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Abstract: Laboratory measurements of elastic interface waves were made using a synthetic fracture in an aluminum specimen. Elastic interface waves were observed for shear wave polarization perpendicular to the fracture plane but not for shear wave polarization parallel to the fracture plane. Group velocities of the elastic interface waves were measured as a function of stress on the sample. The group velocities of both interface waves increased with increasing stress. The specific stiffnesses of the synthetic fracture in aluminum is predicted using the measured group velocities of both interface waves.

1 INTRODUCTION

Fractures play a key role in underground structures and processes. Locating and characterizing fracture by seismic techniques is therefore of great importance to mine stability, production of energy sources in fractured reservoirs, waste isolation, and the study of earthquakes. Though fractures in the Earth are widespread, fundamental issues about their properties must still be addressed. An example is the existence of elastic interface waves along a fracture. A Stoneley wave (Stoneley, 1924) is an elastic interface wave that can travel along a welded interface, i.e., an interface across which stresses and displacements are both continuous. However, a fracture is a non-welded interface, i.e., an interface across which stresses are discontinuous but displacements are continuous. The discontinuity in fracture displacement has been measured quasi-statically in the laboratory by several investigators for internal and shear displacements (Goodman, 1976; Bastia et al., 1983; Swan, 1983; Brown & Scholz, 1985; Yoshida & Scholz, 1989).

The displacement discontinuity model considers a two-welded interface for wave propagation across a fracture. From this purely elastic model, transmission and reflection coefficients, and group velocities are derived which depend on the frequency of the excitation signal and the ratio of fracture-specific stiffnesses (stress/velocity) to the seismic impedance of the half-spaces. The displacement discontinuity model has been found to reproduce the effects of fractures on wave propagation for both synthetic fractures (Myer et al., 1985; Pyrak-Nolte et al., 1990a) and natural fractures in rock (Pyrak-Nolte et al., 1990b). In this paper, the theory for existence of elastic interface waves propagating along a fracture will be presented and compared with direct observations on a synthetic fracture in the laboratory.

999
The existence of elastic interface waves travelling along a fracture is derived by modelling the fracture as a non-welded interface. A non-welded interface is described theoretically by a set of boundary conditions: stress (τ) across the interface is continuous (τ₁ = τ₂) but the displacements (u) across the interface are discontinuous (u₁ = u₂ = u₀, where k is the specific stiffness of the fracture). Several investigators have used these boundary conditions to study wave propagation transmitted across or reflected from a fracture or set of fractures (Kendall & Tabor, 1971; Schoenberg, 1980 & 1983; Pyrzak-Noile et al., 1990a,b). The displacement discontinuity boundary conditions were applied to two generalized Rayleigh waves travelling in the half-space on either side of the fracture assuming discontinuity in both normal and tangential displacements (Pyrzak-Noile & Cock, 1977). Existence of elastic interface waves along a fracture is determined by finding the velocity for which the following determinant is equal to zero (assuming the material properties of each half-space are equal).

\[ \begin{vmatrix} 1 - \alpha^2 & \beta \alpha^2 \gamma^2 \\ (1 - \alpha^2) \beta^2 & 1 - \alpha^2 \end{vmatrix} \]

where

- \( \alpha \) - compressional wave velocity
- \( \beta \) - shear wave velocity
- \( \gamma \) - shear specific stiffness
- \( \alpha_c \) - normal specific stiffness
- \( \omega \) - angular frequency
- \( c \) - interface wave phase velocity
- \( k \) - wave number ( \( \omega \) / \( c \) )

**Table 1. Parameters assumed for modelling elastic-interface waves**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Density</td>
<td>2700 kg/m³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compressional Wave Velocity(^1)</td>
<td>6476.2 m/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shear Wave Velocity(^1)</td>
<td>3120.6 m/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>1.0 MHz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)Measured
Two waves were found to exist: a fast and a slow wave. The existence of both waves depends on the specific stiffness of the fracture, the frequency of the excitation signal, and the physical properties of the material on either side of the fracture (which for a fracture are taken to be equal). Both waves are dispersive and the velocities of both waves range between the Rayleigh wave velocity and the shear wave velocity. Figure 1 is a graph of the phase velocity for both waves as a function of fracture specific stiffness, based on the density of stishovite, and the measured compressional and shear wave velocities of the aluminum specimen (Table 1). The interface wave velocities approach the shear velocity with increasing fracture specific stiffness. For low values of fracture specific stiffness, the phase velocity of each wave approaches the Rayleigh wave velocity. Neither waves exist when the transverse component of the elastic wave is parallel to the fracture plane. These waves are not Stoneley waves, because a Stoneley wave does not exist if the material properties on either side of the interface are identical. The particle motion of each wave is shown in Figure 2 as a function of distance from the fracture. Both waves have inphase particle motion. The slow wave is inphase in the direction parallel to the fracture plane and thus only sensitive to changes in shear stiffness, while the fast wave is in phase in the direction perpendicular to the fracture and thus is only sensitive to changes in the normal stiffness.

3 EXPERIMENTAL SET-UP

To measure elastic interface waves that propagate along a fracture, a synthetic fracture...
was made in a cylinder of aluminum (28.3 cm diameter by 28.3 cm high). Aluminum was chosen because of its low attenuation. Before cutting the aluminum to form the fracture, compressional and shear wave velocities were measured on the intact specimen. The synthetic fracture was made by cutting the aluminum in half, plasing down the surfaces and then sandblasting the surfaces with 300 µm grit to rough the surfaces.

Figure 2. Particle motion of fast and slow interface waves for increasing depth from the interface.
Figure 3 is a diagram of the experimental set-up. Shear wave piezoelectric crystals (1 MHz resonant frequency) were mounted diametrically opposed straddling the fracture. The shear wave particle motion is perpendicular to the fracture plane (90°). The transducers were excited with a 1000 V spike 0.3 μs in duration at a repetition rate of 100 cycles/sec. The received signal was sent to a digital oscilloscope and the data were collected by computer. To change the stiffness of the fracture, the aluminum specimen was placed in a load frame and subjected to a range of stresses (0 MPa to 30 MPa). Measurements were also made for shear wave polarizations of 90° (parallel to the fracture plane) and at 45°.

4 RESULTS

Figure 4 shows the received waveforms for shear wave particle motions of 0° and 90°. An interface wave is observed for 0° and arrives 5.92 microseconds after the arrival of the shear wave at 94.80 microseconds. The amplitude of the shear wave relative to the amplitude of the interface wave indicates that there is almost complete coupling of the transducer energy into the interface wave. For a shear wave orientation of 90°, no interface wave is observed to exist, as predicted by the theory. For an orientation of 45°, the shear wave and interface wave have nearly equal amplitudes. The effect of fracture specific stiffness on elastic interface waves was examined by applying normal stress to the specimen to change the fracture specific stiffness. Figure 5 contains the received waveform (0° orientation) when the specimen is subjected to 3 MPa and 13.2 MPa. At 3 MPa only one interface wave is observed which arrives 5.22 microseconds after the shear wave arrival. At 3 MPa, a broadening of the interface wave is observed, suggesting the emergence of another interface wave. As stress is increased on the aluminum specimen to 13.2 MPa, a second (fast wave) interface
Figure 4. Received waveforms for shear polarizations perpendicular to the fracture plane (0°) and parallel to the fracture plane (90°). No interface wave is observed for a shear wave orientation of 90°.

Figure 5. Received waveforms (shear wave orientation 0°) for stresses of 3 MPa and 13.2 MPa for a fracture in aluminum. As the fracture specific stiffness increases because of the increase in normal stress on the fracture, the fast interface wave emerges.
The fast wave arrives 2.12 microseconds after the shear wave arrival (94.78 microseconds) while the slow wave arrives 5.22 microseconds after the shear wave arrival.

The group velocity for the waves is determined from the measured time delay of the system delay (0.84s) divided by the length of the travel path. Figure 6 is a graph of the measured group velocity for the two interface waves and the shear wave for an orientation of 90°. The shear wave velocity remained essentially constant with increasing stress. For both interface waves the group velocity increases with increasing stress.

Figure 6. Group velocity of shear wave, slow interface wave, and fast interface wave for a fracture in an aluminum specimen as a function of normal stress on the specimen.

5 ANALYSIS

From the theory, it was determined that the slow wave is only sensitive to changes in shear stiffness of the fracture and the fast is sensitive only to changes in the normal fracture stiffness. From the experimental data, the shear and normal stiffness of the fracture can be predicted using the theory for elastic interface waves propagating along a fracture. Because group velocities are measured in the experiment, it is necessary to calculate theoretical values of group velocity. If a wave is non-dispersive then the group velocity is equal to the phase velocity. However, the elastic interface waves are dispersive and the group velocity is calculated based on 

$$\text{velocity} = \frac{\text{distance}}{\text{time}}$$

Figure 7 shows the theoretical curves of group velocity as a function of fracture stiffness for the parameters listed in Table 1. In comparing the phase velocity (Figure 1) and group velocity (Figure 7) of the elastic interface waves, the group velocity is lower in value than the phase velocity for a constant value of fracture stiffness.
Figure 7. Theoretical and measured group velocities as a function of fracture specific stiffness.

In Figure 7, the measured values of group velocity are plotted on the theoretical curves from which the normal and shear stiffness of the fracture is predicted. Table 2 gives the values of the shear and normal stiffness predicted by the theory as a function of stress. Both shear and normal fracture stiffness increased with increasing stress. Fracture stiffness normal to the fracture plane is smaller in value than the shear fracture stiffness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stress (MPa)</th>
<th>Normal Stiffness ($10^{12}$ Pa/m)</th>
<th>Shear Stiffness ($10^{12}$ Pa/m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 CONCLUSION

Elastic interface waves were observed in a synthetic fracture in aluminum. From measurements of the group velocities of the waves, fracture specific stiffnesses were predicted for the fracture. For an incident shear wave with particle motion perpendicular
to the fracture, there is almost complete coupling of the energy into the elastic interface. No interface waves are observed for these wave particle motion parallel to the fracture, as predicted by the theory. The observation of this wave represents a further validation of the displacement discontinuity model for modeling wave propagation in a fracture medium. The experimental observation of this wave may result in the reinterpretation of laboratory and field data. In addition, the observation of the elastic waves suggests that with further development, this wave could be used to characterize natural fractures and hydraulic fractures in situ.
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