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Abstract

More than 15,000 seismic events were recorded by the Israel Seismic Network (ISN) during the past 30 years, at the vicinity of the Dead Sea Fault (DSF) zone. During those years locations were obtained using several velocity models, which resulted in inconsistencies in locations. In addition, we found that seismicity is biased to very shallow depth estimations that do not match other estimations of more localized studies in the region. Thus, improving the location of the seismic record is a necessary and sufficient condition, required for the determination of the properties of the capable tectonic sources in the region of Israel, and to estimate their potential hazard. This study is focused on improving the regional earthquake catalog using robust single event location software (within the Antelope software), based on local (after Gitterman et. al., 2005) and global seismic velocity models. The new relocations show more reasonable depth distributions, in accordance with the seismo-tectonic settings of the region. We also demonstrate and analyze the difference in the event-station distribution, showing location effects of a sparse network, in which the main effect is seen for the focal depths: events located out-of-the-network coverage tend to obtain a focal depth shallower than events located within the network coverage; hence, the out-of-the-network events, are less constrained, resulting in higher location uncertainties. The depth cross-section along the DSF zone within the boundaries of this study presents a good correlation with previous estimation of the boundaries of the seismogenic zone, obtained by heat-flow analysis.

The relocated earthquake catalogue is regarded as the new initial robust locations of the seismic bulletin of the ISN, and considered as the basis for future studies and for more elaborated relocations; it will be soon open to the public and available for download from the Geological Survey of Israel (GSI) website at: <https://www gsi gov il>. This first stage of our project was summarized and accepted to publication in the Seismological Research Letters (SRL), and is attached as an Appendix to this report.
Introduction

Large-scale observations of spatial patterns of earthquake hypocenters show that seismicity is located mainly along plate boundaries (Lay and Wallace, 1995). For smaller scales, such as for regional or local seismic activity, this seismo-tectonic relation is more obscured, and requires higher resolutions of the sub-plate boundaries and fault systems, and an accurate earthquake locations, in order to clearly observe it (e.g., Shearer and Hauksson 2005, Hauksson et al. 2012). Therefore, as we try to extract more information from seismicity patterns, we soon face the issue of how precise is the earthquake catalogue we are examining.

One of the main issues in characterizing fault systems is to determine the seismogenic zones, in which strains are accommodated mainly by brittle failure. The seismogenic zone is affected by many variables; from regional and local stress fields (e.g., Plenefisch and Bonjer, 1997; de Vicente et al., 2008; Palano et al., 2013), through lateral and vertical lithological changes (Aldersons et al., 2003; Brothers et al., 2009), to heat flux ascending from the mantle (Lachenbruch et al., 1985; Grall et al., 2012; Shalev et al., 2013). The base of the seismogenic zone is theoretically determined from the brittle-ductile transition and commonly set between 300 and 350 ºC (e.g., Shalev et al., 2013). Therefore in order to properly determine the observed seismogenic zone (e.g., Sibson, 1982) it is crucial that the seismic depths within an earthquake catalogue are well constrained. Due to the mathematical nature of the location problem, depth has lower accuracy than the epicenter, and is highly sensitive to the applied velocity model. Therefore, besides the general issue of improving earthquake locations (e.g., Allam et al., 2014), the issue of improving their focal depths is very significant for the characterization of active seismogenic zones. Similar to the general expectation that the epicenters will fall in close proximity to surface fault traces, we would expect that the hypocenters will have depth distribution reflecting the lithology, fault structure, and other measures observed in the examined region (e.g., heat flux).

The Israeli Seismic Network (ISN) has been established in 1983 (Shapira and Hofstetter, 2007), and was expanded and upgraded several times, following the technological developments in Seismometry. The network monitors the region, providing specifically good coverage of the Dead Sea Fault (DSF) system and the
Carmel Fault System (CFS). During the past 30 years several velocity models were applied to locate the seismic activity (later inserted into JStar, the local software), and several location algorithms were applied; all leading to inconsistent seismic locations. The current data-processing procedure includes an initial automatic detection and location of seismic events, shortly followed by a) analyst review and fine tuning of the P and S detection, b) relocation and c) magnitude estimation. In the process of a current upgrade of the system we reviewed the seismic catalogue recorded through the years, and found that there is a bias to very shallow depth estimations, that do not match other observations that are known from more localized studies in the region (Hofstetter et al., 1996; Aldersons et al., 2003; Hofstetter et al., 2012; Wetzler et al., 2014), and to the observations seen in other similar seismo-tectonic regions (e.g., Sato et al., 2004; Shearer et al., 2005; Zaliapin and Ben-Zion, 2013).

Our first order solution was to revisit the locations of the entire seismic catalogue, assuming that the P and S picks are valid, using a single robust velocity model of the region, and applying a high quality location algorithm, with world-wide distribution. To achieve this goal we applied the relocate algorithm and the GENLOC library, of the Antelope package (<https://www.brtt.com>). The results and initial analysis provided in the following text, establish a renewed earthquake catalogue, with better locations, and more reasonable depth distribution.

Geological Background

The crustal structure of Israel is characterized by southeast declining Moho boundary, sub-parallel to the Israeli coastline, associated with a transition zone between the relatively thin intermediate crust of the Eastern Mediterranean Sea (20 km depth) and the thicker crust of Jordan (32 km depth) (Segev et al., 2006). This structure was retrieved by the compilation of several studies including: inversion of teleseismic P waves (Hofstetter et al., 2000), refraction profiles (Ginzburg et al., 1979; Makris et al., 1983; Ben-Avraham et al., 2002; Weber et al., 2004; Koulakov and Sobolev, 2006) and gravity and magnetic maps (Rybakov et al., 1997; Segev et al., 2006).

Israel is also located closely to a large fault system, the Dead Sea Transform (DST), extending from the southern Red Sea spreading center to the northern zone of
plate convergence in southern Turkey, a distance of ~1,000 km, defining the plate boundary between the Arabian and African-Sinai plates (Figure 1). The left-lateral slip motion along the DST has accommodated horizontal displacement of ~100 km (Quennell, 1956; Garfunkel et al., 1981; Garfunkel, 2014), in a mean slip motion of ~5 mm/year (Sadeh et al., 2012) since the Early Miocene. The tectonic activity along the DST has formed a series of deep basins: the Gulf of Eilat (Aqaba), the Sea of Galilee and the Dead Sea Basin, which is the largest and deepest of these basins. The Carmel-Gilboa-Faria fault system is an additional fault system, located at northern Israel (Figure 1), and striking NW-SE, diagonally to the DST, and was suggested to precede the DST, developing during the Senonian (Segev and Rybakov, 2011).

The recent 30 years of ongoing tectonic activity along the major regional fault system is demonstrated by the seismicity presented in Figure 2. The seismicity pattern highlights the plate boundaries showing localized seismicity along the DST, and the branching of the transform fault system northwards to Lebanon with the Rohm, Yammuneh, and Serghya Faults (Ron, 1987; Lyakhovsky et al., 1994).

The strongest recorded event in the last 160 years was the 1995, Mw 7.2 earthquake, that was followed by 6 months of intense aftershock activity, and was interpreted as a strike-slip fault (Baer et al., 2008). Paleoseismological studies demonstrate that moderate to large magnitude (M > 7) earthquakes occurred along the DST (Shapira et al., 1993; Marco et al., 1996; Marco and Agnon, 2005; Agnon et al., 2006; Wetzler et al., 2010; Lazar et al., 2010). In addition, historical records attest to the occurrence of moderate to strong earthquakes along the DST, which caused extensive damage to historical settlements, observed at damaged structures throughout the region (Marco, 2008).

Previous seismological studies have demonstrated a relatively deep seismogenic activity, located in the Dead Sea area, indicating focal depths down to ~25 km (Aldersons et al., 2003; Hofstetter et al., 2012; Wetzler et al., 2014). These observations, as well as surface heat flux measurements indicate a cold crust, characterized by deep brittle failure (Shalev et al., 2013).
Dataset and Data Processing

Seismological dataset

We reprocessed the seismic activity of the Dead Sea Fault region, from 1985 to 2015, within a geographic rectangle of 33-37 in longitudes, and 28-34 in latitudes. This dataset includes 15,856 earthquakes (Figure 1), in the magnitude range of $0.5 \leq M_d \leq 7.2$, collected by the Geophysical Institute of Israel (GII). The GII has been monitoring the seismic activity in the region during the past 30 years, using the ISN (Figure 1b) consisting of a total of ~ 140 seismic stations; during these years many of these stations were modified: some were de-activated, others upgraded to 3-channel component digital seismometers, and some are still operating similar to their original settings. Since the ISN includes various types of seismometers, the sampling rates in the seismic station vary between 20 sps for the older stations to 100 sps for the modern ones. The current data acquisition system, operated and maintained by the Division of Seismology of the GII, incorporates the ISN stations, two CTBT stations (Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty), and several CNF stations (Cooperating National Facility). A significantly smaller percentage of the data is incorporated from other regional networks: a) GE, Geophone global network of GFZ, b) JSO, the Jordanian Seismic Observatory, and c) CQ, the seismic network of Cyprus.

Data processing

The earthquake bulletin includes the origin location of the seismic events, their origin time, and the P- and S- wave arrival times reviewed and refined by GII’s analysts. In addition, it holds the error estimations of the locations, based on the picking errors of the arrival times, assigned by the analysts, and errors due the location algorithm and the velocity model (Polozov and Pinsky, 2004). We regarded the arrival times as the most reliable measure we have, and examined the remaining components, mainly focusing on the velocity model used for the relocations.

Relocation method

We applied the relocate program of the Antelope software. The program is an end-user interface to the Generalized Location (GENLOC) Library of Antelope software (<www.brtt.com>), providing many of the methods commonly used for single event
location (Pavlis et al., 2004). The GENLOC library is based on the LOCSAT algorithm (Bratt and Bache, 1988), which originated from the nuclear monitoring program, and is also considered a well tested and robust location program. The program accepts any combination of arrival times and slowness vectors, and can utilize seismic phases, with predicted travel times and/or slowness vectors, provided by the user. It is applicable at any scale from local to global networks, and replaces the azimuth data by slowness vectors. This is done in order to avoid some of the intrinsic problems of azimuth data used in many location algorithms, in which at high velocities or close to the source, azimuth becomes unstable. The location search is done by the standard Gauss-Newton Method (Lee and Stewart, 1981), originally suggested by Geiger (1910), and uses a linear approximation to relate perturbation in the hypocenter parameters to the data. Error handling is done based on Pavlis (1986), in which the total error is a linear sum of the main three types of source-errors: measurement error, modeling error, and non-linearity. The relocate program has a comfortable database interface, allowing the examination of various velocity models.

**Velocity model**

Several velocity models were used at the GII to create the earthquake bulletin, and to the best of our knowledge, in the past decade, many of the events were located based on the velocity model of Feigin and Shapira (1994). In addition, several geographical subsets of the data were relocated, as part of high-resolution studies (e.g., Alderson et al. 2003, Hofstetter et al., 2012, Wetzler et al., 2014, for the Dead Sea Basin; Shamir et al., 2003, Hofstetter et al. 2003 for the gulf of Eilat; Navon 2011 for Sea of Galilee), and several velocity models were used and developed (i.e., Gitterman et al., 2005; Mechie et al., 2009) as part of those studies. We examined many of these models (including the one of Feigin and Shapira (1994), which we name JStar), trying to find the most reliable velocity model, providing the most stable solution with the smallest errors. Gitterman et al. (2005) provided the most recent work, treating the entire region of the DSF, using a set of controlled explosions recorded by all network stations, searching for a velocity model with the best fit to the known origin times and locations. We chose to relocate the seismic catalog here by local velocity model of Gitterman et al., (2005), named here GITT05. We also used the IASP91 velocity model (Kennett and Engdahl, 1991) as a standard reference, which for the purpose of
local-scale seismicity can be treated almost as a single layer model, providing stable solutions. However, while for Southern California, IASP91 is a reasonable approximation, due to the high percentage of igneous rocks at relatively shallow depths (Mooney and Weaver, 1989), in the DSF region there are higher percentage of sedimentary rocks with lower seismic velocities at the shallow crust (up to ~5km depth). This means that although the IASP91 locations are more stable, they are over estimating the depth, since the higher velocities at shallow depths “push” the solution deeper into the crust.

Results

Our new relocated catalog includes 15,181 events, which are 95.7% of the original catalog, remaining after the removal of the poorly constrained locations. Figure 3 shows a) a map view of the relocated events (Figure 3a), and b) depth histograms of different subsets of the events (Figure 3b). It seems that, on average, the original locations (Figure 2) and the new relocations (Figure 3) show quite a similar horizontal pattern, meaning that at least the epicenters did not shift significantly by modifications in the velocity models, and in the location algorithms. The main story of the new relocations is in the new depth distribution presented in Figure 3b1, showing that events are located significantly deeper than the original locations, and having an average vertical shift of ~10 km (using the median). While in the original catalog ~90% of the events were located within the upper 5 km of the crust, after the relocation they are distributed down to 35 km depth, showing an active seismogenic zone with a peak activity at 15 km depth; these numbers are similar for both velocity models, presented by gray (IASP91) and black (GITT05) bars of Figure 3b. Figure 3 also shows the coverage area of the seismic network, marking the area of the seismic network boundaries (dashed line) in which within it, locations are well constrained (In-Network), and beyond it, locations are poorly constrained (Off-Network). Examining Figure 3b we see that while within the coverage area of the seismic network we obtain a reasonable depth distribution (Figure 3b2), as expected for the seismotectonic settings of the DSF zone, epicenters located north (Figure 3b3) and south (Figure 3b4) of the seismic network coverage area have a large number of shallow events. We claim that events located out of the boundaries of the seismic network are poorly constrained due to the lack of azimuthal station coverage.
There were no consistent error estimations of the original relocations, and the majority of events were not assigned an error at all, even in respect to the arrival times, estimated manually by seismic analysts. Therefore, error analysis was done only for the relocate algorithm, comparing between the different velocity models. Figure 4 shows the comparison between the IASP91 and the GITT05 velocity models, showing significantly smaller vertical (Figure 4c) and horizontal (Figure 4a, b) errors for the latter, summarized also by statistical measures in Table 1. As both solutions share the same algorithm and differ only in their velocity models, we interpret the smaller errors as better overall fit of the GITT05 velocity model, and its corresponding locations as our preferred solution. Figure 4 also shows that for the GITT05 velocity model, the error estimations in the horizontal axes are fairly similar to the errors on the vertical axis, with a peak distribution around an error of 0.2-0.25 km. In the case of the IASP91 velocity model, while for the horizontal axes the error peak distribution is around 0.45-0.5 km, the vertical error distribution shows larger errors, with a peak around 0.75 km. Moreover, beyond the statistics, GITT05 velocity model is a more reasonable model than IASP91, accounting for the lower seismic velocities at the upper sedimentary layers of the study area (e.g., Ginzburg and Ben-Avraham, 1997; Hofstetter et al., 2000; Gitterman et al., 2005; Laske and Weber, 2008).

Statistical analysis

Up to this point we examined the relocated events, showing that the main effect is in achieving a reliable depth distribution of the event locations. We will now examine the horizontal shift of the relocated epicenters from their original locations. On the one hand, we would like to check that there is no horizontal bias due to the relocation algorithm, velocity model and / or station distribution; on the other hand, horizontal shifts with preferred orientation might reflect a problem in the original locations that was corrected by the new relocations. In Figure 5, we compare the horizontal-azimuth shift, measured between the original locations and the new relocations, within 20° slices, for the two velocity models: GITT05, and IASP91. In Figures 5a1 and 5b1, we count the number of horizontal shifts in each slice, showing quite homogeneous distribution, with no preferred orientation. However, this is not the complete picture, it does not consider the magnitude of these shifts (measured by horizontal distance). This is done in Figures 5a2 and 5b2, in which for each slice we
calculate the median horizontal shift. It is done for all the events (dark blue), and then also for three subsets: In-Network (magenta), Off-Network North (light blue) and Off-Network South (green). While for In-Network events we see almost homogeneous median shifts, for both velocity models, beyond the coverage area the pattern becomes more heterogeneous: a) for the northern events the median shifts seem to be randomly distributed, and b) for the southern events we see preferred orientation in a sub parallel S-N direction. The latter is also seen in Figure 5c, emphasizing the main difference between the relocations obtained by the two velocity models. For the GITT05 velocity model, the depth relocations, shifts the events on a S-N axis, with no clear preference, due to the similarity to the JStar velocity model. However, for the IASP91 velocity model, the seismic velocities at shallow depths are significantly higher, resulting in a strong effect, in which all those events that were pushed down in the relocations had to be moved further away from the recording stations; that is to say that events were shifted to the south, compensating for the faster ray path travel time. The overall effect of the median horizontal shifts is seen by the dark blue line, which averages all the above considerations. It seems that similar to the error analysis, the horizontal shifts analysis is also showing that the GITT05 local velocity model provides a more stable solution than the IASP91 global velocity model, with less significant bias due the event-station distribution.

Discussion

Earthquake locations and velocity models

We have separated the events into two main regions: a) In-Network - within the coverage area and b) Off-Network - beyond the coverage area of the stations; this was done since the latter has an embedded lack of information, leading to large uncertainties in the resulting locations (Gary Pavlis, Personal Communication). However, even with these large uncertainties, we have shown that with the relocate program we obtain more reasonable locations, not only within the coverage area, but also beyond it. Comparing between the two velocity models: GITT05 and IASP91, we see quite consistent and expected characteristics, in which: a) velocity models with high velocity layers will push the epicenters deeper, b) for Off-Network events, the faster the seismic velocity of a layer, the further away from the stations they would be
located, and c) error estimation of the relocations, generated by both velocity models, show that at least in our case, errors obtained from local GITTO5 velocity model relocations, are lower than the global IASP91 errors. Still, locations beyond the coverage area, especially in the southern tip should be taken with a grain of salt (Gary Pavlis, Personal Communications), since location estimations in this type of situation are simply poorly constrained (Pavlis et al., 2004). Reality might be somewhere in-between these two models, but the error bounds, calculated by the relocate program, are not representing the problem well enough, in order to resolve this issue with more certainty. For those areas, a more focused research should be done (if possible), only for the periods in which there was a better coverage of stations. This will provide better locations for those periods, and might be used as an additional constraint when locating events originating in the same region, at times of sparse station-coverage.

**Seismogenic Depth along the Dead Sea Fault**

The main benefit obtained by the relocations, is that we could now examine seismogenic zones along the DSF and CFS systems. An example to this is presented in Figure 6, showing the distribution of the seismicity in a narrow N-S trending band, along the DSF. The 0.75 quantile curve (continuous gray) marks the depth boundary of 75% of the events; meaning that the majority of the events do not go beyond that depth. This curve is compared to an estimation of the thermal profile along the DSF, obtained by Shalev et al. (2013) by interpolating heat flux measurements. The seismogenic depth is estimated according to the 300-350° temperature contours, indicating the maximum temperatures for brittle failure (Ranalli, 1995; Jaupart and Mareschal, 2010). Here we show that the new relocations provide fairly similar estimation of the seismogenic depth, as suggested by Shalev et al. (2013), reflecting for example, deep seismicity at the cold crust of the Dead Sea Basin (Aldersons et al. 2003; Shamir 2006), and shallow seismicity at the hot crust beneath the Sea of Galilee (Navon, 2011). Furthermore, our seismogenic depth profile is better constrained, showing additional features and depth anomalies that were not seen in Shalev et al. (2013), due to interpolation limitations of the heat-flow measurements, used to construct the seismogenic depth profile of Shalev et al. (2013).

The correlation between the seismogenic depth and the heat flow was observed and discussed, regarding other tectonic regions. For example, in Southern California, Magistrale (2002) has shown that the seismogenic depth (defined by the 0.95
quantile) is strongly heat-flow and lithology dependent, exhibiting deeper
seismogenic depth for lower heat flows, and for more Mafic compositions. Hong and
Menke (2006) focused on the San Jacinto fault zone showing that the 0.95 quantile
-corresponds to the 400°: colder crust at the NW of the fault correlated with deeper
seismicity, and warmer crust at the SE of the fault correlated with shallower
seismicity. Their definition for the seismogenic depth (0.95 quantile) is presented in
Figure 6 (dashed gray), better capturing the overall seismicity, and approximately
correlated to the 400° contour.

Bonner et al. (2003) have shown a more complex picture of the heat-flow to
seismogenic-depth relation. Analyzing all California, and defining the seismogenic
depth according to the 0.99 quantile, some of the regions have shown correlation to
the 450° contour, and some of the lower heat-flow provinces (<50 mW/m2) have
shown correlation to the 260° contour. Bonner hypothesized that other factors such as
stress regime and strain rate contribute to these differences. More detailed work on
these issues are yet to come, once we compile our results with specific areas, in which,
previous high resolution studies have been made in the past.

Conclusions

We applied the relocate program, which is a robust single event location
algorithm, in order to reprocess the arrival-times of the past 30 years in the vicinity of
Israel and the Dead Sea Fault. The result is a revised seismic catalogue for the region
of Israel, with a significant contribution to the depths of the seismicity in the region,
showing a more reasonable depth distribution in the region. This catalogue should be
the basis for future, more elaborated relocation methods e.g., HYPODD (Waldhauser
and Ellsworth, 2000). From all the velocity models tested in this study, the one by
Gitterman et al. (2005) has shown the smallest errors, and provided the most
reasonable and reliable locations.

For the relocated catalogue we separated between the events within the coverage
area of the network, and beyond it, due to the significant difference in their associated
uncertainties. For In-Network events, the location-uncertainty is small, and is
reflected also by the small horizontal shifts, with no preferred orientation. For Off-
Network events, the location-uncertainty is larger and is reflected by the larger
horizontal shifts. For the southern events, originating at the Gulf of Eilat, the
horizontal shifts are showing a clear preferred N-S orientation, which is more pronounced to the south, meaning that more events were shifted further away from the recording stations.

We show that the seismicity could be applied to define the seismogenic zone of the DSF, fitting nicely to the seismogenic depths derived from the heat flux interpolation of Shalev et al. (2013). Moreover, while the Shalev profile is interpolated also in regions with hardly any measurements, we have higher resolution, obtaining a more detailed and accurate profile of the seismogenic zone.

We suggest replacing the current seismic bulletin with our new relocated bulletin, so that it could serve as an initial, more reliable reference for future seismological studies of the region. The new catalogue will be soon available for download, together with GIS layers and Google Earth layers for the convenience of the users, in the website of the Geological Survey of Israel, GSI (<https://www.gsi.gov.il>).

We have completed here a fundamental step in our research objective to improve our estimation of the capable tectonic sources in the region of Israel; improved locations set the underlying foundation required for achieving this goal.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Location (JStar)</th>
<th>Relocation (IASP91)</th>
<th>Relocation (GITTO5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Events</td>
<td>Err x Err y Err z</td>
<td>Events Err x Err y Err z</td>
<td>Events Err x Err y Err z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>15856 8.4 4 6</td>
<td>15150 0.77 1.05 1.3</td>
<td>15181 0.7 1 1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Network</td>
<td>6576 2.3 1.3 2.2</td>
<td>5909 0.44 0.56 0.78</td>
<td>6223 0.43 0.5 0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Network-N</td>
<td>1447 6.5 3.2 3.2</td>
<td>1783 0.71 0.86 1.14</td>
<td>1528 0.78 1.05 1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Network-S</td>
<td>7833 135 17 30</td>
<td>7454 1.47 1.83 2.35</td>
<td>7430 1.39 1.74 2.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1:** Median values of locations and relocations misfits (measured in km) calculated for a) the initial locations, and for the Antelope relocations using b) IASP91 global velocity model, and c) GITTO5 local velocity model (Gitterman et al., 2005). Errors are presented in kilometers for four distribution types: *All* events, *In-Network* events, *Off-Network-N* events and the *Off-Network-S* events. The area of the *In-Network* events is presented by the rectangle in Figure 3.
**Figure 1:** a) Map of the Middle East, including the regional major fault systems (black lines). The regional tectonic plate configuration is presented along with the relative horizontal slip motions (black arrows). The research area is marked by the gray rectangle. b) The regional seismic stations that were operational within the period of 1985 – 2015, including those of the Israel Seismic Network (dark gray circles – short period, black triangles - broadband), and those of the Jordanian Seismic Observatory (light gray diamonds).
Figure 2: a) The earthquake catalog recorded by the GII between 1985 and 2015, having a total of 15856 events. Filled circles show the new locations of the seismic events, with their size scaled by magnitude. b) The seismic P-wave velocity models applied for the region. The initial location was obtained by JStar’s software model (line with diamonds) and for the relocations we used the velocity model of Gitterman et al. (2005) (GITT05 - black line); the IASP91 global crustal model is given here for reference (dashed line).
Figure 3: The relocated catalog, based on the P and S arrivals recorded by the GII between 1985 and 2015, with a total of 15181 events. Filled circles show the new locations of the seismic events, with their size scaled by magnitude. The coverage area of the seismic network is marked by the black dashed rectangle; beyond this area, locations are poorly constrained. b) Depth histograms of the original (white-‘Catalog’), relocated events using Gitterman et al. (2005) velocity model (GITT05 - black), and relocated events using IASP91 velocity model (gray), of four catalog types: b1) all events, b2) events within the coverage area (In-Network), b3) Off-Network North events, and b4) Off-Network South events.
Figure 4: Location errors for the two velocity models: IASP91 in gray histograms, and GITT05 (following Gitterman et al., 2005) in black, for three geographical axes: a) X-axis (East-West), b) Y-axis (North-South), and c) Vertical axis.
**Figure 5:** The horizontal location shifts for two velocity models are presented, using the JStar original locations as the reference for these shifts. The upper row (a1 and a2) are for the relocations obtained by the velocity model of Gitterman et al. (2005), and the middle row (b1 and b2) are for the relocations obtained by IASP91. The rose diagrams, a1 and b1, show the azimuthal shifts measured from the earthquake initial location to the new location; the radius of the 20° slices mark the number of events within the slice, and the contours are of the number of events. Note that both velocity models show homogeneous azimuthal distribution for all the relocated events. The polar diagrams, a2 and b2, show the median shifts for each direction (in meters) for several subsets of the data: all events (blue), in-grid events - located within the coverage area (magenta); off-grid events - located north of the coverage area (light blue), and off-grid events - located south of the coverage area (green). Dashed circles present the total medians shift: a2) 4617, 1779, 4382 and 8157 meters for Gitterman 2005 velocity model, and b2) 5916, 2161, 5521, and 8918 for IASP91, respectfully; c) Cross section emphasizing the S-N horizontal shifts of the off-grid events - located south of the coverage area. The shifts are seen down to 25km depth, for two velocity models: IASP91 (“Global” blue), and Gitterman et al. 2005 (“Local” red). While the shifts of the local model are scattered around the zero, with no clear preference, the shifts of the global model show a strong shift to the south, related to the significantly higher wave velocity at the shallow subsurface.
Figure 6: The seismogenic zone along the DSF; the dashed gray line in (b), is plotted by gray lines in (a) according to a moving quantile of 0.75 (solid), and 0.95 (dashed), applying a window of 10 km (~N-S axis) by 15 km (~E-W), in 5 km intervals. The two black lines are the temperature contours of 300 °C and 350 °C calculated by Shalev et al. (2013) along the DSF, and marked by the black dashed line in (b).
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Abstract

More than 15,000 seismic events were recorded by the Israel Seismic Network (ISN) during the past 30 years, at the vicinity of the Dead Sea Fault (DSF) zone. During those years locations were obtained using several velocity models, which resulted in inconsistent locations. In addition, we found that seismicity is biased to very shallow depth estimations that do not match other estimations of more localized studies in the region. This study is focused on improving the regional earthquake catalog using robust single event location software (within the Antelope software), based on two seismic velocity models: a) a local model (Gitterman et. al., 2005), and b) a global model (Kennett and Engdahl, 1991). The relocated events show more reasonable depth distributions, in accordance with the seismotectonic settings of the region, and the local velocity model shows smaller location errors than the global velocity model, suggesting better convergence of the location solutions. We also demonstrate and analyze the difference in the event-station distribution, showing location effects of a sparse network, in which the main effect is seen for the focal depths: events located out of the network coverage tend to obtain a focal depth shallower than events located within the network coverage. The depth cross-section along the DSF zone, within the
boundaries of this study, presents a good correlation with previous estimation of the boundaries of the seismogenic zone, obtained by heat-flow analysis. The relocated earthquake catalogue is regarded as the new initial robust locations of the seismic bulletin of the ISN, and considered as the basis for future studies and for more elaborated relocations; it is open to the public and can be downloaded from the Geological Survey of Israel (GSI) website at: <https://www.gsi.gov.il>.
Introduction

Large-scale observations of spatial patterns of earthquake hypocenters show that seismicity is located mainly along plate boundaries (Lay and Wallace, 1995). For smaller scales, such as for regional or local seismic activity, this seismo-tectonic relation is more obscured, and requires higher resolutions of the sub-plate boundaries and fault systems, and an accurate earthquake locations (e.g. Hauksson and Shearer, 2005; Hauksson et al., 2012). Therefore, as we try to extract more information from seismicity patterns, we soon face the issue of how precise is the earthquake catalogue we are examining.

One of the main issues in characterizing fault systems is to determine the seismogenic zones, in which strains are accommodated mainly by brittle failure. The seismogenic zone is affected by many variables; from regional and local stress fields (e.g., Plenefisch and Bonjer, 1997; de Vicente et al., 2008; Palano et al., 2013), through lateral and vertical lithological changes (Aldersons et al., 2003; Brothers et al., 2009), to heat flux ascending from the mantle (Lachenbruch et al., 1985; Grall et al., 2012; Shalev et al., 2013). The base of the seismogenic zone is theoretically determined from the brittle-ductile transition and is commonly set to 300 -- 350°C (e.g., Shalev et al., 2013). Therefore in order to properly determine the observed seismogenic zone (e.g., Sibson, 1982) it is crucial that the seismic depths within an earthquake catalogue are well constrained. Typically, focal depth and origin time have lower accuracy than the epicenter, since they are less sensitive to the geometry of the network, and therefore are highly sensitive to the applied velocity model (e.g. Husen and Hardebeck, 2010; Bondár and Storchak, 2011). Besides the general issue of improving earthquake locations (e.g., Allam et al., 2014), the issue of improving their
focal depths is very significant for the characterization of active seismogenic zones. Similar to the general expectation that the epicenters will fall in close proximity to surface fault traces, we would expect that the hypocenters will have depth distribution reflecting the lithology, fault structure, and other measures observed in the examined region (e.g., heat flux).

The Israeli Seismic Network (ISN) had been established in 1983 (Shapira and Hofstetter, 2007), and was expanded and upgraded several times, following the technological developments in seismometry, gradually including more three-component, broadband, seismic sensors since 1996. The network monitors the research area (Figure 1b), providing specifically good coverage of the Dead Sea Fault (DSF) system and the Carmel Fault System (CFS). Over the past 30 years several velocity models have been applied to locate the seismic activity, some of the models have been inserted into JStar, the local software, and several single-event location algorithms have been applied; naturally, this has lead to inconsistent seismic locations. The current data-processing procedure includes an initial automatic detection and location of seismic events, shortly followed by a) analyst review and fine tuning of the P and S detections, b) relocation and c) magnitude estimation. In the process of a current upgrade of the system we reviewed the seismic catalogue recorded over the years, and found that there is a bias to very shallow depth estimations, which do not match other observations that are known from more localized studies in the region (Hofstetter et al., 1996; Aldersons et al., 2003; Hofstetter et al., 2012; Wetzler et al., 2014), and the observations seen in other similar seismo-tectonic regions (e.g., Sato et al., 2004; Shearer et al., 2005; Zaliapin and Ben-Zion, 2013).

Our first order solution was to revisit the locations of the entire seismic catalogue, assuming that the P and S picks are valid, using a single robust velocity model of the
region, and applying a high quality location algorithm. To achieve this goal we applied
the relocate algorithm and the GENLOC library, of the Antelope package
(<https://www.brtt.com>). The results and initial analysis provided in the following
text establish a renewed earthquake catalogue, with better locations, and a more
reasonable depth distribution.

Geological Background

The crustal structure of Israel is characterized by southeast declining Moho
boundary, sub-parallel to the Israeli coastline, associated with a transition zone
between the relatively thin intermediate crust of the Eastern Mediterranean Sea (20
km depth) and the thicker crust of Jordan (32 km depth) (Segev et al., 2006). This
structure was retrieved by the compilation of several studies including inversion of
teleseismic P waves (Hofstetter et al., 2000), refraction profiles (Ginzburg et al.,
1979; Makris et al., 1983; Ben-Avraham et al., 2002; Weber et al., 2004; Koulakov
and Sobolev, 2006), and gravity and magnetic maps (Rybakov et al., 1997; Segev et
al., 2006).

Israel is also located close to a large fault system, the Dead Sea Transform (DST),
extending from the southern Red Sea spreading center to the northern zone of plate
convergence in southern Turkey, a distance of ~1,000 km, defining the plate boundary
between the Arabian and African-Sinai plates (Figure 1). The left-lateral slip motion
along the DST has accommodated horizontal displacement of ~100 km (Quennell,
1956; Garfunkel et al., 1981; Garfunkel, 2014), in a mean slip motion of ~5 mm/year
(Sadeh et al., 2012) since the Early Miocene. The tectonic activity along the DST has
formed a series of deep basins: the Gulf of Elat (Aqaba), the Sea of Galilee and the
Dead Sea Basin (Figure 1b), which is the largest and deepest of these basins. The
Carmel-Gilboa-Faria fault system (Figure 1a) is an additional fault system, located in northern Israel, and striking NW-SE, diagonally to the DST (Figure 1a), and it has been suggested that it precedes the DST, developing during the Senonian (Segev and Rybakov, 2011).

The ongoing tectonic activity along the major regional fault system over the past 30 years is demonstrated by the seismicity presented in Figure 2. The seismicity pattern highlights the plate boundaries showing localized seismicity along the DST, and the northern branching of the transform fault system (Ron, 1987; Lyakhovsky et al., 1994).

The strongest recorded event in the last 160 years was the 1995, Mw 7.2 (Figure 2) earthquake, that was followed by 6 months of intense aftershock activity, and was interpreted as a strike-slip fault (Baer et al., 2008). Paleoseismological studies demonstrate that moderate to large magnitude (M > 7) earthquakes occurred along the DST (Shapira et al., 1993; Marco et al., 1996; Marco and Agnon, 2005; Agnon et al., 2006; Wetzler et al., 2010; Lazar et al., 2010). In addition, historical records attest to the occurrence of moderate to strong earthquakes along the DST, which caused extensive damage to historical settlements, which was observed at damaged structures throughout the region (Marco, 2008).

Previous seismological studies have demonstrated a relatively deep seismogenic activity, located in the Dead Sea area, indicating focal depths down to ~25 km (Aldersons et al., 2003; Hofstetter et al., 2012; Wetzler et al., 2014). These observations, as well as surface heat flux measurements indicate a cold crust, characterized by deep brittle failure (Shalev et al., 2013).
Dataset and Data Processing

**Seismological dataset**

We reprocessed the seismic activity of the Dead Sea Fault region, from January 1985 to February 2015, within a geographic rectangle of 33-37 longitude, and 28-34 latitude. This dataset includes 15,856 earthquakes (Figure 2), in magnitudes of $0.5 \leq M_d \leq 7.2$, collected by the Geophysical Institute of Israel (GII). The GII has been monitoring the seismic activity in the region during the past 30 years, using the ISN (Figure 1b) and consisting of a total of ~140 seismic stations. Over these years many of these stations were modified: some were de-activated, others upgraded to 3-component digital seismometers, and some are still operating similar to their original settings. Since the ISN includes various types of seismometers, the sampling rates in the seismic stations vary between 20 sps for the older stations to 100 sps for the modern ones. The current data acquisition system, operated and maintained by the Division of Seismology of the GII, incorporates the ISN stations, two CTBT stations (Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty), and several CNF stations (Cooperating National Facility). A significantly smaller percentage of the data is incorporated from other regional networks: a) GE, Geophone global network of GFZ, b) JSO, the Jordanian Seismic Observatory, and c) CQ, the seismic network of Cyprus.

**Data processing**

The earthquake bulletin includes the origin location of the seismic events, their origin time, and the P- and S- wave arrival times reviewed and refined by GII’s analysts. In addition, it contains the error estimations of the locations, based on the picking errors of the arrival times, assigned by the analysts, and errors due to the
location algorithm and to the 1-D velocity model (Polozov and Pinsky, 2004). We regarded the arrival times as the most reliable measure we have, and we have examined the remaining components, mainly focusing on the velocity model used for the relocations.

Relocation method

We applied the *relocate* program of the Antelope software. The program is an end-user interface to the Generalized Location (GENLOC) Library of Antelope software (<www.brtt.com>), providing many of the methods commonly used for single event location (Pavlis et al., 2004). The GENLOC library is based on the LOCSAT algorithm (Bratt and Bache, 1988), which originated from the nuclear monitoring program, and is also considered a well tested and robust location program. The program accepts any combination of arrival times and slowness vectors, and can utilize seismic phases, with predicted travel times and/or slowness vectors, provided by the user. It is applicable at any scale from local to global networks, and replaces the azimuth data by slowness vectors. This is done in order to avoid some of the intrinsic problems of azimuth data used in many location algorithms, in which at high velocities or close to the source, azimuth becomes unstable. The location search is carried out according to the standard Gauss-Newton Method (Lee and Stewart, 1981), originally suggested by Geiger (1910), and uses a linear approximation to relate perturbation in the hypocenter parameters to the data. Error handling is done based on Pavlis (1986), in which the total error is a linear sum of the main three types of source-errors: measurement error, modeling error, and non-linearity.

Velocity model

Several velocity models were used at the GII to create the earthquake bulletin,
and to the best of our knowledge, in the past decade, many of the events were located based on the velocity model of Feigin and Shapira (1994). In addition, several geographical subsets of the data were relocated, as part of high-resolution studies (e.g., Alderson et al. 2003, Hofstetter et al., 2012, Wetzler et al., 2014, for the Dead Sea Basin; Shamir et al., 2003, Hofstetter et al. 2003 for the gulf of Eilat; Navon 2011 for Sea of Galilee), and several velocity models were used and developed (i.e., Gitterman et al., 2005; Mechie et al., 2009) as part of those studies. We examined many of these models (including the one of Feigin and Shapira (1994), which we name JStar), trying to find the most reliable velocity model, providing the most stable solution with the smallest errors. A basic comparison of all of these models was carried out at the initial stage of this study, and is further presented and discussed in the Appendix. The outcome of this basic relocation analysis was that we should focus on two models: a) the local / regional velocity model of Gitterman et al., (2005), named here GITT05 and b) the global / regional IASP91 velocity model (Kennett and Engdahl, 1991). Gitterman et al. (2005) provided the most comprehensive work done in the region, treating the entire area of the DSF, using a set of controlled explosions recorded by all network stations, and searching for a velocity model with the best fit to the known origin times and locations. The IASP91 velocity model is considered for several reasons: a) it is a regional / global velocity model, and the dimensions of the area examined in this study is of a regional scale - 6° N-S and 4° E-W, b) some of the areas within the study area, such as the Gulf of Eilat and southwest Jordan have igneous lithology that could be approximated by the IASP91 velocity model, and c) for the purpose of local-scale seismicity it can be treated almost as a single layer model, providing stable reference solutions for the locations obtained by using the GITT05 velocity model. However, while for Southern California, IASP91 is a
reasonable approximation, due to the high percentage of igneous rocks at relatively shallow depths (Mooney and Weaver, 1989), in the DSF region there is a higher percentage of sedimentary rocks with lower seismic velocities at the shallow crust (down to ~5km depth). This means that although the IASP91 locations are more stable in general, on a local scale and at the more sediment-oriented regions, locations are overestimating the depth, since the higher velocities at shallow depths “push” the solution deeper into the crust.

Results

Our new relocated catalog includes 15,181 events (Figure 3a), which are 95.7% of the original catalog remaining after the removal of the poorly constrained locations. It seems that, on average, the original locations (Figure 2) and the relocations (Figure 3a) show quite a similar horizontal pattern, meaning that at least the epicenters did not shift significantly by modifications in the velocity models and in the location algorithms. The main story of the relocated events is in the new depth distribution presented in Figure 3b1, showing that events are located significantly deeper than the original locations, and having an average vertical shift of ~10 km (using the median). While in the original catalog ~90% of the events were located within the upper 5 km of the crust, after the relocation they are distributed down to 35 km depth, showing an active seismogenic zone with a peak activity at 15 km depth (Figure 3b1); these numbers are similar for both velocity models, presented by the dashed (IASP91) and black (GITT05) bars of Figure 3b. Figure 3 also shows the coverage area of the seismic network, marking the area of the seismic network boundaries (dashed line) in which within it, locations are well constrained (In-Network), and beyond it, locations are poorly constrained (Off-Network). By examining Figure 3b we see that while
within the coverage area of the seismic network we obtain a reasonable depth distribution as expected from the seismotectonic settings of the DSF zone (Figure 3b), epicenters located north (Figure 3b) and south (Figure 3b) of the seismic network coverage area have a large number of shallow events. We claim that events located out of the boundaries of the seismic network are poorly constrained due to the lack of azimuthal station coverage.

There were no consistent error estimations of the original relocations, and the majority of events were not assigned an error at all, even with respect to the arrival times, estimated manually by seismic analysts. Therefore, error analysis was done only for the relocations obtained by the relocalize algorithm, comparing the two velocity models: GITTO5 and IASP91. Figure 4 shows the horizontal (X and Y) and vertical (Z) error estimation for both velocity models, and for three main event datasets: All, In-Network and Off-Network. Note, that although each of the axes and each of the datasets show different error estimations, both velocity models have quite similar error histograms for each of the subplots examined in Figure 4. The similarity in error estimation is emphasized by the values of the absolute difference between the medians of both models, $|dMed.|$, presented within the legends of the subplots. As expected, the error estimations for the Off-Network subsets are much higher than the In-Network subsets, also manifested by the mean medians (black solid line) presented in the histograms. In most of the subplots, the histograms show slightly higher bars of the lower range errors, for the GITTO5, suggesting a slightly better model. This observation is manifested in Table 1, concluding that, in the overall of the error statistical analysis, GITTO5 shows slightly smaller errors than IASP91. This statistical preference supports the more fundamental reason to adopt GITTO5 as the preferred velocity model: the GITTO5 velocity model is a more reasonable model than IASP91,
accounting for the lower seismic velocities at the upper sedimentary layers of the study area (e.g., Ginzburg and Ben-Avraham, 1997; Hofstetter et al., 2000; Gitterman et al., 2005; Laske and Weber, 2008).

Statistical analysis

Up to this point we have examined the relocated events, showing that the main effect is in achieving a reliable depth distribution of the event locations. We will now examine the horizontal shift of the relocated epicenters from their original locations. On the one hand, we would like to check that there is no horizontal bias due to the relocation algorithm, velocity model and / or station distribution; on the other hand, horizontal shifts with preferred orientation might reflect a problem in the original locations that was corrected by the relocations. In Figure 5 we compare the horizontal-azimuth shift, measured between the original locations and the relocations, within 20° slices, for the two velocity models: GITT05, and IASP91. We count the number of horizontal shifts in each slice (Figures 5a₁ and 5b₁), showing a rather homogeneous distribution, with no preferred orientation. However, this is not the complete picture, since it does not consider the magnitude of these shifts (measured by horizontal distance). This is done in Figures 5a₂ and 5b₂, in which for each slice we calculate the median horizontal shift. This is done for all the events (dark blue), and also for three subsets: In-Network (magenta), Off-Network North (light blue) and Off-Network South (green). While for the In-Network events we see almost homogeneous median shifts (for both velocity models), beyond the coverage area the pattern becomes more heterogeneous: a) for the northern events the median shifts seem to be randomly distributed, and b) for the southern events we see preferred orientation in a sub-parallel S-N direction. The latter is also seen in Figure 5c,
emphasizing the main difference between the relocations obtained by the two velocity
models. For the GITT05 velocity model, the depth relocations shift the events on a S-
N axis, with no clear preference, due to the similarity to the JStar velocity model. However, for the IASP91 velocity model, the seismic velocities at shallow depths are
significantly higher, resulting in a strong effect, in which all those events that were
pushed down in the relocations had to be moved further away from the recording
stations; that is to say, events were shifted to the south, compensating for the faster
ray path travel time. The overall effect of the median horizontal shifts is seen by the
dark blue line, which averages all the above considerations. It seems that, similar to
the error analysis, the horizontal shifts analysis also shows that the GITT05 local /
regional velocity model provides a more stable solution than the IASP91 regional /
global velocity model, with less significant bias due the event-station distribution.

Discussion

Earthquake locations and velocity models

We have separated the events into two main regions: a) In-Network -- within the
coverage area, and b) Off-Network -- beyond the coverage area of the stations; this
was done since the latter has an embedded lack of information, leading to large
uncertainties in the resulting locations (Gary Pavlis, Personal Communication).
However, even with these large uncertainties, we have shown that with the relocate
program we obtain more reasonable locations, not only within the coverage area, but
also beyond it. Comparing between the two velocity models, GITT05 and IASP91, we
see quite consistent and expected characteristics, in which a) velocity models with
high velocity layers will push the epicenters deeper, b) for Off-Network events, the
faster the seismic velocity of a layer, the further away from the stations they would be
located, and c) error estimation of the relocations, generated by both velocity models, show that at least in our case, errors obtained from local / regional GITT05 velocity model relocations are slightly lower than the regional / global IASP91 errors. Still, locations beyond the coverage area, especially in the southern tip should be taken with a grain of salt (Gary Pavlis, Personal Communications), since location estimations in this type of situation are simply poorly constrained (Pavlis et al., 2004). Reality might be somewhere in-between these two models, but the error bounds, calculated by the relocate program, do not represent the problem well enough, in order to resolve this issue with more certainty. For those areas, a more focused research should be carried out (if possible), only for the periods in which there was a better coverage of stations. This will provide better locations for those periods, and might be used as an additional constraint when locating events originating in the same region, at times of sparse station-coverage.

Seismogenic Depth along the Dead Sea Fault

The main benefit obtained by the relocations is that we could now examine seismogenic zones along the major fault systems. An example is presented in Figure 6, showing the distribution of the seismicity in a narrow N-S trending band, along the DSF. The 0.75 quantile curve (continuous gray) marks the depth boundary of 75% of the events, meaning that the majority of the events do not go beyond that depth. This curve is compared to an estimation of the thermal profile along the DSF, obtained by Shalev et al. (2013) by interpolating heat flux measurements. The seismogenic depth is estimated according to the 300-350º temperature contours, indicating the maximum temperatures for brittle failure (Ranalli, 1995; Jaupart and Mareschal, 2010). Here we show that the relocations provide fairly similar estimation of the seismogenic depth, as suggested by Shalev et al. (2013), reflecting for example, deep seismicity at the
cold crust of the Dead Sea Basin (Aldersons et al., 2003; Shamir, 2006), and shallow seismicity at the hot crust beneath the Sea of Galilee (Navon, 2011). Furthermore, our seismogenic depth profile is better constrained, showing additional features and depth anomalies that were not seen in Shalev et al. (2013), due to interpolation limitations of the heat-flow measurements, used to construct the seismogenic depth profile of Shalev et al. (2013).

The correlation between the seismogenic depth and the heat flow was observed and discussed, regarding other tectonic regions. For example, in Southern California, Magistrale (2002) has shown that the seismogenic depth (defined by the 0.95 quantile) is strongly heat-flow and lithology dependent, exhibiting deeper seismogenic depth for lower heat flows, and for more Mafic compositions. Hong and Hong and Menke (2006) focused on the San Jacinto fault zone showing that the 0.95 quantile corresponds to the 400°: colder crust at the NW of the fault correlated with deeper seismicity, and warmer crust at the SE of the fault correlated with shallower seismicity. Their definition for the seismogenic depth (0.95 quantile) is presented in Figure 6 (dashed gray), better capturing the overall seismicity, and approximately correlated to the 400° contour.

Bonner et al. (2003) have shown a more complex picture of the heat-flow to seismogenic-depth relation. Analyzing all California, and defining the seismogenic depth according to the 0.99 quantile, some of the regions have shown correlation to the 450° contour, and some of the lower heat-flow provinces (<50 mW/m2) have shown correlation to the 260° contour. Bonner hypothesized that other factors such as stress regime and strain rate contribute to these differences. More detailed work on these issues are yet to come, once we compile our results with specific areas, in which, previous high resolution studies have been made in the past.
Conclusions

We applied the *relocate* program, which is a robust single event location algorithm, in order to reprocess the arrival-times of the past 30 years in the vicinity of Israel and the Dead Sea Fault. The result is a revised seismic catalogue for the region of Israel, with a significant contribution to the depths of the seismicity, showing a more reasonable depth distribution in the region. This catalogue should be the basis for future, more elaborated relocation methods e.g., HYPODD (Waldhauser and Ellsworth, 2000). From all the velocity models tested in this study, the one by Gitterman et al. (2005) has shown relatively low errors, and provided the most reasonable and reliable locations.

For the relocated catalogue we separated between the events within the coverage area of the network, and beyond it, due to the significant difference in their associated uncertainties. For In-Network events, the location-uncertainty is small, and is reflected also by the small horizontal shifts, with no preferred orientation. For Off-Network events, the location-uncertainty is larger and is reflected by the larger horizontal shifts. For the southern events, originating at the Gulf of Elat, the horizontal shifts are showing a clear preferred N-S orientation, which is more pronounced to the south, meaning that more events were shifted further away from the recording stations.

We show that the seismicity could be applied to define the seismogenic zone of the DSF, fitting nicely to the seismogenic depths derived from the heat flux interpolation of Shalev et al. (2013). Moreover, while the Shalev profile is interpolated also in regions with hardly any measurements, we have higher resolution, obtaining a more detailed and accurate profile of the seismogenic zone.
We suggest replacing the current seismic bulletin with our new relocated bulletin, so that it could serve as an initial, more reliable reference for future seismological studies of the region. The new catalogue can be downloaded, together with GIS layers and Google Earth layers for the convenience of the users, in the website of the Division of Seismology (<https://seis.gii.co.il>) and in the website of the Geological Survey of Israel, GSI (<https://www.gsi.gov.il>).
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Appendix

We examined several 1-D velocity models that were used in the past 20 years, for the location of seismic activity in the region of Israel. These models include: 1) Feigin and Shapira 1994, which we name JStar, 2) Aldersons et al. 2003, 3) Gitterman et al. 2005, named GITT05, 4) Mechie et al. 2009, which we call Desire-2009, 5) Kennett and Engdahl, 1991, named here IASP91. The first four models are considered local velocity models while the IASP91 is well-known and is considered appropriate for regional to global scale velocity models.

The Feigin and Shapira (1994) velocity model, was generated according to a set of explosions made during the early years of the ISN and recorded by the ISN stations. The Aldersons-2003 velocity model was comprised from three velocity models: for the Dead Sea Basin, for Israel, and for Jordan. We examined the Israel model which was derived from quarry blasts located in the vicinity of the Dead Sea basin. The GITT05 velocity model provides the most comprehensive work, done to date, treating the entire region of the DSF, using a set of controlled explosions recorded by all network stations, including stations in Israel, Jordan, Cyprus, and Turkey. Therefore, although considered a local velocity model, it contains many regional features. The Desire-2009 model is a model that was generated mainly for the Dead Sea Basin, including some features that are to the east and west of the Dead Sea Basin, but does not consider the variations to the north and south of the Basin.

Figure A1 shows the five P-velocity models we have examined in this study. Note that the variation between the different models is mainly within the upper 5km of the crust, showing a ~ 3 – 6 km/s range, in which the higher velocity is seen for the IASP91 regional velocity model. This is an important observation in the sense that it
reflects the strong influence of the Dead Sea sedimentary basin on the generation of
the velocity models, which for three of the models is rather significant: JStar, Desire-

Figure A2 presents the focal depth distribution for the five velocity models, compared
also to the original locations of the catalogue. The main observation, which is also
discussed in the main section of the text, is that in the original catalogue, 90% of the
events occur at very shallow depth (0-5km). This has no geologic or seismotectonic
justification, and contradicts previous and more focused studies done in the region
(e.g., Aldersons et al., 2003; Hofstetter et al., 2012; Wetzler et al., 2014). The second
observation is that Aldersons-2003 seemed to do a very reasonable job in the depth
distribution, even better than IASP91 and GITT05. However, mapping the Aldersons-
2003 relocations provides a very strong shift of all the southern events, to the east
(Figure A3). These new relocations cannot be supported by any other evidences, and
on the contrary, seem to be an artifact generated from the misfit of the Aldersons
model to the high seismic velocity of the igneous lithology in Southern Israel and
Jordan. Therefore, Aldersons-2003 was rejected, and based on Figure A2, GITT05
and IASP91, were the best two other candidates, with a reasonable focal depth
distribution, and hence were chosen for further analysis, discussed in detail in the
main text.
Table 1: Median values of locations and relocations misfits

Median values of locations and relocations misfits (measured in km) calculated for a) the initial locations, and for the Antelope relocations using b) IASP91 global velocity model, and c) GITT05 local velocity model (Gitterman et al., 2005). Errors are presented in kilometers for four distribution types: All events, In-Network events, Off-Network-N events and the Off-Network-S events. The area of the In-Network events is presented by the rectangle in Figure 3.
Figures

**Figure 1:** a) Map of the Middle East, including the regional major fault systems (black lines). The regional tectonic plate configuration is presented along with the relative horizontal slip motions (black arrows). The research area is marked by the gray rectangle; b) The regional seismic stations that were operational within the period of 1985 – 2015, including those of the Israel Seismic Network (dark gray circles– short period, black triangles - broadband), and those of the Jordanian Seismic Observatory (light gray diamonds).

**Figure 2:** a) The earthquake catalog recorded by the GII between 1985 and 2015, having a total of 15856 events. Filled circles show the original locations of the seismic events, with their size scaled by magnitude. The 1995 M7.2 earthquake is presented with the focal mechanism (strike: 222, dip: 77, rake: -15) according to Hofstetter et al. 2003. The inset ‘b’ shows the seismic P-wave velocity models applied for the region. The initial location was obtained by JStar’s software model (line with diamonds) and for the relocations we used the velocity model of Gitterman et al. (2005) (GITT05 - black line); the IASP91 global crustal model is given here for reference (dashed line).

**Figure 3:** The relocated catalog, based on the P and S arrivals recorded by the GII between 1985 and 2015, with a total of 15181 events. Filled circles show the relocated seismic events, with their size scaled by magnitude. The coverage area of
the seismic network is marked by the black dashed rectangle; beyond this area, locations are poorly constrained. b) Depth histograms of the original (white- ‘Catalog’), relocated events using Gitterman et al. (2005) velocity model (GITT05 - black), and relocated events using IASP91 velocity model (gray), of four catalog types: b1) all events, b2) events within the coverage area (In-Network), b3) Off-Network North events, and b4) Off-Network South events.

**Figure 4:** Location errors for the two velocity models: IASP91 in dashed histograms, and GITT05 (following Gitterman et al., 2005) in black, for three geographical axes: a) X-axis (East-West), b) Y-axis (North-South), and c) Vertical axis, and for three data sets: 1-All, 2-In Network, and 3-off Network. The mean median calculated for the two velocity models is shown by the black vertical line in all nine subplots and presented by the absolute value of the difference between the two models.

**Figure 5:** The horizontal location shifts for two velocity models are presented, using the JStar original locations as the reference for these shifts. The upper row (a1 and a2) are for the relocations obtained by the velocity model of Gitterman et al. (2005), and the middle row (b1 and b2) are for the relocations obtained by IASP91. The rose diagrams, a1 and b1, show the azimuthal shifts measured from the earthquake initial location to the new location; the radius of the 20° slices mark the number of events within the slice, and the contours are of the number of events (500, 1000). The polar diagrams, a2 and b2, show the median shifts for each direction (in km) for several subsets of the data: all events (blue), in-grid events - located within the coverage area (magenta); off-grid events - located north of the coverage area (light blue), and off-
grid events - located south of the coverage area (green). Dashed circles present the total medians shift: a2) 4.6, 1.8, 4.4 and 8.2 km for Gitterman 2005 velocity model, and b2) 5.9, 2.2, 5.5, and 8.9 km for IASP91, respectfully; c) Cross section emphasizing the S-N horizontal shifts of the off-grid events - located south of the coverage area.

**Figure 6:** The seismogenic zone along the DSF; the dashed gray line in (b), is plotted by gray lines in (a) according to a moving quantile of 0.75 (solid), and 0.95 (dashed), applying a window of 10 km (~N-S axis) by 15 km (~E-W), in 5 km intervals. The two black lines are the temperature contours of 300 °C and 350 °C calculated by Shalev et al. (2013) along the DSF, and marked by the black dashed line in (b).

**Figure A1:** The five velocity model examined in this study and presented by the P-wave velocity: ‘IASP91’ is based on Kennett and Engdahl (1991); ‘Aldersons-2003’ is based on the Israel model suggested by Aldersons et. al. (2003); ‘JStar’ is by Feigin and Shapira (1994); ‘GITT05’ is as suggested by Gitterman et. al. (2005); ‘Desire-2009’ is composed by Mechie et. al (2009).

**Figure A2:** The focal depth distribution for the five velocity models described in Figure A1, including the original locations of the catalog (‘Original’).
Figure A3: The relocated catalog, based on the P and S arrivals recorded by the GII between 1985 and 2015, with a total of 14849 events, located based on the Israel velocity model suggested by Aldersons et al. (2003). Filled circles show the new locations of the seismic events, with their size scaled by magnitude.
Median values of locations and relocations misfits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Location (JStar)</th>
<th>Relocation (IAsp91)</th>
<th>Relocation (GITT05)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Events</td>
<td>Err x</td>
<td>Err y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>15856</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Network</td>
<td>6576</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Network-N</td>
<td>1447</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Network-S</td>
<td>7833</td>
<td>135.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1:** Median values of locations and relocations misfits (measured in km) calculated for a) the initial locations, and for the Antelope relocations using b) IASP91 global velocity model, and c) GITT05 local velocity model (Gitterman et al., 2005). Errors are presented in kilometers for four data subsets: All events, In-Network events, Off-Network-N events and the Off-Network-S events. The area of the In-Network events is presented by the rectangle in Figure 3.
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A total of over 15,000 seismic events, near the Dead Sea, were recorded by the Israeli Seismic Network (ISN) over its 30 years of activity. Over the years, the location of the events was made using different models of seismic wave velocities, and thus, the location of the events was not consistent. Furthermore, we found that the depths of the seismic events are too shallow compared to the tectonic background, and compared to more focused studies along the Dead Sea. Hence, there is a significant need to improve the location of seismic events, which is a necessary and sufficient condition for the determination of the properties and characteristics of the tectonic sources in Israel, and the assessment of the seismic risk in our region.

In this phase of our research, we focused on improving the location of earthquakes in our region, using:

A. Seismic Location Program (as part of the Antelope Program, each event is located separately), and

B. Use of two different models of seismic wave velocities in the subsoil, one local (Gitterman et al. 2005), and the second global.

Indeed, the new location we made showed a consistent distribution and a better explanation of the region, with depths corresponding to the findings in previous studies. Like us, we also used this to study how location is influenced by the seismic station network coverage compared to the location, where the main effect is that events occurring under good coverage of the seismic network are also well located in terms of depth, while in cases of less successful coverage (like southern earthquakes recorded in the Gulf of Elat), the location resulted in shallow depths and uncertain locations.

The new location catalog is considered the best and most comprehensive location that has been made in Israel, and is a necessary condition for all future research in the field, and as a starting point for more complex methods.

The new location will soon be advertised to the broader public through systems of geospatial databases, such as GIS and Google Earth, at the Geological Survey website: https://www.gsi.gov.il. This first part of the research was finalized as a recently accepted article in an internationally recognized professional journal (Seismological Research Letters – SRL), and is attached as an appendix to this report.
הערת סיכונים סיסמיים של מקורות טקטוניים בישראל: מחקר

後に סיכונים כללית עד להערכה ממוקדת לח刍 והגרעיניים

דו"ח מדעי, שנה ראשונה – נובמבר 2015

שיפור ייעוד רעידות האדמה ב-30 השぬיים האזרחים והיתרקות סכנות

של האזורים הסיסמוגניים לאזורים בקרבת חוף ים המלח

אורי קורצון ונדב צלר

המכון הגאולוגי

משרדי החש鹄יות, האזורי והמים
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