



Meeting for the Central and Eastern United States (CEUS) Earthquake Hazards Program—October 28–29, 2009

**Fogelman Conference Center, University of Memphis,
Memphis, Tennessee**

By Martitia Tuttle, Oliver Boyd, and Natasha McCallister

Open-File Report 2013–1155

**U.S. Department of the Interior
U.S. Geological Survey**

U.S. Department of the Interior
SALLY JEWELL, Secretary

U.S. Geological Survey
Suzette M. Kimball, Acting Director

U.S. Geological Survey, Reston, Virginia: 2013

For more information on the USGS—the Federal source for science about the Earth, its natural and living resources, natural hazards, and the environment—visit <http://www.usgs.gov> or call 1-888-ASK-USGS

For an overview of USGS information products, including maps, imagery, and publications, visit <http://www.usgs.gov/pubprod>

To order this and other USGS information products, visit <http://store.usgs.gov>

Suggested citation:

Tuttle, Martitia, Boyd, Oliver, and McCallister, Natasha, 2013, Meeting of the Central and Eastern U.S. (CEUS) Earthquake Hazards Program October 28–29, 2009: U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 2013–1155, 74 p., <http://pubs.usgs.gov/of/2013/1155/>.

Any use of trade, firm, or product names is for descriptive purposes only and does not imply endorsement by the U.S. Government.

Although this information product, for the most part, is in the public domain, it also may contain copyrighted materials as noted in the text. Permission to reproduce copyrighted items must be secured from the copyright owner.

Contents

Introduction.....	1
Acknowledgments	2
Report on Earthquake Hazards Program Meeting.....	2
Meeting Summary.....	2
Breakout Sessions: Input on Research Priorities for the USGS Earthquake Hazard Program	3
Earthquake Sources and Magnitudes	3
Ground Motion, Near-Surface Velocity Structure, and Site Amplification.....	5
Attenuation Issues (High priority)	5
Instrumentation (High priority)	5
Site Effects (Low priority for borehole arrays. High priority for basic data on velocity structure at existing stations).....	6
Velocity Model (Moderate priority for 3D velocity models.).....	7
Time History Models and Scaling (Moderate priority).....	7
Source Issues (High priority)	7
Numerical and Analytical Models (Moderate priority)	7
Geodesy and Modeling Ground Deformation.....	9
Intraplate Earthquake Processes	12
Community Velocity Model and Earthquake Simulations	14
Seismic-Hazard Mapping	15
Education, Outreach, and the New Madrid Earthquakes Bicentennial.....	18
EarthScope and the Earthquake Hazards Program	20
Reference Cited.....	22
Appendixes.....	23
I. Meeting Agenda.....	23
Wednesday, October 28, 2009.....	23
Thursday, October 29, 2009.....	26
II. List of Conference Attendees	30
III. Abstracts.....	33
Mapping Liquefaction Potential of Soil Deposits near Charleston, South Carolina.....	33
Ground Motion Trends and Issues for ENA.....	33
Deformation Modeling in the Central United States.....	34
Evansville area earthquake hazards mapping project (EAEHMP).....	34
Results of Reprocessing Seismic Reflection Data near Summerville, South Carolina	35
Time-Variable Deformation in the New Madrid Seismic Zone	36
High-Resolution P- and S- Wave Velocity Structure of the Post-Paleozoic Sediments in the Upper Mississippi Embayment.....	36
Geodatabase and Earthquake Hazards Mapping for the St. Louis Area	37
Paleoseismic Features within the Wabash Valley Seismic Zone in Western Kentucky	38
Progress Report on Investigation of Holocene Faulting and Liquefaction along the Southern Margin of the North American Craton (Alabama-Oklahoma Transform).....	38
Suite of CEUS-Specific Hard-Rock Time-Histories and Seismic Hazard Model Updates for the St. Louis Area Earthquake Hazards Mapping Project.....	39
Effects of Shallow 3D Structure of the Mississippi Embayment on Ground-Motion Amplification.....	40
Characterizing near fault velocity structure and seismogenesis along the New Madrid Seismic Zone.....	41

Analysis of Aftershock and Foreshock Activity in Stable Continental Regions: Implications for Aftershock Forecasting and the Hazard of Strong Earthquakes.....	41
Catalog Development for the EPRI/DOE/NRC CEUS SSC Project.....	42
Maximum Magnitudes of Charleston, South Carolina Earthquakes from in situ Geotechnical Data.....	42
Surficial Material Geologic Mapping in Support of the St. Louis Area Earthquake Hazard Mapping Project.....	43
Ground Motion Simulations for the 1811 and 1812 New Madrid Earthquakes.....	43
Is there a Connection between Seismicity and Deformation in the New Madrid and Wabash Valley Seismic Zones?.....	44
Conditional Mean Spectra as a Bridge between Probabilistic and Deterministic Seismic Hazard Assessment.....	45
Seismotectonics of the New Madrid Seismic Zone.....	46
The 1811–1812 New Madrid Sequence—Mainshocks, Aftershocks, and Beyond.....	46
Does Seismicity Delineate Zones where Future Large Earthquakes are likely to Occur in the Central and Eastern United States?.....	47
The Search for Non-volcanic Tremor in the New Madrid Seismic Zone Using a Phased Seismic Array.....	48
New Seismic Design Maps and Associated Web Products for the 2012 International Building and Residential Codes.....	48
Long-Term Deformation History in the Mississippi Embayment—The Mississippi River Seismic Survey.....	49
Can OSL be used to Date Paleoliquefaction Events?.....	50
Mmax and Lithospheric Structure in Central and Eastern North America.....	50
A Phenomenon of a Most Alarming Nature.....	51
Earthquake Source and Ground Motion Characteristics in the Central and Eastern United States.....	51
Paleoseismic Investigation of the East Tennessee Seismic Zone—Preliminary Results.....	52
Site Amplification in Central and Eastern United States.....	53
Recent and Current Earthquake Hazard Reduction Research at the Puerto Rick Strong Motion Program.....	54
Major Earthquakes Recorded by the Initiation and/or Regrowth of Speleothems in Midwestern U.S. Caves—Results from a 2008–2009 NEHRP-Funded Investigation.....	54
Ground-Motion Prediction Equations for Eastern North America from a Hybrid Empirical Method.....	55
P- and S-Wave Velocity Structure and V_P/V_S Ratios in the New Madrid Seismic Zone.....	56
Insights into the Structure and Long-term Deformation in the New Madrid Region from Seismic Reflection Profiles.....	57
Tantalizing Suggestions for Late Pleistocene to Middle Holocene Surface Deformation at the Southeastern Margin of Reelfoot Rift, the Marianna Gap in Crowley’s Ridge.....	57
Central United States Velocity Model Version 1: Description and Validation.....	58
Dynamic Testing by Resonant Column and Torsional Shear Methods.....	59
Overview of Seismic-hazard mapping of Three Pilot Quadrangles in the St. Louis Metro Area.....	59
Shear Wave Velocity Profiles of Deep Soils in the Mississippi Embayment.....	60
Systematic Historical Seismicity Research—An Essential Adjunct in the Pre-Instrumental Period.....	60
The New Madrid Field Trip Guidebook.....	61
Development of the Central and Eastern United States (CEUS) Seismic Source Characterization (SSC) Model.....	62
Earthquake Rupture Directivity and Local Site Effects from a M.73 Earthquake.....	62
Geodesy and the Enigma of Stable Continental Earthquakes.....	63
Damage to Ozark Cave Formations, Ozark Caves, and the New Madrid Seismic Zone—A Nascent Paleoseismological Perspective.....	64

Migration of Large Earthquakes Indicates Distributed Strain in the Central United States	65
Geologic Model Testing in the New Madrid Seismic Zone Region	66
The Central U.S. Seismic Observatory (CUSSO) and its Implication	66
Status of Data Collection for the St. Louis Earthquake Hazards Mapping Project in 2009	67
USGS Estimation of M(MAX) East of the Rocky Mountains	67
Post-Eocene Deformation Observed in Seismic Profiles across the Southwestern Blytheville Arch, Crowley's Ridge, and Western Reelfoot Rift Margin, Arkansas	68
The St. Louis Area Earthquake Hazards Mapping Project–SLAEHMP	69
A Microtremor Study in the New Madrid Seismic Zone	70
Site-Specific Fault Rupture Hazard Assessment—Flourspar Area Fault Complex, Western Kentucky	70
IV. References Cited in Abstracts	71
V. Slide Presentations	74

List of Abbreviations

AD	Anno Domini
AMS	Accelerator Mass Spectrometry
ANSS	Advanced National Seismic System
ANT	Advanced Nuclear Technology
APC	Action Plan Committee
BP	Before Present
CERI	Center for Earthquake Research and Information
CEUS	Central and Eastern United States
CEUSAC	Central and Eastern United States And Canada
CEUS-SSC	Central and Eastern United States Seismic Source Characterization project
CGPS	Continuous Global Positioning System
CMS	Conditional Mean Spectra
CORS	Continuously Operating Reference Stations
COSMOS	Consortium of Organizations for Strong Motion Observation Systems
CPT	Cone Penetration Test
CS	Cellular Seismology
CUS	Central United States
CUSEC	Central United States Earthquake Consortium
CUSSO	Central United States Seismic Observatory
CUSVM	Central United States Velocity Model
DOE	Department of Energy
EAEHMP	Evansville Area Earthquake Hazards Mapping Project
EHP	Earthquake Hazards Program
ENA	Eastern North America
EPRI	Electric Power Research Institute
ESMA	EarthScope in Mid America
ETAS	Epidemic-Type Aftershock Sequence
ETSZ	Eastern Tennessee Seismic Zone
FA	Flexible Array
FAA	Federal Aviation Administration
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
GAMA	Global Position System Array for Mid America
GSC	Geological Survey of Canada
GIS	Geographic Information Systems
GMPE	Ground Motion Prediction Equation
GPS	Global Positioning System
H/V	Horizontal divided by Vertical ground motion
InSAR	Interferometric Synthetic Aperture Radar
IRIS	Incorporated Research Institutions for Seismology
ISC	International Seismological Centre
LiDAR	Light Detection and Ranging
LLNL	Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory
LNG	Liquefied Natural Gas
LPI	Liquefaction Potential Index
MAEC	Mid America Earthquake Center

Mmax	Maximum Magnitude
MoDOT	Missouri Department of Transportation
MSFS	Motagua-Swan Fault System
MS&T	Missouri University of Science and Technology
MT	Magnetotelluric
NAM	North America
NCEER	National Center for Earthquake Engineering Research
NEDB	National Earthquake Database
NEES	Network for Earthquake Engineering Simulation
NEHRP	National Earthquake Hazard Reduction Program
NGA	Next Generation of Ground Motion Attenuation Models
NMSZ	New Madrid Seismic Zone
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NRC	Nuclear Regulatory Commission
NSF	National Science Foundation
NVT	Non-Volcanic Tremor
OSL	Optically Stimulated Luminescence
PAGER	Prompt Assessment of Global Earthquakes for Response
PASSCAL	Program for Array Seismic Studies of the Continental Lithosphere
PBO	Plate Boundary Observatory
PGA	Peak Ground Acceleration
PPRP	Participatory Peer Review Panel
ReMi	Refraction Microtremor
Sa	Spectral Acceleration
SASW	Spectral Analysis of Surface Waves
SCPT	Seismic Cone Penetration Test
SCR	Stable Continental Region
SEMA	Missouri State Emergency Management Agency
SLAEHMP	St. Louis Area Earthquake Hazards Mapping Project
SLU	St. Louis University
S&ME	Soil and Material Engineers, Inc.
SOG	Seismicity Owners Group
SPT	Standard Penetration Test
SRFZ	Saline River Fault Zone
SSHAC	Senior Seismic Hazard Assessment Committee
SUSN	Southeastern United States Network
TA	Transportable Array
TI	Technical Integration team
UBC	Uniform Building Code
USArray	United States Array
USGS	United States Geological Survey
VGDB	Virtual Geotechnical Database
VOAD	Voluntary Organizations Active in Disasters
Vp	P-wave velocity
Vs	Shear wave velocity
Vs30	Average shear wave velocity in the upper 30 meters

WPC Wright Padgett Christopher, Inc.
WPP Wave Propagation Program
WVSZ Wabash Valley Seismic Zone

Meeting for the Central and Eastern United States (CEUS) Earthquake Hazards Program—October 28–29, 2009

Fogelman Conference Center, University of Memphis Memphis, Tennessee

By Martitia Tuttle,¹ Oliver Boyd,² and Natasha McCallister³

Introduction

On October 28th and 29th, 2009, the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) Earthquake Hazards Program held a meeting of Central and Eastern United States (CEUS) investigators and interested parties in Memphis, Tennessee (Tenn.). The purpose of the meeting was to bring together the CEUS earthquake-hazards community to present and discuss recent research results, to promote communication and collaboration, to garner input regarding future research priorities, to inform the community about research opportunities afforded by the 2010–2012 arrival of

¹Martitia Tuttle (formerly with the USGS in Memphis, TN)
Director and Principal Investigator
M. Tuttle & Associates
128 Tibbetts Lane
Georgetown, ME 04548
Telephone: 207-371-2007
mptuttle@earthlink.net

²Oliver Boyd
Research Geophysicist
U.S. Geological Survey
3876 Central Avenue, Ste. 2
Memphis, TN 38152-3050
olboyd@usgs.gov

³Natasha McCallister
Geologist
U.S. Geological Survey
3876 Central Avenue, Ste. 2
Memphis, TN 38152-3050
nmccallister@usgs.gov

EarthScope/USArray in the central United States, and to discuss plans for the upcoming bicentennial of the 1811–1812 New Madrid earthquakes. The two-day meeting included several keynote speakers, oral and poster presentations by attendees, and breakout sessions. The meeting is summarized in this report and can be subdivided into four primary sections: (1) summaries of breakout discussion groups; (2) list of meeting participants; (3) submitted abstracts; and (4) slide presentations. The abstracts and slides are included “as submitted” by the meeting participants and have not been subject to any formal peer review process; information contained in these sections reflects the opinions of the presenter at the time of the meeting and does not constitute endorsement by the U.S. Geological Survey.

Acknowledgments

We wish to thank Tom Pratt for a thorough review and Jill McCarthy and Amber Irish for time spent addressing Tom’s comments and improving the manuscript.

Images on the front cover: (left) Seismic-hazard map from the USGS hazard mapping website, (upper right) detail of seismic hazard in New Madrid from USGS hazard mapping website, and (lower right) seismicity in New Madrid region from U.S. Geological Survey Fact Sheet 2009–3071.

Report on Earthquake Hazards Program Meeting

Meeting Summary

In late October 2009, an Earthquake Hazards Program meeting of CEUS investigators and interested parties was held in Memphis, Tenn. The goal of the meeting was to bring together the CEUS earthquake-hazards research community to present and discuss recent research results, to promote communication and collaboration, to garner input regarding future research priorities, to inform the community about research opportunities afforded by the 2010–2012 arrival of EarthScope/USArray in the central United States, and to discuss plans for the upcoming bicentennial of the 1811–1812 New Madrid earthquakes. The two-day meeting was attended by about 100 people from universities and consulting firms from across North America. Major institutions represented included the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, State Geological Surveys of states in the central United States, the Central U.S. Earthquake Consortium (CUSEC) and the West Tennessee Seismic Safety Commission. In addition, scientists from a number of USGS offices also attended.

The meeting was structured around short oral presentations (10-minute limit) and several poster sessions; there were also several longer invited presentations. Invited speakers included David Applegate, USGS Senior Science Advisor for Earthquake and Geologic Hazards; Chuck Langston, Director of the Center for Earthquake Research and Information (CERI); and Anne Trehu, Director of the EarthScope National Office. David Applegate spoke about “Earthquake Hazards Program Priorities and Future Directions”; Chuck Langston explored “Research Challenges in the CEUS”; and Anne Trehu described various aspects of EarthScope and related research opportunities. In addition, Chris Cramer of CERI, Jim Wilkinson of CUSEC, and Tish Tuttle of the USGS (now at M. Tuttle and Associates) briefed the meeting on preparations, activities, and products planned for the Bicentennial of the 1811–1812 New Madrid earthquakes.

Investigators gave short oral and poster presentations organized in sessions on the following topics: earthquake sources; earthquake ground motion; paleoseismology; long-term deformation and deformation modeling; the New Madrid seismic zone; the Charleston, South Carolina seismic zone; historical seismicity; seismic velocity modeling and site response; seismic-hazard mapping and engineering applications; and educational outreach. In addition, there were breakout sessions on similar topics during which participants were asked to identify the most pressing earthquake-hazard issues and the most promising ways to address those issues. The session facilitators reported back to the larger group, and research priorities were further discussed. Reports from the breakout sessions are presented below.

The meeting was organized by the USGS staff in Memphis: Tish Tuttle (now at M. Tuttle and Associates), Oliver Boyd, and Natasha McCallister. Steve Horton of CERI and Walter Mooney of the USGS also helped plan, organize and facilitate parts of the meeting. The Central U.S. Multi-Hazards Initiative provided financial support for the meeting.

Breakout Sessions: Input on Research Priorities for the USGS Earthquake Hazard Program

Earthquake Sources and Magnitudes

Facilitator: John Ebel

Co-Facilitator: Sue Hough

Participants: Haydar Al-Shukri, Scott Ausbrooks, Mike Blanpied, Mike Bograd, John Ebel, Sue Hough, Joe Gilman, Peggy Guccione, Dave Hoffman, Shannon Mahan, Steve McDuffie, Walter Mooney, Kent Moran, Jerry Prewett, Alan Ruffman, John Tinsley, Tish Tuttle, Rus Wheeler

The purpose of this breakout session was to identify the important research questions concerning earthquake sources and earthquake magnitudes in the CEUS, and to consider possible ways to address these research questions. The discussion quickly focused on the importance of historical earthquake data (and by extension, paleoseismological earthquake data) to learn about seismic source zones in the CEUS. This focus emerged because most knowledge regarding seismic source zones in the CEUS comes from historic earthquake information, due to the relatively low level of instrumentally recorded earthquakes throughout the region. The participants in the discussion agreed that historic earthquake research is not adequately emphasized or funded. In particular, several participants felt that there is much to learn about historic earthquakes through additional research. Many newly identified historical earthquakes have been identified through digital archive searches of old newspapers. Furthermore, historical CEUS earthquake research over the past decade has upgraded the sizes of some earthquakes while decreasing the sizes of others. Mistaken earthquakes, triggered earthquakes, and non-tectonic seismic events have also been identified. Several participants felt strongly about the need for a centralized public database of original historic earthquake reports, perhaps maintained by the USGS.

The discussion also highlighted the need for more paleoseismic work in the region, especially for source zones where there currently are few or no known paleoseismological indicators of past earthquakes. One example is the eastern Tennessee seismic zone. The group did some brainstorming about new research techniques, such as age-data indicators in the

geology or high-resolution LiDAR (Light Detection And Ranging) surveys that might yield new information about the active seismotectonic sources in the CEUS. It was generally acknowledged that it might be challenging to receive positive results from these new research techniques in the short term. One caveat is that these methods might reveal structures that are unrelated to seismogenesis. There was also a suggestion that additional bedrock-geology mapping may be needed in some areas.

The discussion briefly touched on how to estimate magnitudes for earthquakes in the CEUS. Changing instrumentation requires careful calibration to ensure consistent magnitude estimates. Also, moment magnitude is the desired magnitude scale for earthquakes of all sizes, but reliable moment magnitudes can only be computed for earthquakes about M 4.5 in the region; methods must be developed to extend the moment magnitude calculations down to lower magnitudes. Finally, research must continue into the question of how to estimate the magnitudes of historic earthquakes.

Below is a summary of the major discussion points during the breakout session. For each discussion point a group vote was taken to assign a high (H), medium (M), or low (L) priority.

Priority List (H, high; M, medium; L, low):

- (H) Macroseismic information should be investigated and Spanish/foreign archives should be considered. Special attention should be paid to site effects. Calibration events may help investigators to evaluate historic information.
- (H) Paleoliquefaction evidence should be studied for other source zones. Investigators should document evidence and or the lack of evidence of strong ground shaking. Caves can be explored as a possible new area to find constraints on past ground-shaking information.
- (H) A database of age results from liquefaction events, cave formations, landslides, etc., will be helpful to future investigators.
- (H) Targeted LiDAR may lead to identification of earthquake related surface features. Possible targets are New England and central New Hampshire. However, the structure seen in LIDAR may be unrelated to seismogenesis.
- (M) Offshore sources should be more closely considered including the Atlantic and Gulf Coast. For example, can tsunami deposits and turbidite deposits be found and can they be used to constrain earthquake hazard? In New England, are there earthquakes that extend onto the continental slope and are they associated with submarine channels in sediments? What is the cause of 1800s/1890s increased seismicity around southwest Nova Scotia? Would an ocean-bottom seismometer deployment be helpful?
- (L–M) For site response, surface geological mapping including depth to bedrock is essential. This work would provide an important partnership with the states.
- (L) The use of geological indicators may give some insight into past seismic activity. Some examples include age-dating of landscapes to learn about the long-term landscape evolution (for example, cosmogenic dating for degrading of landscapes may not be ideal for trenches/CEUS) and river migration.
- (L) Oil company reflection images and other active source studies of the subsurface can be obtained to help elucidate possible active structures. However, oil company data are usually proprietary and cannot be published.

Ground Motion, Near-Surface Velocity Structure, and Site Amplification

Facilitator: Gail Atkinson

Co-Facilitator: Rob Williams

Participants (partial list): John Ake, Martin Chapman, Jer-Ming Chiu, Chris Cramer, Art Frankel, Dave Gaunt, Youseff Hashash, Tim Larson, Shahram Pezeshk, Larry Salomone, Arash Zhandieh, Zhenming Wang

This group held a wide-ranging discussion of earthquake ground motions, seismic velocity structures, and site amplification in the CEUS. The discussion focused on several issues, including: weaknesses in the understanding of CEUS attenuation, a lack of knowledge about the site conditions for seismograph sites that would be used to refine attenuation estimates, strong support for efforts to collect more data on near-surface seismic velocities and establishment of a publicly available database of existing seismic velocity data, and a common interest in the installation of more seismographs to fill holes in the coverage of existing networks. Another concern that arose was the need to review the applicability of western-United-States-derived relations on attenuation, non-linearity, and stress drop to the CEUS.

Attenuation Issues (High priority)

The discussion began with group recognition of the need for improved attenuation models (and verification) at all distance scales, especially less than 70 kilometers (km), but also through the transition zone and out to regional distances. The regional variability of attenuation is not well constrained in areas like New Madrid, southeastern Canada, and the northeastern United States. More ground-motion data from the CEUS is needed to address this problem; ground-motion information from smaller magnitude earthquakes is available and needs to be collected and analyzed. A project entitled Next Generation Attenuation for the central and eastern United States (NGA East) is aimed at collecting currently available data, including those across stable continental regions (SCRs). A top priority of NGA East is to make the best use of such data. Although more instruments are now in place thanks to the Advanced National Seismic System (ANSS), even denser networks are still needed in order to collect more data at a broader range of distances. There was brief discussion concerning the establishment of a better connection between “attenuation” in seismological terms—that is, wave propagation and seismic phases—versus engineering focus on decay of amplitudes. Ultimately, we need a deeper physical understanding of the bridge between seismology and engineering.

Instrumentation (High priority)

As noted above, the consensus of the group was that more seismic-monitoring stations are needed to collect ground-motion data and constrain attenuation relations in the CEUS. The arrival of EarthScope instrumentation, which is rolling through the region over an 18-month time period as the array moves from the West Coast to the East Coast, provides a short-term opportunity to collect relatively dense seismic data. Moreover, if a funding source can be found to purchase the equipment and operate the stations long term, these instruments could be kept

permanently. The Incorporated Research Institutions for Seismology (IRIS) has a formal policy to allow groups to purchase EarthScope instruments. The instruments are left in the ground, and IRIS is reimbursed for the cost of a new replacement instrument. Many stations have already been left in place under this program.

One difficulty in trying to find a benefactor for new permanent seismic stations is the lack of detailed operations and maintenance costs for the EarthScope sites. The concern was also expressed that the time to act is limited, and that the instruments may already be removed prior to any decision making. There was some discussion of the possibility of purchasing the EarthScope instrumentation after the Transportable Array experiment is over; another suggestion was to take over operation of the vaults for later installation and equipment purchase. It was also noted that the current sampling rate for USArray may not be high enough for earthquake-engineering purposes. It would be better to have accelerographs co-located with broadband instruments to receive fuller data sets because broadband instruments clip at close distances and thereby preclude the possibility of improved attenuation relations at less than 70 km.

Site Effects (Low priority for borehole arrays. High priority for basic data on velocity structure at existing stations)

There was broad agreement that the data from the current Central U.S. Seismic Observatory (CUSSO) downhole seismograph installation in southwestern Kentucky is crucial for understanding CEUS ground motions, especially for the New Madrid and Wabash Valley seismic zones. The CUSSO data should be made publicly available in near real time and used to look at site effects.

In an ideal science-funding world, the group would support the need for borehole arrays of seismometers to gain information on site effects. The information could be used for source studies if dense arrays can be deployed. Borehole array depths stretching as far as 1 km would be ideal but very expensive. The borehole arrays would be extremely useful in understanding soil nonlinearity. We are unaware if soil nonlinearity models from the western United States are applicable to eastern settings such as the Mississippi embayment, and more testing of the applicability of nonlinear models for eastern stratigraphy is required.

There was a strong consensus that basic site information (for example, seismic velocity and surficial geology) is needed for characterizing existing seismograph stations. In the CEUS, only about 20 percent of seismic stations have site-characterization measurements. If site conditions at existing stations are poorly known, then new models of attenuation and non-linearity will be adversely affected. The group discussed how NEHRP and similar programs can be leveraged to obtain this type of information; one potential program that could support such an effort might be the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's NGA East project. The group agreed that site-characterization studies of seismograph stations should be given a high priority; fortunately, efforts are being made in the west through American Recovery and Reinvestment Act stimulus funding to collect this information. Because of limitations in site-characterization methodologies, it was recommended that two techniques (or more) be used (for example, Refraction Microtremor (ReMi) and Spectral Analysis of Surface Waves (SASW) or reflection/refraction).

Liquefaction is another big issue that falls under the category of site effects. Because site-specific data and sophisticated laboratory studies are needed to assess liquefaction probabilities, the liquefaction problem is difficult to address regionally. Liquefaction studies are typically only done for high-value facilities.

Velocity Model (Moderate priority for 3D velocity models.)

The discussion group supported the acquisition of Vs30 seismic velocity data that can be used to address such problems as nonlinear soil behavior. They further recommended that a greater emphasis be put on acquiring deeper P- and S-wave velocity profiles that could extend to the base of sedimentary basins. Currently in the Mississippi embayment there are about 1,000 shallow surveys from about 30- to 50-meter (m) depth, but far fewer measurements that reach 100 m or more. The deeper seismic-velocity information is needed, particularly near the center of the basin, to improve ground-motion simulations and better constrain time histories.

In addition to the need for more individual (1-D) seismic velocity profiles, there was recognition that a 3-D seismic velocity model is also needed. Currently, USGS scientists are developing such a model (referred to as a “community velocity model”) for the Mississippi embayment. This model extends from just north of St. Louis, Missouri, and Evansville, Illinois, to just south of Memphis, Tennessee, and Little Rock, Arkansas.

Time History Models and Scaling (Moderate priority)

Scaling of time histories from earthquakes in the CEUS to match a target spectrum for the design of engineered structures is an engineering issue of importance where seismological input such as spectral acceleration and duration is necessary. This area has had little focus in the central and eastern United States, and while it was not a focus of the meeting, it is an issue that needs to be addressed.

Source Issues (High priority)

The group brainstormed a number of questions on source issues:

1. How do we take knowledge of small earthquakes and scale up to larger events?
2. Can we use a constant-stress model to scale from small to large earthquakes?
3. Is the variability of stress drop bigger in eastern North America than in the west?
4. What is the regional variability of stress drop, if any?
5. How can we better understand the source processes and how they translate to models of the amplitude spectrum (or other characterizations)?

See discussion for “Earthquake Sources and Magnitudes” breakout session.

Numerical and Analytical Models (Moderate priority)

There was a short discussion regarding whether or not we are happy with the tools we have to interpret seismic data. This discussion spanned a range of issues: source scaling, wave propagation, site response, and nonlinearity. It was agreed that it is beneficial to improve modeling methods in anticipation of testing them as data are gathered. For example, when modeling 3D propagation of Lg waves, significant (computing) resources are required. In general, there is a gap in many areas between standard practice (for example, the use of the program “Shake” for site response) and other procedures that may be more appropriate.

Our priority list of activities for the USGS includes:

- Improved attenuation models (and verification) at all distance scales, especially less than 70 km, but also through the transition zone and out to regional distances. We need to address

the question of whether attenuation varies regionally or is the same in the central United States compared to the eastern United States and Canada.

- Increased numbers of permanent seismograph installations to fill in monitoring holes and increase the density of the network.
- More ground-motion data to resolve attenuation issues; even data at smaller magnitudes are valuable and need to be collected and analyzed. We need to address the question of how strong and widespread non-linear effects will be in soft sediment areas.
- Analysis of site effects at the current CUSSO borehole seismometer station installation in Kentucky. For this to happen, the community needs access to the CUSSO data, which is currently not available to the public.
- More site-specific seismic velocity and geology information at existing seismograph stations. In addition, deeper penetrating P- and S-wave velocity profiles are needed—not just Vs30.
- More complete information on the basin velocity structure extending to as great a depth as possible, but to at least 200 m.
- A USGS-sponsored seismic velocity and/or site characterization database.

Geodesy and Modeling Ground Deformation

Facilitator: Michael Hamburger

Co-Facilitator: Eric Calais

Participants: Oliver Boyd, Eric Calais, James Davis, Michael Hamburger, Kathryn Hanson, Beatrice Magnani, Mary Parke, Thomas Pratt, Leonardo Ramirez-Guzman, Bob Smalley, Ron Zurawski

The geodesy and modeling ground deformation breakout session addressed the use of measurements of surface deformation to address basic scientific questions and issues related to seismic-hazard mitigation. We considered the quality and quantity of surface-deformation measurements and what could be done to improve their utility. We also considered issues related to modeling surface deformation observations and opportunities for EarthScope.

Two major issues exist with respect to geodesy and estimation of seismic hazards in the CEUS. Most importantly, surface deformation rates in the CEUS are low, and continuous geodetic monitoring has only been available for two decades. Therefore, the signal of strain accumulation that one would expect on active faults (by analogy with plate boundaries) remains elusive. Furthermore, monumentation and data are of variable quality, and high-quality observations are sparse. As a result, substantial uncertainty remains in our understanding of active deformation of the CEUS both in terms of its rate and spatial distribution.

The second major issue concerns a lack of understanding of earthquake processes in an intraplate setting: How do these processes relate to surface deformation? How does deformation vary with space and time? What is driving deformation? How do models of intraplate fault dynamics differ from those operating in interplate settings? A practical implication of this lack of understanding is that it is difficult to properly design geodetic networks to measure a deformation signal that has not yet been observed.

The group recommended several priorities for improving assessment of seismic hazards in the CEUS using geodesy. Specifically, the group suggested that improved density and quality of long-term geodetic observations are needed and that these observations must be coupled with modeling to help guide station deployment and data interpretation. The group recommended development of a comprehensive set of precise geodetic measurements that would provide baseline measurements prior to any future earthquake in the region, re-measurements of existing networks (including New Madrid, Wabash Valley, Charleston), improvement of monumentation for existing permanent networks (including Continuously Operating Reference Stations (CORS), National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration, Federal Aviation Administration), and continuous monitoring of data quality at existing permanent GPS networks. More specific questions and issues raised during the breakout session are provided below.

Large-scale scientific questions identified are:

- What are the spatial variability and rate of deformation in the CEUS? How do spatial variability and rate of deformation relate to seismic sources?
- How do earthquake processes in the CEUS relate to our fundamental understanding of earthquake physics?

- What are the local deformation patterns associated with intraplate seismic zones?
- How does background deformation compare inside and outside of intraplate seismic zones?
- What are some fundamental models of an intraplate seismic cycle?
- Is there detectable strain accumulation before large earthquakes in continental interiors?
- How applicable are interplate seismic models to plate interiors?
- Are there distinct processes in intraplate seismic zones?
- How do stresses in the crust relate to deformation processes?
- What are the active seismogenic/inactive structures in intraplate seismic zones?
- How strong are faults in intraplate zones? What can we infer from earthquake stress drop?
- What can we learn from large structures that are inactive (such as the Midcontinent Rift and Grenville Front)? Why are some large structures inactive? Have they been active recently? Will they reactivate?
- What is the relation between stress and strain in continental interiors?
- Does geodesy help to constrain seismic moment release?

Improvements to geodetic networks and data-gathering efforts include:

- Conducting more in-depth analysis of existing geodetic data;
- Expanding geodetic monitoring to include known geologic structures/seismicity areas (for example, Meers Fault, S. Illinois/Fluorspar District, E. Tennessee seismic zone);
- Conducting tests of the stability of North America reference frame;
- Increasing the density of existing permanent geodetic networks with campaign and semi-continuous deployments;
- Building hybrid models of continuous GPS + semi-continuous or campaign GPS;
- Improving CORS network by upgrading, for example, the monumentation (15–20 stations are slated for improvement);
- Improving/expanding the Plate Boundary Observatory (PBO) network (\$20–30,000/station);
- Re-measuring campaign stations (for example, Northwestern/Jet Propulsion Laboratory (JPL) network);
- Utilizing LiDAR, Interferometric synthetic aperture radar (InSAR), and other geodetic techniques to identify areas of crustal deformation;
- Deploying high-rate GPS gradiometer for intraplate strain measurements.

Modeling issues include assessing:

- Long-term, large-scale tectonic loading;
- Models of local deformation sources (role of density variation, impacts on local strain variability);
- Role of mantle processes as a constraint on intraplate deformation;
- Sedimentary loading, erosion, climate change, hydrologic loading, glacio-isostatic adjustment, lateral mass transfer, and sediment loading at the Gulf of Mexico;
- Time-variable processes;
- Thermal processes;
- Boundary conditions such as driving forces and rheology;
- Additional data such as V_p/V_s ratio and heat flow to constrain rheology in the modeling;

- The possibility of a “Virtual CEUS,” akin to “Virtual California,” where a heterogeneous and complex numerical model of the CEUS is developed to investigate the time evolution of strain and seismic potential;
- Transfer processes to address how deformation at depth is coupled with surface deformation.

Opportunities for EarthScope deployments include:

- Analysis of existing campaign data and the addition of new campaign measurements;
- Linkage with USArray deployments;
- Addition of backbone sites (co-located USArray/PBO sites);
- Modeling of lithosphere dynamics;
- Identification of heterogeneities and their role in intraplate deformation;
- Monument installation for semi-continuous stations;
- Increasing the spatial density of geodetic observations;

Highest Priority Issues for USGS are:

- Development of a comprehensive set of precise geodetic measurements that would provide baseline measurements prior to any future earthquake in the region;
- Re-measurement of existing networks (New Madrid, Wabash Valley, Charleston, etc.);
- Improvement of monumentation at existing networks (CORS, NOAA, FAA, etc.);
- Continuous monitoring of data quality at existing GPS networks.

Intraplate Earthquake Processes

Facilitator: Chris Powell

Co-Facilitator: Heather Deshon

Participants (partial list): Mahari Ayele, Martin Chapman, Randy Cox, Heather DeShon, Margret Guccione, Michael Hamburger, Robert Hatcher, Charles Langston, Michael Towle, Samuel Panno, Miguel Pando, Christine Powell, John Tinsley, Walter Mooney, Russell Wheeler

We posed the following question: why do intraplate earthquakes happen? This led to a lively discussion with a number of consensus opinions. These opinions include the following thoughts: (1) Although the role of plate tectonics in driving intraplate earthquake activity is undeniable, thinking outside of the plate-tectonics box may be necessary to understand why intraplate earthquakes occur where they do. (2) CEUS seismicity appears to concentrate in distinct places; there are enough seismic stations operating such that a uniform distribution of seismic stations with spacing comparable to the New Madrid seismic zone (NMSZ) seismic network would not reveal undetected seismic zones such as the East Tennessee seismic zone (ETSZ), NMSZ, and Charlevoix. (3) Inherited structure in the crust and in the lithosphere from past tectonic events is important and can help us understand why earthquakes concentrate in certain places. (4) Not all inherited structure is equal; this can help us understand why features such as the mid-continent geophysical anomaly are not seismically active. (5) Favorable orientation in the present-day stress field seems to be important, although some historically weak faults that have favorable orientation are not seismogenic. (6) There must be other factors beyond inherited structure that play important roles in earthquake occurrence such as local perturbations in stress, strain and material properties, variations in temperature and the presence of fluids. (7) The recurrence rate of large intraplate earthquakes may be telling us something fundamental about the physics of intraplate earthquakes that we do not understand. (8) Earthquake activity in the CEUS may migrate from place to place or may migrate within a seismic zone. (9) Stalagmite history suggests that the CEUS has experienced significant earthquake activity for at least the last 7,000 years (yr).

We suggest the following priorities for research projects:

- Use Earthscope instrumentation and/or smaller experiments to investigate the presence of inherited structure in the crust and lithosphere. Are there fundamental differences between crustal and lithospheric structure associated with active CEUS seismic zones and places that are aseismic?
- Conduct targeted experiments involving the flexarray, the portable magnetotelluric array, and campaign GPS surrounding active seismic zones to determine if there are distinct differences in crustal rheological properties and composition that make the active portions of the crust “unique.” Integrate various data sets to better constrain interpretations.

- Investigate areas of preexisting weaknesses that are currently aseismic (for example, mid-continent geophysical anomaly, Nemaha Ridge, Meers Fault) to assess the differences between these locations and locations of active seismicity.
- Conduct physical and numerical modeling to determine the influence of known structure, intrusions, rates of deformation, and erosion on earthquake occurrence, clustering, and recurrence rates.

We conclude with a very important point: A large role that the USGS can play is providing active sources for the targeted experiments. This includes reflection seismology experiments and participation in flexarray experiments associated with the passage of EarthScope.

Community Velocity Model and Earthquake Simulations

Facilitator: Leo Ramirez-Guzman (Rob Graves was not able to attend)

Participants (partial list): Jer-Ming Chiu, Carlos Huerta, Heather DeShon, Charles Langston, and Leonardo Ramirez-Guzman

The discussion was centered on: (1) the availability of information to adequately model the velocity and density structure of the central United States (CUS), (2) the appropriateness of extrapolating from geologic models, and (3) the ease of modifying and performing simulations using the CUS Velocity Model (CUSVM) currently under development. There was common agreement on the necessity for more velocity measurement campaigns, especially regarding the shallow structure of the region, which influences the inversions that help to constrain the deep structure. Attendees suggested that the CUSVM could be used as the initial condition for detailed local inversions. Participants discussed the usefulness of geologic models as guides in regions where information is scarce; extrapolations made only on geologic information need to be thoroughly tested. The facilitator gave a brief description of the model under development and conveyed information about how easy it would be for the research community to modify and incorporate new information, as well as to test hypotheses of wave propagation in the central United States. The participants proposed desirable tests to the model before it could be used by the earthquake-engineering community in the assessment of seismic hazard.

Our priority list for USGS activities include:

- Support of seismic velocity measurement campaigns;
- Making the CUSVM model available to the community—allowing accessibility and modifications to the model;
- Maintenance and support of wave propagation solvers;
- Incorporation of available fine-scale sediment structures and velocity models generated in different hazard mapping projects;
- Validation of the CUSVM using a well-defined dataset that tests the model's ability to simulate surface wave dispersion and amplitudes of shear waves—the set could be the 2008 Mt. Carmel and the 1991 USGS explosions experiment;
- Researching attenuation on multiple scales;
- Evaluating the model's ability to reproduce other datasets, for example, waveform gradiometry, slow deformations, or gravity.

Seismic-Hazard Mapping

Facilitator: Chris Cramer

Co-Facilitator: David Gaunt

Participants: Not provided

The seismic hazards breakout session was a guided discussion on urban hazards maps, seismic-hazard mapping efforts related to the New Madrid Earthquakes Bicentennial, and a listing of possible directions and priorities.

The first issue discussed was the value of the urban seismic-hazard mapping efforts and whether or not they should continue. The suggested subtopics for discussion were: (1) usefulness, (2) data availability, (3) role in building codes, and (4) whether urban hazard mapping efforts should include an assessment of risk in project efforts. The consensus on the usefulness of urban seismic-hazard maps is that they are useful to emergency managers, insurance companies, and engineers; the group therefore concluded that urban seismic-hazard mapping efforts in the CEUS should continue. Concern was expressed that the context and limitations of the maps (not site-specific, among other points) should continue to be emphasized to users. Not all engineers use the urban seismic hazard products, but several do for background material.

Regarding data availability, the consensus was that geological, geophysical, and geotechnical databases should be made available. More detail on site response should be accessible to the engineering community. It would be beneficial to identify ways to extend database availability past the life of a specific project (Memphis in particular). Session participants also suggested maintaining the availability via state geologic surveys and using the Consortium of Organizations for Strong Motion Observation Systems (COSMOS) model of a virtual database center with links to various repositories.

The role of urban hazard maps in building codes (and other regulatory applications) raised several points, including that 1:24,000 quadrangle maps should not be used for site-specific analysis (although they could serve as a guide). The earth science community's responsibility is to produce the "best" hazard maps and allow the engineering community to determine and set the building codes. Another area where urban hazard products could be applied would be the California model of "zone maps" (zones where site-specific determination and mitigation should be considered by developers) for earthquake-related landslide, liquefaction and, shaking hazards. A consideration should be made towards providing more detailed urban seismic-hazard maps that move toward being more site-specific. Limitations of the urban maps must be more efficiently communicated. Also, a better quality assurance study of the methodology (including soil response codes) should be conducted to assess the appropriateness and accuracy of the maps.

Two suggestions were discussed regarding whether or not the urban hazard mapping project should provide risk (loss) assessment products: (1) whether this role is more appropriate for the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), and (2) whether urban hazard maps could be tied into products like the USGS product, Prompt Assessment of Global Earthquakes

for Response (PAGER). Additionally, it was suggested that urban hazard mapping products could be made available for use in FEMA's Hazus software to be more useful to emergency managers and those who evaluate risk in general.

At this point, the discussion shifted to suggestions for improving the quality and resolution of input information. The effect of soil geology is becoming more widely recognized and points to the need for more and better shear-wave velocity (V_s) measurements and the use of geophysics (refraction and reflection) to improve geologic layer estimates between existing well logs and geotechnical measurements. A clear definition of bedrock is needed, as definitions differ in California and CEUS. General practice should move towards applying soil-response models to hard-rock (bedrock) ground motions and away from the current practice of applying soil class factors. (This has already occurred in urban seismic-hazard mapping but needs to be emphasized.) Additionally, some panel participants requested that urban hazard mapping better identify areas of relandscaping (removal and redistribution of material), fill, filled quarries, and liquefaction hazard.

The group then asked who should be involved in the urban seismic-hazard mapping process? The initial list of suggestions included researchers, government agencies, the business sector, and the public. Additional responses added building-code officials and engineers. The group agreed that all of these types of individuals and more should be involved in the process at some level, and it was suggested that the urban hazard mapping process should involve an educational element as well as product generation and dissemination. Members of the discussion group discussed the trend/habit to "one-stop-shop" in the government permitting process, and urban seismic-hazard mapping products should be made available through those venues.

One last suggestion was to conduct one or more comprehensive reflection line(s) across an urban area to identify areas of potentially active faulting beneath cities. The context of this suggestion was Memphis, but is applicable in general. Recent results of a Mississippi River survey by Beatrice Magnani at CERl, which identified faulting near Memphis, was given as an example (unpublished data). Overall, the group agreed that although the scientific value of such efforts is clear, it may not be cost effective in all urban settings.

The group eventually asked what products and activities related to seismic-hazard maps would be desirable to complete for the New Madrid Earthquakes Bicentennial in 2011–2012. Six suggestions were made (not in order of priority): (1) update and expand the Memphis urban hazard maps to all of Shelby County; (2) generate maps for Little Rock, Arkansas (Ark.), and the New Madrid area communities; (3) conduct a cross-Memphis (approximately E–W) seismic reflection survey to identify potentially active faults beneath Memphis; (4) produce hazard maps at several scales such as regional, quadrangle, and more detailed (smaller scale); (5) produce new scenario maps beyond current New Madrid M7.7 and Marked Tree M6.2 scenarios, particularly for new geologic features (that is, the new Mississippi River fault feature mentioned above) and for M greater than or equal to six earthquakes near specific CUS communities; and (6) drill and instrument a deep borehole in the Mississippi embayment targeting fault intersections (possibly use directional drilling and try to partner with exploration industry).

When asked which of these desirable products and activities can reasonably expect to be completed for the bicentennial, the consensus was the various hazard maps and the cross-Memphis reflection line (first five tasks listed in the previous paragraph).

Urban hazard mapping priorities were also discussed. Criteria for setting priorities should be based on the hazard/risk of an urban area, community involvement, and researcher interest.

Federal Emergency Management Agency document, FEMA 366, provides guidance concerning hazard/risk and would assist in setting priorities. Several target urban areas were suggested by advocates present (not in priority order): Memphis, Tenn., update; Little Rock, Ark.; Charleston, South Carolina (S.C.); New York, New York (N.Y.); Boston, Massachusetts (Mass.); and Providence, Rhode Island (R.I.). The consensus of the participants was that consideration should be given to conducting urban hazard mapping projects in more than one urban area at the same time to meet the high demand for such products in these communities. Additionally, there is a need to educate the public and the next generation of earth-science and engineering professionals and to provide them with the appropriate knowledge and understanding of seismic hazard and hazard maps.

The following is a list of considerations for future urban seismic-hazard mapping.

Criteria for project selection should include:

- Hazard vs. Risk (FEMA 366)—infrastructure at risk should be as important a consideration as ground shaking hazard;
- Community Involvement—evidence for user community involvement/interest in a working group or advisory committee;
- Researcher Interest—availability of a research community sufficient to develop urban hazard maps for a project.

Possible future projects can be done for multiple cities simultaneously to meet the high demand for this type of product and include Charleston, S.C.; Little Rock, Ark.; New York, N.Y.; and Boston, Mass. Projects need a component of education for the public and the next generation of hazard mapping professionals to provide hazard mapping professionals with the appropriate knowledge and understanding of hazard maps.

Education, Outreach, and the New Madrid Earthquakes Bicentennial

Facilitator: Jim Wilkinson

Co-Facilitator: Phyllis Steckel

Participants: Brian Blake, Elaine Clyburn, Perle Dorr, Sue Evers, Joe Gillman, Sue Hough, Natasha McCallister, Walter Mooney (part of the time), Kent Moran, Alisa Nave, Sam Panno, Phyllis Steckel, Michael Towle, Tish Tuttle (part of the time), Jim Wilkinson, Stan Weinrich, Ron Zurawski

Most of those who participated in the Education, Outreach, and the New Madrid Earthquakes Bicentennial session are already active in this work area. These individuals are able to meet face-to-face only infrequently; face-to-face meetings are extremely valuable for planning and coordination purposes. An annual (or at least a biannual) meeting similar to this one is recommended.

Numerous new and veteran ideas were discussed that both are appropriate and provide a favorable cost-benefit comparison, including: (1) develop a Governor's Earthquake Advisory Commission/Council; (2) engage Voluntary Organizations Active in Disasters (VOAD) and faith-based groups; (3) build on coincidence of EarthScope; (4) enlist kids to enlist their families; (5) develop and support media interest. However, having the staff available to develop the new outreach ideas and/or the funding to implement them are problematic in essentially all cases.

There are many education and outreach efforts in progress. The rate of progress for these efforts, as well as the expansion into new projects, could be improved with consistent and dependable levels of staffing and funding. In general, it was agreed that there are many more excellent, feasible ideas than it will be possible to implement.

The New Madrid earthquake issue is somewhat clouded by misinformation. Some misinformation has evolved within popular culture over many years, whereas some has developed more recently from diverse interpretations of research results by researchers. It is important that all misinformation is corrected in a clear and timely manner.

There was some discussion of the need for a "marketing plan" for the New Madrid outreach effort. This could formalize the effort and clearly identify goals, projects, methods, audiences, and responsibilities. It was agreed that the number of states involved and the general funding available for such coordination is also now problematic.

The following is a priority list for USGS activities organized into three main themes.

Education programs need to be developed and implemented for:

- K-12 and general audiences;
- Private-sector audiences (including business, industry, equity, and insurance);
- Public-sector audiences (including elected officials, public infrastructure), for example, a Governor's Earthquake Advisory Commission/Council and earthquake program managers (in state emergency management agencies);
- First-responders (including fire and police);

- “Second-responders” active in response and recovery (including VOAD and faith-based groups).

Outreach efforts include:

- Opportunities to build on the EarthScope project by teaching the public about earth structure and earthquakes;
- Enlisting new media (including Facebook and Twitter) to reach online audiences;
- Participating in primary outreach outlets, for example:
 - Print and published—newspapers, magazines; books; reports; etc.
 - The New Madrid Field Trip Guidebook (USGS Open-File Report publication);
 - Broadcast and electronic—televised special programming and news and webcasts;
 - Static and events—museum displays, field trips, workshops, conferences, town hall meetings, etc.
 - “Earthquakes: Mean Business,” a meeting about earthquake hazards for varied professionals in businesses affected by earthquakes;
 - Interstate 55 Marston (New Madrid) Rest Stop where an earthquake display was erected;
 - Commissioned play or musical piece;
 - *The Earthquake Trail*, a set of stops in the New Madrid region significant for historic earthquakes;
- Opportunities to balance mainstream media attention given to research that claims “New Madrid is dead”; for example, webcasts customized for specific public- and private-sector interests (including insurance, media, finance, equity, infrastructure, and transportation);
- Consistent coordination between researchers and media; for example, opportunities to leverage “photogenic” field work into feature stories should be pursued;
- Diversifying historical research—almost exclusively within European-American heritage so far—to incorporate:
 - Native American sources,
 - Spanish-language sources, and
 - French-language sources.

New Madrid Earthquakes Bicentennial efforts include:

- Opportunities to complement EarthScope by having bicentennial events highlight EarthScope research related to earthquakes in the midcontinent;
- Enlisting specific historical sources and sites to attract mainstream media attention, for example:
 - Experiences of famous people (including Lincoln);
 - Earthquakes’ influence on courses of other histories (including the War of 1812, settlement patterns).

We conclude that a major priority for the USGS concerns information sharing and coordination. There is a need for those working in the New Madrid region to meet specifically and regularly (approximately 1–2 yr) to discuss, brainstorm, plan, coordinate, communicate, and rejuvenate efforts.

EarthScope and the Earthquake Hazards Program

Facilitators: Steve Horton and Beatrice Magnani

Participants: Not provided.

EarthScope is moving east, and as the Transportable Array (TA) moves through the Midcontinent, our knowledge about continental lithosphere and the upper mantle will be greatly enhanced. The average station spacing of TA stations (approximately 70 km) will limit the lateral resolution, and the “automatic” analysis based on teleseismic arrivals (for example, receiver functions) with a maximum signal frequency around 1 hertz (Hz) will have limited vertical resolution, particularly of the middle to upper crust. Still, regional and local earthquake and explosion signals along with ambient noise will be recorded by the TA. Studies utilizing the TA data (for example, for anelastic and scattering attenuation, ground motion attenuation relationships, or noise cross correlation [to obtain “surface waves” that can be inverted to derive V_s]) would enhance hazard assessment and should be encouraged by the USGS Earthquake Hazard Program (EHP). As noted by the community vision EarthScope workshop on page 17 (Krishna, 2004), these data might also be used for “surface-wave dispersion measurements, P_n and P_g tomography models, seismic scattering and attenuation studies, and long-range seismic refraction and reflection experiments ... to image the lithosphere with unprecedented resolution.” In addition, it would be sensible to mine these data for microseismicity to help identify previously unknown areas of activity. These activities should be of medium-high priority only because they can be done after the TA moves through the region. Site characterization at TA stations (as they move toward more populated areas in the CEUS) is a low priority until important data are recorded.

On page 15 (Krishna, 2004), the community vision EarthScope workshop report hypothesizes that “Modern earthquakes in the central and eastern U.S. (CEUS) concentrate in areas of major crustal and/or lithospheric preexisting zones of weakness.” The EarthScope in Mid-America (ESMA) Workshop Report also states that one of their major scientific questions is: to what extent do inherited crustal and mantle structures influence modern seismogenesis? Approaches that could help address this question include: (1) the use of active sources to supplement Flexible Array (FA) and TA studies adjacent to active seismic zones and other areas where scientists wish to understand differences and similarities between active and quiescent/stable areas; and (2) the acquisition of higher resolution potential field data to piggyback FA deployments and to determine if there is a potential field signature that characterizes seismically active areas. As the TA moves through the region, there will be a unique opportunity to obtain instrumentation (through the FA) and funding (from EarthScope and perhaps the EHP) for targeted high-resolution studies of the middle and upper crust. The EHP is encouraged to consider supporting experiments that will take advantage of the presence of the TA/FA.

The community vision EarthScope workshop report suggests on page 15 that these preexisting zones of weakness can be imaged with good spatial resolution by seismic methods.

Determinations of the locations and mechanical properties of major crustal and/or lithospheric zones of weakness and their surrounding basements will help define those areas of highest seismic hazard in the CEUS.

The report suggests that experiments utilizing a very dense array of the EarthScope portable instrumentation to obtain crustal seismic velocity images in local areas of the most important seismic activity in the CEUS will be very important in the search to identify exactly which basement geologic features are seismically active today. Such detailed experiments, with station spacing no more than a few hundred meters, could be carried out for the Ramapo fault, which stretches through New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, and such areas as the New Madrid, Charleston, eastern Tennessee, and central New Hampshire seismic zones to image basement faults or other geologic features with which the local concentrations of earthquakes may be associated. These rich new datasets would help determine what crustal properties are common to all of these active seismic source zones.

This activity is a high priority supported by the two EarthScope workshops held in the eastern United States, the keynote presentation in this meeting by Chuck Langston, and the consensus opinion of the participants of this breakout session.

The role of fluids in earthquake processes (for example, as illuminated by magnetotelluric (MT) methods) is a significant question and a major theme of the Earthscope workshop report. As noted by keynote speaker Anne Trehu, a number of MT instruments are potentially available through EarthScope. The participants agreed that advocating and supporting the placement of magnetotelluric instruments in the New Madrid seismic zone should be a high priority for the USGS.

Other topics that were discussed include the adoption of USArray stations (including long-term maintenance) and the enhancement of the geodetic infrastructure for the eastern and central United States.

Although supported by the group, adoption of USArray stations probably falls under the purview of ANSS. Enhancement of the geodetic infrastructure is covered under the Geodesy Breakout Session.

Priority investigations and data-gathering efforts supported by the USGS should include:

- Investigating differences and similarities between active and quiescent areas by conducting active source seismological investigations using the FA and TA;
- Studying the role of fluids in earthquake processes (for example, Montana);
- Conducting experiments that will take advantage of the presence of the TA/FA;
- Collecting higher-resolution potential field data as a piggyback to FA deployments;
- Analyzing TA data for such things as scattering attenuation, ground-motion attenuation relationships, noise-cross correlation, and other properties and processes that enhance seismic hazard assessment;
- Conducting site-characterization studies at TA stations (as we move toward more populated areas in the CEUS).

Reference Cited

Sinha, A. Krishna, comp., 2004, A community vision of EarthScope science frontiers in eastern North America (Appalachian Geologic Province): Arlington, Virginia, National Science Foundation, 32 p., accessed March 13, 2013, at http://www.earthscope.org/es_doc/workshops/WS-communityvision.pdf.

Appendixes

I. Meeting Agenda

Wednesday, October 28, 2009

Registration and Poster Hanging 7:30–8:00 am

Welcome and Opening Remarks 8:00–8:05 am

Tish Tuttle, USGS

Earthquake Hazards Program Priorities and Future Direction 8:05–8:25 am

David Applegate, USGS

Research Challenges in the CEUS 8:25–9:00 am

Chuck Langston, CERl

Earthquake Sources 9:00–9:35 am

Posters Room 316

Salomone, L., and others: Development of the Central and Eastern U.S. Seismic Source Zone Characterization Model

Falero, V, and others: Catalog Development for the EPRI/DOE/NRC CEUS SSC Project

Wheeler, R., Johnston, A. C.: USGS Estimation of $M(\max)$ East of the Rocky Mountains

Mooney, W., J. Ritsema: M_{\max} and Lithospheric Structure in Central and Eastern North America

Ebel, J.: Analysis of Aftershock and Foreshock Activity in Stable Continental Regions: Implications for Aftershock Forecasting and the Hazard of Strong Earthquakes

Kafka, A.: Does Seismicity Delineate Zones Where Future Large Earthquakes are Likely to Occur in the Central and Eastern United States

Poster Viewing 9:35–10:25 am

Earthquake Ground Motion 10:25–10:55 am

Posters Room 215

Atkinson, G.: Ground Motion Trends and Issues for ENA

Pezeshk, S., and others: Ground-Motion Prediction Equations for Eastern North America from a Hybrid Empirical Method

Shulman, D., W. Mooney: Earthquake Rupture Directivity and Local Site Effects from a M 7.3 Earthquake

Ray, R.: Dynamic Testing by Resonant Column and Torsional Shear Methods

Wolf, L., and others: A Microtremor Study in the New Madrid Seismic Zone

New Madrid Seismic Zone 10:55–11:30 am

Posters Room 217

Hough, S.: The 1811–1812 New Madrid Sequence: Mainshocks, Aftershocks, and Beyond

Moran, N., and others: A Phenomenon of a Most Alarming Nature

Horton, S., and others: Seismotectonics of the New Madrid Seismic Zone

Langston, C., and others: The Search for Non-volcanic Tremor in the New Madrid Seismic Zone Using a Phased Seismic Array

DeShon, H., and others: Characterizing Near Fault Velocity Structure and Seismogenesis along the New Madrid Seismic Zone

Powell, C., and others: P- and S-wave Velocity Structure and V_p/V_s Ratios in the New Madrid Seismic Zone

Lunch and Poster Viewing 11:30am–1:00 pm

Paleoseismology 1:00–2:00 pm

Posters Main Conference Room

Tuttle, M., and others: Migration of Large Earthquakes Indicates Distributed Strain in the Central United States

Van Arsdale, R., R. Csontos: Geologic Model Testing in the New Madrid Seismic Zone Region

Rains, D., M. Guccione: Tantalizing Suggestions for Late Pleistocene to Middle Holocene Surface Deformation at the Southeastern Margin of Reelfoot Rift, the Marianna Gap in Crowley's Ridge

Cox, R., and others: Progress Report on Investigation of Holocene Faulting and Liquefaction along the Southern Margin of the North American Craton (AL-OK Transform)

Woolery, E., and others: Site-specific Fault Rupture Hazard Assessment—Fluorspar Area Fault Complex, Western Kentucky

Counts, R., and others: Paleoseismic Features within the Wabash Valley Seismic Zone in Western Kentucky

Obermeier, S., and others: Paleoseismic Investigation of the East Tennessee Seismic Zone: Preliminary Results

Mahan, S., and others: Can OSL be Used to Date Paleoliquefaction Events?

Panno, S., and others: Major Earthquakes Recorded by the Initiation and/or Regrowth of Speleothems in Midwestern U.S. Caves: Results from a 2008-2009 NEHRP-Funded Investigation

Tinsley, J.: Damage to Ozark Cave Formations, Ozark Caves, and the New Madrid Seismic Zone—A Nascent Paleoseismologic Perspective

Poster Viewing 2:00–2:45 pm

Long-Term Deformation and Deformation Modeling 2:45–3:25 pm

Posters Room 218

Pratt, T.: Insights into the Structure and Long-term Deformation in the New Madrid Region from Seismic Reflection Profiles

Magnani, M., and others: Long-term Deformation History in the Mississippi Embayment: The Mississippi River Seismic Survey

Williams, R., and others: Post-Eocene Deformation Observed in Seismic Profiles Across the South Western Blytheville Arch, Crowley's Ridge, and Western Reelfoot Rift Margin, AR

Smalley, B, and others: Geodesy and the Enigma of Stable Continental Earthquakes

Calais, E., and others: Time-variable Deformation in the New Madrid Seismic Zone

Boyd, O., and others: Deformation Modeling in the Central United States

Hamburger, M., and others: Is There a Connection Between Seismicity and Deformation in the New Madrid and Wabash Valley Seismic Zones?

Poster Viewing 3:25–4:00 pm

Breakout Sessions 4:00–5:30 pm

Earthquake Sources and Magnitudes Room 316

John Ebel (Facilitator) and Sue Hough (Co-Facilitator)

Ground Motion, Near-Surface Velocity Structure, Site Amplification Room 215

Gail Atkinson (Facilitator) and Rob Williams (Co-Facilitator)

Geodesy and Modeling Ground Deformation Room 218

Mike Hamburger (Facilitator) and Eric Calais (Co-Facilitator)

Intraplate Earthquake Processes Room 217

Chris Powell (Facilitator) and Heather Deshon (Co-Facilitator)

Group Dinner — *Rendezvous Restaurant* (optional)

Depart Fogelman 6:10 pm

Thursday, October 29, 2009

Charleston, SC Seismic Zone and Eastern US 8:00–8:30 am

Posters Room 217

Gassman, S., and others: Maximum Magnitudes of Charleston, South Carolina Earthquakes from In Situ Geotechnical Data

Chapman, M., J. Beale: Results of Reprocessing Seismic Reflection Data near Summerville, SC

Andrus, R., T. Heidari: Mapping Liquefaction Potential of Soil Deposits near Charleston, SC

Ruffman, A.: Systematic Historical Seismicity Research: An Essential Adjunct in the Pre-instrumental Period

Pando, M., and others: Recent and Current Earthquake Hazard Reduction Research at the Puerto Rico Strong Motion Program

Seismic Velocity Modeling and Site Response 8:30–9:05 am
Posters Room 217

Ramirez-Guzman, L., and others: Central United States Velocity Model Version 1: Description and Validation

Chiu, J., E. Woolery: High-resolution P- and S-wave Velocity Structure of the Post-Paleozoic Sediments in the Upper Mississippi Embayment

Wang, Z., and others: The Central U.S. Seismic Observatory (CUSO) and its Implication

Dolenc, D., S. Horton: Effects of Shallow 3D Structure of the Mississippi Embayment on Ground-motion Amplification

Ni, S., et al: Earthquake Source and Ground Motion Characteristics in the Central and Eastern United States

Graves, R.: Ground Motion Simulations for the 1811 and 1812 New Madrid Earthquakes

Poster Viewing 9:05–9:50 am

Seismic-Hazard Mapping & Engineering Applications 9:50–10:40 am
Posters Main Conference Room

Williams, R., and others: SLAEHMP Technical Working Group: The St. Louis Area Earthquake Hazards Mapping Project–SLAEHMP

Cramer, C.: Suite of CEUS-specific Hard-rock Time-histories and Seismic Hazard Model Updates for the St. Louis Area Earthquake Hazards Mapping Project

Chung, J., J. Rogers: Geodatabase and Earthquake Hazards Mapping for the St. Louis Area

Gaunt, D.: Surficial Material Geologic Mapping in Support of the St. Louis Area Earthquake Hazard Mapping Project

Watkins, C.: Status of Data Collection for the St. Louis Earthquake Hazards Mapping Project in 2009

Boyd, O., and others: Evansville Area Earthquake Hazards Mapping Project

Hashash, Y., and others: Conditional Mean Spectra as a Bridge between Probabilistic and Deterministic Seismic Hazard Assessment

Luco, N., and others: New Seismic Design Maps and Associated Web Products for the 2012 International Building and Residential Codes

Education and Outreach 10:40–10:50 am

Posters Room 218

Steckel, P.: The New Madrid Field Trip Guidebook

Patterson, G.: Public Earthquake Resource Center

EarthScope Experiments and EHP 10:50–11:30 am

Anne Trehu, EarthScope National Office

New Madrid Earthquakes Bicentennial Plans 11:30–11:45 am

Tish Tuttle, USGS; Chris Cramer, CERI; Jim Wilkinson, CUSEC

Lunch and Poster Viewing 11:45 am–1:30 pm

Breakout Sessions 1:30–3:00 pm

Community Velocity Model and Earthquake Simulations Room 217

Rob Graves (Facilitator) and Leo Ramirez-Guzman (Co-Facilitator)

Seismic-Hazard Mapping Room 215

Chris Cramer (Facilitator) and David Gaunt (Co-Facilitator)

Education, Outreach, New Madrid Earthquakes Bicentennial Room 218

Jim Wilkinson (Facilitator) and Phyllis Steckel (Co-Facilitator)

EarthScope and Earthquake Hazards Program Room 316

Steve Horton (Facilitator) and Beatrice Magnani (Co-Facilitator)

Reports Back from Breakouts and Group Discussion 3:00–4:30 pm

Session Leaders

Closing Remarks 4:30–4:35 pm

Tish Tuttle, USGS

Poster Dismantling 4:35–5:00 pm

II. List of Conference Attendees

Al-Shukri, Haydar	alshukri@seismo.ualr.edu	University of Arkansas Little Rock
Anderson, Bob	andersonb@calquake.com	CA Seismic Safety Commission
Andrus, Ronald	randrus@clemson.edu	Clemson University
Applegate, David	applegate@usgs.gov	U.S. Geological Survey
Assimaki, Dominic	dominic@gatech.edu	Georgia Institute of Technology
Atkinson, Gail	gmatkinson@aol.com	University of Western Ontario
Ausbrooks, Scott	scott.ausbrooks@arkansas.gov	Arkansas Geological Survey
Beverly Cook	becook@memphis.edu	University of Memphis
Blake, Brian	bblake@cusec.org	Central US Earthquake Consortium
Blanpied, Mike	mblanpied@usgs.gov	U.S. Geological Survey
Bograd, Mike	michael_bograd@deq.state.ms.us	MS Office of Geology
Boyd, Oliver	olboyd@usgs.gov	U.S. Geological Survey
Calais, Eric	ecalais@purdue.edu	Purdue University
Calvert, Mike	mcalvert@cusec.org	Central US Earthquake Consortium
Chapman, Martin	mcc@vt.edu	Virginia Polytechnic Institute
Chiu, Jer-Ming	jerchiu@memphis.edu	University of Memphis
Chung, Jae-Won	jc8r4@mst.edu	MO Univ. of Science and Tech.
Clyburn, Elaine	elaineclyburn@yahoo.com	West Tenn. Seismic Safety Comm.
Counts, Ron	rcounts@email.uky.edu	University of Kentucky
Cox, Randel	randycox@memphis.edu	University of Memphis
Cramer, Chris	ccramer@memphis.edu	University of Memphis
DeShon, Heather	hdeshon@memphis.edu	University of Memphis
Dolenc, David	ddolenc@d.umn.edu	University of Minnesota Duluth
Dorr, Perle	perle.dorr@iris.edu	IRIS Consortium
Ebel, John	ebel@bc.edu	Boston College
Ebersole, Sandy	Sebersole@gsa.state.al.us	Geological Survey of Alabama
Frankel, Art	afrankel@usgs.gov	U.S. Geological Survey
Gassman, Sarah	gassman@cec.sc.edu	University of South Carolina
Gaunt, David	david.gaunt@dnr.mo.gov	MO Dept. of Natural Resources
Gillman, Joe	Joe.gillman@dnr.mo.gov	MO Dept. of Natural Resources
Glaser, Laura	laura.glaser@amec.com	AMEC Geomatrix
Graves, Robert	robert_graves@urscorp.com	URS Group, Inc.
Guccione, Margaret	guccione@uark.edu	University of Arkansas, Fayetteville
Hackley, Keith	hackley@isgs.illinois.edu	Illinois Geological Survey
Hafner, Katrin	hafner@iris.edu	IRIS Consortium
Hajihashemi, Ali	hjhshemi@memphis.edu	University of Memphis
Hamburger, Michael	hamburg@indiana.edu	Indiana University
Hanson, Kathryn	Kathryn.Hanson@amec.com	AMEC Geomatrix
Harrison, Richard	rharriso@usgs.gov	U.S. Geological Survey
Hartleb, Ross	hartleb@lettis.com	William Lettis & Associates, Inc.
Hashash, Youssef	hashash@uiuc.edu	Univ. of IL Champaign-Urbana
Hatcher, Bob	bobmap@utk.edu	Univ. of Tenn., Knoxville
Hoffman, David	Dhoffman@mst.edu	MO Univ. of Science and Tech.

Horton, Stephen	shorton@memphis.edu	University of Memphis
Hough, Susan	hough@usgs.gov	U.S. Geological Survey
Huerta, Carlos	carlos.huerta@upr.edu	Univ. of Puerto Rico, Mayaguez
Johnson, David	David.Johnson@adem.arkansas.gov	Arkansas Geological Survey
Keifer, John	kiefer@uky.edu	University of Kentucky
Langston, Charles	clangstn@memphis.edu	University of Memphis
Larson, Timothy	tlarson@isgs.illinois.edu	CUSEC- Illinois Rep
Lindvall, Scott	lindvall@lettis.com	William Lettis & Associates, Inc.
Magnani, Beatrice	mmagnani@memphis.edu	University of Memphis
Mahan, Shannon	smahan@usgs.gov	U.S. Geological Survey
Mahdi, Hanan	hhmahdi@ualr.edu	University of Arkansas Little Rock
Marble, John	John_Marble@deq.state.ms.us	MS Office of Geology
McCallister, Natasha	nmccallister@usgs.gov	U.S. Geological Survey
McCarthy, Jill	jmccarthy@usgs.gov	U.S. Geological Survey
McDuffie, Steve	Stephen_M_McDuffie@RL.gov	Nuclear Regulatory
Commission		
Mills, Hugh	hmills@tntech.edu	Earth Science Dept. Tenn Tech
Mooney, Walter	mooney@usgs.gov	U.S. Geological Survey
Moran, Nathan	nk Moran@memphis.edu	University of Memphis
Mueller, Chuck	cmueller@usgs.gov	U.S. Geological Survey
Murray, Mark	murray@ees.nmt.edu	New Mexico Inst. of Mining & Tech.
Ni, Sidao	Stone_Ni@URSCorp.com	URS Group, Inc.
Odum, Jack	odum@usgs.gov	U.S. Geological Survey
Olgun, Guney	olgun@vt.edu	Virginia Polytechnic Institute
Pando, Miguel	mpando@uprm.edu	Univ. of Puerto Rico, Mayaguez
Panno, Samuel	panno@isgs.uiuc.edu	Illinois Geological Survey
Patterson, Gary	glptrsn@memphis.edu	University of Memphis
Pezeshk, Shahram	spezeshk@memphis.edu	University of Memphis
Powell, Christine	capowell@memphis.edu	University of Memphis
Pratt, Tom	tpratt@usgs.gov	U.S. Geological Survey
Prewett, Jerry	patrick.mulvany@dnr.mo.gov	Missouri Geological Survey
Pujol, Jose	jpujol@memphis.edu	University of Memphis
Ramirez-Guzman, L.	lramirezguzman@usgs.gov	U.S. Geological Survey
Ray, Richard	ray@engr.sc.edu	University of South Carolina
Rogers, David	rogersda@mst.edu	MO Univ. of Science and Tech.
Rosenblad, Brent	rosenbladb@missouri.edu	University of Missouri
Ruffman, Alan	aruffman@dal.ca	Geomarine Associates Ltd.
Salomone, Larry	lawrence.salomone@srs.gov	CEUS SSC Project Manager
Shulman, Deborah	dshulman@usgs.gov	U.S. Geological Survey
Smalley, Bob	rsmalley@memphis.edu	University of Memphis
Spooner, Jeff	jspooner@usgs.gov	U.S. Geological Survey
Steckel, Phyllis	psteckel@charter.net	Independent
Stirewalt, Gerry	Gerry.Stirewalt@nrc.gov	Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Stovall, Scott	spstovll@memphis.edu	University of Memphis
Tinsley, John	jtinsley@usgs.gov	U.S. Geological Survey
Trehu, Ann	trehu@coas.oregonstate.edu	EarthScope National Office

Tuttle, Martitia	mptuttle@usgs.gov	U.S. Geological Survey
Van Arsdale, Roy	rvanrsdl@memphis.edu	University of Memphis
Villalobos-Pogue, V. Survey	Veronica.Pogue@adem.arkansas.gov	Arkansas Geological Survey
Wang, Zhenming	zmwang@uky.edu	University of Kentucky
Watkins, Conor	cwatkins@usgs.gov	U.S. Geological Survey
Weinrich, Stanley	stanweinrich@yahoo.com	West Tenn. Seismic Safety Comm.
Wheeler, Rus	wheeler@usgs.gov	U.S. Geological Survey
Wilkinson, Jim	jwilkinson@cusec.org	Central US Earthquake Consortium
Williams, Robert	rawilliams@usgs.gov	U.S. Geological Survey
Withers, Mitchell	mwithers@memphis.edu	University of Memphis
Wolf, Lorraine	wolflor@auburn.edu	Auburn University
Wollery, Edward	woolery@uky.edu	University of Kentucky
Zandieh, Arash	azandih1@memphis.edu	University of Memphis

III. Abstracts

Mapping Liquefaction Potential of Soil Deposits near Charleston, South Carolina

Ronald D. Andrus, Department of Civil Engineering, Clemson University, Clemson, SC 29634-0911, randrus@clemson.edu
Tahereh Heidari, Department of Civil Engineering, Clemson University, Clemson, SC 29634-0911, Theidar@clemson.edu

The 1886 Charleston, South Carolina earthquake (moment magnitude of about 7.0) is the largest and most destructive historic seismic event to have occurred in the eastern United States. A major cause of damage was liquefaction-induced ground failure. Although more than 120 years have passed since the earthquake, the liquefaction potentials of the aged soil deposits in the area are still poorly understood. The main objectives of this ongoing project sponsored by the U.S. Geological Survey are to characterize 1886 liquefaction and ground deformation behavior of geologic deposits in the greater Charleston area, and to quantify liquefaction potentials of the various deposits.

Liquefaction potential maps of Charleston peninsula and Mount Pleasant based on the 1886 earthquake have been developed so far. Development of the maps involved analysis of several first-hand accounts of ground failure, evaluation of numerous cone penetration test (CPT) measurements, and correlation of the results with geology. The CPT measurements were performed by various organizations, including S&ME and WPC. Nearly all documented cases of liquefaction and ground deformation in the city of Charleston and the town of Mount Pleasant occurred within the younger deposits adjacent to the harbor, rivers, and creeks. Only a few cases of ground deformation occurred within the older beach to barrier island deposits of the 100,000-year-old Wando Formation.

Liquefaction potentials are expressed in terms of the liquefaction potential index (LPI) proposed by Iwasaki and others (1978). Somewhat surprising is that the LPI values are similar for both the younger and the older sand deposits. To match 1886 field behavior, deposit resistance corrections for age and/or cementation are needed in the LPI computations. This presentation will focus mainly on the analysis and map recently completed for Mount Pleasant.

Ground Motion Trends and Issues for ENA

Gail M. Atkinson, University of Western Ontario, London, ON, N6A 5B7, gmatkinson@aol.com

The predicted characteristics of ground motion play a key role in earthquake engineering studies that examine the ability of structures to withstand future large earthquakes. In general, ground motion prediction involves specifying the underlying source, path and site response characteristics that determine the motion. For seismic hazard applications, these functions are usually encapsulated in ground-motion prediction equations (GMPEs) that provide predictions of peak ground motions and response spectra as functions of magnitude, distance, and site conditions. In eastern North America (ENA), GMPEs are developed, in large part, by relying on models of source, path and site effects, as the recorded ground-motion data are too sparse to allow direct empirical definition of GMPEs. In ENA, definition of each of the model elements is based on uncertain inferences, in which we rely on information from moderate events in the CEUS, coupled with broader knowledge of scaling behavior based on experience in more active regions.

In this presentation, I discuss the current state of knowledge regarding source, path and site processes as applicable to ENA ground motion prediction. The extent to which empirical data provide constraints on each of these elements is

the key focus. I overview ENA source and attenuation models and identify current model issues and uncertainties. Then, instrumental and intensity data for moderate-to-large earthquakes in ENA are reviewed on an event-by-event basis to draw conclusions as to the range of model parameters suggested by the data. Finally, the implications of residual uncertainty in source, path and site processes for GMPEs in ENA are explored.

Deformation Modeling in the Central United States

Oliver Boyd, U.S. Geological Survey, Memphis, TN, olboyd@usgs.gov
Yuehua Zeng, U.S. Geological Survey, Golden, CO, zeng@usgs.gov
Art Frankel, U.S. Geological Survey, Golden, CO, afrankel@usgs.gov
Leo Ramirez-Guzman, U.S. Geological Survey, Golden, CO, lramirezguzman@usgs.gov

We explore the surface deformation and strain rate signal associated with earthquakes and creep on deeply buried faults beneath the Mississippi embayment with the use of analytic, semi-analytic and numerical modeling methods. We seek to answer the following questions: How does subsurface faulting and steady-state creep, if present, translate into surface deformation? How do rates of surface deformation change during the earthquake cycle? What is the recurrence behavior of New Madrid type events? To what extent is this understanding transferable to intraplate earthquakes in general? How do earthquakes within the central United States migrate around the region? Do concepts of stress transfer play a crucial role? What is the effect of the embayment and of other heterogeneities in the upper crust on surface deformation and earthquake occurrence and recurrence?

We present estimates of constant and time-variable surface deformation. The former results from a model in which steady creep occurs on the deeply buried southern strand of the New Madrid

fault zone. Homogeneous and heterogeneous material models are considered. The latter estimate of time-variable surface deformation results from modeling the viscoelastic relaxation in the lower crust/upper mantle after an earthquake on the southern strand of the New Madrid fault zone.

Evansville area earthquake hazards mapping project (EAEHMP)

EAEHMP Technical Working Group: O. Boyd
(contact: olboyd@usgs.gov)

Evansville is in close proximity to known active earthquake zones, the Wabash Valley and New Madrid seismic zones, and has experienced minor earthquake damage several times in the past 200 years. For these reasons, there is concern about the earthquake hazards of the Evansville area. Earthquakes currently cannot be predicted, but scientists can estimate how strongly the ground is likely to shake as a result of an earthquake. Earthquake hazard maps provide one way of conveying such estimates of strong ground shaking.

The Evansville Area Earthquake Hazards Mapping Project's goal is to provide state-of-the-art urban seismic-hazard maps for the greater Evansville area, which also includes parts of Kentucky. The urban seismic-hazard maps include the effects of local geology, which varies between the Ohio River floodplain and its associated tributaries and the loess covered uplands of Indiana and Kentucky. These variations in materials and thicknesses will govern the amount of amplification by the soils and locations of liquefaction. Preliminary digital maps of Modified Mercalli Intensities, a measure of ground shaking and related damage, show variability of earthquake hazards in the Evansville area based on the soils for several scenarios. The scenario earthquakes are a magnitude 7.7 event in

the New Madrid seismic zone, 100 miles away, and a magnitude 6.8 event with an epicenter in southwestern Indiana, 25 miles from Evansville, and represent reasonable maximum magnitude earthquakes for these areas.

Paleoseismologists, studying the geologic record of past earthquakes, found that New Madrid events, like the 1811-1812 earthquake sequence, occur on average every 500 years, and that large earthquakes have occurred repeatedly in southwestern Indiana/southern Illinois over the past 12,000 years, the last one occurring about 4,000 years ago. Specific information about how the scenarios were developed can be found on the Evansville hazard mapping website, http://earthquake.usgs.gov/regional/ceus/urban_map/evansville/.

The earthquake hazard maps will be available free via the Internet. They can be customized by the user to show regional areas of interest, such as neighborhoods, public infrastructure facilities, and transportation corridors. However, they do not replace site-specific analyses. The U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), which produces earthquake hazard maps for the Nation, collaborated with local partners to develop detailed maps for urban areas such as Evansville that are vulnerable to strong ground shaking. The Kentucky and Indiana Geological Surveys worked with the USGS to produce surficial geologic maps. These partners also worked with Purdue University, the Center for Earthquake Research and Information (CERI) at the University of Memphis, and the Illinois State Geologic Surveys to decide on parameters for the scenario earthquakes. Purdue University in collaboration with CERI performed the liquefaction, scenario and probabilistic seismic hazard calculations and produced the final maps. Additional partners are the Southwest Indiana Disaster Resistant Community Corporation and the Central U.S. Earthquake Consortium.

Results of Reprocessing Seismic Reflection Data near Summerville, South Carolina

Martin Chapman, Department of Geosciences,
Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, Virginia 24061,
mcc@vt.edu

Jacob Beale, Department of Geosciences, Virginia
Tech, Blacksburg, Virginia 24061,
jabeale@vt.edu

Reprocessing of seismic reflection data collected near Summerville, South Carolina, in the period 1975–1983 reveals an extensive early Mesozoic extensional basin lying between Summerville and Charleston. The basin is delineated by the geometry of basement reflections that image early Mesozoic mafic volcanic rocks, and by positive magnetic and gravity anomalies. Cenozoic compressional reactivation of Mesozoic extensional faulting is imaged in the interior of the basin. The northwestern boundary of the basin is marked by a sharp gradient in the magnetic field. Folding of Cretaceous and Tertiary Atlantic Coastal Plain sediments, diffractions from the basement and truncation of basement reflections is observed at four locations along this magnetic gradient, indicating that the northwestern basin boundary is controlled by faulting. Instrumentally located earthquakes are tightly clustered at the location of the faulting imaged in the interior of the basin, and in proximity to the imaged faulting on the northwestern basin margin. Modeling of the magnetic and gravity data indicates that the upper crust beneath the seismically imaged structural basin is composed of mafic rocks to a depth of at least 4 km. It appears that the Charleston earthquake occurred due to compressional reactivation of extensional faulting associated with a localized zone of intense early Mesozoic continental rifting.

Time-Variable Deformation in the New Madrid Seismic Zone

Eric Calais, Department of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN 47906, USA, ecalais@purdue.edu

Andy Freed, Department of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN 47906, USA

Roy van Arsdale, Department of Earth Sciences, University of Memphis, Memphis, TN 38152, USA

Seth Stein, Department of Earth and Planetary Sciences, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL 60208, USA

A new analysis of GPS measurements across the New Madrid seismic zone (NMSZ) in the North American midcontinent shows that deformation accumulates at a rate indistinguishable from zero and less than 0.2 mm/yr. At steady-state, a (maximum) rate of 0.2 mm/yr implies a (minimum) repeat time of 10,000 years for low M7 earthquakes, in contrast with the 500–900 year repeat time of paleo-earthquakes. Strain in the NMSZ is therefore currently accumulating too slowly to account for seismicity over the past approximately 5,000 years, hence excluding steady-state fault behavior. In addition, geological observations show that large earthquakes and significant motions on the Reelfoot fault started most recently in the Holocene, indicating that the NMSZ area as a whole may be experiencing a transient burst of seismic activity. Models proposed so far to explain how large earthquakes may repeat with little far-field straining all require an ad-hoc weak zone under the NMSZ, a feature that is not corroborated by independent geophysical observations. Here, we investigate a model where stress changes are caused by the Quaternary denudation/sedimentation history of the Mississippi valley. We show that flexural stresses are sufficient to trigger earthquakes in a

continental crust at failure equilibrium. Subsequently, the resulting viscoelastic relaxation leads to failure again on the main fault (lower strength threshold) and on neighboring faults. In the absence of significant far-field loading, this process can only maintain seismic activity for a few 1,000 years.

High-Resolution P- and S- Wave Velocity Structure of the Post-Paleozoic Sediments in the Upper Mississippi Embayment

Jer-Ming Chiu, CERl, the University of Memphis, jerchiu@memphis.edu
Edward Woolery, Dept. of Geological Sciences, University of Kentucky, woolery@uky.edu

Site response, sedimentary basin geometry, earthquake-induced strong ground motion, distribution of earthquake hypocenters, and characteristic features of active faults (for example strike, dip, sense of slip) are among the most essential elements for a successful seismic hazard assessment in the upper Mississippi embayment. However, these elements cannot be realistically evaluated without reliable V_p and V_s information for the embayment sediments. Over the last decade, direct measurements (for example, shallow boreholes) and indirect methods (for example, seismic surveys and earthquakes) have been applied at many sites in the area to measure V_s in shallow sediments, to determine soil profiles as a function of depth, and to study attenuation of seismic waves in the unconsolidated sediments. From these efforts, the V_s averaged to 30 m depth (V_{s30}) has commonly been referred as an indicator to predict earthquake ground-motion amplification, and to form the basis of site hazard classification under National Earthquake Hazard Reduction Program-Uniform Building Code (NEHRP-UBC). Site specific amplification maps have been constructed for a few basins in the U.S. based on the soil

classification and V_{s30} . However, results of a few previous shallow seismic profiles in the central New Madrid seismic zone (NMSZ) reveal that the largest amplification may correspond to the largest impedance (velocity*density) contrast at a depth around 100 m inside the sedimentary basin. Examples of deep borehole array observations in other areas reveal that a large velocity contrast at a depth of approximately 60 m is responsible for a significant amplification to double its peak ground acceleration (PGA) from the bottom of the basin. Therefore, high-resolution V_p and V_s profiles for the entire sediment column are essential to quantify the site specific amplification factor that may not be properly represented by the general information of V_{s30} and soil classifications. This is particularly true for the Mississippi embayment. In a previous collaborative USGS project, V_p and V_s information for the entire sediment column at 20 sites are explored by combining short seismic reflection/refraction lines, well logs, and earthquake waveforms. Our preliminary results confirm that seismic velocities and lithologic features of the sediments in the embayment are characterized by significant lateral and vertical variations and that they cannot be described simply by any 1-D homogeneous horizontally layered velocity model, typically obtained from surface wave analysis or from long seismic refraction profiles. Under current NEHRP project support (2009–2011), we will continue our joint efforts to conduct seismic reflection/refraction lines and install temporary broadband stations at approximately 90 additional sites evenly distributed over the upper Mississippi embayment. The final V_p and V_s model underneath each site obtained from seismic lines and earthquake data will be further validated by comparison with nearby deep well logs and other geological information. By integrating velocity results from this study and shallow velocity information from many other previous studies, reliable 3-D V_p and V_s models for the post Paleozoic sediments throughout the broader upper Mississippi embayment can be constructed. Site specific amplification closely related to the

high impedance contrast, predicted strong ground motion from potential future earthquake source, 3-D basin response, crust structure, earthquake hypocenters, and geometry of active faults in the upper Mississippi embayment can be better evaluated.

Geodatabase and Earthquake Hazards Mapping for the St. Louis Area

Jae-won Chung, Department of Geological Sciences & Engineering, 125 McNutt Hall, 1400 N. Bishop Ave., Missouri University of Science & Technology, Rolla, MO 65409, jc8r4@mst.edu

J. David Rogers, Department of Geological Sciences & Engineering, 125 McNutt Hall, 1400 N. Bishop Ave., Missouri University of Science & Technology, Rolla, MO 65409, rogersda@mst.edu

This project was funded in 2005 to (1) collect existing geodata from various agencies in the St. Louis Metro area; (2) establish a virtual geotechnical database (VGDB) for the St. Louis Metro area, which included stratigraphic assignments; and (3) provide suitable input data for constructing 1:24K seismic-hazard maps for the greater St. Louis Metro area, on either side of the lower Missouri and middle Mississippi Rivers. No previous database existed that crossed the state boundaries or attempted to conjoin dissimilar geologic map units used in Missouri and Illinois.

For this work, seven geological and geotechnical data layers were identified on/beneath 29 USGS quadrangles encompassing the greater St. Louis area. These included: (1) surficial geology, (2) loess thickness, (3) basement bedrock geology, (4) well collar locations, (5) locations and measurements of shear wave velocity (V_s) in the upper 30 m, (6) likely mean elevation of groundwater table, and (7) the depth to Paleozoic-age bedrock beneath the

existing ground surface. These data were converted into a GIS-based virtual geotechnical database (VGDB), similar to the COSMOS model established in California, after 2002.

The VGDB also allowed preliminary assessments of liquefaction potential for scenario earthquakes at M7.5 with PGAs of 0.10g, 0.20g and 0.30g to be assessed at 500 data sites. Severe liquefaction was predicted within clayey and sandy alluvial deposits of Holocene age in the Mississippi River floodplain of Illinois, where the depth to groundwater was shallow (less than 3.5m).

Paleoseismic Features within the Wabash Valley Seismic Zone in Western Kentucky

Ronald Counts, Kentucky Geological Survey,
rcounts@uky.edu

Roy Van Arsdale, University of Memphis,
rvanrsdl@memphis.edu

Edward Woolery, University of Kentucky,
ewoolery@uky.edu

The Wabash Valley seismic zone is a poorly defined region of active seismicity in southwestern Indiana, southeastern Illinois, and western Kentucky that has produced eight earthquakes of M 5.0 or larger within the past 200 years. In addition, numerous paleoseismic investigations indicate this region has produced several earthquakes larger than M 6.0 and at least one earthquake larger than M.7.0 within the past 14,000 years. The Wabash Valley zone clearly poses a significant seismic threat to the Midwest, but its seismic potential, southern boundary or zone of influence, and how it relates to the New Madrid seismic zone are still debated.

Recent geologic mapping, trenching, drilling, and reconnaissance studies along the Ohio River corridor in western Kentucky have uncovered new paleoseismic indicators that may help answer some of these questions. Many small-scale deformation features associated with seismic shaking, and several large clastic dikes were

found in the banks of the Green River in Davies County. The largest was a weakly cemented, 4- to 7-cm-wide, 3.3-m-high gravel dike that was injected upward into silty floodplain deposits. The base of this dike penetrated a gray clay bed that contained $9,850 \pm 70$ yr B.P. wood and thus the earthquake occurred during the early to mid Holocene.

The most striking paleoseismic feature is a 5-km-long fault scarp that lies along the border of Henderson and Union Counties in the Ohio River floodplain. The scarp trends north, faces west, and is 2.5 m high at its southern end. The scarp height progressively diminishes to zero northward as it approaches the Ohio River, where it is buried by modern floodplain sediment. Seismic reflection profiles across the scarp show that faulting in the Paleozoic bedrock extends upward and offsets Quaternary sediments just below the base of the scarp. A 30-m-long by 3-m-deep trench excavated across the scarp exposed flat-lying floodplain strata east of the scarp and a 3-m down-to-the-west monoclinical flexure at the scarp. Cores collected adjacent to the trench support this tectonic flexure interpretation. Radiocarbon dating of charcoal indicates the strata were folded between 3,500 and 295 yr B.P., so the scarp represents Holocene folding. Geomorphic evidence indicates that the formation of the scarp altered the course of the Ohio River in a manner similar to the way the Reelfoot scarp altered the Mississippi River at the New Madrid bend in southwestern Kentucky. Additional work is needed to better define the timing of deformation, and if older deformation at depth can be identified and dated, a recurrence interval for movement along this newly identified fault could be determined.

Progress Report on Investigation of Holocene Faulting and Liquefaction along the Southern Margin of the North American Craton (Alabama-Oklahoma Transform)

Randel Tom Cox, Dept. of Earth Sciences, Univ. of Memphis, *randycox@memphis.edu*
 Thomas Brezina, Dept. of Earth Sciences, Univ. of Memphis, *tbrezina@memphis.edu*
 Sarah Machin, Dept. of Earth Sciences, Univ. of Memphis, *smachin@memphis.edu*
 Arleen Hill, Dept. of Earth Sciences, Univ. of Memphis, *aahill@memphis.edu*
 Christopher Gardner, Chesapeake Energy, Charleston, WVA, *cgardner@chkenergy.com*
 Joshua Gordon, Southwestern Energy, Conway, AR, *Joshua_Gordon@swn.com*
 James B. Harris, Department of Geology, Millsaps College, Jackson, MS, *harrijb@millsaps.edu*
 Steven L. Forman, Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences, University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago, IL, *slf@uic.edu*

The Alabama-Oklahoma transform fault along the southern margin of the North American craton strikes southeast and is buried beneath the late Paleozoic Ouachita thrust sheets and overlying Mesozoic/Cenozoic sediments. During initial Triassic opening of the Gulf of Mexico the crust rifted along this deep, sub-thrust sheet discontinuity and formed a southeast-striking a graben system with more than a kilometer of structural relief. Faults interior to these grabens show post-Triassic reactivation with flower structure geometries suggesting a strong strike-slip component. Previous trenching and surface exposures of the Saline River fault zone (SRFZ) in southern Arkansas show displacement and warping of Eocene, Pliocene, Pleistocene, and Holocene sediments where Triassic graben faults should reach the surface. Previous trenches in sand blows at five sites near the SRFZ show at least three sand-venting earthquakes of magnitude 6+ in the last 7,000 years. In this study, we have opened new trenches across two parallel shallow faults of the SRFZ at Gee's Landing and Boydell, Arkansas. The trench at Gee's Landing was targeted on a low but highly linear topographic scarp in alluvium overlying a SRFZ graben fault. Coring and electrical conductivity mapping

suggested shallow faulting within 2 m of the surface. Trenching showed that the scarp is a gentle warp in alluvial strata at <2 m depth and thus tectonic in origin. Radiocarbon ages are not available for this trench yet, but charcoal from sediment at 1.18 m and 2.05 m depths in a core from the scarp yields AMS ages of 1302 to 1433 AD and 11,426 to 7,138 BC, respectively. At Boydell, shallow S-wave reflection profiles show faulting of Eocene and Quaternary alluvium beneath a drainage lineament in a sand blow field. A previous trench targeted on the drop of an alluvial contact between core holes only revealed a channel cut and a pre-1620 AD sand blow. We opened a new trench targeted on a linear gradient in our electrical conductivity map and on shearing in a core at 3 m depth. This trench also showed no faulting at <2.5 m depth but did show numerous small sand dikes and sills and evidence of an older episode of lateral spreading. Radiocarbon ages are not available for this trench yet, but radiocarbon and OSL ages of alluvium from nearby sand blow trenches are Holocene. A series of nested 180° river bends (two cut off and one active) upstream from a southeast-trending straight reach on the Saline River at Horsehead Island suggest river diversion around a fault scarp that overlies another SRFZ graben fault. Sediment fill of the older cut-off bend yields an AMS carbon age of 377 to 544 AD. OSL ages of alluvium pre- and post-dating liquefaction exposed in the river bank at Horsehead are 244 AD ± 115 yrs and 609 AD ± 120 yrs, respectively. Upstream ponded sediments may give a chronology of damming episodes and thus faulting recurrence.

Suite of CEUS-Specific Hard-Rock Time-Histories and Seismic Hazard Model Updates for the St. Louis Area Earthquake Hazards Mapping Project

Chris H. Cramer, CERl, Univ. of Memphis, *ccramer@memphis.edu*

The St. Louis Area Earthquake Hazards Mapping Project (SLAEHMP) is a multi-year, multi-contributor project to develop seismic-hazard maps for the greater St. Louis area that include the effects of local geology. As part of this effort, both a suite of central and eastern US (CEUS) specific hard-rock time-histories (seismograms) and an updated seismic hazard model based on the 2008 national seismic hazard model have been developed. The updated computer codes were used to rerun the three pilot quadrangles of SLAEHMP and comparisons were made with the 2007 versions created using the 2002 national seismic hazard model. Generally, because the ground motion attenuation relations used in the 2008 national model lowered the 2%-in-50-year hazard ground motions by 10–20% relative to the 2002 national model, the new SLAEHMP pilot quadrangle 2%-in-50-year ground motions were also lowered over the older model results. For peak ground acceleration (PGA), overall ground motion levels are reduced by 15–20% using the new 2008 hazard model. For 0.2 s spectral acceleration (S_a), the loess/till covered uplands and the alluvial river bottom ground motions are reduced only by 10% or less compared to the 2007 maps due to less nonlinear deamplification from the reduced input ground motions. For 1.0 s S_a there is little change in ground motion levels between the old and new versions of the national maps and the urban hazard maps. Appropriate suites of time-histories for M5, M6, and M7 earthquakes from within eastern North America (ENA), outside ENA, ENA synthetics, and spectrally matched time-histories have been developed for use by SLAEHMP. Comparisons were made using site amplification distributions calculated for different groups of time-histories using common St. Louis reference soil profiles (alluvium and loess/till) including dynamic soil properties. Because soil response is not particularly sensitive to phase arrivals, site response distributions are less sensitive to the group of time-histories used at the 95% confidence level. There is some shape difference in the M7 site response distributions

from the M5 and M6 site response distributions at the 95% confidence level, particularly at lower levels of input ground motion. This suggests the resulting urban seismic-hazard maps may show some sensitivity to whether the hazard analysis uses magnitude specific site amplification distributions for M5, M6, and M7 earthquakes or just one M7 site amplification distribution for all earthquakes as is currently done.

Effects of Shallow 3D Structure of the Mississippi Embayment on Ground-Motion Amplification

David Dolenc, University of Minnesota, Duluth,
ddolenc@d.umn.edu
Stephen Horton, University of Memphis,
shorton@memphis.edu

The Mississippi embayment region contains the New Madrid seismic zone (NMSZ), the most seismically active region in the central and eastern United States that is capable of M8 earthquakes. At the same time, the embayment region is covered with up to 1 km thick low-velocity unconsolidated sediments that are known to amplify ground motions. Because large earthquakes in the NMSZ are infrequent, the effects of the shallow structure on the wave propagation in the Mississippi embayment remain to be better quantified.

We are using finite-difference code WPP with 1D and preliminary USGS 3D velocity and attenuation models to simulate five M4.0–5.2 earthquakes that were well recorded on the regional broadband seismic network. This is work in progress and preliminary results will be presented. Our final goal is to use models that include a 1D velocity crustal model without a sedimentary layer, a 1D velocity crustal model including a simple 1D sedimentary layer, a 1D velocity crustal model overlain by a 3D sedimentary structure, and a complete 3D velocity model (3D crustal and 3D sedimentary model).

We will compare the results to evaluate the effects of the shallow structure on the ground-motion amplification, trapping of the surface waves in the slow velocity structures, and any focusing and interference effects at the basin edge. We will further compare the synthetic waveforms to the observations to evaluate the 3D velocity model.

Our study will provide a better understanding of why and where the strong ground motions as well as extended duration of shaking can be expected in the Mississippi embayment due to slow velocity structures. The study will further provide an estimate on the importance of including the slow velocity layer as well as 3D structure and attenuation in the numerical simulations within the Mississippi embayment. In addition, the comparison of the synthetics to the observations will be used to evaluate the regional 3D velocity model.

Characterizing near fault velocity structure and seismogenesis along the New Madrid Seismic Zone

Heather R. DeShon, CERl, Univ. of Memphis,
hdeshon@memphis.edu
Shishay Bisrat, CERl, Univ. of Memphis,
stbisrat@memphis.edu
Meredith Dunn, CERl, Univ. of Memphis
Sarah Wiley, Whitman College

In order to more accurately assess the seismic hazard posed by intraplate earthquakes, we need to understand the interaction of compositional, thermal, hydrological, and mechanical processes along these faults. We will summarize three ongoing research projects that aim to better characterize the seismotectonics and near fault velocity and attenuation structure of the New Madrid seismic zone. (1) An outstanding question in intraplate settings, including the NMSZ, is the relationship between fluids and faulting. Characterizing three-dimensional

attenuation structure near the source and regionally provides an additional physical constraint towards understanding how intraplate earthquakes develop far from plate boundaries. We present recently completed updated P- and S-wave velocity and Vp/Vs models of the NMSZ using double-difference tomography methods (Powell and others, 2010). (2) Swarms of small-magnitude earthquakes are common in regions of high magmatic activity, but they are not confined to those areas, as evidenced by their occurrence in a range of geologic and tectonic settings. We have completed the process of searching for earthquake swarms throughout the 1995–2008 CERl catalog (Bisrat and others, 2012). Swarms vary in temporal and spatial patterns but appear to localize along fault intersections or along the southern Reelfoot fault. (3) One of the most exciting discoveries to be made within the NMSZ in recent years is the possibility that non-volcanic tremors (NVT) occur within this intraplate system. We have developed automated methods look for NVT across the current network, similar to those methods used to monitor NVT in subduction environments, and we will present results to date.

Analysis of Aftershock and Foreshock Activity in Stable Continental Regions: Implications for Aftershock Forecasting and the Hazard of Strong Earthquakes

John E. Ebel, Weston Observatory, Department of Geology and Geophysics, Boston College, Weston, MA 02493, *ebel@bc.edu*

The Omori-law aftershock parameters for 13 earthquakes in stable continental regions (SCRs) globally are found to distribute in the same way as those for California aftershock sequences. Of 19 SCR mainshocks with $M \geq 6.0$ since 1968, 8 had their largest aftershock within 5 days of the mainshock and 11 within 30 days of the mainshock. The mean magnitude difference between the mainshock and the largest aftershock

of these 19 SCR events is $1.4 \pm .7$ magnitude units, with a range from 0.3 to 3.6 magnitude units. From 1968 to 2003 the rate at which SCR earthquakes of $M \geq 4.5$ worldwide were followed by a comparable or larger earthquake within the next 30 days is 5%. These statistics can be used to produce aftershock forecasts for strong SCR earthquakes and to estimate the chances that an SCR earthquake of $M \geq 4.5$ will be followed by a larger seismic event within the next month.

Catalog Development for the EPRI/DOE/NRC CEUS SSC Project

Valentina Montaldo Falero, AMEC Geomatrix, 2101 Webster Street, 12th Floor, Oakland, CA 94612

Laura Glaser, AMEC Geomatrix, 2101 Webster Street, 12th Floor, Oakland, CA 94612, laura.glaser@amec.com

Bob Youngs, AMEC Geomatrix, 2101 Webster Street, 12th Floor, Oakland, CA 94612

AMEC Geomatrix is developing a project earthquake catalog for the central and eastern United States (CEUS) Seismic Source Characterization (SSC) Project sponsored by the Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI), the Department of Energy (DOE) and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) for use in seismic hazard assessments of nuclear facilities. The input catalogs are obtained from USGS, GSC, NCEER, EPRI-SOG, ANSS, CERl, SUSN, SLU, Lamont-Doherty, Weston Observatory, NEDB, ISC, Jeff Munsey, Ann Metzger, Margaret Hopper, Sykes and others (2008), Department of Conservation and Natural Resources of Pennsylvania and the Ohio seismic network. The catalog extends from -50 to -115 degrees longitude and 24 to 53 degrees latitude. The focal depth and location of some events were relocated by published studies. Non-tectonic events were flagged in the database based on events identified from the published literature, SUSN bulletins and blast lists maintained by the ANSS, NEDB and ISC catalogs. Magnitude

conversions are being evaluated for the entire catalog. The resulting moment magnitude catalog will be used to characterize sources for the CEUS SSC project and will be provided to the NGA East project.

Maximum Magnitudes of Charleston, South Carolina Earthquakes from in situ Geotechnical Data

Sarah Gassman, Associate Professor, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of South Carolina, gassman@cec.sc.edu

Pradeep Talwani, Distinguished Professor Emeritus, Department of Geological Sciences, University of South Carolina, talwani@geol.sc.edu

Mike Hasek, Doctoral Student, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of South Carolina, mjhasek@bellsouth.net

Geotechnical data (SPT, CPT and V_s) from paleoliquefaction sites in the South Carolina Coastal Plain have been used to back-calculate the magnitudes of prehistoric earthquakes (Energy Stress method) and obtain the peak ground acceleration (pga) needed to liquefy the soils at these sites (Cyclic Stress, Ishihara, and Martin and Clough methods). After correcting for the age of the soils ($>200,000$ years), the magnitude ranges of episodes A, B and E centered near Charleston, which occurred approximately 500, 1000, and 3500 ybp, are 6.2 to 7.0; 6.2 to 6.8 and 5.6 to 6.4, respectively. The corresponding pga values at these sites are 0.14g; 0.14 to 0.15g; and 0.30 to 0.53g, respectively. These results suggest that the currently used value in seismic hazard calculations, 7.3 for M_{max} for the 1886 Charleston earthquake, may be too large, and a more realistic range is 6.7 to 7.0. Cyclic triaxial tests are currently being performed on high

quality samples of source sands from the paleoliquefaction sites to obtain the cyclic resistance ratio and establish site specific aging corrections.

Surficial Material Geologic Mapping in Support of the St. Louis Area Earthquake Hazard Mapping Project

David A. Gaunt, Missouri DNR,
david.gaunt@dnr.mo.gov

The Missouri Department of Natural Resources' Division of Geology and Land Survey (MoDNR' DGLS) has produced geologic maps of surficial materials for the Missouri portion of the Columbia Bottom, Granite City, Alton, Elsah, Grafton and Wentzville 7.5-minute USGS quadrangles as part of the St. Louis Area Earthquake Hazard Mapping Project (SLAEHMP). Surficial materials mapping comprises the first phase of seismic hazard assessment by reducing the uncertainty in the three dimensional distribution of surficial material units and their related physical properties.

Borehole data derived from the division's St. Louis Surficial Materials Database developed by Jim Palmer as part of the National Earthquake Reduction Program (NEHERP) was supplemented by the St. Louis GeoDatabase under development by Dr. J. David Rogers and Jae-Won Chung with Missouri University of Science and Technology (MS&T). The St. Louis Geodatabase is being produced with existing data and geotechnical logs from both public and private entities gathered by Conor Watkins with the USGS Mid-Continent Mapping Center. All of the geotechnical information was compiled and correlated with the divisions' water well databases to identify any inconsistencies in depth to bedrock and depth to groundwater measurements.

More than two kilometers of shallow seismic surveys were performed in the field by Ali Atchef and Uchenna Aboaja with MS&T and Mr. Dave Gaunt. Eighteen surveys were

conducted using Geometrics equipment with 24 geophones per line on five meter spacing. Shallow seismic reflection techniques were utilized for depth to bedrock measurements, and shallow seismic refraction techniques were used to determine P-wave velocities in the bedrock and alluvium. Data from the seismic surveys were analyzed and processed by Ali Atchef and Uchenna Aboaja under the supervision of Dr. Stephan Gao at the MS&T campus. The shallow seismic surveys will provide a better understanding of the amplification that will occur at the transition from the bedrock into the alluvium in the event of an earthquake.

Seismic Cone Penetration Tests (SCPT's) were performed at six locations under a cooperative agreement with the Missouri Department of Transportation (MoDOT). The SCPT sampling locations were based on accessibility and spatial gaps in shear wave velocity information. Sampling depths ranged from 11.35 meters to 20.3 meters before reaching refusal providing a detailed perspective on the alluvium caps response to an earthquake.

Subsurface data and stratigraphic profiles were reviewed and compared with published small scale surficial material maps and other previously developed genetic and lithostratigraphic surficial material models to facilitate mapping. These data points were used to verify surficial material type and thickness and to generate top of bedrock elevation contours. This analysis is necessary to assess seismic wave amplification and liquefaction potential of unconsolidated material. In addition, the accuracy and precision of earthquake hazard maps being produced by the St. Louis Area Earthquake Hazard Mapping Project Technical Working Group will be improved through the application of this information.

Ground Motion Simulations for the 1811 and 1812 New Madrid Earthquakes

Robert Graves, URS Group, Inc.,
robert_graves@urscorp.com

The New Madrid earthquakes of 1811–1812 are the largest earthquakes to have struck the central and eastern United States (CEUS) in historic times. Magnitude estimates for these events vary from Mw 7 to 8, with median estimates of Mw 7.5–7.7 (Petersen and others, 2008). Clearly, if these types of events were to occur again, the impact to the built environment could be devastating. Over the last few years, important new information has been obtained regarding source characterization, wave propagation effects and site response in the New Madrid area. Additionally, recent advances in earthquake simulation algorithms and computational resources now allow us to compute realistic estimates of ground shaking from large earthquakes over a very large spatial extent. With the rapidly approaching bicentennial anniversary of the New Madrid earthquakes, we have a unique opportunity to provide valuable public outreach on the potential hazard presented by earthquakes in this region.

The objective of this project is to provide quantitative estimates of the ground motions that were experienced in the greater New Madrid region during the three major earthquakes of 1811 and 1812. Using broadband ground motion simulation procedures, we will estimate the ground motions that were generated by these earthquakes using the most up-to-date information available for these ruptures. Since little is known about the details of the rupture process during these earthquakes, we will also examine the sensitivity of the ground motion response to key elements of the source characterization, such as slip distribution, rupture velocity and hypocenter location. From the computed broadband ground motions, we will calculate instrumental intensities and generate synthetic ShakeMaps that can be compared with inferred modified Mercalli intensities (for example, Hough et al, 2000). Our simulation efforts will be guided by ongoing modeling studies of past CEUS earthquakes (for

example, Ni and others, 2009) and will incorporate the latest available information on subsurface velocity structure (for example, Ramirez-Guzman, and others, 2009) and Vs30 (for example, Brackman, T., and M. Withers, 2006).

Our project will complement ongoing USGS efforts to characterize the ground motions that might occur for a repeat of the 1811 and 1812 earthquakes. We have been actively involved in three previous ground motion simulation projects coordinated by the USGS. Two of these projects involve simulations of Hayward and San Andreas earthquake scenarios in the San Francisco Bay region, including recreations of the 1868 Hayward and 1906 San Francisco earthquakes (for example, Aagaard and others, 2008a, b). The third project is the ShakeOut Scenario exercise, which considers a hypothetical Mw 7.8 rupture of the San Andreas fault in Southern California (Jones and others, 2008). The target of the proposed work is to use rigorous seismological modeling of broadband strong ground motions in order to provide a more comprehensive framework for assessing earthquake hazards in the New Madrid region. Direct products for earthquake loss reduction in CEUS from this work include the development of ground motion maps from large earthquakes for use in emergency planning and loss estimation, and the development of broadband ground motion time histories and response spectra for use in the design and retrofit of structures.

Is there a Connection between Seismicity and Deformation in the New Madrid and Wabash Valley Seismic Zones?

Michael Hamburger, Indiana University,
Department of Geological Sciences,
Bloomington, IN 47405, *hamburg@indiana.edu*
Gerald Galgana, Indiana University, Department
of Geological Sciences, Bloomington, IN 47405

Kaj Johnson, Indiana University, Department of Geological Sciences, Bloomington, IN 47405

We compare geodetic and geophysical data for two spatially connected intraplate seismic zones in the central U.S.: the Wabash Valley seismic zone (WVSZ) of southern Indiana and Illinois and the New Madrid seismic zone (NMSZ) of the Mississippi valley. In both cases, regional seismic and potential field data provide evidence for high-angle, basement-penetrating, faults that define narrow, elongate Precambrian grabens that lie beneath relatively undeformed Paleozoic or Mesozoic rocks. Although only the NMSZ has experienced large-magnitude earthquakes in the historical record, both areas have a Quaternary history including numerous moderate to large magnitude events. They are separated by an enigmatic tectonic zone characterized by basement uplift, major Precambrian strike-slip and normal fault zones, and Mesozoic and Cenozoic magmatism. We examine data from a 56-site campaign GPS geodetic network in the southern Illinois Basin to infer present-day deformation in the WVSZ. We combine newly acquired data in 2007 with that from five previous GPS campaigns from the period 1997–2002. Results from the regional network show highly improved position and velocity estimates of these campaign sites relative to previous campaign measurements, with station velocities indicating systematic northwestward motion of about 0.5–0.7 mm/yr with respect to the Stable North American Reference Frame. Average strains for the entire network show marginally significant strains, with an orientation rotated 45° from the overall direction of intraplate stress in the U.S. mid-continent. We also present results from eight years of GPS observations (2000–2008) from the dense Shawnee network, which appear to be consistent with the regional strain models from the regional network.

In addition, we examine models that test the effect of the 1811–1812 New Madrid earthquakes on the near- and far-field strain and seismicity rates in the region through the

processes of instantaneous elastic deformation in the lithosphere and associated postseismic viscoelastic flow in the asthenosphere. Our results indicate that significant changes in strain and seismicity rates in the southern Illinois Basin can persist for several hundred years following the New Madrid earthquakes. The seismicity rate can increase by as much as a factor of seven over the background rate in the near-field, but by a much smaller amount in the far-field. However, the effect on the modeled seismicity rates is highly dependent on the choice of lower-crust viscosity. We also investigate the possibility that the New Madrid earthquakes could modify seismicity or strain in the WVSZ by producing triggered slip on a buried fault in the Illinois Basin region. Our initial results demonstrate that elevated seismicity and strain in the WVSZ could result from aseismic slip triggered by viscous relaxation in the lower crust long after the New Madrid earthquakes.

Conditional Mean Spectra as a Bridge between Probabilistic and Deterministic Seismic Hazard Assessment

Youssef Hashash, University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana, hashash@uiuc.edu
Norm Abrahamson, Pacific Gas and Electric, naa2@pge.com
Scott Olson, University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana, olsons@uiuc.edu

The conditional mean spectra (CMS) concept introduced by Baker and Cornell (2006) is a promising technique for developing spectra consistent with the uniform hazard response spectra while accounting for the periods most relevant to a structure. In this presentation I will first provide some background on CMS and then present an application of this concept at a site in St. Louis. The use of this concept resulted in spectra that are consistent with the bimodal hazard

at the site from nearby as well as distant (New Madrid) sources. This led to a significant reduction in the estimate of consequences of shaking including liquefaction.

Seismotectonics of the New Madrid Seismic Zone

Stephen Horton, CERl, University of Memphis,
shorton@memphis.edu
Gregory Johnson, Quantum Technology Sciences,
Inc., *gjohnson@qtsi.com*
Meredith Dunn, CERl, University of Memphis,
meredith.dunn@gmail.com
Paul Ogwari, CERl, University of Memphis,
opogwari@memphis.edu

I will present results and progress of two NEHRP-funded studies. Results from a recently completed study, “Seismotectonics of the New Madrid Seismic Zone: New Data and Improved Analytical Techniques,” include one paper and one MS thesis. In “High Resolution Earthquake Location in the New Madrid Seismic Zone,” Dunn and others (2010) find that relocated hypocenters using the double-difference location method align along individual segments of the seismic zone, providing a sharper image of the NMSZ faults. For his thesis, “Earthquake Focal Mechanisms from the New Madrid Seismic Zone,” Johnson (2008) determined 290 focal mechanisms. Two main trends of strike-slip nodal planes match seismicity or structures in the northern Mississippi embayment. Nodal planes oriented approximately 50° are parallel to the Reelfoot rift. Nodal planes oriented approximately 30° are parallel to the Northern Arm and the Mississippi embayment axis. Two major trends of reverse faults occur in the Central Segment. One is oriented about 147° and is parallel to the average trend of seismicity in that segment. The other is oriented north-south. This trend is anticipated for reverse faults secondary to through going strike-slip faults oriented about 45° such as the Blytheville fault zone. Normal faults

concentrate in the Central Segment and show a variety of nodal plane orientations. An inversion for regional stress field shows a horizontal maximum compressive stress oriented $79^\circ \pm 30^\circ$. Progress on a currently funded project “Effects of radiation pattern on earthquake ground motion in the NMSZ” will also be presented.

The 1811–1812 New Madrid Sequence— Mainshocks, Aftershocks, and Beyond

Susan E. Hough, U.S. Geological Survey, 525 S.
Wilson Avenue, Pasadena, CA 91106,
hough@usgs.gov

Documented macroseismic effects provide one of the most direct constraints on magnitudes of the 1811–1812 New Madrid mainshocks and large aftershocks, as well as an important reality check on predicted ground motions from future large events. The first critical step in analysis of macroseismic observations is the assignment of intensity values. The uncertainties associated with these interpretations are occasionally the subject of discussion but are rarely, if ever, explored systematically. The reinterpreted intensity values determined by Hough and others (2000) for the 1811–1812 New Madrid mainshocks, for example, are systematically lower than values assigned earlier by Nuttli (1973) and Street (1982), leading to lower magnitude estimates. To explore the uncertainties associated with intensity assignments and develop a set of consensus intensities for the four principal New Madrid events, extant archival accounts were made available to four researchers with experience analyzing historical earthquakes. The independent assignments were then averaged, resulting in 84 intensity estimates for the 12/16/1811 mainshock and 45–49 estimates for the 1/23/1812 and 2/7/1812 mainshocks and the “dawn aftershock” on 12/16/1811. The consensus values are generally lower than those assigned by Hough and

others (2000). Using the method of Bakun and Wentworth (1997) with two published attenuation models for the CEUS, intensity magnitude estimates range from $M_{I6.5-7.0}$ for the December mainshock, “dawn aftershock,” and January mainshock, and $M_{I7.3-7.6}$ for the February mainshock. These results reveal that uncertainties in intensity assignments contribute significantly to uncertainties in magnitude estimates. For the 12/16/1811 and 2/7/1812 mainshocks, magnitude estimates based on assignments by individual experts vary over a range of 0.3–0.4 units. Using preferred magnitudes for the New Madrid mainshocks and other large historical events, including large aftershocks of the 1811–1812 sequence, I consider the magnitude distribution of earthquakes in the central-eastern U.S. The distribution reveals an apparently significant departure from Gutenberg-Richter statistics, an observation that has been used in previous studies to conclude that the characteristic earthquake model is appropriate for the New Madrid seismic zone (as well as the Charleston, SC, source zone). However, using revised magnitudes for historical events, I find the distribution is characterized by a b-value of 1 between roughly M_6 and 7.5. The modern, instrumental catalog also reveals a b-value of 1, but an a-value that is roughly 3–10 times smaller. I show that this apparent mismatch is likely the result of catalog limitations. ETAS simulations reveal that, in low strain-rate regions, moment release will be strongly controlled by the tendency of seismicity to cluster. An a-value inferred from a short instrumental record will thus tend to significantly underestimate the long-term rate of small events in the region.

Does Seismicity Delineate Zones where Future Large Earthquakes are likely to Occur in the Central and Eastern United States?

Alan L. Kafka, Weston Observatory, Department of Geology and Geophysics, Boston College,
kafka@bc.edu

The spatial distribution of seismicity is often used as one of the indicators of zones where future large earthquakes are likely to occur. This is particularly true for intraplate regions such as the central and eastern United States, where geology is markedly enigmatic for delineating seismically active areas. Although using past seismicity for this purpose may be intuitively appealing, it is only scientifically justified if the tendency for past seismicity to delineate potential locations of future large earthquakes is well-established as a real, measurable, physical phenomenon, as opposed to an untested conceptual model. Based on the method of “Cellular Seismology” (CS) this problem is cast in the form of scientifically testable hypotheses and those hypotheses are tested. CS was inspired by the approach used by the USGS for the seismicity-derived component of the eastern U.S. part of the National Seismic Hazards Maps. The seismicity-derived zonation for those maps is based on the expectation that future large earthquakes will occur near previous earthquakes. The CS method has been applied to a variety of regions around the world to investigate patterns in the extent to which past earthquakes delineate zones where future earthquakes are likely to occur. A common approach for using seismicity to forecast locations of future earthquakes is to use the spatial distribution of rates of activity to delineate zones where future large earthquakes are expected to occur. There are a variety of methods used for rate-based seismicity mapping, and rate-based forecast methods are compared with CS here to evaluate their performance in forecasting locations of earthquakes that have occurred after a forecast was issued. The cases analyzed so far do not reveal any compelling evidence that methods that include information about rates of seismicity perform any better than CS.

The Search for Non-volcanic Tremor in the New Madrid Seismic Zone Using a Phased Seismic Array

Charles Langston, CERl, University of Memphis,
clangstn@memphis.edu

Duayne Rieger, Dept. of Geology and
Geophysics, Yale University,
duayne.rieger@yale.edu

M. Beatrice Magnani, CERl, University of
Memphis, *mmagnani@memphis.edu*

Heather DeShon, CERl, University of Memphis,
hdeshon@memphis.edu

Stephen Horton, CERl, University of Memphis,
shorton@memphis.edu

A swarm of microseisms with ground motions equivalent to earthquakes of M_L -1 and smaller was fortuitously detected in 100 of 162, 14-second-duration long-offset vibroseis shotgathers collected for a seismic reflection experiment near Mooring, TN, directly over the Reelfoot fault zone on the afternoon of 16 November 2006. These natural events show up in the shotgathers as near-vertically incident P waves with a dominant frequency of 8–10 Hz and probably occurred at depths of greater than 10 km. The inferred seismicity rate of 250 to 1000 events per hour is two to three orders of magnitude higher than the background seismicity rate for the New Madrid seismic zone. This detection of microseismic swarms in the Reelfoot fault zone indicates active physical processes that may be similar to non-volcanic tremor seen in the Cascadia and San Andreas fault zones and merits long-term monitoring to understand its source. We are planning to deploy a phased seismic array using 19 PASSCAL broadband seismometers over the Reelfoot fault in November 2009. The array will collect continuous data for approximately one year for us to examine the wavefield of approximately 200 expected local earthquakes and the composition of microseismic background noise. We will be searching for repeated episodes

of the events that were seen in the 2006 reflection data and will use the array to find locations for possible tremor sources.

New Seismic Design Maps and Associated Web Products for the 2012 International Building and Residential Codes

Nicolas Luco, U.S. Geological Survey, Golden,
Colorado, *nluco@usgs.gov*

Charles Kircher, Kircher & Associates, Palo Alto,
California

Andrew Whittaker, The State University of New
York, Buffalo, New York

In April of 2008, the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) completed its latest update of the National Seismic-hazard maps (<http://earthquake.usgs.gov/hazmaps>). This update was timed for use in developing new seismic design maps for U.S. model building codes. Concurrently, the Building Seismic Safety Council (BSSC) Seismic Design Procedures Reassessment Group (SDPRG), with funding from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), updated the methodology currently used (for example, for the 2006 and 2009 International Building Code) to derive seismic design maps from underlying hazard maps. Based on both the 2008 National Seismic-hazard maps and the new SDPRG methodology, the USGS has prepared seismic design maps for the 2009 NEHRP Recommended Provisions for Seismic Regulations for New Buildings and Other Structures, the ASCE/SEI 7-10 Standard, Minimum Design Load for Buildings and Other Structures, and the 2012 International Building and Residential Codes.

In addition to the probabilistic uniform-hazard National Seismic-hazard maps, the preparation of new seismic design maps has included computation of (i) deterministic ground motion values and (ii) risk coefficients which

transform uniform-hazard values into “uniform-risk” ground motions for design that explicitly targets a specified level of risk, namely 1% probability of collapse in 50 years. This presentation will provide an overview of these computations and will explain the USGS implementation of the new SDPRG methodology for deriving seismic design maps from hazard maps. For example, to approximate the spectral accelerations in the maximum direction of ground motion requested by the SDPRG, the probabilistic and deterministic geometric-mean (of two horizontal components) ground motion values computed by the USGS are amplified by suggested conversion factors.

In much of the central and eastern U.S. (CEUS), the net effect of using the 2008 National Seismic-hazard maps and the new SDPRG methodology is to reduce the short-period (0.2 seconds) seismic design values by about 20% relative to the current seismic design maps (for example, in the 2006 and 2009 International Building and Residential Codes). The net effect on the 1.0 second seismic design values is little to no change. Breakdowns of these effects, for example, CEUS cities including Memphis, will be provided in this presentation.

In addition, associated web products developed by the USGS for user-friendly and accurate use of the new seismic design maps (for example, see <http://earthquake.usgs.gov/designmaps>) will be described. These products include (i) a webpage for obtaining summary and detailed reports on seismic design values for a user-specified address or set of coordinates that is displayed in Google Maps, (ii) downloadable poster-sized color maps of seismic design values for a specified site class that can be used to visually verify the results of the aforementioned webpage, and (iii) Google Earth/Maps files (that is, KML/KMZ files) for these and some of the other seismic design maps prepared by the USGS.

Long-Term Deformation History in the Mississippi Embayment—The Mississippi River Seismic Survey

M.B. Magnani, Center for Earthquake Research and Information, University of Memphis, Memphis, TN, mmagnani@memphis.edu
Leah Mitchell, Institute for Geophysics, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX
Brian Waldron, Ground Water Institute, University of Memphis, Memphis, TN

The central U.S. hosts one of the most active intraplate seismic areas in the world, the New Madrid seismic zone (NMSZ). Here the high level of historic and instrumental seismicity clashes with the subdued topography of the Mississippi embayment, minimal geodetic vectors and a puzzling lack of substantial deformation in the post-Late Cretaceous sediments. To explain this apparent paradox it has been proposed that the seismicity in the NMSZ is either (1) very young (at least in its present form), (2) episodic, or (3) migrates throughout a broad region.

In order to test these hypotheses and to understand how the deformation is partitioned within the Mississippi embayment, we collected a 300-km-long, high-resolution seismic reflection profile along the Mississippi River, from Helena, Arkansas, to Caruthersville, Missouri. The profile images a portion of the embayment outside the area of influence of the NMSZ in a region where evidence has been mounting of a seismic source, predating the NMSZ, for which no corresponding structure has yet been identified.

The seismic survey exploited the advantages of marine acquisition (time effective, low cost) using a 245/245 cm³ (15/15 in³) mini-GI airgun fired at 13.790 MPa (2,000 psi), a 24-channel 75-m-long active streamer, with 3.125-m group and 12-m nominal shot interval.

The high quality data identified with unprecedented resolution the existence of three zones of deformation and faulting involving

Quaternary sediments. Two of these areas lie outside the NMSZ, confirming the hypothesis that seismicity has migrated spatially within the embayment, at least during the Quaternary, and suggesting that the long-term seismic activity in this area might extend over a broader region than previously suspected.

Can OSL be used to Date Paleoliquefaction Events?

Shannon Mahan, U.S. Geological Survey, Denver,
smahan@usgs.gov
Ron Counts, KGS, *rcounts@uky.edu*
Martitia Tuttle, U.S. Geological Survey,
Memphis, *mptuttle@usgs.gov*
Stephen Obermeier, Emeritus, U.S. Geological
Survey, *sobermei@yahoo.com*

Paleoliquefaction features (clastic dikes and sills) have been extensively studied in the New Madrid and Wabash Valley seismic zones within an area of the central Mississippi valley (Obermeier, 1989; Obermeier and others, 1991; Munson and Munson, 1996; Counts and others, 2008); the St. Louis region (Tuttle and others, 1999); the Memphis area (Gomberg and others, 2006); and the New Madrid region (Tuttle and Schweig, 1995; Tuttle and others, 2002, 2005, and 2006). Dating the formation of these features is critical for determining the timing of liquefaction features, which are formed during the actual earthquake event. An absence of these features (that is, in east Tennessee) can also be informative (that is, no large earthquakes occurred during this time).

Traditionally, these features have been dated using radiocarbon, Native American artifacts, or stratigraphic analyses. Increasingly, however, optically stimulated luminescence (OSL) dating is being brought to bear upon the question of determining when these liquefaction features formed and the timing of their associated

paleoseismic events. OSL has been used in other areas of the world to date paleoliquefaction sites (summaries in McCalpin, 2009), and there are preliminary OSL ages (Counts and others, 2008, Mahan, and others, 2008) within this area that will be included in this poster. OSL dating works best when the sampled sediment comes from either associated river terraces, the actual sand blows, or the underlying alluvial B horizons (which the sand blows would have covered). Post-depositional iron staining or other coatings do not affect OSL. A coherent plan for a more systematic study is also being developed with the hope that future studies can target those areas that have been overlooked or deserve more study.

This poster will attempt to show all the known data for OSL on paleoliquefaction sites for the central Mississippi valley and provide references to the work. Our poster will also detail the rudimentary principles of OSL and show why OSL can be particularly effective for dating paleoseismic events using correct sampling protocol.

Mmax and Lithospheric Structure in Central and Eastern North America

Walter D. Mooney, U.S. Geological Survey, 345
Middlefield Rd, MS 977, Menlo Park, CA.
94025, *mooney@usgs.gov*
Jeroen Ritsema, Dept. of Geological Sciences,
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109

We introduce a new approach to estimating the seismic potential of continental intraplate regions based on the deep seismic properties of the lithosphere. Our hypothesis is that greater integrative lithospheric strength correlates with lower rates of continental crustal seismicity and with lower maximum earthquake magnitude, also known as Mmax. Integrative lithospheric strength is controlled by lithospheric composition and the geotherm, which is correlated

with S-wave velocity. High lithospheric S-wave velocities, typical of cratonic lithosphere, correspond to high integrative lithospheric strength. We have created new global maps of S-wave velocity anomalies (δV_s) at a depth of 175 km. We find that δV_s ranges from +5% to -5%. We compare the values of these mantle S-wave anomalies with the moment magnitudes of intraplate earthquakes in the overlying crust. We find that only 10% of 460 events with moment magnitudes between 5 to 6; 15% of 110 events with moment magnitudes between 6 to 7; and none of the 14 intraplate events with moment magnitudes greater than 7 occur above mantle lithosphere with δV_s greater than 3.5% (cratonic lithosphere). We conclude therefore that integrated lithospheric strength, as indicated by S-wave velocity anomalies, correlates with crustal seismicity. M_{max} appears to be M7 for stable cratonic continental regions underlain by δV_s greater than 3.5% at 175 km depth. This includes a large portion of the Precambrian continental interior of the central and eastern U.S. with Archean and Neoproterozoic age.

A Phenomenon of a Most Alarming Nature

Nathan K. Moran, CERI, nkmoran@memphis.edu
Tish Tuttle, U.S. Geological Survey,
mptuttle@usgs.gov
Arch Johnston, CERI, ajohnstn@memphis.edu
Tanya Broadbent, CERI, tbroadbnt@memphis.edu

This map is a visual compilation of eyewitness accounts of damage to the Mississippi River and the surrounding areas. It is only representative of a few of them. For more information about the New Madrid earthquakes and their effect on the United States go to our website:
<http://www.ceri.memphis.edu/compendium>

The New Madrid earthquakes were one of the greatest natural disasters to ever affect the United States. Although the quakes occurred nearly 200 years ago when the expansion of the United States had just crossed the New Madrid area, their effect upon the country was widespread. Although the area was still considered a wilderness, scattered settlements were in the immediate area of the epicenters and the Mississippi River was already a major artery of trade for the young republic. Despite the sparse population there were many eyewitnesses to the event who left detailed written accounts of what they observed when the earthquakes occurred. Many of these accounts were keyed to the contemporary guidebook for travelers on the Mississippi River during 1811–1812, Zadock Cramer's *The Navigator*. This book provided a step-by-step guide to river navigation accompanied by a map of the river and its navigable channel. Cramer also pioneered the system of numbering the river islands as a handy guide to travelers. The system was so successful that it is used to this day. Cramer's river map serves as the basis of this poster. Although somewhat distorted in its depictions of the bends of the river, it is accurate in its arrangement of islands and other natural features. This poster uses Cramer's map as the basis for showing where damage occurred on the river and the surrounding area. It is not conclusive in its scope and only shows some of the reports of damage that have been uncovered by historic research.

Earthquake Source and Ground Motion Characteristics in the Central and Eastern United States

Sidao Ni, URS, Sidao_Ni@urscorp.com
Robert Graves, URS,
robert_graves@urscorp.com
Paul Somerville, URS,
paul_somerville@urscorp.com

Broadband simulation has proved effective in modeling ground motion, with the low frequency motion calculated deterministically and high frequency stochastically. The stochastic modeling approach takes account of earthquake rupture complexities and 3D structure heterogeneity along the propagation path for frequencies above a certain transition frequency, typically taken to be about 1Hz. However, source complexity and structure heterogeneity control ground motion in different ways, as the latter depends on distance and the former may depend on earthquake magnitude. At short distances, waves experience less scattering, and waveform modeling can be achieved at higher frequencies. For smaller earthquakes, the stochastic nature of rupture may only emerge above the corner frequency, which may be quite high. To demonstrate the approach, we simulate ground motions up to 10Hz in the central and eastern United States with a frequency-wave number (FK) algorithm accounting for both rupture complexities and scattering due to heterogeneities. The rupture complexities are implemented as frequency depend radiation pattern, and a scattering matrix is introduced in the spectral domain to transfer energy across different components of ground motion. A frequency dependent free path length is used to characterize the amount of scattering along the propagation path, with higher frequency waves experiencing shorter free path length. We apply this approach to simulating the April 18, 2008, Mt. Carmel event, after the source parameters (moment, source mechanism, focal depth) were inverted from long period waveforms (Pnl waves up to 0.3Hz and S/Surface waves up to 0.1Hz) and a 1D velocity model is obtained with waveform inversion based on linearized differential seismograms. Ground motions up to 10 Hz are simulated and are consistent with the observations. However, at even higher frequencies (up to 100Hz), ray-based approaches need to be used to increase computation efficiency.

Paleoseismic Investigation of the East Tennessee Seismic Zone—Preliminary Results

- Stephen F. Obermeier, U.S. Geological Survey (emeritus), 3415 W. County Road 50N, Rockport, IN 47635 *eqliq@yahoo.com*
- James D. Vaughn, Keen GeoServe, LLC, 325 East Vine Street, Dexter, MO 63841 *geoman@newwavecomm.net*
- Robert D. Hatcher Jr., Department of Earth & Planetary Sciences and Science Alliance Center of Excellence, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN 37996-1410 *bobmap@utk.edu*
- Hugh H. Mills, Department of Earth Sciences, Tennessee Technological University, Cookeville, TN 38505 *hmills@tntech.edu*
- S. Christopher Whisner, Department of Geography and Geosciences, Bloomsburg University, 400 East Second Street, Bloomsburg, PA 17815-1301 *swhisner@bloomu.edu*
- Christopher W. Howard, Department of Earth & Planetary Sciences and Science Alliance Center of Excellence, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN 37996-1410 *christopherhoward@gmail.com*

The East Tennessee seismic zone (ETSZ) extends some 275 km from just north of Knoxville, TN, southwestward into NW GA and NE Alabama, and reaches a maximum width of 65 km. It is the second most active in the eastern U.S., behind New Madrid, but the principal difference between the ETSZ and New Madrid, Charleston, and other well-studied seismically active areas in the East is that most of them have had at least one historic $M > 5.5$ earthquake, whereas the largest historic earthquake in the ETSZ has been one or more $M = 4.8$ events. The USGS, however, has rated the ETSZ capable of producing $M = 7.5$ earthquakes, based on its size and frequency of activity. Our purpose is to determine if $M > 5.5$ earthquakes have occurred here during the past 10,000–20,000 years, and if

so, to begin the process of estimating their maximum magnitude and recurrence intervals. The techniques being used are reconnaissance of aerial photos, and then field examination of banks of streams and reservoirs for evidence of earthquake-related liquefaction and deformation, including faulting. We have found evidence of possible liquefaction features in terrace deposits along several streams (for example, the French Broad River), and had previously observed small faults, folds, and other deformation features of possible seismic origin in Pleistocene to Holocene alluvial materials in the ETSZ. We also have observed a paucity of paleoseismic features in abundant exposures of Holocene deposits during canoe reconnaissance of the Sequatchie River, suggesting the possibility that the western boundary of the ETSZ is roughly that defined by the distribution of present seismicity. Of special note in the Sequatchie River banks, though, are numerous features that mimic clastic dikes, which likely originated from physical and geochemical factors not completely understood. More intense field work will be conducted in streams and along the banks of TVA reservoirs during fall and early winter 2009, following fall-winter drawdown of reservoirs. More intensive investigation (for example, trenching) of specific sites will be made during late fall and winter where liquefaction features or deformation are firmly identified.

Site Amplification in Central and Eastern United States

C. Guney Olgun, Research Assistant Professor,
Via Department of Civil and Environmental
Engineering, Virginia Tech, 111-A Patton Hall,
Blacksburg, VA 24061, olgun@vt.edu
James R. Martin II, Professor, Via Department of
Civil and Environmental Engineering, Virginia
Tech, 111-B Patton Hall, Blacksburg, VA
24061, jrm@vt.edu

Current NEHRP/IBC guidelines for simplified seismic design are mainly based on experience and data from sites in the western U.S. The geologic conditions in the CEUS pose the possibility of unanticipated site amplification that cannot be predicted by the current simplified design guidelines. As part of our work on numerous site investigations over the past decade, we have identified a number of unique geological and geotechnical conditions prevalent in the central and eastern U.S. (CEUS) that may not be captured adequately by current guidelines.

Amplification of ground motions as they pass through a layered structure is directly affected by the velocity structure and impedance contrast between layers within the profile. The rock in the western U.S. is highly fractured due to frequent tectonic activity. However the rock in CEUS is much more competent than it is in active interplate tectonic regions. Abrupt velocity contrasts caused by very hard rock ($V_s > 2500$ m/s) close to the ground surface are prevalent in the central and eastern U.S. Our analyses indicate that this geologic condition can cause significant amplifications at short structural periods (0.2–0.7 seconds) that produce motions well above those typically predicted by current NEHRP/IBC procedures based on the average shear wave velocity of the top 30 m (V_{s-30}) of the profile. Also, the common CEUS geological condition such as the Atlantic Coastal Plain and Memphis Basin, which typically consists of a stack of unconsolidated sediments up to 1,000 meters thickness, can amplify ground motions at long periods (typically >2 seconds) that greatly exceed the NEHRP/IBC simplified spectra. Conversely, the thick sediment wedge damps high frequency motions and produces a significant reduction of the ground motions at shorter periods. The resulting ground motions at periods less than 1.0 second can be significantly below the simplified guidelines.

In summary, our findings indicate that site classification based on the average shear wave velocity of the top 30 meters (V_{s-30}) appears to work adequately for sites in regions of frequent

tectonic activity such as coastal California. In the absence of a sharp velocity contrast, V_{s-30} appears to be a reasonable indicator of site response. Site amplification can be very different in tectonically stable regions such as CEUS, where sharp velocity contrasts between hard rock and overlain soil are common geologic features. Our site response analyses focus on these issues and these findings have direct implications for seismic design practice in CEUS.

Recent and Current Earthquake Hazard Reduction Research at the Puerto Rico Strong Motion Program

Miguel A. Pando, Associate Professor, Puerto Rico Strong Motion Program (PRMSP), Department of Civil Engineering, University of Puerto Rico at Mayaguez, PO Box 9000 Mayaguez, PR, 00681-9000, miguel.pando@upr.edu

José A. Martínez-Cruzado, Director PRMSP, Puerto Rico Strong Motion Program (PRMSP), Department of Civil Engineering, University of Puerto Rico at Mayaguez, PO Box 9000 Mayaguez, PR, 00681-9000, martinez@uprm.edu

Carlos I. Huerta, Visiting Professor, Puerto Rico Strong Motion Program (PRMSP), Department of Civil Engineering, University of Puerto Rico at Mayaguez, PO Box 9000 Mayaguez, PR, 00681-9000, carlos.huerta@upr.edu

Luis E. Suárez, Professor, Puerto Rico Strong Motion Program (PRMSP), Department of Civil Engineering, University of Puerto Rico at Mayaguez, PO Box 9000 Mayaguez, PR, 00681-9000, lsuarez@uprm.edu

The poster will present a summary of recent and current research projects carried out by the Puerto Rico Strong Motion Program (PRMSP) related to strong motion instrumentation and general earthquake hazard reduction. The poster

will present results from recent project such as liquefaction potential of calcareous sands from Western Puerto Rico, efforts on seismic microzonation which include development of geotechnical databases and NEHRP site class maps for major cities of Puerto Rico. The poster will also present the results of a recently completed pilot study that compared estimates of the predominant site periods using different techniques using ambient vibration and also weak motion measurements recorded at a several seismic stations in Mayagüez, Puerto Rico. Specifically the pilot study involved comparison of predominant site periods using the Fourier amplitude spectra, the Fourier spectral ratios between the spectra at the site and at a reference station, and the spectral ratios between the horizontal and the vertical components of ambient vibrations, that is, the Nakamura's technique (Nakamura, 1989). In the near future the PRMSP would like to initiate a comprehensive effort related to development of maps of predominant period of vibration for the main cities of Puerto Rico. The poster will also present a summary of the current state of the PRMSP instrumentation network in terms of number of free-field stations, instrumented buildings, bridges, and dams. The objective of this poster for PRMSP is to show an overview of its recent and current research and to receive feedback, and suggestions from CEUS researchers. The PRMSP welcomes visiting scholars, post-docs, and mainland U.S. researchers to come to Puerto Rico and work on joint projects that will help its mission of reducing earthquake risk in the region.

Major Earthquakes Recorded by the Initiation and/or Regrowth of Speleothems in Midwestern U.S. Caves—Results from a 2008–2009 NEHRP-Funded Investigation

Samuel V. Panno, Illinois State Geological Survey, panno@isgs.illinois.edu

Craig C. Lundstrom, University of Illinois,
lundstro@illinois.edu
Zhaofeng Zhang, University of Illinois,
zgzhang@illinois.edu
Keith C. Hackley, Illinois State Geological
Survey, *hackley@isgs.illinois.edu*

Studies of the paleoseismic history of the New Madrid seismic zone (NMSZ) have suggested that large earthquakes on the NMSZ have a recurrence interval of about 500 years. Because this estimate is based on about 2000 years of data, and because of gaps in data beyond 2,000 years BP, additional data on paleoseismicity in this area is needed to refine estimates of a recurrence interval. Further, additional data could be used to better characterize the geophysical nature of the NMSZ. More precise estimates of the number and ages of known paleoseismic events and a more complete record would enhance the ability of Federal, State, and local agencies to make preparedness decisions.

Recent work by Panno and others (2009) (which included data from this investigation) suggests that cave deposits in the Midwestern U.S. constitute a unique record of paleoseismic history of the U.S. Midcontinent. Geological features, particularly stalagmites, in caves of southwestern Illinois, Missouri, Indiana, and Arkansas are temporally coincident with known historic and prehistoric seismic activities. The caves in these states contain speleothems that appear to have been initiated by large earthquakes. In our study area, these include hundreds of actively growing, relatively small, white speleothems, the stalagmites of which are growing on older stalagmites, on older flow stone, on breakdown, and on fine-grained sediments. There were two periods of white stalagmite growth initiation in the caves of southwestern Illinois: one group was initiated around 200 years BP, and the other group was initiated about 90 years BP. The ages of the first group coincide with the 1811–12, magnitude VIII (MM scale) NMSZ earthquakes (within 150 km of the epicenter); the ages of the second group coincide

with the April 9, 1917, magnitude V (MM scale) Missouri earthquake (Illinois caves examined are within 15 km of the epicenter). The U-Th disequilibria ages of initiation dates for older stalagmites and multi-stage stalagmites fell within the range of all known prehistoric earthquake events. Delta ^{18}O and ^{13}C data for five selected stalagmites from three states followed known changes in climate within the Midwestern U.S. during the Holocene.

We hypothesize that these speleothems were initiated by earthquake-induced opening of fracture-controlled flowpaths in the ceilings of cave passages. On the basis of recently collected data, we suggest that the dates of initiation and regrowth, and perhaps changes in stalagmite growth rates may be used as indicators of historic and prehistoric NMSZ earthquakes in the Midwestern U.S., and probably other seismic zones in the world.

Ground-Motion Prediction Equations for Eastern North America from a Hybrid Empirical Method

Shahram Pezeshk, Department of Civil
Engineering, The University of Memphis
spezeshk@memphis.edu
Arash Zandieh, Department of Civil Engineering,
The University of Memphis
Behrooz Tavakoli, Geotechnical & Hydraulic
Engineering Services, Bechtel Corporation

In the field of earthquake engineering, ground-motion prediction models are frequently used to estimate the peak ground motion (PGA) and the pseudo spectral acceleration (PSA). In regions of the world where ground-motion recordings are plentiful (such as WNA), the ground-motion prediction equations are obtained using empirical methods. In other regions such as eastern North America (ENA), with insufficient ground-motion data, other methods must be used to develop ground-motion prediction equations.

The hybrid empirical method is one such method used to develop ground-motion prediction equations in areas with sparse ground motion. This method uses the stochastic method to adjust empirical ground-motion prediction relations developed for a region with abundant strong motion recordings. It estimates strong-motion parameters in a region with a sparse database. The adjustments take into account differences in the earthquake source, wave propagation, and site-response characteristics between the two regions. The purpose of this study is to use a hybrid empirical method and to develop a new hybrid empirical ground-motion prediction equation for ENA, using five new ground-motion prediction models developed by the Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center (PEER) for WNA. A new functional form is defined for the ground-motion prediction relation for a magnitude range of 5 to 8 and closest distances to the fault rupture up to 1,000 km. Ground-motion prediction equations are developed for the response spectra (pseudo-acceleration, 5% damped) and the peak ground acceleration (PGA) for hard-rock sites in ENA. The resulting ground-motion prediction model developed in this study is compared with recent ground-motion prediction relations developed for ENA, as well as with available observed data for ENA.

P- and S-Wave Velocity Structure and V_P/V_S Ratios in the New Madrid Seismic Zone

Christine Powell, CERl, The University of Memphis, Memphis, TN 38152,
capowell@memphis.edu

Meredith Dunn, CERl, The University of Memphis, Memphis, TN 38152,
meredith.dunn@gmail.com

Heather DeShon, CERl, The University of Memphis, Memphis, TN 38152,
hdeshon@memphis.edu

Three dimensional P- and S-wave velocity models are constructed for the New Madrid seismic zone (NMSZ) using double difference local earthquake tomography (tomoDD). TomoDD incorporates catalog travel times with catalog and waveform cross correlation differential times to solve for P and S wave velocities and for high-resolution earthquake locations. The data set consists of a combination of travel times and differential times recorded by the New Madrid Cooperative Seismic Network (NMCSN) from 2000–2007 and the temporary PANDA deployment from 1989–1992. A total of 4,522 P-wave and 3,953 S-wave arrival times results in 18,662 P-wave and 16,354 S-wave differential times for PANDA stations. We use 15,146 P-wave and 10,387 S-wave arrival times resulting in 63,321 P-wave and 37,187 S-wave differential times from 837 earthquakes recorded by the NMCSN. Additionally, 37,040 P-wave and 18,731 S-wave cross correlation differential times strengthen inversion results.

The NMSZ consists of four intersecting arms of seismicity. There are approximately 200 earthquakes/year recorded in the NMSZ despite the absence of a major plate boundary. Most earthquakes occur along the centrally located Reelfoot fault leading to uneven source distribution. We use a finite difference travel time calculator combined with an irregular inversion grid node spacing of 5 to 20 km horizontally and 1 to 3 km vertically. Model resolution is examined using checkerboard synthetic tests. Resolution is highest close to the source region between depths of 5 to 11 km. P-wave velocity results indicate that velocities close to the source region are low relative to the 1D starting model. S-wave velocity models indicate high velocity anomalies associated with the northern portion of the Reelfoot fault and low velocities to the south. The low P- and S-wave velocities may be indicative of anomalous rock properties, such as increased fluid content and fracturing. A high P- and S-wave velocity anomaly is associated with a known mafic intrusion to the northwest of seismicity.

Insights into the Structure and Long-term Deformation in the New Madrid Region from Seismic Reflection Profiles

Thomas Pratt, U.S. Geological Survey, Seattle,
tpratt@usgs.gov

Interpretation of all available seismic reflection profiles in the New Madrid region provides insight into the structure and seismicity of the New Madrid seismic zone (NMSZ). Data used in this study include vibroseis profiles acquired by the USGS, industry vibroseis profiles purchased by the USGS, the COCORP profile across the embayment, and shallow seismic profiles acquired by the USGS. The Blytheville arch is the most prominent feature that can be associated with the NMSZ on the profiles. The arch is an antiform in the Precambrian and early Paleozoic rift strata, as much as 20 km wide and 200 km in length, that coincides with the southeast arm of seismicity within the New Madrid seismic zone. The arch appears to be a structural feature formed by thrust or strike-slip faulting (flower structure) because there is clear faulting on at least one flank of the arch and coherent strata within the arch. Parallel strata within the flanks of the arch indicate that growth was initiated after deposition of the rift strata that are folded in the arch. The prominent erosional surface that truncates the top of the arch indicates that the arch was largely formed before the erosional surface was cut in the Paleozoic. More recent growth of the arch is indicated by slight folding of the erosional surface, particularly slight uplift over the dipping strata on the flanks of the arch. Much of this later growth appears to be Quaternary or Holocene in age because the post-Paleozoic Mississippi embayment strata are parallel within the folds. Prominent faults are evident on the seismic profiles from truncation of rift strata and slight changes in elevation or dip of the erosional unconformity. Prominent faults include one coinciding with the southeast arm of

the seismic zone and with the Bootheel lineament, but other faults are evident over a wider area of the embayment. Deeper strata do not appear to extend beneath the Blytheville arch as coherent strata, suggesting that the arch coincides with a major crustal boundary. The data are consistent with a rift model in which middle and lower crustal reflectivity are associated with the rifting, and deformation is distributed across the rift zone.

Tantalizing Suggestions for Late Pleistocene to Middle Holocene Surface Deformation at the Southeastern Margin of Reelfoot Rift, the Marianna Gap in Crowley's Ridge

Daniel S. Rains, Arkansas Geological Survey,
3815 West Roosevelt Rd., Little Rock AR
72204 *rainsrocks@sbcglobal.net*

Margaret J. Guccione, Department of
Geosciences, OZAR-113, University of
Arkansas, Fayetteville, AR, 72201
guccione@uark.edu

The Marianna Gap, a 13-km wide discontinuity in Crowley's Ridge southwest of Memphis, TN, is associated with apparent surface deformation that dates back at least 70 ka but was not fully breached until ca. 4–7 ka. During the late Pleistocene (60–70 ka), Mississippi River braid-stream channels in the western lowlands were deflected from the regional north-to-south flow path to a west-to-east flow path toward the present Marianna Gap. But the gap had not completely formed at this time and the paleochannels were deflected back to the south at margin of Crowley's Ridge. Additional evidence for presence of a continuous ridge during the Pleistocene is an abandoned paleochannel southwest of the gap (Lick Creek) that appears to be the continuation of the L'Anguille River present northwest of the gap. Flow through the abandoned Lick Creek channel is dated at ca. 24 ka and only a thin sequence of silt (either the

youngest segment of loess deposition or reworked loess) overlies fluvial sediment in the paleochannel. This stratigraphy suggests that the L'Anguille River flowed west of Crowley's Ridge during deposition of the Peoria Loess and only abandoned this path to flow through the gap ≤ 10 ka.

Though the ridge was intact during the Pleistocene, the divide was probably relatively low in elevation at the present gap location. In addition to the diversion of paleobraid channels toward this location, the Peoria loess (25–10 ka) west of the gap is relatively thin compared to loess west of the ridge. The decreased loess thickness adjacent to the gap may have been caused by scour as wind was funneled through a low divide or "wind gap" in Crowley's Ridge.

The gap was fully breached by mid Holocene. A large Mississippi River meander bend of meander belt 3 (active between 4–7 ka) crosscuts the ridge. It is unknown if erosion on the outside of the bend was responsible for breaching the divide, or if the gap had been formed earlier and the river merely enlarged and modified its shape.

It is possible that Marianna Gap has a tectonic origin as suggested by a variety of evidence. First, the gap is a few km south of the Reelfoot rift floor edge and is likely at the Reelfoot rift margin. Second, numerous large liquefaction features dated 5–7 ka are present in and around the gap so seismic activity was important in the region during the middle Holocene. Third, the orientation of Crowley's Ridge shifts and is offset by 10 km at the gap, which suggest that it might have undergone lateral movement. Fourth, surface depression suggests vertical movement. Though the final breaching of Crowley's Ridge occurred between ca. 10–5 ka and may be associated with seismic events, surface deformation persisted for tens of thousands of years prior to the destruction of the Crowley's Ridge near Marianna, Arkansas.

Central United States Velocity Model Version 1: Description and Validation

Leonardo Ramirez-Guzman, U.S. Geological Survey (Golden), lr Ramirezguzman@usgs.gov
Robert A. Williams, U.S. Geological Survey (Golden), rawilliams@usgs.gov
Oliver Boyd, U.S. Geological Survey (Memphis), olboyd@usgs.gov
Stephen Hartzell, U.S. Geological Survey (Golden), shartzell@usgs.gov

We describe and test via numerical simulations a velocity model of the Central United States (CUSVM Version 1). Our model covers an area of 650,000 km² and includes parts of Arkansas, Mississippi, Alabama, Illinois, Missouri, Kentucky, and Tennessee. The model represents the compilation of research carried out for decades consisting of seismic refraction and reflection lines, geophysical logs, and inversions of the regional seismic properties. The CUSVM has a higher resolution description around Memphis and St. Louis, two of the largest urban areas in the central United States. The density, p- and s-wave velocities are synthesized in a stand-alone spatial data base that can be queried to generate the required input for numerical simulations. We calibrate the CUSVM using three earthquakes located N, SW and SE of the zone encompassed by the model to sample different paths of propagation. The selected stations in the comparisons reflect different geological site conditions and cover distances ranging from 50 to 450 km away from the epicenters. The results indicate that both within and outside the Mississippi embayment, the CUSVM satisfactorily reproduces: (a) the body wave arrival times and (b) the observed regional variations in ground motion amplitude and duration in the frequency range 0–0.75Hz.

Dynamic Testing by Resonant Column and Torsional Shear Methods

Richard P. Ray, Associate Professor, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC, ray@cec.sc.edu

One of the challenges facing modelers is the proper selection of shear modulus G , and damping D for various soil strata. This study examines carefully several aspects of measuring those properties using resonant column and torsional shear methods. One difficulty is trying to decide if the test really generates the properties it is supposed to. Using 3-D finite element models of the testing system I modeled the performance of the tests to determine if it measured the properties the way I understood it to be measured. Other possible anomalies, such as soft (small voids) or hard (gravel or nodules) spots and their impact on the overall behavior of the test were studied. Irregular loading histories were also studied since incorporation of irregular loading at small strains is still unexplored territory for finite element models. As part of a research project I studied the effects of large variations in confining stress and how much torque is required to generate significant non-linear strains in test specimens at high confining stress (approximately 500 psi). This part of the study is being used to complete the fabrication of a high confining-stress testing device.

Numerical models match well with behavior measured in the laboratory. However it is difficult to quantify the variability of behavior in a lab specimen without resorting to more sophisticated measurement methods. Further study using video data acquisition will be performed to more carefully examine the strain fields generated by torsional and resonant column testing.

Overview of Seismic-hazard mapping of Three Pilot Quadrangles in the St. Louis Metro Area

J. David Rogers, Department of Geological Sciences & Engineering, 125 McNutt Hall, 1400 N. Bishop Ave., Missouri University of Science & Technology, Rolla, MO 65409, rogersda@mst.edu

Deniz Karadeniz, Haley & Aldrich, 7926 Jones Branch Drive, McLean, VA 22102, dkaradeniz@HaleyAldrich.com

Chris Cramer, Center for Earthquake Research & Information, 3876 Central Ave., University of Memphis, Memphis, TN 38152, ccramer@memphis.edu

The greater St. Louis metropolitan area is a densely populated urban zone, bounded by extensive deposits (up to 76 m thick) of unconsolidated sediment (mostly sands) underling well-defined floodplains. The severe curvature of the bedrock channel depressions at their edges may also be sufficient to trap seismic energy and cause incident body waves to propagate through the alluvium as surface waves, producing stronger shaking and longer durations than would be predicted by 1-D analyses. This phenomenon may explain the significant disparities in reported shaking in the channel fills as opposed to bedrock knobs during historic earthquakes. The ground-motions from the New Madrid seismic zone and Wabash Valley seismic zones that consider site-specific impedance contrasts and basin effects were recently evaluated for three pilot quadrangles (Columbia Bottom, Granite City, and Monks Mound) by the PI. The USGS national hazard maps do not include the effects of local geologic structure or soil cover present in the St. Louis metro area. The range in expected site response for a wide spectrum of earthquake magnitudes from three potential source areas was evaluated, and it is hoped that this information can aid in assessing seismic hazards in the St. Louis area because St. Louis and St. Charles Counties have recently adopted the 2003 International Building Code, which require assessments of

seismic shaking intensity using NEHRP soil classifications. These hazard maps included assessments of the following attributes: (1) probabilistic seismic hazard analysis (2, 5, and 10% probabilities of exceedance in 50 years in predicting the peak ground accelerations [PGA]); (2) selected scenario earthquake analysis for PGA, 0.2 sec and 1.0 sec spectral accelerations (SA); and (3) spectral accelerations at 0.2 second and 1 second periods (at 2, 5, and 10% probabilities of exceedance in 50 years). The sensitivity analyses of seismic site response suggest that the variations of the soil conditions and thickness in the St. Louis area exert: (1) a significant influence on the amplitude, and (2) contrasting shaking characteristics for each of the ground motion parameters, whereas the thickness and shear wave velocity of the weathered bedrock horizon appear to have little impact on site amplification. The peak ground acceleration characteristics reveal that earthquake forces on loessal uplands are expected to be most severe for short period structures, whereas those in the alluvial floodplains will likely be more severe for long-period structures.

Shear Wave Velocity Profiles of Deep Soils in the Mississippi Embayment

Brent L. Rosenblad, Assistant Professor,
University of Missouri, Columbia, MO;

rosenbladb@missouri.edu

Jianhua Li, Project Engineer, MACTEC
Engineering and Consulting, Charlotte, NC
28208 *jli@mactec.com*

Jonathan Bailey, Geotechnical Engineer, US
Army Corps of Engineers, St Louis, MO
jonathan.p.bailey@usace.army.mil

Ryan Goetz, Geotechnical Engineer, US Army
Corps of Engineers, St Louis, MO
ryan.p.goetz@usace.army.mil

Active and passive surface wave measurements were performed at 11 deep soil sites in the Mississippi embayment overlying the New Madrid seismic zone. Measurements were performed from north of New Madrid, Missouri, to Memphis, Tennessee. Shear wave velocity (V_S) profiles were developed at each site to depths of approximately 200 to 250 m from inversion of Rayleigh wave dispersion curves. The average V_S profile calculated from the 11 sites is in good agreement with a previous reference V_S profile developed for the embayment. Using estimates of lithology at each site, relationships were developed between V_S values and formation type, down to the Memphis Sand Formation. Shear wave velocity values determined for near-surface alluvial deposits and the upper Claiborne unit (Jackson/Cockfield/Cook Mountain Formations) were in good agreement with past studies; however, higher values of V_S for the Memphis Sand Formation were obtained in this study. Single-station, three-component measurements of ambient noise were also performed at each site. These data were analyzed using the Horizontal-to-Vertical Spectral Ratio (HVSr) method to obtain estimates of fundamental frequency and average V_S for the full depth of post-Paleozoic sediments. Although the results are in agreement with previous HVSr measurements in the Mississippi embayment, the average full-depth V_S values appear to be overestimated using this method.

Systematic Historical Seismicity Research—An Essential Adjunct in the Pre-Instrumental Period

Alan Ruffman, Geomarine Associates, Halifax,
Nova Scotia, Canada B3J 2L4,
aruffman@dal.ca

Although instrumental data from modern earthquakes allow the seismologist to give a definitive analysis of a recorded event these are limited to the past 100 years. Historic seismic data

can allow the seismologist to reach back 400 years and better address the real seismic hazard from large events that often appear to have a return period in the order of 300–500 years.

Only the provinces of Quebec and New Brunswick have a complete record of their historic seismicity through the work of Pierre Gouin (1917–2005) and soon Ken Burke, respectively. Nova Scotia’s record is complete from 1752 to 1867, Newfoundland’s and Labrador’s record is spotty and a small portion of S. Ontario has a complete record for only one decade (1870–1880). In the U.S. only key larger historic earthquakes have been researched, in particular those that were especially large, located close to a proposed nuclear power plant, or to an LNG terminal, or attracted the interest of a local researcher. No truly systematic and complete historic seismicity compilation is available for central and eastern U.S. Compilations for Caribbean Island nations are patchy at best.

The argument will be made, “We really only need the largest events and we have all these for the past 400 years for at least the thirteen original States of the Union. So why bother with the chatter of the small as-yet unrecognized events?” Well perhaps an example, now enshrined in concrete and steel, may quiet such skeptics?

Canada’s first full-fledged environmental assessment occurred in 1977 to evaluate the proposed Lepreau nuclear power station in New Brunswick on the Bay of Fundy just a few short kilometres from the international boundary. The assessment used the available 1962 W.E.T. Smith seismic catalogue; there was no compilation extant for N. Maine. The 1973–74 study of earthquakes found that the maximum event that had ever been experienced at the site was at “...intensity VII (MMI), or Richter magnitude 6.0 ...” The plant was then built to satisfy this 1973–1974 seismic constraint.

The 1982 central New Brunswick earthquake sequence and the Cape Cod proposed Pilgrim nuclear plant prompted a U.S.-funded reassessment of the four largest known N.B. and northern Maine earthquakes in 1904, 1869, 1855

and 1817. Instead of one large event in Passamaquoddy Bay in 1904 just west of the plant with a maximum magnitude of 5.0, we ended up in 1985 with three events ranging in magnitude from 4.8, to 5.7, to 5.9. The 1869 and 1817 events had been moved 55 km SW and 175 km SE, respectively, to join the 1904 earthquake (Leblanc and Burke, 1985). One could reasonably argue with hindsight by 1985 that the Canadian plant, as-built virtually on the U.S. border 5–6 years earlier, was under-designed with respect to seismic risk. Since the 1985 reassessment, the 1869 event has been relocated to the NE based on more historic work by Burke in 2004.

The New Madrid Field Trip Guidebook

Phyllis J. Steckel, Earthquake Insight LLC, PO Box 2002, Washington, MO 63090, psteckel@charter.net

The New Madrid Bicentennial will be recognized in 2011–12, to mark 200 years since the 1811–12 New Madrid earthquakes rocked most of the central and eastern U.S. This is an exceptional opportunity for coordinated outreach from the geoscience and engineering communities to business leaders, elected officials, the media, and the general public. Since 2005, six Earthquake Insight Field Trips have been hosted by the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) and led by Earthquake Insight LLC. Their purpose was to educate business leaders about earthquake hazards and earthquake risks in the central U.S. During the course of the Earthquake Insight Field Trips, at least 50 to 60 stops have been included on the various routes, and another 50 to 60 have been identified and documented, but not included—often due to the difficulty of access by a bus. The stops are located from the St. Louis metropolitan area in the north to the Memphis metro area in the south, and much of the rural area in between. The stops include field illustrations of the geologic

setting; locations of significant earthquake-related human histories; examples of earthquake engineering practice; and the economic, business, and community vulnerabilities to earthquake hazards. The New Madrid Field Trip Guidebook is now in progress to make this information more available to specific audiences as well as the general public. Descriptions, explanations of the earthquake-related significance, photos, GPS coordinates, local driving directions, and other information will be included for each stop listed in this USGS Open-File Report.

Development of the Central and Eastern United States (CEUS) Seismic Source Characterization (SSC) Model

Lawrence Salomon, Savannah River Nuclear Solutions, LLC, lawrence.salomone@srs.gov
Kevin Coppersmith, Coppersmith Consulting, Inc., kcoppersmith@earthlink.net

Input to probabilistic seismic hazard assessment (PSHA) consists of two elements: seismic source characterization (SSC) and ground motion characterization (GMC). The 1986 EPRI-Seismicity Owners Group (SOG) study incorporated expert judgment to model epistemic uncertainty and set the standard for Probabilistic Seismic Hazard Assessments (PSHAs) at that time. Current licensing applications for next generation nuclear power plants have used the EPRI-SOG source component as a starting point, with updates as appropriate on a site-specific basis. The CEUS Seismic Source Characterization (SSC) for Nuclear Facilities Project is focused on replacing the SSC component of the EPRI-SOG study. The new CEUS SSC model being developed can be used with the EPRI (2004, 2006) GMC model to calculate seismic hazard until the results of the Next Generation Attenuation East (NGA-East) Project are available.

The CEUS SSC Project is an industry-government partnership formed to develop a seismic source characterization model for any site in the CEUS. It is jointly sponsored by the Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI) Advanced Nuclear Technology (ANT) Action Plan Committee (APC), the U.S. Department of Energy (USDOE) and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC). The goals of the project are: (a) replace the 1986 EPRI-SOG and LLNL (1993) seismic source characterizations models for the CEUS, (b) capture the knowledge and uncertainties of the informed scientific community using a Senior Seismic Hazard Assessment Committee (SSHAC) Level 3 process, and (c) provide an up-to-date, consistent, stable input for a PSHA. The CEUS SSC project team consists of program and project management, a technical integration (TI) team and staff, a participatory peer review panel (PPRP), specialty contractors, sponsors, and agency experts. The team assembled represents a first-of-a-kind attempt to form a diverse team from all stakeholders from industry, government and academia to participate in this landmark study. The work consists of 17 tasks and three workshops. In addition to a new CEUS SSC model, other important products from this project include: a CEUS earthquake catalog using moment magnitude, a CEUS geological, geophysical and seismological database important for source characterization efforts, specialized modeling tools for SSC and sensitivity analyses to identify hazard-significant issues. The results from this industry-government three-year study will be published by EPRI at the end of 2010.

Earthquake Rupture Directivity and Local Site Effects from a M.73 Earthquake

Deborah Shulman, U.S. Geological Survey, MS
977, 345 Middlefield Rd., Menlo Park, CA
94025, dshulman@usgs.gov

Walter D. Mooney, U.S. Geological Survey, MS 977, 345 Middlefield Rd., Menlo Park, CA 94025, mooney@usgs.gov

We have documented the ground motion effects of earthquake rupture directivity and local site amplification with data from a recent M7.3 earthquake in Honduras. This event occurred on May 28, 2009, at 2:24 AM local time, and struck off the coast of Honduras on the Motagua-Swan fault system (MSFS), part of the boundary between the North America and Caribbean plates. This plate boundary has an average slip rate of 20 mm/year. This left-lateral earthquake had an average slip of 1.5 m on a 100-km-long near-vertical fault plane (Hayes and Ji, 2009). The hypocenter depth is estimated at 10 km. The main shock caused 130 structures, including homes and office buildings, to collapse or suffer significant damage in northern Honduras. Seven deaths were reported. Due to a lack of recordings in the area, the available documentation of the effects of this earthquake are the USGS “Did you feel it?” responses and the data collected during our field seismic intensity investigation. We conducted the intensity study in Honduras between May 30 and June 6, 2009, and focused on areas with local reports of damage, including the cities of La Ceiba, El Progreso, San Pedro Sula, and Puerto Cortes in northern Honduras, and the island of Roatan in the Caribbean Sea. The damage ascertained at these five sites shows that the severity of damage did not decrease with distance from the epicenter as predicted by standard attenuation relations. Instead, damage was concentrated in El Progreso, approximately 75 km south of the SW end of the rupture and 160 km from the epicenter. The island of Roatan, just 30 km from the epicenter, had significantly less damage than El Progreso, and was graded as VI on the Modified Mercalli Intensity scale whereas El Progreso was graded as VIII. These intensity anomalies can be explained by two factors: (1) SW-directed rupture propagation and proximity to a localized 3.0 m slip pulse (asperity) that occurred near the SW end of the fault (Hayes and

Ji, 2009) that focused energy toward the city of El Progreso and; (2) local site effects, particularly the rigid Precambrian schists and gneisses on the island of Roatan, in contrast to the soft river deposits (sand, organics and clay) beneath the city of El Progreso. This study demonstrates the impact of seismic directivity, high slip on a fault asperity, and local site conditions on the observed damage patterns from this M7.3 earthquake.

Geodesy and the Enigma of Stable Continental Earthquakes

Robert Smalley, Jr., CERl, Univ. of Memphis, rsmalley@memphis.edu
John Paul Puchakayala
James P. Davis, CERl, Univ. of Memphis

The GPS Array for Mid-America (GAMA) was developed under Mid-America Earthquake Center’s (MAEC’s) Hazard Definition component to potentially detect, but not fully describe, deformation associated with NMSZ seismicity. The most important, and controversial, result was detection of statistically significant shortening at the 95% confidence level between two CGPS sites straddling the Reelfoot scarp, which is the surface expression of the micro seismically defined Reelfoot fault. Outside the immediate area of the seismically active NMSZ faults, CGPS does not detect statistically significant deformation with respect to stable North America.

Whereas large earthquakes in the New Madrid area are clearly not consistent with plate tectonics, the jury remains out on interpretation of CGPS data acquired to date within the paradigm of elastic rebound. What would GPS have observed in the decades leading up to the 1811–1812 earthquake sequence? To date, for both plate boundary and stable plate earthquakes, GPS has not detected a geodetic signature that forecasts the occurrence of an earthquake. In central and

eastern North America (NAM), at scales much larger than the faults in the NMSZ, there is little to no tectonic deformation detectable with space geodetic data, including GPS. What is not known with sufficient precision, however, is the deformation field at the scale of the NMSZ faults. Determining deformation associated with the NMSZ, or geologically meaningful upper bounds for it, requires spatial sampling at fault scale. If deformation is local, the lack of observable far field deformation in stable NAM can very well be true, but not useful in terms of explaining the relevant observations—that there have been large, recent repeating earthquakes in New Madrid over the past several thousand years. In addition because deformation expected on local scales remains small (less than several mm/yr), continuous measurements on stable monuments are essential to improve the statistics of the basic measurement.

Whether or not one can identify deformation in the NMSZ depends not only on the magnitude of the difference from stable North America, but also the number of sites defining the deformation and their noise characteristics. The key to distinguishing the NMSZ deformation is being able to identify a statistically significant systematic pattern in the residual velocity field with respect to stable N. America, which requires dense sampling and low noise in the region being tested.

Damage to Ozark Cave Formations, Ozark Caves, and the New Madrid Seismic Zone—A Nascent Paleoseismological Perspective

John C. Tinsley, USGS, EQHaz, Menlo Park, CA
94025, jtinsley@usgs.gov

Canvassing of selected Ozark caves in Missouri and Arkansas has identified several promising natural laboratories that apparently preserve stratigraphic evidence of repeated,

episodic breakage of delicate as well as more massive cave formations (speleothems), including episodic repeated collapse of thin-bedded Paleozoic limestone cave ceiling strata that bury successions of small dripstone deposits, and toppling of columns or stalagmite formations. Field evidence suggestive of earthquake-wrought damage includes the observations that at least four episodes of breakage are preserved in some caves. (Excavation of selected areas likely would reveal earlier events.) Moreover, observed damage is apparently episodic and “quantized” in that broken fragments of soda straw stalactites or columns that rest on active flowstone substrates are either essentially unburied or minimally cemented into place, or are about 30% buried, or 50% to 66% buried, or nearly totally buried, with little or no “in between” stages of burial/breakage observed. Further, as one examines caves located at progressively greater distances from New Madrid, Missouri, at distances greater than 160–180 km, breakage of delicate formations is apparently absent or at least no longer so readily apparent. In some ways, this study is analogous to the “precarious rocks” problem, but is still in its infancy. Not all delicate formations are created equal; certain cave settings seem to be more delicate than others, and additional studies will be required to address the question of how best to quantify “relative delicacy” versus “absolute delicacy” of various cave deposits with respect to earthquake shaking damage. There are many tough analysis of variance issues yet to be resolved.

The emergence of ultra-sensitive analytical mass spectrometers capable of dating cave travertine <100 years old using Uranium-Thorium techniques makes it possible to sample broken formations and determine “kill” dates, as detaching a “soda straw” stalactite from its drip source terminates its growth. An initial round of samples of broken speleothems is presently being radiometrically dated; I anticipate having initial results of the U-series dating within the next couple of months. Presumably our youngest event will be the 1811–1812 earthquake sequence.

Cave conservationists should take heart. No speleothems were broken from growth positions for this study. Rather, only broken fragments preserving the formerly active growth tip were sampled. Obviously, the record of paleoearthquakes preserved in this manner may not be robust, as once broken, formations must re-grow prior to being able to be broken again. There is also no guarantee that all delicate formations are broken in a given earthquake.

In conducting this reconnaissance work, it is imperative to select against caves in which there is extensive vandalism or travertine “mining” or areas in which delicate formations may have been broken owing to human caver traffic or from errant flying mammals. I am pleased to acknowledge initial funding from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for these studies and the capable assistance and guidance of personnel of the Cave Research Foundation with field phases of this investigation.

Migration of Large Earthquakes Indicates Distributed Strain in the Central United States

Martitia P. Tuttle, U.S. Geological Survey, 3876 Central Avenue, Ste. 2, Memphis, TN 38152-3050, mptuttle@usgs.gov

Natasha McCallister, U.S. Geological Survey, 3876 Central Avenue, Ste. 2, Memphis, TN 38152-3050, nmccallister@usgs.gov

Eugene Schweig, U.S. Geological Survey, Denver, CO, schweig@usgs.gov

Haydar Al-Shukri, University of Arkansas Little Rock, Little Rock, AR

Randal Cox, Department of Earth Sciences, University of Memphis, Memphis, TN

Although incomplete for certain time periods and geographical areas, the paleoearthquake record suggests that the New Madrid fault zone produced 1811–1812 type events every 500–2,000 years during the past 4.5 ky and that other faults related to the Reelfoot rift

produced similar events during the past 60 ky. The 1811–1812 New Madrid earthquakes of magnitude 7 to 8 and several similar prehistoric events about 1450 A.D., 900 A.D., 2,350 B.C., and possibly 1,000 B.C., left their mark on the landscape in the form of earthquake-induced liquefaction features and related ground failures, uplift and subsidence of large tracts of land, folding and faulting of river deposits, and abrupt changes to river channels. In addition, very large earthquakes are attributed to faults outside the New Madrid seismic zone proper but still associated with the Reelfoot rift. Seismicity appears to have migrated from one part of the rift to another over the course of 5–15 ky. For example, the northern portion of the Eastern Reelfoot Rift Margin fault in western Tennessee, was active about 11–10 ka, and possibly as recently as 2 ka; the southern portion of the fault near Marianna, Arkansas, may have been active from 6.8–5.5 ka, and possibly as early as 10 ka; and the New Madrid fault zone was active by 4.5 ka and remains active today. These observations suggest that deformation may be localized by the rift, but distributed across multiple faults and over a much larger area than the New Madrid seismic zone. This would result in spatial and temporal variations in fault loading and help to explain possibly low strain rates estimated from recent geodetic measurements. An important implication of these findings is that faults within the Reelfoot rift that have been aseismic during the historical period may become active in the future. With a more complete paleoearthquake record, as well as a better understanding of the geologic structures and tectonic forces controlling the location and periodicity of seismicity, it may be possible to better forecast where and when very large earthquakes are likely to occur in the future. Similar studies in other intraplate areas could show whether the New Madrid region is unique or typical of complex intraplate settings.

Geologic Model Testing in the New Madrid Seismic Zone Region

Roy Van Arsdale, Department of Earth Sciences,
The University of Memphis,
rvanrsdl@memphis.edu

Ryan Csontos, Ground Water Institute, The
University of Memphis, *rcsontos@memphis.edu*

Numerous geologic models have been published for the New Madrid seismic zone and Reelfoot rift. We have proposed (Csontos and others, 2008) that the Reelfoot rift consists of the well documented northeast-trending Cambrian basement faults, but that the rift is cross-cut by northwest-trending Proterozoic faults resulting in a Precambrian basement made of fault-bounded blocks. We believe that surface and near-surface landforms like the Lake County Uplift, Joiner ridge, and southern half of Crowley's Ridge are compressional stepovers caused by right-lateral shear across the Reelfoot rift and that these structurally controlled landforms initiate from basement fault intersections. In our model, Quaternary faulting moves throughout the rift and the most recent displacement history may have progressed from the southern portion of the rift to its Holocene location in the northern portion of the rift in the New Madrid seismic zone. This possible northeastern migration of seismicity during the Quaternary may be related to the Quaternary denudational history of the central Mississippi River valley (Van Arsdale and others, 2007).

Our research (Csontos and others, 2008; Csontos and Van Arsdale, 2008) also indicates that the Reelfoot fault is a southwest-dipping reverse fault in the post-Cambrian section, but that it is a normal fault in the underlying Cambrian and Precambrian section. Thus, the Reelfoot fault is an inverted fault that probably originated as the Proterozoic Grand River tectonic zone. In this model, the Reelfoot fault forms the northern boundary of the Reelfoot rift. If true,

then the Reelfoot rift basin does not continue northeast into the Rough Creek graben.

These models could be tested. Deep seismic reflection profiles could establish the existence of the basement faults at key locations to test our Reelfoot rift model. Similarly, a deep reflection profile could be acquired across the Reelfoot fault to determine if it is a rift-bounding normal fault. Dating of fault and earthquake liquefaction activity throughout the Reelfoot rift may show migration patterns during the Quaternary that parallel the Mississippi valley denudation history.

The Central U.S. Seismic Observatory (CUSSO) and its Implication

Zhenming Wang, Kentucky Geological Survey,
228 Mining and Mineral Resources Building,
University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY 40506,
zmwang@uky.edu

Edward W. Woolery, Department of Earth and
Environmental Sciences, 101 Slone Building,
University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY 40506,
woolery@uky.edu

Jonathan L. McIntyre, Kentucky Geological
Survey, 228 Mining and Mineral Resources
Building, University of Kentucky, Lexington,
KY 40506

A combination of strong-motion accelerometers and medium period seismometers are now under installation at varying depths in the 1,950-foot (594 meter) borehole at the Central U.S. Seismic Observatory (CUSSO) in Fulton County, Ky. The borehole penetrated the entire sediment overburden (586 m) and was terminated 8 meters into limestone bedrock. Prior to casing the hole, electrical, sonic velocity (P- and S-wave) and deviation logs were acquired. Other site characterizations have also been conducted at CUSSO.

Estimating strong ground motions of engineering interest in the thick soil/sediment deposits in the upper Mississippi embayment is problematic. The problems include 1) site effects due to thick (>100 m) layers of low shear-wave velocity sediments and 2) non-linearity. The installation of strong-motion accelerometers at CUSSO will give us the ability to measure strong-motions from the bedrock through the soil column to the surface and measure how the soil column changes the characteristics of strong motions as they propagate to the ground surface. The installation of medium period seismometers, (0.06–50 Hz) at CUSSO will also provide real records for studying the effect by the sediments on seismic wave propagation.

CUSSO, in combination of other instrumentations of the Kentucky Seismic and Strong-motion Network as well as other networks in the region, will provide a better constraint on seismic hazard and risk assessments in the central United States.

Status of Data Collection for the St. Louis Earthquake Hazards Mapping Project in 2009

Conor Watkins, U.S. Geological Survey, Mid-Continent Geographic Science Center, 1400 Independence Rd., Rolla, Missouri 65401, cwatkins@usgs.gov

Subsurface and geospatial data were collected throughout the St. Louis Area Earthquake Hazards Mapping Project (SLAEHMP) area and distributed to project partners. Collection of subsurface data including borehole logs and geophysical data from private and public sources focused on areas of data gaps, such as those in the vicinity of the confluence of the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers, the lower Meramec River, and urban areas developed prior to large scale collection of subsurface information. For example, the Missouri

Department of Natural Resources has collected subsurface borehole and geophysical data in the vicinity of the confluence of the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers, which suggests that buried bedrock river channels occur at depths of up to 60 meters below the ground surface in parts of northeastern St. Charles County.

National Geospatial Agency (NGA) 133 Urban Areas Project images with a resolution of 0.3 meters covering the St. Louis metropolitan area for years 2004, 2006, and 2008 were acquired for use by SLAEHMP partners. These images cover the majority of the SLAEHMP project area. The NGA plans to collect imagery with a 0.15-meter spatial resolution in 2010. The Missouri State Emergency Management Agency (SEMA) provided a 1-meter LiDAR dataset of St. Charles County, Missouri, flown in 2008, covering the northern and western portions of the project area including the confluence of the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers. This dataset extends a few kilometers into Illinois, providing valuable information in the vicinity of Alton and Wood River, Illinois.

USGS Estimation of M(MAX) East of the Rocky Mountains

Wheeler, Russell L., U.S. Geological Survey, Box 25046, MS 966, Lakewood, CO 80225, wheeler@usgs.gov

Johnston, Arch C., Center for Earthquake Research and Information, University of Memphis, Memphis, TN 38152.

Seismic-hazard assessments utilize M_{max} , the moment magnitude M of the largest earthquake thought to be possible in a specified region. M_{max} impacts hazard assessments for residential building codes, critical structures such as nuclear power plants, and other engineered structures and functions of society. In most of the central and eastern United States and adjacent Canada (CEUSAC), long recurrence intervals preclude historical observation of M_{max} .

Paleoseismic M estimates for large earthquakes are few in CEUSAC. Geologic controls on sizes of CEUSAC rupture zones are enigmatic. Therefore M_{\max} estimation consists of compiling and examining M estimates of large historical earthquakes worldwide, in CEUSAC and its tectonically analogous areas (stable continental regions, or SCRs).

We examined the historical records of Earth's SCRs to compile M of earthquakes large enough to be candidates for SCR M_{\max} . The combined record shows M 7.0 or larger only within Mesozoic rifts and passive margins, M_{\max} of 6.8 \pm 0.3 in cratons, and M_{\max} of 6.4 \pm 0.2 in Paleozoic orogens.

Application of the global observations to CEUSAC delineates two regions with different M_{\max} : a central craton, and a bordering extended margin of Mesozoic rifts and passive margins. The craton and extended margin are separated by Cambrian rifts and passive margins, and by the Paleozoic Ouachita and Appalachian orogens. The Cambrian rifts and passive margins contain igneous and stratigraphic evidence of Mesozoic extensional reactivation, as well as historical, paleoseismic and geotechnical evidence of M ca. 7.5 earthquakes in the New Madrid and Wabash Valley seismic zones, and M ca. 7.0 in the Charlevoix zone. The cratonward halves of the two orogens are underlain by the Cambrian fault systems, and the Coastal Plain halves are cut by Mesozoic normal faults. Thus, we added the Cambrian rifts and margins and the Appalachian and Ouachita orogens to the extended margin.

Histograms of large M for cratons and extended margins worldwide have tall peaks at M 6.6–6.7, which suggest that this may be a minimum for M_{\max} anywhere in CEUSAC. High- M tails of the histograms suggest larger M_{\max} . The 2008 USGS national seismic-hazard maps take CEUSAC M_{\max} to be M 6.6–7.2 in the craton (M 7.0 preferred), and M 7.1–7.7 in the extended margin (M 7.5 preferred).

Post-Eocene Deformation Observed in Seismic Profiles across the Southwestern Blytheville Arch, Crowley's Ridge, and Western Reelfoot Rift Margin, Arkansas

Robert A. Williams, U.S. Geological Survey,
Golden, Colorado, 80401, rawilliams@usgs.gov
William J. Stephenson, U.S. Geological Survey,
Golden, Colorado, 80401, wstephens@usgs.gov
Jackson K. Odum, U.S. Geological Survey,
Golden, Colorado, 80401, odum@usgs.gov

In collaboration with the nees@UTexas (Austin), an NSF-supported facility, we collected three high-resolution minivibe P-wave reflection profiles in northeastern Arkansas about 70 km northwest of Memphis, Tenn. These profiles are located in the New Madrid seismic zone and reveal details of an anticline beneath Crowley's Ridge, a buried monocline in the post-Paleozoic deposits near Harrisburg and Lepanto, and faulting across the western Reelfoot rift margin. The profiles, which are higher resolution (144 channels/sweep at 5-m intervals) than previously acquired in this area, are part of a planned continuous transect that eventually will span the Reelfoot rift in a study of regional deformation patterns. Preliminary results from Crowley's Ridge, an anomalous topographic high on an otherwise flat Mississippi embayment surface, are consistent with previous COCORP and USGS reflection data and strongly suggest that the 50-m high topography of the ridge is caused by post-Eocene tectonic uplift related to near vertical ridge-bounding faults. The Paleozoic-Cretaceous reflector sequence is upturned about 50 m on both sides of Crowley's Ridge, an amount roughly equal to the height of the ridge. No seismicity has been recorded in this part of Crowley's Ridge since 1974.

In contrast, the Lepanto profile images a monocline in Paleozoic and younger reflectors within a seismically active area on the eastern margin of the buried Blytheville Arch. The

maximum uplift of the west-side-up monocline, observed on the Paleozoic through Eocene reflector sequence, is about 100 m. This sequence is also an interval of constant thickness from about 800 to 300 m depth. Above the Eocene section, and possibly into the Quaternary, the sediments thicken east of the monocline, suggesting a late Eocene to possibly Quaternary period of growth for this monocline. It is not clear at this stage of interpretation if the current seismicity near Lepanto is related to ongoing deformation of this monocline.

At the western Reelfoot Rift margin we find a 2-km-wide zone of deformation with faulting that displaces Paleozoic and Eocene reflectors about 20 to 30 m in an up-to-the-west sense. Other smaller displacement faults are also observed on the 11-km-long profile. Across the length of the profile the Paleozoic-Cretaceous section also gradually rises to the west about 75 m. The magnitude of deformation and amount of fault displacements observed in these profiles are relatively small compared to some faults we have imaged in California or Washington, but they are consistent with the deformation amounts observed in other parts of the New Madrid seismic zone.

The St. Louis Area Earthquake Hazards Mapping Project–SLAEHMP

SLAEHMP Technical Working Group:
R.A. Bauer, O.S. Boyd, J. Chung, C.H. Cramer,
D.A. Gaunt, D. Hoffman, G.L. Hempen, N.S.
McCallister, J.L. Prewett, B. Prosser, J.D. Rogers,
P.J. Steckel, C.M. Watkins, and R.A. Williams
(rawilliams@usgs.gov)

The SLAEHMP is a major urban hazard mapping effort supported by funding from the USGS Earthquake Hazards Program as well as in-kind contributions from the SLAEHMP working group agencies. The working group is composed of representatives from the Illinois Geological

Survey, Missouri Department of Natural Resources, Missouri University of Science & Technology, University of Memphis, URS-St. Louis, and USGS.

The goal of the project is to provide state-of-the-art urban seismic-hazard maps for the greater St. Louis area in Missouri and Illinois that can be used in land-use planning, public policy making, and private sector decision making. The project was begun in 2004 as a working group of university, state and federal government, and private-sector research scientists, engineers, planners, and decision-makers with the target of completing twenty-nine 7.5-minute topographic quadrangles in the greater St. Louis area. Urban seismic-hazard maps that include the effects of local geology have been completed for three initial quadrangles and maps for additional quadrangles are being prepared. Liquefaction hazard maps for 12 quadrangles in the Mississippi and Missouri floodplains are also being completed.

The project started with surface mapping and the collecting of subsurface geological, geophysical, and geotechnical information to form a three-dimensional soils database. Reference soil profiles were generated from shear-wave velocity (V_s) measurements for the uplands (loess/till) and lowlands (alluvial) portions of the study area (Karadeniz, 2007). The biggest challenge is to properly characterize the uplands to lowlands transition within each quadrangle. The three-dimensional geology database is sampled on a 0.005° (approximately 0.5 km) grid to provide V_s profiles at every grid-point. Site amplification ranges are then generated at each grid-point by the randomization of the V_s profile, dynamic properties, and appropriate input ground motions and then used to generate probabilistic and scenario ground-motion hazard maps (Cramer, and others, 2004, 2006). Probabilistic hazard maps are generated using the completely probabilistic approach of Cramer (2003, 2005) and the 2008 USGS national seismic hazard model (Petersen, and others, 2008).

The resulting urban hazard maps show increased ground motion hazard in the 30–50 m thick alluvium lowlands relative to the 2008 USGS national seismic-hazard maps. For the uplands areas, the urban seismic-hazard maps show ground motion hazard similar to the 2008 USGS national maps for PGA and 1.0 s S_a , and elevated hazard for 0.2 s S_a .

Liquefaction susceptibility of Quaternary deposits has also been assessed. Holocene alluvial units in river valleys and floodplains are the most susceptible to liquefaction. Depending on groundwater conditions, late Pleistocene glaciofluvial outwash has a moderate-to-low susceptibility and upland loess deposits have a very low susceptibility. Because many transportation routes, power and gas transmission lines, population centers, and levee structures exist on the highly susceptible Holocene alluvium, parts of the greater St. Louis area are at significant potential risk from seismically induced liquefaction and related ground deformation.

A Microtremor Study in the New Madrid Seismic Zone

Lorraine W. Wolf, Geology and Geography,
Auburn University, Auburn AL,
wolflor@auburn.edu

Kelli Hardesty, Environmental Resources
Management, Metairie LA,
Kelli.Hardesty@erm.com

Paul Bodin, Dept of Earth and Space Sciences,
University of Washington, Seattle WA,
bodin@u.washington.edu

The usefulness of microtremors, or weak motions, for seismic hazard analyses is a long-debated topic. Key questions are (1) whether the spectral analysis of the microtremor yields a reliable estimation of predominant frequencies, and if so, in what frequency range, (2) whether the source of H/V spectral peaks can be clearly identified, and

(3) whether the technique can identify areas most susceptible to wave amplification. In this study, we use HVSPRs from the microtremors to determine peak frequencies, amplification factors and ground vulnerability indices using the technique of Nakamura (1989) at sites in the New Madrid seismic zone. Our sites were chosen to represent different environments of deposition (and sedimentary facies), different embayment thicknesses, and varying liquefaction susceptibility (determined by geotechnical methods or soil classifications). Results suggest (1) relatively higher vulnerability indices at embayment sites with greater percentages of liquefaction deposits, and (2) an association of some H/V spectral peaks with specific subsurface stratigraphic boundaries. Although some peaks could be attributed to impedance contrasts at specific stratigraphic interfaces, the sources of other peaks (particularly for frequencies > 2 Hz) were not identifiable. Results of the study suggest that the microtremor method may be helpful in identifying those areas most vulnerable to ground amplification in intraplate sedimentary basins, where large earthquakes are infrequent but damaging. However, further research into the frequency limitations of the method and a better understanding of the source of spectral peaks is needed.

Site-Specific Fault Rupture Hazard Assessment— Flourspar Area Fault Complex, Western Kentucky

E. Woolery, University of Kentucky, Dept. of
Earth and Environmental Sciences,
woolery@uky.edu

J. Baldwin, William Lettis & Associates, Inc.,
baldwin@lettis.com

K. Kelson, William Lettis & Associates, Inc.,
kelson@lettis.com

S. Hampson, University of Kentucky, Kentucky
Research Consortium for Energy and
Environment, *skhampson@windstream.net*

R. Givler, William Lettis & Associates, Inc.,
givler@lettis.com

Post-Paleozoic sediments overlying a southerly projection of the Fluorspar Area fault complex and coincident with an area of diffuse microseismicity were evaluated for Quaternary deformation. Nearly 1 km of seismic reflection data were collected and interpreted for evidence of late Quaternary deformation. Five significant high-angle geophysical anomalies were interpreted to extend within approximately 7 m of the ground surface, near the upper limit of the seismic sampling. Eighty-six, closely spaced, 9.1-m-deep, continuous cores were subsequently

collected above these anomalous features. Stratigraphic and chronological analyses were performed on the cores to determine the presence or absence of structure above the geophysical anomalies, and define the near-surface extent and age of deformation. Optical stimulated luminescence dates showed the sampled sediment age ranged between nearly 16 ka and greater than 125 ka. Interpretation of the resultant geologic cross sections indicates identified stratigraphic anomalies were generally constrained to post-date a 53.6 to 75.5 ka loess deposit; however, no perceptible displacement was found at the base of younger loess dated between 16.6 and 23.5 ka.

IV. References Cited in Abstracts

- Aagaard, B.T., Brocher, T.M., Dolenc, D., Dreger, D., Graves, R.W., Harmsen, S., Hartzell, S., Larsen, S., and Zoback, M.L., 2008a, Ground-motion modeling of the 1906 San Francisco earthquake, Part I—Validation using the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake: *Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America*, v. 98, p. 989–1011.
- Aagaard, B.T., Brocher, T.M., Dolenc, D., Dreger, D., Graves, R.W., Harmsen, S., Hartzell, S., Larsen, S., McCandless, Kathleen, Nilsson, Stefan, Petersson, N. Anders, Rodgers, Arthur, Sjögreen, Björn, and M.L. Zoback, 2008b, Ground-motion modeling of the 1906 San Francisco earthquake, Part II—Ground-motion estimates for the 1906 earthquake and scenario events: *Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America*, v. 98, p. 1,012–1,046.
- Baker, J.W., and Cornell, C.A., 2006, Spectral shape, epsilon, and record selection: *Earthquake Engineering and Structural Dynamics*, v. 35, p. 1,077–1,095.
- Bakun, W.H., and Wentworth, C.M., 1997, Estimating earthquake location and magnitude from seismic intensity data: *Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America*, v. 87, p. 1,502–1,521.
- Bisrat, S., H.R. DeShon, and C.A. Rowe, 2012, Swarm activity within the New Madrid Seismic Zone identified using waveform cross-correlation techniques: *Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America*, v. 102, p. 1167–1178, doi:10.1785/0120100315.
- Brackman, T., and Withers, M., 2006, Implementing ShakeMap for the New Madrid Seismic Zone: *Seismological Research Letters*, v. 77, p. 445.
- Counts, R.C., Wang, H., Grimley, D., and Mahan, S., 2008, Luminescence and radiocarbon chronology of loess-paleosol sequences in the lower Ohio River valley: *Geological Society of America Abstracts with Programs*, v. 40, p. 3.
- Cramer, C.H., 2003, Site-specific seismic-hazard analysis that is completely probabilistic: *Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America* v. 93, p. 1,841–1,846.
- Cramer, C.H., 2005, Erratum—Site-specific seismic-hazard analysis that is completely probabilistic: *Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America* v. 95, p. 2026.
- Cramer, C.H., Gomberg, J.S., Schweig, E.S., Waldron, B.A., and Tucker, K., 2004, Memphis, Shelby County, Tennessee, seismic hazard maps: U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 2004–1294, 41 pp.

- Cramer, C.H., Gomberg, J.S., Schweig, E.S., Waldron, B.A., and Tucker, K., 2006, First USGS urban seismic hazard maps predict the effects of soils: *Seismological Research Letters*, v. 77, p. 23–29.
- Csontos, R., and Van Arsdale, R., 2008, New Madrid seismic zone fault geometry: *Geosphere*, v. 4, p. 802–813.
- Csontos, R., Van Arsdale, R., Cox, R., and Waldron, B., 2008, The Reelfoot Rift and its impact on Quaternary deformation in the central Mississippi River Valley: *Geosphere*, v. 4, p. 145–158.
- Dunn, M., Horton, S., DeShon, H.R., and Powell, C.A., 2010, High resolution earthquake location in the New Madrid Seismic Zone: *Seismological Research Letters*, v. 81, p. 406–413.
- Gomberg, J., Wald, L., Dart, R., Schweig, E.S., 2006, Urban Seismic Hazard Mapping for Memphis, Shelby County, Tennessee: U.S. Geological Survey Fact Sheet 05–3142, 4 p.
- Hayes, G., and Ji, C., Finite fault model—Preliminary result of the May 28, 2009 Mw 7.3 Earthquake offshore Honduras: U.S. Geological Survey Earthquake Hazards Program accessed October, 2009, at http://earthquake.usgs.gov/earthquakes/eqinthenews/2009/us2009heak/finite_fault.php.
- Hough, S.E., Armbruster, J.G., Seeber, L., and Hough, J.F., 2000, On the modified Mercalli intensities and magnitudes of the 1811–1812 New Madrid earthquakes: *Journal of Geophysical Research*, v. 105, p. 23,839–23,864.
- Iwasaki, T., Tatsuoka, F., Tokida, K.-i., and Yasuda, S., 1978, A practical method for assessing soil liquefaction potential based on case studies at various sites in Japan: *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Microzonation*, p. 885–896.
- Johnson, G., 2008, Using earthquake focal mechanisms to investigate seismotectonics in New Madrid seismic zone: Memphis, Tenn., University of Memphis, Master's thesis.
- Jones, L.M., Bernknopf, R., Cox, D., Goltz, J., Hudnut, K., Mileti, D., Perry, S., Ponti, D., Porter, K., Reichle, M., Seligson, H., Shoaf, K., Treiman, J., and Wein, A., 2008, The ShakeOut Scenario: U.S. Geological Survey Open File Report 2008–1150, 308 p.
- Karadeniz, D., 2007, Pilot program to assess seismic hazards of the Granite City, Monks Mound, and Columbia Bottom Quadrangles, St. Louis Metropolitan Area, Missouri and Illinois: Rolla, Miss., Missouri University of Science and Technology, Ph.D. Dissertation.
- Leblanc, G., and Burke, K.B.S., 1985, Re-evaluation of the 1817, 1855, 1869 and 1904 Maine-New Brunswick area earthquakes: *Earthquake Notes*, v. 56, p. 107–123.
- Mahan, Shannon A., and Crone, A., 2008, Luminescence dating of Paleoliquefaction features in the Wabash River Valley Area of Indiana: Geological Society of America North-Central sectional meeting, Abstracts with Program, v. 40, p. 78.
- McCalpin, J. (ed), 2009, *Paleoseismology* (2d ed): International Geophysics Series 95, Academic Press, New York, 613 p.
- Munson, P.J., and Munson, C.A., 1996, Paleoliquefaction evidence for recurrent strong earthquakes since 20,000 yr BP in the Wabash Valley area of Indiana: Final Report, submitted to the U.S. Geological Survey, 137 p.
- Nakamura, Y., 1989, A method for dynamic characteristics estimation of subsurface using microtremor on the ground surface: Railway Technical Research Institute, Quarterly Reports, v. 30, p. 25–33.
- Ni, S., Graves, R., and Somerville, P., 2009, Earthquake source and ground motion characteristics in the central and eastern United States: Memphis, Tenn, Meeting for the Central and Eastern United States Earthquake Hazards Program.

- Nuttl, O.W., 1973, The Mississippi Valley Earthquakes of 1811 and 1812—Intensities, ground motion and magnitudes: *Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America*, v. 63, p. 227–248.
- Obermeier, S.F., 1989, The New Madrid Earthquakes—An engineering geologic interpretation of relic liquefaction features: U.S. Geological Survey Professional Paper 1336-B, 114 p.
- Obermeier, S.F., Bleuer, N.K., Munson, C.A., Munson, P.J., Martin, W.S., McWilliams, K.M., Tabaczynski, D.A., Odum, J.K., Rubin, M., and Eggert, D.L., 1991, Evidence of strong earthquake shaking in the lower Wabash Valley from prehistoric liquefaction features: *Science*, v. 251, p. 1,061–1,063.
- Panno, S.V., Lundstrom, C.C., Hackley, K.C., Curry, B.B., Fouke, B.W., and Zhang, Z., 2009, Major earthquakes recorded by speleothems in Midwestern U.S. Caves: *Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America*, v. 99, p. 2,147–2,154.
- Petersen, M.D., Frankel, A.D., Harmsen, S.C., Mueller, C.S., Haller, K.M., Wheeler, R.L., Wesson, R.L., Zeng, Y., Boyd, O.S., Perkins, D.M., Luco, N., Field, E.H., Wills, C.J., and Rukstales, K.S., 2008, Documentation for the 2008 update of the United States National Seismic Hazard Maps: U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 2008–1128, 61 pp.
- Powell, C.A., DeShon, H.R., and Withers, M., 2010, Intrusions and anomalous Vp/Vs ratios associated with the New Madrid Seismic Zone: *Journal of Geophysical Research*, v. 115, B08311, doi:10.1029/2009JB007107.
- Ramirez-Guzman, L., Williams, R.A., Boyd, O., and Hartzell, S., 2009, Central United States velocity model version 1—Description and validation: Memphis, Tenn., Meeting for the Central and Eastern United States Earthquake Hazards Program.
- Street, R., 1982, A contribution to the documentation of the 1811–1812 Mississippi Valley earthquake sequence: *Earthquake Notes*, v. 53, p. 39–52.
- Tuttle, M.P., and Schweig, E.S., 1995, Archeological and pedological evidence for large earthquakes in the New Madrid seismic zone, central United States: *Geology* v. 23, p. 253–256.
- Tuttle, M.P., Chester, J., Lafferty, R., Dyer-Williams, K., and Cande, R., 1999, Paleoseismology study northwest of the New Madrid seismic zone: U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, NUREG/CR-5730, 96 p.
- Tuttle, M.P., Schweig, E.S., Sims, J.D., Lafferty, R.H., Wolf, L.W., and Haynes, M.L., 2002, The earthquake potential of the New Madrid seismic zone: *Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America*, v. 92, p. 2,080–2,089.
- Tuttle, M.P., Schweig, E.S., Campbell, J., Thomas, P.M., Sims, J.D., and Lafferty, R.H., 2005, Evidence for New Madrid earthquakes in A.D. 300 and 2350 B.C.: *Seismological Research Letters*, v. 76, p. 489–501.
- Tuttle, M.P., Al-Shukri, H., and Mahdi, H., 2006, Very large earthquakes centered southwest of the New Madrid seismic zone 5,000–7,000 years ago: *Seismological Research Letters*, v. 77, p. 755–770.
- Van Arsdale, R.B., Bresnahan, R.P., McCallister, N.S., and Waldron, B., 2007, The Upland Complex of the central Mississippi River valley—Its origin, denudation, and possible role in reactivation of the New Madrid seismic zone: *in* Continental intraplate earthquakes—Science, hazard, and policy issues, Stein, S., and Mazzotti, S. (eds.), Geological Society of America Special Paper 425, p. 177–192.

V. Slide Presentations