# **UC Santa Barbara**

**UC Santa Barbara Electronic Theses and Dissertations**

## **Title**

In Situ Observations of Seismic Wave Propagation

## **Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/0r003833>

**Author** Hudson, Kenneth Stewart

## **Publication Date** 2017

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

#### UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

#### Santa Barbara

In Situ Observations of Seismic Wave Propagation

A Thesis submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements for the degree Master of

Science in Earth Science

By

Kenneth Stewart Hudson

Committee in charge:

Doctor Jamison Steidl, Co-Chair

Professor Chen Ji, Co-Chair

Professor Toshiro Tanimoto

Professor Robin Matoza

June 2017

The thesis of Kenneth Stewart Hudson is approved.

 $\mathcal{L}_\mathcal{L}$  , where  $\mathcal{L}_\mathcal{L}$  , we have the set of the set

 $\mathcal{L}=\{1,2,3,4,5\}$ 

 $\mathcal{L}_\text{max}$  , and the set of the

Toshiro Tanimoto

Robin Matoza

Chen Ji, Committee Co-Chair

Jamison Steidl, Committee Co-Chair

June 2017

#### ABSTRACT

#### In Situ Observations of Seismic Wave Propagation

by

#### Kenneth Stewart Hudson

Instrumented geotechnical field sites are designed to capture the infrequent but critically important in situ case histories of ground response, deformation, and liquefaction during significant earthquakes that generate high intensity ground shaking and large strains. The University of California at Santa Barbara has been monitoring densely instrumented geotechnical array field sites for almost three decades, with continuous recording now for more than a decade. When seismic waves travel into soil with sufficiently large ground motions, the soil behaves nonlinearly meaning the shear modulus of the material decreases from the linear value observed during weak ground motions. The degraded shear modulus can continue to affect a site for a period of time by changing the soil response during smaller ground motions after the large event. Decreased shear modulus is inferred when a decrease of shear wave velocity between two sensors in a vertical downhole array is observed. This velocity is calculated by measuring the difference in shear wave arrival times between the sensors using normalized cross correlation. The trend of decreasing shear wave velocity with increasing peak ground acceleration is observed at multiple geotechnical array field sites. The length of time the decreased velocity remains following stronger shaking is analyzed

using more than 450 events over more than a decade at the Wildlife Liquefaction Array (WLA). Using both monthly and yearly velocity averages between sensors, there is evidence that suggests the shear wave velocity remains low over a period of months following larger significant shaking events at the site. In addition, at WLA there is evidence that the decrease in shear wave velocity can be detected at ground motion levels as low as 20 cm/s<sup>2</sup>.

Additionally at the Garner Valley Downhole Array, a permanent cross-hole experiment is used to measure velocity changes in the soil with changing water table height. An underground hammer source swings once a week and is recorded on two geophones at the same depth in a line adjacent to the source. Data collected from December 2010 to June 2012 and again from August 2015 to June 2017 is analyzed. That results shows a strong correlation between water table height and the shear wave velocity in the sediment, with changes of almost 5% over the course of seasonal water table variation.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS



## TABLE OF FIGURES



# *In Situ* **observations of site response during and after nonlinear soil behavior**

#### Introduction

Granular Earth materials have been known to exhibit nonlinear response due to large strain deformation in laboratory experiments since the 1970s (Seed and Idriss, 1970; Hadrin and Drnevich, 1972a, b; Vucetic, 1994; Guyer and Johnson, 1999; Ostrovsky and Johnson, 2001). Although the physics of nonlinear behavior is not well understood, the relationship between the elastic modulus and applied strain level is well quantified by laboratory experiments (Ostrovsky and Johnson, 2001) and is used in seismic hazard assessments to predict how a site will behave during strong ground motions. It is thought that the physical origin of nonlinear behavior is related to the bonding between grains, and not within the individual grains (Guyer and Johnson, 1999). Nonlinear effects are evidenced by an immediate decrease in shear modulus of the material during excitation by an elastic wave with a large enough effective strain. This is manifest as a reduction in the material's shear wave phase velocity and is referred to by Johnson and Sutin as nonlinear fast dynamics (2005). Recently, studies have become focused on *in situ* experiments of nonlinear effects during both induced ground motions (Lawrence et al., 2008; Lawrence et al., 2009) and strong ground motion events (Beresnev and Wen, 1996; Pavlenko and Irikura, 2002; Sawazaki et al., 2006; Karabulut and Bouchon, 2007).

Nonlinear effects observed by Ten Cate et al. in 2000 include a time-dependent recovery process occurring in the material broadly referred to as nonequilibrium dynamics (TenCate et al., 2004). *In situ* studies of the long-term damage to soil observe recovery processes lasting hours (Lawrence et al., 2009) while others appear to last for years (Sawazaki et al. 2006). This study seeks to further constrain the nonequilibrium state following strong ground motions by observing unique *in situ* shear wave velocities at sites during small to medium intensity shaking generated by earthquakes at several downhole arrays, building on the work of Steidl, Civilini and Seale (2014).

#### Methods

The shear wave velocity changes observed in this study are calculated from the difference in arrival times (time lag) between accelerometers at different depths located in geotechnical downhole arrays. A geotechnical downhole array is a site with multiple boreholes, each containing accelerometers (and sometimes pore pressure transducer) at different depths (Figure 1).



Figure 1: Cross section of Wildlife Liquefaction Array (WLA) located on the west bank of the Alamo River 13 km north of Brawley, California. It is a typical example of a geotechnical down-hole array and one used extensively in this study

Data are extracted from the UCSB data portal (http://www.nees.ucsb.edu/data-portal) as a .csv file, which is then converted to MATLAB for analysis. The s-wave arrival is manually or automatically selected within MATLAB and cross correlation of the waveforms with 1 second, 2 second, and 5 second time windows around the arrival time is computed for the East and the North components. This is accomplished by cutting the data to half the window size before s-wave arrival and half the window size after. The time lag is calculated by running a cross-correlation between two waveforms at separate vertical array sensors. To discard incorrect cross-correlations, the time lags are checked against a preselected difference in s-wave arrivals, rejecting the time lag if it is not within 20% of the expected swave arrivals' time difference. This serves to get rid of values that are known to be incorrect because of a variety of reasons that causes the two waveforms to be falsely cross correlated including but not limited to emergent arrivals due to the source mechanism and s-wave polarity, noise, and contamination by the p-wave arrivals in the window prior to the s-wave arrival. If none of the calculated time lags are discarded, there will be six values for the time lag (one for each of the three windows for both the North and East components). This method is being used on several different sites in the UCSB geotechnical array program, including the Delaney Park Array in downtown Anchorage, Alaska (DPK); and the Wildlife Liquefaction Array (WLA), Borrego Valley Array (BVDA), and Garner Valley Array (GVDA) all located in southern California. See Appendix for full lists of events used.

Time lags are converted to shear wave phase velocity by dividing the time lag by distance between the accelerometers used in the cross correlation; the shear modulus is then inferred from the shear wave velocity as proportional to its square due to the relation

$$
v_{\rm s}=\sqrt{G/\rho}
$$

3

where  $v_s$  is the shear wave phase velocity, *G* is the shear modulus, and  $\rho$  is the density of the elastic material. The s-waves are assumed to arrive vertically at the site, any difference in arrival times caused by directionality of the plane waves is averaged out by the number of events used. The results are plotted comparing s-wave velocity against peak ground acceleration (PGA) and s-wave velocity against date/time of event.

#### Results

#### $WLA$

At WLA, s-wave velocities were calculated for more than 450 events occurring from January 2005 to June 2016 between the surface to GL-7.7 meter at the 2004 main site and 1982 "T-hut" site, and between the 2004 main site surface to GL-30 meter, surface to GL-100 meter, GL-30 to GL-100 meter, and GL-7.7 to GL-30 meter accelerometers (GL  $=$ ground level). Nonequilibrium fast dynamics were observed during several large events, showing a trend of increasing time lag (decreasing s-wave velocity) with increasing PGA (Figure 2). The largest ground motions produced between each sensor had differing reduction in the shear wave velocity (Table 1).



Table 1: Percent increase of time lags between the largest calculated time lag between two sensors and the average time lag of events with surface accelerations less than 30 cm/s<sup>2</sup>.





Figure 2: Results showing time lag between 4 pairs of vertical accelerometers from WLA. The error bars extend from the lowest value found during cross correlation to the highest, and the point on that line is the mean of all the values found during cross correlation.

A large swarm of events in August of 2012 produced several  $M_w$  4 or greater earthquakes less than 15 km away from the WLA that generated ground motions above 0.1G in eight occurrences, the largest being  $\sim 0.3$ G. Each of the strong ground motion events induced nonlinearity in the soil at the WLA and caused nonlinearity during distinctly separate, weak ground motion events (<30 Gals). The nonlinearity during weak ground motions persisted in the shallow pairings of sensors for several years (Figure 3). The GL-30 to GL-100 meters sensor pairings do not show a long term degradation (Figure 3c). The degree of the reduction of shear modulus observed from these figures is determined by how much the moving yearly average of all events less than 30 Gals deviates from the average of all the events in the data set.

#### GVDA:

At the Garner Valley Downhole Array (GVDA), significant nonlinearity is observed during five events that exceeded 30 Gals, giving an increase of 40% in time lag between the <30 Gals average and the largest (165 Gals) event, when using the surface and GL-15 meter sensors. Plotting the time lag against date of event displays a varying moving average that stays within the standard deviation of the mean. There is an increase during large events, but it recovers fairly quickly and is not statistically significant. The largest motions occurred at the beginning of the time series and there are no records of the s-wave velocity before then in the data set therefore it is not known if the site is already in a state of degraded shear modulus.



3b

WLA: 0 m to 30 m





 $-260$ 

 $-265$ 

 $-270$ 

-275 g

 $-280$ 

 $-285$ <br>S-Wave

 $-290$ 

 $-295$ 

 $-300$ 

01/01/16

Velocity



Figure 3: Results showing time lag between 4 pairs of vertical accelerometers from WLA against date of event. The events are plotted in the same format as Figure 2. While individual events vary greatly due to imperfections in the cross correlation, moving yearly averages show that the s-wave velocity decreases after large events.



Figure 4: Results from GVDA. Clear evidence of nonlinearity at increased PGA. Data is plotted in the same manner as the previous WLA figures.

DPK:

A reduced s-wave velocity between the surface and GL-10.7 meter accelerometer by more than the standard deviation of the small event average velocity at the array in Anchorage, Alaska suggest that the site experienced nonlinear behavior during the recent January 2017 earthquake (Figure 5). None of the deeper sensors show any significant change in velocity during this event. No other events in the records reduce the shear wave velocity and therefore there is no other nonlinearity observed at the site. Due to lack of events since the recent nonlinear response at DPK, there is not sufficient data to observe a longer lasting slow dynamics recovery.



Figure 5: Results from DPK. Plotted in the same format as the previous two stations' data.

BVDA:

Data from the Borrego Valley Downhole Array (BVDA) has not shown any signs of nonlinearity even though there have been 3 events that produced motions greater than 30 Gals at the site. BVDA does experience a significant difference in shear wave velocity between it's north and east components, with the north component 10% slower than the east component in both the surface to 139 meter and surface to 238 meter sensor pairings (Figure 6a, 7b,c). BVDA does not display any anisotropy between the 19.4-meter and surface sensors (Figure 7a).





Figure 6: Anisotropy at BVDA. 6a: The velocity changes with respect to degree of rotation counterclockwise from North. 6b: The orientation where velocities in both components are equal.

To test the anisotropy between the East and North sensors, each event's raw accelerometer data is rotated at ten-degree intervals by multiplying a rotation matrix to the East and North data vectors compiled into a matrix. Each rotated data set then was processed and average time lags were computed for all the events (Figure 6a).

 $A' = R * A$ 

$$
\begin{bmatrix} A'_{11}A'_{21} \\ \vdots \\ A'_{n1}A'_{n2} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \theta & -\sin \theta \\ \sin \theta & \cos \theta \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} A_{11}A_{21} \\ \vdots \\ A_{n1}A_{n2} \end{bmatrix}
$$

 $A_{n1}$  represents the East vector time series and  $A_{n2}$  represents the North vector time series.



14



Figure 7: Events recorded at BVDA split into their two horizontal components and plotted with time lag against PGA. 7a: The shallowest pairing of sensors (19.4-surface) does not show any difference between the two components and no nonlinearity during the large ground motions produced during the June 10, 2016 earthquake. 7b,c: The deeper pairings of sensors have a large difference between the East and North components, about 10%. These are plotted with the same format as all previous figures.

#### Discussion

The *in situ* observational data previously discussed gives insight into nonlinear and nonequilibrium effects along with the time dependent recovery process of the material after sufficient excitation has occurred. Large strains induced during strong ground motions at WLA, GVDA, and DPK caused physical damage to the soil observed from the reduction in the shear strength of the material associated with the reduction of shear wave velocity between vertical accelerometers. At the WLA site, there is some evidence that the damage to the soil was not immediately healed, with the average shear-wave velocity remaining low

for at least two years. Looking at only the events with PGA under 30 Gals, where even these weaker events had average shear wave velocities that remained low over the two years following the large strain events, supports this evidence. Normally, these events are not expected to exhibit reduced shear-wave velocity. These results confirm other observations of a recovery process in which granular Earth materials return to their original state given sufficient time that has been found both during *in situ* (Lawrence et al. 2009) and laboratory experiments (Johnson and Jia, 2005). Johnson and Jia (2005) performed a slow dynamics recovery experiment under two different effective pressures and found that both returned to their normalized shear modulus after about 10,000 seconds, shorter than the recovery observed in this study. Lawrence et al. (2009) did an induced nonlinear test and found the recovery process only lasted one day. The reason both the lab and induced tests have a much shorter recovery period than these results is likely due to their tests not using earthquake induced strong motion data, but locally generated point source motions at the surface instead. The local point source motions likely do not cause degradation in as large an area as earthquakes, so the local materials are able to recover quickly relative to damage caused by earthquake generated plane waves propagating up from depth over the region. Sawazaki et al. (2006) found two sites that had a reduction of the peak frequency during strong earthquake motion that took a few years for the values to recover, similar to the results presented here.

The WLA data confirms nonlinear fast dynamics and slow recovery in the best resolution of all the data sets due to its 10-year long recording history and continuous functionality of its instruments during that time. The high strain excitation in the nearby 2012 swarm demonstrated the longest lasting recovery, as seen from the reduced s-wave velocity in the two years of motions under 30 Gals following the swarm. This leads us to interpret the nonequilibrium slow dynamic process as one that can last for several years after significant damage has been sustained in the granular Earth material, but that it is still not a permanent effect as we see a return of the average shear modulus to its original value after about three years. Another unique observation at WLA was the depth at which nonlinear effects occurred. In most previous studies and models, nonlinear effects are limited to lower strength soils and the upper few meters at a site. Nonlinearity was still observed with a shear wave velocity reduction of five percent between the GL-30 and GL-100 meter sensors. Although the shear modulus is reduced much less than in the shallower sediments, we are able to surmise that even the deeper and stronger material can display nonlinear fast dynamics.

The GVDA site confirms nonlinearity much in the same way that the WLA data does. Events that create large ground motions between 15 meters and the surface cause damage in the material and reduce its shear strength significantly. The GVDA site provides decent resolution during a ten year period, but not as many well-recorded events have occurred there than at WLA, partly due to the higher noise characteristics of the older vintage of borehole sensor at the GVDA site.

The DPK site has one event with evidence of nonlinearity in the soft upper layer of soil as well, but not between the lower depth sensor pairings. This is likely because of the lack of data at the site because there are only four events with ground motions larger than 20 Gals, therefore the deeper material has not had large enough strains to cause nonlinearity. One hypothesis is that higher stiffness materials need higher ground motions (effective strains) in order to cause damage to and reduction of the shear modulus.

The BVDA site does not display any nonlinearity even though it has experienced some ground motions greater than the threshold for nonlinearity found at the previous sites (~30 Gals). Velocity measurements at the sight indicate it has a faster wave velocity and therefore larger shear modulus when compared to that of the other sites, so although we expected to find less nonlinear behavior during the greater than 30 Gal ground motions, we did not expect to find no nonlinearity because we demonstrate fast dynamics with stiffer material in deeper materials of other sites. We have no clear answer to this question that is raised by the lack of damage to the site during high strains, but it indicates that soil shear strength is not the only variable that affects nonlinear behavior. The sediments at BVDA are significantly stiffer and compositionally different enough from WLA and GVDA to still behave linearly up to 100 Gals of ground motion. The different depositional environment likely plays a role in this. Comparing GVDA to WLA, which has a higher  $V_s30$  (GVDA  $V_s30 \sim 250$  m/s; WLA  $V_s30 \sim 170$  m/s), supports the claim that nonlinearity is not entirely determined by stiffness because GVDA appears to experience greater levels of fast dynamics.

The anisotropy is an interesting observation that merits discussion. It could possibly be caused by long-term damage in the direction parallel to the nearby San Jacinto fault trending 50 degrees west of north. Because the fault is near, tectonic stresses might have caused fractures in parallel to the direction we find the anisotropy. Fractures inhibiting the travel of seismic waves through the bedrock would cause a phase velocity slowing and apparent drop in shear modulus in one direction relative to another. Another cause of anisotropy could be the orientation of the sedimentary bedding in the valley. If the anisotropy is truly more nonequilibrium recovery in one direction than another, we would expect to find increasing amounts of nonlinearity in the shallower materials, but instead we find a constant anisotropy in the deeper sediment and very little in the shallow sediments. This results suggests that the deeper materials have been subjected to more faulting damage than the shallow sediment and it is not related to nonlinear behavior, but instead could be the effects of permanent fault zone damage over time.

A possible source of error in our calculations of the average shear wave velocity or time lag could come from ignoring the time dependent recovery process that we have been studying. It is observed that small events after large shaking exhibit a reduced shear wave velocity; therefore we cannot assume the maximum shear modulus  $(G_{max})$  of the sight is related to the average shear wave velocity at the site during events that are below 30 Gals. A true *Gmax* at the site can only be determined by measuring the shear wave velocity when there is absolutely no memory of previous nonlinearity in the soil. Viewing the moving average of shear wave velocity at WLA indicates that during long periods without strong ground motions, the value appears below the total average for shear velocities from all the small events recorded. Therefore, the actual s-wave velocity is likely faster than is calculated, which would produce even larger percentages of velocity reduction at the site. This conclusion implies that the quantified nonlinearity presented in this study likely underestimate how much actual nonlinearity is occurring and the recovery time is even longer than inferred. Therefore, we take these results as minimum estimates for the true effects of nonlinearity. It may be challenging to find the true  $G<sub>max</sub>$  because the material takes so long to recover, it could be slightly under the influence of earthquakes in years past, such as the 1987 superstition hills earthquake that liquefied the site, so we leave the results as a minimum estimate without trying to infer what the maximum extent could be.

#### Conclusion

This study has demonstrated *in situ* observations of nonlinear and nonequilibrium effects in soil with varying degrees of shear strength during strong ground motions recorded at various down-hole arrays. It also suggests a slow recovery process that can last months and possibly to years after significant damage has been done to granular Earth materials at multiple sights. At the WLA site nonlinearity was consistently detected at accelerations as low as 30 Gals and there is up to a 40% increase in time lag during the largest ground motions. We also discovered a possible effect of long-term anisotropic damage at the BVDA site that needs further examination.

#### **How water table height affects shear wave velocity in soil**

#### Introduction

The permanently installed cross-hole experiment at the Garner Valley Downhole Array and Wildlife Liquefaction Array were placed in order to further constrain how long it takes for Earth materials to recover their shear modulus after larger earthquakes. Since their installation, there has not been any large ground motion at either site, but it was discovered that as the water table varied with the seasons, the shear wave velocity changed. This sparked our following study of pore fluid pressure on shear wave velocity.

The physical processes involved in seismic wave velocity reduction are poorly understood and are very difficult to model. There are many potential sources of seismic energy absorption in rock and unconsolidated sediment including but not limited to frictional affects and pore fluid saturation. Many previous studies have found that pore fluids have strong effects on attenuation in rocks; Tittmann et al (1972) showed that by removing the trace amounts of water vapor present in rocks at room humidity, the attenuation decreases by an order of magnitude. Born (1941) found that when water saturation was reduced to below one percent in sandstone, attenuation was decreased and became frequency dependent with similar results from Gardner et al (1964) in Berea sandstone. Seismic velocity and attenuation in granite and limestone is a function of pore fluid viscosity as studied by Nur and Simmons (1970) and Nur (1971) and interpreted as shear relaxation (Walsh, 1969) or intercrack flow (O'Connell and Budiansky, 1977). Measurements of P and S wave attenuation were first measured in dry and saturated

sandstone by Toksöz et al in 1979 and Johnston et al (1979) concluded that the dominant mechanism for attenuation in both the wet and dry rock was frictional sliding.

There is a general agreement that rocks with pore fluids present have a greater amount of seismic attenuation than dry rocks, but the mechanisms responsible for this effect are disputed. There have also been few *in situ* studies of how water table height affects seismic wave velocity and no long-term studies on how seasonal changes to pore fluid pressure with changing water table height affect attenuation. West and Menkey (2001) performed a study observing changing water table height during the cycle of the tides on a sandy beach and found that saturated layers showed changing wave velocity with changing water table height, attributing increased pore fluid pressure to a reduced shear modulus. This project is intended to bring more *in situ* data forward and to examine how changes in pore fluid pressure over months and years (due to rainfall and drought) affect shear wave velocity.

#### Methods

The Wildlife Liquefaction Array and Garner Valley Downhole Array, two different downhole arrays in Southern California, have permanently deployed cross-hole experiments that are used in this study. Shear wave velocity is found from the cross-hole experiment by measuring the time it takes the waves to travel from a source to two geophones all located at the same depth. Using the distance between the sensors and the time difference, an average shear wave velocity between the two sensors is calculated. At Garner Valley the setup includes a solenoid powered dual directional hammer located at five meters in depth and four geophones, two of which are located at five meters and the other two directly above

22

those at two meters depth (Figure 8). The hammer is triggered to swing both upwards and downwards once a week, Sundays at 7:30 AM local time.

The Wildlife Liquefaction Array also has a cross-hole experiment running once a week. It has a hammer source at 4.6 meters depth and three geophones at the same depth at 3.21 meters, 6.28 meters, and 9.38 meters in a straight line away from the source along with another geophone above the farthest geophone at 2.5 meters depth (Figure 9).



Figure 8.1: The basic layout of the cross-hole experiment at GVDA. 8.2: Top of borehole casing. 8.3: Depiction of one of the four Geospace GS-20DX 14 hz, uniaxial Geophones. 8.4: Close-up of the duel-directional solenoid driven hammer



Figure 9: Layout of cross-hole experiment at WLA

At GVDA, the hammer was swung from December 7, 2010 to June 18, 2012, then from August 9, 2015 to May 14, 2017. The hammer swung every day during the 2010-2012 window and once a week from August 2015 to July 2017. The data is stored as miniSEED files on the servers at the Earth Research Institute. MATLAB scripts extract the data and convert it to a useable format. A Short Term Average over Long Term Average (STA/LTA) moving algorithm detects when the upswing and downswing arrivals occur during the closest geophone's record and then one second windows around those arrival times are created to use for cross correlation. Geophones 42 and 22 (Figure 8a) then have their arrival time windows cross-correlated together and using the difference in arrival times and the distance between the sensors, the shear wave velocity is calculated. The sample rate of the geophones is 2000 samples per second (sps), or every 5 x  $10^{-4}$  seconds. Waves travelling at  $\sim$ 200 m/s (the approximate velocity at 5 meters depth) recorded at 2000 sps by geophones

spaced ~5 m take 0.025 seconds, or 50 samples to cover that distance. If the s-wave speed is increased to 205 m/s, it takes  $\sim$ 0.0244 seconds, a difference of 6 x 10<sup>-4</sup> seconds, only about one sample less to cover the distance. This gives a velocity change detection resolution of about 5 m/s with the 2000 sps data acquisition.

Water table and rainfall data during the time period of interest were also collected from a pore pressure transducer, barometric pressure sensor, and rainfall sensor. The pore pressure transducer and barometric pressure sensor are used to calculate the water table height every day during the periods when the hammer was active.

The same methods are used for the WLA data, except no rainfall data was included in the analysis.

#### Results

The shear wave velocity at GVDA varies between 209 and 225 meters per second. Figure 10 shows the wave velocity and water table height during the two periods the hammer was active for the up swing and down swing. There is a clear trend between rising water table height and decreasing shear wave velocity and vice versa during both time periods. Note that the water table height is always above the geophones that are used in the calculations.

Figure 11 shows the recent hammer swing data with rainfall plotted as well. During the winter storms in early 2017 that brought the water table height above 2 meters occur at the same time that the wave velocity decreases by almost 5%.

25



Figure 10: Water table height and shear wave velocity versus date



Figure 11: Water table height, s-wave velocity, and rainfall versus date

The data from WLA did not produce any meaningful results. The s-wave arrivals are more emergent than the impulsive signal at GVDA and have a long coda after the arrival that make the cross correlation have a very difficult to get an accurate time difference. Because of this issue, it was not possible to analyze the data from the WLA cross-hole array using these cross-correlations methods. Figure 12 displays the velocity data that was resolved; the velocity varies between 149 and 165 m/s. There is a slightly higher resolution because of the slower average shear wave velocity at this site relative to the GVDA, approximately 4 m/s between intervals.



28



Figure 12: The WLA results comparing shear wave velocity and date. There are a few outliers, and a few dates missing because hammer source was not triggered.

#### Discussion

The data from GVDA shows a strong visual correlation between water table height and the shear wave velocity of the material. The higher the water table, the slower the shear wave velocity. Because the geophones are always below the water table at this site, the presence of pore fluids or lack thereof is likely not the causation of the velocity changes observed. Instead, larger fluid pressures due to the increased height of the overlying water column likely causes it. Because the density of the material is staying constant, the assumption is that the shear modulus of the material is changing with the pore fluid pressure. Fluid pressure reduces the effective stress in the sediment likely because of reduced friction

29

between grains causing a reduction in shear wave velocity to occur. Just as shear strength increases with compaction and consolidation of sediment, increased pore fluid pressure acts in the reverse and decreases the shear modulus in these near-surface unconsolidated sediments.

#### Conclusion

The cross-hole experiment has provided evidence that over long periods of droughts and heavy rains, change in the height of the water table cause changes in the shear wave velocity. This is a phenomenon that should be carefully considered when examining shallow shear wave velocity studies because it can change results from one time of the year to another by 5%.

This analysis shows that studying nonlinear change in the shear modulus using the cross-hole arrays is promising in the future because the resolution,  $\sim$  5 m/s at GVDA and 4 m/s at WLA, is fine enough to detect small changes in the s-wave velocity. It will be useful as a tool for studying the slow recovery of the modulus after strong ground motions at the two sites.

#### **References**

- Seed, H.B., and I. M. Idriss (1970). Report No. ERIC 70-10, *Soil moduli and damping factors for dynamic response analysis*, Earthquake Engineering Research Center, University of California, Berkeley.
- Hardin, B. O., and V. P. Drnevich (1972a). Shear modulus and damping in soil: Measurement and parameter effects, *J. Soil Mech. Found. Div. ASCE* **98**, 603–624.
- Hardin, B. O., and V. P. Drnevich (1972b). Shear modulus and damping in soil: Design equations and curves, *J. Soil Mech. Found. Div. ASCE* **98**, 667–692.
- Vucetic, M. (1994). Cyclis threshold shear strains in soil *J. Geotech. Eng.* **120**, 2208-2228.
- Guyer, R. A., and P. A. Johnson (1999). The astonishing case of mesoscopic elastic nonlinearity, *Physics Today* **52**, 30–35.
- Ostrovsky, L., and P. A. Johnson (2001). Dynamic nonlinear elasticity in geomaterials, *La Rivista del Nuovo Cimento* **24**, 1–46.
- Beresnev, I. A., and K. L. Wen (1996). Nonlinear soil response—a reality? *Bull. Seismol. Soc. Am.* **86**, 1964–1978.
- Johnson, P. A., and A. Sutin (2005). Slow dynamics and anomalous fast dynamics in diverse solids, *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.* **117**, 124–130.
- Lawrence, Z., P. Bodin, C. A. Langston, F. Pearce, J. Gomberg, P. A. Johnson, F. Y. Menq, and T. Brackman (2008). Induced dynamic nonlinear ground response at Garner Valley, California, *Bull. Seismol. Soc. Am.* **98**, 1412–1428.
- Lawrence, Z., Bodin, P., and C.A. Langston (2009). In Situ Measurments of Nonlinear and Nonequilibrium Dynamics in Shallow, Unconsolidated Sediments, *Bull. Seismol. Soc. Am.* **99**, 1650-1670.
- Pavlenko, O. and K. Irikura (2002). Nonlinearity in the response of soils in the 1995 Kobe earthquake in vertical components of records, *Soil. Dyn. Earthq. Eng.* **22**, 967-975.
- Karabulut, H. and M. Couchon (2007). Spatial variablitiy and nonlinearity of strong ground motion near a fault, *Geophys. J. Int.* **170**, 262-274.
- Sawazaki, K. H., H. Sato, H. Nakahara, and T. Nishimura (2006). Temporal change in site response caused by earthquake strong motion as revealed from coda spectral ratio measurement, *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **33**, L21303.
- Steidl, J. H., F. Civilini, and S. Seale (2014). What have we learned after a decade of experiments and monitoring at the NEES@UCSB permanently instrumented field sites? Proc. of the 10th U.S. National Conference on Earthquake Engineering,Anchorage, Alaska, 21–25 July 2014.
- TenCate, J. A., E. Smith, and R. A. Guyer (2000). Universal slow dynamics in granular solids, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**, 1020–1023.
- TenCate, J. A., D. Pasqualini, S. Habib, K. Heitmann, D. Higdon, and P. A. Johnson (2004). Nonlinear and nonequilibrium dynamics in geomaterials, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, doi 10.1103/PhysRevLett .93.065501.
- Johnson, P. A., and X. Jia (2005). Nonlinear dynamics, granular media and dynamic earthquake triggering, *Nature* **437**, 871–874.
- Tittman, B.R., Abdel-Gawad, M., and Housley, R.M., (1972). Elastic velocity and Q measurements on Apollo 12, 14, and 15 rocks, *Proc. 3td Lunar Sci. Conf.* p. 2565- 2575.
- Born, W.T., (1941). The attenuation constant of earth materials: Geophysics. 6, p. 132-148.
- Gardner, G. H. F., Wyllie, M. R. J., and Droschak, D. M., (1964). Effects of pressure and fluid saturation on the attenuation of elastic waves in sands, *J. Petr. Tech*., **16**, p. 189-198.
- Nur, A., and Simmons, G., (1970). The effect of viscosity of a fluid phase on velocity in low porosity rocks, *Earth Plan. Sci. Lett.*, **7** p. 99-108.
- Nur, A., (1971). Visocus phase in rocks and the low-velocity zone, *J. Geophys. Res.*, **76**, p. 1270-1277.
- Walsh, J. B., (1969). New analysis of attenuation in partially melted rock, *J. Geophys. Res.* **74**, p. 4333-4337.
- O'Connel, R. J., and Budiansky, B., (1977). Viscoelastic properties of fluid-saturated cracked solids, *J. Geophys. Res.*, **82**, p. 5719-5736.
- Toksöz, M. N., Johnston, D. H., and Timur, A., (1979). Attenuation of seismic waves in dry and saturated rocks. I. Laboratory measurments, *Geophysics*. **44**, p. 681-690.
- Johnston , D. H., Toksöz, M. N., and Timur, A., (1979). Attenuation of seismic waves in dry and saturated rocks: II. Mechanisms, *Geophysics*. **44**, p. 691-711.
- West, M. and Menke, W., (2001). Fluid-Induced Changes in Shear Velocity from Surface Waves. Proc., Symposium on the Application of Geophysics to Engineering and Environmental Problems (SAGEEP), Denver, Co., p. 21-28.

## **Appendix**

List of events for WLA

























List of events for GVDA













List of events for DPK





### List of events for BVDA



