

Accepted Manuscript

Geological Society, London, Special Publications

From gravity cores to overpressure history: the importance of measured sediment physical properties in hydrogeological models

Davide Mencaroni, Jaume Llopart, Roger Urgeles, Sara Lafuerza, Eulàlia Gràcia, Anne Le Friant & Morelia Urlaub

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1144/SP500-2019-176>

Received 30 September 2019

Revised 29 November 2019

Accepted 29 November 2019

© 2020 The Author(s). This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>). Published by The Geological Society of London. Publishing disclaimer: www.geolsoc.org.uk/pub_ethics

To cite this article, please follow the guidance at

https://www.geolsoc.org.uk/~media/Files/GSL/shared/pdfs/Publications/AuthorInfo_Text.pdf?la=en

Manuscript version: Accepted Manuscript

This is a PDF of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting and correction before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the book series pertain.

Although reasonable efforts have been made to obtain all necessary permissions from third parties to include their copyrighted content within this article, their full citation and copyright line may not be present in this Accepted Manuscript version. Before using any content from this article, please refer to the Version of Record once published for full citation and copyright details, as permissions may be required.

From gravity cores to overpressure history: the importance of measured sediment physical properties in hydrogeological models

Davide Mencaroni¹, Jaume Llopart¹, Roger Urgeles¹, Sara Lafuerza², Eulàlia Gràcia¹, Anne Le Friant³,
Morelia Urlaub⁴

¹Institut de Ciències del Mar (CSIC), Barcelona, Spain

²Sorbonne Université, Paris, France

³Institut de Physique du Globe de Paris, Paris, France

⁴GEOMAR Helmholtz Centre for Ocean Research Kiel, Kiel, Germany

mencaroni@icm.csic.es

Abstract: The development of overpressure in continental margins is typically evaluated with hydrogeological models. Such approaches are used to both identify fluid flow patterns and to evaluate the development of high pore pressures within layers with particular physical properties that may promote slope instability. In some instances, these models are defined with sediment properties based on facies characterization and proxy values of porosity, permeability or compressibility are derived from the existing literature as direct measurements are rarely available. This study uses finite-element models to quantify the differences in computed overpressure generated by fine-grained hemipelagic sediments from Gulf of Cadiz, offshore Martinique and Gulf of Mexico, and their consequences in terms of submarine slope stability. By comparing our simulation results with in-situ pore pressure data measured in the Gulf of Mexico, we demonstrated that physical properties measured on volcanic-influenced hemipelagic sediments underestimate the computed stability of a submarine slope. Physical properties measured on sediments from the study

area are key to improving the reliability and accuracy of overpressure models, and when that information is not available literature data from samples with similar lithologies, composition and depositional settings enable better assessment of the overpressure role as a pre-conditioning factor in submarine landslide initiation.

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

Introduction

Overpressure development in marine sediments is a major pre-conditioning factor that favours slope instability by decreasing the amount of gravitational driving stresses required to mobilize sediments (Dugan & Sheahan 2012). If the pressure of the water contained in the pore space exceeds the hydrostatic condition, failures can be initiated in low angle submarine slopes by a relatively minor trigger such as a small magnitude earthquake (Urlaub *et al.* 2015). Generation of overpressure is commonly associated with rapid sedimentation (Dickinson 1953; Gibson 1958) and with the physical properties of the sediments, such as porosity, hydraulic conductivity and compressibility. The occurrence of overpressure within sediments can be studied directly through in-situ measurements with piezocone tests (Lunne *et al.* 1997) and pore pressure penetrometers (Flemings *et al.* 2008), or indirectly from borehole logging measurements, such as sonic, resistivity and density logs (Mouchet & Mitchell 1989), and from velocity analysis derived from seismic reflection data. Finally, overpressure development and evolution can be evaluated using hydrogeological models. The application at the basin scale of those models, in some cases, aims to provide a broad understanding of the conditions that may have generated previous slope instability (Gutierrez & Wangen 2005; Bellwald *et al.* 2019; Llopart *et al.* 2019). In many cases, however, sediment samples from the study area are not available for geotechnical testing. In such instances, porosity, permeability and compressibility values are typically derived from the literature based on their expected lithologies (Urlaub *et al.* 2015), depositional environment (Bellwald *et al.* 2019) or geographic area. On the other hand, measuring sediments physical properties implies a series of inevitable errors and uncertainties, which affect the reliability of models, such as presence of test errors, insufficient number of tests and the inherent variability of soil properties (Phoon & Kulhawy 1999; Zhang *et al.* 2012).

This study aims to evaluate the suitability of hydrogeological models based on literature derived physical properties of sediments collected from similar depositional environments and with comparable grain size distributions. To do this, we built a series of finite-element models that simulate the development of overpressure on a hemipelagic unit rapidly buried by a series of mass

wasting events. Using the same depositional scenario, we defined the hemipelagic layer with initial porosity, hydraulic conductivity and specific storage measured on comparable sediments with similar grain size distribution, but collected in three different depositional settings: Alentejo basin (Gulf of Cadiz, SW Iberian margin), Grenada basin (offshore Martinique, Lesser Antilles) and Ursa basin (Gulf of Mexico). We further used the actual sedimentary history at Ursa Basin, where overpressure is groundtruthed with piezometer measurements, and tested the influence of using actual physical properties from the area versus physical properties taken from other depositional environment of similar grain size.

Depositional settings

We based this study on mechanical properties from 18 hemipelagic sediment samples collected from three different oceanic regions, characterized by different depositional settings, and all affected by well-documented subaqueous slope instabilities (**Fig. 1a**). The Alentejo basin is located in the northern sector of the Gulf of Cadiz, SW offshore Portugal (**Fig. 1b**). The area is characterized by an extensive contourite depositional system (Hernández-Molina *et al.* 2015), generated by the Mediterranean Outflow Water, which distributes sediments entering the gulf mainly through the Guadalquivir river (Mulder *et al.* 2003). The Grenada basin (**Fig. 1c**), offshore Martinique, is mainly composed by volcanic ashes, hemipelagic sediments and volcanoclastic turbidite deposits (Lafuerza *et al.* 2014) due to the activity of the surrounding volcanoes and absence of important sediment inputs from rivers. The sediments in the deep part of the basin accumulate at sedimentation rates up to 20 cm/ky (Le Friant *et al.* 2015). The third area is the Ursa basin (**Fig. 1d**), in the Gulf of Mexico. The region is known for the very high terrigenous sedimentation, entering the basin from the Mississippi River, taking place upon a salt substrate (Worrall & Snelson 1989). The slope is characterized by well-documented overpressure due to sedimentation rates exceeding 25 m/ky during some intervals in the Pleistocene (Flemings *et al.* 2006; Sawyer *et al.* 2007). IODP expedition 308 performed in-situ pore pressure measurements using the DVTPP and T2P piezoprobes (see Flemings *et al.* 2008; Long *et al.* 2008 for further details on the measurements), and documented

high overpressure associated mainly with the high sedimentation rates in the area (Expedition 308 Scientists 2005). Previous studies (Urgeles *et al.* 2007, 2010) modelled the stratigraphic evolution of the margin considering the physical properties of the different units in the Ursa Basin, with the aim of understanding the present-day pore pressure condition revealed by the in-situ measurements. Despite the significant scatter observed in the direct overpressure measurement, especially within the uppermost hemipelagic drape, 1D simulations reproduced the general vertical overpressure distribution at site U1324 (**Fig. 2**) (for more information about previous overpressure modelling see Urgeles *et al.* 2010).

Methods

Sediments from the Alentejo basin (6 samples) have been collected using a gravity corer during the INSIGHT_Leg1 (2018) cruise in the Gulf of Cadiz. Initial void ratio (e_0), compression index (C_c) and initial hydraulic conductivity (e_0) in these samples have been derived with stepped loading (Rowe and Barden type of cell) or Constant Rate of Strain (CRS) oedometer tests (**Fig 3a** and **Table 1**). Samples from Grenada basin (3 samples) and from the Ursa basin (9 samples) were recovered from wells drilled during two separate IODP expeditions. The samples from the Grenada basin used in this study have been drilled at well U1399 during the IODP expedition 340 (Le Friant *et al.* 2015) and their compressibility/permeability properties measured with 1D consolidation tests (**Fig. 3b**) (Lafuerza *et al.* 2014). Sediments from the Ursa basin have been taken from wells U1322 and U1324, drilled during the IODP expedition 308 (Expedition 308 Scientists 2005; Flemings *et al.* 2006). Also in this case, their physical properties have been analysed using a combination of incremental loading and CRS oedometer tests (**Fig. 3c**) (Urgeles *et al.* 2007, 2010; Long *et al.* 2008; Stigall & Dugan 2010).

In our basin-modelling approach, we input the physical properties of the sediments at their initial depositional conditions, to simulate the pre-failure overpressure behaviour of the sediment composing the stratigraphic column. Therefore, input data such as porosity, hydraulic conductivity and specific storage are extrapolated to 1 kPa along the virgin consolidation line (e.g. Llopart *et al.*

2019). All of the samples were composed by hemipelagic sediments, collected outside mass transport deposit areas: for this reason, we assumed they did not undergo heavy deformation or mixing processes and the extrapolation of their physical properties to 1 kPa can be considered as a fair reproduction of their behaviour at depositional conditions.

Grain size distribution for all samples has been measured using laser diffractometers. We adopted the grain size classification proposed by Wentworth (1922) to derive the percentages of sand (2 mm - 62.5 μm), silt (62.5 μm - 4 μm) and clay (< 4 μm) measured in the sediments. The three-components textural classification for muddy sediments proposed by Flemming (2000) has been used to subdivide the analysed sediments in four classes based on their sand, silt and clay content: D-II (very silty slightly sandy mud), D-III (silty slightly sandy mud), E-II (slightly clayey silt) and E-III (clayey silt) (**Fig. 4**).

Overpressure development simulations have been performed using the finite element software BASIN (Bitzer 1996, 1999). Modelling the stratigraphic and hydrodynamic evolution of a 2D section, BASIN allows the calculation of non-equilibrium compaction and overpressure generation on sediments by coupling compaction and 2D fluid flow. The consolidation model incorporates porosity-dependent sediment compressibility through the equation (Bitzer 1996):

$$\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \frac{k_{x(\phi)} \partial p}{\partial x} \right) + \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial z} \frac{k_{z(\phi)} \partial p}{\partial z} \right) = \frac{(1 - \phi) \rho g \alpha_{(\phi)} \partial p}{\partial t}$$

where $k_{x(\phi)}$ is the porosity-dependent hydraulic conductivity in the x -direction, $\alpha_{(\phi)}$ is the porosity-dependent sediment compressibility, p the fluid pressure, ϕ the porosity, ρ is the sediment bulk density and g is the gravity constant. Sediment compressibility in BASIN is calculated from the specific storage (S_s), which is defined as the volume of water removed from a unit volume of a confined aquifer with an increase in the vertical stress. It relates with the more commonly used compression index by the relation (Jorgensen 1980):

$$s_s = \frac{0.434 C_c \gamma_w}{\sigma'_v (1 + e_0)}$$

where C_c is the compression index, γ_w is the specific weight of water, σ'_v is the effective vertical stress and e_0 is the void ratio at depositional conditions (1kPa).

In first instance, we built a series of 1D models to simulate the deposition of a 500 m thick hemipelagic unit with a sedimentation rate of 30 cm/ky, followed by a series of turbidite events that deposit 250 m of sand-rich material during 1000 years. Initial thickness of the units, sedimentation rates and boundary conditions, as well as physical properties of the turbidite unit, are kept constant through the different scenarios. Since no samples associated with turbidites were available in our database, we defined its physical properties with values taken from the literature (Reed *et al.* 2002). The only variables that change in between the different models are initial porosity, initial hydraulic conductivity and initial specific storage of the hemipelagic layer. In the first set of analysis (Scenario A), we defined the properties of the hemipelagic unit by averaging arithmetically the physical properties values for each study area. In the second series of tests (Scenario B), we assigned physical properties to each hemipelagic layer based on the average specific storage, porosity and hydraulic conductivity of the samples from each grain size class. The BASIN input parameters used for the simulation are provided in **Table 2**.

Secondly, to evaluate the reliability of our results and their significance in terms of submarine slope stability, we applied our approach on a case study where in-situ overpressure measurements have been collected. To do so, we considered the results of site U1324 drilled in the Ursa Basin during the IODP expedition 308.

Using BASIN we reproduced the stratigraphic architecture, sedimentation rate, boundary conditions and lithologies of a 1D overpressure model at site U1324 from Urgeles *et al.* (**Fig. 2**) (2010). Then, we substituted the original physical properties associated with the top hemipelagic drape with the ones measured from the sediments collected in the Alentejo and Grenada basins (**Tab. 2**). By doing this,

we aim to evaluate the differences in overpressure generated by defining hydrogeological models with physical properties measured from hemipelagic sediments collected in different areas, and compare them with the reference calibrated results from Urgeles *et al.* (2010). At site U1324, 612 m of sedimentary sequence deposited between the Pleistocene and the Holocene (Expedition 308 Scientists 2005; Flemings *et al.* 2008) were drilled. From bottom to top, the main units composing the Ursa Basin consist of: (1) the sand-dominated lower Mississippi Canyon Blue Unit (Late Pleistocene) (Sawyer *et al.* 2007), (2) a mud dominated channel levee assemblage and (3) a mud-drape deposited during the last ~20ky (Behrmann *et al.* 2006; Flemings *et al.* 2008). The overpressure evolution of the basin had been modelled and is modelled in this study since deposition of the sand-rich Blue unit (~ 100 ky ago), followed by the silt lithologies associated with the filling of the Ursa Canyon, and by the mud-dominated sediments from the channel levee assemblage and hemipelagic sediments (**Fig. 2**) (Urgeles *et al.* 2007, 2010).

This study also refers to pore pressure in terms of overpressure ratio (λ) (Flemings *et al.* 2008), defined as:

$$\lambda = \frac{(p - p_h)}{(\sigma_v - p_h)}$$

where p is pore pressure, p_h is the hydrostatic pressure and σ_v is the lithostatic or total vertical stress. A λ value of 0 means that pore pressure is hydrostatic, while a value of 1 means that the overburden is fully sustained by the pore water.

Results

Physical Properties

The grain size distribution of sediments collected in each study area are relatively homogeneous although each location has a distinctly different composition. Whilst all samples analysed are silt dominated, the percentages vary significantly between 57.36% and 83.1%. Clay contents also ranged between 11.1% and 42.2%, and sand sized grains comprised the lowest fraction at each site (0% to

10.5%) (**Fig. 4**). The Ursa Basin has the lowest sand content, with 8 out of 9 samples corresponding to the “E” class of Flemming’s classification (sand < 5%). Within the Grenada basin 2 out of 3 samples tested show a sand content greater than 5% and a clay content less than 25%. Sediments from the Alentejo basin are similar to the Ursa basin: sand content is less than 5% for 5 out of 6 samples, with clay values between 25% and 35%. Therefore, group D-II in Flemming’s classification is only represented by two samples from the Ursa basin.

We used ternary contour diagrams to visualize different textural composition of sediment in relation with their compression index (**Fig. 5a**), initial porosity (**Fig. 5b**) and initial hydraulic conductivity (**Fig. 5c**). Results show a broadly heterogeneous relationship between grain size and physical properties. Compression index (**Fig. 5a**) ranges between 0.22 and 0.92. The highest C_c values are related to an increase in silt percentage and tend to decrease in sediments with some sand content. Samples from the Grenada basin, with higher silt content, show a compression index ranging between 0.67 and 0.75, while the lowest values are found in sediments from the Ursa basin, where most of the samples show C_c values below 0.65. An exception is represented by sample 308-1322B_H08, which has higher clay content (42.2%) and compression index (0.92).

A similar trend is illustrated in the initial porosity diagram (**Fig. 5b**), with porosity values ranging between 0.52 and 0.79. The higher values are reached in sediments with higher silt content while the lower values are linked to higher sand content. However, sample SdG_02_102 differs from this trend showing a high initial porosity (0.78) despite a relatively low silt content (61%).

Values of hydraulic conductivity at deposition (1kPa) vary within two orders of magnitude (1E-8 to 1E-10 m/s). The Alentejo basin samples produce the highest values while the lowest values correspond to samples from the Grenada basin (**Fig. 5c**).

Our first modelling stage (Scenario A) (**Fig. 6a**) consisted in three separate models, where physical properties of the hemipelagic layer described above have been averaged for each study area (**Tab.**

2). Fine-grained sediments from the Alentejo basin and from the Ursa basin show a comparable range of overpressure development, reaching a maximum overpressure ratio (λ) of 0.18 at 343 mbsf for the Alentejo basin model and 0.25 at 341 mbsf for the Ursa basin (i.e., immediately below the turbidite unit). The computed overpressure ratio from the Grenada basin model shows higher values with λ up to 0.56 at 329 mbsf.

The second modelling scenario (Scenario B) consisted on defining the hemipelagic units with physical properties averaged from their grain size distribution classes (**Fig. 6b**). The minimum peak value ($\lambda \sim 0.06$) is observed in the model defined with properties from the group E-II (sand < 5%, clay < 25%). Models from groups E-III and D-III show comparable maximum overpressure ratios (0.24 and 0.19), while the maximum values ($\lambda \sim 0.53$) are reached by the model defined with the properties averaged from the samples in the group D-II (Sand > 5%, Clay < 25%).

Fig. 7 shows the present-day overpressure resulting at site U1324 from our 1D simulations. Changes in the physical properties of the hemipelagic unit, at the top of the stratigraphy, did not allow any of our scenarios to fit perfectly neither the reference 1D model (Urgeles *et al.* 2010) nor the in-situ overpressure measurements (Flemings *et al.* 2008). The model defined with hydraulic conductivity, specific storage and initial porosity from the Alentejo basin underestimates the overpressure within the hemipelagic layer, mainly because of its higher permeability compared with the hemipelagic sediment from the Ursa basin (**Tab. 2**). Finally, the model defined with physical properties from the Grenada basin provide a very different output compared with the other models (**Fig. 7**). Even if it reproduces better the measured in-situ overpressures from the hemipelagic layer, the hydrodynamics of the model is split in two separate systems: in the lower part of the stratigraphy the overpressure increases constantly from the bottom to the top, reaching a maximum overpressure value of 1 at the base of the muddy sediments. Above this point, the overpressure drops, keeping a constant value of 0.7 up to the seafloor.

Discussion

In the first part of our study, two different scenarios have been used to analyse the influence of variable grain size composition of hemipelagic sediments in overpressure development. In scenario (A), the hemipelagic layer was defined using physical properties collected from specific study areas and resulted in much higher overpressure generation for sediments of the Grenada Basin compared to the other two areas considered. In Scenario (B), the samples with relatively high silt and low clay content and sand content higher than 5% (sediment class D-II) generated the highest overpressure. This sediment class includes only two samples, both collected in the Grenada Basin. In this case, the results obviously coincide with those of samples for the Grenada Basin in scenario A. Our results therefore seem to show that overpressure generation is rather related with the sediment composition and depositional setting instead of grain size distribution. This is in agreement with previous studies showing that there is no direct correlation between grain size distribution and sediment physical properties (Lafuerza *et al.* 2014) in marine muddy sediments.

However, when considering each depositional environment (e.g. river influenced), the grain size distribution has a major influence on overpressure development. Thus, sediments with low clay content (E-II) and samples with similar clay content but higher sand content (D-III) generated lower overpressure (**Fig. 4** and **6a**). Nonetheless, factors not considered in this study such as sorting and particles rounding might have played a significant role that should be investigated in future works.

Comparing the overpressure results with the physical properties used for the simulations indicates that the development of overpressure is associated with low initial hydraulic conductivities and specific storages (**Table 2**). Such differences in physical properties between the Grenada Basin and the other two areas could reflect substantial diversity in sediment composition and mineralogy. This may in turn may be directly linked to the depositional environments: a) the hemipelagic sediments in the Alentejo and Ursa basins are largely fluvially derived from the Guadalquivir and Mississippi rivers, respectively; b) volcanically derived sediments from the Grenada basin where these

sediments are influenced by volcanic ashes released by the extensive series of volcanos in the Lesser Antilles volcanic arc (Wiemer & Kopf 2015).

Comparing the 1D consolidation behaviour for volcanically derived hemipelagic sediments to the river-fed samples, it is possible to make assumptions about the reason of such notable differences in physical properties (**Fig. 3**). The Grenada basin sediments show lower compressibility at low consolidation stress and a transition to high compressibility at higher vertical stress (**Fig. 3b**). Similar behaviour known as structuration has been documented especially for fossiliferous, cemented or highly bioturbated sediments (Locat *et al.* 2003; Spinelli *et al.* 2007): in these instances, sediments are capable of holding water in rigid structures, preventing compaction during the early stages of consolidation or, in case of high degrees of cementation, also at high burial depths. Physical properties of the sediments from the Grenada basin, with higher compression index and lower specific storage and hydraulic conductivity, suggest that a similar mechanism could occur in the volcanic ash-rich hemipelagic sediments from the Lesser Antilles volcanic arc. Volcanic ashes, in fact, may generate the same type of structures preventing pore water to be released in the system at low consolidation stresses.

Structuration in the Grenada basin sediments retains the water in the pore space, reducing the specific storage (which is, by definition, the volume of water removed from a unit volume of a confined aquifer) and decreasing the permeability, since the pore water gets trapped into rigid structures. Those physical properties represent the ideal conditions for the development of overpressure in marine sediments, and this could explain why the Grenada basin sediments (scenario A) develop higher overpressure (near lithostatic), which leads to a lower vertical displacement in the model.

It must be also mentioned that defining hydrogeological models with marine sediments that show structuration might question the hydrogeological model results. "Delayed consolidation" (Locat *et al.* 2003), as it is visible for the Grenada basin hemipelagic sediments (**Fig. 3b**), implies two different

consolidation responses within the same sediment sample. Considering that the compression index is usually input as one representative value for each lithology, modelling such variation can represent a challenge. This is the reason why it is important to recognize structuration phenomena in the analysed samples and to consider its consequences while evaluating simulation results.

This behavior is well exemplified when modelling the Ursa basin sedimentation history with physical properties from the Grenada Basin (**Fig. 7**). The lower hydraulic conductivity and specific storage of the sediments from the Grenada basin, mainly due to the structuring phenomena previously discussed, makes the hemipelagic unit act as a perfectly impermeable seal in case of the very high sedimentation rates of the Ursa Basin. The pore water from the lower formations, characterized by coarser grain size and higher permeability, flow upwards and accumulates at the base of the seal, reaching extreme overpressure values up to 1 (**Fig. 7**). Nonetheless, this trend does not find correspondence in the in-situ measurement, where overpressure reaches its maximum within the hemipelagic layer and decrease constantly with depth, indicating a continuity between the pore water flow in the lower part of the stratigraphy and in the uppermost hemipelagic layer.

Significance for submarine slope stability

The development of overpressure in a submarine slope affects the magnitude of the events that can trigger a failure (e.g. earthquakes), or, in case of very high values and/or steep slope, can lead to slope instability with no external trigger (Stigall & Dugan 2010; Urlaub *et al.* 2015). A preliminary quantification of the consequences from the different overpressure resulting from our 1D models at site U1324 can be made by calculating the factor of safety (FoS) on an hypothetical 2° submarine slope using the equation (Flemings *et al.* 2008):

$$FoS = \frac{\tan \phi_f}{\sin \theta \cos \theta} (\cos^2 \theta - \lambda)$$

where θ is the surface slope, λ the overpressure ratio and ϑ_f the friction angle of 28° as it is was measured on the hemipelagic sediments in the Ursa Basin (Urgeles *et al.* 2007). FoS greater than 1 indicates stable slope, while values lower than 1 indicate slope failure.

The FoS has been calculated on the sediment deposited starting from 40000 years ago, corresponding to the beginning of the mud dominated channel levee assemblage, until the present day (**Fig. 8**). As the FoS decreases with increasing overpressure, the model generated defining the hemipelagic units with the physical properties from the Alentejo and the original Ursa basin reference model, show a decrease in the factor of safety until 20 ka. At this point, the hemipelagic sediment starts depositing and pore water migrates upwards with overpressure dissipating towards the seafloor (**Fig. 8**). The FoS for these two models reaches a minimum of around 3, increasing up to five at the present day. On the contrary, the model where the hemipelagic layer is defined with the physical properties from the Grenada basin shows an increase in overpressure values also after 20ky. This is because the deposition and compaction of the hemipelagic sediments creates a seal which prevent the water from the lower part of the stratigraphy to flow upwards. In this case, the FoS reaches values of around 2 which propagate almost constantly from 20 ka until the present-day (**Fig. 8**).

At the end of the simulations, none of the models results in factor of safety as low to induce the slope to fail (<1) in the considered stratigraphic level. Nevertheless, 1D sedimentation models at site U1324 show a completely different overpressure development history when the model is defined with the hemipelagic sediments from the Grenada basin, resulting in a considerable underestimation of the factor of safety at the base of the first deposited fine sediment unit.

Our modelling results show that physical properties derived from only the lithological characterization or the grain size distribution available in the literature may produce inaccurate overpressure models, with consequent misleading slope stability estimations. On the other hand, models based on physical properties derived from similar grain size, depositional environment and

expected compositional nature of sediments, such as the ones from the Alentejo basin and the Ursa basin, provided similar overpressure development results. This indicates that, in the absence of direct measurements, literature derived physical properties based on grain size characteristics and depositional setting are expected to produce more accurate overpressure development for stability analysis of submarine slopes. However, care should be taken in settings where presence of microfossils such as diatoms, initial cementation or volcanic glass particles could provide sediment structuration.

Conclusions

Using hydrogeological modelling we show how the sediment characteristics in some depositional environments have a significant influence on the amount of overpressure generated in marine hemipelagic sediments. We demonstrate how fine-grained marine sediments collected from different sedimentary environments (volcanic-influenced vs. river-dominated) can result in differences in overpressure in excess of one order of magnitude, and the consequences of those discrepancies for submarine slope stability assessment. Phenomena such as structuration of marine sediments needs to be carefully considered when carrying out basin hydrogeological models. Our results support the idea that, to achieve accurate results, besides accurate stratigraphic architecture and age of the units, hydrogeological models should be defined with physical properties measured from samples collected in the study area. In instances where such an approach is not feasible, assigning initial void ratio, hydraulic conductivity and specific storage extracted from the literature for samples with similar expected lithologies, composition and depositional settings are likely to provide the most accurate estimates. Given that this data is generally difficult to find within the scientific literature, a global open database for published physical properties is paramount to increase the accuracy of basin hydrogeological models in the future.

Acknowledgments

This research used samples and/or data provided by the International Ocean Discovery Program (IODP) and has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No 721403. The Spanish "Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad" and the European Regional Development Fund through grant CTM2015-70155-R (project INSIGHT) are acknowledged. We also thank Brandon Dugan and another reviewer for their comments that significantly improved our manuscript.

References

- Behrmann, J.H., Flemings, P.B., et al. 2006. Rapid sedimentation, overpressure, and focused fluid flow, gulf of mexico continental margin. *Scientific Drilling*, **1**, 12–17, <https://doi.org/10.2204/iodp.sd.3.03.2006>.
- Bellwald, B., Urlaub, M., Hjelstuen, B.O., Sejrup, H.P., Sørensen, M.B., Forsberg, C.F. & Vanneste, M. 2019. NE Atlantic continental slope stability from a numerical modeling perspective. *Quaternary Science Reviews*, **203**, 248–265, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.quascirev.2018.11.019>.
- Bitzer, K. 1996. Modeling Consolidation Sedimentary and Fluid Basins Flow. *Computers & Geosciences*, **22**, 467–478.
- Bitzer, K. 1999. Two-dimensional simulation of clastic and carbonate sedimentation, consolidation, subsidence, fluid flow, heat flow and solute transport during the formation of sedimentary basins. *Computers and Geosciences*, **25**, 431–447, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0098-3004\(98\)00147-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0098-3004(98)00147-2).
- Dickinson, G. 1953. Geological aspects of abnormal reservoir pressures in Gulf Coast Louisiana. *AAPG Bulletin*, **37**, 410–432.
- Dugan, B. & Sheahan, T.C. 2012. Offshore sediment overpressures of passive margins: Mechanisms, measurement, and models. *Reviews of Geophysics*, **50**, 271–276, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2011RG000379>.

- Expedition 308 Scientists. 2005. Overpressure and fluid flow processes in the deepwater Gulf of Mexico: slope stability, seeps, and shallow-water flow. *Integrated Ocean Drilling Program Expedition 308 Scientific Prospectus*.
- Flemings, P., Behrmann, J., John, C. & Expedition 308 Scientists. 2006. Proceedings of the Ocean Drilling Program. *IODP Management International, Inc., College Station TX*.
- Flemings, P.B., Long, H., Dugan, B., Germaine, J., John, C.M., Behrmann, J.H. & Sawyer, D. 2008. Pore pressure penetrometers document high overpressure near the seafloor where multiple submarine landslides have occurred on the continental slope, offshore Louisiana, Gulf of Mexico. *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, **274**, 269–283, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.epsl.2008.06.027>.
- Fleming, B.W. 2000. A revised textural classification of gravel-free muddy sediments on the basis of ternary diagrams. *Continental Shelf Research*, **20**, 1125–1137, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0278-4343\(00\)00015-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0278-4343(00)00015-7).
- Gibson, R.E. 1958. The Progress of Consolidation in a Clay Layer Increasing in Thickness with Time. *Géotechnique*, **8**, 171–182, <https://doi.org/10.1680/geot.1958.8.4.171>.
- Gutierrez, M. & Wangen, M. 2005. Modeling of compaction and overpressuring in sedimentary basins. *Marine and Petroleum Geology*, **22**, 351–363, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpetgeo.2005.01.003>.
- Hernández-Molina, F.J., Sierro, F.J., et al. 2015. Evolution of the gulf of Cadiz margin and southwest Portugal contourite depositional system: Tectonic, sedimentary and paleoceanographic implications from IODP expedition 339. *Marine Geology*, **377**, 7–39, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.margeo.2015.09.013>.
- Jorgensen, D.G. 1980. Relationships betwa Basic Soils-Engineering Equations and Basic Ground-Water Flow Equations. *Geological Survey Water-*

- Lafuerza, S., Le Friant, A., et al. 2014. Geomechanical Characterization of Submarine Volcano-Flank Sediments, Martinique, Lesser Antilles Arc BT - Submarine Mass Movements and Their Consequences: 6th International Symposium. *In*: Krastel, S., Behrmann, J.-H., et al. (eds). Cham, Springer International Publishing, 73–81., https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-00972-8_7.
- Le Friant, A., Ishizuka, O., et al. 2015. Submarine record of volcanic island construction and collapse in the Lesser Antilles arc: First scientific drilling of submarine volcanic island landslides by IODP Expedition 340. *Geochemistry Geophysics Geosystems*, **16**, 420–442, <https://doi.org/10.1002/2014GC005684>.Key.
- Llopart, J., Urgeles, R., et al. 2019. Fluid flow and pore pressure development throughout the evolution of a trough mouth fan, western Barents Sea. *Basin Research*, 1–27, <https://doi.org/10.1111/bre.12331>.
- Locat, J., Tanaka, H., Tan, T., Dasari, G.R. & Lee, H.J. 2003. Natural soils: geotechnical behavior and geological knowledge. *In*: Tan, T., Phoon, K., Hight, D. & Leroueil, S. (eds) *Characterisation and Engineering Properties of Natural Soils*. Lisse. The Netherlands, Swets & Zeitlinger B.V., 3–28.
- Long, H., Flemings, P.B., Germaine, J.T., Saffer, D.M. & Dugan, B. 2008. Data report: consolidation characteristics of sediments from IODP Expedition 308, Ursa Basin, Gulf of Mexico. **308**, <https://doi.org/10.2204/iodp.proc.308.204.2008>.
- Lunne, T., Robertson, P.K. & Powell, J.J.M. 1997. *Cone Penetration Testing in Geotechnical Practice*. London, SponPress.
- Mouchet, J.P. & Mitchell, A. 1989. *Abnormal Pressures While Drilling - Origins, Prediction, Detection, Evaluation. Manuals Techniques 2*, Elf Aquita. Bousens.
- Mulder, T., Voisset, M., et al. 2003. The Gulf of Cadiz: An unstable giant contouritic levee. *Geo-Marine Letters*, **23**, 7–18, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00367-003-0119-0>.
- Phoon, K.-K. & Kulhawy, F.H. 1999. Characterization of geotechnical variability. *Canadian*

Geotechnical Journal, **36**, 612–624, <https://doi.org/10.1139/t99-038>.

Reed, A.H., Briggs, K.B. & Lavoie, D.L. 2002. Porometric properties of siliciclastic marine sand: A comparison of traditional laboratory measurements with image analysis and effective medium modeling. *IEEE Journal of Oceanic Engineering*, **27**, 581–592, <https://doi.org/10.1109/JOE.2002.1040940>.

Sawyer, D.E., Flemings, P.B., Shipp, R.C. & Winker, C.D. 2007. Seismic geomorphology, lithology, and evolution of the late Pleistocene Mars-Ursa Turbidite region, Mississippi Canyon Area, Northern Gulf of Mexico. *AAPG Bulletin*, **91**, 215–234.

Spinelli, G.A., Mozley, P.S., Tobin, H.J., Underwood, M.B., Hoffman, N.W. & Bellew, G.M. 2007. Diagenesis, sediment strength, and pore collapse in sediment approaching the Nankai Trough subduction zone. *Bulletin of the Geological Society of America*, **119**, 377–390, <https://doi.org/10.1130/B25920.1>.

Stigall, J. & Dugan, B. 2010. Overpressure and earthquake initiated slope failure in the Ursa region, northern Gulf of Mexico. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, **115**, B04101, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2009JB006848>.

Urgeles, R., Locat, J. & Dugan, B. 2007. Recursive Failure Of The Gulf Of Mexico Continental Slope: Timing And Causes BT - Submarine Mass Movements and Their Consequences: 3 International Symposium. In: Lykousis, V., Sakellariou, D. & Locat, J. (eds) *Submarine Mass Movements and Their Consequences*. Dordrecht, Springer Netherlands, 209–219., https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-6512-5_22.

Urgeles, R., Locat, J., Sawyer, D.E., Flemings, P.B., Dugan, B. & Binh, N.T.T. 2010. History of Pore Pressure Build Up and Slope Instability in Mud-Dominated Sediments of Ursa Basin, Gulf of Mexico Continental Slope BT - Submarine Mass Movements and Their Consequences. In: Mosher, D. C., Shipp, R. C., Moscardelli, L., Chaytor, J. D., Baxter, C. D. P., Lee, H. J. & Urgeles, R. (eds) *Submarine Mass Movements and Their Consequences*. Dordrecht, Springer Netherlands,

179–190., https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-3071-9_15.

Urlaub, M., Talling, P.J., Zervos, A. & Masson, D.G. 2015. What causes large submarine landslides on low gradient sediment accumulation ? *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth*, **120**, 1–18, <https://doi.org/10.1002/2015JB012347>.Received.

Wentworth, C.K. 1922. A Scale of Grade and Class Terms for Clastic Sediments. *The Journal of Geology*, **30**, 377–392, <https://doi.org/10.1086/622910>.

Wiemer, G. & Kopf, A. 2015. Altered marine tephra deposits as potential slope failure planes? *Geo-Marine Letters*, **35**, 305–314, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00367-015-0408-4>.

Worrall, D.M. & Snelson, S. 1989. Evolution of the northern Gulf of Mexico, with emphasis on Cenozoic growth faulting and the role of salt. Geological Society America, Boulder, CO. *In*: Bally, A. W. & Paller, A. R. (eds) *The Geology of North America—An Overview (Vol A)*. Boulder, Geological Society of America.

Zhang, J., Tang, W.H., Zhang, L.M. & Huang, H.W. 2012. Characterising geotechnical model uncertainty by hybrid Markov Chain Monte Carlo simulation. *Computers and Geotechnics*, **43**, 26–36, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compgeo.2012.02.002>.

Table 1: Compiled physical and grain size data from Gulf of Cadiz, Martinique and Gulf of Mexico

Area	Sample	Original depth (mbsf)	% Sand	% Silt	% Clay	Texture class [#]	ϕ_0	C_c	K_0
Alentejo Basin		1.9				E-III			1.57 x
	SdG-01_190		4.93	57.36	37.71		0.69	0.52	10 ⁻⁸
		1.8				E-III			2.45 x
	SdG-01_187		3.57	62.58	33.85		0.76	0.50	10 ⁻⁸
		1.4				E-III			5.25 x
	SdG-03_144		0.7	69.89	29.41		0.74	0.48	10 ⁻⁸
		1.3				E-III			6.22 x
	SdG-03_137		1.66	70.32	28.28		0.77	0.62	10 ⁻⁸
	2.0				D-III			2.31 x	
	SdG-02_207		8.49	66.23	25.28		0.72	0.45	10 ⁻⁸
		1.0				E-III			7.87 x
	SdG-02_102		0.24	61.25	38.51		0.78	0.65	10 ⁻⁸
Ursa Basin		8.0				E-III			5.70 x
	308_1322_B2_H3		0	57.8	42.2		0.77	0.92	10 ⁻¹⁰
		24.0				E-III			1.12 x
	308_1322_B4_H1		0	68	32		0.71	0.57	10 ⁻⁸
		54.0				D-III			3.48 x
	308_1322_B7_H2		8.2	62.2	29.6		0.66	0.41	10 ⁻⁸
		111.0				E-III			1.06 x
	308_1322_B13_H2		0	68.1	31.9		0.56	0.23	10 ⁻⁸
		144.0				E-III			3.08 x
	308_1322_B17_H2		0	61.69	38.4		0.59	0.25	10 ⁻⁸
		212.0				E-III			4.41 x
	308_1322_B26_H2		0.63	73.37	26		0.52	0.22	10 ⁻⁸
		8.0				E-II			2.32 x
308_1324_B2_H3		2.65	72.4	24.4		0.71	0.58	10 ⁻⁸	
	57.0				E-III			8.87 x	
308_1324_C1_H5		0	74.3	25.7		0.63	0.35	10 ⁻⁹	
308_1324_C2_H2		103.0				E-II		5.70 x	
			0	79.8	20.2		0.61	0.28	10 ⁻¹⁰
Grenada Basin		30.5				D-II			1.55 x
	340-1399B_4H4		10.5	75.8	13.7		0.78	0.69	10 ⁻⁹
		46.5				E-II			1.32 x
	340-1399B_6H3		3.9	76.1	20.1		0.79	0.75	10 ⁻⁹
	138.9				D-II			1.41 x	
	340-1399B_19H3		5.8	83.1	11.1		0.77	0.67	10 ⁻⁹

ϕ_0 : initial porosity; C_c : compression index; k_0 : initial hydraulic conductivity (m/s). #: (Flemming 2000)

Table 2:

Parameters used for the simulations in BASIN. The physical properties associated with Turbidity Layer have been used in all the simulations, while the Hemipelagic changed.

	Samples	Initial Porosity	Initial spec. storage (m ⁻¹)	Initial hydr. cond. (m/s)
Turbidite Layer	(Urgeles et al. 2010)	0.5	0.001	1×10^{-6}
Hemipelagic Scenario A - Areas	Alentejo basin	0.74	0.025	4.28×10^{-8}
	Grenada basin	0.78	0.005	1.43×10^{-9}
	Ursa basin	0.64	0.023	2.71×10^{-8}
Hemipelagic Scenario B – Classes	D - II	0.77	0.003	1.48×10^{-9}
	D – III	0.69	0.014	2.90×10^{-8}
	E – II	0.70	0.017	1.04×10^{-7}
	E – III	0.69	0.027	3.09×10^{-8}

Fig. 1:

(a) Location of the areas where the sediments considered in this study have been collected from. Detailed location of the cores in the (b) Alentejo basin, (c) Grenada basin, (d) Ursa basin.

Fig. 2

Site U1324 stratigraphic model adopted for the 1D simulation with corresponding overpressure: in-situ piezometer overpressure measurements (purple dots) (Expedition 308 Scientists 2005); reference 1D modelling result (green line) (Urgeles *et al.* 2010). Properties for overpressure models in **Fig. 7** are only changed for the upper hemipelagic drape.

Fig. 3:

Consolidation curves showing void ratio e reduction while increasing uniaxial loading σ'_v . Each plot refers to one of the analyzed areas. (a) Alentejo basin. (b) Grenada basin (Lafuerza *et al.* 2014). (c) Ursa basin (Urgeles *et al.* 2010).

Fig. 4

Grain size distribution of the sediments analyzed for this study. The internal subdivision refers to the classification for muddy marine sediments proposed by (Flemming 2000) and adopted in this study.

Fig. 5:

Ternary contour diagrams comparing sediment composition (% sand, silt and clay) with (a) initial porosity, (b) compression index and (c) hydraulic conductivity. Sand axes have been reduced to the range 50% - 100% to facilitate visualization.

Fig.6

Overpressure generated at the end of the simulations vs computed final depths. The plots refer to (a) Scenario A, where physical properties of the hemipelagic units are averaged from each study area

and **(b)** Scenario B, where the properties of the hemipelagic layer are averaged from each of the four represented textural classes.

Fig.7

Overpressure generated at site U1324 vs computed final depth for the (1) In situ piezometer measurements (purple dots); reference overpressure modelled at the same site by Urgeles *et al.* (2010) (black line); overpressure resulting by defining the hemipelagic units with properties collected from the other study areas (red and green lines).

Fig. 8

Overpressure evolution during the last 40ky (a) and computed factor of safety (b) for all models at location of IODP Site U1324. The graph refers to the base of the fine-grained channel levee assemblage unit, which started depositing around 40ky ago.















