

## 1 **Spectral Tremor Detection Method**

2           We stack unfiltered, daylong, east-component seismograms for all the available stations  
3 within the network and normalize for the number of operating stations and daily mean energy  
4 across all frequencies. We produce daily spectrograms with ~82 s windows and 50% overlap.  
5 Peaks of energy are identified within certain bands: the tremor band is chosen as 2-7 Hz and the  
6 earthquake/noise band 7-15 Hz. The spectrograms for the entire duration of the dataset (2006-  
7 2009) are computed and a baseline threshold established above which detections are defined.  
8 Because we want to allow positive tremor or earthquake/noise detections when power in a  
9 significant portion of the defined frequency bands exceed the baseline threshold, we establish a  
10 required percentage of the frequency band that must exceed the baseline threshold (termed the  
11 threshold percentage) for a positive detection. Our algorithm scans the entire dataset and for each  
12 time window determines the percentage of signal within the tremor and earthquake/noise bands,  
13 that falls above the baseline threshold. All time windows where this percentage exceeds the  
14 tremor and/or earthquake/noise threshold percentage are considered a positive tremor and/or  
15 earthquake detection. Time windows that contain only a tremor detection are retained, if an  
16 earthquake/noise-band detection occurs within the same window as a tremor detection, that  
17 tremor detection is negated.

18           In order to determine threshold percentages for tremor and earthquake/noise detections,  
19 we generated 10,201 tremor detection catalogs using data for several weeks surrounding the May  
20 2007 slow slip event and different percentages between 0% and 100%, in 1% increments. We  
21 then compared these detection catalogs with an analyst-determined hand counted tremor catalog  
22 for the same time period [Outerbridge *et al.*, 2010]. The visually determined tremor catalog  
23 indicated that tremor started abruptly on Julian Day (JD) 136, continued at a high level through

24 JD 142, and tapered off by JD 146. The ten days preceding tremor initiation were virtually  
25 devoid of tremor activity. We tuned the threshold percentages to best fit this pattern by  
26 calculating the ratio of tremor detections between JD 136-146 to JD 125-135 for each of the  
27 10,201 tremor catalogs and chose the threshold percentages that maximized this ratio. The  
28 highest ratio attained for the computed catalogs was 16.5, corresponding to tremor and  
29 earthquake percentage thresholds of 46% and 28%, respectively. These values are likely network  
30 and region specific. A combination of the high microseismicity and cultural noise for the Nicoya  
31 region likely determines the best values. This threshold percentage method could be easily  
32 tailored for use in other tectonic environments.

33

#### 34 **Comparison of Automatic Detection to Visually Determined Catalog of Tremor**

35       The visually determined tremor catalog for 2007 presented in *Outerbridge et al.* [2010]  
36 counts the number of tremor episodes that occur within each hour lasting at least four minutes  
37 and computes tremor durations for the entirety of each episode. Because tremor episodes often  
38 consist of several tremor bursts separated by quiet intervals, this catalog overestimates tremor  
39 durations. Both the handpicked and automated tremor catalogs identify peak tremor activity in  
40 2007 on JD 137. On this day the hand-picked catalog contains 36 tremor episodes totaling almost  
41 400 minutes, while the automated detection algorithm described here finds 22 events with a total  
42 estimated duration of only 30 minutes. The spectrogram for this day displays an unusually high  
43 level of noise during both local daylight and night-time hours that unfortunately obscures a lot of  
44 the tremor activity. Automatic tremor detection methods developed for use in Mexico [*Husker*  
45 *et al.*, 2010] and Cascadia [*Wech and Creager*, 2008] also suffer from reduced tremor counts  
46 compared to handpicked determinations of tremor. These researchers have attributed this to

47 storm activity and cultural noise, which both reduce automated detection compared to visual  
48 inspection. *Brudzinski and Allen* [2007] recognized the difficulty of detecting tremor in the  
49 presence of cultural noise and only searched for tremor during the twelve, quiet night-time hours.  
50 Because automated tremor detection algorithms consistently underestimate tremor when  
51 compared with visual inspection, we consider our tremor catalog to provide a lower bound  
52 estimate of tremor activity.

53

#### 54 **Tremor Location Method**

55 Tremor events are located using an envelope cross-correlation method to determine the  
56 phase lag across the network similar to *Obara* [2002]. Daylong seismograms for each station are  
57 band-passed at 2-7 Hz, smoothed, decimated to a 2 Hz sample rate, and converted to single-sided  
58 functions or envelopes. Subtracting the mean and dividing by the standard deviation normalizes  
59 the envelopes for each station. We determine time lags for the maximum cross-correlation  
60 coefficient relative to one of the stations and exclude stations that do not have a correlation  
61 coefficient greater than 0.65. With the phase lag, we locate the tremor events with  
62 HYPOINVERSE [*Klein*, 1978], using a one-dimensional S-wave model determined for this  
63 region [*DeShon et al.*, 2006].

64

#### 65 **References**

66 Brudzinski, M. R., and R. M. Allen (2007), Segmentation in episodic tremor and slip all along  
67 Cascadia, *Geology*, 35, 907-910.

68

69 DeShon, H.R., S.Y. Schwartz, A.V. Newman, V. Gonzalez, J.M. Protti, L.M. Dorman, T. Dixon,  
70 E. Norabuena, and E. Flueh (2006), Seismogenic zone structure beneath the Nicoya Peninsula,  
71 Costa Rica, from 3D local earthquake P- and S- wave tomography, *Geophys. J. Int.*, 164, 109-  
72 124.

73

74 Husker, A., S. Peyrat, N. Shapiro, and V. Kostoglodov, (2010), Automatic non-volcanic tremor  
75 detection in the Mexican subduction zone, *Geofisica Internacional* 49 (1), 17-25.

76

77 Klein, F.W. (1978), Hypocenter location program HYPOINVERSE, U.S. Geological Survey  
78 Open-File Report 78-694, 113 pp.

79

80 Obara, K. (2002), Nonvolcanic deep tremor associated with subduction in southwest Japan,  
81 *Science*, 296: 1679-1681.

82

83 Outerbridge, K. C., T. H. Dixon, S. Y. Schwartz, J. I. Walter, M. Protti, V. Gonzalez, J. Biggs,  
84 M. Thorwart, and W. Rabbel (2010), A Tremor and Slip Event on the Cocos-Caribbean  
85 Subduction zone as measured by a GPS and Seismic Network on the Nicoya Peninsula, Costa  
86 Rica, *J. Geophys. Res.*, doi:10.1029/2009JB006845

87

88 Wech, A. G., and K. C. Creager (2008), Automated detection and location of Cascadia tremor,  
89 *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 35, L20302, doi:10.1029/2008GL035458.

90

91

92

93