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**TOPICS**

- **TEM inversion**
  - what do we mean by TEM inversion
  - motivation
  - forward simulation criteria
  - inversion techniques
- **Ground Example 1**
  - well studied groundwater basin
  - multiple small loops, with multiple stations and multiple
    base frequencies
  - well data, other ground data, airborne data
- **Ground Example 2**
  - relatively immature uranium exploration environment
  - larger loops with multiple stations
  - vertical and horizontal components
- **AEM Example**
  - associated airborne data
what do we mean by TEM inversion?

determine by an automatic procedure of forward models at each datapoint \((x,y)\) the resistivity as a function of depth - \(\rho(z)\)

but with the objective to find as accurately as possible the depths where there are distinct variations in resistivity
• motivation?

for several years, we have been “inverting”
  - moving loop - in-loop and slingram style
  - fixed loop   - inside and outside loop
  - airborne    - inside and outside TX
with Z and X coil orientations

- lead us to the conclusion that inversion of one data element although having multiple time windows is not reliable due to “noise”.

Petroseikon
forward simulation criteria

Reproduce Instrument Response

Current waveforms are periodic:
- Transmitting Waveform is repeated many times and data are stacked
- A discrete spectrum at harmonics of the base-frequency

- Finite bandwidth – electronic implementation, linearity of coils, high frequency noise

- Correct loop geometry - no circular or square approximations

- Utilization of variable current waveforms with different instruments
- inversion techniques
  - overparametrized (occam) vs underparametrized (marquardt)
  - unconstrained and constrained resistivities, thicknesses and depths

although smooth models are useful qualitatively
for some purposes they do not give adequate precision
additional data components allows more complexity
in the discrete models and more certainty with the model
Ground Example 1 – data thanks to USGS WRD

- well studied groundwater basin
- 2 outside and 1 inside loop measurement

1. difference in early-time outside loop response
   - instrument, cultural, natural, or geological noise
2. common crossover time of currents
3. odd late time inloop response
4. noisy but still useful late time outside loop response
• Ground Example 1
  • well studied groundwater basin

without an inversion for multiple datapoints a trial and error procedure must use single station inversions and multiple station forward results iteratively

BUT, TOO TIME CONSUMING and statistically uncertain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>rho</th>
<th>dz</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ground Example 1

- use of stacked data and multiple data point inversions

quicker and less labor oriented multiple data point inversions

model consistent with ground FEM data, and well hole information to a limited depth
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Ground Example 2 – data thanks to UNOR Inc
- relatively immature uranium exploration
- 400x400 loop

Survey Objective:
depth to basement through sedimentary sequence

22 measurements
11 NS, 11 EW

Hz data is relatively symmetric for NS and EW implying suitability of 1D model
• Ground Example 2

by Ch12, start to see switch in curvature inside the loop with characteristic too dropout at centre - “inside loop soundings can be dangerous”
• Ground Example 2

stack data at equivalent distances from centre – 6 data

stacked decays

inside to outside
Ground Example 2

Initial model fits

Repeated manual iteration

Resistivity vs Depth

Sandstone siltstone/mudstone interbeds?
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• Ground Example 2

6 pt inversion – inside/outside somewhat better late and early time but quicker from a manpower perspective

mudstone/siltstone interbeds

mudstone/siltstone interbeds

mudstone/siltstone interbeds
• Ground Example 2

better mid-time fits with only outside loop

mudstone/siltstone interbeds

mudstone/siltstone interbeds

mudstone/siltstone interbeds
AEM Example

- associated airborne data

4 early offtime channels

smooth spatial response
thus we would expect a slowly varying 1D model to be reasonably appropriate
AEM Example

**Petroseikon**

Hz decays correctly but amplitude shift of “3” Hx approximately correct within data limits.
Joint Hz (15 chn) and Hx (5) chns

Ground data model
AEM Example

Joint Hz (15 chn) and Hx (5) chns
Comments

- Multiple common distance outside loop measurements allow:
  a) Checking of geology from 1D inversion interpretation
  b) Allows checking of data accuracy and system effects
  c) Stacking of stations to help minimize lateral effects and improve signal to noise
  d) Multiple station inversions to provide more reliable models

- Calibration of airborne data with ground data for more reliable inversion results