

Development of an automated analysis of
TDEM data for the delineation of a finite
conductor in a conductive half space.

by

Magdalena Combrinck

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

Doctor in Philosophy in Exploration Geophysics

In the Faculty of Natural and Agricultural Science
of the University of Pretoria.

PRETORIA

2006

Development of an automated analysis of
TDEM data for the delineation of a finite
conductor in a conductive half space.

by

Magdalena Combrinck

Supervisor: Professor W. J. Botha

Degree: Doctor of Philosophy in Exploration Geophysics

Department: Geology

Abstract

The objective of this work is to find an efficient, preferably automated, algorithm or interpretational procedure that can be applied in real time to localise conductors buried in a host rock, with special attention given to a conductor in a conductive environment. The Time Domain Electromagnetic (TDEM) method is considered and more specifically the central loop configuration which can be found in both ground and airborne acquisition systems. The traditional interpretation approach of decay curve analysis is automated and combined with an adapted S-layer differential transform (Sidorov and Tiskshaev, 1969) to produce conductivity-depth sections with superimposed decay behaviour at every station. The adaptations made to the S-layer differential transform include:

- a noise filter to improve performance on field data
- the S-layer differential transform compatibility (SLTC) filter which only allows data conforming to the basic mathematical assumptions made in the transform to be processed (This “compatible” behaviour is derived through a number of synthetic model studies.)
- a depth correction based on the implications of approximating an infinite number of currents with a single filament.

A remaining concern when implementing the S-layer transform is found in two consecutive numerical differentiations and various approaches are analysed to ensure stable differentiation procedures. The automated algorithm is applied to a variety of synthetic models to validate its accuracy and finally examples are shown of its application to both ground and airborne data sets.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	General overview.....	1
1.2	Objective.....	3
2	OVERVIEW OF ELECTROMAGNETIC THEORY FOR GROUND, IN- LOOP TDEM DATA	4
2.1	Introduction.....	4
2.2	System geometry and operating specifications.....	4
2.3	Analytical TDEM responses for four common models.....	5
2.3.1	TDEM central-loop response over a conductive half space.....	7
2.3.2	Thin, conductive sheet (S-layer).....	9
2.3.3	Finite conductor in a resistive host rock (half space).....	11
2.3.4	Finite conductor in a conductive host rock (half space).....	12
2.4	Conclusion.....	17
3	CONVENTIONAL INTERPRETATION TECHNIQUES	18
3.1	Introduction.....	18
3.2	Profiles versus soundings.....	19
3.3	Forward Modelling and Inversion.....	20
3.4	Limitations on automation of inversion techniques.....	21
3.5	Decay curve analysis.....	22
3.6	Transforms (Depth imaging).....	24
3.6.1	Conductivity Depth Images (CDI's).....	24
3.6.2	Stationary current images (SCI) (SCI - trademark of Geotrex-Dighem Pty Limited).....	24
3.6.3	S-layer differential transform.....	25
3.7	Combining Strategies.....	27
4	AUTOMATED INTEGRATED ANALYSIS OF TDEM DATA	28
4.1	An integrated analysis algorithm.....	28
4.2	Visualization of the field data for rapid anomaly detection.....	28
4.3	Decay curve analysis.....	30
4.3.1	Layered earth behaviour.....	31
4.3.2	Confined conductor behaviour.....	32
4.3.3	IP effect or severe lateral variation in subsurface conductivity.....	33
4.3.4	Results, output and presentation.....	33
4.4	Numerical calculation of the S-layer differential transform.....	33
4.4.1	Defining the S-layer transform.....	33
4.4.2	Numerical differentiation of TEM data.....	36
4.4.3	Comparison of differentiation methods applied to synthetic data.....	45
4.4.5	Concluding remarks on numerical differentiation.....	54
4.5	The S-layer correction factor.....	55
4.5.1	Defining a S-layer correction factor.....	55
4.5.3	Behaviour of the S-layer transform when applied to synthetic data.....	68
4.5.4	S-layer differential transform compatibility filter.....	92

4.5.5	Imaged conductivity depth sections generated from synthetic data	93
5	APPLICATION TO FIELD DATA.....	100
5.1	Introduction.....	100
5.2	Ground survey.....	100
5.2.1	Data acquisition and system parameters	100
5.2.2	Objective	102
5.2.3	Application of S-layer differential transform.....	102
5.2.4	Comparison of 25Hz (high, H) and 6.25Hz (medium, M) base frequency data	110
5.2.5	Imaged conductivity sections	114
5.2.6	Comparison of automated conductor location with Maxwell plate model results	117
5.3	Airborne survey.....	121
5.3.1	Data acquisition and system parameters	121
5.3.2	Automated processing	122
5.4	Conclusions and recommendations	125

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2-1	The use of equivalent current filament concept in understanding the behaviour of TEM fields over a conducting half space (after Nabighian and Macnae, 1991).....	8
Figure 2-2	Conductive sheet parameters.....	9
Figure 2-3	Equivalent current filaments (images) for a conducting thin sheet at various times after current interruption in the transmitter loop (after Nabighian and Macnae, 1991).....	10
Figure 2-4	Sphere currents at various times (a – surface currents; b-d – equatorial/plane currents) (after McNeill, 1980).	12
Figure 2-5	A permeable conducting sphere embedded in a conducting infinite space. The dipolar source is located at $S(r_0,0,0)$ outside the sphere (after Singh 1973).....	14
Figure 2-6	Time characteristic of $h_{1r}^v(t)$ for $r/a=2$, $\mu_2/\mu_1=1$, and variable σ_1/σ_2 (after Singh 1973).....	14
Figure 2-7	Time characteristic of $h_{10r}^v(t)$ for $r/a=2$, $\mu_2/\mu_1=1$, and variable σ_1/σ_2 (after Singh 1973).....	15
Figure 2-8	Time characteristic of $h_{10\theta}^u(t)$ for $r/a=2$, $\mu_2/\mu_1=1$, and variable σ_1/σ_2 (after Singh 1973).....	15
Figure 2-9	“Reflected” smoke-rings. Electric field intensity is presented as sections for 20 consecutive time channels. The cyan and black contour lines present the electric field intensity for a homogeneous 50 Ohm.m half space and indicate the well-known diffusive smoke-ring behaviour. The colour contours indicate electric field intensity of currents for a 5 Ohm.m prism (black rectangle) in a 50 Ohm.m half space as percentage of the half space response. The “reflected” currents are clearly visible in channels 13 to 20.	16
Figure 3-1	Comparison of apparent conductivity (calculated by differentiating the fitted slowness with respect to reference depth curve) with the actual conductivity for four three-layer models (after Macnae and Lamontagne, 1987).	25
Figure 3-2	Cross-section of the model (top); Conductivity-depth image obtained by differential S-transformation (centre); Conductivity-depth image obtained by regularized S-inversion (bottom). (After Tartaras et. al., 2000).....	26
Figure 4-1	In (a) the raw data are presented in a contoured log-scale. In (b) the data were normalised using the half space value used in the forward model. In (c) the data were normalised as discussed above.	30
Figure 4-2	Flow diagram for decay curve slope analysis.	32
Figure 4-3	Percentage errors for differentiation in different domains of TDEM data for a 10 Ohm.m half space.	38
Figure 4-4	A Lagrange interpolating polynomial fitted to the data points outlining the back of a duck (top) and a cubic spline curve fitted to the same data points (bottom). (From Burden and Faires, 1993, Figures 3.11 and 3.12).....	40
Figure 4-5:	Comparison of differentiation methods applied to (a) unequally spaced points without smoothing of data, (b) unequally spaced points with smoothing of	

data, (c) equally spaced points without smoothing of data and (d) equally spaced points with smoothing.	46
Figure 4-6: A summary (in ascending order) of the average error over twenty data points for each of the alternatives in Figure 4.5. (ES: equal spacing, US: unequal spacing)	47
Figure 4-7: Synthetic data and model for three-layer earth.....	47
Figure 4-8: Effects of smoothing at different points in S-layer transform algorithm.....	49
Figure 4-9: Comparison of S-layer differential transform results for the three numerical differentiation methods applied on (a) unequally spaced data points without smoothing of data, (b) unequally spaced data points with smoothing of data, (c) equally spaced data without smoothing and (d) equally spaced data with smoothing.....	50
Figure 4-10: Four field data soundings; 1 to 4 are very smooth and considered to be clean data, while 5 & 6 contains noise.	51
Figure 4-11: S-layer differential transform results for Sounding 1.	51
Figure 4-12: S-layer differential transform results for Sounding 2.	52
Figure 4-13: S-layer differential transform results for Sounding 3.	53
Figure 4-14: S-layer differential transform results for Sounding 4.	54
Figure 4-15: Half space resistivities compared to resistivities from S-Layer differential transform.	56
Figure 4-16: Values for S and d corrections giving correct resistivity values and the effective depth correction resulting from each pair. (from Excel: summary of depth conversion factor models)	58
Figure 4-17: Cumulative conductance curves for late time halfspace approximations.	60
Figure 4-18: Cumulative conductance curves for late time half space and S-layer approximations.....	61
Figure 4-19: Comparison of S-layer differential transform (SLDT) solutions using different depth factors and layered earth inversions of synthetic data for a two layer earth.	63
Figure 4-20: Comparison of S-layer differential transform (SLDT) solutions using different depth factors and layered earth inversions of synthetic data for a three layer earth (thin conductive layer).....	64
Figure 4-21: Comparison of S-layer differential transform (SLDT) solutions using different depth factors and layered earth inversions of synthetic data for a three layer earth (thick conductive layer). Top: negative values included; Bottom: no negative values.....	65
Figure 4-22: Comparison of S-layer differential transform (SLDT) solutions using different depth factors and layered earth inversions of synthetic data for a thin conductive plate in a resistive half space.	66
Figure 4-23: Comparison of S-layer differential transform (SLDT) solutions using different depth factors and layered earth inversions of synthetic data for a conductive prism in a resistive half space.....	67
Figure 4-24 Cumulative conductance versus depth, 0.02 S/m (50 Ω .m) half space.....	69
Figure 4-25 Conductivity versus depth, 0.02 S/m (50 Ω .m) half space.....	69
Figure 4-26: Cumulative conductance versus depth for two layers of decreasing conductivity; first layer thickness 200m.....	70

Figure 4-27: Imaged conductivity versus depth for two layers of decreasing conductivity; first layer thickness 200m.....	71
Figure 4-28: Cumulative conductance versus depth for two layers of increasing conductivity; first layer thickness 200m.....	72
Figure 4-29: Imaged conductivity versus depth for two layers of increasing conductivity; first layer thickness 200m.	73
Figure 4-30: Imaged conductivity versus depth for two layers of increasing conductivity; first layer thickness 200m – linear scale.....	73
Figure 4-31: Cumulative conductance for a 15m thick layer of varying conductivity at 150m depth in a 0.02 S/m half space.....	74
Figure 4-32: Imaged conductivity versus depth for a 15m thick layer of varying conductivity at 150m depth in a 0.02 S/m half space.....	75
Figure 4-33: Imaged conductivity versus depth for a 15m thick layer of varying conductivity at 150m depth in a 0.02 S/m half space; linear scale.	75
Figure 4-34: Cumulative conductance for a 0.2 S/m layer of varying thickness at 150m depth in a 0.02 S/m half space.....	76
Figure 4-35: Imaged conductivity for a 0.2 S/m layer of varying thickness at 150m depth in a 0.02 S/m half space.....	77
Figure 4-36: Imaged conductivity for a 0.2 S/m layer of varying thickness at 150m depth in a 0.02 S/m half space; linear scale.....	77
Figure 4-37: Cumulative conductance for a 2 S/m layer of varying thickness at 150m depth in a 0.02 S/m half space.....	78
Figure 4-38: Imaged conductivity for a 2 S/m layer of varying thickness at 150m depth in a 0.02 S/m half space.....	78
Figure 4-39: Imaged conductivity for a 2 S/m layer of varying thickness at 150m depth in a 0.02 S/m half space – linear scale.	79
Figure 4-40: Cumulative conductance for a 0.2 S/m layer of 20 m thickness at various depths in a 0.02 S/m half space.	80
Figure 4-41: Imaged conductivity for a 0.2 S/m layer of 20 m thickness at various depths in a 0.02 S/m half space.	80
Figure 4-42: Imaged conductivity for a 0.2 S/m layer of 20 m thickness at various depths in a 0.02 S/m half space – linear scale.....	81
Figure 4-43: Cumulative conductance for a 0.2 S/m layer of 20 m thickness at 150 m depth in various host rock conductivities.....	82
Figure 4-44: Imaged conductivity for a 0.2 S/m layer of 20 m thickness at 150 m depth in various host rock conductivities.....	82
Figure 4-45: Imaged conductivity for a 0.2 S/m layer of 20 m thickness at 150 m depth in various host rock conductivities - linear scale.....	83
Figure 4-46: Cumulative conductance for a 0.2 S/m plate of 20 m thickness at 150 m depth in 0.02 S/m host rock. The horizontal dimensions vary from 100 m to infinite.	84
Figure 4-47: Imaged conductivity for a 0.2 S/m plate of 20 m thickness at 150 m depth in 0.02 S/m host rock. The horizontal dimensions vary from 100 m to infinite.	84
Figure 4-48: Imaged conductivity for a 0.2 S/m plate of 20 m thickness at 150 m depth in 0.02 S/m host rock. The horizontal dimensions vary from 100 m to infinite; linear scale.....	85

Figure 4-49: Cumulative conductance for a 2 S/m plate of 20 m thickness at 150 m depth in 0.02 S/m host rock. The horizontal dimensions vary from 100 m to infinite.	85
Figure 4-50: Imaged conductivity for a 2 S/m plate of 20 m thickness at 150 m depth in 0.02 S/m host rock. The horizontal dimensions vary from 100 m to infinite.	86
Figure 4-51: Imaged conductivity for a 2 S/m plate of 20 m thickness at 150 m depth in 0.02 S/m host rock. The horizontal dimensions vary from 100 m to infinite; linear scale.	86
Figure 4-52: Cumulative conductance for a 0.2 S/m prism at 150 m depth in a 0.02 S/m host rock. The prism dimensions vary from 100 m to 400 m.	87
Figure 4-53: Imaged conductivity for a 0.2 S/m prism at 150 m depth in a 0.02 S/m host rock. The prism dimensions vary from 100 m to 400 m.	88
Figure 4-54: Imaged conductivity for a 0.2 S/m prism at 150 m depth in a 0.02 S/m host rock. The prism dimensions vary from 100 m to 400 m; linear scale.	88
Figure 4-55: Comparison between imaged conductivities of a 0.2 S/m prism, 20 m thick plate and infinite sheet of 20 m thickness at 150 m depth in a 0.02 S/m host rock. Both the plate and prism have horizontal dimensions of 300 m.	89
Figure 4-56: Cumulative conductance for 2 S/m prisms at 150 m depth in a 0.02 S/m host rock. The prism dimensions vary from 100 m to 400 m.	90
Figure 4-57: Imaged conductivity for 2 S/m prisms at 150 m depth in a 0.02 S/m host rock. The prism dimensions vary from 100 m to 400 m.	90
Figure 4-58: Imaged conductivity for 2 S/m prisms at 150 m depth in a 0.02 S/m host rock. The prism dimensions vary from 100 m to 400 m; linear scale.	91
Figure 4-59 : Comparison between imaged conductivities of 2 S/m prisms, 20 m thick plates and infinite sheet of 20 m thickness at 150 m depth in a 0.02 S/m host rock. Plates and prisms with horizontal dimensions of 200 m and 300 m are shown.	91
Figure 4-60: Examples of field data showing "returning smoke ring" behaviour (stations -1200 and -150 from line 4950, Rosh Pinah data set).	92
Figure 4-61: S-layer differential transform results (conductivity depth section) on synthetic data. Top: Thin vertical plate (400mX 400m X 20m)	94
Figure 4-62: Same models as in Figure 4-63. Red dots indicate half space decay behaviour and blue dots indicate conductor in "free air" decay.	95
Figure 5-1: Mountain with TDEM survey team.	101
Figure 5-2: Grid locality and layout.	102
Figure 5-3: Line 4950, Station 100. <i>Top</i> : Raw data with calculated cumulative conductance and imaged conductivity. <i>Middle</i> : No filter effect on input data values, only on cumulative conductance curve with imaged conductivity of filtered conductance values. <i>Bottom</i> : Input data filtered for late channel erratic behaviour and filtered cumulative conductance values.	104
Figure 5-4: Line 4950, Station 300. <i>Top</i> : Raw data with calculated cumulative conductance and imaged conductivity. <i>Middle</i> : No filter effect on input data values, only on cumulative conductance curve with imaged conductivity of filtered conductance values. <i>Bottom</i> : Input data filtered for late channel erratic behaviour and filtered cumulative conductance values.	105

Figure 5-5: Line 4950, Station 400. <i>Top:</i> Raw data with calculated cumulative conductance and imaged conductivity. <i>Middle:</i> No filter effect on input data values, only on cumulative conductance curve with imaged conductivity of filtered conductance values. <i>Bottom:</i> Input data filtered for late channel erratic behaviour and filtered cumulative conductance values.	106
Figure 5-6: Line 4950, Station 450. <i>Top:</i> Raw data with calculated cumulative conductance and imaged conductivity. <i>Middle:</i> No filter effect on input data values, only on cumulative conductance curve with imaged conductivity of filtered conductance values. <i>Bottom:</i> Input data filtered for late channel erratic behaviour and filtered cumulative conductance values.	107
Figure 5-7: Line 4950, Station -1550. <i>Top:</i> Raw data with calculated cumulative conductance and imaged conductivity. <i>Middle:</i> No filter effect on input data values, only on cumulative conductance curve with imaged conductivity of filtered conductance values. <i>Bottom:</i> Input data filtered for late channel erratic behaviour and filtered cumulative conductance values.	108
Figure 5-8: Comparison of SDTC filter only (top) and SDTC with additional noise filter (bottom). Black dots are station elevations (DTM) and white dots represent depths at which conductivities are calculated.	110
Figure 5-9: Line 450N showing good correlation between conductivity depth sections obtained from the high (top) and medium frequencies (bottom).	111
Figure 5-10: Line 1650N showing poor correlation between the high (top) and medium frequencies (bottom).	112
Figure 5-11: Line 450; Stations 750 and 1450; medium and high frequency measured data...	113
Figure 5-12: Line 1650; Stations -200, 150 and 250; medium and high frequency measured data.	114
Figure 5-13: Contour map of conductor decay constants draped over topography and conductivity depth sections in 3D. Top viewpoint is from inclination 20°, declination 180° and 5km distance. Bottom viewpoint is inclination 10°, declination -100° and distance 5km. Axes are Northing, Easting and Elevation above sea level.	115
Figure 5-14: 3D view from inclination 60°, declination 180° and 5km distance with and without contour map of conductor decay constants.	116
Figure 5-15: Line 4050. EM response profiles and sections from automated processing procedures.	118
Figure 5-16: Line 4150. EM response profiles and sections from automated processing procedures.	119
Figure 5-17: Line 4050. Comparison of Maxwell plate model and conductivity depth section.	120
Figure 5-18: Line 4150. Comparison of Maxwell plate model and conductivity depth section.	120
Figure 5-19: EM Response over conductor.....	122
Figure 5-20: Conductivity depth section from S-layer transform, showing dipping conductor.....	123
Figure 5-21: Conductivity depth section in greyscale with channels corresponding to half space power law decay indicated in red.	123

Figure 5-22: Conductivity depth section in greyscale with conductor decay constants plotted at scaled channel positions.	124
Figure 5-23: Conductivity depth section in greyscale with channels on stations showing sign changes indicated in blue.	124

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to thank Prof. Willem Botha (my supervisor) for his patience and when it was required, the lack thereof. Many other people including family, friends, training partners and colleagues contributed to this work through their continued moral support. To Melinda de Swardt who took me for tea when the end seemed too far away a special word of gratitude, as well as to all my students who stimulated my own growth with their questions and enthusiasm.

Sincere gratitude is also extended to BHP Billiton for allowing me to use their data and to that very special breed of geophysicists specialising in EM who published and shared their knowledge without whom there would have been nothing to build this work on. Lastly, to the Creator who thought it well to hide the earth's riches from us, but not without endowing us with the capabilities to find it if looking with courage and persistence.