

**REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE**

*Form Approved  
OMB No. 0704-0188*

The public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing the burden, to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.  
**PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.**

|  |                    |   |                                   |   |   |
|--|--------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| <b>1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY)</b><br>08/08/2016   |                    | <b>2. REPORT TYPE</b><br>Journal & Conference Paper |                                   | <b>3. DATES COVERED (From - To)</b><br>05/01/2016 - 06/01/2016    |   |
| <b>4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE</b><br>A Comparative Study of Two Azimuth-Based Non-Standard Location Methods   |                    |   |                                   | <b>5a. CONTRACT NUMBER</b>  |   |
|  |                    |   |                                   | <b>5b. GRANT NUMBER</b>   |   |
|  |                    |   |                                   | <b>5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER</b>                                 |   |
| <b>6. AUTHOR(S)</b><br>Rongsong JIH  |                    |   |                                   | <b>5d. PROJECT NUMBER</b>   |   |
|  |                    |   |                                   | <b>5e. TASK NUMBER</b>  |   |
|  |                    |   |                                   | <b>5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER</b>                                       |   |
| <b>7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)</b><br>U.S. Department of State / Arms Control, Verification, and Compliance Bureau,<br>2201 C Street, NW,<br>Washington, DC 20520   |                    |   |                                   | <b>8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER</b><br>AVC-VTN-16-G08 |   |
| <b>9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)</b><br>U.S. Department of State / Arms Control, Verification, and Compliance Bureau,<br>2201 C Street, NW, Washington, DC 20520<br><br>(Initial investigation in 1999 partially sponsored by Defense Threat Reduction Agency and U.S. Air Force.)   |                    |   |                                   | <b>10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)</b>                           |   |
|  |                    |   |                                   | <b>11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)</b>                     |   |
| <b>12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT</b><br>Approved for Public Release; Distribution Unlimited  |                    |   |                                   |   |   |
| <b>13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES</b><br>DOS PA review completed June 1, 2016. Published in Bulletin of National Nuclear Center (Republic of Kazakhstan), Volume 66 (2016), Pages 83-89.  |                    |   |                                   |   |   |
| <b>14. ABSTRACT</b><br>Two non-standard, independently developed, azimuth-based seismic triangulation procedures are evaluated. The goal is to develop ad hoc algorithms which can effectively tackle the seismic location problem under the following difficult yet realistic situations often encountered in seismic monitoring for the purposes of hazard reduction as well as for the underground nuclear explosion monitoring: 1) the crustal model is not known, and hence an arbitrary global model may have to be utilized; 2) the seismic network is not calibrated, and hence the phase arrivals will be used as they are – without any station-specific or path-specific correction; and 3) the azimuthal coverage of the recording stations is poor. |                    |   |                                   |   |   |
| <b>15. SUBJECT TERMS</b><br>Seismic Location Algorithm, Azimuthal Triangulation, Induced Perpendicular Bisector, Array Signal Processing, Skewed Seismic Network, Calibration, Ground Truth, Nuclear Explosion Monitoring, Earthquake Hazards  |                    |   |                                   |   |   |
| <b>16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:</b>   |                    |   | <b>17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT</b> | <b>18. NUMBER OF PAGES</b>  | <b>19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON</b>                              |
| <b>a. REPORT</b>   | <b>b. ABSTRACT</b> | <b>c. THIS PAGE</b>                                 |                                   |   | Rongsong JIH  |
| U  | U                  | U   | None                              | 8   | <b>19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (Include area code)</b><br>+1-202-647-8126 |

UDC 550.34:621.039.9

## A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF TWO AZIMUTH-BASED NON-STANDARD LOCATION METHODS

R. Jih

*Department of State / Arms Control, Verification, and Compliance Bureau, Washington, U.S.A.*

In this study, two non-standard, independently developed, azimuth-based seismic triangulation procedures are implemented and evaluated. The goal is to develop ad hoc algorithms which can effectively tackle the seismic location problem under the following difficult yet realistic situations often encountered in seismic monitoring for the purposes of hazard reduction as well as for the CTBT verification: 1) the crustal model is not known, and hence an arbitrary global model (such as IASP91) may have to be utilized; 2) the seismic network is not calibrated, and hence the phase arrivals will be used as they are – without any station-specific or path-specific correction; and 3) the azimuthal coverage of the recording stations is poor.

**SUMMARY**

Two non-standard, independently developed, azimuth-based seismic triangulation procedures are implemented and evaluated in this study.

Through azimuthal triangulation, Asian seismic network operators in China and Japan have been locating earthquakes for several decades using the “Induced Perpendicular Bisectors” (IPB), long before computers were invented and introduced to seismologists. The underlying simple principle can be best illustrated with the following extreme case. If two seismographs happen to record identical arrival times of the same seismic phase, then to the extent the one-dimensional (1-D) structure applies to the region, the hypocenter should lie on the perpendicular bisector of the line segment or the great circle which connects these two specific seismographs. Depending on the epicentral distances, the perpendicular bisector itself could be a great circle along the Earth's surface or a normal section cutting through the Earth. If two or more such perpendicular bisectors are available, then the hypocenter or epicenter can be determined via triangulation. The merit lies in how the perpendicular bisector is derived in a more general setting, when the arrival time varies from station to station, which is typically the case in reality; and when waveform data are not available, which renders techniques based on full waveforms (such as polarization analysis and frequency-wave number (FK) technique) not applicable. The so-called “Yin Zhong Xian” (“引中线” in Chinese) algorithm, hereafter the YZX method, is an Oriental version of IPB-based procedure. It computes one IPB (via interpolation) for each group of three seismographs.

Also relying on the azimuthal triangulation for seismic location, R. Jih [1] proposes a procedure, J0, to derive the back azimuth with a large-aperture network where all seismographs are on one side of the event. Any standard Geiger-type of least-squares inversion routine can be applied to determine the back azimuth easily. Two or more such skewed networks would suffice to derive two back azimuths for triangulation purpose. It has been demonstrated in [1] that this simple,

hybrid procedure is particularly suitable for the seismic location problem at regional distances when [2] the crustal model is not known, [3] the seismic network is not calibrated, and [4] the azimuthal coverage of recording stations is poor. In this paper the procedure J0 is compared against the YZX method, to relocate earthquakes and explosions of known or well-constrained locations. It is shown that, at regional distances, the J0 algorithm performs better than does the YZX method, because the back azimuth derived with J0 is more reliable and stable. This is not surprising, as the YZX tends to be more susceptible to the small-scale lateral heterogeneity, which is often present in the crust. At local distances, however, the two methods seem to perform equally well.

**1. BACKGROUND**

Epicenter remains as one of a few important source parameters that need to be promptly determined with sufficient accuracy and confidence whenever a natural - or man-made - seismic event of concern occurs. Over the years the computer-based Geiger-type least-squares inversion and its variations have become the standard means in solving the location problem.

If the ground-truth location of a nearby seismic event is known, the arrival readings of the new event at each seismograph can be individually “calibrated” to match the predicted travel-time curves of some pre-selected velocity model. It has been long established that, with the station corrections, locations of new seismic events in the vicinity around the ground-truth event can be significantly improved. This is the standard approach of “calibration”. In a special application of this technique, travel-time residuals are obtained from a least-square location routine which is run with the depth constrained to the known “true” value. When these residuals are used as travel-time corrections in the same program run depth-free, nearby events can be located with smaller errors in depth. An elaboration of this specific application has been denoted the SRST (Source-Region-Station-Time) technique by [5] (see also [6]). Alternatively, a postulated 1D crustal velocity model can be adjusted so that the estimated hypocenter would perfectly match the ground-truth event. Thus, the fine-

tuned velocity model can be used to determine the location of nearby events without the need of establishing residual corrections for individual stations. Both the SRST and the model-tuning procedures require at least one ground-truth event. The North Korean-declared nuclear tests at Punggye serve as a classic example where multiple-event location techniques would work very well, and the impressive seismic results seem to be corroborated by satellite interferometry [2].

There are cases where no nearby event of known location is available. Furthermore, there are cases where not only the crustal model is not well known, the seismic stations could be sparse or even spread in a very skew geometry. R. Jih [1] presents a procedure, J0, which could be particularly suitable for these disadvantageous situations. In this study, J0 and another azimuth-based non-standard location procedure are reviewed and compared.

## 2. ADAPTIVE LOCATION METHODS J0 AND YZX

The most commonly used triangulation procedure for location is the “radial triangulation” which is based on intersection of several arcs drawn at respective epicentral distances. The epicentral distances can be individually estimated at each seismograph if, for instance, [2] the differential arrival (such as S-P) is available and [3] the P- and S-wave velocity structure around the seismograph is known. In the case only one common phase, say, the initial P, is available, then each pair of seismographs can jointly determine a hyperbola which passes through the epicenter – provided that, again, the P-wave velocity is known. Lacking the knowledge of the crustal structure, the location derived from radial triangulation could be severely biased when the number of seismograph is limited. The Geiger-type least square inversion using arrival times would inherently suffer from the same drawback and limitations.

Through “azimuthal triangulation”, Asian seismic network operators have been locating earthquakes for several decades using the “Induced Perpendicular Bisectors” (IPB), even before computers were introduced to seismologists. The underlying simple principle can be best illustrated with the following extreme case. If two seismographs happen to record identical arrival times of the same seismic phase, then to the extent the 1D structure applies to the region, the hypocenter should lie on the perpendicular bisector of the line segment or the great circle which connects these two specific seismographs. Depending on the epicentral distances, the perpendicular bisector itself could be a great circle along the Earth's surface or a normal section cutting through the Earth. If two or more such perpendicular bisectors are available, then the hypocenter or epicenter can be determined via triangulation. The merit lies in how the perpendicular bisector is derived in a more general setting when the arrival time varies from station to station, which is typically the case in reality; and when waveform data are not available, which renders techniques based on full waveforms (such as polarization analysis

and frequency-wavenumber (FK) technique) not applicable.

The so-called “*Yin Zhong Xian*” algorithm, hereafter the YZX method, is an oriental version of IPB-based procedure. Given three arrival picks,  $t_1 < t_2 < t_3$ , at three seismographs S1, S2, and S3, respectively, the YZX method finds a point S4 which lies on the great circle connecting S1 and S3 such that the arrival time at S4 would be approximately  $t_2$ . S2 and S4 then determine one IPB. The search of S4 (through interpolation) requires a priori knowledge about the velocity structure. In reality, simple interpolation procedures are often used, which inevitably introduce additional uncertainty into the derived back azimuth, and hence the location would be affected as well.

Also relying on azimuthal triangulation for seismic location, R. Jih [1] proposes a procedure J0 to derive the back azimuth with a large aperture network where all seismographs are on one side of the event. The basic idea of J0 method is to decompose the recording network into (at least) two sub-networks so that each sub-network is comprised of stations spread over only one side of the postulated epicenter. That is, each sub-network should have a very large azimuthal gap and preferably a large aperture as well. Any standard Geiger-type of least-squares inversion routine can be applied to determine the back azimuth easily. Two or more such skew networks would suffice to derive two back azimuths for triangulation.

In this paper the procedure J0 is compared against the YZX method, to relocate earthquakes and explosions of known or well-constrained locations. It is demonstrated that, at regional distances, **the J0 algorithm performs better than does the YZX method, because the back azimuth derived with J0 is more reliable and stable.** This is not surprising, as the YZX tends to be more susceptible to the small-scale lateral heterogeneity which is often present in the crust. At local distances, however, the two methods seem to perform equally well (not shown).


## 3. EXAMPLE 1: THE SALMON EXPLOSION OF OCTOBER 22, 1964

Salmon, an underground nuclear explosion in Mississippi, was seismically recorded throughout North America and at some teleseismic stations. The 5-kt explosion was detonated at 16h 00m 00.0s UT on October 22, 1964, at a depth of 828.1 meters. The epicenter is 31°08'31.57"N, 89°34'11.8"W, in the Taut salt dome in Hattiesburg, Southern Mississippi. Extensive studies have been conducted for this event to validate crustal profiles toward different directions [7 - 9, J. Jordan [et al.] in [7] published phase picks recorded at 143 stations for Salmon explosion. Thirty six arrivals from those stations within 10° are used in this example.

Figure 1 shows 21 “induced bisectors”, each derived with the YZX method from three sites of the 36-station regional network. Figure 2 is the same as Figure 1, except that 25 back azimuths are determined using the

method J0 in conjunction with a global continental average model, IASP91 [10]. The IASP91 model is arbitrarily chosen to mimic the situation where the true crustal structure of a region of interest may not be available, and seismic analysts would have to use a possibly erroneous crustal model to start with (Figure 2). The

method J0 gives tightly converged rays, with the majority intersecting in the vicinity of the ground-truth location. The dashed circle in Figures 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6 has a radius of 18.73 km, which encircles an area of 1,000 km<sup>2</sup>.



G.T. location=31.142N -89.570W 0.828


21 "induced bisectors" used, each derived from a 3-station subnetwork

Figure 1. Adaptive Location of Salmon w. Method YZX

#### 4. EXAMPLE 2: THE TAIWAN STRAIT EARTHQUAKE OF SEPTEMBER 16, 1994

The September 16, 1994, Taiwan Strait earthquake caused significant damages to southeast China. Though at equal distance to Taiwan, its damage to Taiwan was relatively minor. Paths to the mainland China apparently had a weaker attenuation in ground motion. Fifteen pairs of Pn and Sn arrival times have been published by the Fujian Provincial Seismological Bureau [FSB], China [11, 12]. W-Y. Yeh [11] selected five sets of IPBs and suggested that YZX would lead to a solution consistent with the conventional triangulation results using solely S-P times (c.f. Figures 2 and 3 of [11]). In an attempt to duplicate Yeh's result, it is found that the YZX method degrades somewhat as additional IPBs are drawn from different combinations of FSB seismographs (Figure 3). It should be noted that, however, the station coordinates of FSB seismographs used in this relocation exercise are not exact, as they were digitized from geographic maps, which certainly have added extra random errors to the location, with an effect equivalent to those of larger phase picking errors or stronger lateral heterogeneities in the crust.

If the same 1-dimensional model is assumed for



G.T. location=31.142N -89.570W 0.828km

IASP91 model used for all subnetworks


Figure 2. Adaptive Location of Salmon w. Method J0

paths to Taiwan and mainland China, then combining FSB phase picks with those measured at Taiwan's Central Weather Bureau [CWB] leads to a location with large offset (See the yellow diamond in Figure 4). The 1-second difference between FSB and CWB clocks, as speculated by [12], cannot count for this dramatic shift of location. It appears that paths to Fujian region may have a velocity faster than that of the IASP91 model, whereas paths to Taiwan may be much slower. This is evidenced by Figure 4 (bottom) in which FSB and CWB underestimate and overestimate, respectively, the epicentral distances when the IASP91 model is used. Nevertheless, the individual back azimuths determined by FSB and CWB networks are not severely biased in direction. Thus applying the adaptive method J0 would lead to a triangulation result extremely close to the ISC and USGS/NEIC solution, which are based on hundreds of stations spread over all directions. The adaptive method is less sensitive to the choice of crustal model. Changing the crustal model from IASP91 to the southeast China model, which is in routine use at FSB [13] (see also [14]), does not seem to affect the triangulation result (Table). This is yet another indication that the adaptive method J0 is robust.

Table. Comparison of Epicenters of September 16, 1994 Event

| Network / Bulletin | $\phi^\circ$ (N) | $\lambda^\circ$ (E) | Remark                                    |
|--------------------|------------------|---------------------|---|
| Fujian Network     | 22.60            | 118.68              | [11], Southeast China model               |
| Fujian + Guangdong | 22.70            | 118.75              | [11], Southeast China model               |
| CSB Preliminary    | 22.60            | 118.73              | (China Seismological Bureau)              |
| CSB RRSN           | 23.00            | 118.50              | (CSB Rapid Reporting Seismograph Network) |
| Taiwan CWB         | 22.43            | 118.47              | (Taiwan Central Weather Bureau)           |
| IESAS + NCU        | 22.37            | 118.63              | [12]                                      |
| USGS / NEIC        | 22.53            | 118.71              |   |
| ISC                | 22.52            | 118.75              |   |
| Adaptive Method J0 | 22.48            | 118.73              | This study: Fujian+Taiwan, SE China model |
| Adaptive Method J0 | 22.48            | 118.72              | This study: Fujian+Taiwan, IASP91 model   |

(Note: China Seismological Bureau, or CSB, was the name of the Chinese earthquake monitoring agency at the time the earthquake occurred, which has since been renamed China Earthquake Administration, or CEA.)




NEIC=0620 18.7 22.53N 118.71E 13km, ISC=22.52N 118.75E 13 km;  
CWB=0620 15.62 22.43N 118.47E 19km; FSB=22.60N 118.68E 10 km;  
10 "induced bisectors" used, each derived from a 3-station subnetwork

Figure 3. Adaptive Location of 940916 w. Method YZX

**5. EXAMPLE 3: THE KARA SEA EVENT OF AUGUST 16, 1997**

Figure 5 illustrates how the method J0 can be applied to derive the location of Kara Sea event of August 16, 1997. A sub-network "A" comprised of 6 stations (KBS, SPITS, KEV, SDF, KAF, and FINISS), 11 phase picks, are fed into the LocSAT program (Figure 5, top) as described in [15, 16]. The semi-major axes of the seven error ellipses are nearly the same, all pointing to the east – roughly 100° from the north (Figure 6). A second sub-network "B" is formed with 7 stations all spread to the south of Novaya Zemlya, which includes



NEIC=0620 18.7 22.53N 118.71E 13km; ISC (REF)=22.52N 118.75E 13 km;  
CWB (Taiwan)=0620 15.62 22.43N 118.47E 19.1 km; FSB=0620 22.10.22.60N  
118.68E 10.0 km; Adaptive J0 w. IASP91: 22.48N 118.72E

Figure 4. Adaptive Location of 940916 w. Method J0

NRI, ARU, PKK, JOF, VAF, SUF, and KJN. There are 10 phase picks reported by these stations. Seven different continental crustal models produce nearly identical "optimal" back azimuths, pointing to the north (Figure 5, bottom). Using the IASP91 model, the two rays intersect at a location 11 km to the west of pIDC's REB location published in [19] (Figure 6). If the two networks were combined and the conventional location algorithm applied, the resulting location is 24 km to the south of the REB location (unfilled star in Figure 6). In-depth reviews addressing both the technical and political aspects of this event can be found in [18, 19].





Figure 5. Grouping of Seismographs for 970816



]REB location = 72.6484 57.3517 [depth set to 0] (Cross)  
 IASP91, 11 picks ==> OT=2:11:5.281, 72.750 55.358 0.000, Offset=67.2  
 (Network A=FINES KAF KBS KEV SDF SPITS)  
 IASP91, 10 picks ==> OT=2:11:4.357, 71.839 57.472 55.559, Offset=90.4  
 (Network B=ARU JOF KJN NRI PKK SUF VAF)  
 IASP91 + J0 method ==> 72.657 57.033, Offset=10.7 (Blue Star)  
 IASP91 + all picks combined ==> 72.445 57.104, Offset=24.2 (Blank Star)

Figure 6. Locations of 970816, Conventional vs. Adaptive [J0]

## 6. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Two azimuth-based location techniques, J0 and YZX, have been implemented and tested to relocate earthquakes and explosions of known or well-constrained locations. It is shown that, at regional distances, the J0 algorithm performs better than does the YZX method, because the back azimuth derived with J0 is more reliable and stable. This is not surprising, as the YZX tends to be more susceptible to the small-scale lateral heterogeneities which are often present in the crust. At local distances, however, the two methods seem to perform equally well.

An interesting question raised by Prof. Thorne Lay at the 1<sup>st</sup> Event Screening Workshop (November 1997, Beijing) was that, if both the staged location procedure (like J0) and the conventional Geiger inversion are using virtually the same amount of information, would the staged approach offer advantages over the conventional procedure? In the case of simple crustal structure, indeed both methods could perform equally. Figure 2 exhibits a tight clustering of back azimuths derived from the adaptive method J0, resulting a well-constrained epicenter. This can certainly be achieved with all the phase picks lumped in one single Geiger inversion. This is not the case in general, however. As shown in Figure 4, lumping phase picks from Fujian and Taiwan seismic networks into one least-squares inversion would lead to a disastrous location, unless the difference in lateral difference in crustal velocities is accounted for. This is the intrinsic drawback of the conventional location procedure. In the case of staged procedure such as J0, each back azimuth is determined with a skew sub-network. The skew geometry of the sub-network would inevitably lead to large uncertainty in location and large error in epicenter. However, the method J0 does not use the epicenter information in the second stage of the process. The only piece of information – which is the best constrained piece – utilized by J0 is the semi-major axis, or equivalently, the back azimuth. As a result, the J0 method is practically using several back azimuths – each one being better constrained in the process – for triangulation. This explains why J0 is not equivalent to the conventional Geiger inversion.

A side remark on seismic data should be made. Seismic data have multiple uses – quick and accurate location of damaging earthquake so as to permit rapid emergency response, studies of the interior of the earth and the physics of the earthquake source, and nuclear test verification [18]. The field of seismology, which has been involved in earthquake studies for nearly 100 years, has a long tradition of international data exchange, much like that for weather information. It would be a tragedy if a major earthquake disaster strikes and response to the disaster were delayed because seismic data were not available. Example 2 clearly illustrates the advantages and importance of sharing the phase readings between China and Taiwan. China

Earthquake Administration [CEA, formerly China Seismological Bureau or CSB] has been promptly sharing phase readings of large earthquakes with Russia, Pakistan, Algeria, Laos, Myanmar, Samoa, Indonesia, and Cuba [2.4]. It is not surprising that the performance of CEA's RRSN [Rapid Reporting Seismograph Network] in earthquake location has greatly benefited from the data exchange. News has it that CEA and the Central Weather Bureau [CWB] of Taiwan have signed a seismic cooperation agreement in February 2014, and have started routine seismic data exchange between the two sides of the Taiwan Strait since June 2015.

A lesson learned from Example 2 (Figure 4) is that phase picks from different tectonic regions must be combined in a judicious manner, if the conventional Geiger inversion is to be applied. One way to do so is to take into account the difference in crustal structures and apply the path-dependent travel-time tables – or equivalently, path-dependent corrections - prior to lumping the

phase picks together for inversion. If adaptive methods (such as the method J0) are utilized, however, then the improvement in location can be immediately achieved without the need to wait for the time-consuming "calibration research" is conducted. This can be regarded as an *ad hoc* measure.

**ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS AND DISCLAIMER**

*This study was conducted at U.S. Department of State and U.S. Defense Threat Reduction Agency (DTRA) (DTRA records DTL-P-990182 and DTL-P-990284; OSD record OASD-PA-99S0868; DOS PA record 160601). The conclusions and suggestions reflect the opinions of the author's, as a subject technical expert, and should not be interpreted or implied as necessarily representing the official policy of the Department of Defense (DoD), Department of State, or the whole United States Government.*

**REFERENCES**

1. Jih, R.-S. Epicenter estimation using erroneous crustal model(s) and skew regional networks / R.-S. Jih // Phys. Earth Planet. Inter., 1999. - 113, 303-319. DOI: 10.1016/S0031-9201(99)00009-6, <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0031920199000096>.
- 2.\*) Amos, J. Sentinel maps of North Korean nuclear blast aftermath / J. Amos // BBC News, April 21, 2016. - <http://www.bbc.com/news/science-environment-36103812>.
3. NORSAR Information on North Korea's nuclear test on 6 January 2016, <http://www.norsar.no/norsar/about-us/News/North-Korea-nuclear-test-on-6-January-2016>
4. The S&T University of China/ 温联星研究组:中国科大研究精确定朝鲜2016年地下核爆位置和当量, [http://seis.ustc.edu.cn/News/201601/t20160106\\_234889.html](http://seis.ustc.edu.cn/News/201601/t20160106_234889.html)
5. Veith, K. F. Refined hypocenters and accurate reliability estimates / K. F. Veith // Bull. Seism. Soc. Am., 1975. – 75. – P. 1199 - 1222.
6. Blandford, R. R. Use of Source-Region-Station Time corrections at NTS for depth estimation / R. R. Blandford // Report SDAC-TR-75-4. - Teledyne Geotech, Alexandria, VA, 1975.
7. Jordan, J. N. Travel times and amplitudes from the Salmon explosion / J. N. Jordan, W. V. Mickey, W. Helterbran, D. M. Clark // J. Geophys. Res., 1966. – 71 - 14. – P. 3469 - 3482.
8. Springer, D. L. Calculation of first-zone P wave amplitudes for Salmon event and for de-coupled sources / D. L. Springer // J. Geophys. Res., 1966. – 71 - 14. – P. 3459 - 3467.
9. Warren, D. Crustal seismic measurements in southern Mississippi / Warren, D., J. H. Healy, and W. H. Jackson // J. Geophys. Res., 1966. – 71 - 14., - P. 3437 - 3458.
10. Kennett, B. IASPEI 1991 Seismological Tables / B. Kennett (editor) // Research School of Earth Sciences., - Australian National University. – 1991 - 167 pp.
11. Yeh, W.-Y. Preliminary study of the epicenter of September 16, 1994, (magnitude 6.5) earthquake in the Taiwan Strait / W.-Y. Yeh // Fujian Seismology, 1995. – 11 – 1. – P. 110 - 114.
12. Huang, B.-S. Re-examination of the epicenter of 16 September 1994 Taiwan Strait earthquake using the beamforming method / Huang, B.-S., G.-C. Chen, H.-Y. Yan, and Z.-X. Yao // TAO, 1999. – 10 – 3. – P. 529 - 542. <http://tao.cgu.org.tw/pdf/v103p529.pdf>.
13. Fan, Y.-L. Compilation of near-regional travel-time tables for South China / Y.-L. Fan, J.-Z. Lin, R.-H. Hu, and Z.-N. Luo // Development of regionalized travel-time tables in China' (J.-G. Xiu, C. Zhang, and K.-X. Qu, Edt.). - Beijing. - Monitoring and R&D Department, State Seismological Bureau.- 1989.
14. Jih, R.-S. Location calibration efforts in China / R.-S. Jih // Proceedings of the 20th Seismic Research Symposium, 21-23 September, 1998. - Santa Fe, New Mexico, 1998. – 44 - 55.
15. Jordan, T. Teleseismic location techniques and their application to earthquake clusters in the South-central / T. Jordan, K. A. Sverdrup // Pacific, Bull. Seism. Soc., 1981. - Am., 71. – P.1105 - 1130.
16. Bratt, S. R. Locating events with a sparse network of regional arrays / S. R. Bratt, T. C. Bache // Bull. Seism. Soc., 1988. - Am., 78. – P. 780 - 798.
17. Israelson, H., M. D. Fisk, X. Yang, and R. G. North (1997). The August 16, 1997 event in the Kara Sea / H. Israelson, M. D. Fisk, X. Yang, R. G. North // CMR Technical Report CMR-97/38, Center for Monitoring Research, Arlington, VA. - 1997.
18. Sykes, L. R. (1997). Small earthquake near Russian nuclear test site leads to U.S. charges of cheating on Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty / L. R. Sykes // J. Fed. of Am. Scientists. – 50 – 6. – P. 1 - 12.
19. Richards, P. G., and W.-Y. Kim Testing the nuclear test-ban treaty / P. G. Richards, W.-Y. Kim // Nature, 1997. – 389 (23 Oct 1997). – P. 781 - 782.

\*<sup>1</sup>Note – Some of the seismic location results of North Korean nuclear tests corroborated by the German inSAR work are listed below (in addition to [3, 4]):

- 2.1. Chinese Academy of Sciences / Institute of Geology & Geophysics. - Preliminary report on the 6 January 2016 North Korea nuclear test: Relocation, discrimination and yield estimation, 2016.
- 2.2. Zhao, L The 12 February 2013 North Korean underground nuclear test, Seism / L. Zhao, [et al.] // Res. Letters, 2014. - 85:130-134, doi: 10.1785/0220130103, <http://srl.geoscienceworld.org/content/85/1/130.full>.
- 2.3. CTBTO/PTS technical briefing on “DPRK January 6, 2016 event” to CTBT Preparatory Commission, January 7, 2016. <https://swp.ctbto.org/web/swp/dprk-event-06.01.2016>
- 2.4. EARNW2016 presentations by US NDC (AFTAC), Australian NDC (Geosciences Australia), Japan NDC-1 (Japan Weather Association), Chinese NDC (CTBT Beijing NDC & Radionuclide Laboratory), and ROK NDC (Korea Institute of Geosciences & Mineral Resources) on their relative location calculations of the January 6, 2016 event, as presented at the 4th East Asia Regional NDC Workshop, May 16-18, 2016, Beijing, China.
- 2.5. 38North, The Challenge of Predicting Future North Korean Nuclear Tests, <http://38north.org/2016/02/punggye020116/>

### **АЗИМУТТЫ ЕСЕПТЕУ НЕГІЗІНДЕ ОҚИҒАЛАРДЫ СТАНДАРТТЫ ЕМЕСЕ ЖЕРГІЛІКТЕУДІҢ ЕКІ ӘДІСТЕРІН САЛЫСТЫРМА ЗЕРТТЕУ**

Джи Р.

*АҚШ Мемлекеттік департаментінің Қарулану туралы келісімдерді бақылау,  
верификациялау және сақтау бюросы, Вашингтон, АҚШ*

Мақалада, азимутты есептеуінде негізделген, екі стандартты емес, бір біріне байланыссыз әзірленген сейсмикалық триангуляция процедурасы қарастырылады. Зерттеулердің мақсаты, қауіпті төмендету, сондай-ақ ЯСЖТШ сақтауын бақылау мақсатындағы сейсмикалық мониторингінде келесі нақты, жиі кездесетін жағдайларда оқиғаларды сейсмикалық жергіліктеу проблемаларын тиімді шешу үшін алгоритмді әзірлеуі болған: 1) жер қыртысының моделі беймәлім, сондықтан, еркінше глобалды моделі қолданылады (мысалы, IASP91); 2) станциялардың сейсмикалық желісі калибрленбеген, сондықтан, фазалар түсу уақыттары бастапқы түрінде қолданылады – станциялық түзетулерсіз және жүгіру жолына түзетулерсіз; 3) тіркейтін станциялармен оқиғаларды азимуталдік қамтуы нашар.

### **СРАВНИТЕЛЬНОЕ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЕ ДВУХ МЕТОДОВ НЕСТАНДАРТНОЙ ЛОКАЛИЗАЦИИ СОБЫТИЙ НА ОСНОВЕ РАСЧЕТА АЗИМУТА**

Джи Р.

*Бюро контроля, верификации и соблюдения соглашений о вооружениях  
Государственного департамента США, Вашингтон, США*

В статье рассматриваются две нестандартные, разработанные независимо друг от друга, процедуры сейсмической триангуляции, основанные на расчете азимута. Целью исследований была разработка алгоритма для эффективного решения проблемы сейсмической локализации событий в следующих реальных, часто встречающихся ситуациях при сейсмическом мониторинге для снижения опасности, а также для контроля за соблюдением ДВЗЯИ: 1) коровая модель не известна, следовательно, применяется произвольная глобальная модель (например, IASP91); 2) сейсмическая сеть станций не откалибрована, следовательно, времена вступления фаз используются в их исходном виде – без станционных поправок и без поправок на путь пробега; 3) азимутальный охват события, регистрируемыми станциями плохой.

2016  
ВЫПУСК 2

ISSN 1729-7516

НАУЧНО-ТЕХНИЧЕСКИЙ  
ВЕСТНИК

ПЕРИОДИЧЕСКИЙ НАУЧНО-ТЕХНИЧЕСКИЙ ЖУРНАЛ  
НАЦИОНАЛЬНОГО ЯДЕРНОГО ЦЕНТРА  
РЕСПУБЛИКИ КАЗАХСТАН

