Induced Polarization

GeoSci.xyz

Motivation

Minerals



Complex resistivity



Permafrost

Geotechnical



Seafloor massive sulfide



Groundwater



Outline

- Sources of IP
- Conceptual model of IP
- Chargeability
- IP data
- Pseudosections
- Two stage DC-IP inversion
- Case history: Mt. Isa
- EM-IP Inversion (EM decoupling)
- Case history: TKC

Induced Polarization

- Injected currents cause materials to become polarized
- Microscopic causes → macroscopic effect
- Phenomenon is called induced polarization









Conceptual Model of IP

Membrane polarization

Initially - neutral



Apply electric field, build up charges



Charge polarization, Electric dipole



Electrode polarization





Chargeability

Minerals at 1% Concentration in Samples



Material type	Chargeability (msec.)
20% sulfides	2000 - 3000
8-20% sulfides	1000 - 2000
2-8% sulfides	500 - 1000
volcanic tuffs	300 - 800
sandstone, siltstone	100 - 500
dense volcanic rocks	100 - 500
shale	50 - 100
granite, granodiorite	10 - 50
limestone, dolomite	10 - 20

Material type	Chargeability (msec.)
ground water	0
alluvium	1 - 4
gravels	3 - 9
precambrian volcanics	8 - 20
precambrian gneisses	6 - 30
schists	5 - 20
sandstones	3 - 12

Chargeability

Initially - neutral



Apply electric field, build up charges



Charge polarization, Electric dipole



Input current



Measured voltage



IP data

- Seigel (1959):
  - Introduced chargeability: η
  - Effect reduces conductivity

$$\sigma_\eta = \sigma(1-\eta) \qquad \eta \in [0,1)$$

- Theoretical chargeability data

$$d^{IP} = \frac{\phi_s}{\phi_\eta} = \frac{\phi_\eta - \phi_\sigma}{\phi_\eta}$$



- Not directly measureable

IP data: time domain

- IP decay





- IP datum

Dimensionless: $\eta = \phi_s / \phi_\eta$

Value at individual time channel: $\phi_s(t)$

Area under decay curve: $M = \frac{1}{\phi_\eta} \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \phi_s(t) dt$

IP data: frequency domain

- Percent frequency effect:

$$PFE = 100(\frac{\rho_{a2} - \rho_{a1}}{\rho_{a1}})$$

ρ_{a1}: apparent resistivity at f_1

ρ_{a2}: apparent resistivity at f_2



- Phase ψ



IP data

- IP signals due to a perturbation (small change) in conductivity

$$\sigma_\eta = \sigma(1-\eta) \qquad\qquad \eta \in [0, 1)$$

- An IP datum can be written as

$$d_i^{IP} = \sum_{j=1}^{M} J_{ij}\eta_j \qquad i = 1, \ldots, N$$

$$J_{ij} = \frac{\partial log\phi^i}{\partial log\sigma_j}$$

sensitivities for the DC resistivity problem

- In matrix form

$$\mathbf{d}^{IP} = \mathbf{J}\boldsymbol{\eta}$$

$\mathbf{J}$ is an N×M matrix

Summary of IP data

- Time domain:
  - Theoretical chargeability (dimensionless)
  - Integrated decay time (msec)



- Frequency domain:
  - PFE (dimensionless)
  - Phase (mrad)



- For all data types: linear problem

$$\mathbf{d}^{IP} = \mathbf{J}\boldsymbol{\eta}$$

$\mathbf{J}$ is an N×M matrix

IP pseudosections

1) A chargeable block



Chargeability model



Observed apparent chargeability

Pole-Dipole



- Pole-dipole; n=1,8; a=10m; N=316

IP pseudosections

2) A chargeable block with geologic noise





Pole-Dipole



- Pole-dipole; n=1,8; a=10m; N=316

IP pseudosections

3) The “UBC-GIF model”





Pole-Dipole



IP Inversion



Example 1: buried prism



- Pole-dipole; n=1,8; a=10m; N=316; $(\alpha_s, \alpha_x, \alpha_z)$=(.001, 1.0, 1.0)

Pole-Dipole



Example 2: prism with geologic noise



- Pole-dipole; n=1,8; a=10m; N=316; $(\alpha_s, \alpha_x, \alpha_z)$=(.001, 1.0, 1.0)

Pole-Dipole



Example 3: UBC-GIF model



- Pole-dipole; n=1,8; a=10m

Pole-Dipole



Induced Polarization: Summary

- Sources of IP
- Conceptual model of IP
- Chargeability
- IP data
- Pseudosections
- Two stage DC-IP inversion
- Case history: Mt. Isa
- EM-IP Inversion (EM decoupling)
- Case history: TKC

Case history: Mt. Isa

Rutley et al., 2001

Setup

- Mt. Isa (Cluny propect)



- Geologic model



Question

- Can conductive, chargeable units, which would be potential targets within the siltstones, be identified with DC / IP data?

Properties

Geologic model



Resistivity and Chargeability

Rock Unit	Conductivity	Chargeability
Native Bee Siltstone	Moderate	Low
Moondarra Siltstone	Moderate	Low
Breakaway Shale	Very High	Low-None
Mt Novit Horizon	High	High
Surprise Creek Formation	Low	None
Eastern Creek Volcanics	Low	None

Recap: Synthesis from DC

- Identified a major conductor → black shale unit
- Some indication of a moderate conductor

3D resistivity model



Geologic section



Resistivity section



Can a **chargeable**, moderate conductor in the siltstones be identified?

Survey and data

- Eight survey lines
- Two configurations

Surface topography





Apparent chargeability, dipole- pole.



Processing

3D chargeability model



Animation



Interpretation

Resistivity model — Chargeability model



A: Resistive, Non-chargeable

B: Moderate conductivity; low chargeabilty

C: Very high conductivity (> 10 S/m)

E and F: High conductivity and high chargeability

G: Other chargeable regions

Synthesis

Resistivity model   Chargeability model



A: Surprise Creek Formation

- Resistive, non-chargeable

B: Moondarra and Native Bee siltstones

C: Breakaway Shales

- Very high conductivity

E and F: Mt Novit Horizon

- High conductivity and high chargeability

G: Other chargeable regions within siltstone complex

Geologic section



Resistivity section



Induced Polarization: Summary

- Sources of IP
- Conceptual model of IP
- Chargeability
- IP data
- Pseudosections
- Two stage DC-IP inversion
- Case history: Mt. Isa
- Case history: Santa Cecilia
- EM-IP Inversion (EM decoupling)
- Case history: TKC

EM-IP Inversion

EM-IP Inversion: Goals

- Standard time domain DC-IP
- Conductivity inversion
  - DC data
  - EM data
- Illustrate the value of data which is often discarded



EM portion
Generally considered noise

EM-IP Inversion: Goals

- Standard time domain DC-IP
- Conductivity inversion
  - DC data
  - EM data
- Illustrate the value of data which is often discarded
- Use EM conductivity to obtain clean IP data:
  - IP = Observation - EM
- Numerical example from a gradient array





IP portion
Assumed no EM-coupling

Survey and Data

Transmitter



Measured Voltage



EM portion

Generally considered noise

33

Survey and Data

Transmitter



Measured Voltage (off-time)



Observation = EM + IP

Gradient array

- Model

	σ (S/m)	η	τ (s)
A1	1	0	
A2	0.1	0.1	0.5
A3	0.01	0.1	
A4	0.001	0	0.5

- Survey
  - 200m bi-pole (625 data)
  - times: 1-600ms





DC data



DC datum
Observed (+)
Observed (-)
EM data
Normalized potential (V/V)
Time (ms)



(a) DC voltage
A1
A2
A3
Northing (m)
Easting (m)
Voltage (V)
-0.001
-0.022
-0.044



(b) Apparent conductivity
A1
A2
A3
Easting (m)
Apparent conductivity (S/m)
0.021
0.014
0.008

Off-time data





5 ms



80 ms



130 ms



650 ms



DC inversion

- Recovered 3D conductivity



Apparent conductivity



- Depth weighting
  - Compensate for high sensitivity near surface (similar to mag.)

$$\frac{1}{(z - z_0)^3}$$

EM inversion

- Recovered 3D conductivity





- No depth weighting

Conductivity models



- True, DC, and EM conductivities



EM data contain signal

EM decoupling

- Off-time at 80 ms

IP = Observation – EM

EM conductivity



TDEM simulation

Observation

Predicted EM



EM decoupling

- Off-time at 80 ms

IP = Observation – EM

EM conductivity



TDEM simulation

Observation Predicted EM IP



EM decoupling



IP data at 80 ms

IP = Observation – EM

True IP　　　　Half-space



EM decoupling



IP = Observation – EM

IP data at 80 ms



EM decoupling



IP = Observation – EM

IP data at 80 ms



IP inversion

Chargeability > 0.015

True IP



Half-space



DC



EM



Case History:

Inversion of airborne geophysical data over the Tli Kwi Cho kimberlite complex

Devriese et al, 2017; Fournier et al, 2017; Kang et al, 2017

Rock Model from Geophysics



Rock Model from Drilling



Discovery of Tli Kwi Cho (TKC)

DIGHEM Q7200Hz



Location of TKC, NWT



Kimberlite pipe structure



Devriese et al. (2016)

Time domain EM data

DIGHEM (1992)



AeroTEMII (2003)



VTEM (2004)



NanoTEM (1993)





Decay curve



Step 1: Conductivity inversion

DIGHEM



Positive VTEM
(EM-dominant)



→

Cooperative
Inversion

Recovered 3D conductivity



Step 2: EM-decoupling

IP = Observation - EM

130 micro-s

Observed   Predicted EM



Step 2: EM-decoupling

IP = Observation - EM

130 micro-s

Observed | Predicted EM | IP



Step 2: EM-decoupling

IP = Observation - EM

410 micro-s

Observed

Predicted EM





Step 2: EM-decoupling

IP = Observation - EM

410 micro-s

Observed Predicted EM IP



Step 3: 3D IP inversion

Recovered 3D pseudo-chargeability

130 micro-s



Outline of two pipes

Conductivity contour

Step 3: 3D IP inversion

Recovered 3D pseudo-chargeability

130 micro-s

410 micro-s



Outline of two pipes

Conductivity contour

Step 4: Estimate η and τ

Anomaly contours



Cole-Cole model

$$\sigma(\omega) = \sigma_\infty + \sigma_\infty \frac{\eta}{1 + (1-\eta)(\imath\omega\tau)^c}$$



- A1-A3 has small time constant
- A4 has greater time constant

Data Integration



Kimberlite Model





Data Integration: 5 physical property models

Density



Susceptibility



Conductivity



Early chargeability



Late chargeability



Kimberlite Model



Data Integration: 5 physical property models

Density



Susceptibility



Conductivity



Early chargeability



Late chargeability



Kimberlite Model



Rock Model from Geophysics



Rock Model from Drilling



End of Induced Polarization



Additional Material

- Tutorial: IP over Landfills
- Case History: Landfill in Denmark

IP over Landfills

Landfills: Hazards and Goals

- Pollutants
  - Toxic leachates (mercury, arsenic, cadmium, lead, PVC, solvents)
- Concerns
  - Health
  - Water contamination
  - Construction hazard
  - Devalues property
- Goals
  - Locate abandoned landfills
  - Assess size
  - Characterize the waste
  - Monitor reclamation

Nearmont and Congress landfills, Tucson, Arizona

Tucson city limits and regional landfills



Physical Properties

Waste Type	Description	Resistivity	Susceptible	Chargeable
Electronic/ Technological	Metallic objects, heavy metals in solution	Low	Yes	Yes
Construction Debris	Wood, cement, iron rebar, wall board, asbestos, glass, plastics	High	Frequently	Weakly
Earth Materials	Clays, various fill	Low/Moderate	Occasionally	Yes
Green waste	trees, wood clippings etc	Variable	No	Weakly

Traditional Landfill Surveys

Magnetic

DC Resistivity



Near-Surface Electromagnetic



- Most popular surveys have limited success
- IP might be a better diagnostic
- Responsive to: metallic debris, green waste, organic matter, some construction materials

Ryan Airfield (Eastern Pit)

- Waste material: Mixed solid waste (MSW)
- Observations:
  - Resistivity not correlated with pit margins (non-diagnostic)
  - Chargeability (IP) correlates well with historical pit margins (diagnostic)



Dipole-dipole (a=7.5ft, n=0.5-6)

Ryan Airfield (Western Pit)

- Waste material: Construction / demolition
- Observations:
  - Waste correlates with region of high resistivity
  - Waste correlates with chargeable region (significant IP anomaly).

Resistivity



Resistive waste within landfill

Chargeability



IP correlates with landfill

Dipole-dipole (a=7.5ft, n=0.5-6)

Ryan Airfield (Composite)

Chargeability isosurface



- Waste material:
  - MSW and construction / demolition
- Observations:
  - Well locations picked with aim of **not** intercepting waste
  - Verified by drilling

Tumamoc Landfill

- Waste material: Construction / demolition
- Observations:
  - Low resistivity down-gradient from waste → likely conductive leachate
  - Low resistivity and IP offset from one another
  - IP falls within historic landfill boundaries



Tucson region: Organic material

- Waste material: green-waste, trees, clippings
- Observations:
  - Resistivity low
  - Weak but elevated IP signature



Dipole-dipole (a=7.5ft, n=0.5-6)

Nearmont Landfill

- Waste material: Municipal solid waste (MSW)
- Observations:
  - low resistivity + high IP (ideal “fingerprint”)
  - MSW waste confirmed with drilling



Dipole-dipole (a=7.5ft, n=0.5-6)

Example: Landfill Monitoring

- Waste material: municipal solid waste (MSW)
- Surveys:
  - 2003: IP survey
  - 2003-2007: 4 year biodegrediation program
  - 2009: Repeat IP survey
- Observations:
  - Reduction in IP anomaly indicates the effectiveness of biodegredation



Summary

- Resistivity may not be a good indicator of waste

Mixed Waste



Green Waste



Construction/ Demolition Waste



Summary

- Chargeability may be a more consistent indicator of waste

Mixed Waste



Green Waste



Construction/
Demolition
Waste



Case History:
Mapping a landfill, Denmark

Gazoty et al., 2012



Setup

Horlokke area, Denmark



- Landfill
  - Years: 1968-1978
  - 100m x 100m
  - Sludge from waste treatment plant
  - Estimated volume: 65,000m^3
- Containment
  - No membrane
  - No leachate capture
  - No isolation system
- Current state
  - Landfill: hydrocarbons, iron, inorganics
  - Contaminant plume
    - 500m to west; depth (50-60 m)
    - Chlorinated compounds

Setup

Geologic section





- Horlokke landfill
  - Located on an outwash plane (low topography)
  - Clay layer: top 2-3m
  - Waste layer: 6-8m thick
- General geology
  - Gravel and sand with interbedded clay
  - Water level: 2-3m depth
  - Sand layers below landfill host regional aquifer
- Aquifer is used for drinking water
  - Watershed is west of the site
  - No risk currently
  - Concern if watershed shifts east due to climate change

Objectives



Geologic section



- Delineate the boundaries and depth of the current landfill
- Locate the leachate plume
- Identify lithologies
  - Aquitards
  - Clay-rich sandy layers
  - Deep silt/clay lens

Properties

Geologic section



Physical properties

	Resistivity	Chargeability	Gamma
sand/gravel	High	Low	Low
clay/till	Low	High	High
sand	High	Low	Low
landfill	High (?)	High	(?)

Survey

Study area



Time domain IP (TDIP)



Data (chargeability):

$$M_i = \frac{1}{V_{DC} \cdot [t_{i+1} - t_i]} \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} V_{ip}\, dt$$

- Well logs:
  - 25 boreholes, ~85 m depth
  - Gamma logs (white dots)
  - Induction and resistivity logs

- DC-IP survey:
  - 11 lines (each ~410 m)
  - Gradient array
  - Input current: 4sec on and 4sec off
  - 20 time gates (8 per decade)

Processing / Inversion

- Cole-Cole inversion:
  - Laterally constrained inversion (LCI)
  - Invert for Cole-Cole parameters



$$\rho(\omega) = \rho_0\left[1 + M_0\left(1 - \frac{1}{1+(i\omega\tau)^c}\right)\right]$$

Recovered Cole-Cole sections:



Interpretation: Delineating the landfill

Chargeability (M_0) sections

Landfill boundary



Location map



Chargeability



Estimated volume	Using 100 mV/V cutoff: 50,000m^3 From historic record: 65,000m^3

Interpretation: Clay layer (Aquitard)

Resistivity and chargeability sections





Formation	Resistivity	Chargeability	Gamma
Clay	Low (60 ohm m)	High	High

Interpretation

- Creek overlays the clay layer (acts as aquitard)

Interpretation: Clay-rich sandy layer

Resistivity and chargeability sections





Formation	Resistivity	Chargeability	Gamma
Clay	Low	High	High
Clay-rich sandy layer	High	Moderate (50-100 mV/V)	High

Interpretation: Silt/clay lens

Resistivity and chargeability sections





Formation	Resistivity	Chargeability	Gamma
Clay	Low	High	High
Clay rich sandy layer	High	Moderate (50-100 mV/V)	High
Silt/clay lens	Low	High	High

Interpretation: Lithology

Resistivity and chargeability sections



Location map



Geologic interpretation



Interpretation: Lithology

Resistivity and chargeability sections



Location map



Resistivity cut-off volume (<100 Ωm)



Geologic interpretation



Synthesis: delineating the leachate

Resistivity and chargeability sections





Contaminated plume section



Resistivity cut-off volume (<100 Ωm)



Geologic interpretation



Summary

- Found boundaries for the waste
- Estimated volume for the waste
- Delineated the leachate plume
- Lithology of the background
  - Aquitard
  - Clay-rich sandy layer
  - Clay lens