

12

B5



SYSTEMS, SCIENCE AND SOFTWARE

AD A O 46568

SSS-R-77-3038

IMPROVED YIELD DETERMINATION AND EVENT IDENTIFICATION RESEARCH

- J. M. Savino
- T. C. Bache
- T. G. Barker
- J. T. Cherry
- D. G. Lambert
- J. F. Masso
- N. Rimer
- W. O. Wray

Final Report

For Period May 1, 1975 - September 30, 1976

Sponsored by

Advanced Research Projects Agency  
ARPA Order No. 2551

DDC  
 RECEIVED  
 NOV 21 1977  
 B


This research was supported by the Advanced Research Projects Agency of the Department of Defense and was monitored by AFTAC/VSC, Patrick AFB, FL 32925, under Contract No. F08606-75-C-0045.

The views and conclusions contained in this document are those of the authors and should not be interpreted as necessarily representing the official policies, either expressed or implied, of the Advanced Research Projects Agency, the Air Force Technical Applications Center, or the U.S. Government.

Approved for Public Release, Distribution Unlimited

October 1976

AD No. \_\_\_\_\_  
DDC FILE COPY



**SYSTEMS, SCIENCE AND SOFTWARE**

---

SSS-R-77-3038

**IMPROVED YIELD DETERMINATION AND EVENT  
IDENTIFICATION RESEARCH**

J. M. Savino  
T. C. Bache  
T. G. Barker  
J. T. Cherry  
D. G. Lambert  
J. F. Masso  
N. Rimer  
W. O. Wray

Final Report

For Period May 1, 1975 - September 30, 1976

Sponsored by

Advanced Research Projects Agency  
ARPA Order No. 2551

This research was supported by the Advanced Research Projects Agency of the Department of Defense and was monitored by AFTAC/VSC, Patrick AFB, FL 32925, under Contract No. F08606-75-C-0045.

The views and conclusions contained in this document are those of the authors and should not be interpreted as necessarily representing the official policies, either expressed or implied, of the Advanced Research Projects Agency, the Air Force Technical Applications Center, or the U.S. Government.

Approved for Public Release, Distribution Unlimited

October 1976

P. O. BOX 1620, LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92038, TELEPHONE (714) 453-0060

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) IMPROVED YIELD DETERMINATION AND EVENT IDENTIFICATION RESEARCH.		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Final - May 1, 1975 - Sept. 30, 1976
6. AUTHOR(s) Thomas J. M./Savino, C./Bache, T. G./Barker, J. T./Cherry, D. G./Lambert, J. F. Masso, N. Rimer and W./O. Wray		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER SSS-R-77-3038
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Systems, Science and Software P. O. Box 1620 La Jolla, CA 92038		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) Contract No. F08606-75-C-0045
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS VELA Seismological Center 312 Montgomery Street Alexandria, VA 22314		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS Program Code No. 6F10 ARPA Order No. 2551
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office) Final rept. 1 May 75 - 30 Sep 76		12. REPORT DATE October 1976
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for Public Release, Distribution Unlimited		13. NUMBER OF PAGES
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) UNCLASSIFIED
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Work performed on this contract has been reported in a series of 11 topical and		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Explosion Seismology      Yield Estimation Techniques Explosion Source Functions      Seismic Ground Motion Multiple Explosions      Teleseismic Magnitudes Constitutive Models		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Work performed on Contract No. F8606-75-C-0045 has been reported in detail in a series of eleven topical and quarterly technical reports. This final report summarizes the material covered in each of the technical reports and discusses the conclusions obtained. The primary objective of the program is to develop methods for estimating the yield of underground nuclear explosions. The topics addressed include the modeling of both single and multiple explosions, propagation of the resultant stress waves through realistic earth (cont on p 2)		

388 507

LB

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

(cont p 1)

structures, and prediction of short- and long-period explosion seismograms recorded at teleseismically located receivers. The results of these investigations provide a theoretical framework for expressing uncertainties in explosion yield estimates in terms of uncertainties in the near source material properties, local source and receiver crustal structures, and the upper mantle structure of the earth.

A

ACCESSION For	
NTIS	White Section <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DDC	Buff Section <input type="checkbox"/>
UNANNOUNCED	<input type="checkbox"/>
JUSTIFICATION _____	
BY _____	
DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY CODES	
Dist.	AT&A and/or SPECIAL
A	

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. SUMMARY . . . . .	1
II. INTRODUCTION. . . . .	2
III. SUMMARY OF TECHNICAL REPORTS. . . . .	3
3.1 TECHNICAL REPORT NO. 1 . . . . .	3
3.1.1 Introduction . . . . .	3
3.1.2 Theoretical Considerations . . . . .	3
3.1.3 Results of Parameter Study . . . . .	4
3.2 TECHNICAL REPORT NO. 2 . . . . .	8
3.2.1 Introduction . . . . .	8
3.2.2 Near Source Ground Motion. . . . .	8
3.2.3 Teleseismic Ground Motion. . . . .	9
3.2.4 Conclusions. . . . .	13
3.3 TECHNICAL REPORT NO. 4 . . . . .	15
3.3.1 Introduction . . . . .	15
3.4 TECHNICAL REPORT NO. 4 AND TECHNICAL REPORT NO. 5 . . . . .	16
3.4.1 Introduction . . . . .	16
3.4.2 Explosion Source Functions . . . . .	17
3.4.3 Teleseismic Body Wave Predictions for KASSERI and MAST . . . . .	19
3.4.4 Surface Wave Predictions for KASSERI and MAST . . . . .	26
3.5 TECHNICAL REPORT NO. 6 . . . . .	29
3.5.1 Introduction . . . . .	29
3.5.2 Equivalent Elastic Source Calculations . . . . .	29

	Page
3.5.3	Teleseismic Amplitude Dependence on the Source . . . . . 32
3.5.4	Effects of Upper Mantle Properties on Short Period Seismograms . . . . . 35
IV.	SUMMARY OF CURRENT RESEARCH . . . . . 39
4.1	EXPLOSION GROUND MOTION PREDICTIONS . . 39
4.1.1	Source Modeling . . . . . 39
4.1.2	Theoretical Seismograms . . . . . 41
4.2	SIMULATION AND DECOMPOSITION OF MULTIPLE EXPLOSIONS . . . . . 47
4.2.1	Introduction . . . . . 47
4.2.2	Experiment Design and Data . . 47
4.2.3	Experimental Results for the Profile of Stations In-Line with the Explosion Array . . . 49
4.2.4	Experimental Results for the Profile of Stations 45° from the Explosion Array . . . . . 55
4.2.5	Summary and Discussion . . . . . 55
V.	REFERENCES . . . . . 58
	APPENDIX A . . . . . 60

## LIST OF FIGURES

No.		Page
3.1	Effect of air-filled porosity on seismic amplitude. . . . .	7
3.2	Sketch of the explosive array, the resulting nonlinear region and the surface over which the properties of the outgoing displacement field were monitored . . . . .	10
3.3	Crack location and orientation 6.85 msec after detonation . . . . .	11
3.4	Complete crack location and orientation 11.57 msec after detonation. . . . .	12
3.5	Comparison of the "equivalent RDP" representations of the multiple explosion for the calculations including the effect of tensile failure. . . . .	14
3.6	The source function amplitudes for the tuff sources of Table 3.1 and the rhyolite source used for MAST. The source functions are all scaled to 1000 kt. . . . .	18
3.7	Comparison of synthetic and observed short period vertical component seismograms at five SDCS stations for the events MAST and KASSERI. . . . .	20
3.8	Comparison of theoretical and observed b amplitudes for MAST and KASSERI at five SDCS stations. . . . .	23
3.9	Comparison of theoretical and observed d amplitudes for MAST and KASSERI. . . . .	24
3.10	Comparison of theoretical and observed Rayleigh waves at five SDCS stations . . . . .	27
3.11	Source functions for all rock types except 207. . . . .	30
3.12	Agreement of measured synthetic seismogram amplitudes with theoretical scaling relations. No free surface reflection is included in the calculation. . . . .	33

No.		Page
3.13	Agreement measured synthetic seismogram amplitudes with theoretical scaling relations. The free surface effect is included. . . . .	34
3.14	Variation in amplitude and waveform for three upper mantle models for MAST at station RKON. . . . .	36
3.15	Variation in amplitude and waveform for three upper mantle models for MAST at station HNME . . . . .	37
4.1	Source functions for the materials specified in Table 4.1 . . . . .	40
4.2	Assumed relationship between the material strength ( $Y$ ) and the hydrodynamic component of stress ( $\bar{P}$ ) for small $e/e_m$ . . . . .	42
4.3	Comparison of synthetic and actual (heavy line) short-period vertical recordings of NTS explosions at a range $> 3500$ km . . . . .	44
4.4	Explosion and station configuration . . . . .	48
4.5	Original MAST signal at Station 3 and composite signal along the profile in-line with the shot array. . . . .	50
4.6	Narrow band filtered signals (as functions of frequency and time) for the original (a) and composite (b) signals for Station 3 (Figure 4.5) along the profile in-line with the shot array . . . . .	51
4.7	Envelope functions (as functions of frequency and time) for narrow band filtered original (a) and composite (b) signals for Station 3 (Figure 4.4) along the profile in-line with the shot array. . . . .	53
4.8	Sum of the envelopes shown in Figure 4.7 for the original (a) and composite (b) signals for Station 3 along the profile in-line with the shot array. . . . .	54

LIST OF TABLES

No.		Page
3.1	Results of Parameter Sensitivity Study. . . . .	5
3.2	Untitled. . . . .	31
4.1	Material Properties Used in Source Calcula- tions . . . . .	43
4.2	Input Delay Times Versus Observed Delay Times . . . . .	56

## I. SUMMARY

Work performed on Contract No. F8606-75-C-0045 has been reported in detail in a series of eleven topical and quarterly technical reports. This final report summarizes the material covered in each of the technical reports and discusses the conclusions obtained. The primary objective of the program is to develop methods for estimating the yield of underground nuclear explosions. The topics addressed include the modeling of both single and multiple explosions, propagation of the resultant stress waves through realistic earth structures, and prediction of short- and long-period explosion seismograms recorded at teleseismically located receivers. The results of these investigations provide a theoretical framework for expressing uncertainties in explosion yield estimates in terms of uncertainties in the near source material properties, local source and receiver crustal structures, and the upper mantle structure of the earth.

## II. INTRODUCTION

This final report summarizes work performed under Contract Number F8606-75-C-0045, entitled, "Improved Yield Determination and Event Identification Research", by Systems, Science and Software (S<sup>3</sup>) in La Jolla, California. The program, which was conducted during the period from 1 May 1975 through 30 September 1976, consisted of the following major tasks:

- A combined theoretical/empirical evaluation of the effects of variations in near source material properties and emplacement parameters on explosion generated body and surface waves used for establishing magnitude-yield relationships.
- Development of procedures for predicting teleseismic signals from explosions and estimating uncertainties in seismically determined yields in terms of uncertainties in gross earth structure, and local source and receiver structure.

Detailed results obtained for these tasks have been presented in a series of Technical Reports. These results are summarized in the following section of this final report. All reports prepared under this contract are listed in the Appendix.

## III. SUMMARY OF TECHNICAL RESULTS

3.1 TECHNICAL REPORT NO. 1

"Seismic Coupling from a Nuclear Explosion: The Dependence of the Reduced Displacement Potential on the Non-linear Behavior of the Near Source Rock Environment," Cherry, et al., September, 1975.

3.1.1 Introduction

This report describes the results of a theoretical study directed at the determination of the sensitivity of the equivalent elastic source from a nuclear explosion to the non-linear behavior of the near source rock environment. The results of the parameter study provide valuable insight concerning the importance of various material parameters for accurate prediction of seismic coupling. The results also aid in the establishment of guidelines for the collection of geophysical data in the near source region.

3.1.2 Theoretical Considerations

A relationship between the teleseismically determined body wave magnitude,  $m_b$ , and the elastic properties of the near source material is given as

$$m_b \sim \log [\alpha \Psi(\infty)] \quad (3.1)$$

where  $\Psi(\infty)$  is the steady state value of the reduced displacement potential and  $\alpha$  is the near source compressional wave speed. This relationship was derived by considering the impedance contrast between the low velocity source region and the basement rock. Not included in this relationship are the effects of pP or any of the details of the geophysical properties of the crustal layers.

If  $\Psi_i(\infty)$  and  $\Psi_k(\infty)$  are two values of  $\Psi(\infty)$  corresponding to materials  $i$  and  $k$ , then the change in teleseismic magnitude is given by

$$\Delta m = m^i - m^k = \log \left[ \frac{\alpha_i \Psi_i(\infty)}{\alpha_k \Psi_k(\infty)} \right]. \quad (3.2)$$

Equation (3.2) gives the scaling law for teleseismic magnitudes in terms of  $\alpha \Psi(\infty)$ . This equation is always valid as long as the spectrum of the equivalent source is flat within the teleseismic frequency band and path effects associated with earth structure are invariant between events. Finally, uncertainties in yield estimates based on experimentally determined seismic magnitudes may be related to uncertainties in near source material properties via direct application of Eq. (3.2).

### 3.1.3 Results of Parameter Study

The results of the sensitivity study are summarized in Table 3.1. Some general remarks are in order before discussing the effect of individual parameter variations. Note that the ambient density,  $\rho_0$ , and the bulk modulus,  $k_0$ , are included in the table although they are not independent parameters in the context of this study; i.e., their values are determined by the independent parameters appearing in the first ten columns. Calculation No. 18 is selected as the reference for body and surface wave magnitude variations in order to avoid the appearance of minus signs in the  $\Delta m_b$  column. Calculations marked with an asterisk in the  $\Psi(\infty)$  column were performed with a new source description which gave an RDP 42 percent higher than the RDP obtained in Calculation No. 8 using the old source description; the RDP's calculated with the new source description were therefore scaled down by a factor of 0.704 and the scaled values are

TABLE 3.1  
RESULTS OF PARAMETER SENSITIVITY STUDY

$f_w$	$\phi_0$	$P_e$ (kbar)	$P_c$ (kbar)	$u$ (cm/sec)	$\mu$ (kbar)	$Y_0$ (kbar)	$Y_{MAX}$ (kbar)	$P_m$ (kbar)	$P_0$ (kbar)	$\rho_0$ (gm/cm <sup>3</sup> )	$k_0$ (kbar)	$\Psi^{(w)}$ (m <sup>3</sup> )	$\Delta m_b$	Calculation Number
0	0	—	—	3.81	40.0	0	0.5	0.6	0.116	2.4	294.4	13.88	1.2862	1
0.05	0	—	—	2.80	40.0	0	0.5	0.6	0.116	2.243	121.8	10.01	1.0104	2
0.136	0	—	—	2.44	40.0	0	0.5	0.6	0.116	2.015	66.5	7.85	0.8451	3
0.17	0	—	—	2.40	40.0	0	0.5	0.6	0.116	1.938	57.8	7.34	0.8088	4
0.19	0	—	—	2.38	40.0	0	0.5	0.6	0.116	1.895	53.8	7.09	0.7901	5
0.17	0.02	0.075	0.5	2.40	40.0	0	0.5	0.6	0.116	1.90	56.1	3.60	0.4994	6
0.17	0.05	0.075	0.5	2.40	40.0	0	0.5	0.6	0.116	1.84	52.6	2.10	0.2653	7
0.17	0.05	0.075	0.5	2.40	40.0	0	1.0	0.6	0.116	1.84	52.6	1.35	0.0734	8
0.17	0.05	0.15	0.5	2.40	40.0	0	1.0	0.6	0.116	1.84	52.6	1.48*	0.1133	9
0.17	0.02	0.075	0.5	2.40	40.0	0	0.5	0.6	0.075	1.90	56.1	4.20	0.5663	10
0.17	0.02	0.075	1.25	2.40	40.0	0	0.5	0.6	0.075	1.90	56.1	4.60	0.6059	11
0.17	0.05	0.075	0.5	2.32	40.0	0	1.0	0.6	0.116	1.84	45.7	1.31*	0.0456	12
0.17	0.05	0.075	0.5	2.25	40.0	0	1.0	0.6	0.116	1.84	39.8	1.29*	0.0257	13
0.17	0.05	0.075	0.5	2.40	42.0	0	1.0	0.6	0.116	1.84	50.0	1.28*	0.0503	14
0.17	0.05	0.075	0.5	2.40	45.0	0	1.0	0.6	0.116	1.84	46.0	1.17*	0.0113	15
0.17	0.05	0.075	0.5	2.40	40.0	0.1	1.0	0.6	0.116	1.84	52.6	1.32*	0.0637	16
0.17	0.05	0.075	0.5	2.40	40.0	0.2	1.0	0.6	0.116	1.84	52.6	1.31*	0.0604	17
0.17	0.05	0.075	0.5	2.40	40.0	1.0	1.0	0.6	0.116	1.84	52.6	1.14*	0	18
0.17	0.02	0.075	0.5	2.40	40.0	0	0.5	1.25	0.075	1.90	56.1	7.70	0.8296	19
0.17	0.02	0.075	0.5	2.40	40.0	0	0.5	0.6	0.348	1.90	56.1	2.41	0.3251	20
0.17	0.02	0.075	0.5	2.40	40.0	0	0.5	0.6	0.619	1.90	56.1	2.08	0.2612	21
0.17	0.05	0.075	0.5	2.40	40.0	0	0.75	0.6	0.116	1.84	52.6	1.51*	0.1221	22

\* Calculation performed with new source description.

reported in Table 3.1. All calculations appearing in Table 3.1 were performed with a device yield of 20 tons.

Since the elastic properties of the near source material appear in the magnitude relation, Eq. (3.2), via the P wave velocity,  $\alpha$ , it is obviously important to determine their values accurately. As can be seen from Table 3.1, a positive error in determination of  $\alpha$  would cause body wave magnitude to be over-predicted.

The steady state value of the RDP,  $\Psi(\infty)$ , which appears in the magnitude relation, Eq. (3.2), is dependent on the shock response of the near source material. Referring to Table 3.1, the near source material properties which have the most pronounced effect on the shock response are the water mass fraction,  $f_w$ , and the air-filled void fraction,  $\phi_0$ . Positive errors in either  $f_w$  or  $\phi_0$  could lead to substantial under-prediction of seismic magnitudes. The variation of seismic magnitude as a function of  $\phi_0$  is presented in Figure 3.1. Note that the introduction of air-filled voids causes a drastic reduction in seismic coupling and the importance of establishing this parameter preshot is obvious.

Seismic magnitude is not very sensitive to  $P_e$ , the elastic pressure, and  $P_c$ , the crush pressure, indicating that details in the porosity model are relatively unimportant.

Seismic magnitudes are, however, very sensitive to the parameters which describe the failure surface. If  $Y_0$ ,  $Y_m$ , or  $P_m$  are varied such that the material strength is enhanced the coupling efficiency of an explosive device is impaired. Thus, a positive error in the material strength would lead to an under-prediction of seismic magnitude.




Figure 3.1. Effect of air-filled porosity on seismic magnitude.

### 3.2 TECHNICAL REPORT NO. 2

"Teleseismic Coupling from the Simultaneous Detonation of an Array of Nuclear Explosions," Cherry, et al., February, 1976.

#### 3.2.1 Introduction

The problem addressed in this report involves the calculation of teleseismic ground motion produced by three 15 kt nuclear sources detonated simultaneously. The three sources were equally spaced 165 meters apart and were assumed to be contained, i.e., coupling effects due to cratering were not included in the analysis.

In an earlier series of calculations reported by Cherry, et al., (1975b), the region of tension failure resulting from the shock interaction of the three explosions engulfed most of the calculational grid, allowing only for qualitative estimates of the effects on seismic coupling. An improved grid was used for subsequent calculations described in Report No. 2. The discussion that follows is based on results from Report No. 2.

#### 3.2.2 Near Source Ground Motion

The techniques used to predict the teleseismic ground motion from our explosive array require that the divergence,  $\nabla \cdot \vec{S}$ , and curl,  $\nabla \times \vec{S}$ , of the displacement field be monitored over a spherical surface which is outside the nonlinear material response region. The time histories of  $\nabla \cdot \vec{S}$  and  $\nabla \times \vec{S}$  are then decomposed into a multiple expansion in spherical harmonics. This expansion provides an equivalent point source representation which may be used to quantitatively establish the seismic coupling of the array.

Figure 3.2 shows a sketch of the explosive array, the nonlinear region and the spherical surface over which  $\nabla \cdot \vec{S}$  and  $\nabla \times \vec{S}$  were monitored. The computational grid extended far enough beyond this surface so that external reflections would not obviate the free field assumption.

The tensile fracture pattern around two adjacent cavities 6.85 msec after detonation is shown in Figure 3.3. Note the "pre-splitting" between the cavities and the alteration of the fracture pattern from that expected from a spherically symmetric explosive source. This last item is illustrated dramatically in Figure 3.4 which shows the distribution of fractures in the entire grid at 11.57 msec. The fracture pattern above and to the left of the outer source is that expected from a single explosive. The alteration of this fracture pattern is caused by interaction of the stress fields from adjacent explosives.

### 3.2.3 Teleseismic Ground Motion

In order to study the far field seismic signature of an explosive event like that considered here, it is necessary to merge the nonlinear finite difference source calculations presented in the previous subsection of this report with the elastic wave propagation methods of theoretical seismology. This is done via an equivalent elastic source representation of the multiple explosion source.

The familiar reduced displacement potential, RDP, representation of a spherically symmetric explosion is an elementary equivalent elastic source. For more complex sources a representation in terms of an expansion of the outgoing displacement field in spherical harmonics is appropriate. The calculation of an equivalent elastic source in this latter form for a complex asymmetric explosion source was first accomplished by Cherry, et al. [1975a]. A detailed




Figure 3.2. Sketch of the explosive array, the resulting nonlinear region and the surface over which the properties of the outgoing displacement field were monitored.




Figure 3.3. Crack location and orientation 6.85 msec after detonation.




Figure 3.4. Complete crack location and orientation 11.57 msec after detonation.

presentation of the theory and its implementation is given by Bache, et al. [1975a].

In Figure 3.5 the amplitude of the transformed reduced velocity potential,  $|\hat{\Psi}(\omega)|$ , from the 1-D calculations is compared to the equivalent quantity for the two multiple explosions under study. The linear superposition is done by (1) scaling the source as if it were a single 45 kt explosion and (2) considering the event to be the superposition of three 15 kt explosions. Due to the cube root scaling laws, the only difference in the two is that the second representation is somewhat richer in high frequencies.

From Figure 3.5, we see that the "equivalent RDP" from the spherically symmetric portion of the multiple explosion calculation does not differ substantially from that obtained by a linear superposition of one-dimensional sources. It is interesting to note that the corner frequency for the no tensile failure calculation falls between that for the  $3 \times 15$  kt and 45 kt superposition sources. For the second calculation, with tensile failure, the "equivalent RDP" is very little different than that for the 45 kt source.

#### 3.2.4 Conclusions

Calculations performed to date have produced no significant enhancement of teleseismic ground motion from a multiple shot array. This was true in spite of the fact that the near source fracture pattern from the array differed significantly from that produced by a spherically symmetric explosion source. Fairly large perturbations in the seismic radiation pattern did appear but at frequencies outside the teleseismic band.

Enhanced tension failure did occur in the multiple shot calculation. However, for this to seriously affect teleseismic ground motion it would require an explosive




Figure 3.5. Comparison of the "equivalent RDP" representations of the multiple explosion for the calculations including the effect of tensile failure.

spacing, yield and material properties combination in which fracturing from the array is much greater than that produced by a single charge of equivalent yield.

An array in which the important parameters are optimized to significantly alter the teleseismic ground motion could probably be constructed. However, it is much more likely that anomalous observations of teleseismic ground motion from an explosive array are due to overburden effects and high (low) coupling material properties. If these factors fail to explain the anomaly, shock interaction calculations should be performed but should be based on a good estimate of material strength for the rock at the test site.

### 3.3 TECHNICAL REPORT NO. 3

"Constitutive Equations for Fluid-Saturated Porous Media", Garg, S. K., October, 1975.

#### 3.3.1 Introduction

This report describes the development of constitutive relations for fluid-saturated porous media, suitable for inclusion in standard hydrodynamic codes (e.g., CRAM or SKIPPER). The theoretical formulation is based on models for fluid-saturated rock aggregates previously developed by Garg and Nur [1973] and Garg, et al. [1975].

In the development of the constitutive model it is assumed that (1) there is no relative motion between the fluid and the solid, (2) no significant heat exchange occurs between the solid and fluid phases, and (3) porosity  $\phi$  is a function of only the mixture pressure  $P_c$  and the fluid pressure  $P_f$ . The last two assumptions may not be valid under certain field conditions and can be relaxed, although at the expense of some simplicity.

The first assumption (no fluid diffusion) is equivalent to requiring [Garg, et al., 1975] that

$$X \gg \frac{C_0 k p_0}{\phi^2 \mu_f},$$

where

- $X \sim$  length scale of interest,
- $\mu_f \sim$  fluid viscosity,
- $p_0 \sim$  density of porous media,
- $C_0 \sim$  speed of sound in porous media,
- $k \sim$  permeability of porous media, and
- $\phi \sim$  porosity.

It is straightforward to verify that the above inequality is satisfied for many field situations involving shock/seismic wave propagation in fluid-saturated porous media. This report concludes with an iterative procedure for incorporating this new constitutive model into standard hydrodynamic codes.

#### 3.4 TECHNICAL REPORT NO. 4 AND TECHNICAL REPORT NO. 5

"Prediction and Matching of Teleseismic Ground Motion (Body and Surface Waves) From the NTS MAST Explosion," Barker, et al., February, 1976.

"Comparison of Theoretical and Observed Body and Surface Waves for KASSERI, an Explosion at NTS," Bache, et al., May, 1976.

##### 3.4.1 Introduction

These reports present the results of a theoretical calculation of the teleseismic body and surface waves for the underground explosion MAST and KASSERI, and a detailed

comparison of the synthetic seismograms recorded at the stations of the Special Data Collection System (SDCS). This study is a comprehensive analysis of both explosions using computer modeling of the close-in nonlinear ground motion produced by each explosion, propagation of the resulting seismic waves through realistic earth structures and computation of synthetic seismograms at designated teleseismic stations. One of the important questions addressed by this exercise is: What pre-shot measurements of the near-source medium are required in order to predict the amplitude of the seismic signal to within some specified range?

#### 3.4.2 Explosion Source Functions

Fundamental to the prediction of teleseismic ground motion from explosions is the calculation of the explosion reduced displacement potential (RDP) which represents the source coupling into elastic waves. The coupling was computed using the one-dimensional (spherically symmetric) finite difference code, SKIPPER.

A series of source calculations were made for KASSERI and MAST. The KASSERI explosion was detonated in ash flow tuff at Area 20, Pahute Mesa. The working point was well below the water table. Standard measurements for density, grain density, overburden density, water content, saturation and P wave velocity were available.

No material strength data were available for KASSERI. Therefore, we were forced to estimate the material strength from other information. A parameter study of the effect of plausible strength variations on the seismic signal was carried out as part of the KASSERI investigation.

The amplitude of the reduced velocity potential,  $|\hat{\Psi}(\omega)|$ , is plotted in Figure 3.6 for four (146-149) KASSERI




Figure 3.6. The source function amplitudes for the tuff sources of Table 3.1 and the rhyolite source used for MAST. The source functions are all scaled to 1000 kt.

sources and the rhyolite source used for MAST. The  $\hat{\Psi}(\omega)$  is essentially the far field displacement spectrum. In fact,

$$m_b \approx \log \alpha \hat{\Psi} (1 \text{ Hz}),$$

$$M_s \approx \log \mu \hat{\Psi} (0.05 \text{ Hz}),$$

as has been demonstrated theoretically in a number of past S<sup>3</sup> reports [e.g., Bache, et al., 1975a, 1975b].

Comparing calculations 146 and 147, we see that the low strength portion of the strength curve significantly narrows the peaked portion of the spectrum while having a relatively minor effect elsewhere. Comparing 147, 148 and 149, as the strength is decreased the spectrum gets larger. Also, the peak becomes narrower and moves to lower frequencies. The MAST source exhibits behavior between that of 147 and 148.

For MAST and KASSERI the important parameters controlling the teleseismic coupling are  $\alpha = 4.2$  km/sec,  $\mu = 169$  kbar for MAST and  $\alpha = 3.1$  km/sec and  $\mu = 90$  kbar for KASSERI. These values together with the source functions in Figure 3.6 give a first estimate of the relative size of the body and surface waves for these two events. Detailed comparison of theoretical and observed seismograms is made in the following section.

### 3.4.3 Teleseismic Body Wave Predictions for KASSERI and MAST

The teleseismic body wave comparisons are shown in Figure 3.7. For each of the five SDCS stations at which theoretical seismograms were made, we show first the comparison of predicted and observed seismograms for MAST and then for KASSERI. The important result is that the agreement at each of the individual stations is well within a factor of two in amplitude.




Figure 3.7. Comparison of synthetic (left) and observed short period vertical component seismograms at five SDCS stations for the events MAST and KASSERI. The amplitude at 1 Hz is indicated at the left on each record. The bars show the cycle at which the maximum of "d" amplitude measurements were made.




Figure 3.7. (Continued)

The source crustal structures over the top two kilometers were taken from the respective Containment Evaluation Panel (CEP) reports. At greater depths the structures were taken to be the same. For the structure at the receiver an average crustal model having little effect on the seismograms was used at all the SDCS stations. For the upper mantle we chose a slightly modified version of the Helmberger and Wiggins [1971] model HWNE.

The comparison between theoretical and observed amplitudes from the seismograms of Figure 3.7 is shown in Figures 3.8 and 3.9. The data in Figure 3.8 are for the "b" phase; those in Figure 3.9 are for the maximum amplitude in the first three cycles, the "d" phase. Along with the plotted b and d amplitudes, the periods of the cycles at which these measurements were made also appear on the figures.

From the comparison of Figures 3.8 and 3.9, we can draw the following conclusions:

- The scaling of observed amplitudes between the two events is quite consistent except for RKON. We previously pointed out the marked dissimilarity in waveforms at RKON for these two events.
- The match between theoretical and observed amplitudes is about the same for the two events. The exceptional stations are RKON and FNWV. It will be very difficult to explain the RKON anomaly with present techniques since the epicentral distance variation between events is only 0.1 degrees. Waveform similarities at WH2YK, CPSO and HNME discourage attempts to attribute the anomaly to near source effects. Even in our theoretical model the interference pattern at FNWV is enough to make the b amplitude behave erratically as we see by comparing results for




Figure 3.8. Comparison of theoretical and observed b amplitudes for MAST and KASSERI at five SDCS stations. Seismograms were computed for two values of T/Q as indicated. The KASSERI source function is denoted 148 and the upper mantle model is HWNE-3.




Figure 3.9. Comparison of theoretical and observed d amplitudes for MAST and KASSERI.


the two events. However, it is unlikely that current modeling techniques, no matter how accurately used, would permit a very accurate duplication of observed records at this station.

- The scaling between the two computed source functions seems to be approximately correct. Perhaps the MAST source is slightly large compared to KASSERI.
- Differences between theoretical and observed amplitudes are less than a factor of two nearly everywhere. A goodly portion of the discrepancy can likely be attributed to inaccuracy in the upper mantle model. More extensive studies employing much more data could improve this model and therefore the agreement at individual stations.
- Changing T/Q from 0.95 to 1.05 increases the period of the phase measured by  $\approx 0.03 - 0.07$  seconds. The increase in amplitude is 15 - 25 percent.
- The periods of the b phase generally agree with the observations. If anything, they may be a little too short on the average. For the d phase the theoretical periods tend to be a bit too long.
- Clearly, the further we go into the record, the poorer the match between theory and observations. However, the further one goes into the record, the greater the effect of factors other than the coupling of explosion energy into elastic waves. Hence the emphasis on the b phase.

#### 3.4.4 Surface Wave Predictions for KASSERI and MAST

The first step in our procedure for computing explosion surface waves was to select an appropriate average crustal model for the travel path between NTS and the five SDCS stations. Basically, we began with published models that seemed appropriate, then perturbed them slightly to bring the theoretical group velocity dispersion curves and travel times into close agreement with the observed. The observed curves were computed directly from the MAST observations using the  $S^3$  data analysis program MARS [Savino, et al., 1975]. The dispersion curves for the revised models fit the observations to within 0.04 km/sec for periods between 10 and 30 seconds. The models were CIT109-A for WH2YK, MCEV-J for RKON and MCEV-B for CPSO and FNWV. The published models on which they are based are CIT109 [Archambeau, et al., 1969] and MCEV [McEvelly, 1964]. Only the model MCEV-J differs to any substantial degree from the starting model. For the attenuation we used the model of Tryggvason [1965].

Comparison of the theoretical and observed Rayleigh waves at two (HNME and RKON) of the five SDCS stations are shown in Figure 3.10 for both MAST and KASSERI. The radial and vertical components are both shown. The most important result is, as in the case of the body waves, that the scaling between the synthetic KASSERI and MAST seismograms closely matches the observed scaling. This is important because the body and surface waves sample different portions of the source spectrum and are sensitive to different properties of the source medium. The final point to note is that the agreement between the synthetic and observed seismograms in Figure 3.10 at each of the SDCS stations is well within a factor of two in amplitude and could be improved with more refined travel path models.



KASSERI

Station HNME

Figure 3.10. Comparison of theoretical and observed Rayleigh waves at five SDCS stations. Both the vertical and radial components are shown for MAST and KASSERI. The amplitude at 25 seconds is indicated on each record. The bar on the vertical records indicates the cycle at which the Airy phase amplitude was measured. The travel time for this phase is indicated on the observations by T. These values, taken from the SDCS event reports, appear to be incorrect in many cases.




Figure 3.10. (Concluded)

### 3.5 TECHNICAL REPORT NO. 6

"Teleseismic Verification of Data Exchange Yields,"  
Bache, et al., May, 1976.

#### 3.5.1 Introduction

This report addresses the possibility of directly inverting teleseismic ground motion in order to obtain explosion yield. The procedure proposed for accomplishing the inversion is to employ a deterministic model which predicts ground motion from a nuclear explosion. This procedure makes use of the information expected from data exchange packages that provide information on the near explosion source environment. Additional parameters must be inferred from other sources or determined by experiment on geophysical analogues.

This report discusses three major topics: Equivalent elastic source calculations for a wide range of rock types; the teleseismic amplitude dependence on the source, including the effects of the free surface reflected phase, pP, and the effect of upper mantle elastic properties on short period P waves.

#### 3.5.2 Equivalent Elastic Source Calculations

Several source calculations, corresponding to an explosive device yield of 150 kt at a depth of burial of approximately 560 meters, were carried out. The rock types considered ranged from a saturated NTS granite to dry shale and sandstone. Measured material properties for each of the rock types were used in the source calculations.

Figure 3.11 shows the source functions. Since there is a factor of ten difference in amplitude at 1 Hz between the maximum and minimum source functions, it is important to subdivide these sources into classes. Table 3.2 provides




Figure 3.11. Source functions for all rock types except 207.

TABLE 3.2

<u>Calculation</u>	<u>Class</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Rock Type</u>	<u><math>\alpha</math></u>	<u><math>\mu</math></u>	<u><math>\hat{\Psi}</math> (1.0)</u>
207	I	Weak, saturated	Tuff	2.4	40	19
201	II	Strong, saturated	Granite	5.3	207	12.0
203	II	Strong, saturated	Rhyolite	4.2	170	13.3
204	II	Strong, saturated	Tuff	3.1	90	11.2
206	III	Weak, dry	Shale	3.9	150	4.5
202	IV	Strong, dry	Granite	5.3	207	2.2
205	IV	Strong, dry	Sandstone	4.3	204	2.0

this separation. This source classification procedure provides a framework for using data exchange information. The steps involved are the following:

1. Classify the near source rock environment.
2. Perturb the material properties in the class to fit the given depth of burial, density, P wave velocity and, hopefully, S wave velocity.
3. Calculate the range of equivalent sources which are possible in this class. This range will include reasonable variations in material strength and air-filled porosity consistent with past experience from similar rock types.

### 3.5.3 Teleseismic Amplitude Dependence on the Source

The question addressed in this section of the report is how the source spectra translate into short period seismogram amplitudes at teleseismic ranges; that is, into  $m_b$  estimates. In order to answer this question, synthetic seismograms were computed for the range of source functions represented in Figure 3.11. The relative amplitude and frequency content of these seismograms was dependent only on the character of the source and source crustal structure, all other propagation effects held constant. These seismograms were used to examine the scaling of P wave amplitudes as a function of source material both with and without the effects of the free surface included (Figures 3.12 and 3.13).

The important conclusions drawn from this study are:

1. Given the equivalent source, then teleseismic ground motion is directly proportional to  $\alpha$ . The single most important near source material property is  $\alpha$ .




Figure 3.12. Agreement of measured synthetic seismogram amplitudes with theoretical scaling relations. No free surface reflection is included in the calculation.




Figure 3.13. Agreement of measured synthetic seismogram amplitudes with theoretical scaling relations. The free surface effect is included.

2. If possible, use the b amplitude to obtain magnitude estimates. For the yields and DOB of interest, the b phase is least contaminated by pP.

#### 3.5.4 Effects of Upper Mantle Properties on Short Period Seismograms

The distance range of particular interest here is between 20° and 36°. In this analysis synthetic seismograms were computed for this distance range with all factors held constant except the upper mantle velocity structure. The example chosen is the MAST explosion in rhyolite.

The upper mantle models studied are perturbations of models HWNE [Helmberger and Wiggins, 1971] and HWA [Wiggins and Helmberger, 1973]. The perturbations were not allowed outside the envelope of all possible models consistent with travel time, ray parameter and amplitude data for the western United States, as determined by Wiggins and Helmberger [1974]. The changes from the starting models (which are fairly different from each other) were at most 0.3 km/sec.

Synthetic seismograms appropriate for the epicentral distance from NTS to the SDCS stations RKON and HNME are shown in Figures 3.14 and 3.15. These seismograms represent the extremes of the variation observed at these stations when perturbing the models under the constraints mentioned above. The signal at RKON is affected primarily by the structure 100 km above and below the 400 km discontinuity. The HNME seismograms are primarily sensitive to the region below the 600 km discontinuity.

The b and d amplitudes were measured on each seismogram and are listed on Figures 3.14 and 3.15. At the station RKON, within the triplication range, the ratio of the maximum to minimum amplitudes is about a factor of 2-2.5, though the b phase for HWA-3B is exceptionally small. Beyond the




Figure 3.14. Variation in amplitude and waveform for three upper mantle models for MAST at station RKON. For all calculations  $T/Q = 1.05$  and a nominal LRSM response was used.




Figure 3.15. Variation in amplitude and waveform for three upper mantle models for MAST at station HNME.

triplications at HNME, the variation is less, a factor of 1.5-1.6.

The small variation in amplitude at the station beyond the triplications is reassuring. It is, to be sure, based on a limited number of model perturbations, but many of these perturbations were designed to change the amplitude at the HNME range. Any model used must be consistent with the available travel time data, etc., and these data severely constrain the velocity profile. If we assume that parallel layered models adequately represent the upper mantle for our purposes, we can be reasonably certain that errors in our knowledge of the velocity-depth profile lead to errors in our computed amplitudes that are on the order of a factor of 1.5 to 1.6.

#### IV. SUMMARY OF CURRENT RESEARCH

In this section of the report we will briefly summarize the results of work in research areas that were initiated near the end of the reporting period for this contract. This work has not been described in separate Technical Reports.

##### 4.1 EXPLOSION GROUND MOTION PREDICTIONS

The successful prediction of the teleseismic body wave signatures of explosion events involves the following:

1. Computation of the coupling of explosion energy into elastic waves.
2. Constitutive modeling of the behavior of geologic materials over the range of stresses encountered.
3. Propagation of the source-generated elastic waves to teleseismic distances.

In the following subsections we will briefly outline some results on the prediction of ground motion from explosions in different NTS settings.

##### 4.1.1 Source Modeling

In Figure 4.1 we show the equivalent elastic source for explosions detonated in a variety of NTS emplacement materials. The source function is  $\hat{\Psi}(\omega)$ , a Fourier transformed quantity that is related to the far-field displacement spectrum,  $\hat{u}(\omega)$ , in a whole space by

$$\hat{u}(\omega) = \frac{\hat{\Psi}}{R\alpha},$$

where  $R$  is distance and  $\alpha$  is P wave velocity. The key parameters distinguishing the calculations are listed in Table




Figure 4.1. Source functions for the materials specified in Table 4.1. The amplitude axis is scaled to 0.02 kt while the frequency axis is cube-root scaled to the yield indicated for each source.

4.1. They are the elastic properties, density ( $\rho$ ) and velocities ( $\alpha, \beta$ ), the air-filled porosity ( $\phi_0$ ), and the failure envelope parameters,  $Y_0$ ,  $Y_m$  and  $\bar{P}_m$ . Briefly, we have

$$\bar{P} = P - \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{J_3'}{2} \right)^{1/2}$$

where  $P$  is the pressure including the overburden and  $J_3'$  is the third deviatoric stress invariant. The meaning of the parameters  $Y_0$ ,  $Y_m$  and  $\bar{P}_m$  is illustrated in Figure 4.2.

In Figure 4.1 we see that the source functions vary over a considerable range of amplitudes for far-field yield. The body wave magnitude is related to the source function amplitude (to first order) by  $m_b \approx \alpha \hat{\Psi}(f_0)$ , where  $f_0 \approx 1$  Hz. The  $m_b$  is clearly dependent on local material properties as well as explosion yield.

#### 4.1.2 Theoretical Seismograms

The source functions of Figure 4.1 were used to synthesize short period seismogram recordings of NTS events in the appropriate materials. The yield and depth of burial of these events were also known. We had previously developed good velocity and  $Q$  models for the travel path between NTS and a receiver station at teleseismic distances which obtained good recordings of these events.

The comparison between synthetic and actual seismograms at a particular station is shown in Figure 4.3 for seven NTS explosions. The synthetic seismograms include the interference effects of the free surface reflected phase,  $pP$ . The agreement between the predicted (light line) and observed (heavy line) seismograms is quite striking. For all seven explosions, both the absolute amplitude and frequency content of the waveforms have been matched, providing confirmation of the deterministic modeling approach adopted.




Figure 4.2. Assumed relationship between the material strength ( $Y$ ) and the hydrodynamic component of stress ( $\bar{P}$ ) for small  $e/e_m$ . When  $\bar{P}$  is used for the abscissa the shock loading path has a slope of  $1-2\sigma$ .

TABLE 4.1  
MATERIAL PROPERTIES USED IN SOURCE CALCULATIONS

Rainier Mesa

$\rho$	$\alpha$	$\beta$	$\phi_0$	$Y_0$	$Y_m$	$\bar{P}_m$	<u>Source</u>
1.9	2.5	1.3	1.36	0.05	1.45	2.9	242
				0.05	0.35	2.0	246

Pahute Above

$\rho$	$\alpha$	$\beta$	$\phi_0$	$Y_0$	$Y_m$	$\bar{P}_m$	<u>Source</u>
1.91	3.28	1.9	14.5	0.115	3.1	4.7	245

Pahute Below

$\rho$	$\alpha$	$\beta$	$\phi_0$	$Y_0$	$Y_m$	$\bar{P}_m$	<u>Source</u>
2.19	3.4	2.1	0	0.16	4.3	5.6	216

Yucca Above


$\rho$	$\alpha$	$\beta$	$\phi_0$	$Y_0$	$Y_m$	$\bar{P}_m$	<u>Source</u>
1.78	1.8	1.0	14.0	0.03	0.77	1.54	244
				0.15	0.6	2.0	247

Yucca Below

$\rho$	$\alpha$	$\beta$	$\phi_0$	$Y_0$	$Y_m$	$\bar{P}_m$	<u>Source</u>
1.86	2.35	1.3	3.0	0.05	1.45	2.9	248



Paleozoic

$\rho$	$\alpha$	$\beta$	$\phi_0$	$Y_0$	$Y_m$	$\bar{P}_m$	<u>Source</u>
2.78	5.45	3.1	0	0.34	12	14.1	221, 222





Pahute Mesa Below the Water Table



Figure 4.3. Comparison of synthetic and actual (heavy line) short-period vertical recordings of NTS explosions at a range > 3500 km. The delay time between the P and pP phase for the calculations is indicated on each record.



Seismograms for Rainier Mesa Events  
(Source 242)



Yucca Flat Below Water Table



Paleozoics at Yucca Flat

Figure 4.3 (Concluded)

## 4.2 SIMULATION AND DECOMPOSITION OF MULTIPLE EXPLOSIONS

### 4.2.1 Introduction

Recently, we began experimenting with computer simulation and decomposition of multiple explosion scenarios. The objectives of this experiment are to develop procedures, based on close-in seismic measurements, for verifying the number and yields of individual explosions comprising a multiple event. We are also interested in detecting explosions that are detonated concurrently with a multiple event but are located outside the array.

### 4.2.2 Experiment Design and Data

The data selected for the first multiple event scenario consisted of close-in seismic measurements of the single, contained, underground explosion MAST detonated June 19, 1975, in the Pahute Mesa region at NTS. These data were obtained in digital format from Sandia Laboratories in Albuquerque, New Mexico, and include accelerometer and velocity gauge seismograms recorded in the distance range from ground zero to about 9 kilometers from MAST. The digital data were sampled at a rate of 500 points per second.

The explosion and recording station configuration used for the simulated multiple event are shown in Figure 4.4. The test scenario consisted of a linear array of three equivalent yield explosions, equally spaced (355 m) and detonated simultaneously. The explosion spacing of 355 m was taken as representative of row cratering shots in the yield range near 150 kt.

In the numerical simulations to be discussed herein, actual vertical component velocity recordings of the MAST explosion were used. The simulated composite velocity seismograms were constructed at each of the stations along the in-line and 45° profiles shown in Figure 4.4 by delaying



Figure 4.4. Explosion and station configuration.

and summing the actual MAST seismograms recorded at the (approximate) corresponding distances. The delays were based on the spacings between shots, the propagation velocity assumed and the azimuth to the recording station.

An example of the construction of a seismogram for a multiple event is given in Figure 4.5. This seismogram is for Station 3 along the in-line profile. On the left-hand side of Figure 4.5 we show the actual vertical component velocity seismogram recorded at Station 3 for MAST. The distance range in this case is 0.912 km. The multiple explosion time series is shown on the right-hand side of Figure 4.5. Comparing the original and composite signals we see that, except for the change in peak-to-peak signal amplitude, the superposition of the delayed signals from the three explosions results in only subtle changes in the shape of the waveform. It is quite likely that an analyst would not interpret this seismogram as that from a multiple explosion.

#### 4.2.3 Experimental Results for the Profile of Stations In-Line with the Explosion Array

In Figure 4.5 we showed the original velocity record for Station 3 located 0.912 km from MAST. We also showed the composite or summed velocity record for Station 3 on the profile in-line with the three shots. The delays are based on the spacing between shots (355 m) and a velocity of 3.8 km/sec. Hence, delay times of 0.093 seconds are appropriate ( $0.355 \text{ km} / 3.8 \text{ (km/sec)} = 0.093 \text{ sec}$ ) for all stations along this profile.

A series of 16 narrow band filters with center frequencies ( $f_c$ ) ranging from 25 to 100 Hz was applied to both the original and composite signal shown in Figure 4.5. The time series output from these filters is shown in Figure 4.6. For the original MAST record at Station 3, three major bursts of high frequency energy occur for this band of




Figure 4.5. Original MAST signal at Station 3 and composite signal along the profile in-line with the shot array.




Figure 4.6. Narrow band filtered signals (as functions of frequency and time) for the original (a) and composite (b) signals for Station 3 (Figure 4.5) along the profile in-line with the shot array.


frequencies (Figure 4.6a). The times are 0.55, 1.2 and 1.55 seconds. Since we have not attempted to interpret these records, we will not attempt to discuss the origin of these high frequency energy bursts. However, the important fact remains that there is a high signal-to-noise ratio (S/N) at these frequencies. The significance of this result is shown in Figure 4.6b when the same set of filters is applied to the composite (three explosions) event. Here the three major high frequency bursts of energy now show triple peaks where before there was only one. Separation begins at about 40 Hz and becomes increasingly clear at higher frequencies.

Using the Hilbert transform described in Savino, et al. [1975], envelope functions were constructed for each of the sixteen filter outputs. The envelope functions are shown in Figure 4.7a and b for the original and composite signals, respectively. The important point to note (Figure 4.7b) is the clear separation of the three arrivals, corresponding to the three explosions in the scenario. This separation is even more dramatic in Figure 4.8b, where the sum of the envelopes at the different frequencies (Figure 4.7b) is plotted for the composite signal. A similar sum is plotted for comparison in Figure 4.8a for the original signal.

The time separations of the maximum power arrivals between 1.0 and 1.4 seconds in Figure 4.8b correspond as well as can be determined to the time delays (0.093 seconds) associated with the equal spacings of the three simulated bombs. In addition, note that while the amplitude of the composite signal in Figure 4.5 is more than twice the amplitude of the original signal in Figure 4.5, each peak in the composite envelope sum is nearly equal in amplitude to the peak amplitude of the original unsummed signal.

Similar results are obtained for Stations 2 and 4 in this profile. Again, three major high frequency energy levels are observed. Separation due to the three explosions

Filter Envelopes  
- Original Signal



Filter Envelopes  
- Composite Signal





Figure 4.7. Envelope functions (as functions of frequency and time) for narrow band filtered original (a) and composite (b) signals for Station 3 (Figure 4.4) along the profile in-line with the shot array.

Sum of Envelopes  
- Original Signal



Sum of Envelopes  
- Composite Signal




Figure 4.8. Sum of the envelopes shown in Figure 4.7 for the original (a) and composite (b) signals for Station 3 along the profile in-line with the shot array.

occurs at about 40 Hz and becomes more distinct with increasing frequency. Average time separation of the triple peaks is 0.093 and 0.093 seconds, respectively. The observed delay times correspond almost exactly to the input delay times (Table 4.2).

For Stations 5, 6 and 7, high frequency noise dominates the records and the high frequency signal energy, if present, is too low level to obtain any definitive results.

#### 4.2.4 Experimental Results for the Profile of Stations 45° from the Explosion Array

Composite or summed seismograms were synthesized for the stations oriented at a 45° azimuth from the explosion array. Delay times were determined relative to the center explosion position (number 2 in Figure 4.4) and are listed in Table 4.2. The delay times vary and are less than those for the in-line array. At those Stations (2-4) where noise was not a problem, the input and observed delays agree to 1 msec or better.

#### 4.2.5 Summary and Discussion

Close-in seismic data obtained from Sandia for the underground nuclear explosion MAST have been used to simulate a simple multiple explosion. This multiple explosion consisted of three equal sized (150 kt) aligned explosions (separated by 355 m) detonated at the same instant. Two profiles were simulated, one in-line with the explosion array and the other oriented at 45° to the explosion array. Seismic records for the multiple event were synthesized by simple summation of one MAST seismic record to the same record with appropriate delay times. The determination of the delay times was based on the orientation of the two hypothetical station arrays relative to the explosion array, actual station distances from MAST and a compressional velocity of 3.8 km/sec.

TABLE 4.2  
 INPUT DELAY TIMES VERSUS OBSERVED DELAY TIMES

Shot Station	Input Delay Times For Stations In-Line With Shot Array (sec)	Observed Delay Times For Stations In-Line With Shot Array (sec)	Input Delay Times For Stations Along 45° Profile Relative to Shot #2 (sec)	Observed Delay Times For Stations Along 45° Profile Relative to Shot #2 (sec)
2	1-2 0.093	1-2 0.091	1-2 0.034	1-2 0.034
	2-3 0.093	2-3 0.093	2-3 0.076	2-3 0.076
3	0.093	0.093	0.053	0.052
4	0.093	0.092	0.061	0.060
5	0.093	--	0.062	--
6	0.093	--	0.063	--
7	0.093	--	0.064	--

Application of a series of cusp-shaped narrow band filters, with center frequencies ( $f_c$ ) ranging from 25 Hz to 160 Hz, to the synthesized multiple explosion records yielded the following results:

- Accurate relative amplitude and time separation between explosions was achieved at the very close stations and, in particular, at distances of less than 1.5 kilometers. Beyond 1.5 kilometers the signal-to-noise ratio is too low in the high frequency band of analysis to obtain definitive results.
- Separation between explosions was observed to begin at frequencies 3.5 times the explosion frequency (inverse of the explosion delay times). In general, separation of events becomes more distinct with increasing frequency.

## V. REFERENCES

- Archambeau, C. B., E. A. Flinn and D. G. Lambert [1969], "Fine Structure of the Upper Mantle," *J. Geophys. Res.*, 74, pp. 5825-5865.
- Bache, T. C., J. T. Cherry, K. G. Hamilton, J. F. Masso and J. M. Savino [1975a], "Application of Advanced Methods for Identification and Detection of Nuclear Explosions from the Asian Continent," Systems, Science and Software Semi-Annual Technical Report, AFOSR, SSS-R-75-2646, May.
- Bache, T. C., J. T. Cherry, N. Rimer, J. M. Savino, T. R. Blake, T. G. Barker and D. G. Lambert [1975b], "An Explanation of the Relative Amplitudes of the Teleseismic Body Waves Generated by Explosions in Different Test Areas at NTS," Systems, Science and Software Final Report, DNA, SSS-R-76-2746, October.
- Cherry, J. T., T. C. Bache and D. F. Patch [1975a], "The Teleseismic Ground Motion Generated by a Nuclear Explosion Detonated in a Tunnel and Its Effect on the  $M_s/m_b$  Discriminant," Systems, Science and Software Final Report, DNA 3958F, May.
- Cherry, J. T., T. C. Bache and W. O. Wray [1975b], "Teleseismic Ground Motion from Multiple Underground Nuclear Explosions," Systems, Science and Software Technical Report, AFTAC/VSC, SSS-R-75-2709, September.
- Garg, S. K. and A. Nur [1973], "Effective Stress Laws for Fluid-Saturated Porous Rocks," *J. Geophys. Res.*, 78, pp. 5911-5921.
- Garg, S. K., D. H. Brownell, Jr., J. W. Pritchett and R. G. Herrmann [1975], "Shock-Wave Propagation in Fluid-Saturated Porous Media," *J. Appl. Phys.*, 46, pp. 702-713.
- HelMBERger, D. V. and R. A. Wiggins [1971], "Upper Mantle Structure of the Midwestern United States," *J. Geophys. Res.*, 76, pp. 3229-3245.
- McEvilly, T. V. [1964], "Central U. S. Crust-Upper Mantle Structure from Love and Rayleigh Wave Velocity Inversion," *Bull. Seism. Soc. Am.*, 54, pp. 1997-2016.

Savino, J. M., T. C. Bache, J. T. Cherry, K. G. Hamilton, D. G. Lambert and J. F. Masso [1975], "Application of Advanced Methods for Identification and Detection of Nuclear Explosions from the Asian Continent," Systems, Science and Software Semi-Annual Technical Report, AFOSR, SSS-R-76-2792, December.

Tryggvason, E. [1965], "Dissipation of Rayleigh Wave Energy," J. Geophys. Res., 70, pp. 1449-1455.

Wiggins, R. A. and D. V. Helmberger [1973], "Upper Mantle Structure of the Western United States," J. Geophys. Res., 78, pp. 1870-1888.

Wiggins, R. A. and D. V. Helmberger [1974], "Synthetic Seismogram Computation by Expansion in Generalized Rays," Geophys. J., 37, pp. 73-90.

## APPENDIX A

LIST OF REPORTS FROM CONTRACT NO.  
F08606-75-C-0045A. QUARTERLY REPORTS

1. Cherry, J. T., N. Rimer, J. M. Savino and W. O. Wray [1975], "Improved Yield Determination and Event Identification Research," Systems, Science and Software Quarterly Technical Report, AFTAC/VSC, SSS-R-75-2696, August.
2. Savino, J. M., T. C. Bache, T. G. Barker, J. T. Cherry and W. O. Wray [1975], "Improved Yield Determination and Event Identification Research," Systems, Science and Software Quarterly Technical Report, AFTAC/VSC, SSS-R-76-2788, November.
3. Savino, J. M. [1976], "Improved Yield Determination and Event Identification Research," Systems, Science and Software Quarterly Technical Report, AFTAC/VSC, SSS-R-76-2870, February.
4. Bache, T. C., T. G. Barker, J. T. Cherry, N. Rimer and J. M. Savino [1976], "Explosion Source Modeling, Seismic Waveform Prediction and Yield Verification Research," Systems, Science and Software Quarterly Technical Report, AFTAC/VSC, SSS-R-76-2924, May.
5. Lambert, D. G., C. F. Petersen and J. M. Savino [1976], "Explosion Yield Verification, Multiple Explosion Scenarios and Three-Dimensional Seismic Modeling Research," Systems, Science and Software Quarterly Technical Report, AFTAC/VSC, SSS-R-76-2993, August.

B. TECHNICAL REPORTS

1. Cherry, J. T., N. Rimer and W. O. Wray [1975], "Seismic Coupling from a Nuclear Explosion: The Dependence of the Reduced Displacement Potential on the Nonlinear Behavior of the Near Source Rock Environment," Systems, Science and Software Technical Report, AFTAC/VSC, SSS-R-76-2742, September.
2. Garg, S. K. [1975], "Constitutive Equations for Fluid-Saturated Porous Media," Systems, Science and Software Topical Report, AFTAC/VSC, SSS-R-76-2766, October.

3. Cherry, J. T., T. C. Bache, W. O. Wray and J. F. Masso [1976], "Teleseismic Coupling from the Simultaneous Detonation of an Array of Nuclear Explosions," Systems, Science and Software Topical Report, AFTAC/VSC, SSS-R-76-2865, February.
4. Barker, T. G., T. C. Bache, J. T. Cherry, N. Rimer and J. M. Savino [1976], "Prediction and Matching of Teleseismic Ground Motion (Body and Surface Waves) From the NTS MAST Explosion," Systems, Science and Software Topical Report, AFTAC/VSC, SSS-R-76-2727, February.
5. Bache, T. C., T. G. Barker, N. Rimer and J. M. Savino [1976], "Comparison of Theoretical and Observed Body and Surface Waves from KASSERI, and Explosion at NTS," Systems, Science and Software Topical Report, AFTAC/VSC, SSS-R-76-2937, May.
6. Bache, T. C. T. G. Barker, J. T. Cherry and J. M. Savino [1976], "Teleseismic Verification of Data Exchange Yields," Systems, Science and Software Topical Report, AFTAC/VSC, SSS-R-76-2941, May.