







Funded by the Horizon 2020 Framework Programme of the European Union



Modelling 2018 Anak Krakatoa Flank Collapse and Tsunami

Effect of Landslide Failure Mechanisms and **Dynamics on Tsunami Generation**

Thomas Zengaffinen, Finn Løvholt, Geir Kleivstul Pedersen

Published Article in Pure and Applied Geophysics: https://doi.org/10.1007/s00024-020-02489-x Author's e-mail: thomas.zenaaffinen@nai.no

Location and motivation of the volcano Anak Krakatoa



- Landslides and volcano flank collapses are an important tsunami source.
- 2018 Anak Krakatoa event --> several hundred fatalities (Muhari et al. 2019, Putra et al. 2020)
- We study the sea surface elevation at four coastal measurement stations based on various input parameters through numerical modelling.

Landslide model BingClaw

- Deformable mass flow
- Viscoplastic Herschel-Bulkley rheology

 $\dot{\gamma}_r = \left(\tau_y/\mu\right)^{1/n}$

NG

 $|\tau| \le \tau_y \rightarrow$ no deformation $|\tau| > \tau_y \rightarrow$ deformation

- Strain dependent remoulding $\tau_y = \tau_{y,r} + (\tau_{y,0} \tau_{y,r})e^{-\Gamma\gamma}$
- Two-layer model with depthintegrated velocities



Tsunami model GeoClaw

LeVeque et al. (2011), Berger et al. (2011)

- Depth-averaged shallow water model
- Hydrostatic pressure
- Capture of propagating breaking waves
- Dry-land inundation with moving shoreline





Total release volume V_{tot}

- *V_{tot}* = 0.21 km³ (red failure surface)
 --> generally smaller sea surface
 elevations at the gauges
- *V_{tot}* = 0.28 km³ (blue failure surface)
 --> generally larger sea surface
 elevations at the gauges

Panjang, h = 2.74 m

5000

4500





Remoulded yield strength τ_{y_r}

- τ_{yr} = 1 kPa --> smaller landslide
 velocities and generally smaller sea
 surface elevations at the gauges
- τ_{yr} = 100 kPa --> larger landslide velocities and generally larger sea surface elevations at the gauges



NG $\rightarrow \tau_{y_r} = 100$ kPa is reasonable for simulating the event



Gradual volume release V_r

Setup

- Lower, initially weak, landslide part with τ_{y_r}
- Upper, initially stiff, landslide part with τ_{y_0}



NG

 Gradual volume release is a significant control on tsunami genesis



→ Simulated instantaneous collapse fit observation fairly well



Landslide directivity σ

- Satellite images form Babu and Kumar (2019) --> SW failure
- Three failure plane dip directions are indicated in the left figure as lines.
- Simulations with σ = 145° west from the north disagree most with sea surface elevation observation



 $\rightarrow \sigma = 125^{\circ}$ and $\sigma = 135^{\circ}$ match simulation with observation best.

Modification of bathymetric depth



NG

- Water depth increase from 10 m to maximum 60 m (violet zone in left figure previous slide)
 - --> Increase in wave speed, earlier arrival in Panjang --> Increase in first sea surface elevation in at least Panjang

→ Deeper water north of the source is a possibility to decrease the max. surface elevation mismatch in at least Panjang. Simulated wave period is still too large.





Inundation study of the best fit scenario

 Coarse topo-bathymetric data (100 m) refined to 11 m.

- Northern region (top):
 - Maximum simulated runup height 6.1 m
 - Partly good match and partly underestimation
 - Southern region (bottom):
 - Max. in the southern region 7.9 m
 - Underestimation





Summary – what have we learnt

- BingClaw is fairly well suited to model the 2018 Anak Krakatoa flank collapse.
- Flank collapse was most probable
 - a single failure with 0.28 km³
 - directed towards SW
- On Java we have a good overall wave metrics match, on Sumatra some mismatches concerning wave height and wave period.
- Bathymetric depth modifications reduce maximum wave height mismatches in at least Panjang, however not the wave period mismatch.
- Runup heights in selected regions on Java agree with observations in 50%, otherwise underestimated.

Outlook

- Further validation of the landslide model through detailed pre- and post collapse bathymetric data on and around the volcano
 - --> a more accurate volume estimate
 - --> a more detailed failure surface
 - --> extent of the landslide run-out

Finer resolved topo-bathymetric data could be have less errors in shallow regions, and thus better agreement with observations.

References on the 2018 Anak Krakatoa event

- Babu, A., & Kumar, S. (2019). InSAR Coherence and Backscatter Images Based Analysis for the Anak Krakatau Volcano Eruption. In Multidisciplinary digital publishing institute proceedings (Vol. 24, p. 21).
- Fritz, H. M., Solihuddin, T., Synolakis, C., Prasetya, G. S., Borrero, J. C., Skanavis, and others (2019). Near-source field survey of the 22 December 2018 Anak Krakatau tsunami in the Sunda Strait. American Geophysical Union Fall Meeting 2019, NH31A-03.
- Giachetti, T., Paris, R., Kelfoun, K., & Ontowirjo, B. (2012). Tsunami haz665 ard related to a flank collapse of Anak Krakatau volcano, Sunda Strait, Indonesia. Geological Society, London, Special Publications, 361(1), 79–90. <u>https://doi.org/10.1144/SP361.7</u>.
- Gouhier, M., & Paris, R. (2019). So2 and tephra emissions during the december 22, 2018 anak krakatau eruption. Volcanica, 2(2), <u>https://doi.org/91–103.10.30909/vol.02.02.91103</u>.
- Grilli, S. T., Tappin, D. R., Carey, S., Watt, S. F., Ward, S. N., Grilli, A. R., et al. (2019). Modelling of the tsunami from the december 22, 2018 lateral collapse of anak krakatau volcano in the sunda straits, indonesia. Scientific Reports, 9(1), 1–13. <u>https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-48327-6</u>.
- Heidarzadeh, M., Ishibe, T., Sandanbata, O., Muhari, A., & Wijanarto, A. B. (2020). Numerical modeling of the subaerial landslide source of the 22 December 2018 Anak Krakatoa volcanic tsunami, Indonesia. Ocean Engineering, 195, 106733. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oceaneng.2019.106733</u>.
- Muhari, A., Heidarzadeh, M., Susmoro, H., Nugroho, H. D., Kriswati, E., Wijanarto, A. B., et al. (2019). The December 2018 Anak Krakatau Volcano tsunami as inferred from post-tsunami field surveys and spectral analysis. Pure and Applied Geophysics, 176(12), 5219–5233. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s00024-019-02358-2</u>.
- Novellino, A., Engwell, S. L., Grebby, S., Day, S., Cassidy, M., Madden-Nadeau, A., et al. (2020). Mapping Recent Shoreline Changes Spanning the Lateral Collapse of Anak Krakatau Volcano, Indonesia. Applied Sciences, 10(2), 536. <u>https://doi.org/10.3390/app10020536</u>.
- Paris, A., Heinrich, P., Paris, R., & Abadie, S. (2020). The December 22, 2018 Anak Krakatau, Indonesia, Landslide and Tsunami: Preliminary Modeling Results. Pure and Applied Geophysics, 177, 571–590. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s00024-019-02394-y</u>.
- Putra, P. S., Aswan, A., Maryunani, K. A., Yulianto, E., Nugroho, S. H., & Setiawan, V. (2020). Post-Event Field Survey of the 22 December 2018 Anak Krakatau Tsunami. Pure and Applied Geophysics, 1–16, https://doi.org/10.1007/s00024-020-02446-8.
- Suwarsono, N., Prasasti, I., Nugroho, J. T., Sitorus, J., & Triyono, D. (2019). Detecting the lava ow depositis from 2018 Anak Krakatau eruption using data fusion landsat-8 opitc and sentinel1 sar. International Journal of Remote Sensing and Earth Sciences, 15(2), 157–166.10.30536/j.ijreses.2018.v15.a3078.
- Walter, T. R., Haghighi, M. H., Schneider, F. M., Coppola, D., Motagh, M., Saul, J., et al. (2019). Complex hazard cascade culminating in the anak krakatau sector collapse. Nature communications, 10(1), 1–11. <u>https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-12284-5</u>.
- Ye, L., Kanamori, H., Rivera, L., Lay, T., Zhou, Y., Sianipar, D., et al. (2020). The 22 december 2018 tsunami from ank collapse of anak krakatau volcano during eruption. Science Advances, 6(3), eaaz1377. <u>https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aaz1377</u>.
- Zengaffinen, T., Løvholt, F., Pedersen, G. et al. Modelling 2018 Anak Krakatoa Flank Collapse and Tsunami: Effect of Landslide Failure Mechanism and Dynamics on Tsunami Generation. Pure Appl. Geophys. (2020). <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s00024-020-02489-x</u>.







NORGES GEOTEKNISKE INSTITUTT NGI.NO