Integrated Subsurface Analysis of Thickness and Density for Liquefaction Hazard: Case Study of South Cilacap Region, Indonesia.
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Abstract
The thickness of the liquefiable layer can be the factor inducing liquefaction hazard, apart from seismicity. Several studies have been conducted to predict the possibility of the liquefiable layer based on the filed sampling. However, a detailed investigation of the subsurface interpretation has not been defined, in particular the thickness estimation of the liquefiable layer. This study is carried out in south Cilacap area where potential liquefaction is exists due to the earthquake history data and near surface condition. The aim of this study is to investigate the physical properties and thickness distribution using GGMplus gravity data and resistivity data. This research is conducted by spectrum analysis of gravity model and 2D resistivity model. This study’s main results is by performing the residual gravity anomaly with the associated SRTM/DEM data to define the subsurface physical distribution and structural orientation of the area. Residual gravity anomaly is also separated through the low pass filter in order to have robust interpretation. The residual anomaly indicates that the area has identical structural pattern with geological and SRTM map. The results show a pattern of high gravity index in the northeast area of the study having range of 70 – 115 MGaI gravity index, associated with the volcanic breccia, and a low gravity profile with less than 65 in the southwest, associated with the alluvial and water table dominated distribution. The thickness of Alluvial is determined by resistivity model with H1 at a range of 3 meters and H2 at a range of 4 m. This research is included in the potential liquefaction category with the potential for a large earthquake.
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1. Introduction
Liquefaction is a phenomenon of loss of soil shear strength in water-saturated sand due to earthquake vibrations. This event causes the soil to collapse and behave like a liquid (Aditama et al., 2020). In general, the liquefaction phenomenon occurs in granular of sand layers that are saturated with water and receive cyclic loads due to the earthquakes (Jinguiji and Toprak, 2017). Earthquake vibrations cause soil particles to contract, and swiftly become undrained conditions (Pokhrel et al., 2013). When the pore water pressure value is equal to the total soil stress, effective soil stress is zero, resulting in a decrease of shear strength and collapses (Hardy et al., 2015). One way to determine the potential danger of liquefaction is by determining the subsurface conditions such as the lithology, physical property and thickness of water table layer (Muhammad et al., 2016) (Ozscep and Ozcep, 2011). This research is carried out in south Cilacap where the seismicity is potentially high, supported by the prone of alluvial deposition distributed across the southern area (Suwanto et al., 2019).
Regional geology refers to previous research on the Geological Map of Pangandaran Sheet (Van Bemmelen, 1949). Based on the Figure 1C, the stratigraphical unit consists of the Quaternary Deposits (Qa), the Kumbang Formation (Tpk), the Halang Formation (Tmph), and the Fm Halang Sandstone Members (Tmhs). Most of the resistivity data samples are taken from the alluvial (Qa) deposits in the southern area (Van Bemmelen, 1949).

The north western part consists of settlements, rice fields, industry, and others. This area can be said to be a developing area with the support of several factors such as the large population, the times, and the fairly flat topography so that development in this area is also developing (Gao, Chen and Luo, 2013). To support this development, technical information, especially subsurface engineering geology is needed so that the development and development of the area can be sustained (Is Wahyudi et al., 2019). The purpose of this research is to determine the physical properties of rock distribution and the thickness area of liquefiable layer through the resistivity model (Aditama et al., 2019). This result is then projected into the Jingunji model to compare the relevance of liquefiable layer into the potential earthquake (Jinguji and Toprak, 2017).

\[ C_B = 2\pi G_\rho h_p \]  
[1]  
\[ \Delta g_{SB} = \Delta g_D - C_B \]  
[2]

Fig 1. (A) The epicentre relocated distribution map distribution of the South Java trench as potential trigger for ground movement which could affect the liquefaction risks, followed by figure B as the most likely shallow bathymetry map (Widyananto et al., 2020). (C) Research location, situated in south cilacap regency with 400 km (20 km x 20 km), specifically in 9150000 mN – 9170000 mN, and 260000 mE – 280000 mE. The research location is mainly dominated by alluvial distribution of quaternary deposits.

2. Material and Method

2.1 Gravity data

Gravity is acquired using the extraction of satellite data, EGM 2008, overlain by the short scale of topography effect (Hirt et al., 2013). We used 2 out of 4 GGMplus satellite data source, which are (i) Gravity Acceleration, and (ii) Free air anomaly based on the spectrum analysis (Masson et al., 2012). The spectrum analysis is a Fourier transform process to convert a signal into the sum of several sinusoidal signals with various frequencies (Hall, 2012). 

Free fall acceleration and the Gravity anomaly to approach the number of elevations is defined on the following equation [Eq.1; Eq.2]
Where $c_B$ is bouger correction, $G$ is gravity acceleration of earth (constant value), $\rho$ is density, and $h$ is the variability of elevations. Following the first equation [Eq.1], the correction is needed to yield simple bouger anomaly (SBA) (Fitz Gerald, 2020). The correction is then explained on second equation [Eq.2] with the reduction between $\Delta g$ gravity disturbance from GGMPlus dataset and the bouger correction (Zeng, Xu and Tan, 2007; Guillen et al., 2008).

The result highlights an amplitude spectrum and a phase spectrum which is used to estimate the depth of anomaly by estimating the value of the wave number ($k$) and amplitude ($A$). This can be used to calculate the width of the filter window which is then used as data input in the filtering process, separation of regional anomalies, and residual anomalies (Zeng, Xu and Tan, 2007). In addition, plot of $\ln A$ against $k$, divided from six-track slicing. It can be seen in the graph that $\ln A$ against $k$ in the spectrum analysis will experience a reflection of the whole data plot (Figure 2) (Masson et al., 2012). Then on the graph there are red and blue colors, red color represents regional anomalies and blue color represents residual anomalies (Figure 2).

Fig. 2. Six different spectrum analysis is plotted with wave number and amplitude. The graph shows two different colors representing the regional depth and residual depth through red and blue colors, respectively. Those depth will inform the gravity anomaly from the residual data interpolation.
Table 1. Six line shows different regional and residual depth, ranging from 39 km to 75 km of depth. This data is important to get a robust interpretation of gravity anomaly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Regional Depth</th>
<th>Residual Depth</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>X (k cutoff)</th>
<th>Lamda</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-332.34</td>
<td>-39.472</td>
<td>7.63 54</td>
<td>5.4938</td>
<td>0.007312509</td>
<td>859.237913</td>
<td>3.43695165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-11987</td>
<td>-73.744</td>
<td>12.66</td>
<td>4.7714</td>
<td>0.00066217</td>
<td>9488.78065</td>
<td>37.9551226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-1709.9</td>
<td>-58.79</td>
<td>8.4047</td>
<td>4.1676</td>
<td>0.002566213</td>
<td>2448.42701</td>
<td>9.79370805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-9195.7</td>
<td>-75.356</td>
<td>11.983</td>
<td>4.8116</td>
<td>0.000786308</td>
<td>7990.74259</td>
<td>31.9629704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-4095.9</td>
<td>-75.459</td>
<td>10.292</td>
<td>6.1346</td>
<td>0.001034066</td>
<td>6076.19566</td>
<td>24.3047826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-2593.1</td>
<td>-67.315</td>
<td>9.7502</td>
<td>5.8245</td>
<td>0.001554249</td>
<td>4042.58481</td>
<td>16.1703393</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 3. 2D residual map based on the spectrum lines. It shows the residual anomaly in lateral distribution of data. This map is one of important steps to understand the physical property of density in subsurface area.

The spectrum analysis and each gravity data point are then projected into the 2D map model to generate the residual anomaly map distribution (Figure 3). The residual anomaly of gravity will be combined with the Digital Elevation Model type SRTM V.4.1 1 to determine the topography of the peripheral area’s topography (Nakata and Snieder, 2014). The main interpretation will be the combination between residual anomaly and the Digital Elevation Model.

2.2 Resistivity Data

Resistivity data use Schlumberger configuration plotted in 3 different locations (Figure 4). All data obtained will be modeled using Progress 3.0 software to determine 1D resistivity plot against the distance (Tini et al., 2017). This software also uses a forward modeling method to obtain resistivity and depth profiles. The resistivity profile shows the estimation of subsurface layers vertically including the resistivity value and the depth of each layer at the sounding point (Hirt et al, 2013).
In order to generate 2D profiles, we use Res2dinv version 3.54.44. Res2dinv will automatically generate a 2D or 3D subsurface resistivity model from data processing based on geoelectric tomography measurements (Daud et al., 2019). The resistivity model generated by Res2dinv is a model resulting from the inversion of field measurement data in the form of apparent resistivity.

3. Result and Discussion

3.1 Lateral distribution of bouger anomaly

The lateral density distribution is constructed using residual gravity anomaly. It shows that most of the residual anomaly has relatively shallow deflection of subsurface rock, as the anomaly ranging from 20 MGal to 120 MGal. This range creates a variability of gradient and contour straightness in the northeast area, presumably as a result of the large number of fault structures with 115 MGal bordering with very low anomaly at 45 MGal (Figure 5).

Most of low gravity anomalies are distributed in the south and southwest of area. In this area, major fault indication is less, but potentially small-scale fault is existing. Since low gravity is presence, the area is dominated by the distribution of alluvial sediments with 55 MGal - 60 MGal, having low basement thickness due to high gravity anomalies (Figure 6).

This is potentially interpreted as alkaline crustal rocks of the Ocean, lies beneath the Miocene section. Based on the topography, the northeast part has a high topography compared to other areas, thus indicating a homogeneous type of lithology or a uniform level of rock resistance to erosion and weathering. The interpretation of the area is volcanic breccia lithology based on correlation with regional geological maps (Figure 6).
3.2 Near-surface thickness from resistivity data.

Near surface liquefaction thickness is determined by the lithological correlation through the resistivity plot. All resistivity lines have 85 m of length and 2.5 m distances between its electrodes. 2D resistivity model is plotted based on resistivity anomaly of subsurface which has variation of depths between 7.97 - 11 m.

Point A has resistivity values from 3.57–68.7 70, formed predominantly by alluvial deposits (Qa) at a thickness of 1–9 meters. Point A has low resistivity
zone with 3.57-12.7 Ωm, representing the water-saturated alluvial layer and detected at a depth of 4.63-7.97 m below the surface (Figure 7). Point B has a range of resistivity values from 3.09-74 Ωm with an error presentation of 0.94% in the 10th iteration. Alluvial were detected at a depth of 0.625-4.63 m below the surface, with low resistivities between 3-9 Ωm. This low value is in accordance with the observation at point A where the alluvial is dominated by water (Figure 7).

Point C situated around the settlement, this is in accordance with the regional geological map in the area compiled by alluvial deposits (Qa). Based on the resistivity, it has alluvial water dominated with depths ranging from 0.625-4.63 m below the surface, this is in accordance with the resistivity shown in Figure 7 with a light blue-purple image, stretching a total of 85 meters. The low resistivity is at 8.60-12.5 Ωm which represents a water-saturated alluvial layer (Figure 7).

![Fig. 7. The resistivity sections at points A, B and C. It shows the correlation of each measurement point to subsurface lithology. This is done to determine the depth of the water table and alluvial to the bedrock. In general, the three points have a uniform quaternary alluvial thickness pattern.](image)

Table 2. Evaluation of the effect of liquefaction at the soil surface using the ratio of the thickness of the liquefiable layer and non-liquefiable layer obtained from the electrical resistivity survey. In general, points A, B, and C did not experience a significant difference in comparison, with the thickness of the liquefiable layer being bigger than the non-liquefiable layer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Thickness of non-liquefiable layer (H1) (m)</th>
<th>Thickness of liquefiable layer (H2) (m)</th>
<th>Moderate earthquake H2/H1</th>
<th>Large earthquake 1.25H2/H1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 shows the distribution of the thickness of the liquefied layer, associated with the alluvial presence with the water table. The distribution table is a summary of the resistivity plot described in the previous discussion. Thus, a simple method is applied to evaluate the risk of liquefaction using the thickness of the liquefied layer and the non-liquefied layer (Jingunji and Toprak, 2017). Alluvial resistivity and water table determinations at points A, B and C are related to the presence of a liquefiable layer. It is estimated to be H1 (thickness of the non-liquefiable layer) and H2 (thickness of the liquefiable layer), and will be projected to the experimental data, derived from Jingunji, 2017.

Based on the results of the thickness study, it can be seen that this study falls into the category of potential liquefaction in the large earthquake area due to the presence of the H2 value factor in the range of 4 meters and H1 in the range of 3 meters (Figure 8). This is in accordance with the 2017 Jingunji study which states that the influence factor in a large earthquake will cause liquefaction.
Fig. 8. Schematic curve of liquefiable to non-liquefiable layer based on Jingunji 2017 model. This research has overall thickness under the liquefiable domination layer by having 4m of thickness. Thus, indicates liquefiable layer more dominant, resulting in potential lateral movement during the earthquake. This is congruent with the schematic model generated by Jingunji while large earthquake plays an important role in inducing the liquefaction hazard.

4. Conclusion

This study concludes that integrated subsurface analysis using gravity and resistivity approaches greatly determines soil conditions that have the potential for liquefaction. This effect is based on the density distribution conditions of the residual anomaly and the thickness of the liquefiable layer based on the 2D resistivity value.

Based on the gravity value, it was found that the distribution of the residual anomaly varies in all study areas. The maximum residual area is in the north west with a value of 115 MGal. In this area it is possible to have an uplift / basement high with a thin sediment thickness. As well as the existence of a fault with a northwest-southeast orientation with a significant contrast to the 115 MGal and 45 MGal anomalies. In the south, the gravity anomaly drops drastically in the range of 45 - 60 MGal due to the presence of sedimentary basins and the presence of water-saturated alluvial deposits.

On the other hand, the results of the resistivity at points A, B and C were in agreement with the resulting surface sediment thickness at 7.97 - 11 m. This was then carried out by separating the dominant alluvial potential of saturated water, the result was 3 - 70 Ωm. The results of this resistivity plot produce H1 models at a range of 3 meters and H2 at a range of 4 m. So, it can be concluded that based on the Jingunji 2017 approach, this research is included in the potential liquefaction category with the potential for a large earthquake.
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