The M<sub>JMA</sub> 7.6 "Noto Peninsula" Japan Earthquake of January 1<sup>st</sup> 2024

**Preliminary Report with** 

**Emphasis on Recorded Motions and Soil Effects** 

GeoEngineers Without Borders (GeoWB), ISSMGE

**Evangelia GARINI** and **George GAZETAS** 





N ational T echnical U niversity A thens

8 January 2024

# We are grateful to **Dr. Hiroyuki Kimata**

and

## the Japanese K-Net and KiK-Net Administrations

## for providing us with all the records\* of this disastrous earthquake.

\* The processing and analysis of the records were performed by the Authors

## **CONTENTS**

- Introduction: General Information
- Seismological Aspects
- Accelerographs: Analysis, Interpretation, Soil Effects
- Tsunami
- Structural Damage, Collapse of Wooden Houses
- Geotechnical Failures

On 1 January 2024, at 4:10 p.m. local time an  $M_{JMA}$ **7.6** or  $M_w$ **7.5** earthquake occurred near the Noto Peninsula (Hanto, in Japanese) of Ishikawa Prefecture, on the western coast of the so-called (by the Japanese) East Japan, i.e., the northern part of Honshu island. It was triggered by a shallow reverse faulting system.

In Japan most earthquakes occur off the eastern coast, where the Pacific tectonic plate and the Philipine plate subduct beneath the North American and the Eurasian plates. This earthquake occurred on the western coast of Japan in the Sea of Japan.

While strong earthquakes are very frequent in Japan, the region surrounding the January 1, 2024, earthquake has lower rates of seismicity compared to the major subduction zone along its eastern coast. Since 1900, almost 30 earthquakes with magnitudes over 6 have occurred (within 250 km distance radius). However, 3 or 4 earthquakes of about M 6.5 - 7.0 occurred in this area between 2000 and 2010. We mention the <u>Noto Hanto earthquake of 25 March</u> 2007 (a day easy for Greeks to remember) of M 6.7, which members of the NTUA team (GG, NG) along with Professor Tokimatsu visited, before meeting the students of his NTUA class for the annual field trip to Kobe. The collapse of roofs that we see in this earthquake (later photos) are easily explained based on our observations of that time (as will be explained below).





#### **Population Density**

Number of inhabitants per square km

pop < 5 5 < pop < 25 25 < pop < 125 125 < pop < 600 600 < pop < 3000 3000 < pop < 15000 pop > 15000





# SEISMOLOGICAL ASPECTS



#### Japan and the Major Tectonic Plates

Sources: United States Geological Survey; Natural Earth Vijdan Mohammad Kawoosa • Jan. 1, 2024 | REUTERS





Source: The New York Times



Cross-section of slip distribution. The strike direction is indicated above each fault plane and the hypocenter location is denoted by a star. Slip amplitude is shown in color and the motion direction of the hanging wall relative to the footwall (rake angle) is indicated with arrows. Contours show the rupture initiation time in seconds.

Notice that according to USGS's finite fault model, the earthquake rupture extended to a length approximately 200 km. The rupture was <u>bi-lateral, starting in the middle and propagating north-east and south-west</u>. The largest fault slip displacement is estimated to be 3.6 m beneath the peninsula (southeast). The second zone of slippage occurred between the peninsula and Sado Island (northeast), producing up to 1.9 m of slip.



Shake inte	nsity		
Weak			Very strong
<b>Populatio</b> Low	n density	High	)

Sources: United States Geological Survey; Shuttle Radar Topography Mission, NASA; project, University of Southampton Vijdan Mohammad Kawoosa • Jan. 1, 2024 | REUTERS







# Accelerographs: Analysis, Interpretation, Soil Effects

# Recorded

On the K-Net and KiK-Net accelerograph stations



	PGA in g		
STATION	N-S	E-W	U-D
ISK006	1.479	2.678	1.142
ISK003	1.496	1.12	1.11
ISK001	0.904	1.429	0.674
ISK005	1.023	1.146	1.044
ISKH04	0.618	0.484	1.202
ISKH01	0.595	0.748	1.006
ISK015	0.979	0.926	0.747
ISKH03	0.714	0.772	0.759
ISK002	0.686	0.707	0.775
ISKH06	0.573	0.797	0.32
ISKH02	0.47	0.617	0.69
NIG004	0.533	0.475	0.213
ISK008	0.374	0.483	0.354
ISK007	0.374	0.359	0.283
TYM002	0.404	0.26	0.181
NIGH18	0.336	0.379	0.123
TYM009	0.377	0.281	0.156
TYM006	0.304	0.304	0.069
NIG001	0.189	0.305	0.09
NIG003	0.284	0.247	0.175
TYMH03	0.201	0.165	0.192
ISK009	0.251	0.219	0.195
NIG025	0.263	0.231	0.082
TYM010	0.143	0.256	0.076
ISK014	0.178	0.253	0.111
ISK012	0.156	0.236	0.061
ISKH09	0.203	0.162	0.108
ISK010	0.215	0.163	0.101





**Records at 9 stations:** 

A(t), V(t), S<sub>a</sub>(T)

with the Soil Profiles.

We start with the two stations (1 and 2) at the epicenter,

then the station (3) in front of the south-western rupture, and so on (up to 9).

In two of the stations, ground motions in the BEDROCK (at great depths) were recorded and are compared with ground-surface motions



#### **REMARKS on RECORDED GROUND MOTIONS and SOIL EFFECTS**

The **recorded ground motions are extraordinary** from several viewpoints, some quite as expected from "on"-the-fault motions of an M 7.5 event, but others very surprising. Here are some examples:,

(a) In the towns which were essentially just above the ruptured fault the peak accelerations were consistently greater than 1g. This is no surprise. Recall for instance the earlier earthquake in Turkey (6 Feb 23) and the motions recorded "on" the fault. And many other cases.

(b) The duration and appearance of the records, with or without the presence of "packets" of acceleration, are quite consistent with, and in fact would have revealed, the fault rupture process as shown in USGS's latest Slip Distribution on the Fault Plane. For example, as you will see in subsequent slides, the acceleration time-histories of *the two* 

*records that are*  $\approx$  *at or very-very close to the epicenter* (ISKH 01 and ISK 001) display three such packets:

(*i*) the first, originating from the weak but very close rupture around the epicenter (peaks of about 0.45 g and 0.35 g, respectively);

(*ii*) the second, arriving in about 10 s later but originating from the strongest part of the rupture, 5 - 50 km SW from the epicenter (largest peaks of 0.76 g and 0.86g); and

(*iii*) the **third** packet, arriving in about 35 s later originating from **the deepest lessstrong and farther way** (50 km) part (3<sup>rd</sup> segment) of the NE rupture and the **very shallow and farthest away** (70 km) part (4<sup>th</sup> segment) of the SW rupture. Hence, quite naturally, the total duration quite long, at least 60 seconds (including the trailing "coda").

Of course, this analysis is a simplification of reality, and the demarcation of packets is not so clear, as the waves emitted during rupture are continuously arriving at each station. By contrast, in the motion ISK 003 recorded on the devastated town of Wajima (population  $\approx$  26.000), 30-35 km SW of the epicenter, the arrivals of various wave "packets" are almost indistinguishable. Located at the middle of the strongest rupture, it is affected mainly by the waves emitted from the latter's 40 km long rupture. The much later arriving waves from the 70 km away NE less-strong part and the 50 km away SW part of the rupture, have been much attenuated and make a small effect on the intensity of the motion, although its coda waves contribute to the long duration of the record.

(c) In general, the motions are rich in extremely-high-frequency components. Dominant periods of 0.1 s to 0.2 s are quite a surprise. The current observation-based belief in earthquake engineering: the larger the magnitude, the larger the dominant period of the motions. Here we have a complete reversal: a huge magnitude M 7.6 event leads to extremely low dominant periods, that are believed to be appropriate for earthquakes with  $M \approx \leq 5.5$  ! We have attempted a sweeping filtering-out of frequency components exceeding 10 Hz (see analysis of record No. 3, ISK 003) — but to little avail.

Can we ask if, perhaps, some isolated huge spikes of acceleration, of no substantial practical consequence incidentally, are a spurious artefact of the recording system ?? (Specialists: advice ! ).

(d) Regarding the role of soil in modifying the intensity and frequency content of the incoming seismic waves, and hence affecting the ground-surface motions, we draw several conclusions:

- The fundamental natural elastic periods of the soil deposits, roughly estimated by the authors from the V<sub>s</sub> profiles reported by K-Net/KiK-Net, are only in a few cases consistent with the dominant periods of the ground-surface motions.
- In the two sites where the motions were recorded in both the ground surface and in the bedrock (at huge depths, 152 and 188 meters), soil amplification is quite clear, and substantial (spectral amplification ratios, *S*, of about 3 to 5. This is an unambiguous observational fact. However, the natural soil frequencies computed using

the shear-wave velocity profiles reported in the sites of K-Net and KiK-Net, are not consistent with the periods of the peak Amplification functions.

Further investigation is needed to explain if this inconsistency stems from inaccuracies in V<sub>s</sub> profiles; or because the soil amplification in some of the more-rocky stations was overshadowed by seismological phenomena; or if due to 2D and 3D wave propagation effects in the numerous narrow valleys of Noto Hanto !



#### STATION: SUZU (ISKH 01) Motion on the ground surface





#### STATION: SUZU (ISKH01) Ground surface vs Bedrock Motions



STATION: SUZU (ISKH01)

### Ground surface vs Bedrock Motions



Amplification Ratios  $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}(\tau) = S_{a, surface} / S_{a, BEDROCK}$ 



#### STATION: OHYA (ISK 001) essentially on Rock














4 TOGI (ISK 006)

## A strangely-huge PGA record, with *relatively* minute PGV **!!**







#### STATION TOGI : (ISKH 04)





## STATION: ANAMIZU (ISK 005) Dominant periods indicate partial resonance of incident waves with natural soil !!

6





# (7)

#### STATION: OHMACHI (ISK 015)

In view of soil nonlinearity, the dominant periods are consistent with the crude estimates of soil period





8

#### STATION: ICHIURA (ISKH 03)

No apparent relation of dominant with natural periods. Yet, see next slides....



STATION: ICHIURA (ISKH 03)

8

Ground surface vs Bedrock Motions



# 8

#### STATION: ICHIURA (ISKH 03)

#### Ground surface vs Bedrock Motions









The unfortunate use of EPICENTRAL Distance, again. How misleading ! (Recall the Turkey Earthquake ... and many others)

#### EARTHQUAKE CONSEQUENCES

- At least 300 deaths is the current estimate. All the victims were in Ishikawa prefecture, most of them in Suzu and Wajima cities.
- Major damage to roads and houses in the whole Noto peninsula.
- More than **36,000** households lost power in Ishikawa and Toyama prefectures. [https://www.hindustantimes.com/world-news/dozens-earthquakes-hit-japan-tsunami-warning-photos-101704116052162.html.]
- In Wajima, the quake flattened at least 50 homes in the city, trapping dozens of people under the rubble, according to NHK [https://www.ettoday.net/news/20240102/2655265.htm]
- In Suzu, 90% of houses were heavily damaged/destroyed. [https://www.reuters.com/world/japan/least-six-dead-after-huge-earthquake-rocks-japan-new-years-day-2024-01-01/]
- In Nanao, there were many landslides, cracked roads, and collapsed houses.. [https://www.nbcnews.com/news/asia/japan-issues-tsunami-warning-strong-earthquakes-sea-japan-rcna131783/]
- Liquefaction occurred in Niigata 40 km from the NE part of the faultsewer pipes ruptured, and many homes were left without water [https://www.sankei.com/article/20240101-VIXLI6IAHVKOFAHSCHEENE6INQ/];
- A fire occurred in the Wajima city. Due to damaged roads, firefighters were unable to extinguish the flames. An estimated of **200 buildings were burnt** in the fire. [https://www.jiji.com/jc/article?k=2024010200075&g=flash.]
- The highest tsunami recorded was almost 1.5 meters at Wajima Port. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2024\_Sea\_of\_Japan\_earthquake.]

### Tsunami







Cars and houses are washed away by the tsunami on the coast in Noto





The coastal area of Suzu damaged by a tsunami



Damaged by the tsunami neighborhoods along the shore in Suzu



### **Structural Damage**

## (aerial photos)





This aerial photo shows the consequence of a large fire in Wajima. Photo: Fred Mery, AFP



## Damage of a Bridge in Suzu





## Collapse of traditional wooden houses




Collapsed wooden house in Wajima Picture: Kazuhiro NOGI/AFP

Heavy roof tiles

Many structural failures (especially in 1 or 2 storey houses). They were apparently largely (if not only) due to oscillation of the HEAVY ROOFS



Each of the beautiful roof tiles weighs about 4 kg !! (estimate) \*

- Natural Period (estimate) at 0.4 0.6 s
  - . Hence roughly  $A_{ROOF} \ge 2 A_{GROUND}$
- Therefore, mA is unbearingly large
   (even) for the resilient wooden frames !!

\* The justification for the use of such heavy tiles: to protect against the typhoons/hurricanes which may occur up to **10 times/year** !!, not just **1 time/30 years** as earthquakes do !!!

#### We observed three MODES of FAILURE of the destroyed houses:

- I. The most frequent: failure of the ground-floor supporting wooden frame from the large Shear Force from the roof.
- II. Also frequent: the heavy roof was detached and thrown away, in front of the house, wherever the anchoring of the roof onto the frame was weak.
  III. Less frequent: Well-anchored roof of 2-strory houses and the developed huge inertia force produce large overturning moment that caused tilting and

toppling of the buildings.





## THREE MODES OF FAILURE





MODE II

MODE III





## A vehicle trapped underneath a collapsed building in Shikamachi Credit: Kyodo News via AP

FAILURE MODE I



**WAJIMA.** Photo: Buddhika Weerasinghe/Gettv Images



Photo: Hiro Komae via AP

2-story wooden house in Nanao

### (Photo: Getty Images)

## FAILURE MODE III.



**Collapsed building in Nanao** 

Photo: Kyodo News



# Structural damage of modern buildings

(Few cases have been seen until now.

Here is one that has been shown in the Media)





Image Source: https://www.yomiuri.co.jp/pluralphoto/20240101-OYT1I50140/

# Seismic response of rigid blocks: tombstones and traditional gates in shrines

(It would be interesting to find out safely standing slender tombstones and relate their performance with recorded nearby motions )



Source: https://asia.nikkei.com/Economy/Natural-disasters/In-Pictures-Japan-earthquake-shatters-New-Year-s-Day-calm

1

1 I I I



A damaged shrine in Ujima

### Source: REUTERS/Kim Kyung-Hoon



# rigid block rocking oscillation





# The collapsed Torii gate at Ono-Hiyoshi

Shrine in Kanazawa

Photo: KYODO



The collapsed Torii gate at Ono-Hiyoshi

Shrine in Kanazawa

# **Endless Geotechnical Failures !**

local slope failures, embankment subsidence, retaining failures, landslides, sinkholes, liquefaction, and so on...





collapsed houses, cars, roads in Kanazawa Source: Kvodo/via REUTERS The same failure of the previous photo, from a different viewpoint.

Notice the circular slope failure mechanism



in Hakui Photo: Xinhua/Zhang Xiaoyu



### Landslide in Wajima

### Photo: FRED MERY (AFP)





### Road near Anamizu Town.



## Cracks on a road induced by a small landslide in Anamizu Photo: Kyodo


















A view of a collapsed road and houses in Wajima

Source: KYODO/VIA REUTERS

Cracks on a road in Kanazawa Source: IMAGO / Kyodo News 0 m

#### **Rockfalls in Wajima**



### **Major LANDSLIDES**

(over 100)

#### Damage from landslides and such from Noto Peninsula Earthquake

\*Based on photos and data provided by Kokusai Kogyo Co. and Pasco Corp.











Extensive landslide in Wajima







SOURCE: https://youtu.be/6yq\_H1Fyghs?si=U7OtC79MhzfivZ0I

#### **Location Map**







#### Photo: Toshifumi KITAMURA/AFP/Getty Images



## (More Obvious) Soil Liquefaction Cases









# Snapshot from a video of a soil liquefaction

Source: Daily Mail





## An Update will follow (along with more robust Conclusions), after the Japanese Engineers make and publicize their interpretation of more observed failures.

8 January 2024 E.G., G.G. (T.U.C, N.T.U.A)

For Reference:

Garini E., Gazetas G. (2024) "The M<sub>JMA</sub> 7.6 Noto Peninsula Earthquake of January 1<sup>st</sup> 2024, Japan: Preliminary Report with Emphasis on Recorded Motions and Soil Effects", DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.12972.85129