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INTRODUCTION

The University of Utah Seismograph Stations (UUSS) operates regional seismic networks in and around Utah and Yellowstone National Park and provides routine earthquake locations and earthquake catalogs for these two areas (Pechmann et al., 2007). In this study, we expand the reporting to include moment tensors for seismic events occurring in the Utah region (Fig. 1). This region is a complex seismic environment with diverse source types: tectonic earthquakes, mining-induced seismicity (MIS) including mine collapses, and man-made sources such as explosions. Most tectonic earthquakes in the region occur within the Intermountain Seismic Belt (ISB; Smith and Arabasz, 1991). In northern Utah, the ISB roughly delineates the boundary between the Basin and Range and the Middle Rocky Mountains, whereas in central and southern Utah, the ISB separates the actively extending Basin and Range from the more stable Colorado Plateau. The MIS is mostly associated with long-wall coal mining in central Utah (Fig. 1; Arabasz et al., 2007). The man-made blasts occur throughout the state and are related to both surface mining operations and military munitions detonations (Arrowsmith et al., 2008).

Moment tensor inversion relies on broadband data and is usually possible for Utah seismic events of local magnitude ($M_L$) 3.5 and greater occurring after 1997. The first broadband instruments in the Utah region were installed in the mid-1990s, but this network was sparse. Prior to 1998, there were moment tensors for either large events, such as the 1992 $M_w$ 5.5 St. George earthquake (Ritsema and Lay, 1995), or select events in northern Utah that were part of a 1994–1998 moment tensor catalog of the Pacific Northwest (Oregon State University).

Our aim is to develop a catalog of $M_L \geq 3.5$ regional moment tensors for the Utah region, allowing us to quantify and distinguish source types, gain a better understanding of the regional seismotectonics, improve upon current focal-depth information from network travel times, and enlarge the number of reliable estimates of moment magnitude ($M_w$) for use in seismic hazard analyses. In this paper, we (1) evaluate a suite of velocity models for suitability in the Utah regional moment tensor inversion; (2) calculate moment tensors for events in the Utah region with $M_L$ 3.5 or greater from 1998 to mid-2011, extending to smaller events in a few select cases; and (3) evaluate all events for the presence of a significant isotropic component using a statistical F-test.

DATA PREPARATION AND METHODOLOGY

We implement the time-domain, full-waveform, least-squares moment tensor inversion of Minson and Dreger (2008), which is capable of calculating the full moment tensor, including double-couple, compensated linear vector dipole, and isotropic components. This method is well established and has been widely used in regional moment tensor studies worldwide, including South Africa (Brandt and Saunders, 2011), New Zealand (Ristau, 2008), Japan (Kubo et al., 2002), and Brazil (Assumpção et al., 2011). The full moment tensor capability of this method has been utilized to determine whether certain events have isotropic components, such as known and suspected nuclear explosions (Dreger and Woods, 2002; Ford et al., 2009; Shin et al., 2010), suspected mine-collapse events (Ford et al., 2008), source processes of volcanic events (Dreger et al., 2000; Templeton and Dreger, 2006; Cannata et al., 2009), and glacial icequakes (Walter et al., 2009, 2010). This ability to determine a volume-change component is especially important for the mining areas in Utah, where implosive events can occur (Fletcher and McGarr, 2005; Ford et al., 2008).

Moment tensors for each event are determined by matching synthetic and data waveforms. Green’s functions are calculated using frequency–wavenumber integration (Saikia, 1994) and then combined linearly into synthetics, in which the moment tensor elements determine the relative contribution of each fundamental Green’s function to the final synthetic seismogram. Broadband three-component data from at least two stations are instrument corrected to displacement and downsampled to 1 sample/s, after which the horizontal components are rotated into radial and transverse directions. A band-pass filter of either 10–20 s (for $M_L < 4.5$) or 20–50 s (for $M_L \geq 4.5$) is then applied to both the data and the Green’s functions; the long-period filter allows for a point-source assumption. Typically, a post-filter signal-to-noise ratio (SNR)
of 3/1 is considered to eliminate noisy stations. Synthetic seismograms are shifted in time to best correlate with the data. These small time adjustments ($dt$) are necessary at each station to account for inaccuracies in the 1D velocity model. All three components at one station have the same $dt$ value, and $dt$ is limited to half of the shortest period in the filter or to 5 s.

To determine an optimum depth for each event, a suite of inversions at fixed depths is calculated, and the depth corresponding to the inversion with the highest variance reduction (VR), a measure of goodness of fit, is selected.

$$VR = \left(1 - \sum_i \frac{\sqrt{(d_i - s_i)^2}}{\sqrt{d_i^2}}\right) \times 100, \quad (1)$$

in which $d_i$ and $s_i$ are the data and synthetic waveforms, respectively, at time $i$. A higher VR indicates a better fit of the synthetics to the data, with VR = 100% indicating a perfect fit. In this study, we require a minimum VR of 70% for a successful solution. Another measure of fit that can be used to constrain depth and is applicable when an isotropic component is not expected (an isotropic component can be ruled out by a statistical $F$-test, which will be discussed later) is the ratio of the residual to percent double couple (res/Pdc). Figure 2 illustrates the difference between VR and res/Pdc in an example from event number 43 (Ⓒ Table S1 in the supplement).

$$\frac{\text{res}}{\text{Pdc}} = \frac{\sum_i \sqrt{(d_i - s_i)^2}}{\text{Pdc}}. \quad (2)$$

Although VR may be flat over a range of depths, res/Pdc typically has a more distinct minimum. VR is used to determine the overall suitability of the solution, whereas res/Pdc is often used to determine depth. The maximum VR and minimum res/Pdc often coincide at the same or similar depth.

Before routine moment tensor processing began, we performed a quality assessment of the installed software and our processing methods. Using sample datasets and moment tensor solutions provided with the software, we ensured that we could match the example solutions.
Three velocity models are tested in this study, including one with two specified regions of applicability (Fig. 3). SONG (Song et al., 1996) is a simple model consisting of two layers over a half-space and has been used successfully for moment tensors in Utah (Ford et al., 2008) and Nevada (Dreger and Woods, 2002; Ford et al., 2009). WUS is based on a velocity model used by the UUSS to locate earthquakes in the Yellowstone region, with adjustments to fit surface-wave dispersion curves, and has been used in the western United States, including Utah, for regional moment tensor inversion (Herrmann, Benz, and Ammon, 2011). UUmod is the velocity model used at UUSS for earthquake location (Roller, 1965; Keller et al., 1975; Richins et al., 1987). UUmod is based on P-wave refraction and consists of two 1D velocity models: (1) UUmod(BR) for events in the Basin and Range, transition zone to the Colorado Plateau, and Middle Rocky Mountain and (2) UUmod (CP) for events in the Colorado Plateau (Fig. 1). Attenuation (Q) for WUS can be found in the paper of Herrmann, Benz, and Ammon (2011), and Q-values for SONG are from Patton and Taylor (1984). UUmod Q-values are based on the WUS values.

We evaluate the three velocity models by calculating three full moment tensors for every event, one for each velocity model, using the same data for each of the three inversions, that is, same stations and same data window at each station. For each event, the VR resulting from inversions using the different velocity models is then evaluated as a ratio for the three model pairs: WUS/UUmod, SONG/UUmod, and WUS/SONG. The VRs for each model pair are ordered in decreasing value, assigned a sequential event number (from highest to lowest VR ratio; note that this event number does not match that in Table S1 in the supplement), and plotted as shown in Figure 4. Note that the resulting event numbers for each model pair differ, so events are not represented in the same order on the three ratio plots in Figure 4. If more events are above the equal ratio line (γ = 1), then the numerator model has better VR results than those of the denominator model. Figure 4a and Figure 4b show that WUS and SONG produce better results than do the UUmod for a majority of events (75% and 66%, respectively). Furthermore, Figure 4c shows that WUS produces better results than does SONG for 68% of events. Because the assignment of a submodel (BR or CP) when using UUmod is based on epicentral location, the effect of regional sensitivity between these two submodels is also tested. In Figure 4a and Figure 4b, VR ratios using UUmod(BR) are plotted with black symbols and those using UUmod(CP), with gray. WUS produces better results than does UUmod(CP) in all cases, but SONG compared with UUmod(CP) yields better results for only about half of these events.

Events were also sorted north to south and east to west to look for geographic sensitivities, and it was found that SONG performs poorly in the eastern domain compared with the other two models, which could indicate that SONG is not appropriate for the Colorado Plateau. Because SONG was developed for the Basin and Range, its poor performance in a different geologic province is not unexpected. The north-south analysis revealed that UUmod performs best in the northern part of our study area. One possible explanation for the lower VR from UUmod compared with WUS and SONG is that the P-wave refraction analyses used to develop UUmod are less sensitive to the shallow, low-velocity layer that controls the Rayleigh waves, which dominate the moment tensor inversion at long periods (Song et al., 1996). In summary, WUS results in the highest VR for most events, and for consistency, this model is used for the catalog presented here and will be used in future moment tensor inversions at UUSS.

**STATISTICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE ISOTROPIC COMPONENT**

We calculate full and deviatoric moment tensors for each event and then use a statistical F-test to determine whether each event has a significant isotropic component. The F-test compares the variance between a full and a deviatoric moment tensor weighted by the ratio of the degrees of freedom (DOF) in the inversion.

\[
\text{DOF} = \sum_{i} \left( \frac{p m}{f_c} \right) - n - 1, \tag{3}
\]

in which \( p \) is the number of data points, \( s \) is the number of stations, \( m \) is the number of components, \( f_c \) is the filter corner frequency in seconds, and \( n \) is the number of unknowns in the

---

**Figure 3.** Velocity models used in this study. For UUmod, different 1D models are shown: BR for the Basin and Range, transition zone region, and Middle Rocky Mountains and CP for the Colorado Plateau. Black line, \( V_p \); gray line, \( V_S \).
inversion (Dreger et al., 2000; Panning et al., 2001; Dreger and Woods, 2002; Templeton and Dreger, 2006). Because \( f_c \) is expressed in seconds rather than hertz, DOF decreases with a lower frequency filter. Using the ratio of variances (\( F \)-ratio; Menke, 1989) and degrees of freedom, a critical \( F \)-value is calculated. Because the number of points used at each station varies depending on data quality and event size, the degrees of freedom and therefore critical \( F \)-values vary with each event. From the critical \( F \)-value for each event, the statistical significance of the solution with greater VR but more DOF is calculated using routines in MATLAB (2009). \( F \)-test results are included with the event parameters (see Table S1 in the supplement). Panning et al. (2001) used synthetic data with known input sources to investigate the resolvability of isotropic moment tensor components and found that sources with no isotropic input have \( F \)-test results at the 75% confidence level or less, and sources with true isotropic input have \( F \)-test results at the 99% confidence level. Two events in our study (numbers 10 and 32, both \( F \)-tests 100%, Table S1 in the supplement) meet the criteria for isotropic component significance and will be discussed in detail in the next section.

**RESULTS**

Using the WUS velocity model, moment tensor inversions for all events in the UUSS catalog for the Utah region from 1998 to mid-2011 reported with \( M_L \geq 3.5 \) are attempted, and successful solutions for 44 of 63 events are obtained (70%). The resulting source parameters for these 44 successful events and 4 additional events with \( M_L < 3.5 \) are presented in Table S1 (see supplement). Waveform fits for each event are available as an electronic supplement to this paper. The moment tensor results show focal mechanisms ranging from normal to strike slip (Fig. 5, as well as the 48 waveform fit figures in the electronic supplement). Figure 6 is a histogram of counts of attempted and successful events by event magnitude. Unsuccessful attempts are due to poor station coverage, large event-to-station distances (primarily before broadband-station coverage increased in the area), strong microseism noise, or telsisim interference. For example, a \( M_L \) 4.0 earthquake in 2009 was contaminated with low-frequency energy from a \( M_w \) 5.6 earthquake in Mexico. More often, poor SNR at the frequencies used for moment tensor inversion is the cause of failed attempts for smaller events.

We are able to obtain moment tensors for four events with \( M_L < 3.5 \). In these cases, there are two or more stations within 85 km of the epicenter, and fortuitously, the microseism amplitudes are relatively low. The \( M_L < 3.5 \) events are attempted as special cases rather than as part of the routine moment tensor processing, so we do not include them in our completeness statistics and they are not represented in Figure 6. The special cases include two small events in regions of known MIS and two events that generated significant public interest. Focal mechanisms for these smaller events are shown in blue in Figure 5.

**DISCUSSION**

We use \( T \)-axes from moment tensors in this study to examine stress orientations in the Utah region and compare our results with those of other studies. \( T \)-axes for the focal mechanisms

![Figure 4. Comparison of VR ratios versus event number for combinations of the three primary velocity models. For each model pair, the event number represents a sequential ordering of VR ratios from highest to lowest. VR > 1.0 indicates that the numerator model in the ratio produces better results; vertical lines demarcate the change from VR > 1 to VR < 1. In panels a and b, black lines denote UUmod(BR) and gray line denote UUmod(CP).](image-url)
shown in Figure 5 are plotted as black arrows in Figure 7 and reveal a difference in stress orientation between the Basin and Range (western and central Utah) and the Colorado Plateau (eastern Utah and western Colorado). Gray arrows in Figure 7 are $T$-axes from the World Stress Map Project (e.g., Heidbach et al., 2009 and references therein), a compilation of many studies that, in the data represented here, includes stress orientations from single earthquake focal mechanisms, geologic fault-slip data, and borehole breakouts. The $T$-axes from our study are consistent with the World Stress Map compilation data.

Along the ISB, $T$-axes indicate roughly east–west extension in northern and central Utah, with a rotation to northwest–southeast extension, perpendicular to the Basin and Range–Colorado Plateau boundary in southwestern Utah. The rotation in $T$-axes in southwestern Utah corresponds with an increase in strike-slip and oblique mechanisms (Fig. 5). Arabasz et al. (2007) noted that heterogeneous focal mechanisms in the Basin and Range–Colorado Plateau transition in south-central Utah are suggestive of a transitional stress regime between normal and strike-slip faulting, in which the vertical and horizontal maximum compressive stresses are similar in magnitude and the orientation of maximum compressive stress may interchange from event to event. The change in stress orientation in southwestern Utah has also been noted by Pankow et al. (2009), who suggested that the rotation of $T$-axes is the result of partitioning of extension across preexisting transform structures (e.g., Duebendorfer and Black, 1992; Rowley et al., 1997).
Kreemer et al. (2010) proposed that these transform structures and associated seismicity provide evidence for a kinematic connection in southern Nevada between the ISB and the Eastern California shear zone.

We briefly compare our results with two other moment tensor catalogs with which we have solutions in common: (1) a double-couple moment tensor study of North America by Herrmann, Benz, and Ammon (2011; 27 common events) and (2) a mid-1990s moment tensor study of the Pacific Northwest (Oregon State University; three common events). We focus the comparison on the Herrmann, Benz, and Ammon (2011) study because of the larger number of common events and because the North American study is more recent and ongoing. We find two (numbers 10 and 32, Table S1 in the supplement) of the 27 events in common with Herrmann, Benz, and Ammon (2011) to have significant isotropic components and therefore leave them out of the comparison. Of the remaining 25 solutions, 13 (52%) have $T$-axes within 10° of each other, 20 (80%) within 20°, and five with dissimilar $T$-axes (>20° difference). Of the five solutions with dissimilar $T$-axes, two (numbers 1 and 13, Table S1 in the supplement) appear to be due to a significant difference in best-depth selection; for the other three (numbers 11, 22, and 27, Table S1 in the supplement), the solutions are comparable, but there are significant rotations in the dips of the nodal planes. Figure 8 shows the close agreement in $M_w$ between this study and Herrmann, Benz, and Ammon (2011). All three events in common with the Pacific Northwest study have $T$-axes within 20% of each other.

One event (number 12) in our study is a velocity model special case. The event occurred in western Colorado on the far eastern edge of the UUSS monitoring region in 2000, before the regional broadband network was very extensive. Only two available stations recorded adequate data, although the event is fairly large at $M_L$ 4.3. One station is to the east in central Colorado and the other to the west in central Utah. Usually, one velocity model is suitable for all stations in the moment tensor inversion, but for this event, data at the Colorado station are much better fit by UUmod(CP) and at the Utah station, by WUS (Fig. 9). By using Green’s functions from the better-fitting model at each station, a successful moment tensor is obtained. Despite our preference to use a single velocity model for simplicity in routine processing, this event demonstrates the utility of using multiple velocity models when necessary.

We compare $M_w$ from this study with $M_L$ from the UUSS catalog (Fig. 10). Moment magnitudes in this study, computed using the standard Hanks and Kanamori (1979) relation, range from 3.2 to 4.6. The plot of $M_w$ versus $M_L$ shows little systematic bias, and the standard deviation from a line of $x = y$ is 0.2. Pechmann et al. (2007) similarly compared $M_w$ calculated as part of multiple studies using multiple techniques with $M_L$ from the UUSS catalog. They found systematic differences between the UUSS network $M_L$ and the aggregate compilation of $M_w$ but acknowledge that the differences could...
be due to the multiple methods and velocity models used to calculate the $M_w$ values. Hanks and Boore (1984) found that the $M_w - M_L$ relation is nonlinear, whereas several other studies have found good correlation between $M_w$ and $M_L$ (Thio and Kanamori, 1995; Uhrhammer et al., 1996; Zhu and Helmberger, 1996; Herrmann, Malagnini, Munafò, 2011). We will investigate the relationship between $M_w$ and $M_L$ in the Utah region more thoroughly in future work.

In our dataset, we identify two events with significant isotropic components; both are associated with failures in underground mines. One solution is for an event in southwestern Wyoming on 30 January 2000 (number 10, Table S1 in the supplement, $M_w$ 4.3, $F$-test 100%), which is associated with a roof fall (collapse) involving three room and pillar sections in an underground trona mine (McCarter, 2001). The other solution (number 32, Table S1 in the supplement, $M_w$ 4.2, $F$-test 100%) is for the well-documented August 2007 Crandall Canyon coal-mine collapse (see Pechmann et al., 2008). Our solution for the Crandall Canyon event is similar to that of Ford et al. (2008). Before completing the $F$-test, we suspected that a third event (number 11, Table S1 in the supplement) might also have a significant isotropic component because it occurred within the Willow Creek coal mine, closely in time with seven reported roof falls (Ellenberger et al., 2001; McCarter, 2001). This is one of the largest seismic events associated with underground coal mining in Utah (see Pechmann et al., 2008). The full moment tensor solution has a relatively large isotropic component of 21% (not shown in Table S1 in the supplement as the deviatoric solution is the only one reported). However, the $F$-test result of 57% indicates that the full moment tensor solution is not significantly better than the deviatoric, so we cannot confirm that this event has a significant volume change. However, we also cannot rule out that the event has a real isotropic component that is very small compared with the deviatoric portion of the moment tensor. This latter alternative is consistent with the interpretation of a shear-slip event in the roof of the mine that triggered roof falls in the mine workings (Arabasz and Pechmann, 2001; Ellenberger et al., 2001). Inversions of synthetic data similar to those by Panning et al. (2001) may be useful in developing thresholds for the $F$-test and in better understanding a potentially complicated source event such as this one. Without such testing, we are unable to distinguish an event with a small isotropic and large double-couple source from a purely deviatoric source.

**CONCLUSIONS**

We have developed a catalog of moment tensors for events in the UUSS Utah seismic monitoring region from 1998 to mid-2011. The moment tensor catalog contains 70% of the events reported with $M_f \geq 3.5$ in the UUSS earthquake catalog. Moment tensor calculation for events as small as $M_w$ 3.2 ($M_f$ 2.9) is possible with short event-to-station distances and favorable microseism conditions. We will explore the possibility of routinely analyzing events with $M_f < 3.5$ in future work. The WUS velocity model (Herrmann, Benz, and Ammon, 2011) results in the best moment tensor variance reduction for events in the Utah region and will be used in ongoing moment tensor analyses, although we have shown that in special circumstances it may be advantageous to use multiple velocity models.

Twenty-five moment tensors calculated in this study are generally similar to solutions for the same events determined by Herrmann, Benz, and Ammon (2011). Focal mechanisms for the moment tensors developed in this study are consistent with the results of previous studies on the regional tectonics and stress orientation (e.g., Zoback and Zoback, 1989; Arabasz et al., 2007; Heidbach et al., 2009; Pankow et al., 2009; Kreemer et al., 2010). Two events in our catalog have moment tensors with significant isotropic components as determined by the $F$-test and are associated with known mine collapses. The interpretation of an isotropic component in the moment tensor of a third noteworthy mining-related event is less conclusive. The full moment tensor analysis is essential for any region with diverse seismic sources such as Utah, particularly if MIS is monitored.
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