Pressurizing magma within heterogeneous crust: a case study at the Socorro Magma Body, New Mexico, USA
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Key Points:

• InSAR confirms coeval subsidence and uplift (a so-called “sombrero” deformation pattern) persisted for > 100 years at the Socorro Magma Body
• A compliant region, modeled as a viscoelastic body surrounding a sill, is able to reproduce both the pattern and duration of deformation.
• Viscoelastic deformation within a broad compliant region supports the presence of mush zones at SMB and other mid-crustal magma bodies.
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Abstract

Surface deformation measurements play a key role in illuminating magma transport systems at active volcanic systems, however, unambiguous separation of deep and shallow transport remains elusive. The Socorro Magma Body (SMB) lacks an upper crustal magma transport system, allowing us to link geodetic measurements with predictions of numerical models investigating material/rheologic heterogeneities and magma-mush interaction in the mid-/lower crust. New InSAR observations confirm that a pattern of central surface uplift surrounded by a region of subsidence (previously coined “sombrero” deformation) has persisted over >100 yrs at the SMB. Our models suggest this pattern may reflect the presence of a large (> 100 km width), weaker-than-ambient, compliant region surrounding the mid-crustal magma body. Interactions between the pressurizing sill-like magma body and the compliant region drive circulatory motions that manifest the sombrero pattern, depending on both viscoelastic relaxation and pressurization timescales, explaining its rare observation and transient nature.

Plain Language Summary

Magma in the crust is transported and stored within magma bodies (regions that are mostly liquid magma) and “mush” (mostly solid crystals and some liquid magma). Mush zones are thought to be too viscous to be erupted but are likely to be weaker than the surrounding rock. To understand volcanic eruptions, it is important to understand the distribution of magma and mush, and their mutual interactions. Here we study these interactions in a mid-crustal magma body, the Socorro Magma Body (SMB), that does not have a surface volcano. Surface deformation at the SMB helps us study magma-mush interaction, especially in the mid-/lower crust. Previous surface deformation measurements at the SMB show “sombrero” deformation: a central area of uplift surrounded by a ring of subsidence. New satellite radar measurements are consistent with the previously reported pattern, confirming that this deformation remained remarkably constant through nearly 100 years. We suggest this is due to a large weak, mush region surrounding the SMB. Our computer models reproduce a long-lasting, consistent sombrero deformation pattern depending on mush properties as well as pressurization history of the magma body, and we suggest these factors may explain why this pattern is relatively rare.
1 Introduction

Long-lived active volcanic centers are the uppermost expression of a complex trans-
tcrustal transport system bringing magma from beneath and within the lithosphere to
the surface (e.g., Hildreth & Wilson, 2007; Cashman et al., 2017). These systems com-
prise partially molten regions throughout the crust, thought to be a combination of crys-
tal poor magma bodies surrounded by crystal rich “mush” zones near solidus (Cooper
& Kent, 2014; Glazner et al., 2016; Jackson et al., 2018). Mush zones, where crystal vol-
ume fractions exceed 50-60%, are thought to be deformable but not readily eruptible (e.g.,
A. Costa et al., 2009; Bachmann & Bergantz, 2008). Within them, the formation of crystal-
poor (< 50% crystals by volume) eruptible magma (e.g., Hughes et al., 2021) by heat
and mass transfer is the subject of multidisciplinary exploration (e.g., F. Costa et al.,
2020; Bergantz et al., 2015). Magma-mush interactions have been modeled as (visco)poroelas-
tic coupling over length scales of magma intrusions (Mullet & Segall, 2022; Liao et al., 2018,
2021; Alshembari et al., 2023), or permeable flow and transport (Liu & Lee, 2021), possi-
bly including the effects of volatiles (e.g., Parmigiani et al., 2014).

Mush zones in the upper crust are well documented at a number of active volcanic
centers (e.g., Hamling et al., 2015), however, the role of mush in the mid-/lower crust
is less well understood (Annen et al., 2006; Maguire et al., 2022; Magee et al., 2018). For
example, seismic observations at two large and dynamic mid-crustal magma bodies, the
Socorro Magma Body (SMB) and the Altiplano-Puna Magma Body (APMB), suggest
the a broad (>100 km wide; e.g., Fig. 1a) region of anomalously low seismic wavespeeds
in the mid-crust (Ward et al., 2014; Pritchard & Gregg, 2016; Gao et al., 2004; West et
al., 2004; Wilson et al., 2005). These seismic anomalies coincide with volcanism (e.g.,
at the APMB, Long Valley, or Yellowstone) or elevated surface heatflow (e.g., Reiter et
al., 2010), anomalous resistivity structure (e.g., Comeau et al., 2015), and the presence
of anomalous seismicity (Sanford et al., 2002; Jay et al., 2012; Hudson et al., 2022; Rine-
hart & Sanford, 1981; Stankova et al., 2008), suggesting they are thermally/mechanically
anomalous. While these regional mid-crustal seismic anomalies are consistent with the
presence of melt (Maguire et al., 2022; Magee et al., 2018; Ake & Sanford, 1988), we lack
an understanding of how magma and mush may be distributed within them and what
role they play in the larger transcrustal magma transport system. For example, the APMB
underlies numerous volcanoes (Magee et al., 2018; Gottsmann et al., 2017) and it is not
clear how magma and mush are distributed within it. Thermal modeling of episodic melt
injection suggests prolonged heating is necessary to generate long-lived mush zones (Annen et al., 2015; Blundy & Annen, 2016; Karakas et al., 2017). Such mush zones are likely weaker than the surrounding crust (Diener & Fagereng, 2014), but the implications of the resulting rheologic heterogeneity have not been fully considered in studies of surface deformation due to pressurizing mid-crustal magma bodies.

Inspired by regionally-extensive mid-crustal seismic anomalies, we use numerical models to study the role of spatial (horizontal and vertical) heterogeneity within the mid-crust in controlling the surface deformation response to mid-crustal magma pressurization. We are interested in the mechanical coupling between a mid-crustal compliant region (CR) and a pressurizing sill-like magma body. Separating surface deformation patterns due to mid-crustal magma injection and shallower magma dynamics proves difficult where the magma transport system extends to a volcanic system (e.g., Uturuncu Volcano, Long Valley, or Yellowstone) as upper crustal deformation obscures deeper processes (Biggs & Pritchard, 2017). We therefore focus on the SMB (Fig. 1), a large, seismically inferred, sill-like magma body at 19 km depth (diameter 50–70 km and thickness < 1 km; Rinehart & Sanford, 1981; Balch et al., 1997; Fialko et al., 2001), which does not have a volcanic expression.

Our starting point is a pattern of central uplift surrounded by subsidence, so-called “sombrero uplift” (coined by Fialko & Pearse, 2012), observed above both the SMB (Larsen et al., 1986; Pearse & Fialko, 2010; Fialko & Pearse, 2012; Finnegan & Pritchard, 2009) and the APMB at Uturuncu volcano (Fialko & Pearse, 2012; Henderson & Pritchard, 2017; Gottsmann et al., 2018). For the APMB this deformation has been modeled as deformation that couples magma injection at depth with either deeper crustal mechanics (Fialko & Pearse, 2012; Henderson & Pritchard, 2017), or the dynamics of a shallow upper-crustal mush zone (Gottsmann et al., 2017). The SMB, however, lacks an upper crustal expression of the magma transport system motivating the question of how such a sombrero pattern might arise and what impact the presence of a CR may have.

A key finding of our study is that a mid-crustal CR surrounding the SMB leads to a spatial decoupling of surface deformation. Generally, vertical surface uplift directly above a pressurizing sill-like body (radius $r_{\text{source}}$) within a CR may be accompanied by surface subsidence of regions toward the edges of the CR ($r \gtrsim 1.5r_{\text{source}}$), providing an alternative mechanism for emergence of the sombrero pattern. The transient nature
of the sombrero pattern and its duration ($\Delta \tau_{\text{som}}$) is a strong function of the rheologic gradients within the CR and the pressure-time history within the sill, providing an explanation for its rare observation. Importantly, the surface expression of the deformation is controlled by the interplay of the pressurization timescale and the effective (viscoelastic) response timescale in the CR.

2 Deformation observations at the Socorro Magma Body

At the SMB, the sombrero pattern of surface motion has been measured over nearly 100 years through leveling (Larsen et al., 1986) and Interferometric Synthetic Aperture Radar (InSAR) (Fialko et al., 2001; Pearse & Fialko, 2010). These observations, together with other geodetic measurements (Berglund et al., 2012; Larsen et al., 1986), suggest a maximum vertical uplift rate of $\approx 2 - 2.5$ mm/yr.

We acquire Synthetic Aperture Radar (SAR) observations on ascending path 49 frame 107 (Fig. 1b), collected by the European Space Agency’s Sentinel-1 A/B mission (Torres et al., 2012), which we process with GMTSAR (Sandwell et al., 2011) to create 2 pass interferograms spanning January 2017 through December 2021. We create mean velocity stacks (supplementary text S1) from individual interferograms which include December through January multi-year pairs by averaging the observed line-of-sight (LOS) deformation over the time interval of acquisition where observations are weighed by the time interval (e.g., Xiao et al., 2020). The resulting LOS velocity field (Fig. 1b), aligned with prior observations (Pearse & Fialko, 2010; Finnegan & Pritchard, 2009; Fialko et al., 2001) to fit the magnitude of observations, reveals deformation overlying the SMB.

From the average LOS deformation map (Fig. 1b), we extract profiles for comparison to our SMB-specific finite-element model results (Fig 5c). We observe $\approx 3$ mm/yr of peak LOS uplift within the SMB, with uplift limited to the central to western portion of the magma body. North-south and east-west profiles across the peak deformation illustrate the sombrero uplift over the magma body as described by Pearse and Fialko (2010). While residual topography impacts may bias the velocity field, we do not observe similar effects over other nearby topography.

Previous InSAR observations over the SMB report deformation rates of 2-3 mm/yr (Pearse & Fialko, 2010; Finnegan & Pritchard, 2009; Fialko et al., 2001), comparable to our observations during the duration of the SAR acquisitions. We observe a north-south
elongated region of uplift, more consistent with Fialko et al. (2001) than the circular de-
formation shown by Finnegan and Pritchard (2009). Temporal changes in the InSAR-
derived average LOS velocities over the SMB were presented in Finnegan and Pritchard
(2009), therefore, variations in the shape of the region experiencing uplift during our study
are not unprecedented.

This deformation signal is generally attributed to injection of magma in the mid-
crust, however, many studies suggest it cannot be due to solely elastic effects (e.g., Fi-
alko et al., 2001; Pearse & Fialko, 2010; Fialko & Pearse, 2012). Previous models of de-
formation at the SMB (Larsen et al., 1986; Fialko et al., 2001; Pearse & Fialko, 2010;
explicitly consider material heterogeneity in a mid-crustal CR, the main target of our
investigation.

3 Numerical Modeling Results

We present generic finite element models using PyLith (v2.2.2; Aagaard et al., 2017),
to assess the role of a CR surrounding a sill-like pressure source in the mid-crust. We
target the role of the CR and its manifestation in ground deformation (parameters and
model details in supplementary text S2, Table S1, and Fig. S1). Each model comprises
a background layered structure, with deformation driven by time-varying pressurization
of a mid-crustal sill (Fig. 2b). We consider a suite of models, with and without a vis-
coelastic CR surrounding the sill, and explore the effects of varying CR structure (Fig.
2a; Table S1).

A viscoelastic CR in the mid-crust (with lower viscosity than the ambient viscoelas-
tic crust), leads to a phase-lag in surface deformation. When the sill within the CR un-
dergoes pressurization, regions above its center and those to its edges (e.g., $r \geq 1.5r_{source}$)
may be out of phase (demonstrated for vertical motions in Fig 3a and for horizontal mo-
tions in Fig S3). This is the essence of the sombrero signal (central uplift surrounded by
an annular moat of subsidence), and we observe this pattern during the (re-)pressurization
phase (Fig. 2b), where the center begins to uplift while the edges are still subsiding due
to viscoelastic relaxation of the CR. The sombrero pattern is only observed in the pres-
ence of a CR (Fig. 3a); without it, surface velocities are in phase everywhere and have
the same sign (Fig 3b).
When a CR exists, surface motions above the source (within $r/r_{\text{source}} \leq 1$) and outside it ($r/r_{\text{source}} \gtrsim 1.5$) depend on: (1) rheologic gradients within the CR and (2) the applied pressurization history (Fig. 3c-f). Depending on the gradient of viscosity within the CR, we observe a circulatory pattern of motion in the mid-crust (e.g., Fig. 2d,e) and a phase lag between vertical surface velocities above the sill ("center") and outside of the source radius ("shoulder"; Fig. 3c-f; see also Fig S2). The time interval when vertical velocities at the center are positive and the shoulder regions are subsiding is the sombrero duration, $\Delta \tau_{\text{som}}$ (and vice versa, for a “reverse” sombrero, e.g., Fig 3d).

Spatial decoupling of the center and shoulder velocities during sombrero deformation depends on the rheologic gradient within the CR: comparing uniform CR model vs models with horizontal (“nested”) and vertical (“stacked”) viscosity gradients (Fig. 2a). A larger CR viscosity gradient increases the phase lag compared to the uniform CR models (Fig. S2b, d), with systematically higher phase lags in the nested CR model than the stacked CR model (Fig. S2). Horizontal viscosity gradients are, therefore, more important than vertical ones for controlling sombrero-style deformation.

In addition to rheologic gradients, the phase lag in surface velocities is strongly controlled by the pressure-time function. Sinusoidal pressure-time functions yield periodic motions where $\Delta \tau_{\text{som}}$ corresponds to a fixed (phase- and) time-lag for both the sombrero and the reverse sombrero (Fig. 3c,d,f). For sawtooth pressurization, however, the duration of the sombrero may greatly exceed that of the reverse pattern (Fig. 3e). Nested CR models driven by sawtooth pressurization (Fig. 3e) exhibit near-constant surface velocities during a sombrero event.

Decreasing the pressurization rate (e.g., $dP/dt \approx 4\Delta P/T$ for the sinusoidal function) leads to increased sombrero duration, $\Delta \tau_{\text{som}}$ (Fig. 4). The sombrero duration $\Delta \tau_{\text{som}}$ for a given $\Delta P/T$ increases with the ambient background pressure, $P_0$, and decreases with relaxation time $t_r$ (Fig 4a). For the uniform CR, the relation between $\Delta \tau_{\text{som}}$ and $\Delta P/T$ collapses into a single trend when the duration is normalized by the uniform relaxation time within the CR, $t_r$, and the pressurization rate is normalized by $P_0/t_r$ (Fig. 4b). Nested and stacked CR runs also collapse onto similar trends showing an increase in $\Delta \tau_{\text{som}}$ at low $\Delta P t_r/P_0 T$, with systematically higher sombrero durations compared to the uniform CR models at the same dimensionless pressurization rate (Fig. 4b). (We use a volumetrically-averaged relaxation time to nondimensionalize in non-uniform CRs). For the uniform
and stacked CR models, there is a transition at low $\Delta P_t/P_0T$ at which the sombrero
duration is not as sensitive to the pressurization rate. The slope of the trend is similar
for nested CR models, but without a similar observed transition at low rates. (Reaching
a dimensionless pressurization rate of $\Delta P_t/P_0T = 10^{-2}$ is computationally expen-
sive for the nested and stacked CR models due to the large volumetrically-averaged $t_r$.)
The uniform and stacked CR models clearly reach a threshold at which $\Delta T_{som}$ appears
to be nearly independent of $\Delta P_t/P_0T$, suggesting the threshold depends on intra-CR
rheology ($\Delta P_t/P_0T \approx 10^{-2}$ for uniform CR and $10^{-1}$ for stacked CR; Fig. 4b). Mod-
els with the same pressurization rate but different pressure-time functions show little vari-
ation in sombrero duration, demonstrating that the primary controlling factors for som-
brero duration are the pressurization rate and model geometry, and not pressure-time
history (Fig. 4).

4 Discussion

While idealized, the generic models above demonstrate that a weaker-than-ambient
CR surrounding a (de-)pressurizing sill can decouple surface deformation directly above
the sill from deformation laterally displaced from the sill. A key finding is that, during
pressurization, locations vertically above the sill may be uplifting while those outside the
surface projection of the sill may be subsiding, creating a sombrero pattern (Fig. 3). (The
pattern may be reversed when transitioning to a period of de-pressurization.) This phase
lag in the surface deformation pattern depends on the presence of the CR, but the du-
ration of the sombrero depends primarily on pressurization rate: increasing with decreas-
ing pressurization rate, up to a threshold (Fig. 4). Strong viscosity gradients paired with
asymmetric pressurization lead to long sombrero durations with nearly steady ground
motions (Fig. 3c and Fig. 4b). Crucially, a long period of re-pressurization (with roughly
constant $dP/dt$) followed by a sudden decrease in pressure results in a sombrero that lasts
longer than the reverse-sombrero, with slowly-varying surface velocities during the som-
brero (Fig. 3d). Although we lack constraints on SMB sill pressures, rheologic proper-
ties of anatexites suggest that the the bulk strength of partially-molten rocks in the mid-
/lower crust range from $\leq 1 - 5$ MPa during cycles of melt production and drainage
(Diener & Fagereng, 2014). The range of background pressures, $P_0$, and pressure changes
$\Delta P$, in our models (Fig. 4) is consistent with expectations for weakened partially molten
crustal mineralogies (Diener & Fagereng, 2014).
We now present an SMB-specific model constrained by seismic and geodetic observations discussed above: (1) a sill-like body at ≈ 19 km depth, elliptical in mapview, surrounded by anomalously low $V_s$ in the mid-crust (Balch et al., 1997; Rinehart & Sanford, 1981; West et al., 2004; Fig 1a); and (2) a long-lived ($\Delta \tau_{som} \geq 100$ yrs) sombrero pattern of deformation, with nearly constant surface motions (Fialko et al., 2001; Pearse & Fialko, 2010; Finnegan & Pritchard, 2009; Larsen et al., 1986, Fig. 1). Assuming that the $V_s \leq 5\%$ at ≈ 20 km depth region in West et al. (2004) is a proxy for a weaker-than-ambient CR (dashed yellow circle in Fig 1b), we specify horizontal and vertical gradients in CR viscosity (see Table S1). The 200 km diameter of the hybrid CR follows the extent of the low-velocity mid-crustal $V_s$ anomaly and the sill-like ellipsoidal source has thickness 1 km and mapview radii of 24 and 38 km (Fig 5a). With this geophysically-informed SMB-model, we explore the background pressure $P_0$ needed to match the amplitude of the InSAR LOS observations and the pressurization rate $dP/dt$ needed to generate a long-lived (> 100 yr) sombrero pattern.

We find that a sill pressurized to a background pressure of $P_0=1.0$ MPa, with a constant pressure increase of $dP/dt = 4 \Delta P/T = 5$ kPa/yr (implemented as a sawtooth pressure-time function with $\Delta P=250$ kPa and $T = 200$ yrs; Fig 5b), produces a reasonable fit to the InSAR observations (A-A’ and B-B’ in Fig. 5c). The modeled sombrero duration of $\Delta \tau_{som} = 148$ yrs is characterized by persistent, nearly steady surface motions for over 100 yrs, comparable to long-term observations at the SMB (Fig.5c). The width of the modeled deformation depends on the seismically-constrained geometry, and no further adjustment was used to fit the width of the surface pattern in Fig. 5c.

The inferred pressurization rate of $dP/dt \approx 5$ kPa/yr (comparable to Pearse & Fialko, 2010) may be interpreted as due to injection of magma, or to pressurization due to volatile degassing. If driven by magma injection, we infer a volumetric rate $dV/dt = \beta V_0 (dP/dt)$ where $\beta$ is the magma compressibility and $V_0$ is an initial volume. Compressibility of a gas-poor, basaltic magma at 19 km depth is likely lower than compressibility above 10 km depth (e.g., $\beta \approx 0.4 - 2 \times 10^{-10}$ Pa$^{-1}$; Rivalta and Segall (2008)), so $\beta = 0.4 \times 10^{-10}$ Pa$^{-1}$ is a reasonable upper bound. Following pressurization to $P_0 \approx 1$ MPa, the initial volume of the ellipsoidal source (Table S1) is $\approx 1940$ km$^3$, so $dV/dt \approx 3.88 \times 10^{-4}$ km$^3$/yr. If the source includes exsolved volatiles, the inferred volumetric injection rate is likely too large. A dry ($\leq 0.2$ wt % H$_2$O) basaltic magma (e.g., expected in a rift-setting) with $\geq 4000$ ppm CO$_2$ at $\geq 1000^\circ$C is likely to reach saturation at pres-
sures above 500 MPa, comparable to conditions at 19 km depth within the Rio Grande Rift. We lack direct constraints on the CO$_2$ content of the SMB, however, mantle xenoliths from the nearby Rio Puerco and Kilbourne Hole Volcanic Fields have undergone metasomatism by carbonatitic fluids (Porreca & Selverstone, 2006; Harvey et al., 2012), suggesting that pressurization may be a signal of gas exsolution rather than magma injection.

Observations at the APMB span a shorter timeframe than the SMB, and suggest a peak uplift rate at Uturuncu Volcano of $\approx 0.5 \pm 1$ cm/yr (Fialko & Pearse, 2012; Henderson & Pritchard, 2017; Gottsmann et al., 2018). Here, 50 years of geodetic observations suggest transient sombrero deformation (Fialko & Pearse, 2012; Eiden et al., 2023; Gottsmann et al., 2018), and our models provide an explanation for this transience. The inferred pressurization rate at the SMB ($\approx 5$ kPa/yr) is smaller than modeled beneath Uturuncu if all of the deformation is ascribed to upper crustal processes (Gottsmann et al., 2017). As we have demonstrated, for a given pressurization rate the duration of the sombrero pattern is controlled by decoupling between surface motions within $r < 1.5r_{source}$ and $r \geq 1.5r_{source}$, and this decoupling and phase lag depends on intra-CR viscosity gradients (Fig S2). Specifically, sombrero durations will be smaller (and therefore manifest their transience over shorter timescales) if the mid-crustal CR is uniform in rheology vs. if it has significant rheologic gradients within it (Figs 4; S2). Our models raise the possibility that at least part of the transient sombrero pattern in the APMB may indeed be attributed to lateral heterogeneity in the mid-crust, with perhaps a more rheologically uniform CR than in the SMB.

While these results make a compelling case for mid-crustal magmatic processes in controlling the SMB geodetic signal, we acknowledge important complexities are ignored in our models, e.g., near-surface hydrology and groundwater extraction (likely evident at the southern end of profile B-B’ in Fig 5c, which crosses from the Socorro Basin into the Jornada del Muerto Basin). We also ignore extensional stress and material heterogeneity associated with the Rio Grande Rift. In future work, we hope to include heat transfer and poro(visco)-elastic effects to more fully explore CR heterogeneity and implications for magma-mush interactions. During time-variable pressurization in the sill, as magma is either sourced from deeper levels or drained from a mush, we might expect time-dependent rheology in the CR as explored in Liao et al. (2021, 2018); Mullet and Segall (2022); Alshembari et al. (2023). These studies explore interactions in a single melt
injection/withdrawal event, however, our models highlight the importance of cyclic pressure-
time variations, especially when a CR is present, in decoupled surface deformation. As
shown by Liao et al. (2021), two important time scales for controlling stress transfer and
surface deformation include a short time scale driven by poroelastic diffusion, and a longer
viscoelastic relaxation time scale. Indeed, the fast depressurization in the sawtooth func-
tion may be a proxy for porous diffusion of magma into the surrounding CR mush zone,
causing depressurization at a significantly faster rate than allowed by viscous relaxation.
Over longer timescales, however, poroviscoelastic effects may be less important than the
viscous relaxation behavior captured in our models. Specifically, viscous creep within a
weaker-than-ambient mid-crustal CR (e.g., a regionally-extensive partial melt-rich mush)
and intra-CR rheologic gradients drive transient surface deformations as seen in the som-
brero pattern.
Figure 1. a) Topographic relief map of the seismically derived extent of the Socorro Magma Body (SMB), New Mexico, (Rinehart & Sanford, 1981; Balch et al., 1997), within southwestern North America (inset). Quaternary faults (magenta lines), three continuous GPS stations (red diamonds), and locations of the La Ristra seismic stations (black dots) (West et al., 2004) indicated for reference. The orange polygon outlines the NW-SE extent of low mid-crustal seismic wavespeeds ($\Delta V_s < 5\%$ at $\approx 20$ km depth, from (West et al., 2004). (b). InSAR measurements of the SMB spanning 01/07/2017 through 12/21/2021 showing the observed sombrero-style surface deformation. GPS stations (red) and the SMB outline (solid yellow) are as in (a). The yellow ellipse (long-dashes) outlines the pressure source and the larger yellow circle (short-dashes) shows the map-extent of the CR in the SMB-realistic model (Fig. 5).
Figure 2. (a) Cross-section cartoons of generic models with variable CR. All models share a layered background rheology (UC=upper crust, LC=lower crust, LM=lithospheric mantle; see S2), within which a mid-crustal pressure source is embedded (black ellipse). The CR rheology is specified with a single viscosity (uniform CR) or with horizontal gradient in nested cylinders (nested CR) or vertical gradient in stacked cylinders (stacked CR). The nested CR viscosity increases radially and the stacked CR has viscosity increasing vertically. (b) After initial pressurization to a background pressure $P_0$, followed by a prescribed “spin-up” time at constant pressure, one of two periodic pressure functions is applied: a sinusoid with amplitude $\Delta P$ and period $T$ (black), or sawtooth with pressure change $\Delta P$ and period $T$ (red). The “re-pressurization” phase of a given pressure-time function refers to intervals with $\frac{dP}{dt} > 0$ as indicated (blue dashed arrows). (c)-(f) Cross sections illustrating spatially-varying velocity (arrows) for models with the same $r_{\text{source}} = 25$ km, $P_0=1$ MPa, $\Delta P=500$ kPa and $T=200$ yrs, (with sinusoidal pressurization), but with differing CR: (c) no CR, (d) a uniform CR, (e) nested CR, and (f) stacked CR. Velocity snapshots are shown halfway during the sombrero (d-f; durations indicated) or halfway through a pressure cycle (c). Red arrows show upward surface motions and color contours indicate velocity magnitude (mm/yr).
Figure 3. (a) Normalized vertical surface velocity, $V_z$, profiles (normalized relative to the maximum velocity of the no CR case), illustrating the role of the CR in the sombrero pattern of deformation in four models with varying CR; all with $P_0=1$MPa, $\Delta P=500$kPa and $T=200$yrs. Each profile is shown at the same times as the corresponding velocity fields in Fig. 2c-f; see Fig S3 for corresponding radial motions. (b)-(d): Normalized surface uplift velocities at the center ($r = 0$ km, blue) and shoulder (defined as $r/r_{source} = 1.6$, orange), with normalized sinusoidal pressure-time variation (black dashed lines): (b) no CR (corresponds to model in Fig. 2c), (c) a uniform CR (model in Fig. 2d), and (d) nested CR (model in Fig. 2e). (e)-(f) show decoupled center and shoulder velocities for the (e) nested CR and (f) stacked CR driven by pressurization functions as indicated.
Figure 4. (a) Sombrero duration as a function of pressurization rate for the suite of models in this study. (b) Dimensionless sombrero duration (normalized by CR relaxation time) vs dimensionless pressurization rate (normalized by background pressure and CR relaxation time). In (a) and (b), we see a general trend of increasing sombrero duration with decreasing pressurization rate, up to a threshold. Nondimensionalization collapses all uniform CR runs into a single trend, and likewise with the nested CR and stacked CR models. To normalize nested CR and stacked CR runs, $t_r$ was found by volumetrically averaging the relaxation times within the CR.
Figure 5. Summary of SMB-realistic ellipsoidal source/hybrid CR model (Table S1) and results. (a) Cartoon schematic illustrating the CR (200 km diameter), with both horizontal and vertical gradients in $t_r$ (represented by the shading moving away from the pressure source (black); Table S1). (b) Sketch of pressure-time function, with constant pressurization at $dP/dt \approx 5$ kPa/yr, leading to a nearly stationary sombrero pattern over $\Delta t_{som} > 100$ yrs (sawtooth period $T \geq 200$ yrs). (c) Predicted surface velocity profiles (solid and dashed lines) extracted along lines A-A’ and B-B’ in Fig 1b, projected onto the LOS and averaged over 30 yr windows as indicated ($t=0$ is defined at the beginning of the sawtooth function in (b)). Lines extracted from the model are offset by 10.0 km west and 0.5 km north and rotated by -22.55°. InSAR LOS velocities along profiles A-A’ and B-B’ (black dots) and topography (light gray dots) are plotted for comparison. The misfit at the southern end of the B-B’ profile is likely due to groundwater extraction from local agricultural activity.
5 Open Research

All PyLith input files will be made available at the following github repository:
https://github.com/Grant-Block/SMB_FiniteElementModels

The PyLith software is freely available at: https://github.com/geodynamics/pylith
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S1. Methods - InSAR

We impose a temporal baseline of 1850 days and a perpendicular baseline of 200 m to generate interferometric pairs. Using digital elevation models with 30 meter resolution from NASA’s Shuttle Radar Topography Mission (SRTM-1) elevation data (Farr & Kobrick, 2000), GMTSAR calculates terrain corrections. Removal of best-fitting bilinear ramp functions from wrapped phase images reduces background noise (e.g., tropospheric and ionospheric effects (Scott & Lohman, 2016) before unwrapping the modulo $2\pi$ radian observations into line-of-sight (LOS) displacements utilizing SNAPHU (Chen & Zebker, 2001). Mean velocity stacks are then created from individual interferograms by averaging the observed LOS deformation over the time interval of acquisition where observations are weighed by the time interval (e.g., Xiao et al., 2020). The resultant LOS velocity field map is aligned to the local GNSS stations to fit the magnitude of observations. From the average LOS deformation map, we obtain LOS profiles that transect the magma body for comparison to our finite element modeling results.
S2. Methods - Finite element models

In this work we use a finite element model built using the software package PyLith 2.2.2 (Aagaard et al., 2017). Our model is constructed within a 3D Cartesian domain with dimensions 300 km × 300 km × 200 km (Fig. S1b). The domain consists of five layers, each with a different rheology: the upper crust (UC), lower crust (LC), lithospheric mantle (LM), asthenospheric mantle (AM), and the compliant region (CR) (Fig. S1a). All of these subdomains are modeled as Maxwell linear isotropic viscoelastic materials, except for the upper crust, which is modeled as an isotropic elastic material; the parameters of these subdomains are given in Table S1. A linear meshing scheme is used on the free surface of the domain (+z face) and any interface between the subdomains (e.g., the boundary between UC and LC.) The scheme sets the mesh size to its minimum (1 km) at the origin (x, y) = (0,0) of the surface and its maximum (20 km) at the edges (Fig. S1b). Outer domain boundaries other than the free surface are set to the maximum mesh size, and the faces of the magma chamber are set to the minimum mesh size. The models are benchmarked with the analytical solution for a pressurized penny shaped crack in an elastic halfspace derived by Fialko, Khazan, and Simons (2001). The radially-varying meshing scheme and overall domain size are optimized by constraining displacements to be within 10% of this analytic solution for an elastic halfspace. Models are run with a $10^{-7}$ relative tolerance and $10^{-9}$ absolute tolerance. Sensitivity analysis was conducted and we observe no change in our results when increasing the tolerances up to two orders of magnitude. The “magma chamber” in most models is represented as two spherical caps joined at their common circular edge. In the models used to fit to SMB InSAR data (Fig. 5) the magma chamber is represented as an ellipsoid with dimensions given in Table S1.
In all of our models, the pressurizing body is placed at a depth of 20 km and centered 
\((x, y) = (0,0)\). The radius of the source is variable, but is set to be 25 km in most cases, 
with the exception of the ellipsoidal source runs (Table S1). When a cylindrical low-
viscosity CR is present (Fig. 2a), we consider either a uniform viscosity body (“uniform 
CR”), or a CR with either a lateral (“nested CR”) or vertical (“stacked CR”) gradient is 
viscosity, representing a transitional region at the edges of the CR. Viscosity variations in 
the nested CR and stacked CR layouts are achieved with three cylindrical subdomains. 
In the nested CR an inner cylinder extending the full height of the CR is surrounded by 
a middle cylinder with higher viscosity which in turn is surrounded by an outer cylinder 
with a higher viscosity (Fig. 2a, Table S1). In the stacked CR, each cylinder extends the 
full radius of the CR; the lowest viscosity cylinder is at the bottom, the cylinder in the 
middle has a higher viscosity and the highest cylinder has the highest viscosity (Fig. 2a, 
Table S1). In each layered CR the source is placed in the lowest viscosity subdomain. 
All of these layouts are developed to independently evaluate the effect of horizontal and 
vertical viscosity gradients around a pressurizing magma body on surface deformation. 

All faces of the domain are given zero displacement Dirichlet boundary conditions with 
the exception of the \(+z\) face, which is set to be a free surface. The pressure at the 
top and bottom of the magma body is given as an outward normal stress via a time 
dependent Neumann boundary condition, zero shear stress is specified on the magma 
body surfaces. The time dependence of the Neumann boundary condition is taken to 
be periodic after some specified “spin-up time” of constant pressure \(P_0\) (Fig. 2b). This 
spin-up time is set to be 500 simulation years in all model runs, with the exception of 
uniform CR with models with a relaxation time of 10 years. In that case the spin-up time
is set to 1000 years to give the model adequate time to equilibrate. A simulation time step of 0.1 years is specified throughout the entire model run except for runs with the 1000 year spin-up time where the time step is set to 1.5 years during the spin-up period, and the ellipsoidal source runs where the spin-up time step is set to 0.18 years. Two periodic pressure functions are used in this study, sinusoidal and “sawtooth” (Fig. 2b). The sinusoidal function is used to first understand how our models respond to periodic pressurization. It is characterized by an average pressure $P_0$ (the same pressure used in the spin-up period), a pressure amplitude $\Delta P$ and period $T$. The sawtooth function allows asymmetry with different intervals of pressurization and depressurization. It is parameterized by background pressure $P_0$ (again, the same pressure used in the spin-up period), pressure increase $\Delta P$ and period $T$. Additionally, we specify $t_{\text{rise}}$ and $t_{\text{fall}}$ which are the times of pressurization and depressurization respectively. Unless otherwise specified, we set $t_{\text{rise}} = 0.75T$ and $t_{\text{fall}} = 0.25T$. All pressure functions used have two cycles. Results shown are obtained from the second cycle unless noted otherwise.

To compare to the InSAR observations (Fig. 1b), surface velocity profiles from the ellipsoidal source model are rotated counterclockwise by an azimuth of -22.55° for the A-A’ profile and 63.45° for the B-B’ profile to match the NW-SE orientation of the long-axis of the SMB and projected onto the satellite LOS (Fig. 5c). The profiles are also horizontally displaced relative to the center of the ellipsoidal source sill, by $\Delta x \approx -10.0$ km, $\Delta y \approx 0.5$ km (Fig 1b).
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S3. Table - All models

Table S1: Parameters and their values used for the models, unless otherwise noted. Regions are as in Figure S1: CR=compliant region; UC=upper crust; LC=lower crust; LM=lithospheric mantle; AM=asthenospheric mantle. The layered structure values apply for all models, except for the ellipsoidal source models where $r_{source}$ is redefined for the x and y ellipsoidal axes and realistic $V_s$ and $V_p$ are assigned for each layer instead of using a constant shear modulus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Type</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Layered structure</td>
<td>$h_{UC}$, UC height</td>
<td>10 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(background)</td>
<td>$\rho_{UC}$, UC density</td>
<td>2670 kg/m$^3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\mu_{UC}$, UC shear modulus</td>
<td>40 GPa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$h_{LC}$, LC height</td>
<td>14 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\rho_{LC}$, LC density</td>
<td>2970 kg/m$^3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\mu_{LC}$, LC shear modulus</td>
<td>40 GPa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\eta_{LC}$, LC viscosity</td>
<td>$1.26 \times 10^{21}$ Pa s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$h_{LM}$, LM height</td>
<td>70 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\rho_{LM}$, LM density</td>
<td>3350 kg/m$^3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\mu_{LM}$, LM shear modulus</td>
<td>40 GPa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\eta_{LM}$, LM viscosity</td>
<td>$1.26 \times 10^{22}$ Pa s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$h_{AM}$, AM height</td>
<td>100 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\rho_{AM}$, AM density</td>
<td>3250 kg.m$^3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\mu_{AM}$, AM shear modulus</td>
<td>40 GPa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\eta_{AM}$, AM viscosity</td>
<td>$1.26 \times 10^{21}$ Pa s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$r_{source}$, source radius</td>
<td>25 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform CR</td>
<td>$h_{CR, tot}$, Total CR height</td>
<td>14 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$r_{CR, tot}$, Total CR radius</td>
<td>50 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\rho_{CR}$, CR density</td>
<td>2500 kg/m$^3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\mu_{CR}$, CR shear modulus</td>
<td>40 GPa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\eta_{CR}$, CR viscosity</td>
<td>$1.26 \times 10^{18}$ Pa s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nested CR</td>
<td>$r_{CR,1}$, inner CR radius</td>
<td>32 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$r_{CR,2}$, middle CR radius</td>
<td>8 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$r_{CR,3}$, outer CR radius</td>
<td>10 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\eta_{CR,1}$, inner CR viscosity</td>
<td>$1.26 \times 10^{18}$ Pa s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\eta_{CR,2}$, middle CR viscosity</td>
<td>$1.26 \times 10^{19}$ Pa s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\eta_{CR,3}$, outer CR viscosity</td>
<td>$1.26 \times 10^{20}$ Pa s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stacked CR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parameter</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h_{CR,1}$, lower CR height</td>
<td>12 km</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h_{CR,2}$, middle CR height</td>
<td>1 km</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h_{CR,3}$, upper CR height</td>
<td>1 km</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\eta_{CR,1}$, lower CR viscosity</td>
<td>$1.261 \times 10^{18}$ Pa s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\eta_{CR,2}$, middle CR viscosity</td>
<td>$1.261 \times 10^{19}$ Pa s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\eta_{CR,3}$, upper CR viscosity</td>
<td>$1.261 \times 10^{20}$ Pa s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ellipsoidal Source, hybrid CR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$r_{source,x}$, radius of source in $x$ direction</td>
<td>24 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r_{source,y}$, radius of source in $y$ direction</td>
<td>38 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r_{CR, tot}$, total CR radius</td>
<td>100 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h_{CR, tot}$, total CR height</td>
<td>14 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r_{CR,1}$, inner CR radius</td>
<td>75 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r_{CR,2}$, middle CR radius</td>
<td>17 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r_{CR,3}$, outer CR radius</td>
<td>8 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h_{CR,1}$, lower CR height</td>
<td>12 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h_{CR,2}$, middle CR height</td>
<td>1 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h_{CR,3}$, upper CR height</td>
<td>1 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\eta_{CR,1}$, inner CR viscosity</td>
<td>$1.261 \times 10^{18}$ Pa s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\eta_{CR,2}$, middle CR viscosity</td>
<td>$1.261 \times 10^{19}$ Pa s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\eta_{CR,3}$, outer CR viscosity</td>
<td>$1.261 \times 10^{20}$ Pa s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$V_{s,UC}$, $V_{p,UC}$, UC s and p wave speeds</td>
<td>$3500 \text{ m/s}^2$, $6000 \text{ m/s}^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$V_{s,LC}$, $V_{p,LC}$, LC s and p wave speeds</td>
<td>$4200 \text{ m/s}^2$, $6500 \text{ m/s}^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$V_{s,LM}$, $V_{p,LM}$, LM s and p wave speeds</td>
<td>$4500 \text{ m/s}^2$, $7000 \text{ m/s}^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$V_{s,AM}$, $V_{p,AM}$, AM s and p wave speeds</td>
<td>$4300 \text{ m/s}^2$, $7000 \text{ m/s}^2$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
S4. Supplementary Figures

Supplementary Figures S1 to S3.
Figure S1. (a) Schematic slice of the models used in this work, composed of a background layered structure: an elastic upper crust, viscoelastic lower crust, lithospheric mantle, and asthenospheric mantle (material and geometry details in Table S1). The magma body is represented as a penny shaped or ellipsoidal pressure source at a depth of 20 km, (possibly) surrounded by a cylindrical compliant region (CR). (b) Finite-element mesh with dimensions as indicated, constructed in CUBIT/Trelis (Aagaard et al., 2021). The $z=0$ plane and boundaries between layers use a linear meshing scheme where element size increases radially (see Section 2).
Figure S2. (a) Relaxation time vs radial distance within a model with a uniform CR (black solid lines indicate $r_{CR}$=50 and 100 km), and various nested CR models. The lowest relaxation time is $t_r$=1 yr and increases stepwise up to the ambient crustal value of $t_r$=10$^3$ yrs. Colored solid lines represent runs with $r_{CR}$=50 km and colored dashed lines represent runs with $r_{CR}$=100 km. (b) Center-shoulder phase lag calculated for sinusoidal pressure-time functions (e.g., Fig. 3 (b-d)) as a function of horizontal gradient within the various nested CR models (symbols are color-coded by the colors of the lines in (a)), and black symbols are for the uniform CR. Circles represent runs with $r_{CR}$=50 km and stars represent runs with $r_{CR}$=100 km. The model with the highest phase lag is the nested CR model in the main text. (c) Relaxation time vs depth for multiple configurations of the vertically stratified stacked CR models. The lowest relaxation time is $t_r$=1 yr near the source, and increases stepwise upward to the ambient crustal value of $t_r$=10$^3$ yrs. The total CR height is held constant at $h_{CR}$ =14 km, but the layered relaxation time structure is shown for the uniform CR (solid black line) and a suite of stacked CR models. (d) Center-shoulder phase lag as a function of vertical gradient in the CR. The colors correspond to the colors used for the lines in (c).
Figure S3. Normalized radial surface velocity, $V_r$, profiles (normalized relative to the maximum velocity of the no CR case) in four models, illustrating the role of the compliant region (CR) in the sombrero pattern of deformation. All runs shown have $P_0=1\text{MPa}$, $\Delta P=500\text{kPa}$ and $T=200\text{yrs}$. Each profile is the radial component of the runs shown in Fig. 3a, chosen at the same times as the corresponding velocity fields in Fig. 2c-f.