# Resistivity and Shear Wave Velocity as a Predictive Tool of Sediment Type in Coastal Levee Foundation Soils

Association of Levee Boards of Louisiana 30<sup>th</sup> Annual Workshop

> Derek Goff<sup>1</sup> Juan Lorenzo<sup>1</sup> Koichi Hayashi<sup>2</sup>

1: Department of Geology & Geophysics, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA 2: Geometrics, San Jose, CA

1

### Outline



### 2 Field Study – London Avenue Canal







## Geotechnical Analysis – CPT & Borings



- Advantages
  - Highly detailed
  - Established empirical relationships
- Disadvantages
  - Lack of lateral control in heterogeneous environments





# **Geophysical Analysis**

- Resistivity
  - Groundwater levels
  - Sensitive to saturation
- Shear Wave Velocity
  - Compaction differential
  - Shear modulus Stiffness
- Soil Type Identification
  - Empirical model based on Japanese soil studies (Hayashi et al. 2013)





# **Geophysical Analysis**

- Advantages
  - Fast data collection
    - Resistivity:
      ~10 km per day
    - Shear wave velocity: ~1 km per day
  - Near continuous measurements
    - Detect lateral heterogeneities in soils
  - Deployment in urban environments



Liberty and Gribler (2014)



# Foundation Soil Classification

- Soil Type Identification
  - Unified Soil Classification System (USCS)
    - Grain size
    - Plasticity distinguishes silts from clays

- Risk
  - Piping
    - Unconsolidated sands
  - Saturated soils
    - Dewatering & compaction





#### **Geophysical Analysis**

# **Original Model**



- Statistical Approach
  - Cross-plot of resistivity and V<sub>s</sub>
  - Polynomial approximation
    - Predict soil type distribution
- Identifies 3 Soil Types
  - Clays, sand, gravel
  - Silt is not included
- Field Investigations
  - Japan
  - Washington state



**Geophysical Analysis** 

# Modified Estimation Model

- Identify Clay, Silt, and Sand
  - Plasticity difference between silt and clay
- Vs-Resistivity Relationship
  - Identify saturated sediments







#### Field Setting

### London Park



(Modified from Saucier, 1994)



**Field Setting** 

### Seismic, Resistivity, and Boring Logs



(Google Earth, 2014)



**Field Results** 

# **Resistivity Profile**

- Capacitively Coupled Resistivity
- Decrease resistivity with depth
  - Increasing saturation
  - Soil type change
    - Increase grain size, increase connected pore space



(Image from Geoplot)



**Field Results** 

### Seismic Velocity Models





**Field Results** 

## Soil Type Predictions



13



## Geotechnical vs. Geophysical





### Methods

# Shear Wave Velocity Processing



- Common Midpoint Cross Correlation
  - CMP located between receiver pairs
  - Improves lateral resolution



(Hayashi and Suzuki, 2004)

Methods

### Shear Wave Velocity Processing



<sup>16</sup> (SeismicUnix using Park et al. 1999)

(Geopsy using Wathelet, 2004)

## Conclusions

- Geophysical investigation can save time and cost by identifying low and high risk areas of a foundation study
- Soil type estimation picks up large geologic trends, such as the dipping Pine Island Beach Sand
- New model for Mississippi Delta distinguishes silt from clay and sand

### Future Work & Recommendations

• Gather more geophysical data over existing geotechnical sites

Create best fit model from a coastal zone dataset

- Identify organic soils
- Compensate for changes in overburden pressure with depth

### Acknowledgements









College of Science Department of Geology & Geophysics

### Thank You









College of **Science Science** Department of Geology & Geophysics



## **Physical Properties**

• Resistivity (Porosity, Fluid Saturation)

Resistive Soils	Conductive Soils
Silts	Clays
Unsaturated Sand	Saturated Sands

• Shear Wave Velocity (Stiffness, Density)

High Vs (>120 m/s)	Low Vs
Silts	Clays
Consolidated Sand	Unconsolidated Soils



**Preliminary Results** 

# Soil Type Distribution – Modified Model



# Applications of Geophysical Tests

- Reconnaissance
  - Identify High Risk Areas
    - Lateral heterogeneity
    - Low Vs
- Calibrate
  - Existing geology



Samyn et al. (2013)



# **Resistivity Profile**



### **Original Model Statistics**



0% 20% 40% 60% 80% 100%

### London Park

