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Describe the seismic source with...

Kinematic modeling \leftrightarrow Dynamic modeling

are these models always consistent?
Main motivations

Kinematic inversion models
Main motivations

**Kinematic inversion models**

For the same seismic event sometimes the solutions are so awkwardly different even if some of them are retrieved by using the same data set.

4 models of the Mw 7.3, 1992 Landers earthquake

10 models of the Mw 7.1, 2019 Ridgecrest earthquake
Main motivations

**Dynamic inversion models**

To reduce the number of parameters, dynamic friction is often assumed constant. “Dc” results in the more heterogeneous and less constrained parameter.
3D dynamic earthquake rupture simulations including 3D geology and 3D geometry to investigate physics-based scenarios of large earthquakes on the Rodgers Creek, Hayward, Calaveras, and Northern Calaveras faults.

- rock properties affect the locations and amount of slip produced in simulated large earthquakes
- rupture behavior is controlled by nucleation locations and fault geometry
Main motivations

Dynamic parameters from kinematic models

These models retrieve the dynamic parameters of the slip weakening behavior without any assumption on the constitutive law.

However, these results cannot tell us if the adopted kinematic parameters would allow the models to evolve in spontaneous dynamic ruptures.
Workflow

- Ingredients to build dynamic models
- Define families of dynamic models
- Application to the 2016 Norcia earthquake
- Discussions on lithological implications
Setup of dynamic parameters

- Initial shear stress $\tau_0$
- **Yield strength**: depends on the static friction $\mu_S \rightarrow \tau_y = \mu_S \sigma_n$
- **Frictional strength**: depends on dynamic friction $\mu_d \rightarrow \tau_f = \mu_d \sigma_n$
- **Stress drop** $\Delta\tau: \rightarrow \tau_0 - \tau_f = \Delta\tau$
- **Direction of initial stress on the faults**: correlated with the punctual rake
- **Normal Stress** $\sigma_n$: function of depth. Lithostatic or hydrostatic conditions.
- **Dc**: slip weakening distance. Constant or heterogeneous on the fault?
If we have a kinematic model with one simple slip patch...
How can be distributed the dynamic parameters describing the slip weakening law?
From kinematic models to dynamic ones

If we have a kinematic model with one simple slip patch...
How can be distributed the dynamic parameters describing the slip weakening law?

Stress drop would be released in the similar area of the slip patch
Weak nucleation
Friction coefficients can be heterogeneous as well as the initial strength condition.

Families of dynamic models

- Constant $\mu_s$ and $\mu_d$

- Constant $\mu_d$ and Heterogeneous $\mu_s$

- Constant $\mu_s$ and Heterogeneous $\mu_d$
Families of dynamic models

Friction coefficients can be heterogeneous as well as the initial strength condition.

Constant $\mu_s$ and $\mu_d$

Constant $\mu_d$ and Heterogeneous $\mu_s$

Constant $\mu_s$ and Heterogeneous $\mu_d$
Friction coefficients can be heterogeneous as well as the initial strength condition.

- Constant $\mu_s$ and $\mu_d$
- Constant $\mu_d$ and Heterogeneous $\mu_s$
- Constant $\mu_s$ and Heterogeneous $\mu_d$
Case study: The Mw 6.5, 30 October 2016, Norcia event

Location of the closest strong motion stations. Colored contours represent the kinematic models proposed by Scognamiglio et al 2018.
Case study: The Mw 6.5, 30 October 2016, Norcia event

- To validate the mechanical viability a kinematic rupture model proposed for the Mw 6.5, 30 October 2016 Norcia earthquake

- To introduce the “Families” of dynamic models characterized by a different parameterization of heterogeneities

- To discuss the geological and lithological implications on the retrieved friction parameters
Questions: is this model dynamically consistent?

1) «FIRST ORDER»

• If fault geometry allows for a simultaneous rupture on both the fault planes
• If the different rake allows spontaneous dynamic ruptures (-90° main fault; -10° secondary fault)
• the unfavored secondary fault (36° of dip) can host the rupture
• it is possible to propagate the rupture south of the intersection with the secondary one

2) «SECOND ORDER»

• Check the mechanical viability of this specific kinematic rupture model
• there are any preferred models (families) to which to associate the dynamic heterogeneities reproducing specific kinematic characteristics
• the geological and lithological implications on the retrieved friction parameters
SeisSol software for 3D dynamic simulations

SeisSol is a software package for simulating, with unstructured tetrahedral meshes, wave propagation and dynamic rupture based on the arbitrary high-order accurate derivative discontinuous Galerkin method.

This method has a lot of capabilities and in particular it permits:

- representing complex geometries
- modelling heterogeneous media
- high accuracy & high resolution

In this work we do not model complex geometries because the fault surfaces are simplified with two planes. We allow the rupture on two intersecting faults, e.g., we treat fault branching geometries.
Friction coefficients can be heterogeneous as well as the initial strength condition.

Results – heterogeneous initial conditions

- How to impose $D_c$?
- How to impose stress drop?
Results – heterogeneous initial conditions

Dc can be assumed spatially constant or heterogeneous

- In the literature, Dc is one of the most difficult parameters to constrain.
- Many authors discussed the potential biases in estimating this parameter from seismological data due to limited frequency band.
- Dc can be affected by temperature-induced dynamic weakening.

For this particular event a constant Dc value does not allow recovering a realistic rupture:
- Imposing a constant value of Dc < 50 cm leads models to super-shear rupture velocities;
- Imposing a constant value of Dc > 50 cm tends to prevent the rupture since not enough energy is available.
Results – heterogeneous initial conditions

Dc distribution proportional to slip

Original slip distribution of Scognamiglio et al 2018. (we only remove the first 2 km of fault patches to avoid significant fault reactivation due to rupture-free-surface interaction and small normal stress)

The distribution of Dc is retrieved from two different constant ratio Dc/slip for different depths:

Dc/slip=0.1 (10%) around the nucleation
Dc/slip=0.3 (30%) at shallow depths where there are the main slip patches.
How to impose the stress drop?

The stress drop distribution corresponding to a prescribed distribution of slip can be retrieved in different ways:

- By relating stress drop and slip in the wave number domain (originally proposed by Andrews 1980 and updated by Mai and Ripperger 2004). This procedure has been further simplified by assuming the stress drop proportional to the slip.

- By solving the elasto-dynamic equation and using the entire slip-time history at each point of the fault (Ide and Takeo 1997, Bouchon 1997, Tinti et al 2005, Causse et al 2014)

We tested both the procedures but I show only the first one today 😊
Results - Family of heterogeneous strength and stress

- **Frictional strength:** depends on dynamic friction $\mu_d \rightarrow \tau_f = 0.2 \sigma_n$ constant

- **Stress drop** $\Delta \tau (= \tau_0 - \tau_f )$: Proportional to slip distribution of the kinematic model.

- **Initial shear stress** heterogeneous $\tau_0 = \Delta \tau + \tau_f$: proportional to slip distribution.

- **Yield strength:** heterogeneous on the fault plane $\rightarrow$ strength excess: [0 - 3] Mpa

- **Direction of initial stress on the faults:** Rake from the kinematic model

- **Normal Stress** $\sigma_n$: near-hydrostatic pressure. Gradient 16MPa/km.

- **Dc:** slip weakening distance. Dc is a percentage of kinematic slip distribution.
Results - Family of heterogeneous strength and stress

- Frictional strength
- Yield strength
- Average Eg = 0.7 MJ/m²
Results-
Family of heterogeneous strength and stress

Snapshots of slip rate

Snapshots of slip
Frictional strength: \( \tau_f = \tau_0 - \Delta \tau \) proportional to slip distribution
dynamic friction \( \mu_d \rightarrow \) heterogeneous

Stress drop \( \Delta \tau \): Proportional to slip distribution of the kinematic model.

Initial shear stress \( \tau_0 \) (linearly depth dependent) homogeneous \( \tau_0 = \% \tau_y \)

Yield strength: homogeneous on the fault plane: \( \mu_S = 0.5 \)

Direction of initial stress on the faults: Rake from the kinematic model

Normal Stress \( \sigma_n \): near-hydrostatic pressure. Gradient 16MPa/km.

Dc: slip weakening distance. Dc is a percentage of kinematic slip distribution.
Results - Family of heterogeneous dynamic friction

Heterogeneous stress/depth

Dynamic stress drop

Stress/Strength

Heterogeneous dynamic friction

Average $E_g = 0.6\,\text{MJ/m}^2$
Results - Family of heterogeneous dynamic friction

Snapshots of slip rate

Snapshots of slip
Results - Family of heterogeneous dynamic friction
Velocity waveforms

The forth column represents the 3D absolute vector in velocity as a function of time.
The goodness of fit is computed as the Variance reduction without applying any time shift.
Static displacement

Top panels: models with stress drop proportional to slip.

Static displacements are similar across the families when we use the same procedure to infer stress drop.
Discussions – lithological constraints

These results suggest the existence of potential dynamic models for both the families able to support the original kinematic model.

However the dynamic conditions of family B and C are very different:

- In Family B we assume homogeneous dynamic friction (0.2) and heterogeneous static friction (0.2 - 0.7). Lower values are located in the area of small slip.
- In Family C we assume homogeneous static friction (0.5) and heterogeneous dynamic friction (0.1 - 0.4). Higher values are located in the area of small slip.

These two different assumptions have implications on the physical processes occurring in the fault plane. In particular, the choice of reliable friction coefficients has to be related to the rocks where the event nucleates, propagates and generates the large slip patches.
The integration of seismic reflection profiles with seismological data shows that

- the mainshock nucleated within the Triassic Evaporites.
- the main patch of slip seems to be located within carbonates.
Friction values from laboratory experiments

Static friction coefficient

Strong faults

Weak faults

Experiments on Triassic evaporites

Collettini et al 2019

Scuderi et al 2013
Steady-state friction coefficient at high velocity can represent a dynamic friction coefficient during the co-seismic phase at higher slip velocity.

Di Toro et al. 2011
Discussions – lithological constraints

If the mainshock nucleated within the Triassic Evaporites: **fault rocks in this lithology has a static friction around 0.5-0.6** [values can drop as low as 0.4 for high temperatures].

The main patch of slip seems to be located within carbonates: static friction is around Bayerlee value (0.6) and **dynamic friction can be low as 0.2**.

**Static friction as low as 0.2-0.3 can be found only in clay rich rocks (phyllosilicates).** Frictional experiments with increasing content of clay show a transition from velocity weakening to strengthening behavior.
Discussions – lithological constraints

**Family B** could be plausible when considering rocks rich in phyllosilicates. However, the low static friction values are located around the nucleation. Because these values make the rock velocity strengthening, this would be less prone to nucleate. Can this family be reliable with a pre-seismic creep?

**Family C** are promising candidates to better represent the friction values of the seismogenic area in Central Appennines, even if they are not usually considered in dynamic rupture modeling. With this family it is possible to explain the occurrence of a smooth nucleation (low energy) and the dynamic propagation at shallow depths.
Thanks