

## Crustal fracturing and presence of fluid as revealed by seismic anisotropy: case histories from seismogenic areas in the Apennines (Italy)

M. PASTORI<sup>1,2</sup>, D. PICCININI<sup>2</sup>, L. VALOROSO<sup>2</sup>, A. WUESTEFELD<sup>3</sup>, L. ZACCARELLI<sup>4</sup>, F. BIANCO<sup>2</sup>, J.M. KENDALL<sup>3</sup>, D. DI BUCCI<sup>5</sup>, L. MARGHERITI<sup>2</sup> and M.R. BARCHI<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Università degli Studi di Perugia, Italy*

<sup>2</sup> *Istituto Nazionale di Geofisica e Vulcanologia, Rome, Italy*

<sup>3</sup> *University of Bristol, UK*

<sup>4</sup> *Institut de Physique du Globe, Paris, France*

<sup>5</sup> *Dipartimento della Protezione Civile, Rome, Italy*

(Received: April 1, 2011; accepted: September 2, 2011)

**ABSTRACT** An automatic analysis code, Anisomat+, was developed, tested and improved to calculate anisotropic parameters: fast polarization direction and delay time. Anisomat+ was applied on data coming from three zones of the Apennines in Italy. For each area, anisotropic parameters have been interpreted to determine the fracture and stress field taking into account the geological and structural settings. It was recognized that the averages of fast directions are NW-SE-oriented at all sites, in agreement with the orientation of maximum horizontal stress as well as with the strike of the main fault structures. The mean values of normalized delay time range from 0.005 s/km to 0.007 s/km and to 0.009 s/km, respectively for L'Aquila region, Alto Tiberina Fault area and Val d'Agri basin, suggesting a 3-4% of crustal anisotropy. Moreover, for each area, the spatial distribution of anisotropic parameters is examined, and for L'Aquila 2009 seismic sequence also temporal distribution is discussed.

**Key words:** Seismic anisotropy, Apennine crust, L'Aquila earthquake.

### 1. Introduction

In the Earth's crust, anisotropy may be caused by preferentially aligned joints or microcracks, by layered bedding in sedimentary formations, or by highly foliated metamorphic rocks. Crustal anisotropy resulting from aligned cracks can be used to determine the state of stress in the crust, since in many cases cracks are preferentially aligned and/or opened by the active stress field and oriented parallel to the direction of the maximum horizontal stress ( $S_{Hmax}$ ). In tectonically active areas, such as near active fault systems and volcanoes, anisotropy can be used to look for changes in the preferred orientation of cracks that may indicate a rotation of the stress field.

Both seismic P and S waves may exhibit anisotropy and, for both, the anisotropy may appear as a (continuous) dependence of velocity upon the direction of propagation. For S-waves, it may also appear as a (discrete) dependence of velocity upon the direction of polarization. For a given direction of propagation in any homogeneous medium, only two polarization directions are allowed, with other polarizations decomposing trigonometrically into these two. Hence, shear

waves naturally “split” into separate arrivals with these two polarizations; in optics this is called birefringence, in seismology shear wave splitting (Barton, 2006).

During the last decades, the study of seismic anisotropy has provided useful information for the interpretation and evaluation of the active crustal deformation and the stress field in the light of two anisotropic interpretative models, proposed by Crampin (1993), Zatsepin and Crampin (1995) and Zinke and Zoback (2000), that will be described in the following sections. Shear wave splitting analysis can yield valuable information on upper crustal structure, fracture field, and presence of fluid-saturated rocks, being strictly related to stress-aligned, fluid-filled micro-cracks (Crampin, 1984; Barkved *et al.*, 2004).

The automatic analysis code, Anisomat+, was developed to calculate anisotropic parameters, fast polarization direction ( $\varphi$ ) and delay time ( $\delta t$ ), and it has been compared with other two automatic analysis codes: Splitting Parameters Yield [SPY: Bianco and Zaccarelli (2009)] and Shear Birefringence Analysis [SHEBA: Wuestefeld *et al.* (2010)]. It was observed that, if the number of measures is large enough, at each station the average values of the anisotropic parameters are comparable.

This work is aimed at constraining the crustal stress field and at providing information about the presence and migration of fluids in three different sites of the Apennines: Val d’Agri basin, Alto Tiberina Fault area and L’Aquila region. According to many investigators, the crack alignment is generated by the active stress field, and the knowledge of crustal anisotropic parameters can improve the understanding of the stress field perturbations and their effects on the seismogenic structures. In turn, this can contribute to understand the mechanisms that cause the seismogenic process: one of the primary goals of the geophysical research.

## 2. Seismic anisotropy and its relation with the crustal stress field and the presence of fluids

Seismic anisotropy is a commonly observed property of the Earth’s crust (e.g., Crampin and Chastin, 2003, and references therein) and it can be quantified by the shear wave splitting, the elastic equivalent of the birefringence phenomenon in optics. When a seismic shear wave travels through an elastically anisotropic medium, its energy is split into two orthogonally polarized components that travel at different velocities. The polarization direction of the fastest wave is called fast direction ( $\varphi$ ) and the lag of the slower wave is the delay time ( $\delta t$ ).

There are at least two main interpretations for the shear wave splitting in the crust (Crampin and Lovell, 1991): i) the intrinsic structural fabric due to aligned macroscopic fractures (inherited from ancient tectonic phases) or aligned anisotropic minerals [the latter generally found in metamorphic lithotypes, where they can cause rock foliation: Brocher and Christensen (1990)]; or ii) the presence of fluid-saturated micro-cracks or fractures, aligned or opened by the active stress field (Crampin, 1993).

In the first case (Fig. 1a),  $\varphi$  is parallel to the strike of the fractures or of the mineral alignment, thus it is not related to the active stress field, and  $\delta t$  measures the fabric strength (Zinke and Zoback, 2000). In the second case (Fig. 1b),  $\varphi$  is typically polarized parallel to the direction of the maximum horizontal stress, as suggested by the Extensive-Dilatancy Anisotropy model [EDA: Crampin (1978)],  $\delta t$  is a measure of the intensity and/or thickness of the fractures field




Fig. 1 - Main crustal sources of the shear wave splitting phenomena: a) aligned anisotropic minerals (mainly associated to metamorphic rocks); b) filled-fluid micro-cracks or fractures (mainly associated to sedimentary rocks).

that would be sensitive to local variations of the stress field (e.g., variations related to the seismic cycle). In this last interpretation, the dominant fracture direction, the crack density and therefore the maximum horizontal stress direction can be estimated from anisotropic parameters.

The three selected areas are located along the Italian Apennines, a fold-and-thrust belt formed by a deformed sedimentary cover overlying a crystalline crustal basement; this suggests that the anisotropy may be interpreted as principally caused by fractures or microfractures alignment.

In this work, we take into account some interpretative models available in the literature. Zinke and Zoback (2000) proposed a theory for which the local strain field and cracks alignments are the sum of present and previous tectonics phases and are not necessarily related to the active stress; therefore the anisotropic parameters variations are thus only space-dependent. Differently, the EDA model (Crampin, 1993) and its development in Anisotropic Poro Elasticity model [APE: Zatsepin and Crampin (1995)] propose that fluid-filled micro-cracks are the main responsible for anisotropy and are aligned or 'opened' by the active stress field; the local variations of the stress field might be therefore related to the evolution of the pore pressure in time. In this case, the variations of the anisotropic parameters are both space- and time- dependent. Following these latter theories and in accordance with Crampin and Gao (2010), monitoring anisotropic parameter variations could be a potential tool for earthquakes forecasting. These investigators consider the anisotropic parameters sensitive to the variations of the stress field related to both the earthquake occurrence and the variations of fluid pressure in the rock volume.

### 3. Anisomat+: developing, testing and validating

Our first objective for this work has been to develop a semi-automatic code able to evaluate the anisotropic parameters, fast direction polarization ( $\varphi$ ) and delay time ( $\delta t$ ), and then to apply it to the crustal earthquakes located in selected test areas, aimed at characterizing the fracture field of the crust and/or the microfracture field and consequently the stress field. In literature many different techniques are proposed to calculate the anisotropic parameters, and all of them present weaknesses as well as strength points (Silver and Chan, 1991; Zhang and Schwartz, 1994; Crampin and Gao, 2006; Margheriti *et al.*, 2006).

Elaborating a large amount of data in a very short time is the primary advantage in using an automatic code; in this way, generally, the errors due to the subjectivity are reduced, even though the accuracy and robustness of each single elaboration may be affected by some bias. The main goal of this automation has been to minimize the operator intervention during the analysis and to allow the analysis of waveforms just as they are stored in the Italian Seismic Network archive (<http://iside.rm.ingv.it>). The rationale behind this choice is that this code will be useful in the real-time monitoring.

“Anisomat+” is a set of MatLab scripts able to retrieve crustal anisotropy parameters from three-component seismic recording of local earthquakes. The code uses the waveform cross-correlation method on the horizontal components of the seismograms allowing measuring the similarity of the pulse shape between two S waves. These two waves have similar shape, mutually orthogonal oscillation directions and travel with different velocities. The analysis procedure consists in choosing the appropriate frequency range that better highlights the signal containing the shear waves, and a time window for the analysis on the seismograms centred on the S arrival (the temporal window contains at least one cycle of S waves).

To ensure the use of an appropriate waveform, Anisomat+ applies quality controls on: 1) the geometrical incidence angle measured from the vertical, which ranges between  $0^\circ$  and  $45^\circ$ ; 2) the S-wave picking uncertainty; 3) the ratio between the amplitude of horizontal and vertical components ( $A_{N-S-E-W}/A_Z > 1.5$ ); 4) the signal to noise ratio ( $\text{rmss./rmsp} > 4$ ).

The selection criteria applied on the data guarantee that shear wave energy mainly concentrates in the horizontal plane. If the controls are passed, Anisomat+ determines the fast polarization direction and delay time values by using the cross-correlation function. Thus, we can get shear wave splitting parameters by rotating (with steps of  $1^\circ$ ) the north and the east components and calculating their cross-correlation coefficient: when the absolute value of cross-correlation coefficient takes the maximum value, we regard the rotation direction as the fast-wave direction and the amount of the lag time as the delay time of the slow-wave to the fast-wave.

Fig. 2 shows an example of the graphic output of Anisomat+ elaboration where horizontal overlap of the fast and slow components, temporal variation of polarization vectors and particle motion before and after delay time correction are shown.

To verify if the automatic analysis code works properly, we made several tests. The first step was to compare the results from the automatic versions of Anisomat+ to those obtained by the same code applied manually (Pastori *et al.*, 2009). Then, in a second step we compared Anisomat+ with a semi-automatic code called Splitting Parameters Yield [SPY: Bianco and Zaccarelli (2009)], based on a different technique and independently developed under MatLab. In both cases, the comparison was carried out on the same data set recorded in the Val d’Agri basin

in Southern Italy. As third step, to confirm the robustness of our semiautomatic code, we compared Anisomat+ to SHEBA, an additional automatic code developed by the University of Bristol team to estimate anisotropic parameters automatically (Wuestefeld *et al.*, 2010). In this final comparison we used the data set recorded in the Alto Tiberina Fault area in central Italy.

In general, the comparison between Anisomat+ and the other codes (Anisomat manual version, SPY and SHEBA; Fig. 3) gave consistent results. It is possible to observe that the total results for both fast polarization directions and magnitude of the delay times is very similar, although, looking at single station results, one could find from slight to strong differences.

In the comparisons made, we tried to use the same input parameters (filter, window length, etc.) taking into account that each code uses different initial conditions and computational methods (covariance matrix, cross-correlation or both). Moreover, each of them was developed to analyse a specific type of data (volcanic seismicity for SPY, well data for SHEBA and shallow and deep seismic events of tectonic nature for Anisomat+). These differences in the codes are the reason for different single results; however, if the number of measures is large enough, the average values of the parameters are comparable.

#### 4. Case histories from three seismogenic areas along the Apennine chain

The Apennine chain represents the frame of the Italian peninsula and is traditionally divided into three parts: northern, central and southern Apennines. This mountain chain is a fold-and-thrust belt whose core is currently affected by SW-NE active extension, as shown by breakout data and seismicity (Montone *et al.*, 2004), as well as by geological and geomorphological analyses (e.g., Galadini, 1999; D'Agostino *et al.*, 2001). This extension is perpendicular to the main active and inherited faults; moreover the normal faulting can be accompanied by oblique




Fig. 2 -Example of the graphic output of Anisomat+ elaboration. The two top panels show the horizontal component rotated in the fast and slow reference system before and after the delay correction. The intermediate panel shows the polarization vectors of the same time window. The bottom panels show particle motion before and after the delay time correction.




Fig. 3 – Schematic steps and parameters of analysis adopted for each comparison test. Anisomat+ was compared to Anisomat (manual version), SPY and SHEBA; the total results gave generally consistent results.




Fig. 4 - Italian stress indicators (for legend details see World Stress Map Rel. 2008, [http://dc-app3-14.gfz-potsdam.de/pub/stress\\_data/stress\\_data\\_frame.html](http://dc-app3-14.gfz-potsdam.de/pub/stress_data/stress_data_frame.html)), compared to the cumulated anisotropic results [average values of fast directions (black lines) and normalized delay times] obtained for each studied areas: ATF=0.007 s/km; AQU=0.005 s/km; VA=0.009 s/km. It is possible to recognise a close correspondence between fast directions and the maximum horizontal compressive stress [in agree with EDA model Crampin (1993)].

fault slip (e.g., Piccardi *et al.*, 2006 and references therein). According with some investigators [i.e., Di Bucci and Mazzoli (2002) for a discussion], the outer belt is instead still undergoing shortening (e.g., Boncio and Bracone, 2009; Boccaletti *et al.*, 2011).

For each part of the thrust belt, we selected a study area containing an intramountain extensional basin filled by Quaternary continental deposits and located at the top of the Apennine thrust sheets, which are mainly composed of marine sedimentary successions. For each study area, we defined the dominant fast direction and the delay time. The results were then interpreted in the light of the geological and structural setting. It was recognized that the average of fast directions is oriented NW-SE at all sites, in agreement with the orientation of the strike of the main fault structures and also with the active stress field [based on stress indicators as focal mechanisms, e.g., Boncio *et al.* (2004); Cucci *et al.* (2004) and Chiaraluce *et al.* (2007) and borehole breakouts, e.g., Mariucci *et al.* (2008, 2010); Fig. 4]. The space variations of the delay time magnitude are used to define where the anisotropic medium is confined.




Fig. 5 - Rose diagrams of the fast polarization directions obtained for the Val d'Agri basin. The size of the roses on the map is proportional to the number of measurements. The bottom inset shows the total fast directions at all stations. The mean fast directions are almost orthogonal to the minimum horizontal stress ( $S_{hmin}$ ) in the area, represented by the double-headed red arrow (Cucci *et al.*, 2004). The coloured area corresponds to the variation of the normalized delay time.

#### 4.1. Case 1: Val d'Agri basin

The Val d'Agri area, in the southern Apennines, has attracted the attention of geoscientists over the past two decades. The presence of oil fields ranking as the largest in onshore Europe, and the high seismogenic potential documented by historical earthquakes motivated geophysical investigations that focus on the subsurface structure and seismotectonics (Borraccini *et al.*, 2002; Cucci *et al.*, 2004; Shiner *et al.*, 2004; Pastori *et al.*, 2009; Valoroso *et al.*, 2009). Nonetheless, there is still an open discussion about the location of the seismogenic source of an M 7.0 earthquake occurred in that area in 1857 (Burrato and Valensise, 2008, and references therein). Here, we investigated the upper crust of the Val d'Agri, trying to relate the anisotropy to the active structures and the stress field.

Fig. 5 shows the frequency diagrams of the fast polarization directions at stations having more than 10 measurements. The length of rose petals is proportional to the number of measurements



in the corresponding  $10^\circ$  interval. The lower inset shows the total fast directions at all stations.

We notice a NW–SE dominant fast direction at most of the stations (AG04, AG09, AG13, AG14, AG18), whereas other measurements are slightly rotated in a more N100°E direction (AG11 and AG17) or strike E–W (AG05). The remaining station, AG01, does not show a preferential orientation, but the major petals display strikes coherent with the other results. As a whole, in Val d’Agri we observe a dominant fast polarization direction striking NW–SE, perpendicular to the current  $S_{hmin}$  in the region as obtained from available active stress indicators such as borehole breakout and T-axis of focal mechanisms (Cucci *et al.*, 2004). Our findings also agree with the recent finding of a NW-trending normal faulting mechanism, obtained by Valoroso *et al.* (2009) by using the same data set.

For the region we estimated an average normalized delay times of 0.009 s/km. The estimated values for single stations may vary strongly, ranging from 0.002 to 0.012 s/km. We found greater values ( $> 0.01$  s/km; stations AG09, AG14, AG18) at stations located along the SW margin of the Val d’Agri basin, whereas lower values (below  $0.01$  s km $^{-1}$ ) characterize both the sites AG04 and AG11, along the NE margin of the basin, and the station AG05, located to the SE of the nearby Vallo di Diano basin. This is shown by the colours in Fig. 5, which represent the interpolated values of normalized delay times.

#### 4.2. Case 2: Alto Tiberina Fault area

In the northern Apennines, the Upper Tiber River Valley hosts an important geological structure, called Alto Tiberina Fault (hereinafter ATF). Defined in the literature as a low angle normal fault [LANF: e.g., Boncio *et al.* (2000) and Collettini and Barchi (2002)], it attracted the attention of the investigators since the end of the 1990s as an important tectonic structure, both for the accommodation of significant amounts of structural extension and in terms of seismic hazard.

The ATF geometry is well known from a structural point of view (Barchi *et al.*, 1998; Chiaraluca *et al.*, 2007; Mirabella *et al.*, 2008); moreover, in the same area, earthquakes with hypocenters down to 30 km were recorded during the so-called “Città di Castello experiment” and preliminarily localized by Piccinini *et al.* (2003). Geological and seismological data show that the ATF is an active fault system that separates a seismically active hanging wall block from an aseismic footwall. In the hanging wall, minor synthetic and antithetic high-angle normal faults root down into the ATF, which acts as a detachment, suggesting the simultaneous activity of the whole normal fault system. The high-angle normal faults in the ATF hanging wall slip seismically, generating both microseismicity and moderate magnitude earthquakes ( $5 < M < 6$ ) such as the 1984 Gubbio main shock (Chiaraluca *et al.*, 2007). This allows us to characterize the anisotropic behaviour of a rock volume above and below the ATF by computing the anisotropic parameters. We are also able to compare the characteristics of the earthquakes related to the ATF activity from those related to the high angle normal faults. This information is relevant when assessing detailed seismic hazard and accurately constraining possible ground shaking scenarios.

Fig. 6 shows the rose diagrams of the fast polarization directions at stations having more than 10 measurements. In the total fast plot (Fig. 6, upper inset) we observe a dominant NW-SE direction, i.e., the same orientation of the major faults exposed in the area [redrawn from Mariucci *et al.* (2008)]. This direction is also perpendicular to the  $S_{hmin}$  of the active extensional stress field (Boncio and Lavecchia, 2000).




Fig. 6 - Results from the anisotropic elaboration (rose diagrams) shown along with earthquake localizations (blue dots) and main structural features of the ATF area (from Mariucci *et al.*, 2008). The size of rose diagrams representing the polarization directions is proportional to the number of the measurements. Only the stations with more than 10 measurements are reported. The directions at each station, as well as the total of the measurements (upper inset), are almost perpendicular to the  $S_{hmin}$ , which strikes about NE-SW. Spatial variation of normalized delay time, represented by the shadowed areas, and mean of fast directions (blue lines) are reported in the map. A comparison among mean fast direction, minimum horizontal stress direction (Boncio and Lavecchia, 2000; Montone *et al.*, 2004) and main geologic structures (Mariucci *et al.*, 2008) shows a general consistence.

In detail, the means of fast directions, at the selected 13 stations, are roughly parallel to the main geological structures, even if there are stations with rotated directions (i.e., C002, B4, B5, A003). If we consider only normalized delay times (shadowed area in Fig. 6), we observe higher values, 0.01 s/km, located at stations C3 and C004, both located in the footwall of the Gubbio Fault and where most of the seismicity occurs. These values suggest a percentage of anisotropy  $A=3\%$  [ $A=V_{Smean} \cdot \delta tn \cdot 100$ ; Wuestefeld *et al.* (2010);  $V_{Smean}$  is assumed 3.3 km/s according to




Fig. 7 - Two different representations of the obtained anisotropic results for the L'Aquila area: 1) fast direction rose diagrams, with petal size proportional to the number of the measurements, along with earthquake epicentres (yellow dots) and main structural features [red lineaments modified from EMERGEO Working group (2010)]; 2) mean fast directions (blue lines) scaled to the normalised delay time computed at each station. Exception made for station FAGN, the directions at the other stations and the total of the measurements (lower inset) are almost perpendicular to the  $S_{hmin}$ , which strikes about NE-SW.

Piccinini *et al.* (2003)].

#### 4.3. Case 3: L'Aquila region

The 2009 L'Aquila seismic sequence gave us the opportunity to study the shear-wave splitting in the region where a  $M_w > 6$  earthquake (Pondrelli *et al.*, 2010; Scognamiglio *et al.*, 2010)




Fig. 8 - Temporal variation of the anisotropic parameters for the 2009 L'Aquila seismic sequence: delay time (A) and fast direction (B) for AQU station (see Fig. 7). The large dots in A) represent individual measurements, whereas the line is the interpolation of the mean values (small dots) calculated over 5 measurements by using a sliding window. In B) the dashed lines represent the mean of the initial and Dominant Fast Direction (DFD) computed, respectively, before and after the mainshock (indicated by the star). A secondary direction is recognized after the mainshock, given by the 90°-flips from the mean of DFD and also visible in the two rose-diagrams. In the bottom inset, the total fast measurements are also shown; the two shadowed areas represent the standard deviation calculated for the mean values.

occurred on April 6, 2009. According to some authors (Gao and Crampin, 2003, 2006; Crampin and Gao, 2010), observations of shear-wave splitting at seismic stations located just above a seismic sequence before and after the occurrence of a mainshock, might suggest that the time-delays and fast directions of split shear-waves could provide a tool to monitor the stress build-up before an earthquake and the stress release as the earthquake occurs.

The L'Aquila sequence occurred in a recently silent, yet very seismic region of the extensional belt along the central Apennines. The seismic sequence started at the beginning of 2009 and it was confined within the upper 10–15 km of the crust (Chiarabba *et al.*, 2009). We analysed the shear wave splitting resulting from data acquired by three stations of the Italian Seismic National Network (AQU, CAMP and FAGN), during one year from January 1, 2009 to December 31, 2009. The results were compared to the stress field and structural indicators of the area and some hypotheses were discussed on the correspondence between temporal changes in anisotropic parameters and the evolution of the seismic sequence.

In Fig. 7 the rose diagrams and the means [according to the Von Mises criterion: Mardia (1972)] of fast direction polarization (blue lines) are shown; in the lower inset, the fast directions cumulated for all stations are plotted. The fast directions are mainly WNW-ESE-oriented, about N122°, well in agreement with the  $S_{hmin}$  (Boncio *et al.*, 2004; Mariucci *et al.*, 2010; Pondrelli *et al.*, 2010), except for station FAGN, where a SSW-NNE fast direction (about 28°) was found. This direction, which markedly differs from the general structural setting (EMERGEO Working Group, 2010), may be related to the presence of peculiar seismic wavefields at station FAGN (Calderoni *et al.*, 2010).

The delay time values follow the same pattern shown by the fast directions, that is, they are similar each other at AQU and CAMP stations (about 0.005 s/km), whilst a higher value (0.007 s/km) is found at FAGN station.

Looking at changes of anisotropic parameters in time, in particular while approaching the mainshock, we observe some variations of the seismic wave propagation properties. Fluid over-pressurization in fault structures has been suggested as a primary trigger of normal faulting earthquakes (Sibson, 2000; Chiodini *et al.*, 2004). In the only Italian case occurred in recent times and comparable to the L'Aquila sequence (i.e., the 1997 Umbria-Marche sequence), there is evidence for a major role played by fluids over the seismicity (Miller *et al.*, 2004; Chiarabba *et al.*, 2009). From the *a posteriori* analysis of the temporal variations of anisotropic parameters (Fig. 8) we observed an overall increase of the delay time (likely due to an increase of the aligned fractures) and a 90°-flips of some of the fast directions (likely due to over-pressured fluids) starting before the April 6 mainshock. The same trend of  $\delta t$  is observed around Julian days 170–180 (end of June 2009); in this period, a seismic sequence started to the NW of CAMP station. These *a posteriori* observations, which are quite scattered, are consistent with a possible complex sequence of dilatancy-diffusion processes taking place in the rock volume where the earthquake was preparing and the seismic sequence occurring. This may imply that fluids played a key role in the fault failure process and in the development of the seismic sequence, as hypothesized by Lucente *et al.* (2010) for the foreshock sequence.

## 5. Conclusions

In this work we analyzed several thousands of waveforms, recorded at more than 50 stations,

getting about one thousand anisotropic measurements in terms of fast direction and delay time from the three studied areas of the Apennines: Val d'Agri basin, Alto Tiberina Fault area and L'Aquila region.

Overall the obtained results show that average anisotropic parameters are robust measurements: NW-SE average fast directions and average normalized delay times ranging from 0.05 s/km to 0.09 s/km were found (Fig. 4). The mean values of normalized delay time range from 0.005 s/km to 0.007 s/km and to 0.009 s/km, respectively for L'Aquila region, Alto Tiberina Fault area and Val D'Agri basin, suggesting a 3-4% of crustal anisotropy; this same percentage found by Piccinini *et al.* (2006) in central Italy by studying the 1997 Umbria-Marche seismic sequence. This percentage of differential shear wave anisotropy testifies (in the EDA frame interpretation) a crack density  $\varepsilon = 0.045$  ( $\varepsilon = N\alpha^3/V$ , where  $N$  is the number of cracks of radius  $\alpha$  in volume  $V$ ), the critical crack density at which nearby cracks begin to coalesce to form through-going fractures (Crampin, 1993).

These values can be related to different causes, such as the active stress field and the pre-existing crustal structures and tectonic style. Moreover, they provide information about the presence and migration of fluids at depth.

In each area we found a close correspondence between the average fast polarization direction and the orientation of the minimum horizontal stress (Fig. 4), as suggested by the EDA model proposed by Crampin (1993). However, the NW-SE direction found along the Apennines is also the strike of the main pre-existing geological structures (both compressional and extensional); therefore, the observed anisotropy may also have been driven by the inherited fracture fields, following the interpretation proposed by Zinke and Zoback (2000). A connection between the temporal variations of the anisotropic parameters and the possible stress changes (in term of pore-pressure changes, stress and fracture field variation, fluid migration, etc.) related to the L'Aquila mainshock and the associated seismic sequence was however observed, and these variations are compatible with those predicted by APE model. Therefore, the observed temporal variation of anisotropic parameters suggests that the anisotropic results are related to the active stress field and its possible perturbations, and that they could be better interpreted following the EDA-APE model.

Since this technique was applied in areas where earthquakes occur, and therefore where faulting process has produced fractures, it is difficult to separate the contributions to anisotropy of fractures and microfractures.

These areas, in fact, are affected by an extensional tectonic regime where the strike of the active faults is parallel to that of the maximum horizontal stress, and where the cracks opening (that records the active stress field during an earthquake) increases as well the fracturing degree of the rock mass, making it difficult to discriminate which process is more relevant.

To conclude, we think that a systematic study of the spatial and temporal variations of anisotropic parameters at stations distributed over the Italian territory could provide a new key for the understanding of the seismogenic process, even in view of their future, possible application as warnings for strong earthquakes.

**Acknowledgments.** This paper is part of Marina Pastori Ph.D. thesis and was presented at the 29th GNGTS meeting (Prato October 26-28, 2010), where it was acknowledged with the Licio Cernobori award bestowed by the AGLC. We would like to thank all the INGV researchers who contributed to make available the seismic data sets analyzed. We are grateful to the guest editor of the *Bollettino di Geofisica Teorica ed Applicata*, Giuliana Rossi and to Andrea Argani for his thorough review and to the anonymous reviewer.

## REFERENCES

- Barchi M., DeFeyter A., Magnani B., Minelli G., Pialli G. and Sotera B.; 1998: *The structural style of the Umbria–Marche fold and thrust belt*. *Mem. Soc. Geol. It.*, **52**, 557-578.
- Barton N.; 2006: *Rock quality, seismic velocity, attenuation and anisotropy*. Taylor and Francis Group, London, UK, 729 pp.
- Barkved O., Bartman B., Gaiser J., Van Dok R., Johns T., Kristiansen P., Probert T. and Thompson M.; 2004: *The many facets of multicomponent seismic data*. *Oilfield Rev.*, **16**, 42-56.
- Bianco F. and Zaccarelli L.; 2009: *A reappraisal of shear wave splitting parameters from Italian active volcanic areas through a semiautomatic algorithm*. *J. Seismol.*, **13**, 253-266.
- Boccaletti M., Corti G. and Martelli L.; 2011: *Recent and active tectonics of the external zone of the Northern Apennines (Italy)*. *Int. J. Earth Sci.*, **100**, 1331-1348, doi:10.1007/s00531-010-0545-y.
- Boncio P. and Bracone V.; 2009: *Active stress from earthquake focal mechanisms along the Padan-Adriatic side of the Northern Apennines (Italy), with considerations on stress magnitudes and pore-fluid pressures*. *Tectonophys.*, **476**, 180-194.
- Boncio P. and Lavecchia G.; 2000: *A geological model for the Colfiorito earthquakes (September–October 1997, central Italy)*. *J. Seismol.*, **4**, 345-356.
- Boncio P., Brozzetti F. and Lavecchia G.; 2000: *Architecture and seismotectonics of a regional low-angle normal fault zone in central Italy*. *Tectonics*, **19**, 1038-1055.
- Boncio P., Lavecchia G. and Pace B.; 2004: *Defining a model of 3D seismogenic sources for seismic hazard assessment applications: the case of central Apennines (Italy)*. *J. Seismol.*, **8**, 407-425.
- Borraccini F., De Donatis M., Di Bucci D. and Mazzoli S.; 2002: *3D Model of the active extensional fault system of the high Agri River valley, Southern Apennines, Italy*. *J. Virtual Explor.*, **6**, 1-8.
- Brocher T.M. and Christensen N.I.; 1990: *Seismic anisotropy due to preferred mineral orientation observed in shallow crustal rocks in southern Alaska*. *Geology*, **18**, 737-740.
- Burrato P. and Valensise G.; 2008: *Rise and fall of a hypothesized seismic gap: source complexity in the Mw=7.0 16 December 1857 Southern Italy earthquake*. *Bull. Seismol. Soc. Am.*, **98**, 139-148.
- Calderoni G., Rovelli A. and Di Giovambattista R.; 2010: *Large amplitude variations recorded by an on-fault seismological station during L'Aquila earthquakes: evidence for a complex fault-induced site effect*. *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, **37**, L24305.
- Chiarabba C., Amato A., Anselmi M., Baccheschi P., Bianchi I., Cattaneo M., Cecere G., Chiaraluce L., Ciaccio M.G., De Gori P., De Luca G., Di Bona M., Di Stefano R., Faenza L., Govoni A., Improta L., Lucente F.P., Marchetti A., Margheriti L., Mele F., Michelini A., Monachesi G., Moretti M., Pastori M., Piana Agostinetti N., Piccinini D., Roselli P., Seccia D. and Valoroso L.; 2009: *The 2009 L'Aquila (central Italy) Mw6.3 earthquake: main shock and aftershocks*. *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, **36**, L18308, doi:10.1029/2009GL039627.
- Chiaraluce L., Chiarabba C., Collettini C., Piccinini D. and Cocco M.; 2007: *Architecture and mechanics of an active low-angle normal fault: Alto Tiberina fault, northern Apennines, Italy*. *J. Geophys. Res.*, **112**, B10310, doi:10.1029/2007JB005015.
- Chiodini G., Cardellini C., Amato A., Boschi E., Caliro S., Frondini F. and Ventura G.; 2004: *Carbon dioxide Earth degassing and seismogenesis in central and southern Italy*. *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, **31**, L07615.

- Collettini C. and Barchi M.R.; 2002: *A low angle normal fault in the Umbria region (Central Italy): a mechanical model for the related micro-seismicity*. Tectonophys., **359**, 97-115.
- Crampin S.; 1978: *Seismic wave propagation through a cracked solid: polarization as a possible dilatancy diagnostic*. Geophys. J. R. Astron. Soc., **53**, 467-496.
- Crampin S.; 1984: *Effective anisotropic elastic-constants for wave propagation through cracked solids*. Geophys. J. R. Astron. Soc., **76**, 135-145.
- Crampin S.; 1993: *Arguments for EDA*. Can. J. Explor. Geophys., **29**, 18-30.
- Crampin S. and Chastin S.; 2003: *A review of shear-wave splitting in the crack-critical crust*. Geophys. J. Int., **155**, 221-240.
- Crampin S. and Gao Y.; 2006: *A review of techniques for measuring shear wave splitting above small earthquakes*. Phys. Earth Planet. Int., **59**, 1-14.
- Crampin S. and Gao Y.; 2010: *Earthquakes can be stress-forecast*. Geophys. J. Int., **180**, 1124-1127.
- Crampin S. and Lovell J.H.; 1991: *A decade of shear-wave splitting in the Earth's crust: what does it mean? what use can we make of it? and what should we do next?* Geophys. J. Int., **107**, 387-407.
- Cucci L., Pondrelli S., Frepoli A., Mariucci M.T. and Moro M.; 2004: *Local pattern of stress field and seismogenic sources in Melandro Pergola basin and in Agri valley (Southern Italy)*. Geophys. J. Int., **156**, 575-583.
- D'Agostino N., Jackson J.A., Dramis F. and Funicello R.; 2001: *Interactions between mantle upwelling, drainage evolution and active normal faulting: an example from the central Apennines (Italy)*. Geophys. J. Int., **147**, 475-497, doi:10.1046/j.1365-246X.2001.00539.x.
- Di Bucci D. and Mazzoli S.; 2002: *Active tectonics of the Northern Apennines and Adria geodynamics: new data and a discussion*. J. Geodyn., **42**, 687-707.
- EMERGEO Working Group; 2010: *Evidence for surface rupture associated with the Mw 6.3 L'Aquila earthquake sequence of April 2009 (central Italy)*. Terra Nova, **22**, 43-51.
- Galadini F.; 1999: *Pleistocene changes in the central Apennine fault kinematics: a key to decipher active tectonics in central Italy*. Tectonics, **18**, 877-894, doi:10.1029/1999TC900020.
- Gao Y. and Crampin S.; 2003: *Temporal variations of shear-wave splitting in field and laboratory studies in China*. J. Appl. Geophys., **54**, 279-287.
- Gao Y. and Crampin S.; 2006: *A stress-forecast earthquake (with hindsight), where migration of source earthquakes causes anomalies in shear-wave polarisations*. Tectonophys., **426**, 253-262.
- Lucente F.P., De Gori P., Margheriti L., Piccinini D., Di Bona M., Chiarabba C. and Piana Agostinetti N.; 2010: *Temporal variation of seismic velocity and anisotropy before the 2009  $M_w$  6.3 L'Aquila earthquake, Italy*. Geology, **38**, 1015-1018.
- Mardia K.V.; 1972: *Statistic of directional data*. Academic Press, New York, USA, 357 pp.
- Margheriti L., Ferulano M.F. and Di Bona M.; 2006: *Seismic anisotropy and its relation with crust structure and stress field in the Reggio Emilia region (Northern Italy)*. Geophys. J. Int., **167**, 1035-1045.
- Mariucci M.T., Montone P. and Pierdominici S.; 2008: *Active stress field in central Italy: a revision of deep well data in the Umbria region*. Ann. Geophys., **51**, 433-442.
- Mariucci M.T., Montone P. and Pierdominici S.; 2010: *Present-day stress in the surroundings of 2009 L'Aquila seismic sequence (Italy)*. Geophys. J. Int., **182**, 1096-1102, doi:10.1111/j.1365-246X.2010.04679.x.
- Miller S.A., Collettini C., Chiaraluce L., Cocco M., Barchi M.R. and Kraus J.B.; 2004: *Aftershocks driven by a high-pressure CO<sub>2</sub> source at depth*. Nature, **427**, 724-727.
- Mirabella F., Barchi M.R. and Lupattelli A.; 2008: *Seismic reflection data in the Umbria-Marche region: limits and capabilities to unravel the subsurface structure in a seismically active area*. Ann. Geophys., **51**, 383-396.
- Montone P., Mariucci M.T., Pondrelli S. and Amato A.; 2004: *An improved stress map for Italy and surrounding regions (central Mediterranean)*. J. Geophys. Res., **109**, B10410, doi:10.1029/2003JB002703.
- Pastori M., Piccinini D., Margheriti L., Improta L., Valoroso L., Chiaraluce L. and Chiarabba C.; 2009: *Stress aligned cracks in the upper crust of the Val d'Agri region as revealed by shear wave splitting*. Geophys. J. Int., **179**, 601-614.
- Piccardi L., Tondi G. and Cello G.; 2006: *Geo-structural evidence for active oblique extension in South-Central Italy*.



- In: Pinter N., Grenczy G., Weber J., Stein S. and Medak D. (eds), *The Adria microplate: GPS Geodesy, Tectonics and Hazard*, NATO Sci., Ser. IV, Earth and Environm. Sci., **61**, pp. 95-108.
- Piccinini D., Cattaneo M., Chiarabba C., Chiaraluce L., De Martin M., Di Bona M., Moretti M., Selvaggi G., Augliera P., Spallarossa D., Ferretti G., Michelini A., Govoni A., Di Bartolomeo P., Romanelli M. and Fabbri J.; 2003: *A microseismic study in a low seismicity area of Italy: the Città di Castello 2000–2001 experiment*. *Ann. Geophys.*, **46**, 1315-1324.
- Piccinini D., Margheriti M., Chiaraluce L. and Cocco M.; 2006: *Space and time variation of crustal anisotropy during the 1997 Umbria-Marche, central Italy, seismic sequence*. *Geophys. J. Int.*, **167**, 1482-1490.
- Pondrelli S., Salimbeni S., Morelli A., Ekström G., Olivieri M. and Boschi E.; 2010: *Seismic moment tensors of the April 2009, L'Aquila (Central Italy), earthquake sequence*. *Geophys. J. Int.*, **180**, 238-242, doi:10.1111/j.1365-246X.2009.04418.x.
- Scognamiglio L., Tinti E., Michelini A., Dreger D.S., Cirella A., Cocco M., Mazza S. and Piatanesi A.; 2010: *Fast determination of moment tensors and rupture history: what has been learned from the 6 April 2009 L'Aquila earthquake sequence*. *Seismol. Res. Lett.*, **81**, 892-906.
- Shiner P., Beccacini A. and Mazzoli S.; 2004: *Thin-skinned versus thick-skinned structural models for Apulian carbonate reservoirs: constraints from the Val d'Agri fields, S Apennines, Italy*. *Mar. Pet. Geol.*, **121**, 805-827.
- Sibson R.H.; 2000: *Tectonic controls on maximum sustainable overpressure: fluid redistribution from stress transitions*. *J. Geochem. Explor.*, **69-70**, 471-475.
- Silver P.G. and Chan W.W.; 1991: *Shear wave splitting and subcontinental mantle deformation*. *J. Geophys. Res.*, **96**, 16429-16454.
- Valoroso L., Improta L., Chiaraluce L., Di Stefano R., Ferranti L., Govoni A. and Chiarabba C.; 2009: *Active faults and induced seismicity in the Val d'Agri area (Southern Apennines, Italy)*. *Geophys. J. Int.*, **178**, 488-502.
- Wuestefeld A., Al-Harrasi O., Verdon J.P., Wookey J. and Kendall J.M.; 2010: *A strategy for automated analysis of passive microseismic data to image seismic anisotropy and fracture characteristics*. *Geophys. Prospect.*, **58**, 755-773.
- Zatsepin S.V. and Crampin S.; 1995: *Rock deformation: A non-linear anisotropic poro-elastic theory (APE) for pre-stressed fluid-saturated rock*. In: 21° General Assembly IUGG, Boulder, CO, USA, July 2-14.
- Zhang Z. and Schwartz S.Y.; 1994: *Seismic anisotropy in the shallow crust of the Loma Prieta segment of the San Andreas fault system*. *J. Geophys. Res.*, **99**, 9651-9661.
- Zinke J.C. and Zoback M.D.; 2000: *Structure-related and stress-induced shear-wave velocity anisotropy: observations from microearthquakes near the Calaveras Fault in Central California*. *Bull. Seismol. Soc. Am.*, **90**, 1305-1312.

Corresponding Author: Marina Pastori

Istituto Nazionale di Geofisica e Vulcanologia - Centro Nazionale Terremoti  
Via di Vigna Murata 605, 00143 Roma, Italy  
Phone: +39 06 51860685; fax: +39 06 51860541; e-mail: marina.pastori@ingv.it.

