

On the Extraction of Microseismic Ground Motion from Analog Seismograms for the Validation of Ocean-Climate Models

Thomas Lecocq, Fabrice Ardhuin, Fabienne Collin, Thierry Camelbeeck

► To cite this version:

Thomas Lecocq, Fabrice Ardhuin, Fabienne Collin, Thierry Camelbeeck. On the Extraction of Microseismic Ground Motion from Analog Seismograms for the Validation of Ocean-Climate Models. Seismological Research Letters, 2020, 91 (3), pp.1518-1530. 10.1785/0220190276 . hal-03094056

HAL Id: hal-03094056 https://hal.science/hal-03094056

Submitted on 10 Nov 2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

On the Extraction of Microseismic Ground Motion from Analogue Seismograms for the Validation of Oceanic-Climatic Models

Lecocq, T.*1, Ardhuin, F.2, Collin, F.1, and Camelbeeck, T.1

¹Seismology-Gravimetry, Royal Observatory of Belgium, 1180 Brussels, Belgium.

⁶ ²Univ. Brest, CNRS, IRD, Ifremer, Laboratoire d'Océanographie Physique et Spatiale (LOPS), IUEM, 29280, Brest, France.

August 2019

Abstract

We report on a pilot demonstration of the usefulness of analogue seismograms to improve the knowledge g about ocean storms before the 1980s by providing additional data for the quantitative validation of ocean wave 10 modelling, in particular for extreme events. We present an automatic digitization method of paper seismograms 11 to extract microseismic ground motion periods and amplitudes. The original paper records are scanned, vec-12 torised and split in minute chunks, as on the original data. The amplitude is calibrated based on the original 13 metadata mentioned on the paper sheets and official bulletins. The digitized time series are processed to extract 14 Power Spectral Densities (PSD) which are compared with modelled seismic noise levels computed using a nu-15 merical ocean wave model. As a case study, we focus on 1 month of data recorded at the Royal Observatory 16 of Belgium in January-February 1953, around the "Big Flood", a tragic storm surge that flooded the low lands 17 of England, the Netherlands and Belgium on 1 February 1953. The reconstructed spectrogram for the three 18 components of ground motion (1 vertical and 2 horizontals) evidences clear storm signatures that we relate to 19 specific sources in the North Atlantic ocean. The specific case of the Big Flood evidences a lack of amplitude 20 of the modelled data compared to the observations when the storm reached its maximum in the Southern North 21 Sea. We suggest that the source of seismic noise is related to the primary microseism generated in the North 22 Sea, at periods around 7-8 s. Other discrepancies identified suggest small modifications of the source locations 23 or energy. The coherence between the reconstructed horizontal and vertical ground motions confirms the appli-24 25 cability of the analogue data analysis to the reanalyses of the atmosphere-ocean-solid earth data over the whole 20th century, when only horizontal seismographs were installed at observatories around the world. 26

7

ε

^{*}Corresponding author: Thomas.Lecocq@seismology.be

Introduction

Seismologists observed and recorded the Earth's continuous ground motions long before the onset of digital 28 seismography, as early as 1855/1880. Since that time, and until the 1960s to 1980s depending on the observatory, 29 seismic data were recorded analogically, on smoked paper, with ink or on photographic paper. For ocean waves, 30 visual observations from ships make up all the available data until 1946 with a few instrumented records being 31 available, and they only became more common in the 1980s. A global awareness of major ocean storms with 32 wave height measurements only started in 1993 with satellite measurements, but their coverage is not sufficient 33 to catch the peak of storms and our general knowledge of the ocean wave climate heavily relies on numerical 34 models forced by winds from atmospheric reanalyses (Rascle and Ardhuin, 2013; Reguero et al., 2019). Because 35 the wind speed and direction at sea level are diagnostic variables with few measurements before 1994, these 36 estimates and their climatic trends are prone to artificial biases. 37

Another source of quantitative data comes from the ambient noise recorded by seismometers (Bernard, 1990). 38 Microseism has been extensively studied since the early days of seismology (for a review see Ebeling, 2012, and 39 references therein) mostly because of its ubiquity in all seismic records. Microseism is defined as the continuous 40 ground motions induced by the interaction between the atmosphere, the oceans and the solid Earth (for a complete 41 review see Nakata et al., 2019, and references therein). It has been used to study the regional distribution of its 42 sources, for example by Donn and Blaik (1952) who used a simple tripartite azimuth computation to study the 43 1950 storm season in the Northern Atlantic, or by Friedrich et al. (1998) using the first digital records of the 44 Gräfenberg Array, Bavaria, Germany (Harjes and Seidl, 1978) to locate multiple sources of microseism in the 45 North Atlantic ocean. The same data was also compiled by Aster et al. (2008, 2010) for studying its long term 46 evolution based on all available digital data from the Seismic Research Observatory, the High-Gain Long Period 47 and Global Seismic Network ((ASL)/USGS, 1972, 1974, 1988). 48

Using 40 years of seismic records (1954-1998) from Hamburg (Germany), Grevemeyer et al. (2000) showed 49 that changes in the wave climate in the northeast Atlantic Ocean could be inferred from measurements using 50 historical records. Similarly, Dahm et al. (2005) used historical data from different locations in Europe and 51 showed a good correlation between them for specific storm periods. Recently, Gualtieri et al. (2018) showed that 52 tropical cyclones can not only be tracked using the spectral content of the seismic noise, but that their intensity can 53 also be derived from the spectral amplitude. The presence of very long seismic oscillations above 9 s correspond 54 to long ocean wave periods (twice the seismic period, over 18 s) that are the finger prints of extreme ocean storms 55 (Hanafin et al., 2012). 56

Because the magnitude of microseisms is not simply related to the height of ocean waves (Obrebski et al., 2012, e.g.), it is useful to transform a modeled wave climate into microseism amplitudes. This was done by

⁵⁹ Stutzmann et al. (2012) to validate a global microseism model. Stopa et al. (2019) used a similar model, trans-⁶⁰ forming wind to waves, and waves to microseisms, for the calibration of a particular atmospheric reanalysis.

⁶¹ Here we propose a new seismic digitization method, processing scanned paper seismograms from the analogue

⁶² instrumental epoch to extract the spectra of the seismic noise. Those spectra, properly referenced in time and

amplitude, are then compared with a microseism model based on the WAVEWATCH III wave model (Tolman 63

and the WAVEWATCH III Development Group, 2014). For this pilot project, we will focus on the "Big Flood" of 64

1953, a massive storm surge event that dramatically flooded low-lands of the Netherlands, Belgium and England 65

and caused 2165 casualties. 66

94

Seismic analogue records 67

The first seismic records made at the Uccle station of the Royal Observatory of Belgium (ROB) date back to 68 1898 (Royal Observatory of Belgium, 1985; Van Camp and Camelbeeck, 2004) and were acquired using a von 69 Rebeur-Ehlert triple horizontal pendulum built by Bosch (Strasbourg, France). At the beginning of the XXth 70 century, the ROB owned two Wiechert seismometers: one 1000 kg horizontal (installed in 1910) and one 1300 kg 71 vertical (1911) seismometer, two Galitzin double-pendulum horizontal seismometers (1911-1914 and 1919-1962) 72 and one Galitzin-Wilip vertical seismometer (1930). This vertical seismometer was very difficult to stabilise and 73 essentially useless between 1930 and 1935 (Somville, 1930, and the following years until 1935) until it was 74 heavily modified by Somville in 1936 (Somville, 1936, 1937a,b) to be stable at different periods while insuring 75 that the damping and recording remain identical to the original Galitzin-Wilip. 76 The Wiechert seismometers used a pen to scratch rolls of smoked paper as recorder, while Galitzin seis-77

mometers used a galvanometric system to direct a beam of light toward photographic paper. The advantage of 78 the photo records over smoked paper is the much larger contrast between the trace and the background, which 70 could be greyish or scratched on smoked paper. The friction of the pen on the paper also alters the quality of 80 the records, although this effect is more important for the large amplitudes of seismic events than for background 81 noise records. 82

The ROB still owns most of the analogue records, either in paper form stored in 1 wooden box per year of 83 data, or digitized on microfilm, which could also be scanned in the future, depending on their preservation state. 84

Digitizing paper seismograms and extracting ground motion 85

Extracting digital seismic traces from scans (images) has been the subject of numerous articles in the past 20 years 86 and their digitizing process can be classified in two categories, either manual by clicking all the wiggles of a seis-87 mic trace (e.g. Bromirski and Chuang, 2003; Pintore et al., 2005), or automatic using image processing techniques 88 to extract the wiggles (e.g. Baskoutas et al., 2000; Church et al., 2013; Wang et al., 2014). Bromirski and Chuang 89 (2003) show an example on their website (http://iodlabs.ucsd.edu/peter/seismology/SeisDig.html, 90 last accessed August 2019) of scanned seismograms from a Wilip-Galitzin vertical seismometer for January 1941 91 and highlight its similarity with spectrograms that can be obtained nowadays with modern digital seismic data. 92 Our method is very similar to the one described in Wang et al. (2014) and is composed of the following steps, 93 with new steps developed in this study marked with a *: Scan, Colour inversion, Thresholding*, Binarization, 95 Rotation*, Region "labelling"*, Line Thinning - Skeletonization and ObsPy Trace object creation*. These steps

⁹⁶ are described in the following Section. The whole digitization process is written in Python and makes use of state

97 of the art Python modules and available as Jupyter Notebooks (see Data & Resources).

Scanning paper seismograms

The scanning of paper seismogram is a tedious work, but is essential for the conservation of our archives (Okal, 99 2015). Until recently, ROB scans were restricted to those specific sheets where significant events were recorded. 100 For this study, seismograms were scanned using a Contex HD Ultra scanner capable of ingesting a 841 mm-wide 101 sheet of paper (width of an A0 ISO 216 standard). Such a scanner supports scanning photographic paper, but not 102 smoked paper as these could be damaged by the paper drive rollers. The final image is saved to TIFF file format 103 with convenient naming allowing to store the station name (e.g. UCC), the orientation of the seismometer ('v', 104 'n-s' or 'e-w') and the date of the record. For processing noise records, a resolution of 300 dpi is sufficient and is 105 less computationally expensive during the processing than 1200 dpi, i.e. the maximal resolution of the scanner. 106

¹⁰⁷ Colour inversion, thresholding, binarization and rotation

Smoked paper seismograms have a black background (the smoke) and whitish traces, scratched by the pen, while developed photographic papers have a white background and a black trace. In order to easily identify the traces using the same algorithm, the photographic images are inverted to obtain white traces. A threshold (Otsu, 1979) is applied to the image in order to reject small under-represented tones from the image. The image is finally binarized, i.e. all positive values (traces) are set to 1 and the background to 0.

To ease the trace sorting, we rotate the image to account for slight misalignment of the sheet in the scanner. This step is done using a Hough Transform (Hough, 1962; Duda and Hart, 1972), i.e. a computer vision technique to automatically identify straight lines in an image. We only compute the transform for angles in a $\pm 5^{\circ}$ range. The technique outputs identified lines, described by their location and angle. The image is then rotated by the median angle to horizontalise the traces.

Region labelling and skeletonization

The time encoding on paper seismogram is generally done by one of the three following ways: (1) a gap of 1 or more seconds at the end of each minute, generated by lifting the needle off the smoked paper or by intercepting the light beam to photographic paper; (2) a spike or (3) a translation of a few millimetres of the trace. Our Galitzin records are of type 1: the photographic records show 1 second gaps at the end of every minute.

The "labelling" operation consists of identifying regions of the image that are connected and form a shape, in our case, continuous chunks of seismic traces. The regions have coordinates in the image space and can therefore be located and sliced easily for further processing. This processing will only occur if the region identified is long and narrow, as we expect short and wide regions to contain bad data, glitches, handwriting or else. A process of line thinning is then required in order to reduce a two-dimensional region of an image containing an object of random shape to a simple line. 2D objects can be defined by their "skeleton", or "central line". In the case of seismic records, this skeleton will be centred in the white pixels of the trace. Once identified, each trace is stored together with its (x,y) coordinates on the image.

ObsPy Trace creation

The identified seismic traces are analysed using standard modern processing, which is be done by creating one ObsPy Trace object per trace. The x and y location of the traces are used to sort them time wise and the length of each trace is 59 seconds. To evaluate the sampling rate of each trace, we consider the median length of all traces identified on one sheet and compute the number of pixels per second (pps), which is the sampling rate. All traces are then linearly detrended, resampled (interpolated) to 8 Hz using a Lanczos interpolation, tapered with a 0.5 s taper on both ends and highpass-filtered above 0.08 Hz (12.5 s). The start time of each trace is computed from its (x,y) location.

139 Instrument response correction

The functioning and the instrument response of the Galitzin seismometers are known and documented in the official Bulletins of the ROB (Somville, 1922a,b). Table 1 shows the parameters for the Galitzin seismometers as in 1953.

Using Table 1 and Galitzin's formulations (Galitzin, 1911, pp 107-108), we can recompute the real ground motion (x_m) from the measured amplitudes on the paper (y_m) , i.e. amplitude instrumental response for different periods (T_p) :

$$x_m = C_1 (1 + u_1^2) (1 + u^2) \sqrt{1 - \mu^2 f(u)} \frac{y_m}{T_p}$$
(1)

with $C_1 = \frac{\pi l}{kA_1}$, $f(u) = \left[\frac{2u}{1+u^2}\right]^2$, and $u = \frac{T_p}{T}$, $u_1 = \frac{T_p}{T_1}$

The amplitude response of the Galitzin seismometers (Figure 1) allow for studying the microseism because they have a maximal sensitivity in the primary (secondary) microseism band for the horizontal (vertical) Galitzin, respectively.

Since the very beginning of their usage, the Galitzin seismometers were subject to critics about the non-150 validity of the assumption that the recorded data was exactly the ground displacement because the coils and the 151 galvanometer had the same eigenperiod (McComb and Wenner, 1936; Wenner and McComb, 1936). There is 152 indeed a difference in phase between the two when the period of the recorded waves are larger or smaller than 153 the nominal frequency. This was also verified by Somville for the Galitzin-Willip vertical seismometer owned by 154 the ROB. The phase shifts observed are orders of magnitude smaller than the studied period (0.1 s shift or less at 155 1.0 s). This could have a strong impact on phase arrival time measurements, but is negligible for the study of the 156 average microseism periods and amplitudes of minutes to hours. 157

The dominant period of each 1-minute trace is extracted from its PSD (see below) and is used in Equation 1 to obtain the amplification factor, i.e. removing the instrument's amplitude response. The Galitzine seismometers and the digitizing technique have very little sensitivity to frequencies above 1 Hz.

161 Power Spectral Density

The PSD of each seismic trace is computed using Welch's method (Welch, 1967). This methods is known to reduce noise in the power spectra at the expense of reducing the frequency resolution because of frequency binning, which is efficient for obtaining information on the broad second microseismic peak.

The Welch method proceeds by splitting the signal in overlapping segments that are then windowed, in our case with a Hanning Window (Blackman and Tukey, 1958), which enhances the importance of the data at the centre of the window. The windowed segments are then converted to a periodogram using the squared magnitude of the discrete Fourier Transform. Individual periodograms are then averaged to reduce the variance of the power measurements.

The final product of our processing are three-hour medians of the individual PSDs. This granularity was chosen to match the one provided by the ocean modelling.

Ocean microseism generation modelling

Our microseism model is a combination of a numerical wave model and a transformation of wave spectra into 173 microseisms. The wave model is described in Rascle and Ardhuin (2013) and covers the world ocean, with a 174 spatial resolution of 0.5 degree in longitude and latitude. The choice of parameterizations for the wind-wave 175 generation and dissipation is particularly important for the directional distribution of the wave energy and the 176 resulting amplitude of microseism sources (Ardhuin et al., 2011). It is forced by winds from the ECMWF 20 177 century reanalysis (Poli et al., 2016). Based on satellite-derived wave heights for the year 2001, the wind-wave 178 coupling coefficient β_{max} was set to 1.7, giving a good representation of even the extreme wave heights (Stopa 179 et al., 2019). The wave model was run with and without shoreline reflection coefficient R for the wave energy. 180

The transformation of wave spectra to microseisms follows Ardhuin et al. (2011), with a summation of mi-181 croseism sources along great circle paths and an attenuation with a constant Q coefficient. For the ROB location 182 in Uccle, Belgium, we have used Q = 200 or Q = 300 and R = 0.1. For the year 2001 to 2014, these constant 183 coefficients typically give a correlation coefficient r = 0.95 between the measured vertical ground displacement 184 standard deviation over 3 hours and the modeled value of the same parameter, meaning that the modeled events 185 correspond to the ones observed a the ROB. This processing predicts ground motions in a period/frequency band 186 comparable to the one from the Galitzin seismometers. Looking at the spatial distribution of the modeled sources, 187 we thus expect the UCC station to be sensitive to storms in the deep waters off the British isles, the Norwegian 188 coast, south of Iceland along the mid-Atlantic ridge and the northern-western part of the Mediterranean sea. 189

¹⁹⁰ Microseismic activity in January-February 1953

In the end of January 1953, a storm formed in the North Atlantic ocean (Figure 2) and moved towards the northern 191 tip of Scotland before changing direction to the south-east, in the North Sea towards the southern part of Denmark 192 (Wemelsfelder, 1953; Wolf and Flather, 2005). While moving south-east in the North Sea, and although its low-193 pressure centre was not exceptionally deep, this storm generated strong winds and, combined with high spring 194 tides, higher-than-usual sustained surge. During the night from 31 January to 1 February 1953, the surge height 195 was maximal in the low-lands of England, The Netherlands and Belgium. Extreme flooding due to dike failures 196 led to a disastrous number of casualties: 1836 in the Netherlands, 307 in the United Kingdom and 22 in Belgium 197 (Gerritsen, 2005). This disaster, called "The Big Flood", was at the origin of the Delta Plan that today protects 198 the Dutch low-lands from future surges (Wemelsfelder, 1953). In Belgium, between 1953 and 1977, more than 199 3.7 billion Belgian Francs (40 BEF = 1 EUR) were invested to repair and secure dikes and rivers within the Sigma 200 Plan (Ministère des Travaux Publics, 1977). For this case study, we therefore decided to scan the records of the 201 three components of the Galitzin seismometer between 15 January and 15 February 1953, centered on the "The 202 Big Flood". 203

Despite a few sheets being incomplete or missing (sadly the one containing the 1 February when the storm 204 surge was maximal) the ground motion induced by this storm can still be extracted and PSDs reconstructed. One 205 explanation for the absence of the records during the maximum of the storm this is that the developed paper 206 was unusable due to bad records. This hypothesis is supported by the records done on the horizontal components, 207 which exhibit an extreme amplification of the wiggles on the mornings of 31 January and 2 February. 90 analogue 208 seismograms (1 month, 3 components) were systematically processed using our work flow and provided hourly 209 Power Spectral Densities of the ground motion recorded in Uccle. Figure 3 shows the time evolution of the Power 210 Spectral Density - or spectrogram - of the noise records and of the model generated for the same period. There 211 are five periods of significant microseismic activity higher than the background level at 0.25 μm : 17-21 January, 212 26-30 January, 31 January - 2 February, 4-5 February and finally 8-12 February. 213

214 Discussion

The microseismic activity recorded by the Galitzin and Galitzin-Willip-Somville seismometers in Uccle evi-215 dences strong changes during January-February 1953 (Figure 3). The spectrograms are very coherent, which is 216 expected as the amplitude of the ground motions from Rayleigh and Love waves should have a ratio of horizontal 217 to vertical H/V≈1.0 (Darbyshire, 1954; Juretzek and Hadziioannou, 2016). We can therefore average the three 218 spectrograms and take advantage of their slightly different time coverage/gaps. To compare the spectrogram with 219 the modelled ground motion, we extract time series of the total amplitude of the ground motion (displacement, 220 δ_{RMS}) and of the dominant period of the seismic waves from the observed and the modelled data (Figure 5). 221 Spectra (Figure 3) are processed as in Ardhuin et al. (2011), the δ_{RMS} of the noise is defined as the square root 222 of the integral of the noise spectrum: 223

 $\delta_{RMS} = \sqrt{\int_{0.08Hz}^{0.32Hz} F_{\delta} df_s}$

with F_{δ} being the power spectrum of the ground displacement and f_s the period of the seismic wave.

There is a good agreement between the ground motion amplitudes and dominant periods, except for the 17-21 January and the Big Flood event (24 January - 2 February). Because of the original granularity of our data set, we also make use of the individual maximum ground motion per minute and analyse its aggregation using the mean, percentile 95 and standard deviations (Figure 5). In the following, we discuss the different events of interest with respect to the modelled noise sources (Figure 4).

The 17-21 January event (E1 on Figures 3, 4 and 5) is missed by the modelling. The model (Figure 4) locates sources close to the Azores, distributed sources between the Azores and the southern tip of Greenland and, at the same time, strong localized sources on the Norwegian coast and around the Shetland Islands. This period corresponds to very strong sources located at the southern tip of Greenland. To obtain larger amplitudes of the modelled ground motion, we should either diminish the attenuation (higher Q) or increase the energy of the source. Changes of Q are not sufficient to significantly increase the effect of this storm, so we suggest that the two broad sources should have been more energetic that currently modelled.

For the 24-25 January event visible on the modelled data, there is a slight increase in the amplitude but the maximum is missed and could not be investigated due to a gap in the data.

The 26-30 January period (E2) corresponds to sources illuminating the whole West coast of Europe, including South Iceland, UK and Ireland together with a broad source in the Norwegian Sea (Figure 4). The model predicts ground motion amplitudes a little lower with less variations than the observed data. The strongest peak in the observed data corresponds to the moments when the modelled seismic sources hit the west coast of UK and Ireland.

The Big Flood, the 31 January - 2 February storm (E3) shows the largest discrepancy between the model and 245 observations. This period corresponds to the motion of the storm around the Northern tip of Scotland and its 246 way down towards the Channel. The highest peak in amplitude and longest seismic waves period are completely 247 missed by the modelling. The difference is almost twofold (1 µm) in amplitude and 1 s in period. The South-248 ern North Sea is characterized by shallow waters (10 to 150 m) where the coupling between ocean waves and 249 the ground is weak and therefore should generate relatively few microseism, which is what the models indeed 250 predicts. The data, however, proves that strong microseismic energy was recorded at the time of the storm. As 251 possible explanations, we tried to increase the Q factor from 300 to 400 for the area because we know from other 252 seismic studies (Camelbeeck, 1985; El Bouch et al., 2002; Van Noten et al., 2017; Mayor et al., 2018) that the 253 attenuation in NE Belgium is very low due to the presence of the WNW-ESE extending Brabant-London mas-254 sif, but the changes are to subtle to account for the 2x amplitude difference. Another explanation could be that 255 the modelled data concerns secondary microseism, while there were recent evidences that short period (5 - 8 s) 256 primary microseism could be generated in the North Sea (Becker et al., 2019). This would explain the strong 257 energy measured, as well as the dominant period around 7-8 s, coherent with the work of Choi et al. (2018) who 258 calculated the dominant sea wave periods to be between 7 and 9 s during the maximum of the storm. The study 259

of the primary microseism generation and specifically in the North Sea has started recently (Juretzek and Hadziioannou, 2017; Becker et al., 2019) and should soon provide new modelling theories to compare with our results. The local wind field around the UCC seismic station, also known to generate local sources of seismic noise by its interaction with trees for example, can be ruled out, as most of the seismic energy radiated is done at the first mode of resonance of trees, around a 1 to 5 s maximum (Roux et al., 2018), while higher modes occur at much higher frequency.

The 4-5 February period (E4) corresponds to sources located in the centre of the North Atlantic. The modelled data is slightly higher than the observations but the trends are parallel. To match those, either Q should be lower (more attenuation) or the source should be further away or weaker.

The 8-12 February period (E5) corresponds to the sources located south of Iceland, moving south towards the West coasts of UK and Ireland, then Brittany, Bay of Biscay, Galicia (Spain) and the whole West coast of Spain and Portugal, ending with sources located on the west coast of Sardinia. The model has a +1 day delay on the maximum of the 8-12 February storm. The maximum observed occurred on 10 February, when the storm hit Scotland simultaneously with Galicia and the Bay of Biscay. There could also be parts of the Southern North Sea affected by stronger waves, and the explanation of the lacking primary microseism above could also apply here.

275 Conclusions

The digitization of analogue seismograms allows reconstructing the evolution of the microseismic energy recorded 276 at one location. Because of its importance for locating earthquakes, the timing of the seismic records is very accu-277 rate, which leads to a high granularity of observations. For each minute of digitized data, we are able to produce 278 one Power Spectra Density spectrum. Averaging them by hour or 3 hours, we can compare the seismic energy ob-279 servations with modelled microseism obtained from the reanalysis of climate data, as done with WAVEWATCH 280 III. Observations from a single seismometer correspond to the sum of pressure sources originating from a ra-281 dius of a few thousand kilometres around the station, summing up along great circle paths and attenuating with 282 distance. The observations have therefore a very high temporal resolution while integrating spatially. 283

The analogue seismic data digitized for a 1-month period centered on the tragic Big Flood event that surged 284 in the Low-Lands of the Netherlands, United Kingdom and Belgium exhibits changes in ground displacement 285 amplitude and period. Those features can be directly linked to specific sources in the North Atlantic Ocean, the 286 Norwegian Sea or the North Sea. While the general trends of amplitude and period match, discrepancies have 287 been identified and raise questions. For the Big Flood itself, the failure of the model to accurately reproduce the 288 seismic energy recorded could be explained by a strong local source of primary microseism, not modelled here, 289 with wave periods around 7-8 s. This effect could also explain the 1-day difference in the maximum of the energy 290 observed for the 8-12 February storm. This calls for more research on the topic in order to provide a combined 291 model for primary and secondary microseism. The 4-5 February event also exhibits differences between observed 292 and modelled data and such events are particularly interesting as they are the most difficult to accurately model 293

²⁹⁴ due to their remoteness from the shores and thus from most environmental observations.

We show that the amplitude and dominant period of the ground motion displacement can be reconstructed independently using vertical or horizontal seismometers. This will allow going back in time until the very beginning of seismological observations, as horizontal seismographs were the first type of instruments installed worldwide. Analogue seismic data from different observatories can therefore be used to add constraints on atmosphere-oceansolid Earth couplings, to study different areas of the oceans and to better locate the microseismic sources, just like the recent digital seismic data. Merging analogue and digital data would allow reanalyses over the complete 20th century.

Data & Resources

Analogue seismograms used in this article are the property of the Royal Observatory of Belgium and can be consulted at any time upon request to the ROB.

Scanned analogue seismograms were processed using NumPy (Oliphant, 2006), SciPy (Jones et al., 2001), 305 Scikit-Image (van der Walt et al., 2014), ObsPy (Beyreuther et al., 2010; Krischer et al., 2015) and Pandas 306 (McKinney, 2012). Figures created with MatPlotLib (Hunter, 2007) and maps were plotted using Cartopy 307 (Met Office, 2010). The modelled data from WAVEWATCH III are available from the FTP server of Ifremer: 308 ftp://ftp.ifremer.fr/ifremer/ww3/HINDCAST/SISMO (last accessed August 2019). It comes in NetCDF format 309 (Rew and Davis, 1990) which are read using the NetCDF4-python module (Whitaker et al., 2019). The whole 310 processing has been implemented in Jupyter Notebooks (Kluyver et al., 2016) and is accessible open and free on 311 the authors' GitHub account (https://github.com/ThomasLecocq, last accessed August 2019) 312

Acknowledgments

314 C. Hadziioannou is acknowledged for the discussions about the primary microseism in the North Sea. C. Caudron,

- A. Watlet and K. Van Noten are acknowledged for the discussions and proofreading of the manuscript
- The following persons are... ...

317 References

- Ardhuin, F., Stutzmann, E., Schimmel, M., and Mangeney, A. (2011). Ocean wave sources of seismic noise.
- Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans, 116(C9):C09004.
- (ASL)/USGS, A. S. L. (1972). High-Gain Long-Period Network.
- (ASL)/USGS, A. S. L. (1974). Seismic Research Observatory.
- (ASL)/USGS, A. S. L. (1988). Global Seismograph Network (GSN IRIS/USGS).

- Aster, R. C., McNamara, D. E., and Bromirski, P. D. (2008). Multidecadal climate-induced variability in microseisms. *Seismological Research Letters*, 79(2):194–202.
- Aster, R. C., McNamara, D. E., and Bromirski, P. D. (2010). Global trends in extremal microseism intensity. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 37(14).
- Baskoutas, I. G., Kalogeras, I. S., Kourouzidis, M., and Panopoulou, G. (2000). A Modern Technique for the Retrieval and Processing of Historical Seismograms in Greece. *Natural Hazards*, 21:55–64.
- Becker, D., Kruse, T., Dethof, F., Weidle, C., and Hadziioannou, C. (2019). Microseism in the North Sea: Tidal forcing, H/V-variability and a future monitoring network. *EGU General Assembly, Vienna, Austria*, page 1.
- Bernard, P. (1990). Historical sketch of microseisms from past to future. *Physics of the Earth and Planetary Interiors*, 63(3-4):145–150.
- Beyreuther, M., Barsch, R., Krischer, L., Megies, T., Behr, Y., and Wassermann, J. (2010). ObsPy: A Python
 Toolbox for Seismology. *Seismological Research Letters*, 81(3):530–533.
- Blackman, R. B. and Tukey, J. W. (1958). The measurement of power spectra from the point of view of communications engineering - Part I. *Bell System Technical Journal*, 37(1):185–282.
- Bromirski, P. D. and Chuang, S. (2003). SeisDig: Software to digitize scanned analog seismogram images, user's
 manual.
- ³³⁹ Camelbeeck, T. (1985). Some notes concerning the seismicity in Belgium. Magnitude scale. Detection capability
- of the Belgian seismic stations. In *Seismic activity in western Europe*. P. Melchior, reidel edition.
- Choi, B. H., Kim, K. O., Yuk, J.-H., and Lee, H. S. (2018). Simulation of the 1953 storm surge in the North Sea.
 Ocean Dynamics, 68(12):1759–1777.
- Church, E. D., Bartlett, A. H., and Jourabchi, M. A. (2013). Raster-to-Vector Image Analysis for Fast Digitization
- of Historic Seismograms. *Seismological Research Letters*, 84(3):489–494.
- ³⁴⁵ Dahm, T., Krüger, F., Essen, H.-H., and Hensch, M. (2005). Historic microseismic data and their relation to the ³⁴⁶ wave-climate in the North Atlantic. *Meteorologische Zeitschrift*, 14(6):771–779.
- ³⁴⁷ Darbyshire, J. (1954). Structure of microseismic waves: estimation of direction of approach by comparison of
- vertical and horizontal components. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A, Mathematical and
- ³⁴⁹ *Physical Sciences*, 223(1152):16.
- ³⁵⁰ Donn, W. L. and Blaik, M. (1952). A study and evaluation of the tripartite seismic method of locating hurricanes.
- Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America, page 19.

- ³⁵² Duda, R. O. and Hart, P. E. (1972). Use of the Hough transformation to detect lines and curves in pictures. ³⁵³ *Communications of the ACM*, 15(1):11–15.
- Ebeling, C. W. (2012). Inferring Ocean Storm Characteristics from Ambient Seismic Noise. In *Advances in Geophysics*, volume 53, pages 1–33. Elsevier.
- El Bouch, A., Camelbeeck, T., and Martin, H. (2002). Atténuation des ondes sismiques en Belgique et dans les
 régions limitrophes à partir de la coda des tremblements de terre locaux. *Geologica Belgica*, 5(1-2):17–29.
- Friedrich, A., Krüger, F., and Klinge, K. (1998). Ocean-generated microseismic noise located with the Gräfenberg
 array. *Journal of Seismology*, 2(1):47–64.
- Galitzin, B. B. (1911). Ueber ein neues aperiodisches horizontalpendel mit galvanometruscher fernregistrierung.
 Buchdr. der K. Akademie der wissenschaften.
- 362 Gerritsen, H. (2005). What happened in 1953? The Big Flood in the Netherlands in retrospect. Philo-
- sophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences,
- 364 363(1831):1271–1291.
- Grevemeyer, I., Herber, R., and Essen, H.-H. (2000). Microseismological evidence for a changing wave climate in the northeast Atlantic Ocean. *Nature*, 408(6810):349–352.
- Gualtieri, L., Camargo, S. J., Pascale, S., Pons, F. M. E., and Ekström, G. (2018). The persistent signature of tropical cyclones in ambient seismic noise. *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, 484:287–294.
- Hanafin, J. A., Quilfen, Y., Ardhuin, F., Sienkiewicz, J., Queffeulou, P., Obrebski, M., Chapron, B., Reul, N.,

³⁷⁰ Collard, F., Corman, D., and others (2012). Phenomenal sea states and swell from a North Atlantic storm

- in February 2011: a comprehensive analysis. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 93(12):1825– 1832.
- Harjes, H. and Seidl, D. (1978). Digital recording and analysis of broad-band seismic data at Gräfenberg (GRF)
 Array. *Journal Of Geophysics-Zeitschrift Fur Geophysik*, 44(5):511–523.
- Hough, P. V. C. (1962). Method and means for recognizing complex patterns.
- Hunter, J. (2007). Matplotlib: A 2d Graphics Environment. *Computing in Science Engineering*, 9(3):90–95.
- Jones, E., Oliphant, T., Peterson, P., et al. (2001). SciPy: Open source scientific tools for Python.
- Juretzek, C. and Hadziioannou, C. (2016). Where do ocean microseisms come from? A study of Love-to-
- Rayleigh wave ratios: LOVE-TO-RAYLEIGH RATIOS IN AMBIENT NOISE. Journal of Geophysical Re-
- *search: Solid Earth*, 121(9):6741–6756.

- Juretzek, C. and Hadziioannou, C. (2017). Linking source region and ocean wave parameters with the observed primary microseismic noise. *Geophysical Journal International*, 211(3):1640–1654.
- ³⁸³ Kluyver, T., Ragan-Kelley, B., Pérez, F., Granger, B., Bussonnier, M., Frederic, J., Kelley, K., Hamrick, J., Grout,
- J., Corlay, S., Ivanov, P., Avila, D., Abdalla, S., and Willing, C. (2016). Jupyter Notebooks A publishing
- format for reproducible computational workflows. In Loizides, F. and Schmidt, B., editors, *Positioning and*
- Power in Academic Publishing: Players, Agents and Agendas, pages 87–90. IOS Press.
- Krischer, L., Megies, T., Barsch, R., Beyreuther, M., Lecocq, T., Caudron, C., and Wassermann, J. (2015).
 ObsPy: a bridge for seismology into the scientific Python ecosystem. *Computational Science & Discovery*, 8(1):014003.
- Mayor, J., Traversa, P., Calvet, M., and Margerin, L. (2018). Tomography of crustal seismic attenuation in
 Metropolitan France: implications for seismicity analysis. *Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering*, 16(6):2195–2210.
- McComb, H. E. and Wenner, F. (1936). Shaking-table investigations of teleseismic seismometers. *Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America*, 26(4):26.
- McKinney, W. (2012). *Python for data analysis: Data wrangling with Pandas, NumPy, and IPython.* "O'Reilly Media, Inc.".
- ³⁹⁷ Met Office (2010). *Cartopy: a cartographic python library with a matplotlib interface*. Exeter, Devon.
- Ministère des Travaux Publics (1977). Plan Sigma pour la protection du bassin de l'Escaut Maritime contre les
 marées-tempêtes de la mer du nord. Technical report.
- ⁴⁰⁰ Nakata, N., Gualtieri, L., and Fichtner, A. (2019). *Seismic ambient noise*. Cambridge University Press.
- ⁴⁰¹ Obrebski, M., Ardhuin, F., Stutzmann, E., and Schimmel, M. (2012). How moderate sea states can generate loud ⁴⁰² seismic noise in the deep ocean. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 39(11).
- 403 Okal, E. A. (2015). Historical seismograms: Preserving an endangered species. GeoResJ, 6:53–64.
- ⁴⁰⁴ Oliphant, T. E. (2006). *Guide to NumPy*.
- Otsu, N. (1979). A Threshold Selection Method from Gray-Level Histograms. *IEEE Transactions on Systems*,
 Man, and Cybernetics, 9(1):62–66.
- ⁴⁰⁷ Pintore, S., Quintiliani, M., and Franceschi, D. (2005). Teseo: A vectoriser of historical seismograms. *Computers*
- ⁴⁰⁸ & *Geosciences*, 31(10):1277–1285.

- Poli, P., Hersbach, H., Dee, D. P., Berrisford, P., Simmons, A. J., Vitart, F., Laloyaux, P., Tan, D. G., Peubey, C.,
- Thépaut, J.-N., and others (2016). ERA-20c: An atmospheric reanalysis of the twentieth century. *Journal of Climate*, 29(11):4083–4097.
- Rascle, N. and Ardhuin, F. (2013). A global wave parameter database for geophysical applications. Part 2: Model
 validation with improved source term parameterization. *Ocean Modelling*, 70:174–188.
- Reguero, B. G., Losada, I. J., and Méndez, F. J. (2019). A recent increase in global wave power as a consequence
 of oceanic warming. *Nature communications*, 10.
- Rew, R. and Davis, G. (1990). NetCDF: an interface for scientific data access. *IEEE computer graphics and applications*, 10(4):76–82.
- 418 Roux, P., Bindi, D., Boxberger, T., Colombi, A., Cotton, F., Douste-Bacque, I., Garambois, S., Gueguen, P.,
- 419 Hillers, G., Hollis, D., Lecocq, T., and Pondaven, I. (2018). Toward Seismic Metamaterials: The METAFORET
- Project. Seismological Research Letters, 89(2A):582–593.
- ⁴²¹ Royal Observatory of Belgium (1985). Belgian Seismic Network.
- Somville, O. (1922a). Constantes des sismographes galitzine. In *Annales de l'Observatoire Royal de Belgique*,
 volume 1.
- ⁴²⁴ Somville, O. (1922b). Sur la methode d'enregistrement galvanometrique appliquee aux sismographes galitzine.

In Annales de l'Observatoire Royal de Belgique, volume 1.

- 426 Somville, O. (1930). Bulletin Séismique de l'Observatoire royal de Belgique.
- 427 Somville, O. (1936). Bulletin Séismique de l'Observatoire royal de Belgique.
- ⁴²⁸ Somville, O. (1937a). Bulletin Séismique de l'Observatoire royal de Belgique.
- Somville, O. (1937b). Un nouveau type de séismographe vertical. *Publications du Bureau central séismologique international*, Fascicule 15:137–145.
- 431 Somville, O. (1953). Bulletin Séismique de l'Observatoire royal de Belgique.
- 432 Stopa, J. E., Ardhuin, F., Stutzmann, E., and Lecocq, T. (2019). Sea State Trends and Variability: Consistency Be-
- tween Models, Altimeters, Buoys, and Seismic Data (1979–2016). Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans,
- 434 124(6):3923–3940.
- 435 Stutzmann, E., Ardhuin, F., Schimmel, M., Mangeney, A., and Patau, G. (2012). Modelling long-term seismic
- noise in various environments. *Geophysical Journal International*, 191(2):707–722.

447

- Tolman, H. L. and the WAVEWATCH III Development Group (2014). User Manual and system documentation 437 of WAVEWATCH III version 4.18. Technical Note 316, NOAA/NWS/NCEP/MMAB. 438
- Van Camp, M. and Camelbeeck, T. (2004). Histoire des stations sismiques belges: de la station «Solvay» au 430 réseau national de surveillance sismique. Ciel et Terre, 120(6):162-176. 440
- van der Walt, S., Schönberger, J. L., Nunez-Iglesias, J., Boulogne, F., Warner, J. D., Yager, N., Gouillart, E., and 441 Yu, T. (2014). scikit-image: image processing in Python. PeerJ, 2:e453. 442
- Van Noten, K., Lecocq, T., Sira, C., Hinzen, K.-G., and Camelbeeck, T. (2017). Path and site effects deduced from 443 transfrontier internet macroseismic data of two recent M4 earthquakes in NW Europe. Solid Earth Discussions, 444 pages 1-33. 445
- Wadey, M. P., Haigh, I. D., Nicholls, R. J., Brown, J. M., Horsburgh, K., Carroll, B., Gallop, S. L., Mason, T., 446 and Bradshaw, E. (2015). A comparison of the 31 January-1 February 1953 and 5-6 December 2013 coastal
- flood events around the UK. Frontiers in Marine Science, 2. 448
- Wang, M., Jiang, Q., and Pan, Z. (2014). A New Curve Tracing Algorithm Based on Local Feature in the 449 Vectorization of Paper Seismograms. Sensors & Transducers, 165(2):4. 450
- Welch, P. (1967). The use of fast Fourier transform for the estimation of power spectra: A method based on time 451 averaging over short, modified periodograms. IEEE Transactions on Audio and Electroacoustics, 15(2):70-73. 452
- Wemelsfelder, P. J. (1953). The disaster in The Netherlands caused by the storm flood of February 1, 1953. 453 Coastal Engineering Proceedings, 1(4):18. 454
- Wenner, F. and McComb, H. E. (1936). The Galitzin seismometer: Discrepancies between the Galitzin theory and 455 the performance of a Wilip-Galitzin seismometer. Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America, 26(4):317-456 322. 457
- Whitaker, J., Khrulev, C., Huard, D., Paulik, C., Hoyer, S., Filipe, Pastewka, L., Mohr, A., Marquardt, C., 458 Couwenberg, B., Whitaker, J., Cuntz, M., Bohnet, M., Brett, M., Hetland, R., Korenčiak, M., barronh, Onu, 459 K., Helmus, J. J., Hamman, J., Barna, A., fredrik 1, Koziol, B., Kluyver, T., May, R., Smrekar, J., Barker, C., 460 da Silva, D., Gohlke, C., and Kinoshita, B. P. (2019). Unidata/netcdf4-python: version 1.5.1.2 release.
- 461
- Wolf, J. and Flather, R. A. (2005). Modelling waves and surges during the 1953 storm. Philosophical Transactions 462
- of the Royal Society of London A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences, 363(1831):1359–1375. 463

464 Authors' full mailing address

- Thomas Lecocq, Fabienne Collin & Thierry Camelbeeck: Royal Observatory of Belgium, Seismology Gravimetry, Avenue circulaire 3, 1180 Uccle, Belgium
- Fabrice Ardhuin: Univ. Brest, CNRS, IRD, Ifremer, Laboratoire d'Océanographie Physique et Spatiale
 (LOPS), IUEM, 29280, Brest, France.

469 **Tables**

Table 1: 1953 parameters for the Galitzin seismometers at ROB, where T is the period of the pendulum, T_1 the period of the galvanometer, l the reduced pendulum length, μ the damping constant, A_1 the distance of the drum from the galvanometer mirror and k the transfer factor (Galitzin, 1911, p. 103).

Instrument	$T(\mathbf{s})$	T_1 (s)	l (mm)	μ	$A_1 \text{ (mm)}$	k
Galitzin E-W	21.5	21.8	123.8	+0.2	1040	38
Galitzin N-S	24.5	21.8	124.7	+0.2	1040	38
GWillip-Somville V	10.0	10.15	173.8	0.0	1060	97

470 List of Figures

471	1	The amplitude response of the Galitzin seismometers owned by the ROB (Somville, 1930, 1937a,	
472		1953)	18
473	2	Map of the 1953 storm path 72 hours before until 24 after the Big Flood with the atmospheric	
474		pressure and wind fields 6 hours before the Big Flood, redrawn from Wadey et al. (2015). The	
475		dashed ellipses indicate the region where dramatic flooding occurred (red) and the area of maxi-	
476		mal sensitivity (black) for the UCC seismic station (black star)	18
477	3	15 January-15 February 1953 displacement power spectral density (PSD) spectrograms based	
478		on the automatically extracted time series for the Vertical, East-West and North-South compo-	
479		nents, and below, the result of the simulation using WAVEWATCH III and coastal reflections	
480		(REF102040). The thin white contours that highlight the -130 and -120 dB levels are indicated	
481		for illustration purposes only. The thick dashed white line indicates the time of occurrence of the	
482		Big Flood. The arrows indicate the five periods of significant microseismic activity, labelled E1	
483		to E5 in the text and the following figures	19
484	4	Modelled daily average microseismic sources obtained from Ocean Modelling: the power spec-	
485		tral density of equivalent surface pressure summed over all periods, not corrected for coupling	
486		(WAVEWATCH III and coastal reflections REF102040). The arrows indicate the five periods of	
487		significant microseismic activity.	20

488	5	Comparison of the ground displacement amplitude (above) and its dominant period (below) for	
489		the modelled and observed data from digitized seismograms of the UCC station. Two ocean	
490		generated ground motion models with different Q factor are presented. The arrows indicate the	
491		five periods of significant microseismic activity higher than the background level at 0.25 μm :	
492		17-21 January, 26-30 January, 31 January - 2 February, 4-5 February and finally 8-12 February	21



Figure 1: The amplitude response of the Galitzin seismometers owned by the ROB (Somville, 1930, 1937a, 1953)



Figure 2: Map of the 1953 storm path 72 hours before until 24 after the Big Flood with the atmospheric pressure and wind fields 6 hours before the Big Flood, redrawn from Wadey et al. (2015). The dashed ellipses indicate the region where dramatic flooding occurred (red) and the area of maximal sensitivity (black) for the UCC seismic station (black star).



Figure 3: 15 January-15 February 1953 displacement power spectral density (PSD) spectrograms based on the automatically extracted time series for the Vertical, East-West and North-South components, and below, the result of the simulation using WAVEWATCH III and coastal reflections (REF102040). The thin white contours that highlight the -130 and -120 dB levels are indicated for illustration purposes only. The thick dashed white line indicates the time of occurrence of the Big Flood. The arrows indicate the five periods of significant microseismic activity, labelled E1 to E5 in the text and the following figures.



Figure 4: Modelled daily average microseismic sources obtained from Ocean Modelling: the power spectral density of equivalent surface pressure summed over all periods, not corrected for coupling (WAVEWATCH III and coastal reflections REF102040). The arrows indicate the five periods of significant microseismic activity.



Figure 5: Comparison of the ground displacement amplitude (above) and its dominant period (below) for the modelled and observed data from digitized seismograms of the UCC station. Two ocean generated ground motion models with different Q factor are presented. The arrows indicate the five periods of significant microseismic activity higher than the background level at 0.25 μm : 17-21 January, 26-30 January, 31 January - 2 February, 4-5 February and finally 8-12 February.