Multiple geophysical surveys for old landfill monitoring in Singapore

Yin, Ke; Tong, Huanhuan; Giannis, Apostolos; Wang, Jing-Yuan; Chang, Victor Wei-Chung

2016

Yin, K., Tong, H., Giannis, A., Wang, J.-Y., & Chang, V. W.-C. (2017). Multiple geophysical surveys for old landfill monitoring in Singapore. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment*, 189, 20-.

<https://hdl.handle.net/10356/80505>

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10661-016-5722-4>

© 2016 Springer International Publishing Switzerland. This is the author created version of a work that has been peer reviewed and accepted for publication by *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment*, Springer International Publishing Switzerland. It incorporates referee's comments but changes resulting from the publishing process, such as copyediting, structural formatting, may not be reflected in this document. The published version is available at: [<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10661-016-5722-4>].

Downloaded on 26 Apr 2023 21:09:41 SGT

Multiple geophysical surveys for old landfill monitoring in Singapore

Ke Yin^{a,*}, Huanhuan Tong^b, Apostolos Giannis^a, Jing-Yuan Wang^b, Victor W.-C. Chang^{a,b}

^aResidues and Resource Reclamation Centre (R3C), Nanyang Environment and Water Research Institute, Nanyang Technological University, 1 Cleantech Loop, CleanTech One, Singapore 637141, Singapore

^bSchool of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Nanyang Technological University, 50 Nanyang Avenue, Singapore 639798, Singapore

Abstract

One-dimensional boring presents limitations on mapping the refuse profile in old landfills owing to waste heterogeneity. Electrical imaging (EI) and multiple-analysis of surface wave (MASW) was hereby deployed at an old dumping ground in Singapore to explore the subsurface in relation to geotechnical analysis. MASW estimated the refuse boundary with a higher precision as compared to EI, due to its endurance for moisture variation. EI and MASW transection profiles suggested spots of interest, e.g. refuse pockets and leachate mounds. 3D inversion of EI and MASW data further illustrated the transformation dynamics derived by natural attenuation, for instance the preferential infiltration pathway. Comparison of geophysical surveys at different years uncovered the subterranean landfill conditions, indicating strong impacts induced by ageing, precipitation and settlement. This study may shed light on a characterization framework of old landfills via combined geophysical models, thriving landfill knowledge with a higher creditability.

Keywords: geophysical method; EI; MASW; geotechnical analysis; landfill monitoring

* Corresponding author: yinke@ntu.edu.sg; Tel: +65 67904100

25

26 1. Introduction

27 Old landfills receive increasing attention due to their long-term environmental impacts,
28 such as landfill gas emission and leachate outbreak. On top of that, urbanization has led to
29 growing demands on land space. As such landfill redevelopment may alleviate the land
30 scarcity meanwhile remove concerns. Therefore, a site characterization study is needed
31 before taking action (Rattanaoudom 2005).

32 Usually, landfill characterization demands tremendous work that comprised of numerous
33 boreholes and trial pits to obtain information of the subsurface in relation to its surrounding
34 environment. The geotechnical works have little guidance in terms of borehole quality,
35 quantity and location. Uncertainty or sometimes discrepancy may occur. Boring impediments,
36 however, can be reduced with acquired knowledge of the subsurface. Herein geophysical
37 approaches are scheduled. Combination of geotechnical and geophysical methods may
38 provide better accuracy of landfill profile by leverage of respective advantage, i.e. specificity
39 from boreholes and totality from geophysical methods. From the economic perspective,
40 limited number of boreholes is translated into budget saving for geophysical survey and less
41 destruction of the field (Dumont et al. 2016).

42 There is no single geophysical method that can fit all sites. Selection of geophysical
43 methods depends on interpretation methodology and scope of work. In context of Lorong
44 Halus Dumping Ground (LHDG), a technique capable of leachate detection is necessary at
45 first. Secondly, the high precipitation in the tropics may request geophysical techniques with
46 little influence by moisture. Also, the method should be commonly acceptable, affordable,
47 and accessible.

48 Two specific geophysical methods are usually applied, electrical imaging (EI) and
49 multiple-analysis of surface waves (MASW). EI measures the resistivity (or inversely, the

conductivity) contrasts between different materials. It has been applied in landfill characterization world widely (Kavazanjian et al. 1996; Svensson et al. 1999; Peace et al. 1996; NJDEP 2005; Grellier et al. 2007). EI can determine the main landfill characteristics e.g. the presence of percolated water, permeability of landfill liners, and dumping boundaries (Cardarelli and Di Filippo 2004). More specific properties such as the contaminated flow and groundwater movement direction was predicted in combination with topography and granite fracturing (Mota et al. 2004). Moreover, EI may be applied beyond post-closure stage covering stages during the planning, construction and operation (Reynolds and Taylor 1996). It is also deemed as the best choice in many identification work such as characterization of soil/unconsolidated layers, soil and rock properties, saltwater intrusion and soil salinity, etc. (ASTM 2011). MASW measures the contrast in seismic wave velocities as they move in between materials, thereby indicating the difference in stiffness of materials. In particular, surface wave (S-wave) method exhibits little influence by moisture while it has the uniquely reliable correlation to standard penetration test n (SPT-N) values, an important indicator for the soil strength. MASW has been successfully used for determining mechanical properties e.g. shear strength of the landfill body (Zekkos et al. 2014). But, it can aggressively characterize the landfill in terms of leachate- and gas/air- bearing zones and determine the density distribution of the subsurface (Konstantaki 2016).

As a result, EI and MASW were employed for geophysical mapping of LHDG.p3 in 2011 and 2013. The present study combined boring and geophysical analysis to develop an investigation framework for characterization of the old landfill from the perspective of natural attenuation.

2. Methodology

The Lorong Halus dumping ground phase 3 (LHDG.p3) was an uncontrolled dumping ground with little engineering works in application. It was originally a mangrove swamp

75 occupying about 44 ha. It was operated from 1983 to 1989 with the purpose of accepting
76 MSW. However, in 1979 the completion of government incinerator resulted in gradual
77 diversion of MSW into incineration ashes. Rapid urbanization in Singapore during 1980s
78 generated huge amounts of construction and demolition (C&D) waste which had been
79 landfilled as well. As a result, the buried wastes in LHDG.p3 were a mixture of MSW,
80 incineration ashes and C&D waste (Montgomery Watson 1997). Since closure, no significant
81 reclamation activities have been conducted except 2-5 m soil cover.

82 The site investigation comprised of two main thrusts: traditional geotechnical works and
83 non-invasive geophysical surveys. Traditional investigations usually comprise of boring,
84 sampling and a range of in-situ tests, and are also termed “invasive methods”. Boring
85 activities produce borelogs that detail the subsurface profile within a specific confined
86 location. Despite ground truth, the information is disconnected. Geophysical methods do not
87 require penetration past the subsurface, working on the principles of measuring certain
88 properties of a particular media and deducing the parameters of interest.

89 2.1. Soil Boring in 2013

90 Prior to drilling, cable detection work was carried out at all designated borehole locations.
91 Trial pits up to at least 1.5 m depth were done at each borehole location to ascertain the
92 absence of buried cables and services or any other man-made obstruction that could hinder
93 drilling works. The technique employed was by rotary wash boring whereby boring was
94 advanced by rotating drilling bit with cuttings removed by circulating water as the drilling
95 fluid. Casings were used to support unstable grounds or when soft cohesive soil or non-
96 cohesive soil was encountered during boring operations. The diameter of each drilled
97 borehole was 100 mm. Soil sampling and loggings were done in accordance with BS5930
98 (the Code of Practice for Site Investigations, 1999). The land survey was conducted using a
99 global positioning system/real time kinematic positioning (GPS/RTK) methodology. The

base station was set up at a known location and allowed RTK corrections to be transmitted in real time to the rover enable the high order accuracy of the survey coordinates and elevation to be determined. The indicative locations, elevation and termination depth of boring wells were accordingly recorded. Figure 1 presents the location of boring (BH1–5) and deployment details on geophysical investigation. Standard penetration test (SPT) was conducted in accordance with BS1377-9 (1990). The purpose of this empirical dynamic penetration test was to determine the dynamic shearing resistance of soils to the penetration of a split barrel sampler of 50 mm external diameter. It was driven by a 63.5 kg automatic drop hammer with a free fall height of 760 mm. The value of penetration resistance, “N” was the number of blows required to achieve a 300 mm penetration of the barrel. Number of blows required for every 150 mm penetration was recorded, normally only the last two records were used for N determination. SPT was conducted at specified depth when the subsoil was too stiff for undisturbed soil samples to be obtained. The values of N obtained in the investigation were recorded in bore logs. While the bore log was also recorded with continuous soil composition profiles particularly with information on refuse termination depth.

The collected samples were placed into laboratory-supplied wide-mouth glass containers and stored in an ice chest while on site and during transportation to an accredited geotechnical laboratory. Testing items were carried out including physical properties i.e. water content, bulk density, dry density and particle density, particle size distribution, Atterberg limits which were based on BS 1377 (1990), together with chemical properties including pH values (with a pH meter), organic matter (via TOC analyzer), sulfate (precipitation, separation followed by ignition) and chloride content (by titration with Volhard’s method).

Fig. 1

2.2. Geophysical Surveys in 2011 & 2013

EI and MASW surveys were performed on an orthogonal test plot (100 m×100 m) orientated with existing gas extraction wells at each corner for spatial control (Fig. 1). Owing to a small scale investigation, the site ground was assumed as a geometric plane surface with the same elevation at 0 m. Each test comprised 24 survey lines subjected to both EI and MASW survey, among which 21 lines orientated parallel to the x-axis, positioned at 10 m intervals from 0 to 100 m southeast. In addition, 3 tie-lines orientated parallel to the y-axis. The tie-lines were included to restore linear features in the x-axis direction and to improve the data density (Bentley and Gharibi 2004; J. Chambers et al. 2002; J. E. Chambers et al. 2006).

2.2.1. EI method

EI was based on a current flow path between the current-potential electrodes. Dipole-dipole array configuration was adopted in the study as it was well suited to multi-channel systems (J. Chambers et al. 2002). The dipole-dipole array model was well received in geotechnical applications while especially in measuring lateral resistivity changes (Wightman et al. 2003). The field survey entailed the laying of metal rods (32) at 3 m interval on the ground, connected to cable then to multi-electrode resistivity meter together with a power booster. Manual measurement mode was applied, with a built-in 32 ch scanner and high power transmitter. Control system was equipped with CPU compatible to 586 and Interface named RS-232C. The EI survey included several steps. Firstly, vegetation was cleared with a width of around 2 m along the surveying line. A licensed surveyor was then marking the control points for the EI works, followed by setting of a series of potential dipoles which measured the resulting voltage gradient at each station along the line. Subsequent measurement was completed by moving the current dipole down the line. 10 m intervals were based on horizontal distance between two survey lines and the coordinates were accurately recorded. Forward earth modeling (2D) with finite-element method (FEM) inversion was

applied (ElecImager, Japan) to process raw data and generate the image (Coggon 1971; Pridmore et al. 1981; Holcombe and Jiracek 1984; Loke and Barker 1996). In brief, the apparent resistivity with depth was plotted and then contoured. EI was repeated in triplicates. The EI survey was employed twice at the same plot in the respective years of 2011 and 2013.

2.2.2. MASW method

MASW works based on properties that S-wave (mainly the Rayleigh wave) is equivalent to the shear waves ($< 10\%$ error) for earth materials with Poisson's ratios in the range of 0.25-0.48 while a depth less than 20-30 m (Wightman et al. 2003). MASW relies on frequency response and dispersion curves to obtain the subsurface profile. The seismic survey was measured with a seismic exploration system whereas the wave source was generated by hammering on a percussion plate. The system used for the study was a 24-channel seismograph with a natural frequency of geophones at 4.5 Hz, favoring landfill case. A total 24 geophones were fixed on the ground surface with the spike poked into the ground. Meanwhile two seismic land cables with twelve connectors were spread and connected with these geophones, through which electrical signal from each geophone was sent to the digital seismograph. A minimum of 12-geophone overlap condition was maintained for continuous adjacent spreads on the line. During field data acquisition, the operator adjusted the digital seismograph and confirmed the standby of the generating hammering source. After that, the operator monitored the noise condition on the display of the seismograph (for example, noise is caused by nodding of trees by wind and surface water). When it came to minimal noise condition, the operator instructed for hammering. To improve the resolution of near-surface interfaces, energy source positions were set at 1.5 m from the ends of the 3 m geophone spacing array. Multiple shots locations were utilized permitting interpretation of near-surface interfaces at various locations along the array and near the endpoints as well for variable subsurface profiles, and allowed more refined interpretations of shallow and mid-depth

subsurface velocities and interfaces. Shots were gathered to generate the dispersion curve in the frequency domain using the Common Mid Point (CMP) method. The inversion process was based on forward modeling to generate the 1D S-wave velocity distributions by software (SeisImager). For the comparison purpose, MASW surveys were employed twice at the same plot in the respective years of 2011 and 2013.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Bore logs

Five boreholes (BH1-5) were investigated with SPT-N values until depth of 30 m below ground level (BGL), with 20 measurements of each borehole (Fig. 1). Due to limited data points, Fig. 2 presents a collective result of the five boreholes. Hereby, geotechnical properties as a function of depth could be better elucidated. Interestingly, the collective data shows abnormal peaks at depth about 5-20 m BGL, where the values depart from a smooth rising trend and zoom steeply up to as high as 74. Except for the abruptness, SPT-N values were well predicted with a gradual increase (Fig. 2a). The main purpose of the SPT-N test is to provide an indication of the relative density of granular deposits, such as sands and gravels from which it is virtually impossible to obtain undisturbed samples. However, the validity depends on the soil type. Analogously, the SPT-N values for the case of landfill do not necessarily depict the real in-situ physical properties. Instead, the sudden change of values may indicate a stratum compositionally distinct from its adjacent layers, supposing anthropogenic deposits. The large-size particles in the refuse layer may raise the SPT-N value due to clogging of the sampler or due to its contact with it (Machado et al. 2010). Soil sorting at the plot notes traceable amount of municipal solid wastes, such as plastics, woven fabrics and wood pieces at -8 to -15 m (Fig. S2), echoing the abrupt SPT-N elevation. Empirically S-

wave velocities may exhibit correlation with SPT-N values as investigated (Imai and Yoshimura 1982),

$$V_s = 97.0N^{0.314} \quad (\text{Eq. 1})$$

Where the equation is valid when N stays in the range of 1–100, and V_s represents the S-wave velocity (m s^{-1}). Unfortunately the SPT-N values estimated by S-wave velocities (Fig. 2b) at BH5 displayed quite a difference from the real measurement particularly after depth -10 m albeit a good matching between L11 and L23, suggesting a poor correlation owing to the anthropogenic buries.

Fig. 2

SPT-Ns were compared between two depths i.e. -5–20 m vs. the rest (0 to -5 m and -20 to -30 m), suggesting statistically significantly difference between the two group of data with a p-value of 0.012. Comparisons were further made between R5 and R1–4 within each of the two depths (Fig. 2 c & 2d), showing poor linearity ($R^2=0.25$) in depth of -5–20 m too. It is very likely attributable for refuse deposits. As above, the refuse layer may be retrieved by SPT testing plot, from which abnormal SPT-N peaks are indicator for the refuse placement. Due to various compositions of wastes and complexity in the landfill, however, the subsurface stratum needs more data from other aspects for further characterization and identification.

Table 1

Further investigation of the landfill, such as water content, bulk and particle density, particle size distribution, organic matter, pH, sulfide and chloride concentration, and the Atterberg limit were carried out with regards to each borehole (Table 1). Saturated zone was not yet reached until the depth of -7 m as water content was measured less than void ratio. Interestingly, water content presented a positive correlation with void ratio (correl. coeff. =0.82) rather than depth (correl. coeff. =0.22), suggesting obstructed infiltration. As such

water may be isolated in pockets. The pockets may be developed by biogas, precipitation and mineralization derived by natural attenuation. Geochemical measurements such as OM, pH, sulfide and chloride show a characteristic of highly spot-specific, echoing the presence of isolated pockets. Furthermore, particle size distribution posed much less influence on moisture while it used to do. For example, a high silt/clay fraction 66% (w/w) was measured at depth -4.5–5.3 m in BH3, however carrying a low water content (23%). Atterberg limit tests showed a soil type with reduced plasticity (9–24), as a result from leachate permeation (Frempong and Yanful 2008). The reduced plasticity of soil may facilitate the formation of isolated pockets. Organic matter was measured low in the solid, indicating a late stage of the landfill where most organic compounds had been stripped. The pH presented alkaline suggesting a typical matured phase in the landfill as well. Low chloride was detected as well, as a result of the long-term precipitation and dilution.

3.2. Refuse boundary

3.2.1. Estimation by borehole and geophysical methods

The refuse boundary was estimated with bore logs (Fig. 3). A contour map was constructed by combining the refuse surface at different boreholes. Basically the refuse boundary provided useful information to quantify the refuse volume, yet the leachate flow direction was unlikely predicted without knowledge of the heterogeneous distribution of density (Konstantaki 2016). The accuracy on refuse quantity could be compromised by the limited boring number. Alternatively, the refuse layer could be indicated by geophysical imaging (Soupios et al. 2007; Yin et al. 2015). Transection plots for S-wave velocity and electrical resistivity are presented in Fig. 3 and Fig. 4 respectively, where the profiles at survey Line 11 and Line 23 are displayed in combination with overlapped bore logs (BH1-BH5-BH3 in Line 11 and BH4-BH5-BH2 in Line 23).

Fig. 3

Geotechnical parameters (BH1-5) and extracted geophysical data at the same sampling depths were statistically compared to obtain correlation coefficients (Table S1). Electrical resistivity carried a high correlation coefficient with chloride content (0.93)/moisture content (0.66). General poor correlations between S-wave velocity and soil properties though, bulk and dry density presented stronger correlations to S-wave velocity (0.36) than the others, indicating the dominance of hardness on S-wave propagation. Based on the analysis, there were existed significantly cohesive connections between geophysical data and the refuse characteristics, promising complementary explanation of the landfill subsurface. The refuse boundary could be estimated via the correspondent geophysical measures distinguishing the refuse layer from the original ground. The average depth of the refuse layer by MASW and EI at Line 11 was determined at -18.8 ± 1.9 m and -18.0 ± 4.2 m respectively, while 17.7 ± 1.5 m and -24.2 ± 4.7 m at Line 23. By contrast, bore logs showed a respective refuse depth of -18.6 ± 1.0 m and -17.8 ± 1.3 m. In this regards, MASW achieved a better compliance with bore logs, i.e. 18.8 ± 1.9 m vs. 18.6 ± 1.0 m BGL at Line 11 and 17.7 ± 1.5 m vs. 17.8 ± 1.3 m BGL at Line 23. Additional soil distribution beneath such as Kallang formation and old alluvium was indicated by MASW while not from EI (Balía and Littarru 2010). As moisture level highly affects electrical imaging, EI method may present a deteriorated depiction on the subsurface structure in tropics (Samouëlian et al. 2004; Brunet et al. 2010). Hence, edge effects may further compromise the results in EI tomography as shown in Fig. 5 (Griffiths and Lane 1999; Wu et al. 2013). Nonetheless, geophysical methods present improved details with the monitored parameter. In addition it may provide zones of interest carrying potential environmental significance.

Fig. 4 & 5

3.2.2. Comparison between EI and MASW

The S-wave velocity presented complex strata distribution across depth than electrical resistivity. Tomography of EI could be distinguished by three layers, a middle layer contained large areas of warm color (red and yellow) in pockets, in contrast to the more homogeneous upper and lower layer possessing mainly the cold colors (e.g. blue). The middle layer exhibited abrupt changes reference to its surroundings indicating the refuse distribution. The distinction suggests great variation on the corresponding material properties in middle layer, in association with water content, waste composition, physicochemical and biological activities, hydrogeology, etc. (Kibria and Hossain 2015). The upper and lower layer stands for a respective soil cover and the original surface, which could be easily identified by the consistent value strip of the resistivity together with a gentle rolling tomography.

Contrastively, MASW images showed more layers, suggesting more vertical changes of hardness albeit the planar rolling (Hebeler 2001). It is relevant to the landfill design and operation as well as long-term natural attenuation, which amended the subsurface matrix e.g. the void ratio and density. The relative hard layer on top (0 to -4 m) indicated the soil cover. The strip next to it demonstrated interestingly minimum velocity, suggesting a porous zone with low density. With continuous natural attenuation, the organic matter was decomposed releasing biogas from bioactivity, resulting in reduced density and raised porosity. The high porosity up to 50% at 3–7 m BGL (Table 1) echoed such a hypothesis. The bulking property however, was less dominant in deeper layers, likely attributed to settlement and increased saturation (Das et al. 2002; Wall and Zeiss 1995). Moving deeper S-wave interfaces rolled severely. A couple reasons could be responsible for this. The original site of LHDG.p3 before landfilling was recorded as mangrove swamp carrying a soft nature (Yin et al. 2015). Besides, landfills often exhibit uneven settlement (Simões and Catapreta 2013; Chakma and Mathur 2012; Fei and Zekkos 2013). Deeper layers hereby bear these impacts and resulted in more

irregular distribution on the hardness. In addition, infiltration could also pose an impact on the harness distribution (Rosqvist and Destouni 2000).

3.3. 3D pseudo models

3D modeling of the landfill could provide further insights on waste transformation (Tame et al. 2013). Figure 6 & 7 present pseudo-depth slices of EI and MASW simulating the plot area in the years 2011 and 2013. An offset of 2.5 m was adopted to indicate changes of soil profiles spanning a depth of 0–20 m. Comparisons were made based on (1) time, and (2) contrasts of same spots.

Fig. 6 & 7

3.3.1. Landfill characterization by EI and MASW at different periods

Two scenarios were depicted in Fig. 6, dry scenario in 2011 and wet scenario in 2013. The background electrical resistivity was recorded around $200 \pm 20 \text{ } \Omega\text{m}$ for both, indicating a typical unsaturated zone with mixture of silt/sand in the subsurface (Fig. 6). Electrical resistivity in 2013 were found from <100 to $500\text{--}600 \text{ } \Omega\text{m}$, comparable to those observed from two years ago. Interestingly, resistivity distribution across depth demonstrated an opposite trend between two measurements, indicating a strong effect by the moisture condition. The resistivity decreased with increased depth in 2013, suggesting a scenario under infiltration. By contrast, growing resistivity along depth in 2011 suggested higher moisture at the bottom—a stable state which occurred at the dry season. It evidenced that EI survey compromised water content.

High uncertainty though from single EI investigation, hydrogeological conditions in the subsurface could be indicated by comparison of the EI surveys at different periods (Sandberg et al. 2002). For instance, preferential infiltration may occur at the middle of BH4 and BH5 from survey in 2013, while leachate mounding may exit below -15 m from survey in 2011 (Fig. 5). These findings provide advantages in further cares for the landfill if necessary.

Moreover, there existed some higher-resistivity pockets in 2013 as compared to 2011, indicating the growing heterogeneity in the refuse due to natural attenuation.

Figure 7 shows comparison of S-wave velocity performed during the same periods as EI. As compared to EI, MASW demonstrated little impacts from moisture changes (Fig. 7). The background and trend of S-wave distribution was similar between 2011 and 2013. Nevertheless, lower S-wave velocities was obtained at -5–10 m meanwhile higher in deeper zones in 2013 as compared to 2011, which again suggests the geophysical changes in the refuse layer towards more extremity. It may be developed from a few factors. On one hand biochemical degradation facilitates settlement and leads to growing compaction at lower layers reflected by a higher S-wave velocity. On the other hand the upper layer is subjected to continuous loss of materials by leaching and dilution, thus a lower density—a lower S-wave velocity.

3.3.2. Comparison of EI and MASW at different periods

As mentioned, EI is sensitive to environmental parameters relevant to conductivity, including ionic strength and total dissolved solids etc., while MASW interests the hardness/stiffness of the zone, more relevant to settlement. Moisture effects on the EI method have been well noted (Grellier et al. 2007; Bentley and Gharibi 2004). Also, moisture is one of the significant factors posing long-term impacts on the refuse. In this point comparison between the investigated geophysics could reveal extra information of the landfill from perspectives e.g. the refuse components. Coupled with the findings from boring, more refuse details may be unveiled from which a comprehensive diagnosis can be further developed (Meju 2000). Taking account of time effect, transformation may be traceable.

At -2.5 m, all plots showed a stratum suggesting an artificial zone—the cover (Fig. 4). In this layer the S-wave velocity measured low in both events while distinct resistivity was identified between 2011 and 2013, indicating the presence of massive clay/silt which

possesses considerable water-holding capacity. At spots deeper below (e.g. -17.5–20 m in 2013) however, a high resistivity concurrent with a high S-wave velocity may indicate a zone of high porosity, where water is hardly retained. Soft zones at -5–10 m may be born from refuse deposit as shown in Fig. 7. Those red-color spots within the zones, which stand for low-moisture pockets (as shown in EI profile at -7.5–10 m in 2013 in Fig. 6), may fit to materials like plastics which carries both soft nature and hydrophobicity. Soil sorting study at the plot shows the affluence of plastics at -8-10 m, evidenced such a deduction (Fig. S3). Next to BH2–5 where dry spots were indicated by EI in 2013, it was peaked with S-wave velocity, suggesting a hard zone as well. The hardness may be enforced by dryness which reduces the soil plasticity. The situation could be severer with time under limited water supply, unless precipitation promotes infiltration in the landfill and change the moisture content. As such geophysical methods may demonstrate the variation, identify anomalies and therefore provide effective while quantitative reading for the corresponding hot spots.

4. Conclusion

A geophysical modeling of an old landfill was developed with non-invasive geophysical methods. Cohesive correlations existed between geophysical data and geotechnical properties of boring samples. The subsurface profile can be well understood in combination of EI, MASW and limited boring. Transformation of the refuse layer may be predicted by integration of natural attenuation in landfills. Zones of interests could be determined with improved characteristic details such as soft material accumulation, isolated pocket, settling magnitude, moisture retention capacity and leachate mounding etc. Furthermore, long-term geophysical monitoring in the old landfill could indicate crucial parameters relevant to variation in environmental chemistry and hydrogeology of the landfill, assisted with a 3D

372 inversion. Preferential flow paths were herein well located to estimate the leachate
373 distribution.

374

375 Acknowledgements

376 This study is supported by the National Research Foundation of Singapore (NRF-CRP5-
377 2009-2), for Residues and Resource Reclamation Centre, Nanyang Technological University,
378 Singapore.

References

- ASTM (2011). Standard guide for selecting surface geophysical methods. West
Conshohocken, PA: ASTM International.
- Balia, R., & Littarru, B. (2010). Geophysical experiments for the pre-reclamation assessment
of industrial and municipal waste landfills. *Journal of Geophysics and Engineering*,
7(1), 64.
- Bentley, L. R., & Gharibi, M. (2004). Two- and three-dimensional electrical resistivity
imaging at a heterogeneous remediation site. *Geophysics*, 69(3), 674-680,
doi:10.1190/1.1759453.
- Brunet, P., Clément, R., & Bouvier, C. (2010). Monitoring soil water content and deficit
using Electrical Resistivity Tomography (ERT) – A case study in the Cevennes area,
France. *Journal of Hydrology*, 380(1–2), 146-153,
doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2009.10.032>.
- Cardarelli, E., & Di Filippo, G. (2004). Integrated geophysical surveys on waste dumps:
evaluation of physical parameters to characterize an urban waste dump (four case
studies in Italy). *Waste Management & Research*, 22(5), 390-402,
doi:10.1177/0734242x04046042.
- Chakma, S., & Mathur, S. (2012). Estimation of Primary and Mechanical Compression in
MSW Landfills. *Journal of Hazardous, Toxic, and Radioactive Waste*, 16(4), 298-303,
doi:doi:10.1061/(ASCE)HZ.2153-5515.0000117.
- Chambers, J., Ogilvy, R., Kuras, O., Cripps, J., & Meldrum, P. (2002). 3D electrical imaging
of known targets at a controlled environmental test site. *Environmental Geology*, 41(6),
690-704, doi:10.1007/s00254-001-0452-4.
- Chambers, J. E., Kuras, O., Meldrum, P. I., Ogilvy, R. D., & Hollands, J. (2006). Electrical
resistivity tomography applied to geologic, hydrogeologic, and engineering

404 investigations at a former waste-disposal site. *Geophysics*, 71(6), B231-B239,
 405 doi:doi:10.1190/1.2360184.

406 Coggon, J. H. (1971). Electromagnetic and electrical modeling by the finite element method.
 407 *Geophysics*, 36(1), 132-155, doi:10.1190/1.1440151.

408 Das, K. C., Smith, M. C., Gattie, D. K., & Hale Boothe, D. D. (2002). Stability and quality of
 409 municipal solid waste compost from a landfill aerobic bioreduction process. *Advances*
 410 *in Environmental Research*, 6(4), 401-409, doi:[http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1093-](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1093-0191(01)00066-1)
 411 [0191\(01\)00066-1](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1093-0191(01)00066-1).

412 Dumont, G., Pilawski, T., Dzaomuho-Lenieregue, P., Hiligsmann, S., Delvigne, F., Thonart,
 413 P., et al. (2016). Gravimetric water distribution assessment from geoelectrical methods
 414 (ERT and EMI) in municipal solid waste landfill. *Waste Management*, 55, 129-140,
 415 doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2016.02.013>.

416 Fei, X., & Zekkos, D. (2013). Factors Influencing Long-Term Settlement of Municipal Solid
 417 Waste in Laboratory Bioreactor Landfill Simulators. *Journal of Hazardous, Toxic, and*
 418 *Radioactive Waste*, 17(4), 259-271, doi:doi:10.1061/(ASCE)HZ.2153-5515.0000167.

419 Frempong, E., & Yanful, E. (2008). Interactions between Three Tropical Soils and Municipal
 420 Solid Waste Landfill Leachate. *Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental*
 421 *Engineering*, 134(3), 379-396.

422 Grellier, S., Reddy, K., Gangathulasi, J., Adib, R., & Peters, C. (2007). Correlation Between
 423 Electrical Resistivity and Moisture Content of Municipal Solid Waste in Bioreactor
 424 Landfill. In *Geoenvironmental Engineering* (pp. 1-14).

425 Griffiths, D. V., & Lane, P. A. (1999). Slope stability analysis by finite elements.
 426 *Géotechnique*, 49, 387-403

427 Hebel, G. L. (2001). Site Characterization in Shelby County, Tennessee Using Advanced
 428 Surface Wave Methods: School of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Georgia
 429 Institute of Technology, 2001. Directed by Glenn J. Rix.

430 Holcombe, H. T., & Jiracek, G. R. (1984). Three-dimensional terrain corrections in resistivity
 431 surveys. *Geophysics*, 49(4), 439-452, doi:doi:10.1190/1.1441679.

432 Imai, T., & Yoshimura, Y. Correlation of N-value with S-wave velocity and shear modulus.
 433 In the 2nd European Symposium of Penetration Testing, Amsterdam, 1982 (pp. 57-72)

434 Kavazanjian, E., Matasovic, N., Stokoe, K. H., & Bray, J. D. In situ shear wave velocity of
 435 solid waste from surface wave measurements. In Second International Congress on
 436 Environmental Geotechnics, Osaka, Japan, 1996 (Vol. Proceedings 1, pp. 97-102)

437 Kibria, G., & Hossain, M. S. (2015). Investigation of degree of saturation in landfill liners
 438 using electrical resistivity imaging. *Waste Management*, 39(0), 197-204,
 439 doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2015.02.015>.

440 Konstantaki, L. A. (2016). Imaging and characterization of heterogeneous landfills using
 441 geophysical methods.

442 Loke, M. H., & Barker, R. D. (1996). Practical techniques for 3D resistivity surveys and data
 443 inversion. *Geophysical Prospecting*, 44(3), 499-523.

444 Machado, S. L., Karimpour-Fard, M., Shariatmadari, N., Carvalho, M. F., & Nascimento, J.
 445 C. F. d. (2010). Evaluation of the geotechnical properties of MSW in two Brazilian
 446 landfills. *Waste Management*, 30(12), 2579-2591,
 447 doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2010.07.019>.

448 Meju, M. A. (2000). Geoelectrical investigation of old/abandoned, covered landfill sites in
 449 urban areas: model development with a genetic diagnosis approach. *Journal of Applied*
 450 *Geophysics*, 44(2-3), 115-150, doi:[http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0926-9851\(00\)00011-2](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0926-9851(00)00011-2).

451 Montgomery Watson (1997). Consultancy services for the rehabilitation of Tampines
 452 dumping ground: site investigation and alternatives analysis. Final report (Vol. 1):
 453 Montgomery Watson Pte Ltd, Singapore.

454 Mota, R., Monteiro Santos, F. A., Mateus, A., Marques, F. O., Gonçalves, M. A., Figueiras,
 455 J., et al. (2004). Granite fracturing and incipient pollution beneath a recent landfill
 456 facility as detected by geoelectrical surveys. *Journal of Applied Geophysics*, 57(1), 11-
 457 22, doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jappgeo.2004.08.007>.

458 NJDEP (2005). Field sampling procedures manual. (Vol. Chapter 8, pp. 1-46). New Jersey.

459 Peace, J. L., Hyndman, D. A., & Goering, T. J. (1996). Application of Non-intrusive
 460 Geophysical Techniques at the Mixed Waste Landfill, Technical Area 3, Sandia
 461 National Laboratories, New Mexico: Sandia National Laboratories.

462 Pridmore, D. F., Hohmann, G. W., Ward, S. H., & Sill, W. R. (1981). An investigation of
 463 finite-element modeling for electrical and electromagnetic data in three dimensions.
 464 *Geophysics*, 46(7), 1009-1024, doi:doi:10.1190/1.1441239.

465 Rattanaoudom, R. (2005). INVESTIGATION ON TOXICITY AND HAZARDOUS NATURE
 466 OF A MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE DUMPSITE. Asian Institute of Technology,
 467 Thailand.

468 Reynolds, J. M., & Taylor, D. I. (1996). Use of geophysical surveys during the planning,
 469 construction and remediation of landfills (Vol. 11, Engineering geology of waste
 470 disposal). London: The Geological Society of London.

471 Rosqvist, H., & Destouni, G. (2000). Solute transport through preferential pathways in
 472 municipal solid waste. *Journal of Contaminant Hydrology*, 46(1-2), 39-60,
 473 doi:[http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0169-7722\(00\)00127-3](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0169-7722(00)00127-3).

474 Samouëlian, A., Richard, G., Cousin, I., Guérin, R., Bruand, A., & Tabbagh, A. (2004).
 475 Three-dimensional crack monitoring by electrical resistivity measurement. *European*
 476 *Journal of Soil Science*, 55(4), 751-762, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2389.2004.00632.x.

477 Sandberg, S. K., Slater, L. D., & Versteeg, R. (2002). An integrated geophysical investigation
 478 of the hydrogeology of an anisotropic unconfined aquifer. *Journal of Hydrology*,
 479 267(3–4), 227-243, doi:[http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0022-1694\(02\)00153-1](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0022-1694(02)00153-1).

480 Simões, G. F., & Catapreta, C. A. A. (2013). Monitoring and modeling of long-term
 481 settlements of an experimental landfill in Brazil. *Waste Management*, 33(2), 420-430,
 482 doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2012.10.001>.

483 Soupios, P., Papadopoulos, N., Papadopoulos, I., Kouli, M., Vallianatos, F., Sarris, A., et al.
 484 (2007). Application of integrated methods in mapping waste disposal areas.
 485 *Environmental Geology*, 53(3), 661-675, doi:10.1007/s00254-007-0681-2.

486 Svensson, M., Bernstone, C., & Dahlin, T. (1999). The Combination of the SASW Method
 487 and DC-Resistivity in Characterization of Old Landfills. In *Symposium on the*
 488 *Application of Geophysics to Engineering and Environmental Problems 1999* (pp. 123-
 489 131).

490 Tame, C., Cundy, A. B., Royse, K. R., Smith, M., & Moles, N. R. (2013). Three-dimensional
 491 geological modelling of anthropogenic deposits at small urban sites: A case study from
 492 Sheepcote Valley, Brighton, UK. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 129(0), 628-
 493 634, doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2013.08.030>.

494 Wall, D., & Zeiss, C. (1995). Municipal Landfill Biodegradation and Settlement. *Journal of*
 495 *Environmental Engineering*, 121(3), 214-224, doi:doi:10.1061/(ASCE)0733-
 496 9372(1995)121:3(214).

497 Wightman, W. E., Jalinoos, F., Sirles, P., & Hanna, K. (2003). Application of Geophysical
498 Methods to Highway Related Problems. Lakewood, CO: Federal Highway
499 Administration.

500 Wu, B.-J., Zhu, Z.-D., & Gu, Z.-J. (2013). Study on Accuracy of Soil Slope Stability
501 Analysis Based on Strength Reduction FEM. Journal of Water Resources and
502 Architectural Engineering, 11(1), 17-21.

503 Yin, K., Tong, H. H., Noh, O., Wang, J.-Y., & Giannis, A. (2015). Mapping Refuse Profile in
504 Singapore Old Dumping Ground through Electrical Resistivity, S-Wave Velocity and
505 Geotechnical Monitoring. Bulletin of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology,
506 94(3), 275-281, doi:10.1007/s00128-014-1427-y.

507 Zekkos, D., Sahadewa, A., Woods, R. D., & II, K. H. S. (2014). Development of Model for
508 Shear-Wave Velocity of Municipal Solid Waste. Journal of Geotechnical and
509 Geoenvironmental Engineering, 140(3), 04013030, doi:doi:10.1061/(ASCE)GT.1943-
510 5606.0001017.

511

512 Table and Figures

513 Table 1.Geotechnical analysis of soil samples from borehole BH1-5 at depth of 3-7 m.

Borehole No.		BH1			BH2			BH3			BH4		BH5		
Depth		3-3.7	4.5-5.2	6-6.9	3-4.2	4.5-5.2	6-6.8	3-3.5	4.5-5.3	6-6.6	3-3.5	6-6.25	3-3.5	4.5-5.4	6-6.8
Water%		14	30	25	22	24	31	19	23	17	20	24	39	38	35
Bulk density (g/cm ³)		1.79	1.93	1.81	1.98	1.93	1.79	2.01	1.99	2.00	2.06	1.76	1.83	1.87	1.93
Dry density (g/cm ³)		1.57	1.48	1.45	1.62	1.56	1.37	1.69	1.62	1.71	1.72	1.42	1.32	1.46	1.43
Particle density (g/cm ³)		2.65	2.71	2.70	2.70	2.72	2.70	2.67	2.71	2.66	2.71	2.60	2.67	2.68	2.69
Void%		40.8	45.4	46.3	40.0	42.6	49.3	36.7	40.2	35.7	36.5	45.4	50.6	45.5	46.8
Particle size%	Gravel	11	14	6	N.A.	10	6	6	5	14	3	22	15	7	14
	Sand	77	46	57	N.A.	54	42	60	29	59	32	52	66	60	50
	Silt	11	28	28	N.A.	22	38	15	34	11	41	19	17	14	16
	Clay	1	12	9	N.A.	14	14	19	32	16	24	7	2	19	20
Chemical test	OM%	N.A.	N.A.	2.1	1.5	N.A.	N.A.	0.5	N.A.	N.A.	0.1	1	N.A.	2.9	1.8
	S%	N.A.	N.A.	<0.01	<0.01	N.A.	N.A.	<0.01	N.A.	N.A.	<0.01	<0.01	N.A.	<0.01	0.15
	Cl ⁻ %	N.A.	N.A.	0.06	<0.01	N.A.	N.A.	0.04	N.A.	N.A.	0.03	0.05	N.A.	0.23	0.19
	pH	N.A.	N.A.	9.3	7.7	N.A.	N.A.	8.7	N.A.	N.A.	9.2	8	N.A.	8.9	9.7
Atter-berg Limit	Liquid limit	N.A.	37	49	40	40	40	40	47	26	38	41	51	37	38
	Plasticity limit	N.A.	28	31	27	29	28	16	30	12	26	29	30	16	15
	Plasticity Index	N.A.	9	18	13	11	12	24	17	14	12	12	21	21	23
	Soil group	N.A.	MI	MI	MI	MI	MI	CL	MI	CL	MI	MI	MH	CL	CL

514

515

516

517 Figure 1. Site map and borehole locations indicated by the geophysical layout at LHDG.p3.

518

519 Figure 2a) Standard penetration test n (SPT-N) value plotting from the borehole (BH1-5)

520 investigation at LHDG.p3; 2b) SPT-N value at BH5 vs. estimation based on S-Wave velocity

521 using eq. 1 at Line 11 and 23, respectively; 2c) SPT-N values between BH5 vs. BH1-4

522 respectively at depth 5-20 m below ground level (BGL); 2d) SPT-N values between BH5 vs.

523 BH1-4 respectively at depth 0-5 m & 20-30 m BGL (Note: curved lines in Fig. 2b-c represent the

524 95% confidence interval of the least squares linear regressions).

Figure 3. Estimation of refuse boundary with bore logs (BH1-5) in 2013.

Figure 4. Boundary estimation by the pseudo 2D image of surface wave velocity (at line 11 & 23) and by BH1-5-3 and BH2-5-4, respectively.

Figure 5. Boundary estimation by the 2D resistivity (at line 11 & 23) and by BH1-5-3 and BH2-5-4, respectively.

Figure 6. Comparison of EI pseudo-depth slices between 2013 (Left) and 2011(Right).

Figure 7. Comparison of MASW pseudo-depth slices between 2013 (Left) and 2011(Right).

Supplementary material

Table S1. Statistical correlations between geophysical values (S-wave velocity and ER) and soil characters at soil sample locations (BH1-5).

Parameters		Correlation coefficient	
		S-wave (m/s)	ER (Ω m)
Water%		-0.11	0.66
Bulk density (g/cm^3)		0.36	-0.09
Dry density (g/cm^3)		0.35	-0.40
Particle density (g/cm^3)		0.20	0.03
Void%		-0.33	0.41
Particle size%	Gravel	-0.37	0.03
	Sand	0.09	0.06
	Silt	-0.13	-0.26
	Clay	0.25	0.21
Chemical test	OM%	-0.20	0.61
	S%	N.A.	N.A.
	Cl%	0.13	0.93
	pH	-0.25	0.64
Atter-berg Limit	Liquid limit	0.17	-0.09
	Plasticity limit	-0.05	-0.52
	Plasticity Index	0.28	0.60
	Soil group	N.A.	-0.09

Figure S1. Studied site (LHDG.p3) at Lorong Hulas dumping ground in Singapore.

Figure S2. Refuse composition analysis at depth -8-15m in the plot in 2013.

Figure S3. Refuse composition analysis at depth -8-10m in the plot in 2013.