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ABSTRACT

Yucca Mountain has been designated as a potential site for a high level nuclear waste repository. Part of the site characterization program is an investigation of the mechanical properties of the tuffs which comprise Yucca Mountain. This study tested specimens of TCw tuff in triaxial compression to observe the effects of confining pressure, saturation, strain rate, and anisotropy on the compressive strengths and Young’s Moduli of the specimens. Test results have shown that increasing the confining pressure increased the compressive strength and generally increased the Young’s Modulus. Saturation appears to lower both the compressive strength and Young’s Modulus of the specimens. Increasing strain rates increases the compressive strengths, but lowers the Young’s Modulus values. There appears to be a stiffness anisotropy where the specimens are stiffer perpendicular to the orientation of the lithophysal cavity orientation. Correlations with porosity have shown an increase in porosity generally lowers both the compressive strength and the Young’s Modulus of the specimens. From the triaxial tests, the Mohr-Coulomb strength parameters have also been determined. A comparison between the strengths and modulus values from this study, values from previous studies and the suggested values reveal that the
values computed for this study are generally lower than the previously published data. This discrepancy may be due to sample and specimen differences between the studies.
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INTRODUCTION

In order to design, license, construct, operate, and decommission a repository at Yucca Mountain, the behavior and properties of the tuffs which make up the mountain must be studied (DOE, 1988). The intact rock properties of the tuffs at Yucca Mountain are being used for three purposes:

- for direct use in analysis and design of mined openings, shafts and boreholes,
- to determine the spatial distribution of intact rock properties in the Yucca Mountain tuffs, and
- to help predict rock-mass and in-situ rock properties.

Some of the intact rock properties which must be studied include Young’s Modulus and compressive strength. Young’s Modulus is used to characterize the elastic deformation of the tuffs under an applied load. This elastic constant is required for the design, modeling, and analysis of openings in the tuffs and for how the tuffs will deform elastically after excavation and emplacement of waste. The compressive strengths are used for analysis and modeling in-situ rock strength and the stability of subsurface openings (Tillerson and Nimick, 1984). Rock strength depends on the rate of loading or strain. It is possible that the
compressive strength of the tuffs at Yucca Mountain is rate dependent (DOE, 1988).

The objective of this study is to investigate the effect of confining pressure, saturation, strain rate and specimen anisotropy on the compressive strength and Young’s Modulus of Tiva Canyon Tuff specimens which are from the thermo - mechanical unit TCw. The study is comprised of five parts. A background section provides some brief information on the geology of Yucca Mountain, factors affecting mechanical properties of rock specimens and lists the available data on the mechanical properties of Tiva Canyon Tuff and the thermo - mechanical unit TCw. Next, a section detailing the experimental approach used for this study is given. This section deals with core sampling, experimental design, and test procedures. Following the experimental approach section is a results section. This section addresses how the test results were computed and lists the test results. Next, the discussion of results section provides insight into the effects of the test conditions, anisotropy, and porosity on the compressive strength and Young’s Modulus of the tuff specimens. This section also calculates the Mohr - Coulomb strength parameters and compares previous mechanical property data with the compressive strength and Young’s Modulus data from this study. Finally, all of the observations from this study are presented in the conclusions section. The Appendix
contains specimen data and the stress-strain curves from each test triaxial compression test.
BACKGROUND

Geology

Yucca Mountain, located in the state of Nevada, is currently being studied as a potential site for a mined geologic disposal system for high level nuclear waste. Yucca Mountain is situated on land controlled by three Federal agencies: the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), the Department of Energy (DOE) and the U.S. Air Force. By road, Yucca Mountain is located approximately 160 km (100 miles) northwest of Las Vegas (Site Characterization Plan, Volume I, Part A). The location of the Nevada Test Site (NTS) and Yucca Mountain within the state of Nevada is shown in Figure 1.

Yucca Mountain is located in the southwestern portion of the Great Basin, a subprovince of the Basin and Range physiographic province (DOE, 1988). The mountain consists of a cluster of elongated, north-trending ridges and lateral spurs which rise from the Amargosa desert (elevation 800 m) to a flat, faulted summit area (elevation 1800 m), 25 km to the north as shown in Figure 2 (Fox et. al., 1990).

Geophysical surveys and surficial drilling have determined that Yucca Mountain is made up of a sequence of tuffaceous rocks between 1.5 and
Figure 1. Location of the Nevada Test Site and Yucca Mountain Within the State of Nevada (Wilder, 1993).
Figure 2. Location of Yucca Mountain and Other Areas of Positive Relief Within the Nevada Test Site (Scott et. al., 1983).
4 km thick overlying a preCenozoic basement complex (Scott et. al., 1983). The tuffaceous rocks of Yucca Mountain which have been penetrated by surficial drilling follow this nomenclature: major ash flows of a particular eruptive cycle are referred to as a formation and individual cooling units of a particular eruptive cycle are referred to as members (Fox et. al., 1990).

The tuffs, which make up Yucca Mountain, listed in descending order are:

- Paintbrush Tuff Formation, which is comprised of:
  - Tiva Canyon Member,
  - Yucca Mountain Member,
  - Pah Canyon Member,
  - Topopah Spring Member,
- Tuffaceous Beds of Calico Hills Formation,
- Crater Flat Tuff Formation, which is comprised of:
  - Prow Pass Member,
  - Bullfrog Member,
  - Tram Member, and
- Lithic Ridge Tuff Formation (Scott et. al., 1983, and DOE, 1988).

The above formations and members are shown in Figure 3, which was derived from correlations between select drill holes from Yucca Mountain (DOE, 1988).
Figure 3. North-South Stratigraphic Correlation Between Select Drill Holes from Yucca Mountain (DOE, 1988).
The tuffaceous rocks of Yucca Mountain were formed during a 10 million year period, from 16 Ma to 6 Ma, during which 6 major eruptive cycles occurred and silicic ash flows were deposited over an area of 13000 km². Each major eruptive cycle was comprised of several eruptions of chemically similar, silicic pyroclastic ejecta and perhaps, several nuee ardentes. Generally, individual ash flows are chemically zoned from more silicic at the base to less silicic near the top. However, successive ash-flows of a particular eruptive cycle show a general trend towards a high average silica content. The viscosity of these ash flows was very low and they formed sheets which ponded in low areas with tongues extending outwards along favorably oriented valleys. These paleotopographic variations caused the ash flows to intertongue and wedge out to form a modern day complex three dimensional distribution of tuff (Fox et. al., 1990).

The Tiva Canyon Member of the Paintbrush Tuff formation erupted from the Claim Canyon Cauldron (Scott et. al., 1983) about 12.5 Ma (DOE, 1988). It consists of moderately to densely welded tuff, compositionally zoned from high silica rhyolites at the base and central portions to quartz latites which form the densely welded caprocks near the top of the member (Scott et. al., 1983).

The Tiva Canyon Member has been further subdivided into eight zones. From top to bottom, these zones are:
• Caprock zone
• Upper Cliff zone
• Upper Lithophysal zone
• Clinkstone zone
• Lower Lithophysal zone
• Hackly zone
• Columnar zone
• Basal zone

Some of the zones within the Tiva Canyon Member have been further subdivided (Scott et. al., 1983, and Scott and Bonk, 1984).

The geological stratigraphy of the tuff units of Yucca Mountain do not readily lend themselves to describing the material properties of their associated formations because the formations may contain more than one type of rock. Most formations at Yucca Mountain contain at least two types of tuff: welded ashflows and bedded tuffs (Ortiz et. al., 1984). Ortiz et. al. (1984) have divided the geological stratigraphic tuff units of Yucca Mountain into thermo-mechanical units, which is shown in Figure 4. This study has only tested specimens from the thermo-mechanical unit TCw.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geologic Stratigraphy</th>
<th>Thermo-Mechanical Unit</th>
<th>Lithologic Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undifferentiated Overburden</td>
<td>UO</td>
<td>Undifferentiated Overburden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiva Canyon Member</td>
<td>TOw</td>
<td>Welded, Devitrified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yucca Mountain Member</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pa-h Canyon Member</td>
<td>PTn</td>
<td>Vitric, Nonwelded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topopah Spring Member</td>
<td>TSw1</td>
<td>Lithophysal, Alternating Layers of Lithophyse-Rich and Lithophyse-Poor Welded, Devitrified Tuff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuffaceous Beds of Calico Hills</td>
<td>CHn1</td>
<td>Ash Flows and Bedded Units: Units CHn1, CHn2, and CHn3 May Be Vitric (v) or Zeolitized (z)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHn2</td>
<td>Basal Bedded Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHn3</td>
<td>Upper Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prow Pass Member</td>
<td>PPw</td>
<td>Welded, Devitrified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CFUn</td>
<td>Zeolitized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullfrog Member</td>
<td>BFw</td>
<td>Welded, Devitrified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CFMn1</td>
<td>Lower Zeolitized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CFMn2</td>
<td>Zeolitized Basal Bedded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CFMn3</td>
<td>Upper Zeolitized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tram Member</td>
<td>TRw</td>
<td>Welded, Devitrified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4. Stratigraphy, Thermo-Mechanical Units and Lithologic Equivalent of the Tuffs at Yucca Mountain (Lin et. al., 1992).
Factors Affecting Mechanical Properties

There are many factors which influence the compressive strengths and Young's Moduli of rock specimens in laboratory testing. These factors can be divided into two main groups: inherent factors and test conditions. This section discusses the inherent factors and test conditions which were examined for this study and their effects on the compressive strengths and Young's Moduli of rock specimens.

Inherent Factors

Inherent factors are those factors which are found in the rock itself, such as porosity, mineralogy, anisotropy, and density. This discussion is limited to porosity and anisotropy, which were the only inherent factors determined for this study.

For mechanical purposes, pores are the most important constituent in a rock because they are the weakest portion of a rock. The pores may influence the strength and deformation properties of a rock specimen (Franklin and Dusseault, 1989). Much work has been done to establish relationships between porosity and parameters such as electrical resistivity, compressional wave velocity, permeability, compressive strength, Young's Modulus, Poisson's Ratio, and axial strain at failure of tuffs from the Nevada Test Site (Nelson and Anderson, 1992, and Price,
Figure 5. (a) Effect of Porosity on Compressive Strength and (b) Effect of Porosity on Young's Modulus (Price et. al, 1993).
Figure 5 shows two plots which demonstrate the effect of porosity on the ultimate strength (Figure 5a) and on Young's Modulus (Figure 5b). These tests were performed on specimens of Yucca Mountain tuff under unconfined conditions, at room temperature, saturated, and at a constant axial strain of $10^{-6}$ s$^{-1}$. If Figure 5, $n$ represents the functional porosity (volume fraction of porosity + volume fraction of clay (Montmorillonite)) and $\phi$ represents volume fraction of porosity. It is apparent that an increase in porosity decreases both the ultimate strength and the Young's Modulus of Yucca Mountain tuff (Price et al., 1993).

Olsson and Jones (1980) measured the porosity of the Tiva Canyon Tuffs which they tested. The measured porosities ranged from 8.8% to 54%. The measured values were 8.8%, 8.8%, 8.8%, 26.7%, and 54.0%.

Another inherent factor which may affect the mechanical properties of rock specimens tested in the laboratory is the anisotropy of the specimen. Anisotropy of rock properties occurs as a result of endogenous and exogenous factors. Endogenous factors are associated with the process of rock formation, such as the structure and texture of sedimentary rocks, or the lithophysal cavities in tuffaceous rocks. Exogenous factors are associated with the influence of the surrounding environment. Examples of exogenous factors include the effect of
pressure and temperature (Kwasniewski, 1993). Anisotropy in tuffs from Yucca Mountain may be due to the alignment of microcracks, lithophysal cavities, or mineral grains. Microcracks may develop along grain boundaries of extrusive igneous rocks, such as tuff, as the rock mass cools (Martin et al., 1992).

When the ash flow sheets which make up Tiva Canyon Tuff were initially deposited, trapped gases may have formed gas pockets called lithophysal cavities. These cavities, which are preserved in the tuff, are spherical to highly oblate voids ranging in size from less than 1 cm to 30 cm in diameter. Surrounding the cavities is a thin (~1 mm) inner rim of vapor phase crystals. Outside this rim is another rim of pale colored altered rock matrix. This outer rim is usually about 1 cm thick.

There are two major lithophysal zones within the Tiva Canyon Member, the Upper Lithophysal zone and the Lower Lithophysal zone. Field relations suggest that these zones are continuous sheets and are a result of two separate, gas-rich eruptive pulses. These cavities will influence effective hydraulic conductivities, decrease the rock thermal conductivities and bulk densities and will alter the mechanical properties of the Tiva Canyon Member (Scott et al., 1983). Tillerson and Nimick (1984) state the lithophysal cavities are expected to decrease the strength of the tuffs.

The anisotropy of strength and deformation properties can be
observed by testing specimens of different orientations from within the same rock block. In an attempt to measure the degree of anisotropy of the elastic moduli of tuffs from the Nevada Test Site, Olsson and Jones (1980) measured independently the axial and transverse strains during hydrostatic loading. A typical plot of the two strains during hydrostatic loading is shown in Figure 6.

![Figure 6](image)

**Figure 6.** Axial and transverse strains of a tuff sample during hydrostatic loading. The tuff sample was from the Nevada Test Site (Olsson and Jones, 1980).

The ratio of the slopes from the linear portions of the two curves ($K_{\text{axial}}$ and $K_{\text{transverse}}$) was considered to be a measure of anisotropy. The ratios ranged from near 7 for welded tuffs to near 0.1 for non-welded
tuffs. The terms used, $K_{\text{axial}}$ and $K_{\text{transverse}}$, should not be confused with the bulk modulus, $K$. These values, $K_{\text{axial}}$ and $K_{\text{transverse}}$, can be considered to be "Young’s" Modulus values measured under proportional loading, but they are not true values of Young’s Moduli (Olsson and Jones, 1980). Olsson and Jones (1980) also state that "welded tuff is stiffest perpendicular to bedding", which is approximately vertical.

Martin et. al. (1992) measured the anisotropy of a welded tuff (Topopah Spring Tuff) from Yucca Mountain. Their results state that the tuff can be considered transversely isotropic with the axis of symmetry normal to the bedding plane. The tuff was significantly more compliant normal to the layering than within the bedding plane. Thus, the vertical direction was the slow direction for the P waves and the Young’s Modulus was lower perpendicular to the bedding than it was parallel to the bedding (Martin et. al., 1992). Other studies, Price et. al., 1985; 1987, have stated that the axis of symmetry is perpendicular to the preferred orientation of the shard matrix, which is a result of gravity and flow during deposition of the ash flow. The anisotropy is thought to be produced by the preferred orientation of the shard matrix and perhaps, the pore distribution (Martin et. al., 1992).

**Test Conditions**

Test conditions under which rock specimens are tested affect the
compressive strength and the Young's Modulus of the specimen. The test conditions which were varied in this study were confining pressure, saturation, and strain rate.

Most rocks show an increase in compressive strength with an increase in confining pressure (Goodman, 1989). The confining pressure hampers the growth of the largest cracks within a rock specimen. The largest cracks can no longer cause fracture, thus a further increase in load is possible. This is the cause of the increase in strength with and increase in confining pressure (Dyskin et. al., 1994). Olsson and Jones (1980) state that confining pressure appears to have no significant effect on Young’s Modulus for volcanic tuffs from the Nevada Test Site. Nimick et. al. (1985) state that a variation of confining pressure between 0 and 10 MPa produced no definite trend in Young’s Moduli for the Topopah Spring Tuff specimens they tested.

Water saturation of silicic rocks, such as tuff, tends to weaken rock specimens in two ways: by chemical effects and by mechanical effects. The chemical weakening effect of water is caused by a reduction of surface energy at grain boundaries and at the tips of internal flaws (Franklin and Dusseault, 1989). The surface energy is a measure of the work required to produce a unit area of surface by a reversible and isothermal process. Both surface energy and mechanical strength of a solid depend on the strength of its bonds (Swolfs, 1972). Water tends
to hydrolyze strong silicon-oxygen bonds (-Si-O-Si-) into weaker hydroxyl groups (-Si-OH), and thereby weaken the bonds at crack tips within the specimen (Franklin and Dusseault, 1989). The weakened crystals deform plastically by dislocation-propagated slip (Griggs, 1967).

Mechanically, water can affect the strength of rock specimens through the coupling of diffusion and deformation which can cause non-equilibrium pore pressure. That is, if the rock specimen is compacting, the pore pressure will increase and if the rock specimen is dilating, the pore pressure will decrease. These altered pore pressures can influence the strength of rock specimens in accordance with the principle of effective stress. To determine whether chemical or mechanical effects of water saturation are dominant, one can perform tests on saturated and unsaturated specimens at various strain rates. Then, the strength can be plotted as a function of strain rate and, if the trend of the lines passing through the points of saturated and dry specimens are parallel, the primary effect of water saturation is said to be chemical (Olsson and Jones, 1980).

Saturated and dry compression tests have been run on specimens of Grouse Canyon Tuff and Calico Hills Tuff to determine the effects of water saturation on the compressive strength of the two tuffs. Saturated Grouse Canyon Tuff showed an average of 30% compressive strength decrease over air dried specimens (Price, 1983). The saturated
Calico Hills Tuff specimens showed a 23% decrease in compressive strength over air dried specimens (Tillerson and Nimick, 1984).

An increase in the strain rate will generally increase the compressive strength of a rock specimen. The strength variation with strain rate variation is most likely due to stress concentrations at the tips of internal flaws in the rock specimen. Slow strain rates allow local time dependent crack growth whereas fast strain rates precludes time dependent crack growth and gives higher compressive strengths (Franklin and Dusseault, 1989).

Tillerson and Nimick (1984) cite several studies on the effect of strain rate on the compressive strengths of tuffs from the Nevada Test Site. Data from these studies indicate that there is an average strength decrease of three to six percent for every factor of 10 decrease in strain rate. However, Price et. al. (1987) have stated that there is a general increase in strength with a decrease in strain rate with both saturated (4% ultimate strength increase per decade decrease in strain rate) and dry specimens (11% strength increase per decade decrease in strain rate) of Topopah Spring Tuff. Martin et. al. (1993) tested Topopah Spring Tuff at strain rates of $10^{-9}$ s$^{-1}$ and compared their results to tests conducted by Price et. al. (1987), who tested the same tuff at strain rates of $10^{-7}$ to $10^{-3}$ s$^{-1}$, to determine the effect of strain rate on the moduli and effective strengths of saturated specimens. They found that
at strain rates between $10^{-9}$ s$^{-1}$ and $10^{-6}$ s$^{-1}$, the strengths decreased with decreasing strain rate. At a strain rate of $10^{-3}$ s$^{-1}$, the strengths decreased from those tested at $10^{-5}$ s$^{-1}$. Martin et. al. (1993) attribute this strength anomaly to a build up of pore pressure which causes hydrofracturing and reduced strengths.

Studies have shown that an increase in strain rate (loading rate) increases the Young’s Modulus of rock specimens (Judd, 1963 and Price et. al., 1987). However, specimens of tuff tested by Price et. al. (1987) have shown the opposite trend, a decrease in Young’s Modulus with an increase in strain rate. Young’s Modulus decreased 6% with a decrease in strain rate from $10^{-6}$ to $10^{-7}$ s$^{-1}$. Also, Nimick et. al. (1984) state that there is no definite trend in Young’s Modulus for specimens of Topopah Spring Tuff tested at strain rates of $10^{-7}$ s$^{-1}$, $10^{-6}$ s$^{-1}$, and $10^{-7}$ s$^{-1}$.

**Available Data of Mechanical Properties**

Table 1 summarizes the total testing effort of Tiva Canyon Tuff, prior to this study. The lack of test data for the thermo - mechanical unit TCw has prompted the Reference Information Base (RIB), Version 4.4 (DOE, 1991) to recommend using the uniaxial compressive test results from thermo - mechanical unit TSw1 (Topopah Spring Member, alternating lithophysae - rich and lithophysae - poor, poorly welded, devitrified tuff) as representative for the TCw thermo - mechanical unit (Lin et. al, 1993).
Lin et. al. (1992) state that the mechanical properties of TCw should resemble the lithophysae-poor TSw2 more than the lithophysae-rich TSw1 because the description of the TCw in thermo-mechanical units figure (Figure 4) did not report any lithophysae in the Tiva Canyon.

Table 1. Previous Test Data of Tiva Canyon Tuff (after Lin et. al., 1993; Price, 1983; and Olsson and Jones, 1980)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confining Pressure</th>
<th>Strain Rate</th>
<th>Test Temperature</th>
<th>Number of Specimens</th>
<th>Compressive Strength</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unconfined</td>
<td>10^-4 s^-1</td>
<td>Room Temperature</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.03 &amp; 364 MPa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 MPa (1450.3 psi)</td>
<td>10^-4 s^-1</td>
<td>Room Temperature</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>406 MPa (59000 psi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 MPa (2900.6 psi)</td>
<td>10^-4 s^-1</td>
<td>Room Temperature</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>895 MPa (130000 psi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.7 MPa (3002.1 psi)</td>
<td>10^-4 s^-1</td>
<td>200° C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>125.7 MPa (18300 psi)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL NUMBER OF TIVA CANYON TUFT SPECIMENS TESTED** 5

Member (Lin et. al., 1993). Therefore, Lin et. al. (1993) chose the uniaxial compressive strength of TSw2 as being representative of TCw.

Table 2 gives the intact rock uniaxial compressive strength, elastic modulus and Poisson's ratio of the thermo-mechanical unit TCw and TSw1 and TSw2 for comparison. The values of Young's Modulus and Poisson's Ratio for the various thermo-mechanical units in Table 2 were derived from the RIB, Version 4.4 (Lin et. al., 1993).
Table 2. Intact Rock Uniaxial Compressive Strength and Elastic Modulus of TCw, TSw1, and TSw2 (after Lin et. al, 1993)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thermo-mechanical Unit</th>
<th>Uniaxial Compressive Strength (MPa)</th>
<th>Elastic Modulus (GPa)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TCw</td>
<td>161 ± 63</td>
<td>19.9 ± 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSw1 (lithophysae-rich)</td>
<td>16 ± 5</td>
<td>15.5 ± 3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSw2 (lithophysae-poor)</td>
<td>161 ± 63</td>
<td>21.7 ± 4.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Mohr-Coulomb strength properties of Tiva Canyon Tuff were investigated by Olsson and Jones (1980) and the Mohr - Coulomb strength properties for TCw were compiled by Lin et. al. (1993). The strength properties for TCw, TSw1, TSw2 thermo-mechanical units and the Tiva Canyon geologic unit are given in Table 3.

Table 3. Intact Rock Mohr-Coulomb Strength Properties (after Olsson and Jones*, 1980 and Lin et. al., 1993)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thermo-mechanical or Geologic Unit</th>
<th>Cohesion (MPa)</th>
<th>Angle of Internal Friction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tiva Canyon*</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCw</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSw1 (lithophysae-rich)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSw2 (lithophysae-poor)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For the densely welded upper part of this member, after Olsson and Jones (1980)

It should be noted that the information provided by Olsson and Jones (1980) refers to the densely welded caprock portion of the Tiva Canyon Member. Their testing was performed before the division of the geological stratigraphy into thermo - mechanical units.
Lin et. al. (1993) state that there is insufficient data for the TCw thermo-mechanical unit and that the triaxial testing results from the TSw2 thermo-mechanical unit were used as the Mohr-Coulomb strength properties for the thermo-mechanical unit TCw.
EXPERIMENTAL APPROACH

The experimental approach section deals with three topics: core sampling, experimental design, and test procedures. Test procedures is divided into three sub-sections: triaxial testing apparatus, P-Wave velocities, and saturation apparatus.

Core Sampling

The samples used in this study were obtained from a muckpile in front of the starter tunnel at Yucca Mountain. The muckpile contained rocks which were from the alcove excavation inside the starter tunnel, which is in the TCw thermo-mechanical unit. The samples were removed from the alcove by drill and blast methods and then excavated by mechanical excavators.

Specimens were cored from the muckpile samples of TCw using a thin-walled bit. The specimens were cored in two distinct orientations, parallel and perpendicular to the lithophysal cavities. The specimens were cored in this manner to investigate the anisotropy of the compressive strength and the Young’s Modulus of the specimens. The orientation of the specimens with respect to the lithophysal cavity orientation is shown in Figure 7. Each specimen is represented by a
Figure 7. Orientation of Rock Specimens with Respect to the Orientation of the Lithophysal Cavities found in the Samples of TCw Tuff.
number, a letter, and an orientation notation. For example, 726B-PER indicates that the specimen was cored from sample 726, the core was the second one taken from the sample (indicated by the letter B), and the specimen was cored perpendicular to the lithophysal cavity orientation.

Once cored, the specimen ends were cut and ground to the specifications of ASTM D-4543. The specimens were then weighed and measured. Any large, visible lithophysal cavities on the surface of the specimens were filled with epoxy, and the specimens were re-weighed to determine the mass of epoxy used.

**Experimental Design**

The objective of this study is to investigate the effect of confining pressure, saturation, strain rate and anisotropy on the compressive strengths and Young’s Moduli of tuff specimens from the thermo-mechanical unit TCw. Cylindrical specimens have been divided into three sets and tested in triaxial compression. Specimens in SET 1 were tested in an air dried condition under a constant nominal strain rate of $10^{-5}$ s$^{-1}$ and at confining pressures of 0.1 MPa, 5 MPa, and 10 MPa. Specimens in SET 2 were tested in a saturated condition under a constant nominal strain rate of $10^{-5}$ s$^{-1}$ and at confining pressures of 0.1 MPa, 5 MPa, and 10 MPa. Specimens in SET 3 were tested in an air dried condition under a constant nominal strain rate of $10^{-4}$ s$^{-1}$ and at a confining pressure of
10 MPa. Table 4 contains the test conditions and the sample orientations of each set of specimens.

### Table 4. Test Conditions of Each Set of Specimens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Conditions</th>
<th>SET 1</th>
<th>SET 2</th>
<th>SET 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confining Pressure (MPa)</td>
<td>0.1, 5, and 10</td>
<td>0.1, 5, and 10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strain Rate (s⁻¹)</td>
<td>10⁻⁵</td>
<td>10⁻⁵</td>
<td>10⁻⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturation Condition</td>
<td>air dried</td>
<td>saturated</td>
<td>air dried</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specimen Orientation</td>
<td>parallel and perpendicular</td>
<td>parallel and perpendicular</td>
<td>parallel and perpendicular</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tables 5 through 7 contain the number of specimens tested at each orientation and each confining pressure for SET 1, SET 2, and SET 3.

### Table 5. SET 1 Confining Pressures, Specimen Orientation, and Number of Specimens Tested.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confining Pressure</th>
<th>Specimen Orientation</th>
<th>Number of Specimens Tested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.1 MPa (15 psi)</td>
<td>Perpendicular</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parallel</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 MPa (725 psi)</td>
<td>Perpendicular</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parallel</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 MPa (1450 psi)</td>
<td>Perpendicular</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parallel</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6. SET 2 Confining Pressures, Specimen Orientation and Number of Specimens Tested.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confining Pressure</th>
<th>Specimen Orientation</th>
<th>Number of Specimens Tested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.1 MPa (15 psi)</td>
<td>Perpendicular</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parallel</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 MPa (725 psi)</td>
<td>Perpendicular</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parallel</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 MPa (1450 psi)</td>
<td>Perpendicular</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parallel</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. SET 3 Confining Pressures, Specimen Orientation and Number of Specimens Tested.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confining Pressure</th>
<th>Specimen Orientation</th>
<th>Number of Specimens Tested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 MPa (1450 psi)</td>
<td>Perpendicular</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parallel</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From these three sets of tests, observations of the effect of confining pressure, saturation, strain rate, and specimen orientation on the compressive strength and Young’s Modulus for tuff specimens from the thermo - mechanical unit TCw are made. Also, the Mohr - Coulomb Strength Parameters are calculated from the test results from SET 1 and SET 2.
Test Procedures

Triaxial Testing Apparatus

The triaxial testing apparatus used for this study was a servocontrolled triaxial pressure apparatus. The apparatus can simultaneously measure the axial stress, axial and volumetric strains, pore fluid pressure, permeability, compressional wave velocity and the electrical resistivity of a 10- by 20-cm (4- by 8-inch) or a 2.125- by 4.25-inch (NX) sized right cylindrical test specimens during triaxial compression. The apparatus is capable of applying differential axial stresses of up to 585 MPa (85 000 psi) on NX-sized specimens. Confining and pore pressures up to 100 MPa (15 000 psi) can be applied by the apparatus.

The differential axial load is measured by a load cell connected in series with the load piston. Axial displacement is measured with a linear variable displacement transducer which is corrected for measured apparatus distortion. The volumetric strain is measured with a linear variable displacement transducer which is attached to the piston of a multiple-rate syringe pump used for confining pressure control. This value is also corrected for the measured apparatus volume change caused by the application of the axial load.

Voltage outputs from the confining pressure transducer, up- and downstream pore pressure transducers, the load transducer and the
linear variable displacement transducers from the axial displacement and the confining pressure pump are monitored, stored and printed with a microcomputer-based data acquisition system (Donath et al., 1988). The data acquisition system, ROMTAS (ROck Mechanics Testing and Analysis System), was developed at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. The outputs are also plotted on an x-y recorder. The microcomputer also provides closed-loop servocontrol of the axial strain rate, confining pressure and pore pressure (Donath et al., 1988). The triaxial test assembly and loading ram are shown in Figure 8.

**P-Wave Velocities**

P-Waves, also known as compressional waves, can provide useful correlations to specimen properties such as Young's Modulus and porosity. The P-Wave velocity also provides an indication of deformation-induced microfracturing (Donath et al., 1988). Housed in the triaxial testing apparatus (top specimen end cap) is a ceramic transducer which converts 0-to-350-volt electrical pulses from a puller unit to compressional (P-Waves) waves. These waves are sent through a specimen which is being tested in triaxial compression and then converted back into electrical pulses by another ceramic transducer (housed in the bottom specimen endcap). The electrical pulses are then sent to a receiver which is connected to an oscilloscope. The
Figure 8. Triaxial Test Assembly and Loading Ram Used in the Triaxial Testing.
oscilloscope is used to read the apparent travel time of the P - Waves through the specimen. The apparent travel time is then corrected for the linear expansion of the triaxial system to obtain the actual velocity of the P - Wave.

**Saturation Apparatus**

The saturation apparatus consists of a pressure/vacuum chamber, capable of pressures up to 500 psi and a hand pump to produce the confining pressure. According to Boyd et. al. (1994), pressure saturation increases the degree of saturation and achieves saturation faster than vacuum saturation.

The specimens chosen to be saturated were dried for 48 hours at a temperature of 110 ± 5°C. The specimens were then put into the vacuum/pressure chamber and a vacuum was exerted across the specimens and de - ionized water for six hours. The chamber was then flooded with the de - aired de - ionized water and kept under 500 psi pressure for 96 hours (4 days). The specimens were kept submerged in water until testing.
RESULTS

From the triaxial tests, two strains (axial and volumetric) are measured throughout the test and the radial strain is calculated through the following relationship:

$$\frac{\Delta V}{V} = \epsilon_{axial} + 2\epsilon_{radial}$$

The three strains are then plotted against the differential axial stress on the same plot to obtain the specimen’s stress-strain curves, as seen in Figure 9, which are typical stress-strain plots for the TCw specimens tested. The differential axial stress does not include the stress from the confining pressure. From the stress-strain curves, several observations can be made regarding the properties of the specimen tested.

- The axial stress-axial strain curve is linear from the start of the test, which indicates that there were few, if any, cracks, fractures, or pores in the rock which were closed by the application of the axial stress. Also, there does not appear to be any yielding at the end of the stress strain curve, which indicates a sudden, brittle failure of the specimen. The shape of this axial stress-axial strain curve is commonly called an elastic stress-strain curve.

- The axial stress-volumetric strain curve is linear throughout the
Figure 9. Typical Stress - Strain Curves from Triaxial Testing of TCw Tuff.
test. Figure 9 indicates that the specimen volume is decreasing linearly while the specimen is being loaded. It is interesting to note that near the end of the test, the specimen does not dilate or, increase in volume, because of the formation of microcracks throughout the specimen. This behavior is also indicative of a sudden, brittle failure.

- The axial stress - radial strain curve is linear, until the very late stages of the test. Figure 9 indicates that the specimen radius is increasing linearly throughout most of the test and near the end of the test, close to the onset of failure, the specimen radius begins decrease. Again, the abrupt ending of this curve indicates a sudden, brittle failure.

The term compressive strength, which is used throughout this study, is the ultimate strength because each specimen was loaded to failure. Failure of the specimens was taken as the point of maximum load, after which the specimen lost the ability to hold the maximum load. Young’s Modulus was calculated by a least squares fit between ten and fifty percent of the maximum compressive strength. This is the standard method of determining Young’s Modulus for tuffaceous rock specimens from Yucca Mountain (Price et. al., 1994). The P-wave velocities used for this study are an average of the velocity readings between ten and fifty percent of the maximum compressive strength. The porosity value is a matrix porosity which has been calculated as follows:
The test results for this study are presented in tabular form in Tables 8 through 10. Table 8 gives the test results for SET 1, Table 9 gives the test results for SET 2, and Table 10 gives the test results for SET 3. Porosities were not determined for SET 1 and SET 3 because of the possibility of a reduced strength from saturation and re-drying. P-Wave velocities were not determined for the samples in SET 3 because apparatus control took too much operator time to try to read the apparent P-Wave velocities during the test.

\[ V_v = \frac{M_{\text{sat}} - M_{\text{dry}}}{\rho_{\text{water}}} \]

\[ V_{\text{sample}} = \text{Length} \times \frac{\pi (\text{Diameter})^2}{4} \]

\[ n = \frac{V_v}{V_{\text{sample}}} \]

(Brown, 1981)
Table 8. SET 1 Test Results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confining Pressure</th>
<th>Specimen - Orientation</th>
<th>Compressive Strength (MPa)</th>
<th>Young's Modulus (GPa)</th>
<th>Axial Strain at Failure (%)</th>
<th>P-Wave Velocity (km/sec)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 MPa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>726B - PER</td>
<td>157.10</td>
<td>25.05</td>
<td>0.773</td>
<td>4.241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>729D - PER</td>
<td>220.8</td>
<td>25.03</td>
<td>0.958</td>
<td>4.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>729E - PER</td>
<td>159.04</td>
<td>27.70</td>
<td>0.567</td>
<td>4.222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>736A - PER</td>
<td>126.7</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>0.704</td>
<td>4.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>730D - PER</td>
<td>114.68</td>
<td>22.80</td>
<td>0.555</td>
<td>4.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>728B - PAR</td>
<td>203.52</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>0.865</td>
<td>4.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>737B - PAR</td>
<td>97.60</td>
<td>28.03</td>
<td>0.406</td>
<td>4.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>736B - PAR</td>
<td>157.44</td>
<td>21.21</td>
<td>0.804</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>726A - PER</td>
<td>129.20</td>
<td>26.10</td>
<td>0.538</td>
<td>4.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>729C - PER</td>
<td>145.14</td>
<td>21.80</td>
<td>0.738</td>
<td>4.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>747B - PER</td>
<td>95.30</td>
<td>20.30</td>
<td>0.602</td>
<td>4.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>746A - PER</td>
<td>134.90</td>
<td>26.20</td>
<td>0.600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>730C - PAR</td>
<td>159.80</td>
<td>24.47</td>
<td>0.656</td>
<td>4.236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>742C - PAR</td>
<td>83.78</td>
<td>20.95</td>
<td>0.525</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>742A - PAR</td>
<td>87.69</td>
<td>18.38</td>
<td>0.579</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>734D - PAR</td>
<td>140.30</td>
<td>18.72</td>
<td>0.851</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>734B - PER</td>
<td>77.50</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>0.352</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>739A - PER</td>
<td>104.00</td>
<td>31.60</td>
<td>0.397</td>
<td>4.354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>743B - PER</td>
<td>72.30</td>
<td>25.80</td>
<td>0.367</td>
<td>3.863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>749E - PER</td>
<td>95.40</td>
<td>24.70</td>
<td>0.466</td>
<td>4.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>750E - PER</td>
<td>69.80</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td>0.370</td>
<td>3.864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>729H - PAR</td>
<td>116.30</td>
<td>28.03</td>
<td>0.475</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>730A - PAR</td>
<td>47.02</td>
<td>16.93</td>
<td>0.435</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>730B - PAR</td>
<td>68.72</td>
<td>22.36</td>
<td>0.376</td>
<td>4.157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>750C - PAR</td>
<td>71.41</td>
<td>16.39</td>
<td>0.600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>750A - PAR</td>
<td>106.93</td>
<td>18.83</td>
<td>0.652</td>
<td>3.722</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9. SET 2 Test Results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confining Pressure</th>
<th>Specimen - Orientation</th>
<th>Compressive Strength (MPa)</th>
<th>Young’s Modulus (GPa)</th>
<th>Axial Strain at Failure (%)</th>
<th>P - Wave Vel. (km/s)</th>
<th>Porosity (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 MPa</td>
<td>747A-PER</td>
<td>140.54</td>
<td>15.65</td>
<td>0.899</td>
<td>4.325</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>741A-PER</td>
<td>132.12</td>
<td>15.60</td>
<td>0.873</td>
<td>4.433</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>749B-PAR</td>
<td>168.36</td>
<td>15.27</td>
<td>1.042</td>
<td>4.280</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>735C-PAR</td>
<td>125.17</td>
<td>13.73</td>
<td>0.893</td>
<td>4.168</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>729G-PAR</td>
<td>208.30</td>
<td>17.13</td>
<td>1.181</td>
<td>4.395</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 MPa</td>
<td>726C-PER</td>
<td>135.44</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>0.908</td>
<td>4.251</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>750G-PER</td>
<td>42.41</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>0.862</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>750D-PAR</td>
<td>129.47</td>
<td>14.61</td>
<td>0.877</td>
<td>4.304</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>727C-PAR</td>
<td>107.63</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>0.866</td>
<td>4.336</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>731A-PAR</td>
<td>106.79</td>
<td>13.80</td>
<td>0.775</td>
<td>4.262</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>750B-PAR</td>
<td>90.22</td>
<td>11.02</td>
<td>0.853</td>
<td>4.331</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1 MPa</td>
<td>747C-PER</td>
<td>73.25</td>
<td>12.23</td>
<td>0.622</td>
<td>4.364</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>730E-PER</td>
<td>53.63</td>
<td>10.61</td>
<td>0.511</td>
<td>4.252</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>749C-PAR</td>
<td>65.10</td>
<td>8.15</td>
<td>0.778</td>
<td>4.093</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>742B-PAR</td>
<td>57.02</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>0.508</td>
<td>4.114</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>750K-PAR</td>
<td>110.96</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>0.842</td>
<td>4.303</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10. SET 3 Test Results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confining Pressure</th>
<th>Specimen - Orientation</th>
<th>Compressive Strength (MPa)</th>
<th>Young's Modulus (GPa)</th>
<th>Axial Strain at Failure (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 MPa</td>
<td>727A - PER</td>
<td>153.1</td>
<td>13.84</td>
<td>1.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>726D - PAR</td>
<td>224.8</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>1.359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>729F - PAR</td>
<td>183.3</td>
<td>21.61</td>
<td>0.920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>738B - PAR</td>
<td>190.3</td>
<td>21.40</td>
<td>0.972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>746C - PAR</td>
<td>152.7</td>
<td>22.91</td>
<td>0.608</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

This section presents five major topics. First, the effect of test conditions, namely, confining pressure, saturation, and strain rate, on the compressive strengths and Young's Moduli of the specimens is discussed. Next, the effect of anisotropy and porosity on the compressive strengths and Young's Modulus values is presented. Then, the Mohr - Coulomb strength parameters are calculated for SET 1 and SET 2 specimens. Finally, the results from this study are compared with results from previous studies.

Effects of Test Conditions

Confining Pressure

As stated earlier, an increase in confining pressure tends to increase the compressive strength of rock specimens. This statement is true for the TCw specimens tested for this study. Figure 10 shows a plot of all of the compressive strength data from SET 1 as a function of confining pressure. This plot shows there is large variation of compressive strengths at each confining pressure. At a confining pressure of 0.1 MPa, the compressive strengths range from a low of 47.02 MPa to a high of 116.30 MPa, a difference of 60%. At a confining pressure of 5
Figure 10. Compressive Strength as a Function of Confining Pressure, SET 1.
MPa, the compressive strengths range from 83.78 MPa to 159.80 MPa, a difference of 48%. At the highest confining pressure, 10 MPa, the compressive strengths range from a high of 220.80 MPa to a low of 97.6 MPa, a difference of 56%. Figure 10 also indicates that there is some overlap in the compressive strength data. That is, a specimen whose compressive strength was determined to be 110 MPa, could have been tested at any one of the three confining pressures. Thus, confining pressure is not a good indicator of compressive strength. There appears to be a general trend of an increase in compressive strength with an increase in confining pressure for SET 1, as seen in Figure 10. With such large variations in data, it may be advantageous to plot the average compressive strengths as a function of confining pressure to help notice any trends. Such a plot is shown in Figure 11.

From Figure 11, it is easy to see the trend of increasing compressive strength with increasing confining pressure. For the perpendicular specimens, increasing the confining pressure 50 times (0.1 MPa to 5 MPa) increased the average compressive strength 1.5 times (82.80 MPa to 126.14 MPa). For the parallel specimens, the same increase in confining pressure produced an average increase in compressive strength of 1.43 times (82.48 MPa to 117.89 MPa). Increasing the confining pressure 100 times (0.1 MPa to 10 MPa) increased the average compressive strength in the perpendicular specimens by 1.86 times
Figure 11. Average Compressive Strength as a Function of Confining Pressure, SET 1.
(126.14 MPa to 155.66 MPa). The corresponding increase for the parallel specimens was 1.85 times (117.89 MPa to 152.85 MPa). It is interesting to note that the average compressive strengths of the perpendicular specimens and the parallel specimens are approximately the same but in each case, the perpendicular specimens have slightly larger average compressive strengths.

Figure 12 shows a plot of the Young’s Modulus of SET 1 as a function of confining pressure. As with the compressive strength data, there is a large scatter among the Young’s Modulus data at each confining pressure. At 0.1 MPa confining pressure, the modulus values range from 15.39 GPa to 31.6 GPa, a 51% difference. At a confining pressure of 5 MPa, the modulus values range from 18.38 GPa to 26.20 GPa, a 30% difference. At a confining pressure of 10 MPa, the modulus values range from 21.21 GPa to 28.03 GPa, a 24% difference. There is also an overlap in the Young’s Modulus data. A specimen with a modulus value of 25 GPa could have been tested at any of the three confining pressures. Thus, confining pressure is not a good indication of modulus values. It also appears that the increase in confining pressure tends to reduce the variability or scatter of the data. With scattered data such as this, it may be advantageous to plot only the average values of Young’s Modulus for both specimen orientations as a function of confining pressure. Such a plot is shown in Figure 13.
Figure 12. Young's Modulus as a Function of Confining Pressure, SET 1.
Figure 13. Average Young's Modulus as a Function of Confining Pressure, SET 1.
Figure 13 shows that confining pressure does not seem to influence the average Young's Modulus for the perpendicular specimens. At a confining pressure of 0.1 MPa, the average modulus value for the perpendicular specimens is 26.52 GPa. Increasing the confining pressure to 5 MPa and then to 10 MPa did not affect the average modulus values for the perpendicular specimens. However, the modulus values for the parallel specimens showed an increase with an increase in confining pressure. The modulus values increased from 20.31 GPa to 20.63 GPa to 24.75 GPa with an increase in confining pressure from 0.1 MPa to 5 MPa to 10 MPa. Figure 13 shows that there is a difference between the parallel and perpendicular specimens. The average modulus for the parallel specimens seems to be affected by an increase in confining pressure whereas the confining pressure increase seem to have no effect on the average modulus values of the perpendicular specimens. The effect of confining pressure on the average Young's Modulus may be explained in one of two ways: apparatus/measurement error, or Young's Modulus anisotropy within the TCw thermo - mechanical unit. The explanation is more suited to a discussion on anisotropy, and will be discussed later.

Saturation

In all previous studies performed on dry and saturated tuffs from the
Nevada Test Site, saturation has decreased the compressive strength of the specimens tested (Price, 1983 and Tillerson and Nimick, 1984). No researcher has indicated a change in Young’s Modulus with a change in saturation condition.

The average compressive strengths of SET 1 and SET 2 are plotted in Figure 14. The figure shows, that in general, the average strengths of saturated specimens are lower than those of air dried specimens. However, the specimens with the largest average compressive strengths are saturated specimens which were cored parallel to the lithophysal cavities and tested at a confining pressure of 10 MPa. At all three confining pressures, there is not a large variation in the strengths. At a confining pressure of 0.1 MPa, the largest average compressive strength is 83.80 MPa (air dried, perpendicular specimens) and the lowest average compressive strength is 63.44 MPa (saturated, perpendicular specimens). This corresponds to a 24.3% strength reduction. At a confining pressure of 5 MPa, the largest average compressive strength is 126.13 MPa (air dried, perpendicular specimens) and the lowest average compressive strength is 88.93 MPa (saturated, perpendicular specimens). This corresponds to a 29.5% decrease in strength. At a confining pressure of 10 MPa, the largest average compressive strength is 167.28 MPa (saturated, parallel specimens) and the lowest average compressive strength is 136.33 MPa (saturated, perpendicular specimens). This
Figure 14. Average Compressive Strength as a Function of Confining Pressure, SET 1 and SET 2.
shows that specimen variability is very high and average values can be very misleading. However, it is interesting to note that the saturated perpendicular specimens consistently had the lowest average compressive strengths. Generally, specimen strength is slightly reduced by saturation, but, due to high specimen variability, the data is inconclusive.

Unlike the compressive strength data, the Young's Modulus values vary between the air dried and saturated specimens. The average Young's Modulus data from SET 1 and SET 2 is averaged and plotted against confining pressure in Figure 15. Figure 15 shows that the saturated specimens have lower average Young's Modulus values. At high confining pressures, the average Young's Moduli decrease from approximately 24.5 GPa (air dried specimens) to approximately 15.4 GPa (saturated specimens), a 37% decrease in average Young's Modulus values. At a confining pressure of 5 MPa, the average Young's Modulus values for the perpendicular specimens decreased approximately 59%. The average Young's Modulus for the parallel specimens at the same confining pressure decreased approximately 37%. At a confining pressure of 0.1 MPa, the average Young's Modulus values for the perpendicular specimens decreased approximately 57%. The average Young's Modulus values for the parallel specimens at the same confining pressure decreased approximately 45%.
Figure 15. Average Young's Modulus as a Function of Confining Pressure, SET 1 and SET 2.
It appears that the saturated specimens do not exhibit the Young’s Modulus anisotropy which is exhibited by the air dried specimens. It is obvious that saturation of specimens from the thermo-mechanical unit TCw causes the specimens to become less "stiff", but the strength is not greatly reduced.

**Strain Rate**

The strain rate effects on the strength and Young’s Modulus of tuffs from the Nevada Test Site have been studied by Price et. al., 1986; Martin et. al., 1993; and Tillerson and Nimick, 1984. Their findings indicated that an increase in strain rate will increase both the compressive strengths and Young’s Moduli of the tuffs.

The average compressive strength and average modulus values for SET 1 and SET 3 specimens are shown in Table 11. As expected, an increase in strain rate from $10^{-5}$ s$^{-1}$ to $10^{-4}$ s$^{-1}$ increased the strength of air dried TCw specimens. As shown in Table 11, the average compressive strength increased from 154.3 MPa (strain rate of $10^{-5}$ s$^{-1}$) to 180.8 MPa (strain rate of $10^{-4}$ s$^{-1}$). This is a 14.7% increase in
Table 11. Average Compressive Strength and Moduli Comparison Between SET 1 and SET 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SET</th>
<th>STRAIN RATE</th>
<th>AVERAGE COMPR. STRENGTH (MPa)</th>
<th>AVERAGE YOUNG’S MODULI (GPa)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SET 1</td>
<td>$10^{-5}$ s$^{-1}$</td>
<td>154.26</td>
<td>24.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SET 3</td>
<td>$10^{-4}$ s$^{-1}$</td>
<td>184.84</td>
<td>19.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

average compressive strength.

Table 11 also compares the average Young’s Modulus values from SET 1 specimens tested under a confining pressure of 10 MPa with the average Young’s Modulus values from SET 3. Surprisingly, the average Young’s Moduli for the specimens tested at the higher strain rate showed a 28.63% decrease over the specimens tested at the slower strain rate (19.2 GPa compared to 24.6 GPa). Obviously, there is a great deal of specimen variability since the specimens do not respond as expected to the increase in strain rate. The decrease in Young’s Moduli with an increase in strain rate may also be attributed to sample damage from excavation. However, Price (1986) observed the same trend with specimens of Topopah Spring Tuff tested at different strain rates.

**Anisotropy**

Triaxial testing of air dried specimens from the thermo - mechanical unit TCw, cored in two distinct orientations: perpendicular and parallel
to lithophysal cavities (Figure 7), was performed to observe any anisotropies. The average compressive strengths from SET 1 and their respective confining pressures are plotted in Figure 11. Referring back to this figure, as expected, an increase in strength occurs with an increase in confining pressure. However, this figure indicates that there is no observable compressive strength difference between the parallel and perpendicularly cored specimens. This implies that there is no strength anisotropy for our TCw specimens.

Referring back to Figure 13, the average Young's Modulus from SET 1 plotted as a function of confining pressure shows that there is a distinct difference between the average Young's Modulus for the parallel and perpendicular orientated specimens. This difference may be explained by either a modulus (stiffness) anisotropy or an experimental problem measuring the axial strain of specimens during deformation.

Since there are two possible explanations to the stiffness anisotropy question, an investigation was undertaken to determine if there may be a stiffness anisotropy. A background search discovered that Olsson and Jones (1980) claim that welded tuff is stiffest perpendicular to bedding. Also, Martin et. al. (1992) claim that Topopah Spring Tuff is stiffest parallel to bedding. Obviously, there is some merit in exploring the possibility that there is a stiffness anisotropy.

Martin et. al. (1992) tried to correlate the P-Wave velocities to the
Young's Modulus values. They have also showed that there is an increase in P - Wave velocity with an increase in Young's Modulus for tuffs from the Nevada Test Site. If there is a stiffness anisotropy, the P Wave velocity should be greater in the direction of greater stiffness. Figure 16 shows a plot of the P - Wave velocity as a function of Young's Modulus from SET 1 specimens tested at a confining pressure of 0.1 MPa. It is clear that there is a trend in the data of increasing P wave velocity with an increase in Young's Modulus. On average, the perpendicular specimens have a higher P - Wave velocity than do their parallel counterparts. The perpendicular specimens have an average P Wave velocity of 4.082 km/sec whereas the parallel specimens have an average P - Wave velocity of 3.940 km/sec, a 3.5% difference.

Plotting the P - Wave velocities as a function of confining pressure for the specimens from SET 1 tested under a confining pressure of 10 MPa, the average P - Wave velocities for the two sets of specimens, perpendicular and parallel, should be approximately the same since their Young's Modulus values are approximately the same. The P - Wave velocities from SET 1 tested under a confining pressure of 10 MPa are plotted as a function of Young's Modulus in Figure 17. This figure shows that the data points are clustered around a small area, as expected. The average P - Wave velocity for the perpendicular specimens from SET 1 tested under a confining pressure of 10 MPa is
Figure 16. P-wave Velocity as a Function of Young’s Modulus, SET 1 (Specimens Tested at a Confining Pressure of 0.1 MPa).
Figure 17. P-Wave Velocity as a Function of Young's Modulus, SET 1 (Specimens Tested at a Confining Pressure of 10 MPa).
4.189 km/sec. The average P-Wave velocity for the parallel specimens from SET 1 tested under the same confining pressure is 4.154 km/sec. The P-Wave velocities of the specimens tested under a confining pressure of 10 MPa are greater than those tested under a confining pressure of 0.1 MPa. This may be due to the increase in Young's Modulus and/or the pressure dependency of the P-Wave velocities. It is a well known fact that the P-Wave velocity is pressure dependent (Carmichael, 1989). Thus, according to the P-Wave velocities, there is a stiffness anisotropy in the TCw specimens which were tested. The specimens are stiffest perpendicular to bedding, or, in the vertical direction.

Another way to investigate a stiffness anisotropy is to look at the stress-strain curves. Since there are many stress strain-curves, and basically, they are all the same: nearly linear until failure where the stress-strain curve drops suddenly, one can look at the end points of the stress-strain curves and see if there is a difference between specimens cut parallel and perpendicular to the lithophysal cavities. Figures 18 and 19 plot an average end point of the stress-strain curves for the three confining pressures from the specimens in SET 1. Around the average end points is a box which defines one standard deviation of the average stress and average strain at each confining pressure. Comparing the two figures, the stress component of each end point is
Figure 18. Average Compressive Strength and Axial Strain at Failure, SET 1 (Perpendicular Orientation).
Figure 19. Average Compressive Strength and Axial Strain at Failure and Box Defining One Standard Deviation of Compressive Strength and Axial Strain at Failure, SET 1 (Parallel Orientation).
nearly the same for each confining pressure, which indicates that there is no strength anisotropy. However, the axial strain component of the end points for the parallel specimens is shifted to the right at lower confining pressures. At higher confining pressures, the boxes nearly overlap each other. Obviously, the parallel specimens experience more axial strain at failure but experience the same stress at failure as the perpendicular specimens. Reviewing the Young's Modulus calculation, which is stress divided by strain, for the parallel specimens, which strain more than the perpendicular specimens, the calculated Young's Modulus will be less than the value calculated for the perpendicular specimens. However, at high confining pressures (10 MPa) there does not seem to be an anisotropy because the specimens experience the same amount of stress and axial strain at failure. Thus, according to the stress-strain curves of the specimens tested, there is a stiffness anisotropy in the TCw specimens tested. The specimens are stiffest perpendicular to bedding, or, in the vertical direction.

Porosity

As stated earlier, there have been numerous attempts to correlate rock properties from the tuffs at the Nevada Test Site to their porosities. This section will describe the effect of porosity on the compressive strength and Young's Modulus of saturated TCw specimens. The
porosity values given in this study are volume fraction porosities which were derived from the difference in saturated and dried specimen weights.

Recent studies (Price et. al., 1993 and Martin et. al., 1994) have shown that, in general, an increase in porosity will decrease the compressive strength of tuffaceous specimens from the Nevada Test Site. This is true for the specimens of TCw tested for this study. The porosity and compressive strength data from SET 2 is plotted in Figure 20. As one would expect, there is a general trend indicating a drop in compressive strength with an increase in porosity. The porosity values ranged from approximately 10% to approximately 18%. Within this range of porosities, the maximum compressive strengths ranged from a high of 208.3 MPa to a low of 42.41 MPa. The lowest strength corresponds to the specimen which had the highest porosity.

Figure 20 is also useful in explaining the effect of confining pressure on compressive strength. Two specimens, both with porosities of approximately 15% had compressive strengths of approximately 98 MPa when tested at confining pressures of 5 MPa, whereas two specimens, with porosities of approximately 15%, tested at a confining pressure of 0.1 MPa had maximum compressive strengths of approximately 59 MPa. This is an increase of approximately 40% with an increase in confining pressure of 4900% increase.
Figure 20. Compressive Strength as a Function of Porosity, SET 2.
An increase in porosity is expected to decrease the Young’s Modulus of a rock specimen. This has been shown by Price et. al., 1993 and Martin et. al., 1994 and has been found to be true with the TCw specimens tested for this study. The general trend of the Young’s Modulus data from SET 2, when plotted as a function of porosity, such as in Figure 21, is a decrease in Young’s Modulus with an increase in porosity. The porosity values ranged from approximately 10% up to approximately 18%. Within this range of porosities, the Young’s Modulus values ranged from a high of 17.3 GPa to a low of 6.88 GPa. The lowest modulus value corresponds to the specimen which had the highest porosity.

**Mohr - Coulomb Strength Parameters**

The classical method of determining the Mohr - Coulomb strength parameters is to draw semi - circles defined by pairs of major and minor principal stresses at failure in $\tau - \sigma$ space. The semi - circles corresponding to failure are joined by a tangent curve or Mohr envelope which defines the upper limit of all possible non - failure states of stress. The straight line version of this envelope is the Mohr - Coulomb strength criterion (Franklin and Dusseauult, 1989). The slope of the straight line envelope is $\phi$, the angle of internal friction, and the intersection of the envelope with the $\tau$ axis is the cohesion of the specimen.
Figure 21. Young's Modulus as a Function of Porosity, SET 2.
Rather than drawing semi-circles in $\tau - \sigma$ space, the Mohr-Coulomb strength parameters can be determined mathematically from values in $\sigma_1 - \sigma_3$ space. The strength parameters can be developed from a least squares curve fit between the axial stress at failure, $\sigma_1$, and confining pressure, $\sigma_3$. The expression takes the form:

$$\sigma_1 = \sigma_{uc} + N\sigma_3$$

where:

- $\sigma_{uc}$ = unconfined compressive strength
- $N$ = confinement factor

$\sigma_{uc}$ and $N$ are then used to generate a Mohr-Coulomb failure criterion which relates the normal ($\sigma_N$) and shear ($\tau$) stresses on the plane of failure to the material constants of cohesion ($c$) and the angle of internal friction ($\phi$). The Mohr-Coulomb criterion takes the form:

$$\tau = c + \sigma_N \tan \phi$$

where:

$$c = \frac{\sigma_{uc}}{2\sqrt{N}}$$
\[ \phi = 2\left(\tan^{-1}\sqrt{N\cdot45^\circ}\right) \]

(Lin et. al., 1993)

Figures 22 and 23 show plots of \( \sigma_1 \) vs \( \sigma_3 \) and the least squares curve fit through the data points from SET 1 specimens cored parallel and perpendicular to the lithophysal cavities to calculate the parameters \( N \) and \( \sigma_u \) needed to mathematically develop the Mohr - Coulomb strength parameters. From Figures 22 and 23, the following expressions are obtained:

Perpendicular Specimens:

\[ \sigma_1 = 85.03 + 7.26 \sigma_3 \]

Parallel Specimens:

\[ \sigma_1 = 81.92 + 7.12 \sigma_3 \]

The Mohr - Coulomb strength parameters were calculated using both the classical method and the mathematical method used by Lin et. al. (1993). When using the classical method, three sets of Mohr - Coulomb strength parameters were calculated: a maximum set, an average set and a minimum set. The maximum set was calculated using the maximum values of \( \sigma_1 \) from SET 1, the average set was calculated using an
Figure 22. Least Squares Curve Fit - Compressive Strength vs Confining Pressure, SET 1 (Perpendicular Specimens).
Figure 23. Least Squares Curve Fit - Compressive Strength vs Confining Pressure, SET 1 (Parallel Specimens).
average values of $\sigma_1$ from SET 1 and the minimum set was calculated using the minimum values of $\sigma_1$ from SET 1. The Mohr - Coulomb strength parameters calculated are given in Table 12 and shown graphically in Figures 24 and 25.

Table 12. Calculated Mohr - Coulomb Strength Parameters of SET 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specimen Orientation</th>
<th>Failure Envelope</th>
<th>$\phi$ (degrees)</th>
<th>Cohesion (MPa)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perpendicular</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematically Derived</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>15.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parallel</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematically Derived</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>15.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 12 and Figures 24 and 25, the mathematically derived Mohr - Coulomb strength parameters are almost identical to the average Mohr - Coulomb strength parameters obtained from the classical method. This is because the least squares fit can be considered an average value of $\sigma_1$ with a variation of $\sigma_3$.

The Mohr - Coulomb strength parameters have also been derived for SET 2 to examine the effect of saturation on the cohesion and the angle
Figure 24. Failure Envelope Comparison, SET 1 (Perpendicular Specimens).
Figure 25. Failure Envelope Comparison, SET 1 (Parallel Specimens).
of internal friction. Since the mathematically derived parameters correlate with the average parameters derived from the classical method of determining the Mohr - Coulomb parameters, only the mathematically derived parameters are calculated for SET 2. Figures 26 and 27 show the plots of $\sigma_1$ vs $\sigma_3$ and the least squares curve fit through the data to calculate the parameters $N$ and $\sigma_{uc}$ needed to mathematically develop the Mohr - Coulomb strength parameters. From Figures 26 and 27, the following expression are obtained:

Perpendicular Specimens:

$$\sigma_1 = 59.14 + 7.37\sigma_3$$

Parallel Specimens:

$$\sigma_1 = 71.33 + 9.06\sigma_3$$

Table 13 compares the Mohr - Coulomb strength parameters for the Tiva Canyon Tuff specimens from SET 1 and SET 2.
Figure 26. Least Squares Fit - Compressive Strength vs Confining Pressure, SET 2 (Perpendicular Specimens).
Table 13. Comparison of Mohr - Coulomb Strength Parameters of SET 1 and SET 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Set Number</th>
<th>Specimen Orientation</th>
<th>( \phi ) (degrees)</th>
<th>Cohesion (MPa)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SET 1</td>
<td>Perpendicular</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>15.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parallel</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>15.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SET 2</td>
<td>Perpendicular</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>10.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parallel</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>10.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 13, saturation reduces the cohesion of the specimens, however, the angle of internal friction remains unchanged with saturation.

Comparisons With Previous Data

Compressive Strength Comparison

The easiest way to compare the compressive strength data is in tabular form. Table 14 lists the confining pressures specimens were tested at, average test results from this study, previous test results, and suggested values for compressive strength values for Tiva Canyon Tuff. Table 14 shows there is a very wide range of compressive strength data. The compressive strengths determined from this study are much lower than previous test data (125% lower for the high strain rate and 10 MPa confining pressure). Also, the suggested compressive strength values are much higher than the compressive strength values determined in this
study.

The compressive strength difference may be due to several factors. The samples may have been damaged by excavation, thus lowering the compressive strength. Also, the samples of TCw tuff which were obtained for this study were basically outcrop samples, whereas specimens which were previously tested were from depths ranging from 26.7 meters to 64.8 meters (Price, 1982). Thus, the samples used in this study may have been stressed from the removal of overburden and weakened by weathering processes.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confining Pressure (MPa)</th>
<th>Average Compressive Strength (MPa)</th>
<th>Previous Test Data* (strain rate = 10^4 s^-1)</th>
<th>Suggested Values (MPa)**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strain rate: 10^-5 s^-1</td>
<td>strain rate: 10^-4 s^-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>SET 1: 154.61</td>
<td>SET 3: 180.84</td>
<td>406 MPa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SET 2: 154.90</td>
<td>NO DATA</td>
<td>NO DATA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SET 1: 122.01</td>
<td>NO DATA</td>
<td>NO DATA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SET 2: 102.00</td>
<td>NO DATA</td>
<td>NO DATA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>SET 1: 83.14</td>
<td>NO DATA</td>
<td>7.03 &amp; 364 MPa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SET 2: 72.00</td>
<td>NO DATA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One other type of compressive strength comparison which can be
used is to compare the compressive strength - porosity relationship from this study and other studies. Figure 28 shows a plot of the compressive strengths of specimens from SET 2 tested at a confining pressure of 0.1 MPa versus the specimen porosity. A best fit line is plotted through this data and compared with a best fit line through similar data for tuffs from the Nevada tests tested at the same conditions. As shown by Figure 28, the data from this study shows a similar trend as the trend shown by Price et. al. (1994). However, the data presented by Price et. al. (1994) includes not only Tiva Canyon Tuff, but other tuffs as well.

Young’s Modulus Comparison

Data from this study, test data from Olsson and Jones (1980) and suggested values of Young’s Modulus for Tiva Canyon Tuff and TCw are presented in Table 15. Table 15 shows that previous testing of Tiva Canyon Tuff specimens has produced large variations in Young’s Modulus values. None of the specimens tested for this study came near to the Young’s Modulus values determined by previous testing. This difference may be explained by the differences in the specimens used in each study. However, the suggested values of Young’s Modulus are close to the values obtained by testing SET 1 specimens. Specimens from SET 2 have a Young’s
Figure 28. Best Fit Line - Compressive Strength vs Porosity, SET 2 (Specimens Tested at a Confining Pressure of 0.1 MPa).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confining Pressure (MPa)</th>
<th>Average Young's Modulus (GPa)</th>
<th>Previous Test Data* (strain rate = 10^-4 s^-1)</th>
<th>Suggested Values (GPa)**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strain rate: 10^-5 s^-1</td>
<td>strain rate: 10^-4 s^-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>SET 1: 24.60</td>
<td>SET 3: 19.15</td>
<td>43.9 GPa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SET 2: 15.48</td>
<td>NO DATA</td>
<td>no suggested values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SET 1: 22.12</td>
<td>NO DATA</td>
<td>NO DATA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SET 2: 12.39</td>
<td>NO DATA</td>
<td>no suggested values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>SET 1: 23.41</td>
<td>NO DATA</td>
<td>.41 &amp; 57.5 GPa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SET 2: 11.26</td>
<td>NO DATA</td>
<td>19.9 ± 3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A comparison can also be made with the Young's Modulus - porosity relationship from tuffs from the Nevada Test Site and the tuffs tested in this study. Figure 29 shows the variation of Young's Modulus with porosity for SET 2 specimens tested at a confining pressure of 0.1 MPa and the same variation of other tuffs from the Nevada Test Site tested by Price et. al. (1994). Both sets of specimens were tested under similar conditions. It is obvious that the Young’s Modulus values determined for the study by Price et. al. (1994) were much higher than the modulus...
Figure 29. Best Fit Line - Young's Modulus vs Porosity, SET 2 (Specimens Tested at a Confining Pressure of 0.1 MPa).
values determined for this study. However, the same general trend is observed, decreasing Young’s Modulus with increasing porosity.

**Mohr - Coulomb Strength Parameters Comparison**

Table 16 compares the Mohr - Coulomb strength parameters determined by this study with Mohr - Coulomb strength parameters from previous studies and the suggested values the Mohr - Coulomb strength parameters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cohesion (MPa)</td>
<td>cohesion (MPa)</td>
<td>cohesion (MPa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SET 1</td>
<td>Perpendicular</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>15.78</td>
<td>68 28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parallel</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>15.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SET 2</td>
<td>Perpendicular</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>10.89</td>
<td>68 28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parallel</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>10.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16 shows that the suggested values and values from previous testing are much higher than the Mohr - Coulomb strength parameters determined in this study. The angle of internal friction value determined by Olsson and Jones (1980) may be higher since they tested their specimens at higher strain rates, which result in higher compressive strengths. However, the specimens which were tested for this study at
the strain rates used by Olsson and Jones (1980) had far lower compressive strength values than those obtained in their study.
CONCLUSIONS

Several conclusions on the compressive strength and Young’s Modulus of specimens from the thermo-mechanical unit TCw can be drawn from the triaxial testing performed for this study.

• There is a large variation in compressive strengths and Young’s Moduli of specimens from the thermo-mechanical unit TCw.

• Generally, there is an increase in compressive strength with an increase in confining pressure.

• An increase in confining pressure raises Young’s Moduli for specimens cored parallel to the lithophysal cavities but has no effect on the Young’s Moduli for specimens cored perpendicular to the lithophysal cavities.

• Generally, saturation lowers the average compressive strengths of TCw specimens.

• Saturation lowers the average Young’s Modulus values of TCw specimens.

• Saturation lowers the cohesion of TCw specimens, but has no appreciable effect on the angle of internal friction of the specimens.

• An increase in strain rate generally increases the compressive strengths of TCw specimens.

• An increase in strain rate generally decreases the Young’s Moduli of
TCw specimens.

- TCw specimens show no indication of an average compressive strength anisotropy.
- TCw specimens show an indication of an average Young’s Modulus anisotropy.
- An increase in porosity generally lowers the compressive strength of TCw specimens.
- An increase in porosity generally lowers the Young’s Moduli of TCw specimens.
- Comparisons with previous data show that the data from this study is generally lower than the strengths and Young’s Modulus values from previous studies and lower than the suggested values. This difference may most probably due to excavation damage and a shallower rock specimen than the rock specimens used in the previous studies.
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APPENDIX - Test Data
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specimen Number - Orientation</th>
<th>Specimen Dimensions (inches)</th>
<th>Specimen Weights (grams)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Diameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>726A - PER</td>
<td>5.072</td>
<td>2.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>726B - PER</td>
<td>4.488</td>
<td>2.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>726C - PER</td>
<td>5.231</td>
<td>2.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>726D - PAR</td>
<td>4.311</td>
<td>2.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>727A - PER</td>
<td>4.459</td>
<td>2.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>728B - PAR</td>
<td>4.523</td>
<td>2.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>727C - PAR</td>
<td>4.014</td>
<td>2.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>729A - PER</td>
<td>4.909</td>
<td>2.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>729D - PER</td>
<td>4.742</td>
<td>2.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>729E - PER</td>
<td>4.745</td>
<td>2.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>729F - PAR</td>
<td>4.790</td>
<td>2.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>729G - PAR</td>
<td>4.783</td>
<td>2.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>729H - PAR</td>
<td>4.903</td>
<td>2.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>730A - PAR</td>
<td>4.580</td>
<td>2.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>730B - PAR</td>
<td>4.345</td>
<td>2.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>730C - PAR</td>
<td>4.484</td>
<td>2.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>730D - PER</td>
<td>4.439</td>
<td>2.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>730E - PER</td>
<td>4.499</td>
<td>2.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>731A - PAR</td>
<td>4.602</td>
<td>2.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>734B - PER</td>
<td>4.601</td>
<td>2.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>734D - PAR</td>
<td>4.597</td>
<td>2.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>735C - PAR</td>
<td>4.695</td>
<td>2.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>736A - PER</td>
<td>4.290</td>
<td>2.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>736B - PAR</td>
<td>4.743</td>
<td>2.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>738B - PAR</td>
<td>4.087</td>
<td>2.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>737B - PAR</td>
<td>4.711</td>
<td>2.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>739A - PER</td>
<td>4.892</td>
<td>2.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specimen Number - Orientation</td>
<td>Specimen Dimensions (inches)</td>
<td>Specimen Weights (grams)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Diameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>741A - PER</td>
<td>4.825</td>
<td>2.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>742A - PAR</td>
<td>4.766</td>
<td>2.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>742B - PAR</td>
<td>4.825</td>
<td>2.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>742C - PAR</td>
<td>4.882</td>
<td>2.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>743A - PER</td>
<td>4.581</td>
<td>2.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>743B - PER</td>
<td>4.536</td>
<td>2.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>746A - PER</td>
<td>4.168</td>
<td>2.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>746C - PAR</td>
<td>4.980</td>
<td>2.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>747A - PER</td>
<td>4.868</td>
<td>2.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>747B - PER</td>
<td>4.616</td>
<td>2.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>747C - PER</td>
<td>4.667</td>
<td>2.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>749B - PAR</td>
<td>4.652</td>
<td>2.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>749C - PAR</td>
<td>4.120</td>
<td>2.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>749E - PER</td>
<td>4.715</td>
<td>2.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750A - PAR</td>
<td>4.278</td>
<td>2.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750B - PAR</td>
<td>4.721</td>
<td>2.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750C - PAR</td>
<td>4.824</td>
<td>2.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750D - PAR</td>
<td>4.842</td>
<td>2.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750E - PER</td>
<td>4.860</td>
<td>2.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750G - PER</td>
<td>4.931</td>
<td>2.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750K - PAR</td>
<td>4.337</td>
<td>2.115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Diagram showing the relationship between Differential Axial Stress (MPa) and Radial Strain (%) for Axial Strain, Radial Strain, and Volumetric Strain.
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