

APPLICATIONS OF ENGINEERING SEISMOLOGY FOR SITE CHARACTERIZATION

Öz YILMAZ¹, Murat ESER², Mehmet BERILGEN³

ABSTRACT

We determined the seismic model of the soil column within a residential project site in Istanbul, Turkey. Specifically, we conducted refraction seismic survey at 20 locations using a receiver spread with 48 4.5-Hz vertical geophones at 2-m intervals. We applied nonlinear tomography to first-arrival times to estimate the P-wave velocity-depth profiles and performed Rayleigh-wave inversion to estimate the S-wave velocity-depth profiles down to a depth of 30 m at each of the locations. We then combined the seismic velocities with the geotechnical borehole information regarding the lithology of the soil column and determined the site-specific geotechnical earthquake engineering parameters for the site. Specifically, we computed the maximum soil amplification ratio, maximum surface-bedrock acceleration ratio, depth interval of significant acceleration, maximum soil-rock response ratio, and design spectrum periods T_A - T_B .

We conducted reflection seismic survey along five line traverses with lengths between 150-300 m and delineated landslide failure surfaces within the site. We recorded shot gathers at 2-m intervals along each of the seismic line traverses using a receiver spread with 48 40-Hz vertical geophones at 2-m intervals. We applied nonlinear tomography to first-arrival times to estimate a P-wave velocity-depth model and analyzed the reflected waves to obtain a seismic image of the deep near-surface along each of the line traverses.

Keywords: Engineering Seismology, Travel Tomography, Surface-Wave Inversion, Reflected Waves

INTRODUCTION

A geotechnical project involves interdisciplinary coordination between the seismologist, geomorphologist, and the geotechnical and earthquake engineers. We obtain a seismic image of the near-surface from the analysis of reflected waves to delineate fault geometry and geometry of layers within the soil column. We obtain a P-wave velocity-depth model of the soil column from the analysis of refracted waves. Finally, we estimate an S-wave velocity-depth profile for the soil column from the analysis of surface waves. These intermediate products, combined with the geomorphology of the site and the geotechnical borehole and laboratory data, are then used to define the parameters for the soil geometry, soil pedology, and the soil dynamics associated with the geotechnical model of the soil column, which is then used for geotechnical design for soil remediation.

Figure 1 shows the location map of the site. The size of the area is approximately 40 acres. Elevations vary between 125-180 m. Topography is fairly flat in the western half of the site while there is a downhill slope in the northerly direction in the eastern half. The top soil is entirely clay.

¹ Director, Anatolian Geophysical, Istanbul, Email: oz@anatoliangeo.com

² Operations VP, Anatolian Geophysical, Istanbul, Email: murat@anatoliangeo.com

³ Assoc. Professor, Department of Civil Engineering, Yildiz technical University, Istanbul, Email: berilgen@yildiz.edu.tr

The site has been designated for a residential project that involves construction of multistorey apartment blocks.




Figure 1. Location map for the seismic survey conducted within the residential development project site. The survey consists of refraction profiling at 20 locations (KS01-20) and reflection profiling along five line traverses (YS05-09). The red arrows denote the orientation of the receiver spreads for the refraction survey. The green curves denote the extremities of the landslide failure zone.

DATA ACQUISITION

At each of the 20 refraction-survey locations (KS01-KS20) within the project site (Figure 1), we deployed a receiver spread with 48 4.5-Hz vertical geophones at 2-m intervals. We used a buffalo gun at the bottom of a charge hole with a diameter of 10 cm and a depth of 30 cm, and acquired three shot records with source locations at each end of the spread and at the center of the spread (Figure 2). The sampling rate for recording is 0.5 ms and the record length is 2 s. The orientation of the receiver spread at each location was chosen such that the elevation change along the receiver spread is minimal.

Along each of the five reflection-survey lines within the project site (Figure 1), we deployed a receiver spread with 48 40-Hz vertical geophones at 2-m intervals. We used a hand hammer and a steel plate, and acquired hundreds of shot records at 2-m intervals along each of the seismic lines with lengths between 150-300 m. The sampling rate for recording is 0.5 ms and the record length is 1 s.




Figure 2. Example common-shot gathers acquired by a 94-m receiver spread (the green bar on top) at location KS08. The red asterisks denote the shot locations --- two shots with 2-m offset from the ends of the receiver spread and a shot at the center of the spread.

ANALYSIS OF REFRACTED AND SURFACE WAVES

By applying a nonlinear traveltimes tomography (Zhang and Toksoz, 1997) to the first-arrival times picked from the three shot records, we estimated a near-surface P-wave velocity-depth model along the receiver spread at each of the 20 locations. By applying smoothing during the inversion and lateral averaging after the inversion, we then obtained a P-wave velocity-depth profile down to a depth of 30 m, representative of each location.

We applied a workflow (Yilmaz and Eser, 2002) for the analysis of the first-arrival times which are primarily associated with refracted waves. First, an initial P-wave velocity-depth model is derived from the traveltimes picked from the field records. Then, this ‘initial’ model is perturbed iteratively by nonlinear traveltimes tomography to estimate a ‘final’ P-wave velocity-depth model. At each iteration, first-arrival times are modeled and compared with the actual (picked) traveltimes. Iteration is stopped when the discrepancy between the modeled and actual traveltimes is reduced to an acceptable minimum.

Next, we identified at each KS location the off-end shot record with the most pronounced dispersive Rayleigh-type surface-wave pattern (Figure 3), which was first isolated from the refracted and reflected waves by inside and outside mute, then filtered using a 2,4-36,48-Hz passband to remove low- and high-frequency noise. We then performed plane-wave decomposition to transform the data from offset-time to Rayleigh-wave phase-velocity versus frequency domain (Figure 4). A dispersion curve associated with the fundamental mode of the surface waves was picked in the transform domain based on the maximum-energy criterion (Figure 4) and inverted to estimate the S-wave velocity as a function of depth (Figure 3) (Park et al., 1999; Xia et al., 1999). In this procedure, initial depth-profiles for P- and S-wave velocities are iteratively perturbed until a final S-wave velocity-depth

profile is estimated. At each iteration, modeled dispersion values and the picked (actual) dispersion values are compared. Iteration is stopped when the discrepancy between the modeled and actual dispersion values is reduced to an acceptable minimum. The velocity estimation from surface waves represents a lateral average over the receiver spread length in contrast with the velocity estimation from borehole seismic measurements which are influenced by localized lithologic anomalies and borehole conditions.




Figure 3. Dispersive surface waves isolated from the reflected and refracted waves on a shot record at one end of the receiver spread at location KS13 (left), and the S-wave velocity-depth profile (the blue curve) estimated by inversion of the surface waves (right). The vertical axis in depth is associated with the S-wave velocity and the vertical axis in frequency is associated with the dispersion curve as in Figure 4. The S-wave velocity-depth profile was estimated by an iterative inversion of the dispersion curve for the Rayleigh-wave fundamental mode shown in Figure 4. Iteration is stopped when the discrepancy between the modeled (the black curve on the right) and actual dispersion values (the black dots on the right) is reduced to an acceptable minimum.




Figure 4. The dispersion spectrum of the surface waves in the shot record shown in Figure 3, computed after the plane-wave decomposition. In this figure, the vertical axis represents the phase velocity of Rayleigh waves. Note that each frequency component of the Rayleigh waves travels at a different speed, thus the dispersive character of these waves within the soil column. The largest portion of the Rayleigh-wave energy often, but not always, is associated with the fundamental mode. For this mode, a dispersion curve that represents the change of phase velocity with frequency is picked as shown. Then, this dispersion curve is used in an inversion algorithm to estimate the S-wave velocity-depth profile for the soil column at the KS location (Figure 3).

Following the analysis of refracted waves to estimate the P-wave velocities and the analysis of surface waves to estimate the S-wave velocities at each of the 20 locations, we interpolated the velocities and generated velocity contour maps for depth levels 0-30 m at 4-m intervals (Figures 5 and 6). Additionally, we computed the ratio of the P-wave velocities to the S-wave velocities as a function of depth and generated the velocity-ratio contour maps (Figure 7). Based on the velocity variations, the site was divided into three sections --- the western section with relatively low S-wave velocities, the eastern section with relatively high S-wave velocities, and the transitional central section (Figure 8). We then drilled geotechnical boreholes within each section down to a depth of 50 m, 40 m, and 30 m at locations coincident with the center of the spreads KS05, KS10, and KS14, respectively.




Figure 5. The P-wave velocity map for a depth level of 12 m created by three-dimensional interpolation of the P-wave velocity-depth functions associated with the 20 locations (indicated by the red dots) where the refraction seismic survey was conducted. These velocity functions were derived by lateral averaging of the P-wave velocity-depth models at each of the KS locations. The black polygon defines the boundaries of the project site.




Figure 6. The S-wave velocity map for a depth level of 12 m created by three-dimensional interpolation of the S-wave velocity-depth functions as in Figure 5 associated with the 20 locations (indicated by the red dots) where the refraction seismic survey was conducted. The black polygon defines the boundaries of the project site.




Figure 7. The P-to_S-wave velocity ratio map for a depth level of 12 m created by three-dimensional interpolation of the P- and S-wave velocity-depth functions associated with the 20 locations (indicated by the red dots) where the refraction seismic survey was conducted. The P-wave velocity functions were derived by lateral averaging of the P-wave velocity-depth models at each of the KS locations. The S-wave velocity-depth functions are as in Figure 5. The black polygon defines the boundaries of the project site.




Figure 8. The S-wave velocity map for a depth level of 28 m. The red dots represent the spread centers at the 20 locations where the seismic survey was conducted. The blue circles denote the geotechnical borehole locations for each of the three sections. The black polygon defines the boundaries of the project site.

ESTIMATION OF GEOTECHNICAL EARTQUAKE ENGINEERING PARAMETERS

For each section within the project site (western, central, and eastern), the S-wave velocities within the soil column combined with the borehole lithology (Figure 9) were used to determine the geotechnical earthquake engineering parameters. We begin with a rock-site SH accelerogram that describes the time history of the strong ground motion associated with the August 1999 Izmit earthquake (Yilmaz et al., 2006). Given the S-wave velocity-depth profile, the geotechnical borehole information, and the accelerogram that describes the ground motion at the rock site, we calculated the accelerogram that simulates the ground motion at the soil site (Figure 10) for each of the three sections within the site. This one-dimensional site-response analysis was performed using a frequency-domain algorithm that

models the nonlinear material behavior of the soil column as an equivalent linear system (Schnabel et al., 1972; Bardet et al., 2000).

In earthquake engineering, the soil response to an earthquake motion is calculated based on the scenario that corresponds to a maximum possible peak ground acceleration that may occur at a location (Kramer, 1996). Hence, the accelerogram at the rock site (equivalently, at the soil-bedrock interface), was actually upscaled to a maximum value of 0.3g before the modeling of the accelerogram at the soil sites within each section (KS05, KS10, and KS14).





Figure 9. Correlation of the S-wave velocities with the lithology column from the geotechnical borehole at the center of the spread at location KS10 (Central Section in Figure 8).

From Figure 10, we determined for each section the ratio of the maximum ground acceleration at the soil site to the maximum acceleration at the soil-bedrock interface --- often referred to as *maximum surface-bedrock acceleration ratio*. For each section, we also computed the maximum acceleration as a function of depth, and determined the depth range for which surface-bedrock acceleration ratio is significant (Figure 11a). Specifically, as the bedrock motion is upward propagated through the soil column, maximum acceleration values are computed at discrete depth levels through the soil column. From Figure 11b, we determined the peak spectral amplitude at the soil site and the frequency at which this peak occurs (3.3 Hz). The latter is called the natural frequency of the soil column and the period that corresponds to the peak-amplitude frequency is called the *natural period* of the soil column (0.3 s). Also from Figure 11b, we computed the ratio of the peak spectral amplitude at the soil site to the spectral amplitude corresponding to the same frequency at the rock site (2.4). This is called the *maximum soil amplification ratio*, which is a measure of how much the soil column amplifies the earthquake motion that occurs at the soil-bedrock interface.



Anatolian Geophysical

Figure 10. Analysis for geotechnical earthquake engineering parameters at site KS10 (Central Section in Figure 8): (a) The accelerogram that describes the bedrock motion associated with the August 1999 Izmit earthquake measured at the rock site (green), which is assumed to be equivalent to the response at the soil-bedrock interface at the soil site (upscaled to a maximum acceleration value of 0.3g), and the accelerogram that describes the ground motion at the soil site KS10 within the central section of the project site (red) modeled by using the velocity and borehole information given by Figure 9. The maximum surface-bedrock acceleration ratio is 1.5. (b) The amplitude spectra of the measured and modeled accelerograms. Note that the significant amplification within soil column occurs between 0-12 Hz bandwidth.

Next, for each section within the site, we computed the response spectra (Figure 11c) which describe the response of structures (buildings) with a range of natural periods to the modeled ground motion at the soil site and the actual ground motion at the rock site. The structure is defined as a spring system with a single degree of freedom (SDOF), usually with damping ratio of 5%. From Figure 11c, we determined the maxima of the response spectra at the ground level (8g) and soil-bedrock interface (3g), and computed *the maximum soil-rock response as the spectral acceleration ratio (2.4)*. We also determined *the design spectrum periods TA-TB (0.05-0.55 sec)*. TA and TB correspond to the minimum and maximum periods for which the spectrum is nearly flat. Outside the TA-TB bandwidth, the spectrum ramps down rapidly.

Listed in Table 1 are the geotechnical earthquake engineering parameters for each of the three sections within the site. Combined with the parameters for the soil dynamics, such as the bearing capacity, these parameters are used by the geotechnical engineer for soil classification and by the civil engineer for structural design of buildings.




Figure 11. Analysis for geotechnical earthquake engineering parameters at site KS10 (Central Section in Figure 8): (a) Maximum acceleration as a function of depth, (b) soil-bedrock amplification ratio, and (c) site-specific design spectra for the rock site (green) and the soil site (red), and the code-specific design spectrum for the soil site (yellow). Note that the most significant acceleration values at the rock site occurs between T_A-T_B : 0.05 – 0.55 sec.

Table 1. Geotechnical earthquake engineering parameters.

Section	Maximum soil amplification ratio	Natural period of the soil column (sec)	Maximum surface-bedrock acceleration ratio	Depth interval with significant acceleration (m)	Maximum soil-rock response	Design spectrum periods $T_A - T_B$ (sec)
West	2.2	0.4	1.3	0 - 10	1.3	0.05 - 0.60
Central	2.4	0.3	1.5	0 - 15	2.4	0.05 - 0.55
East	2.8	0.15	1.7	0 - 10	2.1	0.05 - 0.65

ANALYSIS OF REFLECTED WAVES

In contrast with a comprehensive processing sequence applied to reflection seismic data used in exploration for oil and gas fields (Yilmaz, 2001), shallow reflection seismic data usually require a simple processing sequence (Steeple and Miller, 1990) that includes application of deconvolution, time-variant spectral whitening, bandpass filtering, AGC, and migration. Aside from deriving a seismic section that represents the subsurface image down a depth of 150 m (Figure 12), we also estimated the near-surface P-wave velocity-depth model, again using the nonlinear traveltime tomography, for each of the five line traverses (Figure 13). The nonlinear tomography solution is

based on not just the first-arrival times but also changes in traveltimes gradient. As such, within the near-surface, we were able to resolve strong lateral velocity variations associated with the landslide failure surfaces (Figure 13).

The seismic images along the YS line traverses exhibit horizontal, piecewise continuous, but strong reflectors that are associated with sandstone interbeddings within the otherwise predominantly clayey soil column (Figure 12). Whereas the P-wave velocity-depth models along the YS line traverses exhibit low-velocity near-surface layers (Figure 13), which, following the subsequent geotechnical borehole investigations, have been confirmed as landslide masses that are widespread within the project site (Figure 1). Several landslide failure surfaces have been delineated as shown in Figure 13.




Figure 12. The seismic image of the deep near-surface along the YS09 line traverse (line location shown in Figure 2). This image was derived by analysis of reflected waves in the shot gathers recorded along the line traverse at 2-m intervals using a receiver spread with 48 40-Hz vertical geophones. The black curve denotes approximately the topography along the line traverse. The high-amplitude reflectors indicated by the red arrows correspond to the sandstone interbeddings within the predominantly clayey soil column.

CONCLUSIONS

Site investigations require multidisciplinary participation by the geologist, seismologist, geotechnical and earthquake engineers. The contribution of the seismologist includes a seismic image of the near-surface from the analysis of reflected waves to delineate fault geometry and geometry of layers within the soil column, a P-wave velocity-depth model of the soil column from the analysis of refracted waves, and an S-wave velocity-depth profile for the soil column from the analysis of surface waves. As such, the role of the seismologist is to provide these intermediate products to the geotechnical and earthquake engineers so as to define the parameters associated with the soil geometry, soil pedology, and the soil dynamics which constitute the geotechnical model of the soil column. In this case study, we demonstrated the role of the seismic method in defining the geotechnical model of the soil column, which can then be used for geotechnical design for soil remediation.




Figure 13. The P-wave velocity-depth models along the YS line traverses (line locations shown in Figure 2). The pink zones are associated with the low-velocity landslide masses. The white curves denote the landslide failure surfaces.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank the Hanyapi Real Estate Development Corp., Istanbul and the corporate technical advisor, Professor Ahmet M. Işıkara for giving us the opportunity to conduct this integrated seismic project and granting the permission for publishing the results.

REFERENCES

- Bardet J., Ichii, K., and Lin C., Manual of EERA: a computer program for equivalent-linear earthquake site response analysis of layered soil deposits, University of Southern California, 2000.
- Kramer, S. L., Geotechnical Earthquake Engineering, p. 273, Prentice-Hall, New Jersey, 1996.
- Park, C. B., Miller, R. D., and Xia, J., Multichannel analysis of surface waves: Geophysics, 64, 800-808, 1999.
- Schnabel, P. B., Lysmer, P. B., and Seed, H. B., SHAKE: A computer program for earthquake response analysis of horizontally layered sites, *in* Report EERC 72-12, Earthquake Engineering Research Center, University of California, Berkeley, 1972.
- Steeple, D. W. and Miller, R. D., Seismic reflection methods applied to engineering, environmental, and groundwater problems: *in* Geotechnical and environmental geophysics, Ward, S. H., ed., Soc. of Expl. Geophys., Tulsa, OK, 1-30, 1990.
- Xia, J., Miller, R. D., and Park, C. B., Estimation of near-surface shear-wave velocity by inversion of Rayleigh waves: Geophysics, 64, 691-700, 1999.
- Yilmaz, O., Seismic data analysis --- processing, inversion, and interpretation of seismic data: Soc. of Expl. Geophys., Tulsa, OK, 2001.
- Yilmaz, O. and Eser, M., A unified workflow for engineering seismology: Expanded Abstracts, 72nd Annual International Meeting of the Society of Exploration Seismologists, Houston, TX, 2002.
- Yilmaz, O., Eser, M., and Berilgen, M. M., A case study for seismic zonation in municipal areas, The Leading Edge, March issue, 319-330, Society of Exploration Geophysicists, Tulsa, OK, 2006.
- Zhang, J. and Toksoz, M. N., Nonlinear refraction traveltime tomography: Geophysics, 63, 1726-1737, 1997.