

# Penrose Report: Geological Fingerprints of Slow Earthquakes

## CONVENERS

**James Kirkpatrick**, *McGill University, Department of Earth and Planetary Sciences, Montréal, Québec, Canada, james.kirkpatrick@mcgill.ca*

**John Platt**, *University of Southern California, Department of Earth Sciences, Los Angeles, California, USA*

**David Schmidt**, *University of Washington, Department of Earth and Space Sciences, Seattle, Washington, USA*

**Melodie French**, *Rice University, Dept of Earth, Environmental and Planetary Sciences, Houston, Texas, USA*

**Christie Rowe**, *McGill University, Department of Earth and Planetary Sciences, Montréal, Québec, Canada*

## INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this Penrose Conference was to bring together a multi-disciplinary group of scientists to debate how geological evidence can contribute toward understanding why slow earthquakes occur and to explain their characteristics. Slow earthquakes are a family of fault and shear zone slip events that include slow slip events (SSEs), tectonic tremor, and low frequency earthquakes (LFEs). In some systems these different events occur together, and they are known as episodic tremor and slip, or “ETS”. Compared to earthquakes, the slip across a fault during a slow earthquake occurs slowly, but significantly faster than plate-rate creep. Slow earthquakes are numerous, appear to contribute significantly to the overall slip budget in portions of plate boundary faults, and may elucidate stress transfer between portions of plate boundaries with different locking patterns. Understanding slow earthquakes is therefore critical to better constrain regional seismic hazards and may also inform us of the physical conditions and fault loading rates at depth.

The conference was held April 1-5, 2022, at the USC Wrigley Institute for Environmental Studies on Pimu (Santa Catalina Island), California, where the exceptional exposures and structural complexity of the Catalina Schist provided inspiration for the discussions. Forty-seven attendees, including around 45% early career scientists, traveled from eight different countries including Canada, Germany, Japan, Italy, the Netherlands, New Zealand, and the UK. The meeting launched with a series of keynote talks presenting cutting-edge perspectives on slow earthquakes from seismological, geodetic, experimental, modeling, and geological communities. The subsequent breakout discussion sessions and poster sessions at the meeting were devoted to research presentations from the participants, framing relevant hypotheses that explain slow earthquakes, and debating how geological evidence can be leveraged to test those hypotheses.

A day-long field trip taking in exposures of the Catalina Schist that were metamorphosed and deformed under conditions similar to where some slow earthquakes occur today informed much

of the meeting discussions. Exposures included a mélangé and a sheeted vein complex in the Catalina Blueschist Unit, which focused attention on controls on fluid pressure, coupling between metamorphic and structural processes, the importance of mechanical heterogeneity during deformation, and the rates at which veining/fracture and distributed deformation occur. In the Catalina Amphibolite Unit, blocks of mafic and ultramafic rocks in a metasomatized matrix attested to fluid-rock interaction and the accompanying progressive changes in rock rheology leading to mechanical heterogeneity.

The keynote presentations emphasized that the well-resolved source parameters of slow earthquakes (e.g.  $\sim 10^{-7}$  m/s slip rate, km/day rupture propagation rate, and  $\sim 10$  kPa stress drop for SSEs) are distinct from regular earthquakes. Furthermore, to first order the geodetic and seismic records of slow earthquakes appear to be similar, regardless of tectonic setting or depth of the slip event. A broadly held view was that because the SSEs accommodate substantially more of the plate motion budget and exhibit much larger seismic moments than LFEs, SSEs are the dominant member of the slow earthquake family and should be the focus of future efforts to understand the physics of slow slip. However, some participants argued that the LFE components of SSE were the best-resolved geophysically, and should be instrumental in driving more specific comparisons to geologic features. The breakout discussions therefore explored the significance of existing geological observations and the future research needs from geological work in two themes:

*1. Is there any process, condition, or structure common to slow earthquakes that could explain their characteristics?*

The consistent geodetic and seismological characteristics of slow slip suggests there may be a common process or set of conditions at the sources of SSEs and possibly another for tectonic tremor and LFEs. Attendees debated if and how grain-scale deformation mechanisms, deformation structure geometry, and deformation conditions (e.g. effective pressure, temperature etc.) could be different across the range of slow earthquake occurrences but combine to yield similar slip phenomena. A combination of deformation mechanisms involving frictional sliding plus some viscous-type mechanism likely promotes slow earthquakes. Further work is needed to determine how the two mechanisms interact and are preserved in the rock record, recognizing that both the interactions and the preservation may vary between different SSE settings. Attendees agreed that geological field observations from slow earthquake source depths indicate the deformation associated with these events likely affects a volume rather than a planar or quasi-planar surface, which is also allowed by the geophysical constraints. Heterogeneity is ubiquitous but further work is needed to determine what structures or rheological contrasts are relevant to slow slip. Although slow slip phenomena occur over a broad range of metamorphic conditions, attendees noted that low effective stresses promote slow slip by driving slip toward frictionally-neutral stability, though low effective stresses alone cannot explain why slow slip occurs rather than regular earthquakes. More detailed analyses of slow earthquake sources in places with well-constrained thermal structures should be undertaken to connect the deformation conditions with slow earthquake characteristics.

## *2. How can geological observations test the slow earthquake hypotheses?*

Multiple hypotheses have been proposed that can explain how slip velocities during slow earthquakes are limited, thereby differentiating them from regular earthquakes. Many of the hypotheses are developed from the rate and state friction framework, and are supported by laboratory rock friction experiments. Others call for coupled frictional-viscous deformation. The relevance to natural systems is largely untested. Attendees examined the hypotheses and asked what geological structures might serve as records that the hypothesized mechanisms were active in ancient slow earthquakes, what geological features would lead the hypothesis to be rejected, and whether there are new geological observations that should be collected to test the hypotheses. For most hypotheses there are both deformation structures that are predicted to be consistent with the hypothesis and characteristics of deformed rocks that would reject the hypothesis. Some, such as a specific velocity-neutral condition and a dislocation creep-based mechanism might be indistinguishable from perceived “steady-state” structures. Work is needed from both the observational and geological communities to reconcile the relevant scales of deformation process and structures so that future field and microscale observations can contribute positively toward understanding slow slip.

### **CONSENSUS**

Ultimately, the breakout discussions concluded that no signature has been identified in the rock record of shear offset slip faster than plate-rate creep, but which does not radiate seismic waves. Overcoming this barrier may depend on a combination and linkage of deformation-related features, rather than a “smoking gun” (in contrast to frictional heat anomalies which record seismic slip). Defining the mechanisms accommodating slow slip is important for informing the physics of slow slip, but will likely require definition of different geological signatures in different settings. Future cross-disciplinary studies are needed to reconcile the observations of active slow slip with the rock record. This type of work will benefit from a clarification of terminology so that aspects of the deformation associated with slow slip can be compared across fields. The Penrose attendees are developing a set of papers to address these next steps and will invite community participation.

### **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

The 2022 Penrose Conference met on Pimu (Catalina Island), ancestral home of the Gabrielino/Tongva Nation, the Juaneño Band of Mission Indians Acjachemen Nation, and the Payómkawichum (Luiseño) nations. This conference was made possible thanks to financial support from the Geological Society of America, the National Science Foundation GeoPRISMS program, and the Southern California Earthquake Center (SCEC). We thank GSA meeting manager Becky Sundeen for organizational and administrative support during the challenging planning process and the staff at the Wrigley Center for their huge efforts.

## **PARTICIPANTS**

Alexis Ault, Nick Beeler, Maia Cohen, Cailey Condit, Meghomita Das, Sara De Caroli, Eric Dunham, Åke Fagereng, Melodie French, Joan Gomborg, Djordje Grujic, Shuoshuo Han, Kayleigh Harvey, Jessica Hawthorne, Greg Hirth, Will Hoover, Charis Horn, Matt Ikari, Jamie Kirkpatrick, Alissa Kotowski, Peter Lindquist, Xi Lu, Olivia Marcelli, Shea McLafferty, Tim Melbourne, Francesca Meneghini, Margo Odlum, Kristina Okamoto, Daniel Ortega-Arroyo, Zhigang Peng, Sarah Penniston-Dorland, Sandra Piazzolo, John Platt, Jacqueline Reber, Emily Roland, Christie Rowe, Heather Savage, David Schmidt, Susan Schwartz, Caroline Seyler, Chris Thom, Kohtaro Ujiie, Laura Wallace, Jessica Warren, Randy Williams, Stuart Williams, Baoning Wu.



Photo credit: Daniel Ortega-Arroyo.