

03135



KUNGL  
TEKNISKA  
HÖGSKOLAN

**ENGINEERING GEOLOGICAL INFORMATION  
- ITS VALUE AND IMPACT ON TUNNELLING**

**Robert Sturk**

Stockholm 1998

Doctoral Thesis 1027  
Division of Soil and Rock Mechanics  
Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering  
Royal Institute of Technology

## Summary

---

In this thesis the use of engineering geological information, with emphasis on geological hazards, within underground projects is reviewed and discussed. Based on a decision and risk analysis approach, requirements on engineering geological information and a concept of making statistically based engineering geological prognoses is proposed.

Decision and risk analysis provide a framework and wide variety of tools for approaching a problem in a logic and stringent way. In the case of underground construction, the technique has a potential of improving the decision process and the handling of engineering geological information. The nature of the decision, being the main issue throughout the complete thesis, may in short be summarized as:

- o a definition of possible alternatives,
- o a definition of a decision criterion,
- o an analysis of possible outcomes and
- o an estimation of the probability of possible outcomes.

One important part of decision and risk analysis is to understand and describe the process of events, following a realization of a hazard and ending with some sort of damage. Furthermore to understand and describe events that may initiate the realization of a geological hazard. The following definition is introduced: *A geological hazard (e.g. flowing ground), is a threat of a potential damage (tunnel failure) and is a built-in property of a risk object (the rock mass). The damage event causes damage, i.e. in a wide sense loss of resources. The initiating event (e.g. unsuitable or incautious excavation) triggers a damage event. Warning bells (in this case e.g. increased deformations or muddy water flow from probe holes) indicate that a hazards is about to be realized.* It is concluded that geological hazards play an important role within underground construction and envisaged that a better understanding of the hazards themselves and the process from an initiating event to the actual damage will lead to a more cost effective execution of underground projects. A description and analysis of common damage events, warning bells and initiating events show that in order to avoid damage it is within the risk analysis work important to focus not only on technical/geological problems but also on management of the project organisation. Good communication and transferring of correct information are found to be key factors to carry out successful projects. In this respect it is also concluded that risk analysis and quality assurance are closely related.

Engineering geological information and prognoses play an important role in decision-making throughout an underground project. However, the complex nature of geological hazards necessitates a stringent handling of engineering geological information and a comprehensive quality assurance which reach beyond the scope of traditional systems. As a consequence of this the concept of EGIR (Engineering Geological Information Requirements), including a top-down philosophy when approaching geological problems, is introduced. The four corner-stones within EGIR are; the decision, the quantification of uncertainty, the language and the quality assurance.

The first requirement implies that all engineering geological information must be adapted to and relevant for the current decisions and the current project stage. The decision is the main issue and should be put in focus. Decision and risk analysis provide a general framework and specific tools for fulfilling this requirement.

Secondly, uncertainty related to the information should be quantified, primarily by using statistical modelling. It is shown that it is possible to create stochastic geo-models based on traditional statistical modelling principles for example in order to model spatial variability in rock. Furthermore, that a bayesian approach provides a possibility for combining subjective judgement with observational data and update prior knowledge as additional observations are made available. This implies an excellent tool of achieving better handling of uncertainty. Thereby, the making of reliable engineering geological prognoses as a basis for decisions is facilitated.

The third requirement says that explicit information must be comprehensive enough to flow properly through the project organisation and yet be understandable. It must be unambiguous and adapted to the receiver. It is for example argued that traditional rock classification systems, where a lot of information is truncated and translated into one single value, sometimes but far from always fulfil this requirement. Especially engineering geological information used during the construction stage must be more comprehensive and more focused upon geological hazards.

Finally, the information should be quality assured. As the engineering geological information is related to very complicated processes, a dual quality system is proposed. This systems aims at doing the things right, as emphasized in traditional quality systems, and doing the right things.

By step-by-step fulfilling EGIR and applying a top-down working procedure (decision-model-data) one will automatically get a system or a working procedure for forming, carrying and transferring engineering geological information and establishing engineering geological prognoses that has the potential of improving the overall execution of underground projects. The proposed methodology has been applied to three Swedish case studies each representing a typical problem often encountered in underground projects. For each case, the concept of EGIR and a project specific, specially developed stochastic geo-model have been tested. The first case, from the Stockholm Ring Road Project, is an example of modelling a geologic boundary (depth to rock surface) with kriging. Secondly, a layered stochastic geo-model has been employed to calculate expected time and amount of construction material for a TBM-tunnel at the Äspö Hard Rock Laboratory. The last case, from the Hallandsås Railway Tunnel Project, illustrates the use of a bayesian stochastic geo-model for predicting excavation conditions, ahead of the tunnel face, for the coming rounds. The results from the case studies indicate that it is possible:

- o To focus upon the important decision and gather relevant engineering geological information for making a prognosis as basis for this decision, by employing a top-down approach.
- o To handle and quantify uncertainty, as long as some main demands on the statistical modelling are fulfilled. Stochastic geo-models should consequently; reflect the nature properly (be geologically logical), include routines for updating, include routines for expressing the reliability of investigation methods and programmes, and make subjective assessments possible.
- o To use a language related to engineering geological information that is understood, possible to communicate, unambiguous and adapted to the receiver. This requirement is easier fulfilled by evaluating the sender-receiver situation, evaluating the depth of messages (information-exformation) and define classes or states relevant for the current decisions and problems.

The last requirement according to EGIR is to gain a satisfactory quality assurance of the engineering geological information. This issue is really outside the scope of this thesis but

literature studies carried out and the author's experience indicate the need for a quality system based on a broad definition of quality.

Altogether it might be concluded that the implementation of decision and risk analysis, EGIR and the top-down philosophy (for approaching engineering geological problems), outlined in this thesis, has a potential of making the execution of underground projects more successful and cost effective. However, it is also important to remember that if an unsuitable model and/or wrong engineering geological information are used, the basis for decisions may be insufficient or wrong. Examples are given in the thesis.

# Contents

---

<i>Summary</i>	<i>iv</i>
<i>Preface</i>	<i>vii</i>
<i>Contents</i>	<i>ix</i>
<i>Notations and symbols</i>	<i>xv</i>
<b>Roman letters</b>	<b>xv</b>
<b>Greek letters</b>	<b>xvii</b>
<b>Abbreviations</b>	<b>xvii</b>
<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Objectives and scope of work	2
1.3 Limitations	4
1.4 Definitions	4
<b>2. Decision and Risk Analysis for Underground Projects</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1 Introduction	7
2.2 The concept of decision and risk analysis	7
2.3 The concept of uncertainty in decision and risk analysis	11
2.3.1 Inherent variability	12
2.3.2 Modelling uncertainty	12
2.3.3 Parameter uncertainty	12
2.4 Methods of describing uncertainty in information related to design and construction of underground facilities	13
2.4.1 Deterministic methods of handling uncertainty	14
2.4.2 Probability-based methods of handling uncertainty	15
Frequentist statistics	15
Bayesian statistics - degree of belief	16
2.5 Decision and risk analysis tools relevant to design and construction of underground facilities	17
2.6 Summary and conclusions	19
<b>3. Geological hazards - their impact on underground projects and possibilities of detecting them</b>	<b>21</b>
3.1 Introduction	21
3.2 Overview of geological hazards	22
3.2.1 Risk object	22
3.2.2 Description of some geological hazards	22
3.2.3 Occurrence of geological hazards - geological regimes	24
3.3 Process of events leading to geologically induced damage	26
3.3.1 Different types of damage events	26
Damage events with impact on the excavation works	26
Damage events with impact on the operation of an underground facility	27
Damage events with impact on the environment	27
3.3.2 Initiating events and warning bells	28

3.3.3 Quality assurance	29
Obstacles in achieving good quality	29
Quality systems	30
3.3.4 Tunnelling - disruptions in the excavation works due to geological hazards	31
<b>3.4 Possibilities of detecting geological hazards - pre-investigation and rock characterization</b>	<b>33</b>
3.4.1 Geological knowledge	34
3.4.2 Geological mapping	35
3.4.3 Geophysical exploration	36
Geophysical surface investigations	37
Geophysical bore hole investigations and investigations from the tunnel face	38
Geological hazards and warning bells detectable by geophysical exploration	40
3.4.4 Exploration by drilling	41
Surface drilling investigations	41
Drilling investigations from the tunnel face	42
Geological hazards and warning bells detectable by drilling	42
3.4.5 Reliability of pre-investigation methods for detecting geological hazards	44
Geological mapping	49
Seismics	49
GPR and bore hole radar	50
Resistivity	50
Core and probe drilling	51
Summary - quantification of reliability	51
<b>3.5 Summary and conclusions</b>	<b>52</b>
<b>4. Engineering geological information in underground projects</b>	<b>55</b>
<b>4.1 Introduction</b>	<b>55</b>
<b>4.2 Engineering geological information</b>	<b>55</b>
4.2.1 A decision perspective on engineering geological information	55
4.2.2 General aspects on carrying and transferring information	56
4.2.3 Requirements on engineering geological information and prognoses as given in the literature	58
4.2.4 Traditional system for engineering geological prognoses (deterministic approach)	59
<b>4.3 Engineering geological information requirements EGIR</b>	<b>61</b>
4.3.1 Suggested requirements	61
4.3.2 The concept of using EGIR and a top-down philosophy	62
<b>4.4 Examples on engineering geological information relevant for some important decisions in different project stages</b>	<b>63</b>
4.4.1 Feasibility stage	64
4.4.2 Design/production planning stage	64
4.4.3 Construction stage	66
<b>4.5 Summary and conclusions</b>	<b>67</b>
<b>5. Statistical modelling of engineering geological information</b>	<b>69</b>
<b>5.1 Introduction</b>	<b>69</b>
<b>5.2 Specific demands on (and arising from) statistical modelling</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>5.3 Reflecting nature</b>	<b>72</b>
5.3.1 Characteristics related to spatial variability of rock masses (geological logics)	72
5.3.2 Modelling spatial variability in rock	75
Independent processes	79
Markov process models	79
Poisson process	80
Homogenous stochastic fields with scalar state - interpolation using kriging	81
<b>5.4 Updating</b>	<b>83</b>
5.4.1 Basic bayesian methodology	83
5.4.2 Description of data generating processes	84

5.4.3 Likelihood - treatment of additional data	84
Assessment of likelihoods based on observations and subjective knowledge	85
Ways of improving the assessment of likelihoods	86
5.4.4 Prior - initial knowledge	87
5.4.5 Numerical solutions for bayesian inference	89
5.4.6 Composite bayesian model	90
<b>5.5 Description of "reliability" of investigation methods</b>	<b>90</b>
5.5.1 Regression analysis	90
5.5.2 Correlation analysis	92
<b>5.6 Description of the reliability of investigation programmes</b>	<b>93</b>
<b>5.7 Subjective assessment of input data</b>	<b>93</b>
<b>5.8 Application of statistical modelling for decisions within underground construction - design and use of stochastic geo-models</b>	<b>93</b>
<b>5.9 Summary and conclusions</b>	<b>94</b>
<b>6. Example of modelling a geological boundary with kriging - design stage Stockholm Ring Road Project</b>	<b>97</b>
<b>6.1 Introduction</b>	<b>97</b>
<b>6.2 Stockholm Ring Road Project</b>	<b>97</b>
6.2.1 General	97
6.2.2 Geological description of the Kvarholmsvägen area	98
<b>6.3 Engineering Geological Information Requirements, EGIR</b>	<b>98</b>
<b>6.4 Statistical modelling</b>	<b>99</b>
6.4.1 Model description	99
6.4.2 Modelling sequence and input data	99
6.4.3 Calculation results	100
<b>6.5 Summary and conclusions</b>	<b>103</b>
<b>7. Example of modelling construction time and material using a layered stochastic geo-model - design/production planning stage Äspö Hard Rock Laboratory</b>	<b>105</b>
<b>7.1 Introduction</b>	<b>105</b>
<b>7.2 Äspö Hard Rock Laboratory</b>	<b>105</b>
7.2.1 General	105
7.2.2 Geological description	106
7.2.3 Methods of excavation, rock support and grouting	107
<b>7.3 Engineering Geological Information Requirements, EGIR</b>	<b>107</b>
<b>7.4 Statistical modelling</b>	<b>109</b>
7.4.1 Introduction	109
7.4.2 Description of the layered stochastic geo-model used at Äspö	109
Statistical simulation model	110
Transformation of basic data to relevant engineering geological information	111
Model for updating	113
7.4.3 Modelling sequence - three different prognoses	114
7.4.4 Difficulties with assessment of geological input data and bayesian updating of triangular distributions	114
7.4.5 Available input data and assessment of prior	117
Rock Classes	118
Single water-bearing fractures	119
Minor weakness zones (< 5 m)	120
Major weakness zones (> 5 m)	122
Extreme zones (>20 m)	123
Spalling	124



<b>7.5 Results</b>	<b>124</b>
7.5.1 Computation results, engineering geological prognosis on TBM tunnelling	124
7.5.2 Outcome from TBM tunnelling	126
<b>7.6 Conclusions from practical application</b>	<b>126</b>
7.6.1 Applicability of statistical modelling	126
Data generating processes	126
Comparison between prognoses and outcome	127
Value of additional information and the influence of prior estimates	128
Reliability of geological pre-investigations with emphasis on core drilling	129
7.6.2 Applicability of EGIR	130
<b>8. Example of modelling conditions ahead of the tunnel face with a bayesian stochastic geo-model - construction stage Hallandsås Project</b>	<b>131</b>
<b>8.1 Introduction</b>	<b>131</b>
<b>8.2 Hallandsås railway project</b>	<b>131</b>
8.2.1 General	131
8.2.2 Geological description	132
General conditions	132
Southern Marginal Zone - conceptual deterministic geological model	133
8.2.3 Method of excavation and decision process on site	134
8.2.4 Pre-investigations used during tunnelling in the Southern Marginal Zone	135
<b>8.3 Engineering Geological Information Requirements, EGIR</b>	<b>136</b>
<b>8.4 Statistical modelling</b>	<b>137</b>
8.4.1 Introduction	137
8.4.2 Model description	138
Principles of handling prior knowledge	138
Principles for treatment of additional data	138
Principles for calculation of the product of the prior and various likelihood functions	139
8.4.3 Verification of the model	139
8.4.4 Modelling of the Southern Marginal Zone	139
Available input data	139
Computation sequence and description of different computations	140
Assessment of prior	142
Assessment and updating of sample likelihoods	144
8.4.5 Computation results	153
<b>8.5 Conclusions from practical application</b>	<b>154</b>
8.5.1 Applicability of statistical modelling	154
Review of model - potentials and limitations	154
Comparison between prognoses and outcome	155
Markov properties	156
Updating of likelihoods - use of data derived from excavated segments	157
Reliability of investigation methods	157
8.5.2 Applicability of EGIR	160
<b>9. Discussion and conclusions</b>	<b>163</b>
<b>9.1 Introduction</b>	<b>163</b>
<b>9.2 General aspects on decision and risk analysis</b>	<b>163</b>
<b>9.3 EGIR and its applicability</b>	<b>164</b>
<b>9.4 Applicability of stochastic geo-models</b>	<b>165</b>
<b>9.5 The author's reflections and experiences from four years of research</b>	<b>166</b>
<b>10. Proposals for further research</b>	<b>169</b>
<b>References</b>	<b>171</b>



<b>LIST OF APPENDICES</b>	<b>I</b>
<b>A1. Basic data for kriging analysis, Stockholm Ring Road Project</b>	<b>III</b>
<b>A2. Engineering geological information from the Southern Marginal Zone, Hallandsås Project</b>	<b>VII</b>
<b>A3. Specific description of a bayesian statistical model used at the Hallandsås Project.</b>	<b>XI</b>
<b>A4. Verification of the bayesian statistical model used at the Hallandsås Project</b>	<b>XXI</b>
<b>A5. Subjective assessment of transition probabilities for a markov process</b>	<b>XXXIII</b>
<b>A6. Results from Computations 4f and 4g, Hallandsås Project</b>	<b>XXXVII</b>
<b>A7. <math>\chi^2</math>-test of markov properties, Hallandsås Project</b>	<b>XLI</b>