http://www. jgg09. com Doi:10.3724/SP.J. 1246.2011.00024

## **Co-seismic deformation of 2011** *Mw9.* **0 Japan earthquake observed by InSAR technique**

Shen Qiang and Tan Kai *Institute of Seisrrwlogy, China Earthquake Administration, Wuhan* 430071 , *China* 

**Abstract:** Co-seismic line-of-sight displacements of the 2011 *Mw9.* 0 Japan earthquake derived from lnSAR data of Envisat ASAR, ALOS PALSAR and TerraSAR-X show a maximum value of about - 245cm to - 221 em near the epicenter. This result is in good agreement with the result of GPS measurement. The observed displacement pattern suggests an earthquake-rupture zone over 500km long, with a ground-motion pattern in the vicinity of the northern segment more complex than that of the southern segment, possibly due to immediate aftershocks that occurred between satellite passes.

**Key words:** *Mw9.* 0 Tohoku earthquake; lnSAR; surface displacement

#### **1 Introduction**

A catastrophic *Mw9.* 0 earthquake occurred on March 11 , 2011 at a depth of 32 km in western Pacific Ocean, approximately 72 km east of  $Japan<sup>[1]</sup>$ . In this paper, we report on a study of the co-seismic deformation field based on lnSAR radar images from Envisat ASAR, ALOS PALSAR and TerraSAR-X, covering areas shown in figure **1.** We then compared our preliminary result with the result of GPS measurement for verification.

#### **2 Data and processing**

Several pairs of pre- and post-earthquake radar images

Received :2011.04-10; Accepted:2011-D6-29

of Envisat ASAR, ALOS PALSAR and TerraSAR-X were used to generate interferometric patterns. The surface displacements in line of sight ( LOS) were obtained by using two-pass and three-pass methods, respectively.



Figure 1 Locations of the earthquake epicenters , and areas covered by radar images used in this study ( rectangles ; Envisat in gray, ALOS in green and TerraSAR-X in red)

Corresponding author: + 86 - 18971407030 ; E-mail: cl980606@ hotmail. com

This work is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China( 41004008) , Key Foundation of Institute of Seismology, China Earthquake Administration (IS201026019), State Key Laboratory of Cryospheric Sciences , Cold and Arid Regions Environment and Engineering Research Institute, Chinese Academy Sciences ( SKL CS09 - 03 ) ; the Foundation of State Key Laboratory of Water Resources and Hydropower Engineering Science, Wuhan University ( 2009B54) ; the Director Foundation of Institute of Seismology, China Earthquake Administration ( IS200826057 )

The basic parameters of interferometry are listed in table 1. Previous studies have shown that shorter spatial and temporal baselines should be used<sup>[3]</sup>. However, available radar images were very few at the time of this earthquake , and they were mainly for emergency observations. As shown in table 1, Envisat ASAR had the best temporal baseline, and ALOS PALSAR pairs had a larger valid perpendicular baseline. To illustrate the capability of TerraSAR-X, post-earthquake images with an interval of 11 days were used to compare with the **co-seismic displacements.** 

We used the open source InSAR software ROI\_PAC to process Envisat ASAR and ALOS PALSAR data with two-pass D-InSAR, the open-source software Doris to **process co-seismic deformation measurements of Terra-**SAR-X with three-pass method, and the SARScape software to process post-earthquake displacement measurements. Key steps of processing included decoding, **automatic matching, interferogram formation, topogra**phy removal, phase unwrapping, and geographic pro**jection. Since precise orbital information was not avail**able and the available images were taken mostly in e**mergency , we had to rely on the lower-accuracy pre**diction orbits for D-InSAR processing. This might have caused error in the calculation of the initial offset values and led to processing problems in obtaining interferometric images. Thus in the InSAR processing we **needed to exercise step-by-step control, especially in**  image matching.

### **3 InSAR displacement fields and analysis**

The co-seismic deformation fields from two pairs of Envisat ASAR interferometric images are shown in figure 2. The maximum LOS displacement in the area covered by track 347 was  $-245$  cm at  $(141.245^{\circ}E, 38.464^{\circ}$ N) ( see also top part of Fig. 3 ) , in Ishinomaki close to the epicenter. The maximum LOS displacement in the area covered by track  $074$  was  $-221$  cm at (140. 994°E,37. 674°N) (see the lower part of Fig. 3) , only 30 km away from the first nuclear power plant in Fukushima ( TEPCO in Fig. 3), where the displacement was as high as 200 em. Track 074, unlike track 347, revealed two areas of larger deformation, **and the displacement in the southern region was gener**ally 10 em larger, perhaps because it was closer to the larger aftershocks. This may be seen in the GPS displacement maps also (Figs. 6 and 7).

**To assess measurement precision, we first compared**  the above-mentioned two sets of results along a profile shared by both track 347 and track 074 ( red line in Fig. 2). As shown in figure  $2(c)$ , the displacement profiles are nearly parallel with a correlation coefficient of 0. 997. Figure 2 (d) shows the difference between the profiles and a polynomial fit. The difference varies from 50 em to 70 em , and the overall difference was mainly caused by the selected reference point for phase unwrapping, which can be eliminated through system**atic correction. Additional causes include differences**  in satellite orbit, topography, satellite-to-ground geometry, atmosphere and temporal span , among which the effects from orbital accuracy, satellite-to-ground geometry and topography are nonlinear. Thus , it may be better to use the polynomial fit to eliminate the uncertainty caused by these satellite parameters. By using a 4-order polynomial fitting the R-square test reached 0. 859, indicating that the model represents the variation of displacement difference quite well. Most of the **residues in the difference are less than 5 em, indica**ting a good agreement.

Orhit	<b>Sensor</b>	Temporal span	Temporal baseline (days)	$B_{\perp}(m)$
347	<b>Envisat ASAR</b>	$2011 - 02 - 19 - 2011 - 03 - 21$	32	$-119.5$
074	<b>Envisat ASAR</b>	$2011 - 03 - 02 - 2011 - 04 - 01$	30	$-103.0$
401	ALOS PALSAR	$2010 - 10 - 28 - 2011 - 03 - 15$	139	1437.5
056	ALOS PALSAR	$2010 - 11 - 20 - 2011 - 04 - 07$	139	1137.3
042	TerraSAR-X	$2010 - 10 - 20 - 2008 - 09 - 21$	759	$-91.9$
042	TerraSAR-X	$2010 - 10 - 20 - 2011 - 03 - 12$	143	48.1
042	TerraSAR X	$2011 - 03 - 12 - 2011 - 03 - 23$	11	27.5

Table 1 Basic interferometric parameters (B denotes valid perpendicular baseline)

Download English Version:

# <https://daneshyari.com/en/article/4683715>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/4683715>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)