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Abstract  Interferometric synthetic aperture radar (InSAR) data over the area of the Hector Mine earthquake ($M_w$ 7.1, 16 October 1999) reveal postseismic deformation of several centimeters over a spatial scale of 0.5 to 50 km. We analyzed seven SAR acquisitions to form interferograms over four time periods after the event. The main deformations seen in the line-of-sight (LOS) displacement maps are a region of subsidence (60 mm LOS increase) on the northern end of the fault, a region of uplift (45 mm LOS decrease) located to the northeast of the primary fault bend, and a linear trough running along the main rupture having a depth of up to 15 mm and a width of about 2 km. We correlate these features with a double left-bending, right-lateral, strike-slip fault that exhibits contraction on the restraining side and extension along the releasing side of the fault bends. The temporal variations in the near-fault postseismic deformation are consistent with a characteristic time scale of $135/25$ or $1150/42$ days, which is similar to the relaxation times following the 1992 Landers earthquake. High gradients in the LOS displacements occur on the fault trace, consistent with afterslip on the earthquake rupture. We derive an afterslip model by inverting the LOS data from both the ascending and descending orbits. Our model indicates that much of the afterslip occurs at depths of less than 3 to 4 km.

Introduction

The Hector Mine earthquake ($M_w$ 7.1, 16 October 1999) ruptured the surface along the Lavic Lake fault, the Bullion fault, and sections of several other faults within the eastern California shear zone (ECSZ) (Fig. 1) (Dibblee, 1966; USGS et al., 2000; Treiman et al., 2002). The ECSZ contains a series of northwest-trending faults that collectively take up a substantial amount of the motion between the Pacific and North American plates (Dokka and Travis, 1990). InSAR observations in the area of the nearby 1992 Landers earthquake reveal transient deformation localized near the earthquake rupture, highlighting the importance of monitoring the near-field postseismic deformation (Massonnet et al., 1993, 1994; Zebker et al., 1994; Peltzer et al., 1996). To obtain adequate InSAR coverage of the crustal deformation following the Hector Mine earthquake, we asked the European Space Agency to continue acquiring SAR data in the region. To date, four high-quality postseismic interferograms can be constructed, and we expect more will become available as additional ERS-2 SAR data are collected in 2002.

Our analysis of the Hector Mine earthquake focused on the near-field (<50 km from the rupture) postseismic deformation, using SAR data collected by the European Space Agency satellite ERS-2. Although a number of GPS measurements collected after the earthquake may provide constraints on the larger-scale deformation (>50 km) (Agnew et al., 2002; Owen et al., 2002), they lack the spatial resolution to characterize the details of postseismic deformation within 10 km of the main rupture. The large-scale postseismic deformation has also been analyzed using two of the four interferograms presented here (Pollitz et al., 2001). These larger-scale studies have been interpreted in terms of viscoelastic deformation of the lower crust–upper mantle; however, we believe this interpretation is premature, because the observed LOS displacements are small (on the order of a few centimeters) and are not correlated between different interferograms, suggesting that they might be atmospheric artifacts.

Here we examine postseismic deformation over four time periods: 4 to 249 days, 39 to 144 days, 74 to 319 days, and 39 to 354 days after the earthquake (Fig. 2). The four interferograms, derived from seven independent SAR acquisitions, all show consistent patterns. This enables us to perform a quantitative analysis of the postseismic decay time. There were only two large aftershocks ($M_w$ 5.0) in this combined time period, and these occurred well north of the main rupture, so the deformation we have observed is likely aseismic.
Figure 1. Location map of the 1999 Hector Mine earthquake within the eastern California shear zone and in relation to the Landers and Joshua Tree earthquakes. Star indicates the epicenter of the Hector Mine main shock. The largest gray box indicates the European Space Agency’s ERS-2 satellite track T127, which images the region of interest. Two smaller gray boxes show area of detailed analysis (Fig. 3).

InSAR Processing

We use repeat-pass interferometry (Zebker et al., 1994; Massonnet and Feigl, 1998; Price, 1999; Rosen et al., 2000) to create LOS displacement maps of an area about 110 km by 110 km surrounding the rupture (Fig. 1). The X-band receiving station at Scripps Institution of Oceanography was initially used to acquire these data, so they could be processed in near real-time, although later the data were obtained from ESA through its distributors, SpotImage and Eurimage. Figure 2 gives the perpendicular baselines of the relevant data from the descending track across the Hector Mine earthquake area (ERS track 127), using precise orbital information from Delft Technical University (Scharroo and Visser, 1998). The topographic phase was removed during each interferogram formation to isolate the deformation phase. The USGS 90-m topography was used to help unwrap the phase of a long-baseline (195 m) topographic pair. The residual phase of each interferogram was unwrapped (Goldstein et al., 1988) and transformed into LOS displacement. A best-fitting plane was removed from each displacement map to account for possible errors due to imprecise orbits. Such detrending does not introduce any spurious signal to the LOS data on length scales less than ~50 km. We refer to these maps as postseismic pairs 1, 2, 3, and 4, as shown in the timeline (Fig. 2).

The ERS satellites measure LOS displacement at an angle of about 23° from vertical, such that the LOS displacements are more sensitive to vertical rather than horizontal motion. The steep look angle of the ERS satellites impedes precise estimates of pure strike-slip fault offsets (Massonnet and Feigl, 1998). Furthermore, the faults in the eastern California shear zone lie at high angles to the look direction of the radar from the descending orbit and nearly perpendicular to the look direction from the ascending orbit. Radar data from the ascending orbits is quite limited, so determination of vector offsets in postseismic deformation is a considerable challenge.

Postseismic Deformation

The LOS deformation maps for each of the four postseismic intervals show long-wavelength deformation patterns that are highly variable and dependent on the plane removed from each map. Although our postseismic interferogram 1 (full interferogram not presented here) shows general agreement with the corresponding interferogram published by Pollitz et al. (2001), we do not yet believe that the large-scale pattern is related to crustal deformation, because several other interferograms show different large-scale patterns. In contrast, at the smaller scale (<50 km), each inter-
Figure 3. Postseismic 1 LOS displacement (large image) between day 4 and 249 after the Hector Mine earthquake (10-mm contour intervals). Color scale varies from dark blue, representing the greatest away-from-satellite displacement (max. ~65 mm), to red, representing the maximum toward-satellite displacement (max. ~40 mm). Red lines correspond to profiles drawn across the fault (Fig. 4). Yellow dots correspond to the USGS-mapped Hector Mine fault rupture, while the green dots represent other mapped faults in the surrounding area. Blue dots are plotted at a tenth of degree latitude and longitude for location reference. The three smaller boxes, postseismic 1, postseismic 3 (74–319 days), and postseismic 4 (39–354 days), highlight the region of maximum high-low displacement. The regression analysis discussed later utilizes this data within this area. The postseismic 2 displacement map is not shown because it resembles postseismic 4 but with lower overall amplitude in accordance with its shorter time interval.
ferogram displays a prominent near-fault signal that is well resolved by the available data (Fig. 3). Conspicuous are a region of subsidence (60 mm LOS increase) on the northern end of the fault, a region of uplift (45 mm LOS decrease) located to the northeast of the primary fault bend, and a linear trough running along the main rupture having a depth of up to 15 mm and a width of about 2 km. Profiles A–A’, B–B’, and C–C’ (Fig. 4) show the decay of the LOS displacement in the vicinity of the surface rupture. A discussion of each of the four interferograms is presented in the next section. Qualitatively, we interpret the near-fault postseismic deformation as being due to crustal relaxation following co-seismic displacements on a right-lateral, strike-slip fault with a double left-bend (Fig. 5). The curvature of the fault produced a region of uplift near the restraining bend and a region of opening and subsidence near the releasing bend (Crowell, 1974; Davis and Reynolds, 1996).

Analysis of Individual Interferograms

Postseismic 1 (4–249 days; Fig. 3). All three structural features are clearly visible on this map. A broad region of LOS increase lies distinctly on the west side of the fault, with a displacement of about −60 mm (profile A–A’, Fig. 4). This might represent either true ground subsidence or right-lateral afterslip, or both. The area on the northeastern side of the rupture displays a zone of positive LOS displacements (consistent with uplift, right-lateral afterslip, or both) up to 45 mm. This LOS high occurs about 2 km east of the Lavic Lake fault and appears to decrease gradually toward the west across the fault (profile B–B’ in Fig. 4). On the east side of this high is a sharp N–S trending discontinuity, suggesting shallow slip on a N–S trending fault. The high also coincides with the approximately 1 m of east-side-up coseismic uplift (Sandwell et al., 2002).

A linear trough runs along the entire rupture zone, although it is most prominent along the releasing bend of the fault (profile C–C’, Fig. 4). We believe this feature was formed by fault-zone collapse, with the greatest amplitude of subsidence in the area of extension at the releasing bend.

Postseismic 2 (39–144 days; not shown). This second LOS displacement map shows the same features as postseismic pair 1, but with lower amplitude due to its relatively short time interval (105 days). The interval time is less than one half of the time interval of the three other postseismic pairs; i.e., interferograms 1 (245 days), 3 (245 days), and 4 (315 days). The total peak-to-trough displacement seen on this map is about 50 mm, whereas postseismic map 1 shows nearly 105 mm. The greatest change between the postseismic pairs 1 and 2 is the disappearance of the along-fault trough in postseismic pair 2.

Postseismic 3 (74–319 days; Fig. 3). This interferogram starts 74 days after the earthquake and displays decreased amplitudes in all three structural features. Compared to the other three maps, this displacement map is considerably noisier, perhaps due to atmospheric effects. The broad high–low signatures still exist in the same locations and display a peak-to-trough range of about 60 mm. The trough along the rupture is apparent in this map (∼10 mm), suggesting that the relaxation time is more than 74 days.
Postseismic 4 (39–354 days; Fig. 3). This displacement map has the largest time span. The LOS displacement pattern is very similar to that seen in postseismic pair 1, although the amplitudes are smaller in postseismic pair 4. This suggests that, although a large portion of postseismic deformation occurred during the 40 days after the earthquake, the process responsible for the near-fault postseismic deformation was still active beyond 1 to 2 months following the earthquake.

Near-Field Postseismic Relaxation Time

All four LOS displacement maps show the characteristic high–low pattern (Fig. 3). Assuming that this pattern is associated with a single exponential relaxation mechanism (e.g., Shen et al., 1994), one can determine the relaxation time, \( \tau \), that best explains the InSAR data. The predicted LOS displacement, \( D \), at position \( x \) and time \( t \) after the earthquake is given by

\[
D(x, t) = D_\infty(1 - \exp(-t/\tau)),
\]

where \( D_\infty \) is the permanent postseismic deformation. The postseismic displacement map \( I \), measures the LOS component of deformation between the reference time, \( t_{ref} \), and the repeat time, \( t_{rep} \), where \( i \) is the number of a particular postseismic pair (i.e., 1 to 4). The model LOS displacement map predicted by equation (1) is

\[
I_{model}^i = D_\infty(\exp(-t_{rep}/\tau) - \exp(-t_{ref}/\tau)).
\]

To eliminate dependence on \( D_\infty \), we take the ratio of two displacement maps corresponding to different observation times:

\[
M_k^i = \frac{I_{model}^i}{I_{model}^k} = \frac{\exp(-t_{rep}/\tau) - \exp(-t_{ref}/\tau)}{\exp(-t_{ref}/\tau) - \exp(-t_{rep}/\tau)}.
\]

From the four observed interferometric pairs, we can form six independent LOS ratios:

\[
R_k^i = \frac{I_i}{I_k}.
\]

We isolate a small section of each interferogram covering the high–low signal seen at the northern end of the fault rupture (Fig. 3, inset area). A nonbiased linear regression (i.e., functional analysis) (Mark and Church, 1977) was then used to calculate the ratio \( R \), as well as the uncertainty \( \sigma \) (Fig. 6 and Table 1). This method of analysis assumes that errors exist in both the dependent and independent variables, unlike standard least-squares methods, which assume error in only one variable. The ratio of signal amplitudes about their mean value, \( s_i \), is also known as the slope of the reduced major axis (Kermack and Haldane, 1950), and we believe it to be the best estimate of the slope. Uncertainties in the slope estimates are established using a standard least-squares technique in which the dependent variable is initially assigned all the variance and the slope, \( s_{xy} \), of the best-fit line is calculated. Next, the uncertainty is transferred from the dependent variable to the independent variable, and the calculation is repeated. The inverted slope values for the resulting best-fit line are denoted as \( s_{xy} \). Table 1 shows each interferometric pair along with the corresponding \( s_i \), \( s_{xy} \), and \( s_{xy} \) values, and Figure 6 exhibits all three lines superimposed upon the six regression plots from interferometric pairs.

Given these estimates of postseismic displacement ratios and their associated uncertainties, we can now calculate the best-fitting relaxation time by minimizing the weighted RMS (root mean squared) misfit, \( \chi^2 \), between the observed ratio, \( R \), and the model ratio, \( M \).

\[
\chi^2 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left( \frac{M_k^i - R_k^i}{\sigma_k^i} \right)^2,
\]

where

\[
\sigma_k^i = \frac{|s_{xy} - s_k| + |s_{xy} - s_i|}{[2]}
\]

and \( N \) is the total number of independent interferometric ratios used in our analysis (\( N = 6 \)). Since the model is non-linear (see equation 3), we varied the relaxation time \( \tau \) to find the minimum value of \( \chi^2 \), as shown in Figure 7. From this analysis we obtain a relaxation time of 135 ± 42 or −25 days. The uncertainty in this estimate is taken at the points where the \( \chi^2 \) curve is 10% greater than the minimum.

The relaxation time for the Hector Mine earthquake can be compared with similar estimates of time decay of the deformation following the 1992 Landers earthquake. Our inferred relaxation times are somewhat larger than the estimate of 84 ± 23 days made by Savage and Svarc (1997) and significantly larger than the 38 days calculated by Shen et al. (1994). An overall similarity between the characteristic relaxation times obtained from our analysis of deformation following the Hector Mine earthquake and previous results for the post-Landers deformation suggests that the same relaxation process may be responsible for the observed deformation following both events.

Possible candidates for the postseismic deformation are deep afterslip (Shen et al., 1994; Bock et al., 1997; Savage and Svarc, 1997), viscoelastic relaxation (Deng et al., 1998; Pollitz et al., 2001), and poroelastic relaxation (Peltzer et al., 1996). Both deep afterslip and viscoelastic relaxation are thought to occur in the lower crust (−15–30 km depth); poroelastic relaxation is believed to take place in the upper crust (0–15 km depth).

Afterslip is presumed to occur on the lower crustal extension of the seismogenic fault, and the viscoelastic relaxation is likely to involve the bulk of the lower crust. Although the two lower-crust deformation mechanisms give rise to very similar horizontal displacements at the Earth’s surface, the predicted vertical displacements are substantially different. This potentially allows one to distinguish the
two candidate mechanisms (e.g., Pollitz et al., 2001). Unfortunately, on spatial scales in excess of a few tens of kilometers (i.e., corresponding to the deformation processes in the lower crust) the observed postseismic LOS displacements are small (1–2 cm) and uncorrelated between independent interferograms, making them difficult to interpret in terms of tectonic deformation. Indeed, we performed the above regression analysis on the interferogram pairs using the full 100 km × 100 km displacement map (Fig. 1). The data are highly scattered and show no common features among the

Figure 6. Plot of the six pairs of interferograms with best-fit lines overlying data points. Slope \( s_o \) is the mean value of the ratio of signal amplitudes between two interferograms, found using a nonbiased linear regression. Slopes \( s_{xy} \) and \( s_{yx} \) provide uncertainty bounds for the slope estimates. Both are calculated using a standard least-squares technique in which \( s_{xy} \) is the best-fit line when the dependent variable holds all the variance and \( s_{yx} \) is the best-fit line when the independent variable holds all the variance.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratio</th>
<th>( t_{ref} )</th>
<th>( t_{rep} )</th>
<th>( t_{ref}^{out} )</th>
<th>( t_{rep}^{out} )</th>
<th>( s_o )</th>
<th>( s_{xy} )</th>
<th>( s_{yx} )</th>
<th>( \sigma )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( R_1^1 )</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>0.686</td>
<td>0.642</td>
<td>0.733</td>
<td>.0450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R_1^2 )</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>0.821</td>
<td>0.725</td>
<td>0.929</td>
<td>.1010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R_2^1 )</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>0.509</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>0.544</td>
<td>.0330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R_2^2 )</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>0.620</td>
<td>0.574</td>
<td>0.671</td>
<td>.0710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R_3^1 )</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>0.742</td>
<td>0.707</td>
<td>0.780</td>
<td>.0360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R_3^2 )</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>.1550</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( t \) is in days after the 16 October 1999 Hector Mine earthquake.
Subscripts ref and rep refer to ratio subscript interferogram number.
Superscripts ref and rep refer to ratio superscript interferogram number.
interferograms on the larger scale. Conversely, the near-fault LOS anomalies are quite persistent in different interferograms, most likely indicating shallow deformation on or near the earthquake rupture. Here we investigate the possibility that the postseismic LOS displacements near the Hector Mine rupture result from shallow afterslip or volume changes (or both) on the earthquake fault.

Postseismic Deformation Model

The LOS displacements from only one satellite look direction do not allow one to distinguish between the horizontal and vertical components of deformation (e.g., Fialko et al., 2001). In our analysis therefore, we use data from both the descending and ascending orbits that span a similar time interval, from about 1 month to about 1 year after the earthquake. The corresponding interferograms are shown in Figures 8a and 8b. The raw InSAR data were processed using the JPL/Caltech software package ROI_PAC, and a mosaic of 7.5-min USGS digital elevation maps with 30-m postings. Unfortunately, no independent interferometric postseismic pairs are available from the ascending orbit, so we cannot verify what part of a signal shown in Figure 8b might be due to atmospheric effects; however, both the LOS increase near the releasing fault bend to the north-west of the epicenter and the LOS decrease around the epicenter common to all four descending interferograms are also apparent in the ascending interferogram, suggesting that these LOS displacements represent mostly vertical motion. The area immediately to the southwest of the epicenter is more complicated, as it is characterized by LOS decrease in the descending interferogram and LOS increase in the ascending interferogram.

We model the postseismic signal revealed by the InSAR data using the fault geometry that best explains the coseismic displacement field (Simons et al., 2002). The fault is represented by four rectangular segments that are subdivided into individual slip patches whose size is chosen to yield a uniform model resolution. The position of the top edges of the fault segments are denoted by magenta lines in Figure 8. The fault subpatches are approximated by finite dislocations in an elastic half-space (e.g., Okada, 1985). Our goal is to find a slip distribution on the model fault that best explains the observed postseismic LOS data. The best-fitting slip distribution is found through a constrained least-square minimization (for details of the inversion technique, see Simons et al., 2002). We perform a number of simulations in which we vary the number of degrees of freedom for slip on the individual fault segments and the degree of smoothing. Initially, a linear inversion is done, for the overall sense of pure strike slip on the fault segments, in which we impose no constraints on the slip direction but use relatively heavy smoothing to prevent spurious checkerboarding slip patterns. These simulations indicate that the data are most consistent with the right-lateral sense of slip on the earthquake rupture. In the subsequent simulations, we restrict strike slip to be right-lateral and reduce the degree of smoothing until some compromise is found between the quality of fit to the data and the model roughness. We find that neither the pure strike slip, nor a combination of strike and dip slip, on the Hector Mine rupture produces the near-fault subsidence and uplift patterns seen in Figures 8a and 8b. Allowing for the fault-normal displacement component results in a qualitatively better fit to the data. Next, we impose a sign constraint on the fault-normal displacements using the same approach as described above for the strike slip mode. From this constraint, the fault-normal contraction is found to be the dominant mode for volume changes on the fault plane and seems to be required by the data. The reduction in the RMS misfit between the data and the model predictions is 33%, 42%, and 52% for the pure strike slip; strike and dip slip; and a combination of the strike-slip, dip-slip, and fault-normal contraction, respectively. Figures 8c and 8d show predictions of our preferred model, which includes the spatially varying strike-slip, dip-slip, and fault-normal displacements, and Figure 8e shows the inferred distribution of slip (arrows) and fault-normal contraction (color).

The best-fitting model (Figure 8e) shows up to a few tens of centimeters of predominantly strike-slip (right-lateral) subsurface motion along the uppermost several kilometers of the fault, especially on the north-northwest-trending splay that did not break the surface during the earthquake (segment 3 in Fig. 8), and up to ten centimeters of fault-normal contraction near the fault bends. The magnitude of afterslip seems to anticorrelate with the coseismic slip magnitude (see Simons et al., 2002, their Fig. 9). In particular, segment 2, which had the largest coseismic displacement, is characterized by the smallest afterslip. We point out that fault contraction is required to explain the
Figure 8. (a) Descending and (b) ascending postseismic LOS displacements (positive toward the radar); (c) and (d), predictions of our preferred model, which includes the spatially varying strike-slip, dip-slip, and fault-normal displacements; (e) best-fitting model, with arrows denoting the inferred slip distribution and color denoting the fault-normal contraction.
subseismic displacements at the northern end of segment 2. Post-
seismic displacements on the fault are not well resolved at
depths greater than about 5 km, because the LOS data at
distances greater than several kilometers away from the fault
are dominated by the atmospheric noise. The latter statement is
corroborated by calculations assuming various depth of
the fault afterslip. In particular, inversions in which the fault
depth is taken to be 6 km give rise to an increase in the RMS
misfit of only 2%, but inversions in which the fault depth is
limited to 2 km increase the RMS misfit by more than 20%

Integrating the strike slip over the fault area in the upper
5 km of the fault and using the typical shear modulus for the
crust of $3.3 \times 10^{11}$ Pa, we obtain an estimate for the post-
seismic moment release on the order of $10^{18}$ Nm. The de-
duced geodetic moment is at least an order of magnitude larger
than the cumulative seismic moment of all aftershocks
that occurred on or near the respective fault area (the after-
shock catalog courtesy of E. Hauksson, [Hauksson et al.,
2002]). This suggests that most of the slip revealed by the
InSAR data (Fig. 8) occurred aseismically.

The fault-normal contraction inferred from our analysis
most likely indicates volume changes in the upper section
of the Hector Mine rupture, although physical mechanisms
responsible for such volume changes are not well under-
ostood. Peltzer et al. (1996, 1998) interpreted the InSAR ob-
servations of near-field deformation following the Landers
rupture as indicating the hydraulic response of fluid-satu-
rated rocks to coseismic changes in the ambient stress. Sim-
ilarly, Massonnet et al. (1996) suggested that postseismic
deformation along some sections of the rupture of the 1992
Landers earthquake indicated fault-zone collapse due to
post-earthquake crack closure and fluid expulsion from the
fluid-saturated fault core. Massonnet et al. (1996) interpreted
the InSAR data from one look direction as indicating about
30 cm of fault closure in the depth interval between 6 and
11 km. Results shown in Figure 8 suggest that the fault-zone
contraction following the Hector Mine earthquake is quite
shallow (the uppermost 3 to 4 km) and likely extends to the
surface. To the best of our knowledge, no surface manifes-
tations of fluid expulsion from the fault zone have been ob-
served. An alternative explanation is that the fault zone con-
traction may be caused by the porosity reduction (which may
or may not involve fluid flow). The latter interpretation im-
plies that a comparable increase in porosity is created co-
seismically due to the enhanced dilatancy in the releasing
bends of a strike-slip fault. The systematic centimeter-scale
misfit between the coseismic interferograms and the slip
model that assumes no fault-normal displacements (Simons
et al., 2002) may be consistent with the local dilatancy ef-
teffects, although the signal is too small compared to the co-
seismic LOS displacements to allow a robust interpretation.

Conclusion
Postseismic displacement maps derived from ERS SAR
data provide significant information on the structural defor-
mation in the area of the Lavic Lake fault rupture. Large
zones of subsidence and uplift occur near the northern end
of the rupture, and a narrow trough runs along the fault. We
interpret the region of uplift and the trough as characteristics
of a right-lateral, strike-slip fault with a double left-bend.
The cause of the northwestern zone of subsidence remains
unclear. Subsequent interferograms continue to exhibit these
structural signatures, but to a lesser magnitude. All interfer-
ograms display a high-low signal at the northern end of the
rupture. We isolate this pattern and use a nonbiased linear
regression to constrain a near-field relaxation of $135 \pm 42$
or $-25$ days. Since our relaxation time compares well to
the Landers earthquake decay rate estimated by Savage and
Srvc (1997) of $84 \pm 23$ days, we infer that the acting near-
field postseismic relaxation processes are similar. Using an
interferogram along an ascending orbit to obtain a second
component of surface deformation, we confirm that most of
the near-field postseismic deformation is vertical. Moreover,
we develop an afterslip model that is consistent with both
the ascending and descending interferograms. A necessary
feature of the model is a component of fault-zone collapse.
Future data acquisitions by the ERS-2 satellite along as-
cending orbits will provide better constraints on the vector
postseismic displacements.
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