Cataloguing earthquake environmental effects in Italy : Analyses of some strong earthquakes

<u>Sabina Porfido</u> & Eliana Esposito - CNR IAMC, Naples Luca Guerrieri, Eutizio Vittori, Anna Maria Blumetti, —ISPRA, Rome A.M. Michetti - University of Insubria, Como







OUTLINE

Some questions about the catalogue.
Analysis of some strong earthquakes
Summary of ground effects
Implications



Some important questions:

Why is so important the EEE Catalogue ?
 It is important to have a complete data set in order to compare recent , historical and paleoearthquakes at global and local scale.

Who can use it ? Scientific Community, Administrators, politicians, private insurance How can you use the catalogue? From scientific ,political and administrative point of view







Historical earthquakes of Intensity ≥ IX MCS (from CPTI) and capable faults (ITHACA database), in the Southern Apennines, superimposed on a digital elevation model of the Southern Apennines (Porfido et al., 2002)



Epicenters (yellow stars) and end-to-end length of rupture zones (white lines) regarding 1688, 1694, 1805, 1930 and 1980 historical earthquakes in Southern Apennines



<u>Methodology</u>

- 1. Analyses of historic sources, including completeness and reliability of the document within the historical context and source classification.
- 2. Scientific papers, technical reports, air photo interpretation, field checking and paleoseismological analyses in trenches, Eyewitness accounts,
- 3. Classification of the coseismic environmental
- effects
- 4. Intensity asse



1st INQUA-IGCP-567 Interr	5 June 1688, Sannio earthquake						
	Locality	Longitude	Latitude	Type of effect	Site distance	IMCS	IEEE
	Alvignano	14,34E	41,24N	HA	19	9	8
onal Warkshop on	Apice	14,90E	41,11N	HA	39	10	7
ake Archaeosa asoseismology	Atella	15,65E	40,88N	GC	105	8	7
7 - 14 September 2009 Bario Claudia	Benevento	12,05E	44,15N	HA, SM	29	10	7
Spein	Cerreto sannita	14,55E	41,28N	HA, SM, GC	0	9	8
	Montoro superiore	14,90E	41,11N	SM	59	8-9	7
	Napoli	14,27E	40,86N	HA	57	7-8	7
	Piedimonte d'Alife	14,37E	41,35N	HA, GC	15	9	8
			10 5011	01.00	100		1.000

Macroseismic surface fault ing parameters: Rupture Length: 32 km; Max. displacement: Unknown

Total distribution of slope movements ~ 1,700 km² (except Pomarico)

INQUA EEE intensity scale

1688, Sannio earthquake

 $I_0 = X$







INQUA EEE intensity scale

 $I_0 = X$





Old Aquilonia, Landslide 1930, Irpinia earthquake I=X MCS 73 effects 61 ESI Int.



Macroseismic surface faulting parameters: Rupture Length: 38 km; Max displacement: 40 cm

Total areal distribution of slope movements ~ 3.900 km²

INQUA EEE intensity scale



CALITRI - ESI Loc Int=8



landslides **O** Ground crack **O** liquefaction

Main landslide

•

1980, Irpinia-Basilicata earthquake



	-JGCP-567 Internal	ional Workshop on Ea Baelo Claudia, Sp	rthquake Arc ain (2009)	chaeology and P	alaeoseismology,
7-14 Settember 2000 Spain	Date	Epicentral area	Victims	ESI epicentral Int.	Surface faulting
	1688.06.05	Sannio	10,000	10	SRL: 32 km Max D = 90 cm
	1694.09.08	Irpinia-Basilicata	6,000	10	SRL: 38 km
	1805.07.26	Molise	6,000	10	SRL: 40 km Max D = 150 cm
	1930.07.23	Irpinia	1,404	10	SRL:38 km; Max D: 40 cm
	1980.11.23	Irpinia-Basilicata	3,000	10	SRL: 40 km Max D = 100 cm



-



miligation of environmental effects

ground rupture hazard?

earthquake Scenario?



1930, Irpinia earthquake

1980, Irpinia-Basilicata earthquake



Caposele spring at 22.5 km from the fault. A discharge increase of 150 liters/sec (about 3%) was measured a few hours after the seismic event, compared to the measurement on 16 July 1930, a week before the earthquake

Caposele spring at 5 km from the fault. Flow of the Caposele spring increased of 3000 l/s (about twice). A general increase in discharge was observed for a period of 6 to 12 months after the earthquake



The distribution of hydrologic variations displays an almost linear decay away from the causative faults, with 90% of the effects within **40 km** for the **1805** event and **130 km** for the **1980** event. Most of the anomalies produced by the 1930 earthquake were **30 to 120** km from the fault (ESPOSITO *et alii*, 2001,2009; PORFIDO*et alii*, 2002,2007)



Cumulative number of landslides vs. minimum distance from earthquake fault.

•(A) **1805 earthquake**: 11.5% of landslides occurred at a distance >30 km.

•(B) **1930 earthquake:15.3**% of landslides occurred at a distance > 30 km.

•(C) **1980 earthquake**: 17.5% landslides occurred at a distance > 30 km.

The landslides distribution vs fault distance shows that most of them (81,4%) occurred within a distance of 30 km, the 13% decreases very rapidly with distance between 30 and 60 km. Isolated phenomena (5%) were observed up to distances of nearly 100 km.





Plot of the maximum distances from the fault of the three main types of landslide induced by the 1805, 1930 and 1980 earthquakes. All the values are in good agreement with the upper-bound envelope curves proposed by Keefer (1984).



Active faults distribution

Land-Urban Planning

Can we really rebuild an area without considering the

ground effects?

<u>Secondary effects area</u>

Landslides distribution Hydrological changes Liquefaction phen.



Fractures along Sinizzo Lake, 2009



Paganica fault-L'Aquila 2009



Kashiwazaki,2007

