



# LUND UNIVERSITY

## An alternative methodology for the analysis of electrical resistivity data from a soil gas study

Johansson, Sara; Rosqvist, Hakan; Svensson, Mats; Dahlin, Torleif; Leroux, Virginie

*Published in:*  
Geophysical Journal International

*DOI:*  
[10.1111/j.1365-246X.2011.05080.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-246X.2011.05080.x)

2011

[Link to publication](#)

### *Citation for published version (APA):*

Johansson, S., Rosqvist, H., Svensson, M., Dahlin, T., & Leroux, V. (2011). An alternative methodology for the analysis of electrical resistivity data from a soil gas study. *Geophysical Journal International*, 186(2), 632-640. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-246X.2011.05080.x>

*Total number of authors:*  
5

### **General rights**

Unless other specific re-use rights are stated the following general rights apply:  
Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

Read more about Creative commons licenses: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

### **Take down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

LUND UNIVERSITY

PO Box 117  
221 00 Lund  
+46 46-222 00 00

## An alternative methodology for the analysis of electrical resistivity data from a soil gas study

Sara Johansson<sup>1,2</sup>, Håkan Rosqvist<sup>3</sup>, Mats Svensson<sup>2</sup>, Torleif Dahlin<sup>4</sup>  
and Virginie Leroux<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Physics, Lund University, Lund, Sweden. E-mail: scwsp@mahidol.ac.th

<sup>2</sup>Tyréns AB, Malmö, Sweden

<sup>3</sup>NSR AB, Helsingborg, Sweden

<sup>4</sup>Engineering Geology, Lund University, Lund, Sweden

Accepted 2011 May 13. Received 2011 May 13; in original form 2010 February 26

### SUMMARY

The aim of this paper is to present an alternative method for the analysis of resistivity data. The methodology was developed during a study to evaluate if electrical resistivity can be used as a tool for analysing subsurface gas dynamics and gas emissions from landfills. The main assumption of this study was that variations in time of resistivity data correspond to variations in the relative amount of gas and water in the soil pores. Field measurements of electrical resistivity, static chamber gas flux and weather data were collected at a landfill in Helsingborg, Sweden. The resistivity survey arrangement consisted of nine lines each with 21 electrodes in an investigation area of 16 × 20 m. The ABEM Lund Imaging System provided vertical and horizontal resistivity profiles every second hour. The data were inverted in Res3Dinv using L<sub>1</sub>-norm-based optimization method with a standard least-squares formulation. Each horizontal soil layer was then represented as a linear interpolated raster model. Different areas underneath the gas flux measurement points were defined in the resistivity model of the uppermost soil layer, and the vertical extension of the zones could be followed at greater depths in deeper layer models. The average resistivity values of the defined areas were calculated and plotted on a time axis, to provide graphs of the variation in resistivity with time in a specific section of the ground. Residual variation of resistivity was calculated by subtracting the resistivity variations caused by the diurnal temperature variations from the measured resistivity data. The resulting residual resistivity graphs were compared with field data of soil moisture, precipitation, soil temperature and methane flux. The results of the study were qualitative, but promising indications of relationships between electrical resistivity and variations in the relative amount of gas and water in the soil pores were found. Even though more research and better data quality is necessary for verification of the results presented here, we conclude that this alternative methodology of working with resistivity data seems to be a valuable and flexible tool for this application.

**Key words:** Time series analysis; Numerical approximations and analysis; Electrical properties; Hydrogeophysics; Permeability and porosity; Equations of state.

### INTRODUCTION

In landfill research, electrical resistivity measurements are particularly suitable for detecting leachate, because of the large decrease in resistivity these features create. The idea of using resistivity for detecting subsurface gas or estimating gas emissions is relatively new.

During 2007, a field investigation at the Filborna landfill outside Helsingborg in Sweden was carried out. The aim was to use time-lapse electrical resistivity monitoring to follow water migration during and after leachate recirculation. An unexpected result

was that irregular zones of increased resistivity occurred at various locations during the experimental period. These zones were interpreted as possible subsurface gas accumulations (Rosqvist *et al.* 2007). The idea of interpreting high-resistivity zones in landfills as gas accumulations was also presented by Moreau *et al.* (2004). Their investigation site was located at a French bioreactor, where relative changes in resistivity were studied during a leachate recirculation event. In one part of the landfill, the electrical resistivity first decreased, after which it increased before returning to the initial value. Another zone showed the opposite behaviour with an initial rise of resistivity followed by a decrease, before returning

to the reference value. The interpretation of this pattern was that a simultaneous flow of both liquid and gas in the concerned porous areas could cause the observed variations in resistivity (Moreau *et al.* 2004).

The two main gas transport mechanisms in soils are diffusion and advection. Diffusion is a molecular transport process driven by a concentration gradient, whereas advection involves movements of whole air volumes due to pressure imbalances (Barber *et al.* 1990; Campbell 1998; Stepniewski *et al.* 2002). Even though the processes involved in soil gas transport inside landfills are known, large uncertainties regarding the actual pattern of subsurface gas movements still remain. This causes a problem, especially in landfill gas models. The uncertainties originate in the structural heterogeneity of landfills; differences in waste composition and density create large variations in porosity, soil moisture and hydraulic conductivity across a landfill that are difficult to model without exhaustive excavations (Crawford & Smith 1985; Lamborn 2007). The heterogeneity of landfill soils also results in highly variable spatial and temporal patterns of gas emissions from landfills (approximately 55 per cent methane, CH<sub>4</sub> and 45 per cent carbon dioxide, CO<sub>2</sub>; Crawford & Smith 1985).

The interpretation from the earlier studies of noticeably increased resistivity in various landfill zones as gas accumulations has not yet been verified. Another possibility is that the zones could be the result of inversion artefacts. The latter was discussed at the 'Workshop on 'Geophysical measurements at landfills' in Malmö, 2008. However, during 2008 a project that aimed to investigate the possibilities of detecting and verifying gas accumulations in landfills with electrical resistivity was carried out (Rosqvist *et al.* 2009). One of the objectives was to evaluate if resistivity data can be useful as a tool for studies of subsurface gas dynamics, and linked to the varying gas emissions from landfill soil surfaces (Johansson 2009). It was to address this question that the field measurements and data analysis presented in this paper were performed.

The aim of this paper is to present the methodology of the resistivity data analysis, together with results focused around one of six selected field measurement points. For a more detailed description of the project as a whole, see Rosqvist *et al.* (2009) and Johansson (2009).

## MATERIAL AND METHODS

### Data collection

The field investigation was carried out during the summer of 2008 at the Filborna landfill in Helsingborg, Sweden. An investigation area of 16 × 20 m was chosen on the top of an uncovered deposition cell. The waste in the uppermost 0.0- to 0.5-m-thick soil layer was more than 60 years old and did not produce gas anymore, whereas more recent, gas-producing material was deposited further down.

Electrical resistivity was systematically measured with the ABEM Lund Imaging System, an automatic system that provided a full resistivity data set every second hour during June to September 2008. The survey arrangement consisted of nine electrode lines with 21 electrodes each. The electrode spacing was 1 m and the distance between each pair of lines was 2 m. Relatively small spacings between the electrodes and the lines were chosen to obtain high spatial resolution. The pole-dipole array in forward and reverse configurations was used for the measurements to obtain deep ground penetration, and the distant electrode was located approximately 100 m away from the measurement area.


A weather station with a Campbell C1000 data logger (Campbell Manufacturing) recorded soil temperature at 5-cm depth below the soil surface and precipitation (ARG10, tipping bucket) every second in the immediate vicinity of the investigation area. The weather station logger sometimes underestimated the amount of precipitation, but reliably recorded the times of all rain events. In addition, twelve 30-cm-long time domain reflectometer (TDR)-probes were installed in the ground, equally spaced over a large part of the investigation area. The TDR-probes were connected to a multiplexer and a TDR100-instrument, and the measurements were made manually and concurrent with gas flux measurements. Soil moisture values were calculated with the response curves from the TDR-instrument, but unfortunately the magnitude of the values turned out to be rather uncertain, mainly because no soil samples needed for calibration of the TDR-probes were collected at the site.

Measurements of CH<sub>4</sub> flux from the soil surface were made with the static chamber method during five field days (August 18–22). The principal concept of the method is to measure how the concentration of a specific gas rises inside a chamber, placed upon a gas-emitting surface. Three air samples were collected with syringes from the chambers during each measurement. The chambers, which occupied 0.055 m<sup>2</sup> areas of the ground when placed on the soil surface, were sealed to the ground with clay to prevent air leakage. Six fixed measurement points in the investigation area were selected for the static chamber measurements (Fig. 1). Three of the measurement points were located over zones with relatively high resistivity values (points K1, K2 and K3) and the other three over zones with lower resistivity values (points K4, K5 and K6). The measurements were carried out between one and three times a day at all measurement points. In the laboratory, the concentration of CH<sub>4</sub> in the air samples was analysed through separation by gas chromatography (GC, Shimadzu 17A) and detection by flame ionization detection (FID). Injection/detection and column oven temperatures were 140 and 70 °C, respectively. The samples were introduced into the GC column (Porapak Q) by syringe injection via a 1 mL sample loop. Helium was used as the carrier gas with a flow rate of 40 mL min<sup>-1</sup>. The CH<sub>4</sub> fluxes (mg CH<sub>4</sub> m<sup>-2</sup> hr<sup>-1</sup>) were calculated on the basis of the linear change in chamber concentration with time.

### Data analysis

The resistivity data for each set of measurements were inverted in Res3Dinv (Geotomo Software Sdn, Bhd; Loke 2008), using L<sub>1</sub>-norm-based optimization method with a standard least squares formulation. Because the L<sub>1</sub>-norm minimizes the sum of the absolute values of the data misfit, the effect of bad data points is reduced compared with the standard least squares (L<sub>2</sub>) optimization method (Loke *et al.* 2003). A 3D-model was computed for each time a measurement was taken with the same constraints and the same grid geometry each time. The total number of cells in the model was 10 880, and the dimensions of each cell corresponded to  $x = 0.5$  m,  $y = 1.0$  m and  $z_1 = 0.224$  m,  $z_2 = 0.260$  m and  $z_3 = 0.296$  m in layers 1, 2 and 3, respectively. As the ground surface was essentially flat, topography was not incorporated in the models. A homogeneous half-space based on the average of the logarithms of the measured apparent resistivities was used as starting model for the inversions. Because the available version of the software did not support time-lapse inversion, each data set was inverted individually and the difference between the time steps and various statistical parameters were calculated afterwards.

The measured data were generally of high quality illustrated by small residuals and the smooth appearance of the measured data.



**Figure 1.** The location of the CH<sub>4</sub> flux measurement points on a horizontal resistivity profile from the initial day of the investigation period. All zones with resistivity values exceeding 50 Ωm are shown in black. The white circles marks measurement points K1, K3 and K2 (left to right) and the black circles K6, K5 and K4 (down from above).

The number of measurement points used in the inversions of the data sets from 10:00 on August 18 to 12:00 on August 22 was nearly always 3888, with a few exceptions of 3885–3887 measurement points. The residual error of the inversions during the same period was  $4.5 \pm 0.2$  per cent. From the period 14:00 to 22:00 on August 22, the data quality was slightly worse. The number of measurement points was 3860, and the residual error  $7.2 \pm 0.1$  per cent.

The inverted resistivity data consisted of 640 coordinate values in each horizontal resistivity layer (in total 17 layers). The inverted data for each layer and each model were plotted as raster images, but the resolution was too rough for a spatial analysis. The flux measurements were representative for 0.055 m<sup>2</sup> circular areas of the soil (occupied by the chambers), whereas each cell in the resistivity models corresponded to a 0.5 m × 1.0 m area of the soil. The difference in resistivity between neighbouring cells was often large as a consequence of the low spatial resolution of the model. To smooth the data values and to obtain a more realistic representation of the soil, the resistivity model was linearly interpolated. Each cell in the interpolated model then corresponded to a 0.1 m × 0.1 m area of the soil. The main reason for the linear interpolation was to decrease the size of the model cells to be able to select areas (each containing several interpolated model cells) underneath the gas measurement positions. An average of the resistivity values in each defined area was calculated for each resistivity measurement. One benefit of using linear interpolation was that the resistivity values of not only the closest model cell, but also the surrounding model cells were taken into consideration in the analysis. Taking more than one inverted data value into account reduces the uncertainty in the data analysis.


It was noticed early on from a visual interpretation that zones of high resistivity values seemed to vary between growing larger and smaller over time. Apart from that, there was no dramatic temporal change in the overall resistivity distribution of the investigation area.

Underneath measurement points K1, K2 and K3 definitions of high-resistivity zones were made by identifying borders around the zones where the resistivity values dropped rapidly. It was possible to follow the vertical extension of the defined areas by comparing the horizontal resistivity profiles of different depths (Fig. 2a–c). In layer 4 (0.6–1.0 m), the resolution of the resistivity data had decreased so much that it became difficult to follow the defined areas at greater depths. The soil layers below layer 3 (0.4–0.6 m) were therefore left out of the analysis. The resistivity values underneath measurement points K4, K5 and K6 were low over a large area, with no steep changes in resistivity. At these locations, rectangular areas corresponding to 0.33 m<sup>2</sup> of the soil surrounding the chambers were selected in the resistivity model to represent the soil below the measurement points.

Data collected every 2 hr from August 18 10:00 to August 22 22:00 were used in the data analysis. The average resistivity values in the defined areas were calculated for each time step and plotted on a time axis. The number of model cells included in each area corresponding to the measurement points was defined by the data from the first time step, and the definitions of the areas were thereafter kept constant irrespective of the development of the values in the included and surrounding model cells. Because of the relatively large time step in the resistivity data, the graphs of resistivity variations over time were interpolated with quadratic splines to get a continuous representation of the variations (Fig. 3).

The graphs showing the variations in resistivity over time are likely to reflect changes of the soil state in the defined areas throughout the investigated period. All soils consist of mineral particles (geological or organic), water and gas. The relative ratios of these constituents can be described by the following relationship:

$$\phi = \alpha + \theta = 1 - \frac{\rho_b}{\rho_m}, \quad (1)$$



**Figure 2.** Horizontal resistivity models showing zones with resistivity values exceeding  $100 \Omega\text{m}$  in black. (a) The limitations of a possible gas accumulation below measurement point K2 could be distinguished in layer 1 (0.0–0.1 m) of the soil (compare with Fig. 1) and followed into (b) layer 2 (0.1–0.4 m) and (c) layer 3 (0.4–0.6 m).

where  $\phi$  is the total soil porosity,  $\alpha$  is the volumetric air content and  $\theta$  is the volumetric water content of the pores. The bulk density  $\rho_b$  is the total density of the dry soil, whereas  $\rho_m$  represents the density of the mineral soil particles (Chapin 2002; Tang 2003). Since 5 days is a relatively short period of investigation, settlement of the landfill and other possible causes of physical changes in the ground can be neglected. With a constant pore volume, the variations in soil state reflected by resistivity logically depend on the relative amount of gas and water contained in the soil pores. It is presumed that decreasing resistivity corresponds to an increased amount of water in the soil pores and vice versa.

However, before any reliable attempt to interpret the variations in resistivity could be made, the influence of the varying soil temperature on the measured resistivity values had to be taken into consideration. Soil temperature has an effect on resistivity, because the conductivity of materials increases with increasing temperatures. The temperature effect on resistivity measurements follows the well-known equation:

$$\rho_t = \frac{\rho_r}{1 + \alpha(t - t_r)}, \quad (2)$$

where  $\rho_r$  is the resistivity measured at a reference temperature  $t_r$ ,  $t$  is the ambient soil temperature and  $\alpha$  is the temperature coefficient of resistivity which has an approximate value of 0.025 per degree (Keller *et al.* 1966).


The temperature effect in eq. (2) has nothing to do with the physical amount of gas or water in the soil pores, but only the mobility of the ions present in the soil. Therefore, this effect was modelled from the soil temperature data measured at the field site and subtracted from the measured resistivity values (Fig. 3). In this way, graphs showing the *residual variation in resistivity* could be produced. The residual variation in resistivity could only be calculated for the uppermost soil layer (layer 1, 0.0–0.1 m), because soil temperature was not measured at deeper depths. However, the diurnal variations in soil temperature decrease rapidly with depth, which means that the temperature effect on resistivity is less significant in the deeper layers.

This method leads to the assumption that the main variations in the residual resistivity graphs correspond to a change in the relative amount of gas and water in the soil pores, because the temperatures effect on resistivity has been removed from the graphs.


The residual variations in resistivity were compared with the gas flux data as well as the meteorological data collected in field, to evaluate whether or not the variations seen in the resistivity data were likely to reflect physical changes in the soil.

## RESULTS

Measurement point K2 showed what was considered the most interesting results of all six measurement points during the investigation period. The reason for this is related to the high variability in resistivity ( $\sim 50 \Omega\text{m}$  in 1 week). Point K2 was located in a zone of particularly high resistivity values (possibly a gas accumulation) with values that ranged from  $\sim 100$  to  $150 \Omega\text{m}$  in the uppermost soil. In Fig. 4, the measured resistivity variations in soil layers 1, 2 and 3 below measurement point K2 are plotted together with the  $\text{CH}_4$  fluxes measured at the soil surface. It can be seen that the resistivity is generally higher in layer 2 than in layer 1, but that the layers exhibited similar behaviour. In other words, when the resistivity increases in layer 1, it also increases in layer 2 but not necessarily by the same amount. However, in layer 3 the variations differ, and sometimes even behave opposite to the upper soil (compare for



**Figure 3.** Comparison between the measured resistivity variations (layer 1 at point K2) and the variations that would be theoretically expected from the variations in soil temperature alone.



**Figure 4.** CH<sub>4</sub> fluxes from the soil surface at measurement point K2, and the measured variations in resistivity in soil layers 1–3.


example the negative peaks in layers 1 and 2 with the simultaneous positive peak in layer 3 at 22:00 on August 19).

Fig. 5(a) below shows the residual variation in resistivity of layer 1 together with CH<sub>4</sub> fluxes from measurement point K2. A comparison of Figs 4 and 5(a) stresses how the graphs of residual variation in resistivity helps to differentiate between physical changes in the soil and variations caused by temperature variations. In contrast to the original inverted data in Fig. 4, three major resistivity peaks and a clearly decreasing trend of resistivity during the investigation period can be observed in Fig. 5(a).

Fig. 5(b) shows the precipitation and soil moisture data throughout the investigation period. Three larger rain events during the first

2 days are followed by more frequent but less intense precipitation towards the end of the period. Increasing soil moisture during the week is very likely to cause the decreasing trend of resistivity seen in Fig. 5(a). Fig. 5(a) also shows that although the flux data set is limited, there is also a rough indication of lower CH<sub>4</sub> fluxes towards the end of the investigation period.

In Fig. 5(a), the second and third large rain events result in simultaneous negative peaks in resistivity. In both cases, the resistivity rises to considerable positive peaks shortly after, and the CH<sub>4</sub> flux reach the highest values. In all six measurement points, except K5, a similar pattern was observed. Fig. 5(c) shows the residual variation in resistivity and CH<sub>4</sub> fluxes from point K3. Here, all three rain



**Figure 5.** The response of resistivity to rain events is clearly visible in the residual resistivity graphs. (a) At measurement point K2, the second and third rain event seen in (b) are visible as negative peaks in resistivity, immediately followed by considerable positive peaks. The overall decreasing trend in resistivity corresponds to an increasing trend in soil moisture. (b) The precipitation data show three larger rain events in the beginning of the period, followed by more frequent but less intensive precipitation towards the end. The soil moisture data shows a general increasing trend over the week. (c) The rain events and following positive peaks are detected at five of in total six measurement points. At measurement point K3, all three larger rain events are well detected.

events are clearly visible in the resistivity data as negative peaks, immediately followed by positive peaks. Although no flux measurements were made shortly after the first or second rain event, the maximum CH<sub>4</sub> flux from point K3 can be observed after the third rain event and can possibly be linked to the peak in resistivity.

Fig. 6(a) and (b) shows that there are also indications of a relationship between the diurnal variations of soil temperature and the residual variation in resistivity (note that this relationship has nothing to do with the inverse proportional relationship between the temperature-dependent mobility of ions and measured resistivity in eq. (2); this effect has already been withdrawn from the residual resistivity variations). The resistivity variations at measurement point K5 (Fig. 6b) seem to be almost exclusively determined by soil temperature; rain events or variations in soil moisture are not visible in the resistivity data here.

## DISCUSSION

### Discussion of results

At five of the six measurement points, it was noticed that soil temperature seemed to control the main pattern of the residual resistivity variations of layer 1. This is especially evident at point K5, and it can be suggested that the material overlying the measurement point has an impact on the results. At point K5, the surface layer consisted of a high percentage of clay. Because water infiltrates slower through clay than through more porous materials, this could be an explanation of the fact that the measured resistivity at point K5 shows no fast response to rain events or soil moisture, and therefore seems to be controlled only by the soil temperature.

It is clear that the soil temperature affects the measured resistivity data in two different ways: first in a general way, in which the temperature is inversely proportional to the resistivity (eq. 2). This is an established theory that is explained by the faster mobility of ions with increasing temperatures. Secondly, it is suggested that the additional effect of the variations in temperature on resistivity, illustrated in Fig. 6(a) and (b), is related to physical changes of the gas in the soil pores.


In landfill gas models, several authors (e.g. Hashemi *et al.* 2002; Liang *et al.* 2008) have used the ideal gas law to describe the state of gases in soil pores. If the gas is assumed to be a perfect gas, the relationship between the volume  $V$ , the temperature  $T$  and the partial pressure  $p_j$  for a gas substance  $j$  is

$$p_j V = n_j RT, \quad (3)$$

where  $n_j$  is the number of moles and  $R$  is the gas constant. If a gas consists of a mixture of substances, the total gas pressure and number of moles are a sum of the different substances (Campbell 1998).

If the ideal gas law can be applied to describe the gas present in the soil pores, it can be proposed that the gas pressure in the soil follows the same diurnal pattern as the soil temperature (assuming that the study volume is kept constant, which is the case in the current analysis, and that the transport of gas molecules between the volume and the surroundings is negligible compared with the amount of gas in the study volume). Increasing gas pressure in the soil pores is likely to cause an increase in resistivity of the soil, because gas itself is a poor conductor of electricity and an increasing pore pressure slows down the transport of electrons through the soil by creating a discontinuity in the water volume in the soil pores.

Referring to Fig. 6(a), it seems reasonable to relate the third resistivity peak, during August 21, to the soil temperature maximum,



**Figure 6.** The residual variation in resistivity seems to be linked to diurnal variations in soil temperature. (a) Although different factors, including soil temperature, affects the resistivity variations at measurement point K2, (b) the resistivity data from measurement point K5 seems to be exclusively determined by the soil temperature variations.

whereas the second resistivity peak, during August 20, appears before the soil temperature maximum. Resistivity also rises slightly before the soil temperature during August 20 (this behaviour was consistent at all points except K5).

It seems likely that the first two resistivity peaks seen at point K2 are related not only to soil temperature, but also to the second and third rain events (during August 19), which are detected as clear negative peaks in resistivity. In Fig. 4, it can be seen that simultaneously with the second rain event and the corresponding negative peaks in layers 1 and 2, the resistivity is still high in soil layer 3. When, shortly after, the resistivity rises in layers 1 and 2, the opposite is seen in layer 3 where the resistivity decreases.

The results suggest a physical explanation; the water infiltrated in the upper layers of the soil initially forces gas downwards into

deeper soil layers where the gas pressure rises. When the water continues to infiltrate deeper into the soil, the gas is instead forced upwards to the upper soil layers. This explanation seems to be in agreement with the measured  $\text{CH}_4$  fluxes at point K2; initially when the resistivity is rising in the upper soil layers after the second rain event, the fluxes are high (suggesting gas emission by advection flux). When the resistivity has decreased to a minimum in the upper layers, the measured flux is much lower (the same order of magnitude as the fluxes before the rain event). A similar pattern is seen during and after the third rain event in K2 (Fig. 4); negative peaks occur in layers 1 and 2 whereas a positive peak is seen in layer 3, occurring simultaneously with the rain event. Shortly after the resistivity rises in layers 1 and 2, while the opposite pattern is seen in layer 3, presumably due to infiltrating water. Unfortunately, no



CH<sub>4</sub> flux was measured immediately after the third rain event, but a large CH<sub>4</sub> flux was measured while the second resistivity peak in the upper layers was still present (perhaps maintained by the increasing soil temperature, compare with Fig. 6a). The reason for the lower CH<sub>4</sub> flux measured shortly afterwards is not clear, but it may be related to a simultaneous smaller rain event, compare Fig. 5(a) and (b).

If the maximum fluxes corresponding to presumed advection transport after rain events are excluded, a general decreasing trend of the size of the fluxes over the investigation period can be vaguely distinguished at point K2 (Fig. 5a). In landfills, the soil moisture content of the upper soil is one of the most important factors controlling gas emissions through the soil surface by diffusion flux, because high soil moisture content can prevent gas from diffusing to the atmosphere if the soil pores become water saturated (Boeckx *et al.* 1996). The results from point K2 are suggested to be in accordance with this theory, although the data sets are too small for a statistically significant correlation between soil moisture and CH<sub>4</sub> flux.

### Experience with the method

The good and even quality of the time-lapse resistivity data are probably an important reason for the promising results obtained in this study. If the relative data quality differs a lot between time steps, the uncertainty in the origin of the resistivity variations may increase so much that a small-scale analysis of this kind becomes difficult.

The decision to interpolate the resistivity data to smooth out the, in some cases, steep borders between the coordinate values in the model should not cause biases in itself, because a linear interpolation does not create any data that does not exist and makes no specific additional assumption. As a result of the linear interpolation (which is a way to handle the relatively rough resolution of the resistivity model), it was possible to identify more realistic limitations of resistivity zones below measurement points K1, K2 and K3. It constitutes a source of uncertainty to limit the borders of the zones as described in the Material and Methods. Even though physical changes exist and have an influence also on the surrounding soil, it was assumed that this was negligible in relation to the presumed main changes that would occur in the centre of the presumed gas accumulations.

A central problem with time-lapse analysis is related to the time step of the resistivity measurements in relation to the real changes in the ground; it is possible to miss out on fast changes that occur in the soil in between two resistivity measurements (here two hours). An attempt to handle this problem was to interpolate between the data points with quadratic spline functions. Applying quadratic spline functions instead of for example linear functions helped to smooth the appearance of the variations and assume how the resistivity is most likely to change in between the resistivity models. The result was helpful in terms of providing a qualitative picture of the changes in the ground and enabled comparisons with other data. Because of the nature of the resistivity data in terms of time step and the need for interpolation, it was important not to keep too much focus on details in the variations of resistivity. It is possible that small variations are results of instrumental noise or rapid changes that could not be completely retrieved from the data.

The main difficulty in the analysis was to be critically aware that some of the resistivity variations could be inversion artefacts instead of real changes in the soil. This problem complicates the

discussion about water infiltration earlier, where resistivity variations of different layers are compared with each other. It is possible that the different behaviour of layer 3 compared with layers 1 and 2 in Fig. 4 is a result of inversion artefacts. However, because the interpretation that the resistivity variation here is caused by water infiltration is in good agreement with both precipitation and flux data, the discussion should not be dismissed. There are matters, besides the argument that it is physically likely that the variations could be real, that speak against inversion artefacts. For example, there are no contradictions between the resistivity variations in layers 1 and 2; inversion artefacts could as well appear here, as between layers 2 and 3. In addition, there are several examples in the same graph where really large variations in layer 3 are not reflected in layer 2 (e.g. large positive resistivity peak in layer 3 at early August 21, see Fig. 4).

Because of various sources of uncertainty in the size of the CH<sub>4</sub> fluxes (including simple sampling equipment) it should be avoided to analyse the fluxes in detail. However, the errors should not be too large for a comparative analysis like the one presented here, and the uncertainty in flux size is most certainly smaller than the real temporal and spatial variations at the measurement points. It is important to stress that the uncertainty in the data affects most of the results quantitatively. These should thus be treated as general trends and indications of processes, rather than statistically verified relationships.

Using electrical resistivity data together with gas flux measurements appears to be useful to understand the behaviour of gas in heterogeneous soils. However, a number of adjustments of the field methodology could probably improve the results and perhaps lead to more general and numerically established relationships. Testing the method with different resistivity setups and inversion techniques would be interesting for further development of the methodology. A smaller investigation area and shorter time intervals between the resistivity measurements may, for example, possibly increase the amount of details that could be visible in the data.

### CONCLUSIONS

Although the field method and data quality can be improved, the results indicate that it can be valuable to use electrical resistivity data for analysing soil gas behaviour and its relation to surface emissions at landfills. The resistivity data must be interpreted carefully, because technical effects and uncertainty can cause problems when looking at the data on a small scale. However, resistivity data seem to have the potential to visualize subsurface gas presence and dynamics in heterogeneous soils.

At this particular site, the resistivity data have suggested that the main pattern of gas dynamics in the ground relates to diurnal variations in soil temperature, which affects the gas pressure in the soil pores and the extension of the gas accumulations. In combination with gas flux measurements, the analysis has indicated that advection flux of gas from the soil to the atmosphere is likely to occur at different locations around the landfill as a consequence of pressure imbalance in the soil after larger rain events. In addition, there are indications that diffusion flux occurs and is coupled mainly to soil moisture.

Hopefully, studies of this kind can improve the knowledge and understanding of the reason for the spatially and temporally varying fluxes from landfills and general behaviour of gas in heterogeneous soils. With new and alternative methodologies of working with resistivity data it can be concluded that electrical resistivity has the potential to be a valuable tool for applications like this.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to thank Carl-Henrik Månsson and Magnus Lindsjö for collaboration during the field work, Harry Lankreijer and Anna Ekberg at the Department of Earth and Ecosystem Sciences at Lund University, and Carl-Erik Magnusson at the Department of Physics, Lund University. We also would like to thank the editor and two anonymous reviewers for comments on the original paper, and PhD Anne Gordon for the linguistic review and help with clarifications of the text.

## REFERENCES

- Barber, C., Davis, G.B., Briegel, D. & Ward, J.K., 1990. Factors controlling the concentration of CH<sub>4</sub> and other volatiles in groundwater and soil-gas, *J. Contam. Hydrol.* **5**, 155–169.
- Boeckx, P., Van Cleemput, O., Villalvalvo, I., 1996. CH<sub>4</sub> emission from a landfill and the CH<sub>4</sub> oxidizing capacity of its covering soil, *Soil Biol. Biochem.*, **28**(10/11), 1397–1405.
- Campbell, G.S. 1998. *An Introduction to Environmental Biophysics*, Springer, New York, NY.
- Chapin, F.S., III, Matson P.A. & Mooney H.A., 2002: *Principles of Terrestrial Ecosystem Ecology*, Springer, New York, NY.
- Crawford, J.F. & Smith P.G., 1985: *Landfill Technology*, Butterworths, London.
- Johansson, S., 2009. Electrical resistivity as a tool for analyzing soil gas movements and gas emissions from landfill soils, *MSc thesis*, Lund University.
- Hashemi, M., Kavak, H.I., Tsotsis, T.T. & Sahimi, M., 2002. Computer simulation of gas generation and transport in landfills—I: Quasi-steady-state condition, *Chem. Eng. Sci.* **57**, 2475–2501.
- Keller, G.V. & Frischknecht, F.C. 1966. *Electrical Methods in Geophysical Prospecting*, Pergamon Press, London.
- Lamborn, J., 2007. Developing a landfill gas model, in *Tenth International Waste Management and Landfill Symposium*, S. Margherita di Pula, Cagliari, 2005 October 3–7.
- Liang, B., Liu, L., Xue, Q. & Zhao, Y., 2008. Porosity prediction with settlement and biodegradation in municipal landfill, in *Proceedings of the 2008 2nd International Conference on Bioinformatics and Biomedical Engineering*, pp. 1289–1292, Shanghai.
- Loke, M.H. 2008. Geotermo software Sdn. Bhd. Available at: <http://www.geoelectrical.com> (last accessed on 2010 June 4).
- Loke, M.H., Acworth, I. & Dahlin, T., 2003. A comparison of smooth and blocky inversion methods in 2D electrical imaging surveys. *Explor. Geophys.*, **34**, 182–187.
- Moreau, S., Bouye, J.-M., Duquennoy, C., Barina, G. & Oberti, O., 2004. Electrical resistivity survey to investigate biogas migration under leachate recirculation events. *Waste 2004; Integrated waste management and pollution control policy and practice, research and solutions*, Stratford-upon-Avon, 2004 September.
- Rosqvist, H., Dahlin, T., Linders, F. & Meijer, J.-E., 2007. Detection of water and gas migration in a bioreactor landfill using geoelectrical imaging and a tracer test, in *Eleventh International Waste Management and Landfill Symposium*. S. Margherita di Pula, Cagliari, 2007 October 1–5.
- Rosqvist, H., Leroux, V., Dahlin, T., Svensson, M., Lindsjö, M., Månsson, C.-H. & Johansson, S., 2009. Mapping landfill gas migration using resistivity monitoring, *Waste Res. Manage.*, **164**, 3–15.
- Stepniewski, W., Horn, R., Martyniuk, S., 2002. Managing soil biophysical properties for environmental protection, *Arg. Ecosyst. Environ.*, **88**, 175–181.
- Tang, J., Baldocci, D.D., Qi, Y., Xu, L., 2003. Assessing soil CO<sub>2</sub> efflux using continuous measurements of CO<sub>2</sub> profiles in soils with small solid-state sensors, *Arg. Forest. Meteorol.* **118**, 207–220.