Floods on Mars released from groundwater by impact
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Abstract

On Earth, large earthquakes commonly cause saturated soils to liquefy and streamflow to increase. We suggest that meteoritic impacts on Mars may have repeatedly caused similar liquefaction to enable violent eruption of groundwater. The amount of erupted water may be comparable to that required to produce catastrophic floods and to form outflow channels.
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1. Introduction

Liquefaction frequently occurs on Earth during or immediately after large earthquakes, when saturated soils lose their shear resistance, become fluid-like, and are ejected to the surface, causing lateral spreading of ground and foundering of engineered foundations (e.g., Terzaghi et al., 1996). During the 1964 Alaskan earthquake, for example, ejection of fluidized sediments occurred at distances more than 400 km from the epicenter (Waller, 1968). Increased streamflow is also commonly observed after earthquakes (Montgomery and Manga, 2003). Suggested causes include coseismic liquefaction (Manga et al., 2003), coseismic strain (Muir-Wood and King, 1993), enhanced permeability (Rojstaczer et al., 1995) and rupturing of hydrothermal reservoirs (Wang et al., 2004a).

Extensive laboratory and field studies (e.g., Terzaghi et al., 1996) show that saturated soils liquefy during ground shaking as a result of pore-pressure buildup that in turn is due to the compaction of soils in an undrained condition. Furthermore, laboratory experiments (Dobry et al., 1982; Vucetic, 1994) showed that the threshold of pore-pressure buildup is insensitive to the type of soils (from clays to loose sand) and the environmental conditions. Thus we may reasonably suggest that saturated soils on Mars, even though composed of pulverized basalt rather than alluvial sand, may also experience undrained consolidation, pore-pressure buildup and liquefaction when subjected to strong ground shaking.

Liquefaction caused by meteoritic impact is also preserved in the sedimentary record (Underwood, 1976; Warme and Kuehner, 1998; Terry et al., 2001). Among the documented examples is a field of circular plugs of sandstone near the Oasis impact crater in Libya, which “appear to be the result of upward movement of fluidized sand” (Underwood, 1976). Strong evidences for liquefaction (Terry et al., 2001) and related landslides (Bralower et al., 1998; Klaus et al., 2000) were also found shallow submarine sediments in connection with the Chicxulub impact at the Cretaceous–Tertiary boundary. Soil liquefaction during underground and surface explosions has also been documented (e.g., Charlie et al., 1996). Could meteoritic impact on Mars also have caused liquefaction and floods?

Heavy meteoritic bombardment on the early Mars formed a thick layer of dust, regolith and ejecta. Assuming that abundant water was present on the early Mars, a saturated aquifer of global extent may have been present beneath a few km of frozen ground (e.g., Carr, 1996; Cliffford and Parker, 2001). Stewart and Ahrens (2003) showed that meteoritic impacts may cause melting and vaporization of ice in the ground close to the crater. We suggest here that liquefaction can release water at great distances from the impact site. Given that Mars’ surface heat flow in the late-Noachian to early Hesperian was ∼5 times greater than its present value (e.g., Schubert et al., 1992), it is likely that the cryosphere was much thinner, and thus much weaker, during that time (Cliffford and Parker, 2001). Under these conditions, meteoritic impact may have caused widespread liquefaction of the near-surface aquifers (Cliffford, 1997).

Unfortunately, quantitative studies of impact-induced liquefaction are limited. Leyva and Cliffford (1993) calculated the pore-pressure change on Mars during an impact by assuming that the change was caused by a single compressional wave. Field and laboratory studies show, however, that pore-pressure change and liquefaction are more likely to be caused by many cycles of shearing of saturated soils (e.g., Terzaghi et al., 1996). In view of the difficulties in making theoretical predictions, we adopt an empirical approach.

2. Relationship between crater size and spatial extent of liquefaction

Because liquefaction is a major concern in earthquake-prone areas, numerous attempts have been made to predict its occurrence. Field and laboratory studies show that liquefaction depends on many factors, including
For meteoritic impacts, there are too few documented examples of liquefaction to determine the farthest distance to the liquefaction site or the occurrence of increased streamflow. Thus an indirect approach is required. From cratering experiments and dimensional analysis, an empirical scaling relation was derived by Melosh (1989), relating the diameter of the impact crater, \( D \), and the impact energy \( W_{\text{im}} \) (all parameters in SI units):

\[
D = 1.8 \rho_p^{-0.11} \rho_t^{-1/3} \frac{1}{s_{\text{planet}}} L^{-0.22} \left( \frac{W_{\text{im}}}{13} \right)^{0.13} \left( \frac{\rho_s}{\rho_t} \right)^{0.22},
\]

where \( \rho_p \) and \( \rho_t \) are, respectively, densities of the projectile and target, \( s_{\text{planet}} \) is the surface gravity of the planet, and \( L \) is the projectile diameter. Obviously, other combinations of variables are possible, for example, \( W_{\text{im}} \) may be expressed in terms of the size, density and velocity of the impactor. We prefer the combination of variables in Eq. (2) because the impact energy may be related to seismic energy, as explained next, and the crater diameter \( D \) is directly observable, while the alternative choice of the impactor size or velocity as variables may not be helpful from an observation or application perspective.

In large impacts, most of the impact energy is spent in fracturing, ejecting, heating, melting and vaporizing the projectile and the target, and only a small part of the impact energy is converted to seismic waves (with energy \( W_s \), with a conversion factor \( s = W_s/W_{\text{im}} \) known as the seismic efficiency. Estimates of \( s \) range from \( 10^{-5} \) to \( 10^{-3} \), with the most commonly accepted value being \( 10^{-4} \) (e.g., Schultz and Gault, 1975). Given \( W_s \), we may estimate the seismic magnitude produced by an impact by using the classical Gutenberg–Richter relation:

\[
\log W_s = 4.8 + 1.5M_{\text{im}}.
\]

Impact-generated seismic events, however, contain significantly less shear energy than earthquakes of the same magnitudes. A rule of thumb developed from cratering experiments is that, to produce the same amount of shear energy, the seismic magnitude of an impact needs to be one magnitude greater than that of an earthquake (Melosh, 1989). Replacing \( M \) in (1) by \( M_{\text{im}} + 1 \), \( W_s \) in (3) by \( sW_{\text{im}} \), and combining (1) and (3), we obtain

\[
R_{\text{max}} = \frac{s}{c} W_{\text{im}}^{0.3}.
\]

where \( c = 10^{-4.2} \). Furthermore, in applying this relation to different planets, we need to scale it with respect to the surface gravity of the planets, because the occurrence of consolidation and liquefaction requires relative motion among soil particles which is resisted by the friction between soil particles, which in turn is, on the average, proportional to gravity. Since the stress required to overcome friction is, to a first approximation, proportional to strain and hence to the square root of strain energy that in turn is, again to a first approximation, proportional to the inverse square of distance, the liquefaction limit on a planet may be scaled by a factor of \( s_{\text{Earth}}/s_{\text{planet}} \). Hence the maximum distance from impact on a planet to liquefaction and streamflow increase \( R_{\text{max}} \) is related to the crater diameter \( D \) by

\[
R_{\text{max}} = \frac{s_{\text{Earth}}}{s_{\text{planet}}} \left( \frac{s}{c} \left( \frac{1.8 \rho_p^{-0.11} \rho_t^{-1/3} \frac{1}{s_{\text{planet}}} L^{-0.22} \left( \frac{W_{\text{im}}}{13} \right)^{0.13}}{\left( \frac{\rho_s}{\rho_t} \right)^{0.22}} \right)^{0.3} \right).
\]

3. Discussion

Equation (5) predicts, for Earth (Fig. 2A), \( R_{\text{max}} = 200 \pm 100 \) km for the Oasis crater in Libya \( (D = 11.5 \) km; Underwood, 1976) and \( R_{\text{max}} = 5000 \pm 2000 \) km for the Chicxulub crater in Mexico \( (D \sim 100 \) km; Melosh, 1989). To this group we add the Upheaval Dome crater (Alvarez et al., 1998), with \( D = 4 \) km and \( R_{\text{max}} = 60 \pm 30 \) km, even though the origin of this crater is controversial. Figure 2A shows that the observations at all these sites are consistent with predictions, although there is too little data to constrain \( R_{\text{max}} \) as a function of \( D \). Also plotted in Fig. 2A is the possible liquefaction-induced debris-flow deposit \( \sim 450 \) km south of the young
distribution (Hartmann and Neukum, 2001), we infer a total of \(4.02\) Ga. Assuming further a ~\(10^{-5}\) cal studies of the extruded liquefied sediments (Deyhle et al., 2003).

Corrected studies of the extruded liquefied sediments (Deyhle et al., 2003) are plotted in solid circles: Oasis Dome (Underwood, 1976), Chicxulub Lowel crater (Ori and Mosangini, 1998). (B) Estimated maximum volume of released groundwater by impact-induced liquefaction related to Chicxulub crater (Klaus et al., 1998), which is commonly attributed to the collapse of the chaotic terrain (Fig. 3a) often found at the heads of outflow channels. Impacts that produced craters of ~100 km in diameter may each have released groundwater with a volume of ~\(10^8\) km\(^3\) from a 1-km thick global aquifer. Using Eqs. (2) and (3) and assuming a seismic efficiency of ~\(10^{-5}\) we estimate that the equivalent seismic magnitude for impacts producing craters of ~100 km in diameter is ~10. Since this is beyond the range of magnitudes for which there is data for liquefaction or streamflow (Fig. 1), the application of Eq. (1) in estimating \(R_{\text{max}}\) may be subject to substantial uncertainty and can only be taken as an order-of-magnitude estimate. Nonetheless, we may reasonably suggest that even greater amounts of groundwater may have been released during impacts that produced the largest basins on Mars (i.e., Hellas, Chryse, Argyre, Isidis, Utopia, with \(D \sim 10^3\) km).

Estimating the volume of groundwater required to form the outflow channels is difficult. Assuming that the regolith in the outflow channels was removed by a single outburst flood, Carr (1986) estimated a lower bound of ~\(7 \times 10^4\) km\(^3\) for the Maja Valles and ~\(7 \times 10^5\) km\(^3\) for the Kasei Valles. However, the regolith in the outflow channels may have been removed by many separate flood events, each with a much smaller volume of floodwater (e.g., Williams et al., 2000). Thus the amount of groundwater released by impact may be sufficient to form the outflow channels. A thick cryosphere and hence cold climate on Mars are often thought to be required in the Hesperian for the formation of outflow channels (e.g., Clifford and Parker, 2001). A thick cryosphere allows the buildup of pore pressure in the underlying aquifer, thereby enabling violent eruptions of groundwater and formation of large catastrophic floods. In the model presented here, lithostatic pore pressures are created during each liquefaction event by undrained compaction of soils induced by meteoritic impacts. Thus violent eruptions of groundwater and large catastrophic floods in the Hesperian may occur without requiring a thick cryosphere or cold climate. In fact, a thin, and thus a weak, cryosphere may be necessary for the model, since a thicker cryosphere may make it more difficult for groundwater to breakout. Thus the model implies that large releases of groundwater may have decreased drastically near the end of the era of heavy bombardment—consistent with the dramatic decline of erosion rates during that time (Baker and Partridge, 1986; Craddock and Maxwell, 1993). The model is also consistent with the evidence for massive subsurface flow of water (Carr and Malin, 2000) and localized water sources for the valley networks (Guillick, 2001) because the eruption of pressurized groundwater will be focused in newly formed or pre-existing fractures.

One particular surface manifestation of liquefaction on Mars may be the chaotic terrain (Fig. 3a) often found at the heads of outflow channels (Ori and Mosangini, 1998), which is commonly attributed to the collapse of the surface when groundwater is evacuated (e.g., Carr, 1996). However, the checkerboard patterns of gaps between blocks of chaotic terrain (Fig. 3a) suggest some combinations of lateral spreading and collapse. Liquefaction on Earth (Fig. 3b) often leads to lateral spreading and collapse of the surface (e.g., Kayen et al., 2002), so chaotic terrain on Mars may be a manifestation of the same effect, but on a much larger scale. Lateral spreading creates tensile stresses in the overlying layers, causing rupture to allow groundwater and liquefied sediments to erupt to the surface. The lower gravity on Mars implies lower confining pressure at depths, which in turn implies a reduc-
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Fig. 2. (A) Estimated maximum extent of liquefaction and increased streamflow are plotted versus impact-crat diameter on Earth and Mars: solid line for seismic efficiency of \(10^{-3}\) and dashed lines for seismic efficiencies of \(10^{-3}\) and \(10^{-5}\), respectively. Observations for liquefaction on Earth are plotted in solid circles: Oasis Dome (Underwood, 1976), Chicxulub crater (Terry et al., 2001) and Upheaval Dome (Alvarez et al., 1998); liquefaction-induced debris-flows related to Chicxulub crater (Klaus et al., 2000) is plotted in inverted triangle. Also plotted is a possible liquefaction-induced debris-flow deposit south of the young Lowell crater (Tanaka et al., 1998). (B) Estimated maximum volume of released groundwater by impact-induced liquefaction as a function of crater diameter for a range of aquifer thickness.

Lowell crater (\(D \sim 250\) km) on Mars (Tanaka et al., 1998). This deposit, if correctly explained, is also consistent with prediction.

Based on the liquefaction limit proposed for Mars (Fig. 2A), we suggest that impacts producing craters with diameters of 100 km or greater may have caused global occurrence of liquefaction and streamflow. Assuming the timeline proposed by Frey (2004) for impact events on early Mars, we estimate a total of ~\(380\) impacts with crater diameter >200 km since Hellas formed (4.02 Ga). Assuming further a ~\(2\) power law for crater size distribution (Hartmann and Neukum, 2001), we infer a total of ~\(1500\) impacts with crater diameter >100 km and ~\(10^{10}\) impacts with crater diameter >10 km since Hellas. The liquefaction effect due to each smaller impact, however, decreases drastically according to Eq. (5). Using this relation and a ~\(2\) power law for crater size distribution, we compare the integrated maximum liquefaction area caused by the numerous “mid-size” impacts (with crater diameters from 10 to 100 km) with that caused by the fewer but larger impacts. We find the former is comparable to that caused by impacts with crater diameters from 100 to 200 km, but is smaller by nearly an order of magnitude than that caused by impacts with crater diameters from 100 to 1000 km.

Soil engineers sometimes assert that the occurrence of liquefaction is limited within the upper few tens of meters of Earth’s surface. This conclusion, however, may be a result of limited information. Liquefaction structures ranging from a few hundred to several kilometers in depth have been documented in exploration well logs (Deville et al., 2003), inferred from seismic profiles (Van Rensbergen and Morley, 2003), and from geochemical studies of the extruded liquefied sediments (Deyhle et al., 2003).

The amount of groundwater released from soils during liquefaction may be determined from the change in soil volume (the volumetric strain) which is mostly related to the degree of consolidation of the liquefied soils. Laboratory measurements (Silver and Seed, 1971; Yoshimi and Kuwabara, 1973; Whitman et al., 1981) and field investigation of soil settlement (Lee and Al-baisa, 1974) showed that the amount of water released during liquefaction ranges from ~3–5% of the soil volume for loose sands and 0.2% or smaller for very dense sands. As an order-of-magnitude estimate in the present study, we assume that the amount of groundwater released from the martian regolith during liquefaction is 1% of the regolith volume.

As noted earlier, the liquefaction sites at the farthest distance \(R_{\text{max}}\) are those with optimal conditions for liquefaction. Observations on Earth show that the actual occurrence of liquefaction is rather spotty and would account only ~1% of the maximum possible area of \(\pi (R_{\text{max}})^2\). Thus the volume of groundwater released during an impact event from an aquifer of thickness \(h\) would be of the order of \(10^{-4}\pi (R_{\text{max}})^2 h\). The result for Mars (Fig. 2B) shows that impacts that produced craters of ~100 km in diameter may each have released groundwater with a volume of ~\(10^6\) km\(^3\) from a 1-km thick global aquifer. Using Eqs. (2) and (3) and assuming a seismic efficiency of ~\(10^{-5}\) we estimate that the equivalent seismic magnitude for impacts producing craters of ~100 km in diameter is ~10. Since this is beyond the range of magnitudes for which there is data for liquefaction or streamflow (Fig. 1), the application of Eq. (1) in estimating \(R_{\text{max}}\) may be subject to substantial uncertainty and can only be taken as an order-of-magnitude estimate. Nonetheless, we may reasonably suggest that even greater amounts of groundwater may have been released during impacts that produced the largest basins on Mars (i.e., Hellas, Chryse, Argyre, Isidis, Utopia, with \(D \sim 10^3\) km).

The amount of groundwater released from soils during liquefaction which is mostly related to the degree of consolidation of the liquefied soils. Laboratory measurements (Silver and Seed, 1971; Yoshimi and Kuwabara, 1973; Whitman et al., 1981) and field investigation of soil settlement (Lee and Al-baisa, 1974) showed that the amount of water released during liquefaction ranges from ~3–5% of the soil volume for loose sands and 0.2% or smaller for very dense sands. As an order-of-magnitude estimate in the present study, we assume that the amount of groundwater released from the martian regolith during liquefaction is 1% of the regolith volume.
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Fig. 3. (a) Chaotic terrain on Mars at the heads of outflow channels Simud Vallis and Tiu Vallis (from Ori and Mosangini, 1998). (b) Lateral spreading of frozen ground due to liquefaction of a sand bar on the Tanana River in Alaska after the 2002 Denali earthquake (from Kayen et al., 2002). The polygonal pattern was observed along several hundred km of the river de-
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