Schatzalp Workshop on Induced Seismicity (organized by SSS ETH Zurich)

Drilling to probe quasi-static and dynamic seismic ruptures in deep South African gold mines (DSeis) from cm- to km- scale Schatzalp participants

H. Ogasawara, Y. Yabe, T. Ito, G. van Aswegen, A. Cichowicz, R. Durrheim, T. Onstott, T. Keift, A. Ishida, HY. Ogasawara, T. Yasutomi, A. Funato, K. Imanishi, M. Okubo, M. Boettcher, P. Moyer, W. Ellsworth, M. Ziegler, S. Wiemer, C. Janssen, S. Shapiro, H. Gupta, P. Dight, N. Wechsler, A.K. Ward, B. Liebenberg, Y. Mukuhira, S.N. Somala, J.P. Hunt, S. Bucibo, N. Berset, R. Harris, E.D. Cason and the ICDP DSeis Team

Thursday, 16 March 2017 10:30- (18 min talk) in the session Scaled Experiments





INTERNATIONAL CONTINENTAL SCIENTIFIC DRILLING PROGRAM



EIS

Schatzalp Workshop on Induced Seismicity (organized by SSS ETH Zurich)

Drilling to probe quasi-static and dynamic seismic ruptures in deep South African gold mines (DSeis) from cm- to km- scale Schatzalp participants

H. Ogasawara, Y. Yabe, T. Ito, G. van Aswegen, A. Cichowicz, R. Durrheim, T. Onstott, T. Keift, A. Ishida, HY. Ogasawara, T. Yasutomi, A. Funato, K. Imanishi, M. Okubo, M. Boettcher, P. Moyer, W. Ellsworth, M. Ziegler, S. Wiemer, C. Janssen, S. Shapiro, H. Gupta, P. Dight, N. Wechsler, A.K. Ward, B. Liebenberg, Y. Mukuhira, S.N. Somala, J.P. Hunt, S. Bucibo, N. Berset, R. Harris, E.D. Cason and the ICDP DSeis Team

Thursday, 16 March 2017 10:30- (18 min talk) in the session Scaled Experiments



2015 ICDP-Ritsumeikan Workshop (70 people from 7 countries)

- Background
 - Drilling into the 2007 Mw2.2 hypocenter
 - 2011 M~2 quasi-static rupture evolution ahead of stopes (Yasuo's key note in 2015 Schatzalp Workshop http://www.seismo.ethz.ch/static/schatzalp/2015/Yabe.pdf)
 - A 2014 M5.5 (Hiroshi's poster in 2015 Schatzalp Workshop)
 - A new stress measurement method (Funato et al. 2016)
- Drilling targets that ICDP approved on 31 August 2016 that evolved in $\sigma_1 > 130$ MPa and $\tau_{max} >$ several tens of MPa.
 - Target A: the 2011 M~2 quasi-static ruptures*
 - Target B: a 2014 M2.8 dynamic rupture*
 * To be flooded in 2018 because of mine closure.
 - Target C: a 2016 M3.5 dynamic rupture (an alternative AE site)
 - Target D: a 2014 M5.5 dynamic rupture
- 1st drilling will commence in later March or early April
- Conclusions

- Background
 - Drilling into the 2007 Mw2.2 hypocenter
 - 2011 M~2 quasi-static rupture evolution ahead of stopes (Yasuo's key note in 2015 Schatzalp Workshop http://www.seismo.ethz.ch/static/schatzalp/2015/Yabe.pdf)
 - A 2014 M5.5 (Hiroshi's poster in 2015 Schatzalp Workshop)
 - A new stress measurement method (Funato et al. 2016)
- Drilling targets that ICDP approved on 31 August 2016 that evolved in $\sigma_1 > 130$ MPa and $\tau_{max} >$ several tens of MPa.
 - Target A: the 2011 M~2 quasi-static ruptures*
 - Target B: a 2014 M2.8 dynamic rupture*
 * To be flooded in 2018 because of mine closure.
 - Target C: a 2016 M3.5 dynamic rupture (an alternative AE site)
 - Target D: a 2014 M5.5 dynamic rupture
- 1st drilling will commence in later March or early April
- Conclusions

Background project (JAGUARS chaired by Masao 2006-2008): Yasuo detailed the Mw2.2 nucleation in the 2015 Schatzalp WS. He drilled into the 2007 Mw2.2 hypocenter at 3.3 km depth.



Background project (JAGUARS 2006-2008) Drilling reveled that the Mw2.2 was not on the dyke-hostrock contact but on a pre-existing weakness. However, the drilling direction was not ideal for good core recovery.

Background project (JAGUARS 2006-2009) Drilling reveled the Mw2.2 was not on the dyke-hostrock contact but on a pre-existing weakness. However, the direction didn't allow good core recovery

During the following Jpn-SA project (2009-2015), Ogasawara et al. (2012) optimized an overcoring technique suitable for working condition at highly stressed ground in SA gold mine, demonstrating that core recovery with minimum damage even at earthquake-prone ground is feasible with great care for drilling direction.

Background

- Drilling into the 2007 Mw2.2 hypocenter
- 2011 M~2 quasi-static rupture evolution ahead of stopes (Yasuo's key note in 2015 Schatzalp Workshop http://www.seismo.ethz.ch/static/schatzalp/2015/Yabe.pdf)
- A 2014 M5.5 (Hiroshi's poster in 2015 Schatzalp Workshop)

A new stress measurement method (Funato et al. 2016)

- Drilling targets that ICDP approved on 31 August 2016 that evolved in $\sigma_1 > 130$ MPa and $\tau_{max} >$ several tens of MPa.
 - Target A: the 2011 M~2 quasi-static ruptures*
 - Target B: a 2014 M2.8 dynamic rupture*
 * To be flooded in 2018 because of mine closure.
 - Target C: a 2016 M3.5 dynamic rupture (an alternative AE site)
 - Target D: a 2014 M5.5 dynamic rupture
- 1st drilling will commence in later March or early April
- Conclusions

With a new method (Funato and Ito, 2011; Funato et al., 2016), we measure shade width variation to measure τ_{max} without overcoring, hydrofracturing, borehole scoping, or conventional time-consuming lab testing.

Diameter variation of the core corresponding to τ_{max} of several tens of MPa at the Mw2.2 seismogenic zones.

Abe et al. (2017)

The measured differential stress was

- much better constrained than those by analyses of b/h breakout and core discing (blue and green).

consistent with stress model calibrated by overcoring measurements.
 At the other sites, consistent with an overcoring measurement results.
 Effective in the ground where stress is too high for hydrofracturing method.

Background

- Drilling into the 2007 Mw2.2 hypocenter
- 2011 M~2 quasi-static rupture evolution ahead of stopes (Yasuo's key note in 2015 Schatzalp Workshop http://www.seismo.ethz.ch/static/schatzalp/2015/Yabe.pdf)
- A 2014 M5.5 (Hiroshi's poster in 2015 Schatzalp Workshop)
- A new stress measurement method (Funato et al. 2016)
- Drilling targets that ICDP approved on 31 August 2016 that evolved in $\sigma_1 > 130$ MPa and $\tau_{max} >$ several tens of MPa.
 - Target A: the 2011 M~2 quasi-static ruptures*
 - Target B: a 2014 M2.8 dynamic rupture*

* To be flooded in 2018 because of mine closure.

- Target C: a 2016 M3.5 dynamic rupture (an alternative AE site)
- Target D: a 2014 M5.5 dynamic rupture
- 1st drilling will commence in later March or early April
- Conclusions

Target A: observation network of M~2 quasi-static rupture evolution ahead of stopes in Cooke 4

- ✓ Regularly spacing ~10 planer structures
- \checkmark Dipping by 60~70° to south
- \checkmark Sub-parallel to the mining edge

- ✓ Regularly spacing ~10 planer structures
- \checkmark Dipping by 60~70° to south
- ✓ Sub-parallel to the mining edge
- Location of planer activity migrated with active mining front.

- ✓ Regularly spacing ~10 planer structures
- \checkmark Dipping by 60~70° to south
- ✓ Sub-parallel to the mining edge
- Location of planer activity migrated with active mining front.

- ✓ Regularly spacing ~10 planer structures
- \checkmark Dipping by 60~70° to south
- ✓ Sub-parallel to the mining edge
- Location of planer activity migrated with active mining front.

Naoi et al. 2015

Target A: Quasi-static rupture evolution which we drill a ~50m hole to probe

Naoi et al. 2015

Naoi et al. (2013 and 2015) have already investigated in detail the temporal variation in b-value and repeating earthquakes.

- Background
 - Drilling into the 2007 Mw2.2 hypocenter
 - 2011 M~2 quasi-static rupture evolution ahead of stopes (Yasuo's key note in 2015 Schatzalp Workshop http://www.seismo.ethz.ch/static/schatzalp/2015/Yabe.pdf)
 - A 2014 M5.5 (Hiroshi's poster in 2015 Schatzalp Workshop)
 - A new stress measurement method (Funato et al. 2016)
- Drilling targets that ICDP approved on 31 August 2016 that evolved in $\sigma_1 > 130$ MPa and $\tau_{max} >$ several tens of MPa.
 - Target A: the 2011 M~2 quasi-static ruptures*
 - Target B: a 2014 M2.8 dynamic rupture*
 - * To be flooded in 2018 because of mine closure.
 - Target C: a 2016 M3.5 dynamic rupture (an alternative AE site)
 - Target D: a 2014 M5.5 dynamic rupture
- 1st drilling will commence in later March or early April
- Conclusions

Skip this slide because of time shortage

- Target B and C were the seismogenic zones of the events that the strong motion damaged infrastructure considerably.
- Target B: a 2014 M2.8 dynamic rupture*
 - $\sigma_1 > 130$ MPa was measure before the M2.8 event.
 - Originally, AE monitoring and multiple drilling were planned.
 The rupture was to be exhumed by future mining to compare.
 - As it turned out that the mine was closed down and is to be flooded in 2018 because of mine closure, drilling to deploy AE network was abandoned.
- Target C: a 2016 M3.5 dynamic rupture at 3.3 km depth
 - A site alternative to Target B
 - Low σ_1 was measured after the M3.5
 - Geology Department drilled a hole although seriously disked.
 - We drill holes with much better core recovery and deploy AE network.

- Background
 - Drilling into the 2007 Mw2.2 hypocenter
 - 2011 M~2 quasi-static rupture evolution ahead of stopes (Yasuo's key note in 2015 Schatzalp Workshop http://www.seismo.ethz.ch/static/schatzalp/2015/Yabe.pdf)
 - A 2014 M5.5 (Hiroshi's poster in 2015 Schatzalp Workshop)
 - A new stress measurement method (Funato et al. 2016)
- Drilling targets that ICDP approved on 31 August 2016 that evolved in $\sigma_1 > 130$ MPa and $\tau_{max} >$ several tens of MPa.
 - Target A: the 2011 M~2 quasi-static ruptures*
 - Target B: a 2014 M2.8 dynamic rupture*
 * To be flooded in 2018 because of mine closure.
 - Target C: a 2016 M3.5 dynamic rupture (an alternative AE site)
 - Target D: a 2014 M5.5 dynamic rupture
- 1st drilling will commence in later March or early April
- Conclusions

Target A-C: Usual mechanism at usual depth

On normal faults (striking NE-SW)

in horst/graben structure. On mining horizons Seismicity follows weekday afternoon blasting although not the case for larger events.

No background M>0 seismicity beneath mining horizons before the 2014 M5.5 event

Target D: Unusual mechanism at unusual depth

On the mining horizon, lots of NE-SW normal faults are mapped, hosting normal-faulting induced events. Dykes are only NNW-SSE structures, but too minute on the mining horizons to host a M5.5 earthquake.

The ICDP 1st NQ 750m hole from Site 1 is to locate the M5.5 rupture precisely, followed by logging and in-hole geophone array installation.

The ICDP 2nd NQ 600m hole intersects the fault at greater depth, dedicated for hydrological and geomicro-biological monitoring.

If JSPS approves a fund, we drill **the 3rd or more holes** > 900m traversing both denser and sparser aftershock areas.

Initial 1-month; latest 1-year; 1-month in July 2016.

Slip, cm Inverted by Elisworth (Fault normal view)

The ICDP 1st NQ 750m hole from Site 1 is to locate the M5.5 rupture precisely, followed by logging and in-hole geophone array installation.

The ICDP 2nd NQ 600m hole intersects the fault at greater depth, dedicated for hydrological and geomicro-biological monitoring.

If JSPS approves a fund, we drill the 3rd or **more BQ holes** > 900m traversing both denser and sparser aftershock areas.

Higher and lower stress drop

- Background
 - Drilling into the 2007 Mw2.2 hypocenter
 - 2011 M~2 quasi-static rupture evolution ahead of stopes (Yasuo's key note in 2015 Schatzalp Workshop http://www.seismo.ethz.ch/static/schatzalp/2015/Yabe.pdf)
 - A 2014 M5.5 (Hiroshi's poster in 2015 Schatzalp Workshop)
 - A new stress measurement method (Funato et al. 2016)
- Drilling targets that ICDP approved on 31 August 2016 that evolved in $\sigma_1 > 130$ MPa and $\tau_{max} >$ several tens of MPa.
 - Target A: the 2011 M~2 quasi-static ruptures*
 - Target B: a 2014 M2.8 dynamic rupture*
 * To be flooded in 2018 because of mine closure.
 - Target C: a 2016 M3.5 dynamic rupture (an alternative AE site)
 - Target D: a 2014 M5.5 dynamic rupture
- 1st drilling will commence in later March or early April
- Conclusions

Conclusions

We aim to probe ruptures with $\sim 2 < M < 5.5$, seismologically spatio-temporary well elucidated which evolved both quasi-statically and dynamically, to recover cores fully (partly oriented and with a triple-tube barrel) by drilling in line with σ_1 direction, and to measure stress and log boreholes and cores followed by in-hole monitoring to elucidate seismicity further.

Geomicrobiologists compare seismicity with water and gas to see if there is any change in H2 generated by seismicity that suggests microbiological activity fueled by the H2.

The above allows us to address open questions - in seismology (what controls ruptures or seismicity), and - in geomicrobiology (what fuels deep underground life), to discuss the robustness and reliability of seismological inversion, to foster international early-career researchers.

Targets A and B at Cooke 4

Although it is only 1km depth, stress is high at the remnant. The M2.8 rupture (Target B) was to be exhumed by mining from yellow band.

Target A (Target B was to be elucidated as well as Target A)

Will be able to compare our drilling with seismological inferred structure.

Drilling enriches our understanding of seismogenic zones because seismic events only convey information of the locality where the events took place.

Target C (A M3.5 fault in a dyke)

