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Closing crack earthquakes within the Krafla caldera, North Iceland
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SUMMARY

Moment tensor analysis with a Bayesian approach was used to analyse a non-double-couple (non-DC) earthquake ($M_w \sim 1$) with a high isotropic (implosive) component within the Krafla caldera, Iceland. We deduce that the earthquake was generated by a closing crack at depth. The event is well located, with high signal-to-noise ratio and shows dilatational $P$-wave first arrivals at all stations where the first arrival can be picked with confidence. Coverage of the focal sphere is comprehensive and the source mechanism stable across the full range of uncertainties. The non-DC event lies within a cluster of microseismic activity including many DC events. Hence, we conclude that it is a true non-DC closing crack earthquake as a result of geothermal utilization and observed magma chamber deflation in the region at present.
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1 INTRODUCTION

Non-double-couple (non-DC) events have been reported from several locations in Iceland (Klein et al. 1977; Foulger et al. 1989; Miller et al. 1998; Nettles & Ekström 1998) and elsewhere in the world (Satake & Kanamori 1991; Dreger 2000; Ford et al. 2009).

Such events have been observed in geothermal environments (Ross et al. 1996; Miller et al. 1998; Vavrycuk 2002) and in volcanic areas (Chouet 1979; Imai 1982; Shuler & Ekström 2009; Chouet & Matoza 2013). Strongly implosive non-DC events with well-constrained moment tensors have been reported previously from several volcanic environments (Imai 1982; Foulger et al. 1989; Waite et al. 2008). In this paper, we present an example of a well-constrained non-DC microearthquake within the Krafla caldera, N-Iceland, with a large closing crack (implosive) component.

The Krafla central volcano lies within the Northern Volcanic Zone (NVZ) of Iceland (Fig. 1A). The divergent plate boundary is expressed as a series of en echelon volcanic systems, each comprising a fissure swarm and central volcano. The Krafla central volcano has developed a caldera and is transected by an NNE-SSW trending fissure swarm. The last major rifting episode in Krafla occurred from 1975 to 1984, with a series of eruptions and dyke intrusions at Krafla (Björnsson et al. 1985; Einarsson 1991; Buck et al. 2006).

A shallow magma chamber at 3 km depth has been detected in Krafla caldera by the attenuation of shear waves (Einarsson 1978) and compressional wave delays (Brandsdóttir et al. 1997). The magma chamber is approximately 2–3 km in extent north–south, 8–10 km east–west and is 0.7–1.8 km thick (Brandsdóttir et al. 1997). Surface deformation modelling, using geodetic, tilt and levelling data, shows that the magma chamber has been deflating since 1989 (Sturkell et al. 2008 and references therein). In 2009, the IDDP (Iceland Deep Drilling Project) drilled into a pocket of rhyolitic melt 2.1 km below the surface (1.6 km below sea level) (Elders et al. 2011). Within the Krafla caldera, there are high levels of microseismicity, mainly associated with magma cooling and geothermal activity (Heinisson et al. 2015; Schuler et al. 2015) within the steam-dominated Krafla geothermal system (Gudmundsson & Arnórsson 2002).

Foulger et al. (1989) observed microearthquakes in the Krafla area that had a variety of non-DC mechanisms, including explosive tensile-crack events and implosive events. They hypothesized that this range of source mechanisms indicated a heterogeneous stress regime, following a crustal spreading episode from 1975 to 1984. The physical mechanisms for the implosive events were hypothesized to be due to cavity collapse at depth.

Ford et al. (2009) observed examples of non-DC events ($M_w \sim 3.4–4.0$) with a large implosive component (closing crack) in Utah. These events all occurred following mine collapses; hence the source mechanism was known prior to moment tensor analysis.

Several well-constrained, strongly non-DC events were recorded by a dense, temporary seismic array at Krafla during routine analysis of detected microearthquakes (Fig. 1A). We focus on one
event in particular for which we observe only dilatational P-wave first arrivals across the focal sphere, indicating a negative isotropic component to the source mechanism. This microearthquake occurred within a cluster that includes events that show stable, purely DC, moment tensor solutions (Fig. 1B). An example of a well-constrained DC event, spatially close to Event A, is analysed for comparison. This allows us to be confident that we have detected a true non-DC event, rather than obtaining spurious non-DC solutions resulting from uncertainties in the velocity model or hypocentre locations (suggested by Frohlich (1994) as a cause of non-DC mechanisms).

2 METHODOLOGY

2.1 Seismic network

The temporary deployment by Cambridge University consisted of three-component broad-band seismometers (Guralp 6TD, loaned by SEIS-UK) in and around the Krafla caldera. The temporary network at Krafla was deployed in July 2009 and remained at similar density within the Krafla caldera until September 2011 (Fig. 1A). Data from this period (July 2009 to September 2011) were recorded at 50, 100 or 200 samples per second (sps), depending on the time of year and the memory capacity of the instruments. We analysed waveform data from this array as well as nearby stations in the permanent South Iceland Lowland (SIL) seismic monitoring network operated by the Icelandic Meteorological Office, with data downsampled to 50 sps.

2.2 Earthquake locations

An initial catalogue of automatic earthquake locations was obtained using the Coalescence Microseismic Mapping code (Drew et al. 2013), from which the largest earthquakes within a cluster about 1.4 km NNE of the 1975–1989 inflation centre (derived from repeated ground levelling during the Krafla rift episode; Björnsson 1985; Björnsson et al. 1985) were selected for manual refinement. P- and S-wave arrival times were picked manually for these events, which were located using NonLinLoc (Lomax 2001) and then relatively relocated using HypoDD (Waldhauser & Ellsworth 2000) to obtain final hypocentre solutions (Fig. 1B).

In order to test the robustness of our hypocentre locations and moment tensor solutions under different velocity model assumptions, three different velocity models (Arnott 1990; Arnott & Foulger 1994; Brandsdóttir et al. 1997) as well as an average velocity model, were trialled (see Table S1, Supporting Information). An incorrect velocity model may distort the station positions on the focal sphere, thus affecting the moment tensor solution.

The FIRE refraction profile provided the best constraint on the velocity structure within the Krafla region (Brandsdóttir et al. 1997) revealing a high-velocity mid-crustal dome beneath Krafla caldera, with two narrow (<100 m) low-velocity zones at shallower depths. Earlier velocity models used by Arnott (1990) and Arnott & Foulger (1994) were based on local earthquake tomography. Since the earthquakes are all located <3 km b.s.l., irrespective of which velocity model we use, variation in the shallow velocity structure is not significant in contributing to inferred hypocentre locations. The final hypocentre locations were obtained using the High Velocity Model (HVM), adapted from Brandsdóttir et al. (1997).

The $V_p/V_s$ ratio is highly variable in the Krafla region (Schuler et al. 2015). Hypocentral locations using $V_p/V_s$ values between 1.70 and 1.86 were tested, with the 1.76–1.78 range providing the smallest misfit residuals and the most internally consistent models. This result is consistent with $V_p/V_s$ ratios obtained from Wadati plots of earthquakes in this study and from seismic refraction data (Brandsdóttir et al. 1997).
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2.3 Moment tensor inversion and decomposition

We used a Bayesian approach for moment tensor source inversion, which allows rigorous inclusion of uncertainties, such as location uncertainty, in the resultant probability density function (PDF) using marginalization (Sivia 1996, section 1.3; Pugh et al. 2016). The inversion approach determines the probability of a given moment tensor producing the observed data. We hand-picked the P-wave polarities, but could not use amplitudes for these relatively small events in the source inversion because they were difficult to measure accurately in the presence of noise.

The inversion was run twice, initially constrained to the DC space and then over the full range of possible moment tensor solutions, allowing non-DC components to be constrained. A uniform random sampling search algorithm was used to generate random samples of the source space. Each sample was tested against the data, and the probability of that sample producing the observed data was evaluated. The resultant PDF gives the maximum probability solution along with a range of possible solutions and their associated probabilities. Application of Bayes theory requires the inclusion of an a priori PDF. In this case, a uniform a priori PDF was used, signifying that no prior information about the mechanisms was assumed.

3 RESULTS

A total of 124 events from 2009 July to 2011 September were relatively relocated. Most lie in a cluster 200–500 m southeast of station K070 at 1–3 km b.s.l. (Fig. 1B), with smaller clusters due west. The epicentres are located within the central section of the fissure swarm and follow the northern margin of the shear wave attenuation zones delineated by Einarsson (1978) below 3 km depth. The final hypocentre locations were obtained using the HVM; adapted from Brandsdóttir et al. (1997). We use a $V_p/V_s$ ratio of 1.78 for the final locations, although, as will be demonstrated, changing the velocity model and the $V_p/V_s$ ratio within reasonable bounds does not greatly affect the locations or the moment tensor solutions. All locations are tabulated in the Supporting Information.

3.1 Moment tensor solutions

The moment tensors of all events have been calculated by inverting picked P-wave polarities. Within the main cluster, one event (Event A, 11:07 on 2009 November 11, Fig. 1B) has dilatational P-wave first-motion arrivals at all stations that could be picked unambiguously. The dilatational arrivals of Event A comprehensively cover the focal sphere (Fig. 2A), which indicates that the event has a large isotropic component. Such events are fairly rare, with only a few examples reported previously (Imai 1982; Foulger et al. 1989; Ford et al. 2009). Hence, this event merits particular scrutiny, to assess the stability of the solution and to ensure that the result is well constrained. Some other non-DC events were also found in the same cluster, although they are less well constrained (fewer clear first arrivals) and therefore are not discussed further.

Moment tensor solutions are plotted on a fundamental eigenvalue lune (Tape & Tape 2012a,b), which can be used to identify possible source types of an event and compare to other events. The moment tensor PDF for Event A indicates that this microearthquake was generated by a closing crack at depth (Fig. 2B).

3.2 Assessing the stability of the moment tensor solutions

In order to assess the stability of the closing crack solution, the moment tensor was computed for each velocity model and for a range of $V_p/V_s$ ratios. These are the main uncertainties in earthquake location, and hence this is where inaccuracies in the location and
take-off angles may be introduced. The moment tensor PDF using different velocity models and $V_p/V_s$ ratios for Event A is shown in Fig. S1 in the Supporting Information. The solutions all plot in the same well-constrained region of the lune, indicating a stable closing crack solution.

A DC event within the same cluster, spatially close to Event A, (Event B 01:11, 2010 July 15, Fig. 2B), can also be shown to have a stable moment tensor solution. The DC events are spatially and temporally close to the non-DC events, therefore excluding systematic errors in take-off angles or seismometer polarity being the cause of a non-DC solution.

Taking into account location uncertainties, the probability of Event A fitting a non-DC closing crack solution is 0.98. The probability of Event A fitting a DC solution is less than 0.002. The probability of Event A fitting a CLVD (compensated linear vector dipole) solution is 0.01. In contrast, Event B has a 0.81 probability of fitting a DC solution and only 0.19 probability of having a non-DC component (Pugh et al. 2016). Event B has vertical and subhorizontal nodal planes, which is unusual for tectonic earthquakes. It is likely that the vertical nodal plane is the fault plane as it is aligned along the rift fabric. Collapse along a vertical plane is likely to be facilitated by a void space beneath it, although in this case, there is no recognized non-DC component in Event B itself.

4 DISCUSSION

The highly implosive (closing crack) non-DC Event A is of interest because only a few examples of such events have been reported previously. Some skepticism of these results is appropriate, since such implosive events are rare within the literature and the methods were available to monitor regional movements, such as inflation or deflation, observations of opening or closing crack microearthquakes could indicate volcanic activity and magma movement at depth.

5 CONCLUSIONS

A dense seismic network in Krafla has detected an example of a non-DC microearthquake. All first arrivals from this earthquake show dilatational polarities, with comprehensive coverage of the focal sphere. This event is located spatially close to a well-constrained DC event. Uncertainties in the velocity model, the $V_p/V_s$ ratio and the location are tested for both events using a Bayesian approach. It is shown that both the DC and non-DC events are stable for the full range of uncertainties. The presence of a DC event indicates that the non-DC event is not due to a spurious seismic network or location method. The non-DC event is shown to have a large closing crack component. This is likely to arise from the current deflation of the magma chamber, occurring following the spreading episode in 1974–1985.
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