



Hydraulic Tomography Using Fiber Bragg Grating Multilevel Well

Presenter: Jui-Pin Tsai Ph.D.

Department of Bioenvironmental Systems Engineering

National Taiwan University





Outline

- Introduction
- Theory-Fiber Bragg Grating Sensor
- Theory-Hydraulic tomography
- Field study
- Conclusion

Introduction

- Target of our EPA project
 - Soil and groundwater remediation
 - Delineating a three dimensional hydrogeological parameter fields using head observations
 - Predict the flow paths of plume and remediation agent

- Limitations need to be overcome
 - Well diameter is 2-in
 - Fully penetrating
 - Depth-discrete measurements
 - Packer installation
 - Electronic sensor: Cable diameter ∝ measurement length



Traditional well in the remediation site

Fiber optical sensors - Theory

• Fiber Bragg grating (FBG) sensor



$$e = \frac{Dl}{l} = \frac{D/_B}{/_B}$$
 e : strain
: wavelength

Huang, An-Bin, et al. "Stability monitoring of rainfall-induced deep landslides through pore pressure profile measurements." Soils and Foundations 52.4 (2012): 737-747.



Laboratory test - FBG piezometer



- Measurement ranges: 0 400 kPa (40.8 mH₂O)
- Diameter: 36 mm
- Wight: 500-600 g
- Resolution : 0.1 kP a
- Accuracy : 0.2% FS
- Wavelength range: 1520-1570 nm
- Manufactured by Citpo Tech

Laboratory test - FBG thermometer



- Measurement ranges: 0–50°C
- Length: 50-60 mm
- Wight: 10-20 g
- Resolution : 0.1 °C
- Accuracy : 0.4% FS
- Wavelength range: 1520-1570 nm
- Manufactured by Citpo Tech

Development of multilevel well using FBG

• FBG multilevel well



Custom designed by Cipto tech., Taiwan

• Multifunction FBG sensor





Assemble the multifunction FBG sensors in the study site

Hydraulic tomography (HT)

- Hydraulic tomography (HT) is a type of data collection strategy
- The collected head data sets are converted to aquifer parameter filed through successfully linear estimator (SLE), which is developed by Prof. T.-C. Jim Yeh in 1996

A simple example

2-D horizontal aquifer









Successive Linear Estimator (SLE)

Objective: conditional expectation of a stochastic field

given sampled observations h collected in hydraulic tomographic survey

 Successive linear approximation of the nonlinear relationship between h and Y

$$\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_{c}^{\left(r+1\right)} = \hat{\mathbf{Y}}_{c}^{\left(r\right)} + \mathcal{W}^{\mathrm{T}}\left(\boldsymbol{h}^{*} - \boldsymbol{h}^{\left(r\right)}\right)$$

Weights depend on spatial correlation function of Y and sensitivity of h to Y

 Update residual covariance (uncertainty) and cross-covariance to obtain new weights

$$\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{yy}^{(r+1)} = \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{yy}^{(r)} - \boldsymbol{\omega}^{\mathrm{T}} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{dy}$$

 Start iteration with unconditional covariance function of Y (a prior information)
Stop iteration when no improvement

(Yeh et al., 1996)



Hydraulic tomography

- Head variations during the four injection events
- Scatter plot of simulated and observed groundwater levels



Hydraulic tomography using FBG data

• Estimated K field • S_s estimate



Predicting the flow paths of remediation agent

- Predict the spatiotemporal distribution of remediation agent based on the groundwater model with the estimated parameter fields.
- Facilitate the planning of contaminated site remediation.



Conclusion

- This study successfully employed FBG technology to develop a multilevel monitoring system (MLMS) to monitor the spatiotemporal groundwater pressure and temperature in the subsurface environment.
- The groundwater levels in response to the four injections from different levels in 2-in wells are monitored precisely.
- The multi-depth groundwater level measurements are successfully used to delineate the 3-D K and Ss fields for the study site.
- FBG MLMS is testing in several sites in Taiwan.

Thanks for your listening! Q&A jptsai@ntu.edu.tw Article: https://doi.org/10.1364/OE.412518

Comparisons of the measurements between FBG and electronic sensors



- Solinst Levelogger Model 3001
 - range = 100 m
 - accuracy of 0.05% FS in pressure
 - 0.05°C in temperature
- Maximum difference
 - $5 \text{ cm H}_2\text{O}$ in pressure
 - 0.27 °C in temperature
- Difference may source from different sensor accuracy and response time

Validation of Estimated K filed



1.0E-03