \cdot H} \cdot F \quad (5)$$

Where:

$\sigma_{ci}$ = uniaxial compressive strength of intact rock (MPa).

$K_0$ = ratio of the horizontal to vertical virgin stress.

H = tunnel depth (m).

F = shape coefficient, see Table 7.

Table 7. F values for calculating ICE.

| Underground excavation | F |
|---|---|
| Circular tunnel, $\phi = 6$ m | 1.3 |
| Circular tunnel, $\phi = 10$ m | 1.0 |
| Conventional tunnel, 14 m wide | 0.75 |
| Caverns 25 m wide x 60 m high | 0.55 |

ICE makes it possible to predict the stress-strain behavior of the faces of the tunnels classifying them into five categories as show in Table 8.

Table 8. Designation of stress-deformation behavior of a tunnel section as a function of the "*Índice de Comportamiento Elástico*" (ICE).

| ICE | Stress-deformation behaviour |
|---|---|
| > 130 | Completely elastic |
| 70-130 | Elastic with incipient yielding |

| 40-69 | Moderate yielding |
|-------|-------------------|
| 15-39 | Intensive yielding |
| < 15 | Mostly yielding |

According to the above, only the excavation faces in which ICE < 70 will present substantial deformation for significant variations in the determination of RMR.

When the expressions were applied to the RMR ratings over the last decades, particularly when analyzing the RMR's obtained from boreholes in the Chuquicamata Mine (Chile), it was found that the factor $F_s$ ranges between 0 and 1.3, according to Figure 5.



Figure 5. $F_s$ values depending on the ICE.

The graphic of Figure 5, can be adjusted with the following expressions

ICE < 15          $F_s = 1,3$

$$15 < ICE < 70 \qquad F_s = \frac{2.3 \cdot \sqrt{100 - ICE}}{7.1 + \sqrt{100 - ICE}} \qquad (6)$$

ICE > 70          $F_s = 1$

## 2.3 Criteria for assessing the new parameters of the RMR

It has already been indicated that the RMR update has retained two parameters of the RMR89: uniaxial compressive strength and the effect of water; the RQD and the discontinuities spacing have been combined and are expressed as the number of discontinuities per meter.

All of these factors are rated employing the same criteria in the RMR89; therefore, one needs only to establish the criteria for assessing the discontinuities condition and the alterability of the intact rock.

The discontinuities condition is rated in accordance with the criteria contained in Table 9, which are derived from the "Guidelines for Classification of Discontinuity Conditions", Bieniawski (1989), which means that the maximum score for this parameter is *20 points*.

Table 9. Ratings for Discontinuities Condition.

| Continuity | < 1 m | 1-3m | 3-10m | > 10m |
|------------|-------|------|-------|-------|
| | 5 | 4 | 2 | 0 |
| Roughness | Very rough | Rough | Smooth | Slickensided |
| | 5 | 3 | 1 | 0 |
| Gouge infilling | Hard | | Soft | |
| | < 5mm | > 5mm | < 5mm | > 5mm |
| | 5 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| Weathering | Unweathered | Moderately weathered | Highly | Decomposed |
| | 5 | 3 | 1 | 0 |

To define the intact rock alterability ratings, a comparative study of this RMR update and the RMR89 was performed by compiling a large database established by Geocontrol.

### 2.3.1 Database employed

Geocontrol has a database composed of 2,298 cases of tunnel sections, constructed by the NATM, where the RMR89 has been determined.

The average value of the basic RMR in this database, without adjusting for the orientation of the tunnel, is 51 points and its frequency histogram is shown in Figure 6.



Figure 6. Database RMR89 frequency histogram.

The highest value of RMR89, in the database, is 73 points and the lowest one is 15 so the range has 58 points.

In this database, 68.5% of the cases are between 65 and 40 points, which matches well with the range of RMR in Spanish rock masses, when the RMR is not adjusted for discontinuities.

Figure 6 also shows that there are only five cases with RMR>70; which also matches with the usual practice that indicates that the RMR89 tends to concentrate the values in the central third of its range.

### 2.3.2 Tested ratings for intact rock alterability
As indicated, the alterability of intact rock is determined using the Slake Durability Test, as defined in ASTM D 4644-87, which allows one to obtain the index $I_{d2}$.

In order to select the ratings for the alterability, four hypotheses were considered, which are presented in Table 10.

Table 10. Ratings tested for alterability.

| Hypothesis | VALUES OF $I_{d2}$ (%) | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | >98 | 95-98 | 85-95 | 60-85 | 30-60 | <30 |
| RMR14-I | 10 | 8 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 0 |
| RMR14-II | 10 | 10 | 10 | 8 | 4 | 0 |
| RMR14-III | 10 | 9 | 8 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| RMR14-IV | 10 | 10 | 9 | 3 | 1 | 0 |

Figure 7 shows the frequency histograms of the four hypotheses to rate the alterability along with the histogram of RMR89.



Figure 7. RMR89 and the four hypothesis for the rock alterability.

This figure clearly shows that the ratings from hypothesis RMR14-II produce the desired effect of distributing the sample from the central

third of the range to the upper third; thereby solving the RMR89 defect, mentioned above.

If a correlation factor R = 1 is assigned to the RMR89 it results in the correlation factor of RMR14-II being R = 0.982; whereby it is proved that, despite the RMR14-II sample shifts towards the highest RMR values, this correlation is not significantly worse.

According to the above, the ratings to take into account the alterability in the RMR14 are shown in Table 11.

Table 11. Ratings for intact rock alterability.

| Alterability $I_{d2}$ (%) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| > 85 | 60-85 | 30-60 | < 30 |
| 10 | 8 | 4 | 0 |

### 2.4 RMR14 calculation

Table 12 summarizes all the ratings for evaluation of the five parameters which comprise the RMR14, without adjusting for the tunnel axis orientation with respect to the most important set of discontinuities.

Table 12. Rating for calculating RMR14$_b$.

| 1. Strength of Intact Rock | 2. Number of discontinuities |
|---|---|



| 3. Discontinuities Condition |

| Continuity | < 1 m | 1-3m | 3-10m | > 10m |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 5 | 4 | 2 | 0 |
| Roughness | Very rough | Rough | Smooth | Slickensided |
| | 5 | 3 | 1 | 0 |
| Gouge infilling | Hard | | Soft | |
| | < 5mm | > 5mm | < 5mm | > 5mm |
| | 5 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| Weathering | Unweathered | Moderately weathered | Highly | Decomposed |
| | 5 | 3 | 1 | 0 |

| 4. Presence of water |

| Ground state | Dry | Slightly wet | wet | Dripping | Water flow |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Assessment | 15 | 10 | 7 | 4 | 0 |

| 5. Alterability |

| Alterability $I_{d2}$ (%) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| > 85 | 60-85 | 30-60 | < 30 |
| 10 | 8 | 4 | 0 |

The three adjustment factors are calculated according to the information contained in Table 13.

Table 13. Adjustment Factors for RMR14.

| I. Tunnel orientation versus that of discontinuities ($F_0$) | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| STRIKE PERPENDICULAR TO TUNNEL AXIS | | | | Strike parallel to Tunnel Axis | | Irrespective of Strike Dip 0º-20º |
| Drive with dip | | Drive against dip | | | | |
| Dip 45-90 | Dip 20-45 | Dip 45-90 | Dip 20-45 | Dip. 45-90 | Dip 20-45 | |
| Very favorable | Favorable | Medium | Unfavorable | Very unfavorable | Medium | Medium |
| 0 | -2 | -5 | -10 | -12 | -5 | -5 |

| II. Mechanical excavation |
|---|



| III. Stress - Strain behavior |
|---|



## 3 CORRELATION BETWEEN RMR89 AND RMR14

Figure 8 shows an excellent correlation between RMR89 and RMR14, calculated with 2,298 cases of the database, corresponding to the equation:

$$RMR14 = 1.1 \cdot RMR89 + 2 \qquad (7)$$



Figure 8. Correlation between RMR14 and RMR89.

## 4 WORKS IN PROGRESS

This R & D project of Geocontrol, partly funded by the CDTI, ends in February 2014 and by then it is expected to perform the following two tasks:

*Software to calculate the RMR14*: A software that allows determination of the RMR14 and the parameters for stress-strain calculations.

*Empirical selection of supports*: A chart that provides an empirical guide for the support and reinforcement of underground works, with respect to their dimensions and the "stress-strain-behavior of the rock mass".

Most of all, the current update to the RMR System is being conducted within the framework of an innovative tunnel design methodology termed "Interactive Structural Design" (*Diseño Estructural Activo*, Celada 2011), as depicted in Figure 9 a, b and c.

## 5 CONCLUSIONS

Since its introduction in 1989, the RMR89 has remained as an accepted worldwide tool to characterize the behavior of rock masses.

Over the past decades there have been many innovations to improve the RMR that have been incorporated in this work, as the result of a research project at Geocontrol, partially funded by the CDTI.

Figure 9 a. The methodology of the"Interactive Structural Design" (Diseño Estructural Activo, Celada 2011) PHASE I. Site characterization.

Figure 9 b. PHASE II. Structural Design.

Figure 9 c. PHASE III. Confirmation during construction.

In addition, in recent years, renewed attention was paid to the RMR System because of its applications to the assessment of rock mass excavability (RME) and, especially, its direct correlation with the Specific Energy of Excavation (EEE) for TBMs has shown that it can be used effectively to detect changes in tunneling ground conditions, in real time, when recording TBM performance and serving as a warning of adverse conditions as construction proceeds (Bieniawski and Celada, 2006).

The RMR update presented in this paper, and called RMR14, has a new structure, which consists of three parameters from the RMR89, to which the modified discontinuities condition and the effect of the alterability of the intact rock have been added.

Furthermore, besides the adjustment factor for the orientation of the tunnel already present in the RMR89, the RMR14 includes two new adjustment factors, one for the case in which the excavation is carried out by mechanical means and another one for the stress-strain behavior of tunnel faces.

The new RMR14 correlates well with the RMR89, based on a database containing 2,298 cases, and thus maintains the essence of the RMR System used for over 40 years.

During the WTC in Brazil in May 2014, it is expected to present software for calculating the RMR14 and a comprehensive chart for empirical determination of the support to be installed in tunnels.

## REFERENCES

Alber, G. 1993. Classifying TBM contracts. *Tunnels & Tunnelling*, v. December, p.41-43.

Barton, N. and Bieniawski, Z.T. 2008. Setting the record straight about RMR and Q. *Tunnels & Tunnelling*, v. February, p.26-29.

Bieniawski, Z.T. 1973. Engineering Classification of Jointed Rock Masses. *The Civil Engineer in South Africa*, v.15, p.335-343.

Bieniawski, Z.T. 1989. *Engineering Rock Mass Classifications: a Complete Manual*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 251p.

Bieniawski, Z.T.; Celada, B.; Aguado, D. and Rodríguez, A. 2011. Forecasting tunnelling behavior. *Tunnels & Tunnelling*, v. August, p.39-42.

Bieniawski, Z.T.; 2011. Errores en la aplicación de las clasificaciones Geomecánicas y su corrección. *Jornada sobre la Caracterización Geoctécnica del Terreno.* Madrid: ADIF. 35p.

Bieniawski, Z.T.; Celada, B.; Tardáguila, I. and Rodríguez, A. 2012. Specific energy of excavation in detecting tunneling conditions ahead of TBMs. *Tunnels & Tunnelling*, v. February, p.65-68.

Celada, B. 2011. *Manual de Túneles y Obras Subterráneas.* Madrid: UPM. Capítulo 23. p.850-854.

De Oliveira, T. 2007. Contribução à classificação geomecânica de maciços rochosos utilizando o Sistema RMR. *Monografia de Trabalho de Formatura (TF-07/42).* Orientador: Prf. Dr. Lindolfo Soares. Universidad de Sao Paulo, Instituto de Geociencias, Brasil.

Geocontrol S.A. 2012. *Actualización del Índice Rock Mass Rating (RMR) para mejorar sus prestaciones en la caracterización del terreno. Centro para el Desarrollo Técnico* Industrial (CDTI). Proyecto: IDI-20120658. Madrid, España.

Lowson, Alex and Bieniawski, Z.T. 2013. Critical assessment of RMR-based tunnel design practices: A practical engineer's approach. In: *Proc. RETC 2013.* Washington, DC: Society of Mining Engineers, p.180-198.