BOREHOLE ELECTROMAGNETIC SURVEY OF THE ENGINEERING GEOSCIENCE WELL FIELD AT THE RICHMOND FIELD STATION: DATA PRESENTATION

Dimitri Bevc

Engineering Geoscience University of California, Berkeley December 1987

Introduction

A borehole electromagnetic survey of the Engineering Geoscience well field at the Richmond Field Station was carried out on October 23 and November 7, 1987. The work was performed with a Geonics EM-39 induction logger.

The objective of the survey was to determine the stratigraphy of the site and to obtain background data for comparison with data that may be obtained during future hydrologic experiments. The findings of this investigation are in general agreement with the geology proposed by Pouch,¹ and the resistivity and self-potential logs taken by Asch.² However, a more complete picture of the stratigraphy is now possible.

The data is presented as apparent conductivity plots and interpreted in two stratigraphic sections.

- 1 -

Survey Procedure and Equipment Description

The survey was carried out by Seunghee Lee and Dimitri Bevc, under the direction of Professor Alex Becker. Observation wells one through six and the extraction well were logged on October 23 and again on November 7, 1987 (Figure 1). Additional readings were made on the dates of October 28 and November 6 to confirm survey validity.

The procedure at each well on the 23rd of October was to measure the conductivity of the water near the surface of the well, and then to log the hole, recording both in-phase and quadrature components. On the seventh of November, the depth of the water in the well was measured along with the conductivity, and only the quadrature component was recorded. Water depth and conductivity are presented in Table 1. The EM data from the two days was found to be consistent and is presented in Figures 3 through 9.

The Geonics EM-39 operates at a frequency of 39.2 kHz and has an intercoil spacing of 50 cm. A focusing coil is employed to reduce sensitivity to borehole fluid and improve vertical resolution. Peak instrument response occurs at a radial distance of 28 cm from the probe axis and 50% of the response arises from material at radial distances greater than 58 cm. The measured quantities are the quadrature component of the magnetic field, which is in most cases proportional to apparent conductivity, and the in-phase component.³

The EM-39 was interfaced with two Hewlett-Packard digital voltmeters and an Hewlett-Packard 300 computer. The

- 2 -

probe was lowered and raised by hand. A BEI model H25 optical encoder on the pulley enabled data to be recorded every 3.46 inches. Data was gathered both on the way down and up the hole.

Total time to conduct the entire procedure at one well is approximately 20 minutes. The time required to actually transit the well with the probe is about two to three minutes in each direction. Due to the time constant of the instrument this results in a depth shift of about one foot.⁴

Data Description

The data is presented as plots of apparent conductivity versus depth. The depth scale is one inch to 20 feet. Conductivity is plotted at a scale of one inch to 200 mS/m for Figure 2, and one inch to 100 mS/m for all the other Figures. Figure 2 is a comparison of the logs for observation wells one through five and the extraction well. Correlation between anomalies is evident in these plots. Figures 3 through 9 are comparisons of data gathered on October 23 and November 7 for all the wells.

Examination of the figures reveals the data to be very repeatable. Except for wells four and five which were started two feet below surface, the logs taken on November 7 were all started with the probe center at ground level. The October 23 logs were started with the top of the probe at the top of the casing. This accounts for the different starting points of the plots.

- 3 -

The saturated response evident in the extraction well (Figure 9) is due to wire screens located at depths of 70 to 75 feet and below 100 feet. All of the logs have a strong near surface anomaly in excess of 200 mS/m at approximately the four to ten foot level. This anomaly has been identified with Pouch's "Jacob" layer. The wells were cased in this depth range when the SP and resistivity logs were ran, so no previous data was available for this zone. Surface resistivity data substantiates the existence of this near surface conductive layer (see Appendix).

The anomalies have been named in keeping with Pouch's convention. Feminine names denote inferred aquifer zones and masculine names denote inferred aquitard zones. The inferred aquifers seem to correlate with conductivity lows. Figures 10 and 12 illustrate how these names are assigned and correlated with Pouch's stratigraphy (Figure 11). The data reveals many previously undetected layers, some of the most prominent of which are Hunter, Denali, 17, Kahiltna, and Crosson. These new names were assigned arbitrarily so as to be distinguishable from Pouch's.

SP logs reflect the The resistivity and same character as the induction log. A good example is the SP log of OBS 5, where the character of the curve, particularly below 60 feet follows that of the EM log very closely (Figure 15). This type of correlation is evident in all the logs. There is an unexplained offset in depth between the EM data and the Resistivity/SP data, especially as depth increases. For the extraction well, the SP data shows the sequence Alice, Cliff, Kathy, Deborah to match the EM data very well, but as depth increases the Becky anomaly is offset by about four feet (Figure 16). The Gamma logs correlate to the same degree as Here, the inferred aguifer zones the others. appear to correspond to gamma count highs.

- 4 -

Stratigraphy

Figure 13 is a stratigraphic interpretation of the EM logs along cross-section AA'. The depths and thicknesses are estimated. Aside from the numerous additional layers, there are other significant departures from Pouch's cross-section. The Cliff layer is split into the Cliff and Hunter layers by Deborah, Elias, and Kathy. The latter three layers pinch out somewhere between OBS 1 and 3, where Cliff and Hunter merge. The Kathy layer is replaced by Ruth in OBS 1, and Ruth is present throughout the cross-section. The Ted, Becky, and Tom layers are extended into OBS 1.

Some of the most interesting features along crosssection BB' (Figure 14), are the additional layers between Lisa and Denali at OBS 6 and the pinching out of 17 at OBS 2. This cross-section indicates a dip to the East for the deeper layers.

Conclusion

The results of this survey allow a more complete analysis of the stratigraphy at the Engineering Geoscience well field. The EM data is easier to interpret than the previous logs and was successfully correlated with known structure.

- 5 -

TABLE	1
-------	---

Well #	Water 1	Conductivity		
	Depth below	Height above	11-7	10-23
	feet	feet	mS/m	mS/m
1	11.3	7.0	25.9	27.7
2	10.5	8.3	30.0	29.5
3	9.9	8.6	35.5	37.4
4	10.1	8.1	57.0	62.6
5	10.0	8.2	30.7	32.7
6	10.6	7.2	51.2	54.0
EXT	10.1	8.3	32.8	35.0

(*) Water depth relative to ground surface and water elevation relative to mean sea level as measured on November 7, 1987. Conductivity of water in millisiemens per meter as measured on October 23 and November 7, 1987.

- 6 -

References

¹ G. W. Pouch, <u>Hydrogeologic Site Assesment of the</u> <u>Engineering Geoscience Well Field at the Richmond Field</u> <u>Station, Contra Costa County, California.</u> Engineering <u>Geosciences, Department of Materials Science and Mineral</u> <u>Engineering, University of California, Berkeley, 1987.</u>

² T. Asch, Engineering Geoscience, Department of Materials Science and Mineral Engineering, University of California, Berkeley 94720. Personal communication November 1987.

³ J. D. McNeill, <u>Geonics Technical Note TN-20: Geonics EM39</u> <u>Borehole Conductivity Meter Theory of Operation.</u> Geonics Limited, Mississauga, Ontario Canada, February 1986.

4 K. C. Taylor and J. W. Hess, <u>Field Evaluation of Geonics</u> <u>EM-39</u>, Water Resources Center, Desert Research Institute, Reno, Nevada, 1987.



Figure 1. Locations of Engineering Geoscience Wells and cross-sections AA' and BB'.





Figure 2a. Comparison of logs for observation wells five, four, two, three, and one (from bottom to top). Successive plots are offset by 100 mS/m. Horizontal scale is 1"=20', vertical scale is 1"=200 mS/m.



Figure 2b. Comparison of logs for observation well five, extraction, four, three, and one (from bottom to top). Successive plots are offset by 100 mS/m. Horizontal scale is 1"=20', vertical scale is 1"=200 mS/m.



Figure 3. Data from observation well one, taken on October 23 and November 11, 1987. Data for October 23 is offset by 100 mS/m. Horizontal scale 1"=20', vertical scale 1"=100 mS/m.



Figure 4. Data from observation well two, taken on October 23 and November 11, 1987. Data for October 23 is offset by 100 mS/m. Horizontal scale 1"=20', vertical scale 1"=100 mS/m.



Figure 5. Data from observation well three, taken on October 23 and November 11, 1987. Data for October 23 is offset by 100 mS/m. Horizontal scale 1"=20', vertical scale 1"=100 mS/m.



Figure 6. Data from observation well four, taken on October 23 and November 11, 1987. Data for October 23 is offset by 100 mS/m. Horizontal scale 1*=20', vertical scale 1*=100 mS/m.



Figure 7. Data from observation well five, taken on October 23 and November 11, 1987. Data for October 23 is offset by 100 mS/m. Horizontal scale 1"=20', vertical scale 1"=100 mS/m.



Figure 8. Data from observation well six, taken on October 23 and November 11, 1987. Data for October 23 is offset by 100 mS/m. Horizontal scale 1"=20', vertical scale 1"=100 mS/m.



Figure 9. Data from the extraction well, taken on October 23 and November 11, 1987. Data for October 23 is offset by 100 ms/m. Horizontal scale 1"=20', vertical scale 1"=100 ms/m.



3

Figure 10. Electromagnetic induction logs along line AA', illustrating how names were assigned to anomalies.

Richmond Field Station Vertical Scale 1:240 10 meters **Engineering Geoscience Well Field** Horizontal Scale 1:250 Vertical Exaggeration 1.04X (west of Building 300) 0 10 meters Datum is ground level Stratigraphic Cross-section North South (about 17' above mean sea level). OBS 2 OBS 3 INJ OBS 4 OBS 1 EXT OBS 5 and the state of t SI WANT I TO T ALCHINE TO M the same provide a state to be the Bring & Brings lan Cliff 1000 -Thu V 7 7 4010 Nathalie Chinese - Brit Shar 100 - Reller Mike 120-Figure 11. Stratigraphic cross-section along AA' as determined by Pouch. Figure 11 Geologic Correlations ï



Figure 12. Electromagnetic induction logs along line BB', illustrating how names were assigned to anomalies.

Richmo	ond Field Station			ς	10 meters	Vertical Sca	le 1:240	
Engine	ering Geoscience	Well Field	in the second			Horizofiai S Vertical Exa	noeration 1 04X	
(west of Bu	ilding 300)		10 meters	0		Datum is an	und level	
uth Stratigraph	ic Cross-section					(about 17' al	nove mean sea level).	North
						(upout		·
						OBS 2		A
20 E	EXT			OBS 4		OBS 3	INJ	OBS 1
5 <u>5</u>		n. Briteliternen -	BRIAN			a 14 14 14		
	and the second	The state of the s	JACOB	- same - taile	-14 - 17 ⁻¹⁶	L 15th March 175		
· Saarci ar		A	3.84	1				
ant Property States	A second state and an and a second state of the second state of th	And a state of the	PLAC	The second s	William and William And	P. M. S. Million	1933	1
1917 - C.			Southern Street and		State State State	AND THE REAL PROPERTY.	sent in the set	Presidential Same Same 1
and the second second	and the second se		ST CROSS SCIENCES	A CONTRACTOR OF THE OWNER	Main an	and the second s	Sector Children and a sector	10 10 AV
		RUTH	and starts with the second starts			L	All second s	
TOCHN P LOGAN	and the second second second second	The second se	The second second	and the second second	4	the state of the second states	میں ^{معر} ب ہے، م ^{یر} م	And In 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19
·····	2 2 2		was trinks of	and pro-	The summer of the set of the	States and the second second	Contract T. Co., on a submitted on State	20 E 0000000000000000000000000000000000
	Construction Role of an automatic and an and	and the state of the second	5 Blok -962 (1991)	11111	i i	1.3		All the Martin American "
Contract Sectors	the standard and a standard and	Dimenter Distantie	د او اور دوه او دوس است. د او اور د و	Phase Andrew Manager	Carling Street	- and the fill of the second	to the second	Out the light County of Carlow 4.
and the second second	Martin Contraction and Contraction of the Contracti	Surgers you and the WANN	1 / Somewith	1 Chandred address to	Martin Barris	the Martin when a survey	the second s	¥ (1292
Anna an	10	TOM		1	A THE PROPERTY AND A THE PROPERT	1		
Sector and	······································		9. u		- The second states	-?		Second 45
and the second s		BECKY THIS	1	T CARDAN RE AND MANAGER	to school of a line of the second	A TANKING PERSONAL PROPERTY AND A DESCRIPTION OF THE PERSON AND A DESCRIPTION AND A DESCRI	And the second s	State of the state
		TED	A Contraction of the second		Another and the state of the state	and the second	A CONTRACTOR OF THE OWNER OF THE	The second s
	?	CAS	IN Shi wasan a shi wasan	Pepper Philippeneters Present	A CONTRACTOR OF A CONTRACTOR O	HE STRANDA		Land Street
			ALL		insuit the state		and the second and	and an interest and and and and
4- U.S			Che Stangel State	Tarter and all the	A CONTRACTOR OF A DATE OF A CONTRACTOR	and the second s	Real and the second	
No. and an other	NATHALIE			+	? 7 -		4	l.
		FORAKER	-1	torest and				
	Tourseland a strange day like the	and the second	and the state of the	1272 2.23			*	
		Termer 2	A Construction of the other					
MARIA				<u>1</u>				
				1				
	1							

Figure 13. Stratigraphic cross-section along line AA' as inferred from electromagnetic induction logs.

a,

1

÷.

.

ï

B

OBS 2

OBS 3

0356

B

BRIAL	The second state of the second of the second s
Jackson States	The second se
IAN	
A an average of the second sec	and year the second and a second
	A DE LA CARACTERIA DE LA C
RUTH	
AN SAME DUP MINING THE LOOG APP - I APPREMINATION PROVIDED IN	and a special provide a set of the
Elsa	
LADING DELLAT	and the second sec
The state of the second s	
S DENALI	ANALY AND ALL
and the second	And the second sec
Kamutua	and the second
Tom	
Becky Har	The state of the s
	THE W

TAUANA ? CROSON

Figure 14. Stratigraphic cross-section along line BB' as inferred from electromagnetic induction logs. Vertical scale 1"=20'



Figure 15. Resistivity and SP logs from observation well 5 taken on September 18, 1986.



Figure 16. Self-Potential log from the extraction well taken on October 7, 1986.

APPENDIX:

RESISTIVITY SURVEY TO DELINEATE THE NEAR SURFACE ANOMALY AT THE RICHMOND FIELD STATION

Induction logs of the Engineering Geoscience wells at the Richmond Field station indicate an anomalously high conductivity near the surface. To verify the existence of a high conductivity associated with Pouch's Jacob layer, a Wenner resistivity array was deployed in the vicinity of observation well number four.

One set of readings was taken on November 11, 1987 for dipole separations ranging from one to 24 feet. This data is presented in Table Al. Figure Al shows how this data is fit by a three layer curve.¹ The fit indicates a layer of approximately 2000 mS/m and thickness of one foot at a depth of three feet, between two 74 mS/m layers.

Although this data set confirms the existence of a conductive layer, the parameters are only approximate since the data is not fit extremely well by the theoretical curve.

¹ J. C. Van Dam and J. J. Meulenkamp, <u>Standard Graphs</u> for <u>Resistivity Prospecting</u>, <u>Rijkswatestaat</u>, The Netherlands, 1969.

 Dipole Spacing (feet)	Apparent Resistivity (ohm-meters)
 1	13.4
2	14.6
3	8.6
4	6.5
6	6.9
8	7.7
12	6.9
18	10.3
24	11.5

TABLE A1

Apparent resistivity from Wenner array in the vicinity of observation well four, November 11, 1987.