Seismological monitoring of landquakes and river bedload transport 透過地震方法監測地表崩塌事件與河床載搬運

<u>Vvn Weian Chao (</u>趙韋安)



Department of Geosciences, National Taiwan University



A seismological study of landquake from real-time broadband seismic networks

Geophys. J. Int. (2013)

doi: 10.1093/gji/ggt121 Geophysical Journal International Advance Access published April 29, 2013

A seismological study of landquakes using a real-time broad-band seismic network

Chi-Hsuan Chen,^{1,3} Wei-An Chao,¹ Yih-Min Wu,¹ Li Zhao,² Yue-Gau Chen,¹ Wan-Yun Ho,¹ Ting-Li Lin,⁴ Kuan-Hung Kuo⁵ and Jui-Ming Chang¹

Chen et al. (2013, GJI)

Detection of spectrogram



Shiaolin event



Landquake Epicenter Determination (LED)

SNR > 2.5





Landquake Epicenter Determination (LED)











Seismic parameters



a. Scaling between envelope area and collapseb. Limitation of detection



Identification of landquake type



Potential of initial impact (P_I , %) = (1-T_R/S_D) x 100 % Frequency of rock impact signal (F_I , Hz) = PGV / A_E DFTEs (Dam-formation-type events)

Summary



Dynamic processes of the landquakes from long- and short-period seismic signal analysis



World's Learning Geospatial Group

会社バスコノ国際航

Chao et al. (2014, in preparation)

the right of each trace. (b) Landslide force histories inverted for the landslide. (c) Temporal evolution of the acceleration and the velocity of the integration of the inverted forces.

In a past decade, seismology has provided a way to infer the dynamics of large mass movements from long-period (10–150 sec) seismic singals.

(e.g., Brodsky et al., 2003; Lin et al., 2010; Yamada et al., 2013; Ektröm & Stark, 2013; Hibert et al., 2014)

Sciences Natural Hazards Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 2, 7309-7327, 2014 Simple Scaling of Catastrophic Landslide Dynamics Discussions and Earth System www.nat-hazards-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/2/7309/2014/ Göran Ekström and Colin P. Stark doi:10.5194/nhessd-2-7309-2014 **Sciences** Science 339, 1416 (2013); © Author(s) 2014. CC Attribution 3.0 License. DOI: 10.1126/science.1232887 Seismology of the Oso-Steelhead landslide Α B C. Hibert, C. P. Stark, and G. Ekström src 1.5 × 10¹⁰ 0.3 Horizontal Trajectory 5349 0.2 -200 Up North 0.1 mΝ East (my) 5348.5 buiutron MTU 5348 MTU 5347.5 0.0 -400 0.5 Forces (N) -0.1 – North East -0.2-600 – Un -0.520 30 40 50 60 • 10 b dpo -800 -200 *mE* 0 Time [s] 17:37:30 17:38:00 17:38:30 17:39:00 17:37:00 b 5347 585 585.5 586 586.5 Long-period force acts on the Earth UTM Easting (km) We carry out a combined analysis of the short- and long-period seismic signals generated by the devastating Oso-Steelhead landslide that occurred on 22 March 2014. The seismic records show that the Oso-Steelhead landslide was not a single slope failure, but a succession of multiple failures distinguished by two major collapses that occurred approximately three minutes apart. The first generated long-period surface waves that were recorded at several proximal stations. We invert these long-period signals for the forces acting at the source, and obtain estimates of the first failure runout and kinematics, as well as its mass after calibration against the mass-center displace-

> suggests that the source dynamics of the second are more complex than the first. No distinct long-period surface waves were recorded for the second failure, which prevents

ed from remote-sensing imagery. Short-period analysis of both events

14年12月26日星期五

Force [10¹² N]

С

Source mechanisms of landquake & earthquake



The acceleration and deceleration of the bulk mass during the landquake cause a loading and unloading of the slope that generated long-period seismic waves.

Time



Synthetic seismograms

The <u>Green's Functions (G)</u> are calculated using a numerical implementation of the propagator-matrix approach (e.g. fk3.0 software package; Zhu and Rivera, 2002).



Variance reduction (VR) & Fitness

Normalized cross-correlation coefficient

$$NCC = \frac{C_{os}}{\sqrt{C_{oo}C_{ss}}}$$

 C_{os} : the maximum observed-synthetic cross-correlation coefficient C_{oo} , C_{ss} : the maximum autocorrelation coefficient

Variance reduction (VR)

$$VR = 1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{np} (obs_i - syn_i)^2}{\sum_{i=1}^{np} obs_i^2}$$

so if observed = synthetic, VR = 1 synthetic = 0, VR = 0 observed = -synthetic, VR = -3

Fitness= Avg. NCC + Avg. VR

Earthquake? or Explosion?

 $M_{20} = 3.81$

earthquake-type Fitness: 0.7884 Mw=3.70 CLVD: 55.33% DC: 44.67%

SGSB Vertical RadialTangential shif= 0.00 CC= 0.87 VR= 0.75 shif= 0.00 CC= 0.69 VR= 0.48 shif= 0.00 CC= 0.52 VR= 0.27 obs. obs. obs. MMMM-Immsyn. 200.00 sec Epi. = 10.55 deg. Azi. = 211.10 deg. Max. Amp. = 0.52E-03 cm TPUBVerticalRadialTangential shif= 0.00 CC= 0.80 VR= 0.64 shif= 0.00 CC= 0.19 VR= 0.03 shif= 0.00 CC= 0.60 VR= 0.09 f1 - f2 = 0.030 - 0.050 HzMMMMMM Mmm syn 200.00 sec Epi. = 15.40 deg. Azi. = 354.52 deg. Max. Amp. = 0.40E-03 cm TWGB Vertical RadialTangential shif= 12.00 CC= 0.64 VR= 0.35 shif= 14.00 CC= 0.73 VR= 0.17 shif= 12.00 CC= 0.71 VR= 0.10 $lon = 120.644 \ lat = 23.162 \ dep =$ 1.00 mm syn. syn. $DC1 = 184.2/76.2/20.3 \ deg.$ DC2= 89.2/70.3/ 165.4 dea 200.00 sec $M0= 0.44E+22 \ dyne*cm$ $Epi. = 58.72 \ deg.$ $Azi. = 130.39 \ deg.$ $Max. Amp. = 0.15E-03 \ cm$ MASB Vertical RadialTangential shif=-18.00 CC= 0.86 VR= 0.10 shif=-20.00 CC= 0.43 VR= 0.04 shif= 14.00 CC= 0.37 VR= 0.07 % OF DC= 44.67 % OF CLVD= 55.33 % OF ISO= 0.00 Mmm Mmm ∿//////// Avg. VR = 0.217Avg. CCC= 0.571 200.00 sec Fitness= 0.7884E+00 $Epi. = 60.89 \, deg.$ Azi. = 181.08 deg. Max. Amp. = 0.19E-03 cm ij Mij dyne*cm YULBVerticalRadialTangential $shif = 12.00 \ CC = \ 0.67 \ VR = \ 0.32 \ shif = \ -1.00 \ CC = \ 0.60 \ VR = \ 0.08 \ shif = \ 3.00 \ CC = \ 0.33 \ VR = \ 0.11 \ CC = \ 0$ NN -.9897E+20 EE 0.3979E+21 oos. syn. NE 0.3321E+22 M~~~~~ Annananan syn. syn NZ 0.1310E+22 EZ 0.1643E+22 200.00 sec ZZ -.2989E+21 $Epi. = 71.48 \ deg.$ $Azi. = 68.97 \ deg.$ Max. Amp. = $0.13E - 03 \ cm$ SSLBVerticalRadialTanaential shif= 1.00 CC= 0.48 VR= 0.23 shif= -1.00 CC= 0.52 VR= 0.20 shif= 15.00 CC= 0.48 VR= 0.11 MMMM obs. ∽₩₩ syn 200.00 sec $Epi. = 76.13 \, deg.$ $Azi. = 24.51 \, deg.$ Max. Amp. = 0.12E-03 cm ESLB Vertical RadialTangential shif= -3.00 CC= 0.49 VR= 0.23 shif= 14.00 CC= 0.54 VR= 0.20 shif= 16.00 CC= 0.47 VR= 0.03 syn. MM-200.00 sec Epi. = 108.66 deg. Azi. = 48.37 deg. Max. $Amp. = 0.89E-04 \ cm$ YHNBVerticalRadialTangential shif= -1.00 CC= 0.68 VR= 0.31 shif= 13.00 CC= 0.44 VR= 0.15 shif= 14.00 CC= 0.62 VR= 0.17 MM/~~~~ 1111 200.00 sec Epi. = 182.75 deg. Azi. = 23.90 deg. Max. Amp. = 0.95E-04 cm

isotropic-type Fitness: 0.6619 Mw=3.81



Mw = 3.70

What waveforms tell you?



Force angle: 21° (field measurement: avg. 18°) Force magnitude: 1.86 x 10¹¹ N

1.10 x 10¹¹ N (Ekström & Stark, 2013) 35–150 sec filtered 0.50 x 10¹¹ N (Lin et al., 2010) 50–100 sec filtered

0808 15:00 (UTC) 4000 Typhoon Morakot Path 2000 phy(m) 0808 09:00 -2000 Multiple force vector -4000 Taiwan Strait -6000 HNB from long-period signals 🖵 🏧 0808 00:00 0807 18:00 **SSLB ESLB** YULB TPUB SGSB TWGB MASB ECLB Shiaolin event A BATS km 🗑

Topography changes (Kuo et al. 2011)

Collapse area = 2.48 km² Estimated volume = 25 x 10⁶ m³





What waveforms tell you?





Force strike: 276° Force angle: 17.4° (field measurement: avg. 26°) Force magnitude: 2.1 x 10¹¹ N Fitness: 0.8735

What waveforms tell you?

ECLBTangentialVertical Radial shif= 0.00 CC= 0.77 VR= 0.53 shif= -2.00 CC= 0.55 VR= 0.29 shif= -1.00 CC= 0.37 VR= 0.06 obs obs. 200.00 sec $Epi. = 16.46 \ deg.$ $Azi. = 73.81 \ deg.$ $Max. Amp. = 0.18E - 02 \ cm$ MASB Vertical RadialTangential shif= -8.00 CC= 0.44 VR= 0.16 shif= -2.00 CC= 0.49 VR= 0.20 shif= -1.00 CC= 0.34 VR= 0.11 f1-f2 = 0.030 - 0.050 Hzsyn. 200.00 sec $Epi. = 19.11 \, deg.$ $Azi. = 289.41 \ deg.$ Max. Amp. = 0.15E-02 cm SCZB Vertical RadialTangential shif= -8.00 CC= 0.42 VR= 0.15 shif= 0.00 CC= 0.56 VR= 0.30 shif= -1.00 CC= 0.48 VR= 0.22 syn. lon= 120.808 lat= 22.555 dep= MM _____syn. $F0 = 0.76E + 17 \, dyne$ Avg. VR = 0.261200.00 sec Avg. CCC = 0.540 $Epi. = 27.55 \, deg.$ $Azi. = 222.27 \, deg.$ $Max. Amp. = 0.16E-02 \ cm$ TWGB Vertical Radialritness= 0.8011E+00 Tangential shif= -1.00 CC= 0.73 VR= 0.50 shif= -2.00 CC= 0.66 VR= 0.22 shif= 0.00 CC= 0.62 VR= 0.33 Strike= 264 75 dea = 28.88 dea syn. a7 -.6097E+01 North [+] MIM syn. -.6640E+02 East [+] -.3677E+02 Down [+] 200.00 sec Epi. = 40.32 deg. Azi. = 43.74 deg. Max. Amp. = 0.78E-03 cm TWMB Vertical RadialTangential shif= 4.00 CC= 0.47 VR= 0.20 shif= 6.00 CC= 0.40 VR= 0.16 shif= 0.00 CC= 0.64 VR= 0.30 syn. MMMM Mmm 200.00 sec $Epi. = 48.74 \ deg.$ $Azi. = 307.36 \ deg.$ Max. Amp. = 0.10E - 0.2 cmWLCB Vertical RadialTangential shif= -8.00 CC= 0.54 VR= 0.29 shif= 0.00 CC= 0.73 VR= 0.37 shif= -2.00 CC= 0.26 VR= 0.06 ~~//M//~~~ www. sun March and a sun a sun and a Mmm syn. 200.00 sec $Epi. = 50.69 \, deg.$ $Azi. = 243.10 \, deg.$ Max. Amp. = $0.14E - 02 \ cm$ SGSB Vertical RadialTangential shif= 2.00 CC= 0.69 VR= 0.37 shif= 0.00 CC= 0.64 VR= 0.39 shif= -3.00 CC= 0.43 VR= 0.18 obs. 11..... 200.00 sec Epi. = 62.32 deg. Azi. = 339.07 deg. Max. Amp. = 0.63E-03 cm TWKB Vertical RadialTangential shif= -1.00 CC= 0.66 VR= 0.27 shif= 0.00 CC= 0.77 VR= 0.39 shif= -3.00 CC= 0.38 VR= 0.14 syn. syn. Mrmm syn 200.00 sec $Epi. = 67.95 \ deg.$ $Azi. = 179.63 \ deg.$ Max. Amp. = $0.64E - 03 \ cm$ TWHB Vertical RadialTangentialshif= -2.00 CC= 0.69 VR= 0.46 shif= 5.00 CC= 0.26 VR= 0.03 shif= 0.00 CC= 0.58 VR= 0.06 syn. wi Www M MMM~~~~ Mm WWW \mathbb{W} 200.00 sec $Epi. = 70.70 \ deg.$ $Azi. = 79.01 \ deg.$ Max. $Amp. = 0.96E - 03 \ cm$





Force strike: 264° Force angle: 28.9° (field measurement: avg. 25°) Force magnitude: 7.6 x 10¹¹ N Fitness: 0.8011



Seismologically determined bedload flux during the typhoon season

Chao et al. (Scientific Reports; revised)

Motivations

Sediment transport and bedrock incision are critical parameters in studies of the landscape evolution and are needed for flood hazard mitigation.

However, most of conventional geomorphic methods are in situ and can not be used during an extreme flowing water environment. Thus, no information is available during typhoon events.

A potential solution to this data gap is to use remote monitoring that is possible because geophones or seismometers capture ground vibration caused by the surface process.

(Kanamori & Given, 1982; Brodsky et al., 2003; Deparis et al., 2008; Lin et al., 2010; Yamada et al., 2013; Chen et al., 2013)

Seismic, hydrological, and meteorological data



Drains area: 842 km² River length: 117 km

14年12月26日星期五

Characteristics of river seismic noise



Spatial variation of the observed PSD



As expected, the hourly PSD during typhoon passage at NZO3 (closest to river) reveal a strong increase in the PSD amplitude.

Π

Noise phase cross-correlation function



Observed hysteresis



Seismologically-determined bedload flux

Results of inversion

Summary of input parameters for **inversion**

Seismological compoenets (frequency-dependent):

- 1. Rayleigh-wave group and phase velocity (v_u, v_c) (Boore & Joyner, 1997; Ma et al., 2013)
- 2. Quality factor (\mathcal{Q}_{θ}) (Ma et al., 2013)
- 3. Observed *PSD* amplitude

Fluvial compoenets:

 Flow depth of water (*H*) (WRA, 2011)
Geometry of channel-bed: Width (*W*): 60 m (WRA, 2011)
Slope (θ): 0.6 degree (CGS, 2013)
Grain size distribution (CGS, 2013)



Discussion & conclusions

Temporal changes of sediment flux ratio (suspended load flux, $q_{\rm s}$ v.s. bedload flux, $q_{\rm b}$)



While previous studies (repeat bathymetric surveys of water reservoirs) found that the bedload comprises about $30 \pm 28\%$ of the total river load in the high mountains, this fraction is likely to be temporally variable.

Our result is consistent with the ratio 3:7 during the post-typhoon period.

However, the bedload to suspended load sediment flux ratio roughly follows a 4:1 trend during typhoon passage.

In summary, the value of q_b is generally larger than q_s during the typhoon passage, and vice versa in the off-typhoon period.

Discussion & conclusions

In our results of river seismic noise analysis, the highly coherent signals in the stacked NPCCFs only appear during typhoon passage, which demonstrates the different conditions of transport capacity and sediment flux relative to the off-typhoon period.

So we conclude that the discrepancy in the scaling between q_b and q_s indicates a difference in the amount of meteorologically-controlled hillslope mass wasting into the fluvial system and/or a complex transition from the bedload regime to the suspension regime between typhoon passage and off-typhoon periods.

Discussion & conclusions

With good constraints on the grain size distribution and the seismic quality factor, our study confirms the potential of using near-river seismic noise observations (PSD) to estimate bedload flux and to further investigate the temporal changes of sediment flux ratio.

This alternative approach to bedload estimation is also useful for studying the fluvial bedrock erosion and mountain landscape evolution.



Seismometers

2009–2011 ChingShui Geothermal

Field trip

2010 Chenyoulan



Personal website: <u>vvnchao.blogspot.tw</u> Mail to me: <u>vvnchao@gmail.com</u>

Thanks for your listening

High mountain (西巒大山)





2011 Chijiawan

