



# GROUND-BASED THERMAL MONITORING

Nick Varley Universidad de Colima, Mexico nick@ucol.mx

# Thermal monitoring

- Remote sensing often is the first signal of a new eruption for remote volcanoes
- Fumarole direct temperature measurements
- Spring water temperatures
- Radiometer large pixel detectors
- Temperature of PFs, lahars
- Thermal imaging

# Thermal imaging

### Recent development of IR cameras

- Getting cheaper
- Stable calibration
- Lightweight, portable instruments



Thermal infrared 7.5 – 13  $\mu$ m Sensitivity - <0.1°C Fast – up to 60 Hz

# VarioCAM thermal camera



320 x 240 model



• German camera ■ Hr model 640 x 480 Resolution enhancement 1280 x 960 ■ 8 – 13 µm ■ 50 Hz Firewire  $\Box$  SD cards ■ 32,000 Euro (43,000 USD)

# Thermal imaging

### MEDICAL THERMAL IMAGING Can Detect Many Diseases And Disorders In Their Early Stages



![](_page_5_Picture_0.jpeg)

# Applications

![](_page_5_Figure_2.jpeg)

### **Moisture Behind Drywall**

![](_page_5_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_5_Picture_5.jpeg)

# Thermal imaging of volcanoes

#### Passive activity

Remote sensing of fumarole temps.

#### Effusive activity

- Characteristics of dome growth mechanism of emplacement
- Estimation of effusion rate

#### Explosive activity

- Characteristics depth of source, ash contents
- Air entrainment process
- Real-time monitoring with radiometers

# Operation

Emissivity of rocks
 Absorption of atmosphere – relative humidity
 Atmospheric models used

![](_page_8_Figure_0.jpeg)

Comparison of object temperature and radiative heat flux. Dotted curve represents temperature/radiative heat flux conversion function. Agrees with Plancks-law over the range of interest (-10 to 200 °C)

Transmissivity of a 5800 m path at 4000 m elevation using the Tropical Atmosphere Model. The contours are interpolated from values calculated using the MODTRAN code

#### Models of apparent fumarole temperatures

![](_page_9_Figure_1.jpeg)

a) Distance versus apparent temperature for theoretical fumaroles. The radiating areas and temperatures of the fumaroles are: 102 m<sup>2</sup> at 50 °C; 36.1 m<sup>2</sup> at 100 °C; 19.2 m<sup>2</sup> at 150 °C; 12.1 m<sup>2</sup> at 200 °C. Areas correspond to an apparent temperature of ~35 °C at typical atmospheric conditions of 5 °C and 64% relative humidity. 2 regimes. (i) apparent temperatures are controlled by the atmospheric transmissivity; (ii) control is dominated by the pixel size.

b) Effect of atmospheric conditions
on apparent temperature. Contour
lines of apparent temperature show
how it changes with weather
conditions. Error bars represent mean
variation within a 24 hour period.

Stevenson & Varley 2008 JVGR

![](_page_10_Figure_0.jpeg)

Data processing – filter for clouds and explosions

![](_page_11_Picture_0.jpeg)

Much lower SO<sub>2</sub> flux compared to 1998-9 although similar effusion rate

→ magma arrived with lower volatile contents – volume degassed during explosive events during 2003-4

Infrared – 3 effusion centres, E fracture

NEC camera  $1.5 - 3 \mu m$ 

![](_page_12_Picture_0.jpeg)

# Calculation of effusion rate

- •Thermal radiance used to calculate effusion rate
- •Comparison with satellite data (AVHRR & MODIS)
- •Also calculated using photos and GIS

![](_page_12_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_12_Figure_6.jpeg)

### Recent eruption – started Jan. 2007

![](_page_13_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_13_Picture_2.jpeg)

Superimposed thermal and visual images of dome on 9 Feb. 2007

# Precursors 6 months before effusion started:

- Increase in B in spring waters
- Seismicity increase in LP events
- Increase in fumarole temperature

![](_page_13_Figure_8.jpeg)

Thermal image with white areas having temperatures > 200° C.

## **Remote sensing of fumaroles**

![](_page_14_Picture_1.jpeg)

• Decreasing tendency during 2005-2007; 2008 onwards fairly constant

- Negative anomaly prior to 5 June event
- Temperature increases and decreases related to explosions
- Relatively large pixel size and large distance for atmospheric effects but sufficiently sensitive to detect small variations

![](_page_14_Figure_6.jpeg)

![](_page_14_Figure_7.jpeg)

#### Mean night time temperatures from Nevado

![](_page_15_Figure_0.jpeg)

Increase in fumarole temps.

Decrease occurred when dome made it to the surface

#### Dome evolution from thermography

![](_page_16_Figure_1.jpeg)

Hot spots within small explosion craters

Evidence of circular structure in IR image

#### 05 June 2007

## Magma extrusion

![](_page_17_Picture_1.jpeg)

11 Nov. 2007 Pixel temps. > 500° C

![](_page_17_Figure_3.jpeg)

Growth directed in certain directions – small lobes

Exogenic

Larger dome – sides no longer show high temperature

- Hot central core
- Extrusion on upper surface & sides
- Cooled lower slopes
  - •Talus accumulation
  - •Thermal insulation

# 2007 – 2011 dome

![](_page_18_Figure_1.jpeg)

First stage – exogenic growth 11 Nov. 2007 Pixel temps. > 500° C Various methods used to estimate dome volume

![](_page_18_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Figure_5.jpeg)

# Dome thermal analysis

![](_page_19_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Picture_1.jpeg)

Hotspot – 321° C Extrusion with rockfall or explosive vent

![](_page_21_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_21_Figure_1.jpeg)

- Persistent hotspots
- Hot outside upper surface
- Fractures gas flow

![](_page_22_Picture_0.jpeg)

#### Dome cooling – polygons → columnar jointing

26 Dec. 2010

![](_page_22_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_23_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_23_Picture_1.jpeg)

25 February 2010

- Steepening & unloading on W dome side from rockfalls
- New lobe appears

![](_page_23_Figure_5.jpeg)

![](_page_23_Picture_6.jpeg)

29 March 2010

![](_page_24_Picture_0.jpeg)

# Final effusive phase: lobe W side

#### 26 December 2010

- Dome is offset to W
- Rockfalls and unloading of this part of dome reestablished growth mechanism
- New lobe formed in 2010
- Dome growth stopped
- Fresh material rockfalls

![](_page_24_Picture_8.jpeg)

# Infrared images of rockfalls

Estimate volume from heat flux from slope
 Investigate heating of dome before rockfall
 Relationship with explosions

![](_page_25_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_26_Picture_0.jpeg)

#### Rockfall quantification

26.05.2010 Rockfall 17:42 – 17:48

- A = 250 m<sup>3</sup> • B = 558 m<sup>3</sup>
- Comparison with seismic signal
- Quantify volumes lost

# 04 Jan. 2011 - rockfall

![](_page_27_Figure_1.jpeg)

Video clip

![](_page_28_Figure_0.jpeg)

# **Explosion monitoring**

![](_page_29_Picture_1.jpeg)

#### VarioCAM infrared camera 8 – 13.5 µm

![](_page_29_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_29_Picture_4.jpeg)

Fumarole temperatures monitored-Looking for long-term trends-Short-term relationship with explosions

Stevenson, J.A., and N. Varley, Fumarole monitoring with a handheld infrared camera: Volcán de Colima, Mexico, 2006-2007, *Journal of Volcanology and Geothermal Research, 17*7 (4), 911-924, 2008.

![](_page_30_Picture_0.jpeg)

### **Remote sensing of fumaroles**

- Decreasing tendency during 2005-2007; 2008 onwards fairly constant
- Negative anomaly prior to 5 June event
- Temperature increases and decreases related to explosions
- Relatively large pixel size and large distance for atmospheric effects but sufficiently sensitive to detect small variations

![](_page_31_Figure_5.jpeg)

![](_page_31_Figure_6.jpeg)

### Variation in fumarole temperature

![](_page_32_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_33_Figure_0.jpeg)

Large event of 23 Sept. – prior heating & subsequent cooling over several days

![](_page_33_Figure_2.jpeg)

Large event of 27 July – large heating prior to event, then cooling

![](_page_34_Figure_0.jpeg)

#### Explosion 11/08/07

2<sup>nd</sup> pulse produces acoustic emission but no seismicity detected

2 sources shown in thermal images – one rich in ash, the other poor

#### nfrared images

- Calculation of heat flux
- Thermal expansion, air entrainment process
- Influence of ash particle fraction

![](_page_35_Picture_4.jpeg)

### Column processes

![](_page_35_Figure_6.jpeg)

![](_page_35_Figure_7.jpeg)

#### 10 March 2006 15:54

![](_page_35_Picture_9.jpeg)

# Isla Socorro - Study of active dome

![](_page_36_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_37_Picture_0.jpeg)

# Crater Lake monitoring

![](_page_38_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_38_Picture_2.jpeg)

# El Chichón, Mexico Gas emission from sides and beneath lake

![](_page_39_Figure_0.jpeg)

# CO<sub>2</sub> flux survey

- Survey carried out of crater floor
- Emissions related to deep processes
- Controlled by geological structure
- 3 populations on cumulative flux plot

![](_page_39_Figure_6.jpeg)

# Poás, Costa Rica

![](_page_40_Figure_1.jpeg)

Convection within crater lake

Video clip

![](_page_41_Figure_0.jpeg)

### **THERMAL SENSORS - RADIOMETERS**

![](_page_42_Picture_1.jpeg)

• Permanent real-time monitoring system

#### Possible to calculate

- Ascent velocity
- Gas flux
- Characterize event

Combined with seismic/infrasound data

• Depth of the explosion

![](_page_43_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_43_Figure_1.jpeg)

Real time monitoring system

comparison with seismic data

# Radiometer data

![](_page_44_Figure_1.jpeg)

- Relationship between seismicity and explosion column temperature is not straightforward
- Influenced by
  - Variation in ash-contents difficult to quantify
  - Cooling from air entrainment
  - Source depth
  - Energy release characteristics impulsive or emergent, pulses, multiple vents

#### Comparing thermal emission of explosion column with seismicity

![](_page_45_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_45_Figure_2.jpeg)

17/09/07 00:35

![](_page_45_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_45_Figure_5.jpeg)

03/08/07 12:03

'Cold' gas releases occur but also hot puffs with no seismicity