

Which fault and what next?

Ross S. Stein

WHAT at first appears to be a semantic dispute between distinguished geologists about what to call Northridge's nemesis — the Pico or the Oak Ridge blind thrust fault — turns out to hinge on fundamental questions about where Los Angeles's most perilous fault might lurk^{1,2}. The only point of accord is that, by whatever name, the fault segment that slipped in last year's magnitude 6.9 earthquake is not a major player in southern California's pantheon of buried or 'blind' faults.

Writing in a November issue of *Nature*, Davis and Namson¹ argued that the fault on which the 17 January 1994 earthquake struck is a 'back thrust' or splinter off the more ominous Elysian Park blind thrust fault. The Elysian Park thrust is several times longer than the Pico, and in Davis and Namson's view, slips at three times the Pico's rate and is thus capable of much larger earthquakes. When the Elysian Park thrust ruptures, for example, the famed Hollywood sign will heave perhaps a metre heavenwards. Yeats and Huftile, writing on page 418 of this issue², argue

that the Northridge shock occurred on the east end of the Oak Ridge fault. They contend that the rate of slip of the Oak Ridge fault is three times that in the Ventura basin at Northridge and three times that of the Elysian Park thrust in Los Angeles. Thus they point to the Oak Ridge, which extends 70 km east from Northridge into the heavily populated Ventura basin and has shown a high rate of historical strain³, as the most ominous threat.

Davis and Namson's¹ key argument is that the Santa Susana anticlinorium north of the earthquake is a fold uplifted by slip on the blind south-dipping Pico thrust it conceals. The south flank of the fold rose by about half a metre during the earthquake⁴. Davis and Namson regard the north-dipping Santa Susana fault, whose trace snakes along the south flank of the anticlinorium, as a shallow bedding-plane thrust passively folded by the Pico fault. The fold, and thus the Pico below, is in their view about 30 km long, disappearing about

10 km east of the Oak Ridge fault, and is unrelated to it.

Yeats and Huftile² counter that a 60-mgal trough in the isostatic residual gravity field of the Ventura basin⁵ corresponds to the 15-km-deep sedimentary basin that abuts the downthrown side of the Oak Ridge fault⁶, and argue that since the gravity trough extends without interruption to the San Fernando Valley near Northridge, so must the Oak Ridge fault. So although the mapped fault trace disappears 30 km from Northridge, the fault continues by stealth as a blind thrust. Yeats and Huftile regard the Santa Susana anticlinorium as the product of slip on both the Oak Ridge and Santa Susana faults. In their view, the fold disappears west of the Oak Ridge trace because the Santa Susana fault, rather than the Pico, terminates at that point.

Both studies, to my mind, could go further to bolster their arguments. Davis and Namson do not show a map of the Santa Susana anticlinorium; its western terminus relative to the Oak Ridge and Santa Susana faults is the keystone to their contention that the Pico stops east of the Oak Ridge fault. Similarly, Yeats and Huftile do not show the gravity field. In fact the 60-mgal trough shallows to 48

EARTHQUAKES

From California to Kobe

THE Kobe earthquake offers a chilling vision of the damage that the Northridge shock might have wrought had it struck beneath Los Angeles. Despite the larger size of the Kobe event (moment magnitude $M_w=6.9$ rather than 6.7), the Northridge earthquake shook the ground harder. Two factors explain the heavier toll at Kobe. The Japanese shock ruptured towards and then through the port and industrial city. In contrast, the Northridge event struck beneath a suburban setting and ruptured away from Los Angeles. And the heavy industry and dense housing sited on soft soil and landfill at Kobe proved a tragic combination, whereas Northridge is underlain by stiffer soils. Unfortunately, Kobe's predicament is all too close to conditions elsewhere, such as along the Hayward fault that rims the east margin of the San Francisco Bay, where another of the world's great ports lies waiting. The Hayward fault produced two shocks of magnitude around 7 during the nineteenth century, and so, like Kobe, could rupture again.

Earth scientists in Japan have made impressive progress in analysing the earthquake, and have generously distributed preliminary findings through the Coordinating Committee for Earthquake Prediction, chaired by Kiyoo Mogi of Nihon University, to which we are indebted. The Kobe event struck on the

Arima-Takatsuki-Rokko fault system, one of the many shallow crustal faults in southwest Japan driven by the motion between the Philippine Sea and Eurasian plates. The fault lies 200 kilometres inland of the plate boundary, where two $M \approx 8$ earthquakes occurred between 1944 and 1946, and slips at about the same rate as the fault on which the Northridge earthquake struck, so earthquakes of magnitude 7 or over are rare. Seattle and Anchorage lie 250 and 350 kilometres, respectively, from their plate boundaries, and share some susceptibility to Kobe's fate.

The Kobe shock is a classic strike-slip earthquake, where each side of the fault moves sideways. The earthquake focus lies at the centre of an aftershock zone 50 kilometres long and 15 deep, a pattern reminiscent of the 1989 $M_w = 6.9$ Loma Prieta earthquake on the San Andreas fault. As much as 2 metres of surface fault-slip was found on Awaji Island southwest of the epicentre, typical of strike-slip earthquakes of this size. Some 6–12 hours before the main shock, four foreshocks of magnitudes 1.5–3 occurred at the future epicentre, similar to the 1992 Landers, California, earthquake ($M_w = 7.3$) and unlike the Loma Prieta shock. The Rokko strainmeter, a mere 25 kilometres northeast of the epicentre and within the aftershock zone,

however, shows no discernible precursor during the month or hours before the rupture, at a level of 0.1 microstrain. This is consistent with experience in the United States for shocks of similar size, but is nevertheless disappointing. Nor was any precursory magnetic signal seen at an instrument 50 kilometres from the epicentre.

In 1916 a shock of magnitude $M=6.1$ struck within a few kilometres of the 17 January 1995 epicentre. Small shocks cluster along the future rupture zone on Japanese maps of 1980–91 seismicity, reminiscent of many strikeslip faults in the US, such as the Hayward and the New Madrid seismic zone. The shear strain rate along the fault, also used in California to help gauge the earthquake hazard, is higher than average for Japan, but not by much. The rate, about 0.3–0.4 microstrain per year near the fault, is similar to the San Andreas and associated faults in the US. Fourteen years ago, in *Earthquake Prediction — An International Review* (Maurice Ewing Series 4, AGU, 1981), Tokihiko Matsuda placed the Arima-Takatsuki-Rokko fault among seven inland fault zones that appeared to be late in their earthquake cycles, and that he thus, with quite extraordinary foresight, termed 'precaution' faults.

R.S.S. and William L. Ellsworth, USGS

mgal and changes trend where the Oak Ridge disappears and the Santa Susana fold appears⁵, so the continuity of the trough is subject to interpretation. Each group would benefit from subjecting its cross-section to explicit gravity modelling.

More study of the fault segment that ruptured in 1994 is unlikely to resolve this dispute; the slip surface is already beautifully illuminated by its aftershocks⁴. Rather, what is needed is a closer look at the Santa Susana fault to the north and the Elysian Park fault to the south. The western termini of the Santa Susana fault and fold are crucial to arguments on both sides, and the slip rate of the Elysian Park thrust, which could range from 1.5 to 5 mm yr⁻¹, dictates whether a large earthquake on this fault — which straddles the heavily populated Los Angeles basin and the San Fernando Valley — could be in store. Ironically, calculations suggest that the Northridge earthquake increased the stress on both

the central Elysian Park and the eastern Oak Ridge faults⁷, and the rate of small shocks near both faults is now higher than it was before the Northridge earthquake struck. So, regardless of which fault is the more dangerous, both are showing signs of wear. □

Ross S. Stein is at the US Geological Survey, Menlo Park, California 94025, USA.

1. Davis, T. L. & Namson, J. S. *Nature* **372**, 167–169 (1994).
2. Yeats, R. S. & Hufnagle, G. J. *Nature* **373**, 418–420 (1995).
3. Donnellan, A., Hager, B. H. & King, R. W. *Nature* **366**, 333–336 (1993).
4. USGS & SCEC teams *Science* **266**, 389–397 (1994).
5. Roberts, C. W., Jachens, R. C. & Oliver, H. W. *Isostatic Residual Gravity Map of California and Offshore Southern California* (Calif. Div. Mines & Geol., Sacramento, 1990).
6. Jachens, R. C. & Griscom, A. in *The Utility of Regional Gravity and Magnetic Anomaly Maps* (ed. Hinze, W. J.) 347–360 (Soc. Explor. Geophys., Houston, 1994).
7. Stein, R. S., King, G. C. P. & Lin, J. *Science* **265**, 1432–1435 (1994).

From California to Kobe

When the Kobe earthquake struck, it was one of the most violent crustal events in the world since the 1905 San Francisco earthquake. The fault has 500 kilometres of slip boundary, where the 1994–95 earthquake occurred between 1944 and 1945 and slip at about the same rate as the fault on which the Northridge earthquake struck, to earthquakes of magnitude 7 or over are rare. Seattle and Anchorage lie 500 and 300 kilometres respectively from their slip boundaries and share some responsibility for Kobe's fate.

The Kobe shock is a classic strike-slip earthquake where each side of the fault moves sideways. The earthquake from the centre of the aftershock zone (20 kilometres long and 12 km × 2.5 km in cross-section) of the 1994–95 event (see figure) is as much as 2 metres in surface fault slip was found on land, 10 metres south of the coastline. Several of strike-slip earthquakes of this size occur 8–12 hours before the main shock. Large strike-slip earthquakes of the 1994–95 event (see figure) are as much as 2 metres in surface fault slip was found on land, 10 metres south of the coastline. Several of strike-slip earthquakes of this size occur 8–12 hours before the main shock. Large strike-slip earthquakes of the 1994–95 event (see figure) are as much as 2 metres in surface fault slip was found on land, 10 metres south of the coastline. Several of strike-slip earthquakes of this size occur 8–12 hours before the main shock.

The Kobe earthquake offers a striking vision of the damage that the Northridge shock might have wrought had it struck between Los Angeles. Despite the larger size of the Kobe event (moment magnitude 6.9 rather than 6.7), the Northridge earthquake shows the ground for the two factors explain the answer. The Kobe earthquake struck through the port and industrial city. In contrast, the Northridge event struck through a suburban setting and required travel from Los Angeles. And the heavy industry and dense housing that are still and health at Kobe proved a tragic combination, whereas Northridge is underlain by softer soils. Ironically, Kobe's predicament is all too clear to conditions elsewhere, such as along the Hayward fault that runs the east margin of the San Francisco Bay, where's another of the world's great strike-slip faults. The Hayward fault produced two quakes of magnitude around 7 during the nineteenth century, and in the Kobe could repeat again.

Each scenario in Japan have made intensive progress in studying the earthquake and have previously funded preliminary findings through the Coordinating Committee for Earthquake Prediction, chaired by Kijoi Mugi of Tohoku University, to which we are indebted. The Kobe event struck on the