#### Seismic coupling at divergent plate boundaries from rate-and-state friction

Hannah Mark (WHOI/MIT) Mark Behn (WHOI) Jean-Arthur Olive (LDEO) Yajing Liu (McGill)

TEI RIE 9 February 2017



# Seismic coupling coefficient

The seismic coupling coefficient  $\chi$  is the fraction of slip on a fault that occurs seismically.



χ = Seismic/Tectonic M = Magmatic/Total

# Seismic moment release



#### Variations in seismic coupling?



Seismic coupling coefficient χ varies across divergent boundaries.



Data from Bird and Kagan [2004], Cowie et al. [1993], and Olive and Escartin [2016].

# Variations in seismic coupling?



#### Question:

How much of the variation in seismic coupling can we explain with variations in thermal structure and fault geometry?

#### Test:

- Model seismic cycles on normal faults
- Vary thermal structure and fault geometry

- Compare the range of coupling behavior generated in models to the range of values observed in natural systems.

Variations in seismic coupling with thermal structure for transform faults. Figure from Liu et al. [2012]

# Rate-and-state friction

Empirical laws where friction properties depend on slip **rate** and slip **history** 

Friction parameter (a-b):

 $(a-b) > 0 \rightarrow velocity-strengthening$ 

 $(a-b) < 0 \rightarrow$  velocity-weakening



#### Rate-and-state friction model

Empirical laws where friction properties depend on slip **rate** and slip **history** 

Friction parameter (a-b):

(a-b) > 0  $\rightarrow$  velocity-strengthening

 $(a-b) < 0 \rightarrow$  velocity-weakening

Use (a-b) vs. T and a uniform thermal gradient to prescribe frictional parameters

Vary: thermal gradient, fault dip, lithology, long-term slip rate, alongstrike dimension



Data from Blanpied et al. [1995] and He et al. [2007]



### Model results

#### Cooler (50°C/km) Hotter (65°C/km) (a-b) 0Velocity-strengthening2Velocity-strengthening4Velocity-weakening010101214Velocity-strengthening Velocity-strengthening 0.120 0.105 W=5.68 Velocity-weakening W=7.37 0.090 0.075 0.060 Velocity-strengthening 0.045 0.030 0.015 -5 -105 10 -10-5 0 5 10 0 Along-strike distance [km] Along-strike distance [km] 0.000 10 Scaled max velocity 8 1 mm/s 6 4 2 oL 50 300 100 150 200 250 300 200 50 100 150 250 0 Time [yr] Time [yr]

#### Model results



#### What controls seismic coupling?

![](_page_9_Figure_1.jpeg)

# What controls W/h\* in natural systems?

![](_page_10_Figure_1.jpeg)

D<sub>c</sub> related to the size of asperity contacts

 $D_c \approx .1 \text{ mm}$  from olivine friction experiments [Boettcher et al., 2007] To match observations, we use  $D_c$  on the order of 5+ mm Can we use model results to estimate h\* or  $D_c$  in natural settings?

#### What controls W/h\* in natural systems?

![](_page_11_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### What controls W/h\* in natural systems?

![](_page_12_Figure_1.jpeg)

# Conclusions

- Seismic coupling coefficient for normal faults scales with thermal regime (W/h\*)
- Observations are best matched with h\* approx.
  10-50 times laboratory values
- Calculating χ from moment release rates involves a trade-off between h\* and M

![](_page_13_Figure_4.jpeg)

# Continental observations

• Rifting environment with local array data over several years: Walker Lane?

![](_page_14_Picture_2.jpeg)