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On August 4, 2020 at 15:08:18 UTC, a warehouse located in the harbor of Beirut heavily exploded, causing fatalities and destroying an entire district of the Lebanese capital.

This explosion is the most powerful ground-truth event (GT0) of these past years. It generated SHI arrivals detected in the Euro-Mediterranean region and in Africa.

- As predicted, infrasound arrivals are detected to the west of the event (westwards stratospheric jet in August) up to I11CV (6200 km)
  - 5 stations of the IMS Infrasound network: I48TN, I26DE, I42PT, I17CI, I11CV
  - At least 3 national stations: IMAR (Israel), IPLOR (Romania), PSZI (Hungary)
- Tens of regional seismic stations (Ml 3.3), up to YTIR (265 km)
- Hydroacoustic high amplitude T-waves arrivals on an OBS seismic network (CY60* deployed south of Cyprus) at 100 km

This presentation focuses on localization and energy estimations obtained from IMS infrasound stations only. Special focus is given to I48TN (Tunisia, closest IMS station at 2400 km).
DATA ANALYSIS
ARRAY PROCESSING WITH DTK-GPMCC (1/2)

I48TN - 2400 KM

- 11 separated stratospheric arrivals (22 minutes of coherent signal)
- Moderate uncoherent wind noise (2 to 4 m/s at I48H1)
  - Low frequency content < 0.2Hz is buried in incoherent noise
- Clear « V-shape » detection pattern in time-frequency space
- Trace Velocity decreases over time
- First arrivals have « fast » celerities for stratospheric arrivals (337m/s)

I26DE - 2450 KM

- More emergent signal (3 visible stratospheric arrivals, 18 minutes of coherent signal)
- Low to Moderate uncoherent wind noise (1 to 2 m/s at I26H1)
  - Low frequency content < 0.09 Hz is buried in incoherent noise
- High frequency content is buried in coherent noise (light green detections)
- Trace Velocity decreases over time
- First arrivals have « fast » celerities for stratospheric arrivals (332m/s)
DATA ANALYSIS

ARRAY PROCESSING WITH DTK-GPMCC (2/2)

- One emergent high amplitude stratospheric arrival (10 minutes)
- Followed by long duration low SNR / low frequency arrivals (<1 Hz) refracted from middle and lower thermosphere atmospheric layers (40 min)
- Very low uncoherent wind noise (<0.5 m/s at I17H1)
  - Low frequency content detected down to 0.05Hz
- No high frequency content (>1.5Hz) : High frequencies are too attenuated
- High amplitude arrivals have stable trace velocities (340-345 m/s)

- One emergent low amplitude stratospheric arrival (10 minutes)
- Low uncoherent wind noise (<1.5 m/s at I11L1)
- No high frequency content (>1.5Hz) : High frequencies are too attenuated
- Interaction of signal of interest with microbaroms in [0.2 Hz – 0.5 Hz] frequency band (coherence loss)
At I48TN and I26DE, trace velocity decreases over time.

Other well-documented comparable examples:

- **From ground explosions:** I48TN for 26 August 2009 Sayarim 1 infrasound calibration experiment (~100t TNT eq., comparable ducting conditions)
- **From bolides:** when fragmentation occurs at low effective sound speed altitudes (eg: Voroneh bolide, 21 June 2018, ~2.8 kt TNT eq., I26DE)

When effective sound speed positive gradient is weak in the stratosphere, higher incidence angles which travel on longer paths but in faster velocity layers arrive before lower incidence angles (high trace velocity phases arrive before low trace velocity phases)

- **Top right figure:** green ray which refracts at 52 km arrive before black ray which refracts at 37km, even if it travelled a longer path
- **In summer, \( C_{\text{eff}} \) weak positive gradients are common, because altitude of maximum temperature (45-50 km) occurs at lower altitudes than stratospheric jet (55-60 km) -> « thick » effective sound speed duct
- **In winter, \( C_{\text{eff}} \) gradients are generally much stronger.** For ground to ground propagation, higher velocity layers in which travel high launch angles do not compensate the longer path. In that case, high trace velocity phases arrive after low trace velocity phases

Bottom right figure: Phase identification (from simulated trace velocities simulated with ray tracing and mesured trace velocity values). First arrivals have refracted around 50 km and last arrivals have refracted under 40 km
Broadband full-wave modeling is performed with FLOWS (normal mode code developed at CEA [Millet, 2016])

- Frequency band: [0 Hz – 1.2 Hz]
- Source at 1 km: blast wave, W=500t TNT eq.
  -> Source parameters from Kinney and Graham, 1985 / Pressure signature from Reed, 1977
- Propagation: ECMWF 137 levels 2020/08/05@00:00 UTC + One realization of gravity wave from Gardner Spectrum [Gardner, 1993]

One synthetics signal is calculated for each array element of I48TN (7 elements)

Array processing is performed from calculated synthetics with DTK-GPMCC (same configuration as the one used to process data)

The lack of detections below 0.2 Hz in the data is due to the incoherent wind noise level which is higher than the level of signal of interest

Decrease of trace velocity over time and the fast celerities of first arrivals (337 m/s) are well restored by simulation. These observations are propagation effects

The « V-shape » is well restored by simulation and is also a propagation effect. It is due to the interaction of the incident infrasound wavefield with gravity wave small scale structures in the stratosphere (partial reflections of the high frequencies which corresponding wavelengths can interact with small scale structure size)

Coherent energy of first modeled arrivals have lower frequencies than observed first arrivals. This suggests that real small scale structures would have smaller vertical wavelengths than the one used for the modeling (from Gardner)
ENERGY ESTIMATION : PREPROCESSING (1/2)

CHOICE OF GRAVITY WAVE REALIZATION

- Broadband full wave modeling up to 1.2 Hz (W = 500t TNT eq.)
- To study the effect of gravity wave realization on arrival times (for localization) and waveform amplitudes (for energy estimation):
  - Atmospheric specifications:
    - Mean flow: ECMWF 137 levels 2020/08/05@00:00 UTC (range-independent)
    - Unresolved small scale structures: 11 gravity wave realizations from Gardner spectrum (no amplitude correction factor, max amp of perturbation of $C_{eff}$ is $\sim 10 \text{ m/s}$)
  - Conclusions relative to localization process
    - Number of arrivals depends on gravity wave realization
    - Each arrival duration depends on gravity wave realization
    - Gravity wave realization does not impact significantly arrival time associated to the pick of the maximum amplitude of each phase
  - Conclusions relative to energy estimation process
    - The arrival with maximum amplitude depends on gravity wave realization
    - Gravity wave realization does not impact significantly global maximum amplitude (but modeled waveform without gravity wave have much higher amplitude...)

Gravity wave realization controls the number of arrivals and the duration of each arrival

Realization #11 provides the best fit
ENERGY ESTIMATION : PREPROCESSING (2/2)

CHOICE OF GRAVITY WAVE AMPLITUDES

- Broadband full wave modeling up to 1.2 Hz (W = 500t TNT eq)
- To study the effect of the amplitude of gravity wave perturbation on arrival times (for localization) and waveform amplitudes (for energy estimation):
  - Atmospheric specifications:
    - Mean flow: ECMWF 137 levels 2020/08/05@00:00 UTC (range-independent)
    - Unresolved small scale structures: 1 gravity wave realization (#11) and 10 values of Amplitude Correction Factor between 0.2 and 2 (max amplitude of perturbation between 1 m/s and 20 m/s)

Gravity wave amplitude controls the Amplitude / Duration parameters (by scattering effect)

- Conclusions relative to localization process
  - Number of late arrivals depends on gravity wave amplitude
  - Each arrival duration highly depends on gravity wave amplitude
  - Gravity wave amplitude does not impact arrival time associated to the pick of the maximum amplitude of each phase

- Conclusions relative to energy estimation process
  - The arrival with maximum amplitude does not depend on gravity wave Amplitude Correction Factor
  - Gravity wave amplitude impacts significantly global maximum amplitude (by a factor of 2)

Amplitude Correction Factor between 1 and 1.2 provides the best fit (max amplitude of perturbation ~10m/s)

Disclaimer: The views expressed on this poster are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the view of the CTBTO.
To estimate the acoustic energy of the event, gravity wave realization and Amplitude Correction Factor are chosen from previous sensibility study

- Realization #11 and Amplitude Correction Factor = 1.2

- 9 values of energies are tested, between 50t and 10kt TNT eq.

- Broadband full wave modeling up to 1.2 Hz

- Fit is performed from comparison of time series envelopes and spectral levels in [0.2 Hz – 1.2 Hz] frequency band

**Best fit is obtained for yield within 400t – 600t TNT eq. range from I48TN, I17CI and I11CV (only I48TN shown here)**

- I42PT was not used (too noisy)

- Modeled I26DE amplitudes are 2 to 3 times too high
  - Probable explanation: bounces occur over topographic areas (not modeled), unlike paths to other stations (over sea/desert)

- 1 kt is excluded, 800 t is very unlikely (estimated from low frequency levels, below 0.2 Hz)

- Validation: the same methodology was applied for the 26 August 2009 Sayarim 1 infrasound event (W = 96 t, [Fee et al., 2013]).
  - The two events are comparable in terms of source location, propagation conditions and remote detecting stations.

**Disclaimer:** The views expressed on this poster are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the view of the CTBTO.
Construction of propagation tables (phase-dependent velocity models and azimuth deviations) from ECMWF analysis model (2020/08/05@00:00 UTC)
- Velocity models are extracted from max amplitudes of modeled waveforms (range-independent)
- Azimuth deviations are calculated from 3D ray tracing modeling (phase identification on figure)

Model uncertainties: $\sigma_{vel} = 5 \text{ m/s}, \sigma_{\phi} = 2^\circ$

Measure uncertainties associated to extraction features are neglected (max amp are picked)

3 localizations are calculated:
- Yellow: with 17 infrasound arrivals from 5 stations
- Green: with 5 infrasound arrivals (one per station, arrival with the highest amplitude) from 5 stations
- Red: with 17 infrasound arrivals and 1 seismic arrival (GEM, 77km) from 6 stations

Localization uncertainties remain quite high using infrasound-only data, despite the used in depth methodology (limiting factors: spatial distribution of remote detecting stations, propagation directivity, slow propagation medium)

Data, synthetics and phase identification

The size of the infrasound-only confidence ellipses (green and yellow) remain large because of the ambiguity between origin time and spatial location

With one single seismic arrival (red), the ambiguity disappears (t0 is known)
**Same localization methodology is applied from ECMWF 2020/08/04@15:00 UTC model**

- New netcdf products distributed by the IDC (time resolution: 1 hour, spatial resolution: 0.25° x 0.25°)
- ECMWF 2020/08/05@00:00: ECMWF analysis (most recent data are assimilated)
- ECMWF 2020/08/04@15:00: ECMWF forecast (provided by run at 00:00)

**Surprisingly, synthetics calculated from ECMWF 2020/08/04@15:00 generally fit worse the data than synthetics calculated from ECMWF 2020/08/05@00:00 (especially at I48TN and I26DE)**

- This suggests that forecast models in the stratosphere would be less performant than in the troposphere?
- Arrival celerities shift within 3-5m/s at I48TN and I26DE, depending on phase
- But predicted amplitudes are not impacted (ducts remain the same)

Despite worse fits using ECMWF 2020/08/04@15:00 UTC model (forecast), estimated localizations remain close (considering infrasound uncertainties) to the ones obtained from ECMWF 2020/08/05@00:00 model (analysis)

**Energy estimation is not impacted**
In this presentation, **special focus is given to the in depth interpretation of I48TN data** (closest IMS infrasound station at 2400 km)

- **Frequency-dependent detection patterns are well explained** and are a combinaison of local uncoherent background noise and long range propagation effects (eg: decrease of trace velocities over time)
  - We quantify here the **benefit to finely characterize the infrasound wavefield in the time-frequency space** (DTK-GPMCC is used)
  - Ongoing: vertical wavelengths of gravity waves could be inferred from arrival-dependent coherent frequency bands

- Full-wave modeling technics was massively used. It allows to understand the **effect of gravity waves on modeled waveforms** and to **quantify its impact on event characterization and event localization**

- Energy estimation from IMS infrasound-only data provides the **most likely yields within 400 t – 600 t TNT eq. range**

- **Energies over 1 kt TNT eq. are excluded** (from spectral levels under 0.2 Hz)

- Despite a **complex but precise phase identification**, localization uncertainties using infrasound-only IMS data remain large. These uncertainties are reduced by a factor of 10 to 50 if only one seismic arrival time is used

- The use of **ECMWF forecasts** at event origin time (2020/08/04 15:00) provides slightly worse localization results than **ECMWF analysis** at 2020/08/05-00:00
  - This result suggests that forecasts in the stratosphere would be less performant than at tropospheric altitudes → **Ongoing study...**