# The Growing Wealth of Aseismic Deformation Data: What's a Modeler to Model?

Evelyn Roeloffs U.S. Geological Survey Earthquake Hazards Team Vancouver, WA



# Topics

- Pre-earthquake deformation-rate changes
  - Some credible examples
- High-resolution crustal deformation observations
  - borehole strain
  - fluid pressure data
- Aseismic processes linking mainshocks to aftershocks
- Observations possibly related to dynamic triggering



# The Scientific Method

• The "hypothesis-testing" stage is a bottleneck for earthquake research because data are hard to obtain



• Modeling has a role in the hypothesis-building stage

http://www.indiana.edu/~geol116/



# Modeling needs to lead data collection

- Compared to acquiring high resolution deformation data in the near field of large earthquakes, modeling is fast and inexpensive
- So modeling should perhaps get ahead of reproducing observations
- Or modeling could look harder at observations that are significant but controversial, and could explore a wider range of hypotheses



# Earthquakes can happen without detectable preearthquake changes





e.g.Parkfield M6 2004



# Deformation-Rate Changes before the Mw 6.6 Chuetsu earthquake, 23 October 2004



- Intraplate thrust earthquake, depth 11 km
- GPS-detected rate changes about 3 years earlier
  - Moment of pre-slip approximately Mw 6.0 (1 div=1 cm)
  - deviations mostly in direction of coseismic displacement
  - not all consistent with pre-slip on the rupture plane



Great Subduction Earthquakes with Evidence for Pre-Earthquake Aseismic Deformation-Rate Changes

- Chile 1960, M<sub>w</sub>9.2
  - 20-30 m of slow interplate slip over a rupture zone
    920+/-100 km long, starting 20 minutes prior to
    mainshock [Kanamori & Cipar (1974); Kanamori &
    Anderson (1975); Cifuentes & Silver (1989) ]
  - 33-hour foreshock sequence north of the mainshock, propagating toward the mainshock hypocenter at 86 km day<sup>-1</sup> (Cifuentes, 1989)
- Alaska 1964, M<sub>w</sub>9.2
- Cascadia 1700, M9





Fig. 8. Location of sampling sites (A) and composite section (B) showing buried peat tayers beneath the marsh surface at Girdwood site GW-2. Peats G and H were also exposed and sampled at GW-1. GW-33 and 34 are sites reported by Zong et al. (2003) and GW-99 by Shennan et al. (1999).

# Cascadia Microfossil Studies



- Microfossils from sites at Netarts
   Bay show
   evidence for
   preseismic sea level rise
- Time scale indeterminate

Shennan et al., 1996, 1998



# 1944 Tonankai (Ms 8.2) & 1946 Nankaido (Mw 8.3)





(Inferred locations of preseismic slip from Linde & Sacks 2002)

# Tokai Experiment Watches Slow Slip

#### Strain change on July 20-22, 2005



M. Hoshiba, presentation at UJNR Workshop 2006



# Cascadia Slow Slip Events

- Recur about every 14 months in northern Washington and Vancouver Island
- Generally accompanied by seismic tremor



Miller, Melbourne, Johnson and Sumner, 2002



#### Elastic Dislocation Models for Slip Events (constrained to the subduction interface)



Science for a changing world

Dragert et al., presentation at ETS Workshop 2008

# PBO Borehole Strain Network-Cascadia





# Strainmeter Diagram

- Designed by M.T. Gladwin
- Variable Capacitance Sensors
- Resolution better than 1 nanostrain
- Frequency Ranges:
  - "High Frequency" (20 sps)
  - "Tidal" (3 days to 1 hour)
  - "Intermediate Term" (3 months to 3 days)
  - "Long Term" (> 3 months)
    - Cannot measure absolute strain rates









# Cascadia Aseismic Slip Events

#### eEEmeNN Strain 2008

science for a changing

eEN Strain 2008



# Cascadia Aseismic Slip in 2005

eEEmeNN Strain 2005 eEN Strain 2005 1.2 1.2 0.4 0.4 0.35 0.35 1 1 0.3 0.3 B003 BOOG 0.8 0.8 0.25 microstrain (formation) 0.25 Rain, mm 0.2 0.6 B004 0.6 0.2 0.15 0.15 0.4 0.4 **B00** 0.1 0.1 0.2 0.2 0.05 0.05 RO 0 0 0 0 08/27 09/03 09/10 09/24 10/08 10/15 10/22 09/17 10/01 08/27 09/03 09/10 09/17 10/01 10/08 10/15 10/22 09/24 1020 1020 Rain, mm COD4mx Rain, mm 5400 1010 hPa 1010 1000 1000 990 990 ń 08/27 09/03 09/10 09/17 09/24 10/01 10/08 10/15 10/22 08/27 09/03 09/10 09/17 09/24 10/01 10/08 10/15 10/22

science for a changing world



# Transient Aseismic Slip Throughout

125°

50"

48"







46"

44\*

42"

40"



### Grants Pass PBO Borehole Strain







# Slow Slip Events: Status of Models

- Models that reproduce transient aseismic slip for Cascadia
  - Liu and Rice: Rate-State Friction model
  - Segall: Dilatant Stabilization
- Questions not addressed by these models:
  - Relationship to megathrust earthquake initiation
  - Generation of tremor
  - Possible relationship with segmentation of the subduction zone



Cascadia Asperities from Basin-Centered Gravity Lows



Wells et al., 2003



# Sumatra: Asperities Underly Islands





Chlieh et al., 2008

# Could Major Subduction Sequences be Forecast?

- The *locations* of asperities are believed to be persistent features
- The asperity locations seem able to be identified from geophysical and/or geodetic data
  - Can modeling explain this?
- Could the *timing* of major subduction "aftershocks" be forecast?



Transient Deformation Preceding M7.6 aftershock of M8.4 Peru Earthquake (23 June 2001)



Melbourne & Webb, 2002





# Need Models to Account for Observed Time Delays of Stress Transfer

- Delays of hours or days seem to require critical slip distances that are larger than laboratory observations
- However, observations show that strain and fluid pressure changes initiated by dynamic stresses can grow and persist over days



The "Parkfield Transient"



-5

color geodimeter, creepmeters





Rate increase also consisten with changes in intervals of repeating earthquakes



# Reported Strain Change before the 1989 Loma Prieta Earthquake





# 3-Component Borehole Strain Data







# Detrended 3-Component Strain Data





#### Strain and Fluid-Pressure Observations of Responses to **Distant Earthquakes**



Pressure drops in non-thermal wells on and around the resurgent dome



126<sup>0</sup>

124 ° 122° 120° 118<sup>0</sup> 116<sup>0</sup> Earthouake CALIFORNIA Magnitude Mendocino Fault 9/1/94 M7.1 655 km 9. CA-NV Border 9/12/94 M6.1 138 kn NEVADA 3. Mono Lake 10/24/90 M5.7 Long ' Vallev 42 km 2. Loma Prieta 10/18/89 M7.1 6. Lone Pine 5/17/93 M6.2 272 km 119 km 16. Hector Mine 10/16/99 M7.1 421 k 7. Northrid /17/94 M6 7 391 km 4. Sierra Madre 6/28/91 M5.8 393 km Pressure rises in hot wells

> Hydrologic Data collected by **USGS WRD**



# Landers Earthquake: M7.3, 451 km



#### Earthquake-Induced Fluid-Pressure Changes are Not Limited to Shallow Depths

- Serendipitous recording of fluid pressure drop in 3-km deep Long Valley Exploration Well caused by Hector Mine Earthquake
- Prototype Hi-T pressure sensor being tested by Sandia Labs





# Nov. 22, 1997

•M4+ events with dilatational components and long duration Pwaveforms (*Dreger et al.* [2000])

•Upward-propagating swarm including spasmodic bursts (*S. Prejean* [2002])

•Fluid pressure and strain changes just like Landers





# Pressure Increases in Thermal Wells: Non-Poroelastic Scenarios





# Seismic waves increase temperature at many hydrothermal locations



# Time-Dependent Permeability (and Rheology)

Mineral deposition and ductile creep reduce permeability

Hydrofracturing and seismic activity restore permeability

Fluid pressure and strain-rate changes affect rheology





# Summary: Modeling Targets

- Aseismic slip in subduction zones
  - Wide variety of time scales, moments
  - Possible association with pre-earthquake processes
  - Lots of new data from PBO, more networks to come
- Physical basis of asperities
- Linkages of mainshocks to aftershocks
  - What governs the time dependence?

