

# S41B - 0997 Seismic Energy Partitioning Inferred from Pseudotachylite-bearing Faults (Gole Larghe Fault, Adamello batholith, Italy)



Lidia Pittarello\* Giulio Di Toro\* Andrea Bizzarri\*\* Jafar Hadizadeh\*\*\* Giorgio Pennacchioni\*  
 lidia.pittarello@unipd.it giulio.ditoro@unipd.it bizzarri@bo.ingv.it hadizadeh@louisville.edu giorgio.pennacchioni@unipd.it  
 \*Dipartimento di Geologia, Paleontologia e Geofisica, Università di Padova, Italy  
 \*\*Istituto Nazionale di Geofisica e Vulcanologia, Bologna, Italy  
 \*\*\*Department of Geography and Geosciences, University of Louisville, Kentucky USA

**Aim of this study**  
 Partitioning of the earthquake energy between **fracture energy**  $E_G$  (energy required to create new rupture surface in the slip zone and a damage zone in the wall rock) and **frictional heat**  $E_H$  determines the features of the rupture propagation and the mechanical behavior of a seismic fault. The  $E_G/E_H$  ratio cannot be inferred from seismological investigations. We propose to use the cataclastic microstructures associated with pseudotachylite (solidified friction melt produced during coseismic slip) to constrain the  $E_G/E_H$  ratio.

**Methods**

1. We selected a pseudotachylite-bearing fault, that records one single seismic rupture, from an exhumed fault exposed in the Adamello batholith (Gole Larghe Fault zone, Italy, Pan.1).
2. We estimated  $E_H$  by energy balance calculations (Pan.2).
3. We estimated  $E_G$  by:
  - 3a. SEM and FE-SEM image analysis of fragmented plagioclase survivor clasts within the pseudotachylite and fracture patterns in the host rock.
  - 3b. Clast Size Distribution (CSD) and fracture density by computer-aided image analysis. $E_G$ , then, was determined by multiplying the seismically created new fracture surfaces for the specific surface energy ( $\gamma$ ) of the rock-forming minerals (Pan.4).

**Results & Conclusions**  
 The above estimates yield  $E_H = 23.3 \text{ MJ m}^{-2}$  and  $E_G$  in the range of 0.110-0.500  $\text{MJ m}^{-2}$ .  
 We conclude that, for this local seismic energy balance estimate,  $E_G$  is negligible compared to  $E_H$  (Pan.5).

