Abstract

True triaxial creep tests are performed to determine the effects of the intermediate principal stress on the time-dependent behavior of the Maha Sarakham salt. The applied octahedral shear stresses vary from 5 to 14 MPa while the mean stress is maintained constant at 15 MPa. The loading conditions include conventional triaxial compression, polyaxial and triaxial extension testing. Regression analyses of the results based on the Burgers model indicate that the instantaneous deformation tends to be independent of $\sigma_2$. The visco-elastic and visco-plastic parameters notably increase with $\sigma_2$. To calculate the $\sigma_2$ effect on the long-term closure of salt storage caverns the Burgers parameters are defined as a function of the Lode parameter. The results indicate that the conventional creep test results may overestimate the actual closure of cylindrical and spherical caverns by as much as 15% and 35%, respectively.
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1. Introduction

The effects of confining pressures on the mechanical properties of rocks are commonly simulated in a laboratory by performing triaxial compression testing of cylindrical rock core specimens. A significant limitation of these conventional methods is that the intermediate and minimum principal stresses are equal during the test while the actual in-situ rock is normally subjected to an orthotropic stress state where the maximum, intermediate and minimum principal stresses are different ($\sigma_1 > \sigma_2 > \sigma_3 > 0$). It has been found that compressive strengths obtained from conventional triaxial testing cannot represent the actual in-situ strength where the rock is subjected to an anisotropic stress state (Haimson, 2006; Haimson & Chang, 2000; Hunsche, 1984; Tiwari & Rao, 2004, 2006; Yang, Zou, & Sui 2007). From the experimental results on brittle rocks obtained by Haimson (2006) and Colmenares & Zoback (2002) it can be generally concluded that in a $\sigma_1$–$\sigma_2$ diagram, for a given $\sigma_3$, $\sigma_1$ at failure initially increases with $\sigma_2$ to a certain magnitude, and then it gradually decreases as $\sigma_2$ increases. The effect of $\sigma_2$ is larger under higher $\sigma_3$. Cai (2008) offers an explanation of how the intermediate principal stress affects the rock strength based on the results from numerical simulations on fracture initiation and propagation. He states that the intermediate principal stress confines the rock in such a way that fractures can only be initiated and propagated in the direction parallel to $\sigma_1$ and $\sigma_2$. The effect of $\sigma_2$ is related to the stress-induced anisotropic properties and behavior of the rock and to the end effect at the interface between the rock surface and loading platen in the direction of the $\sigma_2$ application. The effect should be smaller in homogeneous and fine-grained rocks than in coarse-grained rocks where pre-existing micro-cracks are not uniformly distributed.

Phueakphum, Fuenkajorn, and Walsri (2013) study the effect of intermediate principal stress on tensile strength
of sandstone. The results indicate that the compressive and tensile strengths and cohesion obtained from the triaxial extension tests ($\sigma_1 > \sigma_2 > \sigma_3$) are greater than from the triaxial compression tests ($\sigma_2 = \sigma_3$).

Several failure criteria have been developed to describe the rock strength under true triaxial stress states. Comprehensive reviews of these criteria have been given recently by Haimson (2006), Colmenares and Zoback (2002), Cai (2008), Al-Ajmi and Zimmerman (2005), Benz and Schwab (2008), and You (2009). Among several other criteria, the Mogi (You, 2009) and modified Wiebols and Cook (Colmenares & Zoback, 2002; Zhou, 1994) criteria are perhaps the most widely used to describe the rock compressive strengths under true triaxial stresses.

Even through the effect of $\sigma_3$ on rock strengths has long been recognized and studied as mentioned above, the $\sigma_y$ effect on time-dependent deformation of rocks has rarely been addressed. The experimental investigation on their issue is very limited. Mellegard, DeVries, and Callahan (2007) describe the steady-state creep rate of salt by considering the intermediate principal stress. From limited experiment data it has been concluded that the Lode angle does not affect the steady-state strain rate of salt. The transient strain rate might be slightly higher in triaxial extension than triaxial compression. The knowledge and understanding of the $\sigma_y$ effect on salt creep are however important for the determination or prediction of the long-term closure of compressed-air energy and gas storage caverns in salt. Such closure will dictate the efficiency and capacity of the storage operation.

The objective of this study is to experimentally determine the effects of the intermediate principal stress on the instantaneous and time-dependent deformation of rock salt obtained from the Maha Sarakham formation. True triaxial creep testing has been performed on rectangular salt specimens with loading conditions varying from triaxial compression ($\sigma_1 > \sigma_2 > \sigma_3$), polyaxial ($\sigma_1 > \sigma_2 > \sigma_3$), to triaxial extension ($\sigma_2 = \sigma_3 > \sigma_1$). The Burgers model is used to describe the elastic, visco-elastic and visco-plastic deformations of the salt specimen tested under various stress states. Radial closure of spherical and cylindrical gas storage caverns in the Maha Sarakham salt is calculated to compare the results obtained from testing under different loading conditions.

### 2. Salt Specimens

The tested specimens have been prepared from 60 mm salt cores drilled from the depths ranging between 160 m and 270 m by Pimai Salt Co. in the northeast of Thailand. The salt cores belong to the Middle salt member of the Maha Sarakham formation in the Khorat basin. This salt formation hosts several solution-mined caverns in the basin. It is also being considered as a host rock for compressed-air energy storage caverns by the Thai Department of Energy, and for chemical waste disposal by the Office of Atomic Energy for Peace. Warren (1999) describes the origin and geological structures of the Maha Sarakham salt. The salt cores used here are virtually pure halite with average grain (crystal) sizes of $5\times5\times5$ mm. The salt cores have been dry-cut to obtain rectangular blocks with nominal dimensions of $54\times54\times108$ mm. No bedding is observed in the specimens.

### 3. Test Method

The tests are categorized into three series based on the loading conditions: triaxial compression ($\sigma_1 > \sigma_2 = \sigma_3$), polyaxial ($\sigma_1 > \sigma_2 > \sigma_3$), and triaxial extension ($\sigma_2 = \sigma_3 > \sigma_1$). The applied constant octahedral shear stresses range from 5, 8, 11 to 14 MPa which are used, as much as practical, for all stress conditions. All specimens are tested under the same mean stress of 15 MPa, to triaxial compression of the applied principal stresses and their corresponding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specimen No.</th>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>Loading Conditions</th>
<th>Density (g/cm³)</th>
<th>Constant Principal Stresses $\sigma_i$ (MPa)</th>
<th>$\tau_{oct}$ (MPa)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TC-2</td>
<td>209.68-209.80</td>
<td>$\sigma_1 &gt; \sigma_2 = \sigma_3$</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC-11</td>
<td>255.67-256.02</td>
<td>$\sigma_1 &gt; \sigma_2 = \sigma_3$</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC-13</td>
<td>238.22-238.28</td>
<td>$\sigma_1 &gt; \sigma_2 = \sigma_3$</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC-16</td>
<td>162.82-162.88</td>
<td>$\sigma_1 &gt; \sigma_2 = \sigma_3$</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC-20</td>
<td>204.10-204.15</td>
<td>$\sigma_1 &gt; \sigma_2 &gt; \sigma_3$</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC-19</td>
<td>204.02-204.06</td>
<td>$\sigma_1 &gt; \sigma_2 &gt; \sigma_3$</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC-14</td>
<td>268.32-268.38</td>
<td>$\sigma_1 &gt; \sigma_2 &gt; \sigma_3$</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC-17</td>
<td>162.74-162.80</td>
<td>$\sigma_1 &gt; \sigma_2 &gt; \sigma_3$</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC-4</td>
<td>253.64-253.75</td>
<td>$\sigma_1 = \sigma_2 &gt; \sigma_3$</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC-8</td>
<td>208.30-208.40</td>
<td>$\sigma_1 = \sigma_2 &gt; \sigma_3$</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC-18</td>
<td>202.14-202.26</td>
<td>$\sigma_1 = \sigma_2 &gt; \sigma_3$</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
octahedral shear strain for each specimen.

A polyaxial load frame (Fuenkajorn, Sriapai, & Samsri, 2012) has been used to apply constant axial stress (σ₁) and lateral stresses (σ₂ and σ₃) to the salt specimens. After installing into the center of the load frame, the salt specimen is secured by six loading platens arranged in three mutually perpendicular directions. The loading areas of the platens are slightly smaller than the specimen dimensions. The top and bottom platens have the loading area of 52×52 mm². The four lateral platens have loading area of 52×106 mm. This allows axial and lateral deformations of the specimens during testing. Neoprene sheets are placed at the interfaces between the platens and specimen surfaces. The pre-calculated dead weights are placed on the two lower beams to obtain the lateral stress of 15 MPa. This uniform stress is maintained for the first three hours. The reading intervals are gradually increased to every hour after five days of testing. All tests are conducted under ambient temperature (25-28 degree Celsius).

4. Test Results

Figure 1 shows the principal strains (ε₁, ε₂, ε₃) and volumetric strains (εᵥ) as a function of time for all tested specimens. The curves show the instantaneous, transient and steady-state creep phases of the salt. For all loading conditions the axial strains increase with time (τext) while the mean stresses are maintained at 15 MPa. They are calculated from the three principal stresses as (Jaeger, Cook, & Zimmerman, 2007):

\[ \tau_{text} = \frac{1}{3} \left( (\sigma_1 - \sigma_2)^2 + (\sigma_2 - \sigma_3)^2 + (\sigma_3 - \sigma_1)^2 \right)^{1/2} \]  

(1)

\[ \sigma_m = \frac{(\sigma_1 + \sigma_2 + \sigma_3)}{3} \]  

(2)

Each specimen is tested up to 21 days. The deformations along the principal axes are monitored using displacement digital gages. The readings are made every one minute for the first three hours. The reading intervals are gradually increased to every hour after five days of testing. All tests are conducted under ambient temperature (25-28 degree Celsius).

The Burgers model is used to describe the test results primarily because it is simple and capable of describing the elastic, visco-elastic and visco-plastic phases of the salt creep under isothermal condition. It is recognized that numerous creep models or constitutive equations have been developed to represent the time-dependent behavior of rock salt. They are however complex and cannot isolate each phase of salt creep. Figure 3 shows the physical components arranged in the Burgers model. Assuming that the salt is isotropic and linearly elastic a relation between octahedral shear strain and stress can be written as (Jaeger et al., 2007):

\[ \gamma_{oct} = \frac{\tau_{text}}{2G} \]  

(4)

where G is the shear modulus of the salt. Using the Laplace transformation a linear visco-elastic relation can be derived from the above equation by using time operator of the Burgers model, and hence the octahedral shear strain can be presented as a function of time (Richards, 1993):

\[ \gamma_{oct}(t) = \frac{\tau_{text}}{2G} \left[ (t/\eta_1 + 1/E_{1}) + (1/E_{2})(1 - \exp(E_{2} \times t / \eta_2)) \right] \]  

(5)

where τtext is the applied constant octahedral shear stresses (MPa), t is the testing time (day), E₁ is the elastic modulus (GPa), E₂ is the spring constant in visco-elastic phase (GPa), \( \eta_1 \) is the viscosity coefficient in steady-state phase (GPa-Day), and \( \eta_2 \) is the viscosity coefficient in transient phase (GPa-Day). Regression analyses on the octahedral shear strain-time curves based on Equation (5) using the SPSS statistical software (Wendai, 2000) are performed to determine the Burgers parameters for each salt specimen. Table 2 summarizes the calibration results.

The Lode parameter (μ) (Hunsche & Albrecht, 1990; Mellegard et al., 2007; Zhang, Bai, & Francois, 2001) is used here to address the σ₂ effect on salt creep in three dimensions. It is calculated by:

\[ \mu = \frac{(2\sigma_2 - \sigma_1 - \sigma_3)}{(\sigma_1 - \sigma_3)} \]  

(6)

The Lode parameter is equal to -1 for the triaxial extension testing, and equal to 1 for the triaxial compression testing. Figure 4 shows the Burgers parameters as a function of the Lode parameter (μ). The parameters \( \eta_1 \), E₁ and \( \eta_2 \) tend to decrease with increasing the Lode parameter. The spring constant, E₂ corresponding to the instantaneous deformation of salt, tend to be independent of the Lode parameter.

The parameters \( \eta_1 \), E₁ and \( \eta_2 \) obtained from the triaxial extension (σ₁=σ₂>σ₃) are about 1-1.5 times greater than those obtained from the polyaxial loading conditions (σ₁>σ₂>σ₃). The triaxial creep condition yields in the lowest magnitudes of the three parameters. Linear equations are used...
Figure 1. Strain-time curves obtained from triaxial compression (a), polyaxial compression (b) and triaxial extension (c). Numbers in bracket indicate $[\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3]$.

Figure 2. Octahedral shear strains ($\gamma_{oct}$) as a function of time obtained from triaxial compression (a), polyaxial compression (b) and triaxial extension (c).
where $\alpha_i$, $\beta_i$, and $\gamma_i$ are empirical constants equal to 8.935 GPa-day, 0.397 GPa and 0.516 GPa-day for the Maha Sarakham salt, and the constants $\alpha_2$, $\beta_2$, and $\gamma_2$ equal to 38.48 GPa-day, 2.89 GPa and 3.98 GPa-day. By substituting Equations (7) through (9) into Equation (5) the octahedral shear strain can be defined as a function of Lode parameter in the form of the

$$\eta_1 \{\mu\} = -\alpha_1 \times \mu + \alpha_2$$

$$E_2 \{\mu\} = -\beta_1 \times \mu + \beta_2$$

$$\eta_2 \{\mu\} = -\gamma_1 \times \mu + \gamma_2$$

Table 2. Burgers parameters calibrated from each salt specimen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Loading conditions</th>
<th>Loading conditions</th>
<th>$\mu$</th>
<th>$\tau_{oct}$ (MPa)</th>
<th>$E_1$ (GPa)</th>
<th>$E_2$ (GPa)</th>
<th>$\eta_1$ (GPa.day)</th>
<th>$\eta_2$ (GPa.day)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Triaxial Compression ($\sigma_1 \neq \sigma_2 = \sigma_3$)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polyaxial Compression ($\sigma_1 \neq \sigma_2 \neq \sigma_3$)</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triaxial Extension ($\sigma_1 = \sigma_2 \neq \sigma_3$)</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4. Burgers parameters as a function of Lode parameter ($\mu$).
Burgers model. It can be used to calculate the time-dependent deformation of rock salt while considering the effect of $\sigma_z$.

6. Creep Closure of Storage Caverns

Sets of analytical solutions are derived to calculate radial displacements around cylindrical and spherical storage gas or compressed-air caverns in an infinite salt mass. These two cases are used here because their geometries impose the stress states that are different from that obtained from the conventional laboratory creep testing ($\sigma_i>\sigma_i=\sigma_z$). The salt is assumed to be time-independent under hydrostatic stress (i.e., linear visco-elastic material). It is recognized that the Burgers model is based on the linear visco-elastic theory. It may not truly represent the non-linear creep deformation of the in-situ salt around the cavern. The model is used here to demonstrate the effect of $\sigma_i$ obtained from the experimental result on the salt creep. The radial displacements ($u_r$) of cylindrical cavern are obtained from the Laplace transformation using time operator of the Burgers model which can be expressed as:

$$u_r = P_i\left[\frac{(A + B)}{9K} + \alpha \cdot \frac{(2A - B)}{3}\right] - P_i r \alpha$$  \hspace{1cm} (10)

$$A = \frac{\{(1 + k)/2 \times \left(r + (a^2/\theta)\right)\} + \{(1 - k)/2 \times \left(r - (a^2/\theta)\right) + (4a^2/\theta)\} \cos \theta}{\cos \theta}$$  \hspace{1cm} (11)

$$B = \frac{\{(1 + k)/2 \times \left(r - (a^2/\theta)\right)\} - \{(1 - k)/2 \times \left(r - (a^2/\theta)\right)\} \cos \theta}{\cos \theta}$$  \hspace{1cm} (12)

$$\alpha = \frac{t}{\eta_i} + \frac{1}{E_i} + \frac{1}{E_2} \times \left(1 - \exp(E_2 \times t/\eta_2)\right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (13)

where $P_i$ and $P_i$ are an internal and external pressures, $A$ and $B$ are time-independent functions of position, $K$ is bulk modulus, $k$ is stress ratio, $\alpha$ is time-dependent function, $\theta$ is tangential coordinate, $r$ is radius and $\alpha$ is inner boundary. Derivation of the $\alpha$ function is given in the Appendix section. For a spherical cavern under hydrostatic stresses the radial displacement ($u_i$) can be obtained from the following equations (Pariseau, 2012):

$$u_i = P_i \left[\frac{(1/18K) + (\alpha/3)}{(a^2/\theta)} + P_i \left[-\frac{(1/18K) + (\alpha/6)}{(a^2/\theta)} - \frac{t}{\eta_i} + \frac{1}{E_1} + \frac{1}{E_2} \times \left(1 - \exp(E_2 \times t/\eta_2)\right)\right]\right]$$  \hspace{1cm} (14)

$$a = \frac{(t/\eta_i) + (1/E_1) + (1/E_2) \times \left(1 - \exp(E_2 \times t/\eta_2)\right)}{\eta_i}$$  \hspace{1cm} (15)

The creep parameters (Table 2) calibrated from the three loading conditions is used to determine the effect of intermediate principal stress on time-dependent closure of a salt cavern. In general, the salt around a cylindrical cavern is under polyaaxial stresses state ($\sigma_i>\sigma_i>\sigma_z$). For the spherical cavern the surrounding salt is under triaxial extension stresses ($\sigma_i>\sigma_i>\sigma_z$). For this demonstration, the cylindrical cavern is taken as an upright cylinder with a diameter of 50 m. The spherical cavern also has a diameter of 50 m. The external pressure is calculated from the in-situ stress of 10.9 MPa which is equivalent to the depth of about 500 m. The storage cavern model is assumed to be subjected to the internal pressures of 2.2 MPa or about 20% of the in-situ stress at the cavern shoe, representing the minimum storage pressure of salt cavern. This is mainly to demonstrate the effect of $\sigma_z$ on the creep closure. The internal pressure is assumed to be uniform on the cavern boundaries.

Figure 5 compares the radial closure of the cylindrical and spherical cavern shapes calculated by Equations (10) and (14) for 90 days. The radial closure obtained from the conventional compression creep test results is greater than that from the polyaaxial compression and triaxial extension ($\sigma_i=\sigma_i>\sigma_z$) creep test results. The figure suggests that the conventional creep test results overestimate the actual closure of cylindrical and spherical caverns by as much as 15% and 35%, respectively. It should be noted that the calculation of cavern closure as demonstrated here is made under extreme loading condition, i.e., the internal pressure is left constant for long period (90 days). This is primarily to reveal the $\sigma_z$ effect on the creep closure of the storage caverns. In reality however...
the storage caverns may not be allowed to subject to the low minimum storage pressure to longer than few days.

7. Discussions and Conclusions

The true triaxial creep test results indicate that the elastic deformation of salt, $E_1$, is not affected by the intermediate principal stress, $\sigma_2$. This agrees with the experimental results obtained by Sriapai and Fuenkajorn (2013) that the salt elastic deformation tends to be independent of $\sigma_2$. The intermediate principal stress affects both transient and steady-state creep phases of the Maha Sarakham salt. The creep strains decrease when $\sigma_2$ increases from $\sigma_1$ (triaxial compression) to $\sigma_1$ (triaxial extension). The visco-plastic coefficient $\eta_3$ and visco-elastic parameters ($E_2$ and $\eta_3$) tend to decrease with increasing the Lode parameter.

Under the simplified test conditions used here (i.e. constant mean stress and temperature) the Burgers model reveal the effect of $\sigma_2$ on the time-dependent deformation of the salt. The conventional creep test results may overestimate the actual closure of cylindrical and spherical caverns by about 15% and 35%, respectively. The findings imply that laboratory test results obtained from the conventional and commonly-used uniaxial and triaxial creep testing methods (e.g. ASTM D7070-08 standard practices) may over predict the time-dependent deformation of the actual in-situ salt under the true triaxial stress conditions.

It is recognized here that prediction of in-situ salt creep under true triaxial stresses using laboratory test data is difficult. Attempts have been made notably by Morgan and Wawersik (1989) who point out the discrepancies between the in-situ measurements at WIPP site and the creep model calibrated from the results of the thick-wall hollow cylinder under homogeneous and inhomogeneous loadings. The closure calculations presented in this paper is only to demonstrate the effect of $\sigma_2$ on the salt creep under simplified loading condition. The actual creep behavior of the salt around storage cavern would involve several factors that are not included in this study.

Acknowledgements

This study was funded by Suranaree University of Technology and by the Higher Education Promotion and National Research University of Thailand. Permission to publish this paper is gratefully acknowledged. We would like to thank Pimai Salt Co. for donating salt cores used in this study.

References


Appendix A
Derivation of solutions for cylindrical and spherical cavern closure

The purpose of this appendix is to develop analytical solutions to calculate radial displacements around cylindrical and spherical cavities in an infinite plate of linear viscoelastic material subjected to a uniform stress field. The analysis is performed in plane strain. The material behavior is assumed to follow the Burgers model.

A-1 Cylindrical cavity in an infinite plate
The radial displacement around the cylindrical hole obtained from the elastic solution (Obert & Duvall, 1967) can be expressed as:

\[ u_i = \left(\frac{1}{E}\right) \left[\left(\sigma_x + \sigma_y\right)/2 \cdot \left(r + \left(a^2/r\right)\right) + \left(\sigma_x - \sigma_y\right)/2 \cdot \left(r - \left(a^2/r\right)\right)\right] \cdot \cos(\theta) \]

where \(\sigma_x, \sigma_y\) = lateral stresses, \(a = \) hole radius, \(E = \) Young’s modulus, \(\nu = \) Poisson’s ratio, \(\theta = \) tangential coordinate. Let \(\sigma_x = P\) and \(\sigma_y = kP\), where \(P\) is a time-independent applied stress. Equation (A-1) becomes:

\[ u = P/E (A) – P\nu/E (B) \]

where \(A \) and \(B \) are time-independent functions of position:

\[ A = \left[(1 + k)/2 \cdot \left(r + \left(a^2/r\right)\right)\right] + \left(1/9K\right) + \left(2/3\right) \]

\[ B = \left[(1 + k)/2 \cdot \left(r - \left(a^2/r\right)\right)\right] - \left(1/9K\right) + \left(1/3\right) \]

where \(k = \) stress ratio \(\sigma_x/\sigma_y\). For the internal pressure term we can use a superposition law. Equation (A-2) becomes:

\[ u = P/E (A) – P\nu/E (B) – P\tau/2G \]

where \(G\) is shear modulus.

By taking Laplace transformations of Equation (A-2), they can be expressed in terms of transform variable “s” as follows:

\[ \hat{u}(s) = \left[\hat{P}(s)/\hat{E}(s)\right] (A) – \left[\hat{P}(s) \times \hat{\nu}(s)/\hat{E}(s)\right] (B) – \hat{P}(s) \times \hat{r}(s)/2\hat{G}(s) \]

where \(\hat{u}(s), \hat{P}(s), \hat{\nu}(s), \hat{E}(s), \hat{r}(s)\) and \(\hat{G}(s)\) are the transformed operators.

Substituting \(\hat{P}(s)\) by \(P/s\), \(\hat{\nu}(s)\) by \(r/s\), \(\hat{E}(s)\) by \(9K\hat{Q}_i/(\hat{Q}_i + 6K\hat{P}_i)\), and \(\hat{\nu}(s)\) by \((3K\hat{P}_i – \hat{Q}_i)/(\hat{Q}_i + 6K\hat{P}_i)\) and Equation (A-6) becomes:

\[ \hat{u}(s) = \left\{P/s (A) \left[(\hat{Q}_i + 6K\hat{P}_i)/(9K\hat{Q}_i)\right]\right\} – \left\{P/s (B) \left[(3K\hat{P}_i – \hat{Q}_i)/(9K\hat{Q}_i)\right]\right\} \]

where time operator of the Burgers model, \(\hat{P}_i = 1 + (\eta_i/E_i + \eta_i/E_j) \cdot s + (\eta_i \eta_j/E_i E_j) \cdot s^2\) and \(\hat{Q}_i = \eta_s + (\eta_i \eta_j/E_i E_j) \cdot s^2\) and performing inverse Laplace transformations, the radial displacements \(u\) around a circular hole in linear viscoelastic media can be expressed as:

\[ u(t) = \left[\left(1/9K\right) + (2/3)\alpha\right] (A) – \left[-\left(1/9K\right) + (3/3)\alpha\right] (B) – P\tau/2G \]

By rearranging terms of Equation (A-8), they can be expressed in a simple form as:

\[ u = \left[\left(A + B/9K\right) + (\alpha \cdot (2A - B/3))\right] – P\tau/2G \]

\[ \alpha = (t/\eta_i) + (1/E_i) + (1/E_j) \cdot (1 – \exp(E_j \cdot t/\eta_j)) \]

A-2 Spherical cavity
For a spherical cavern under hydrostatic stress the radial displacement can be calculated as (Pariseau, 2012):

\[ u_i = \left[(1 + \nu) / 2E\right] (a^2/r^2) (P) \]

To incorporate an internal pressure we can use superposition law, and hence Equation (A-11) becomes:

\[ u = \left[(1 + \nu)a^3 / 2Er^2\right] (P) \]

By taking Laplace transformations of Equation (A-2), it can be expressed in terms of transform variable “s” as follows:

\[ u(s) = \left[(P/s) / 2E(s)\right] + (P/s) \cdot \hat{\nu}(s) / 2E(s)] \left[C – [P/s / (4G)]\right] \]

where \(C\) is time-independent function of position \(C = a^3/r^2\). Using the time operator of the Burgers model and performing inverse Laplace transformation, the radial displacement \(u\) around a spherical cavity in linear viscoelastic media can be expressed as:

\[ u = P\left[(1/18K) + (\alpha/3)\right] \cdot C + P\left[(1/18K) + (\alpha/6)\right] \cdot C – (P/2) \cdot C \cdot \alpha \]