Central and Eastern United States Seismic Source Characterization for Nuclear Facilities

Volume 1: Chapters 1 to 4



U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research Washington DC 20555 NUREG-2115 U.S. Department of Energy 1000 Independence Avenue SW Washington, DC 20585 Report # DOE/NE-0140

Electric Power Research Institute 3420 Hillview Avenue Palo Alto, CA 94304 Report # 1021097

ELECTRIC POWER RESEARCH INSTITUTE

AVAILABILITY OF REFERENCE MATERIALS IN NRC PUBLICATIONS

NRC Reference Material

As of November 1999, you may electronically access NUREG-series publications and other NRC records at NRC's Public Electronic Reading Room at <u>http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm.html</u>. Publicly released records include, to name a few, NUREG-series publications; *Federal Register* notices; applicant, licensee, and vendor documents and correspondence; NRC correspondence and internal memoranda; bulletins and information notices; inspection and investigative reports; licensee event reports; and Commission papers and their attachments.

NRC publications in the NUREG series, NRC regulations, and *Title 10, Energy*, in the Code of *Federal Regulations* may also be purchased from one of these two sources.

- 1. The Superintendent of Documents U.S. Government Printing Office Mail Stop SSOP Washington, DC 20402-0001 Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov Telephone: 202-512-1800 Fax: 202-512-2250
- 2. The National Technical Information Service Springfield, VA 22161-0002 www.ntis.gov 1-800-553-6847 or, locally, 703-605-6000

A single copy of each NRC draft report for comment is available free, to the extent of supply, upon written request as follows:

Address: U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Office of Administration Publications Branch Washington, DC 20555-0001 E-mail: DISTRIBUTION.SERVICES@NRC.GOV

Facsimile: 301-415-2289 Some publications in the NUREG series that are posted at NRC's Web site address

http://www.nrc.gov/reading-m/doc-collections/nuregs are updated periodically and may differ from the last printed version. Although references to material found on a Web site bear the date the material was accessed, the material available on the date cited may subsequently be removed from the site. Documents available from public and special technical libraries include all open literature items, such as books, journal articles, and transactions, *Federal Register* notices, Federal and State legislation, and congressional reports. Such documents as theses, dissertations, foreign reports and translations, and non-NRC conference proceedings may be purchased from their sponsoring organization.

Non-NRC Reference Material

Copies of industry codes and standards used in a substantive manner in the NRC regulatory process are maintained at-

The NRC Technical Library Two White Flint North 11545 Rockville Pike Rockville, MD 20852–2738

These standards are available in the library for reference use by the public. Codes and standards are usually copyrighted and may be purchased from the originating organization or, if they are American National Standards, from-

American National Standards Institute 11 West 42rd Street New York, NY 10036-8002 www.ansi.org 212-642-4900

Legally binding regulatory requirements are stated only in laws; NRC regulations; licenses, including technical specifications; or orders, not in NUREG-sories publications. The views expressed in contractor-prepared publications in this series are not necessarily those of the NRC.

The NUREG series comprises (1) technical and administrative reports and books prepared by the staff (NUREG-XXXX) or agency contractors (NUREG/CP-XXXX), (2) proceedings of conferences (NUREG/CP-XXXX), (3) reports resulting from international agreements (NUREG/IA-XXXX), (4) brochures (NUREG/BR-XXXX), and (5) compilations of legal decisions and orders of the Commission and Alomic and Safety Licensing Boards and of Directors' decisions under Section 2.206 of NRC's regulations (NUREG-0750).

 \pm

9

JT

Central and Eastern United States Seismic Source Characterization for Nuclear Facilities

Cosponsors

U.S. Department of Energy 1000 Independence Avenue SW Washington, DC 20585

R. H. Lagdon, Jr. Chief of Nuclear Safety Office of the Under Secretary for Nuclear Security, S-5

M.E. Shields Project Manager Office of Nuclear Energy, NE-72

Electric Power Research Institute 3420 Hillview Avenue Palo Alto, CA 94304

J. F. Hamel Program Manager Advanced Nuclear Technology

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research Washington DC 20555

R.G. Roche-Rivera NRC Project Manager **DISCLAIMER OF WARRANTIES AND LIMITATION OF LIABILITIES**

EPRI DISCLAIMER

THIS DOCUMENT WAS PREPARED AS AN ACCOUNT OF WORK SPONSORED OR COSPONSORED BY THE ELECTRIC POWER RESEARCH INSTITUTE, INC. (EPRI). NEITHER EPRI, ANY MEMBER OF EPRI, ANY COSPONSOR BELOW, NOR ANY PERSON ACTING ON BEHALF OF ANY OF THEM:

(A) MAKES ANY WARRANTY OR REPRESENTATION WHATSOEVER, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, (I) WITH RESPECT TO THE USE OF ANY INFORMATION, APPARATUS, METHOD, PROCESS, OR SIMILAR ITEM DISCLOSED IN THIS DOCUMENT, INCLUDING MERCHANTABILITY AND FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE, OR (II) THAT SUCH USE DOES NOT INFRINGE ON OR INTERFERE WITH PRIVATELY OWNED RIGHTS, INCLUDING ANY PARTY'S INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY, OR (III) THAT THIS DOCUMENT IS SUITABLE TO ANY PARTICULAR USER'S CIRCUMSTANCE; OR

(B) ASSUMES RESPONSIBILITY FOR ANY DAMAGES OR OTHER LIABILITY WHATSOEVER (INCLUDING ANY CONSEQUENTIAL DAMAGES, EVEN IF EPRI OR ANY EPRI REPRESENTATIVE HAS BEEN ADVISED OF THE POSSIBILITY OF SUCH DAMAGES RESULTING FROM YOUR SELECTION OR USE OF THIS DOCUMENT OR ANY INFORMATION, APPARATUS, METHOD, PROCESS, OR SIMILAR ITEM DISCLOSED IN THIS DOCUMENT.

DOE DISCLAIMER

THIS REPORT WAS PREPARED AS AN ACCOUNT OF WORK SPONSORED BY AN AGENCY OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT, NEITHER THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT NOR ANY AGENCY THEREOF, NOR ANY OF THEIR EMPLOYEES, MAKES ANY WARRANTY, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, OR ASSUMES ANY LEGAL LIABILITY OR RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE ACCURACY, COMPLETENESS, OR USEFULNESS OF ANY INFORMATION, APPARATUS, PRODUCT, OR PROCESS DISCLOSED, OR REPRESENTS THAT ITS USE WOULD NOT INFRINCE PRIVATELY OWNED RIGHTS. REFERENCE HEREIN TO ANY SPECIFIC COMMERCIAL PRODUCT, PROCESS, OR SERVICE BY TRADE NAME, TRADEMARK, MANUFACTURER, OR OTHERWISE DOES NOT NECESSARILY CONSTITUTE OR IMPLY ITS ENDORSEMENT, RECOMMENDATION, OR FAVORING BY THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT OR ANY AGENCY THEREOF. THE VIEWS AND OPINIONS OF AUTHORS EXPRESSED HEREIN DO NOT NECESSARILY STATE OR REFLECT THOSE OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT OR ANY AGENCY THEREOF.

NRC DISCLAIMER

THIS REPORT WAS PREPARED AS AN ACCOUNT OF WORK SPONSORED BY AN AGENCY OF THE U.S. GOVERNMENT. NEITHER THE U.S. GOVERNMENT NOR ANY AGENCY THEREOF, NOR ANY EMPLOYEE, MAKES ANY WARRANTY, EXPRESSED OR IMPLIED, OR ASSUMES ANY LEGAL LIABILITY OR RÉSPONSIBILITY FOR ANY THIRD PARTY'S USE, OR THE RESULTS OF SUCH USE, OF ANY INFORMATION, APPARATUS, PRODUCT, OR PROCESS DISCLOSED IN THIS PUBLICATION, OR REPRESENTS THAT ITS USE BY SUCH THIRD PARTY WOULD NOT INFRINGE PRIVATELY OWNED RIGHTS. THE STATEMENTS, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ARE THOSE OF THE AUTHOR(S) AND DO NOT NECESSARILY REFLECT THE VIEW OF THE US NUCLEAR REGULATORY. OMMISSION.

This document was <u>not</u> developed under a 10CFR50 Appendix B program.

SPONSORS' ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The project sponsors would like to acknowledge the following individuals for directing the project:

Coppersmith Consulting, Inc. 2121 N. California Blvd., #290 Walnut Creek, CA 94596

Technical Integration (TI) Lead K.J. Coppersmith

Savannah River Nuclear Solutions, LLC Savannah River Site Building 730-4B, Room 313 Aiken, SC 29808

L.A. Salomone

This document describes research sponsored by the Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI), U.S. Department of Energy (U.S. DOE) under Award Number DE-FG07-08ID14908, and the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (U.S. NRC) under Award Number NCR-04-09-144.

CEUS SSC Project Manager

This publication is a corporate document that should be cited in the literature in the following manner:

Technical Report: Central and Eastern United States Seismic Source Characterization for Nuclear Facilities. EPRI, Palo Alto, CA, U.S. DOE, and U.S. NRC: 2012.

AUTHORS

This document was prepared by the following investigators:

Technical Integration Lead	Kevin J. Coppersmith
Project Manager	Lawrence A. Salomone
Technical Integration Team	Chris W. Fuller
_	Laura L. Glaser
	Kathryn L. Hanson
	Ross D. Hartleb
	William R. Lettis
	Scott C. Lindvall
	Stephen M. McDuffle
	Robin K. McGuire
	Gerry L. Stirewalt
	Gabriel R. Toro
,	Robert R. Youngs
Database Manager	David L. Slayter
Technical Support	Serkan B. Bozkurt
	Randolph J. Cumbest
	Valentina Montaldo Falero
•	Roseanne C. Perman
	Allison M. Shumway
	Frank H. Syms
	Martilia (Tish) P. Tuttle, Paleoliquefaction Data Resource

v

iii

LI NI 1021077

This document has been reproduced from the best available copy.

ABSTRACT

This report describes a new seismic source characterization (SSC) model for the Central and Eastern United States (CEUS). It will replace the *Seismic Hazard Methodology for the Central and Eastern United States*, EPRI Report NP-4726 (July 1986) and the *Seismic Hazard Characterization of 69 Nuclear Plant Sites East of the Rocky Mountains*, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory Model, (Bernreuter et al., 1989). The objective of the CEUS SSC Project is to develop a new seismic source model for the CEUS using a Senior Seismic Hazard Analysis . Committee (SSHAC) Level 3 assessment process. The goal of the SSHAC process is to represent the center, body, and range of technically defensible interpretations of the available data, models, and methods. Input to a probabilistic seismic hazard analysis (PSHA) consists of both seismic source characterization and ground motion characterization. These two components are used to calculate probabilistic hazard results (or seismic hazard curves) at a particular site. This report provides a new seismic source model.

Results and Findings

The product of this report is a regional CEUS SSC model. This model includes consideration of an updated database, full assessment and incorporation of uncertainties, and the range of diverse technical interpretations from the larger technical community. The SSC model will be widely applicable to the entire CEUS, so this project uses a ground motion model that includes generic variations to allow for a range of representative site conditions (deep soil, shallow soil, hard rock). Hazard and sensitivity calculations were conducted at seven test sites representative of different CEUS hazard environments.

Challenges and Objectives

The regional CEUS SSC model will be of value to readers who are involved in PSHA work, and who wish to use an updated SSC model. This model is based on a comprehensive and traceable process, in accordance with SSHAC guidelines in NUREG/CR-6372, *Recommendations for Probabilistic Seismic Hazard Analysis: Guidance on Uncertainty and Use of Experts.* The model will be used to assess the present-day composite distribution for seismic sources along with their characterization in the CEUS and uncertainty. In addition, this model is in a form suitable for use in PSHA evaluations for regulatory activities, such as Early Site Permit (ESPs) and Combined Operating License Applications (COLAs).

Applications, Values, and Use

Development of a regional CEUS seismic source model will provide value to those who (1) have submitted an ESP or COLA for Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) review before 2011; (2) will submit an ESP or COLA for NRC review after 2011; (3) must respond to safety issues resulting from NRC Generic Issue 199 (GI-199) for existing plants and (4) will prepare PSHAs to meet design and periodic review requirements for current and future nuclear facilities. This work replaces a previous study performed approximately 25 years ago. Since that study was

ix

completed, substantial work has been done to improve the understanding of seismic sources and their characterization in the CEUS. Thus, a new regional SSC model provides a consistent, stable basis for computing PSHA for a future time span. Use of a new SSC model reduces the risk of delays in new plant licensing due to more conservative interpretations in the existing and future literature.

Perspective

The purpose of this study, jointly sponsored by EPRI, the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), and the NRC was to develop a new CEUS SSC model. The team assembled to accomplish this purpose was composed of distinguished subject matter experts from industry, government, and academia. The resulting model is unique, and because this project has solicited input from the present-day larger technical community, it is not likely that there will be a need for significant revision for a number of years. See also Sponsors' Perspective for more details.

Approach

The goal of this project was to implement the CEUS SSC work plan for developing a regional CEUS SSC model. The work plan, formulated by the project manager and a technical integration team, consists of a series of tasks designed to meet the project objectives. This report was reviewed by a participatory peer review panel (PPRP), sponsor reviewers, the NRC, the U.S. Geological Survey, and other stakeholders. Comments from the PPRP and other reviewers were considered when preparing the report. The SSC model was completed at the end of 2011.

Keywords

х

Probabilistic seismic hazard analysis (PSHA) Seismic source characterization (SSC) Seismic source characterization model Central and Eastern United States (CEUS)

CONTENTS

Abstract
Contents
List of Figures
List of Tables
Executive Summary
Participatory Peer Review Panel Final Report Dated October 24, 2011xcv
Project Acknowledgements
Sponsor's Perspective
Abbreviations
1 INTRODUCTION1-1
1.1 Background and History1-1
1.1.1 EPRI-SOG and LLNL Projects1-2
1.1.2 Development of the SSHAC Process1-2
1.1.3 Implementation of the SSHAC Methodology1-3
1.1.4 Regional SSC Model for Nuclear Facilities
1.1.5 Differences from USGS National Seismic Hazard Mapping Project1-4
1.2 Purpose of the CEUS SSC Project1-5
1.2.1 Implementation of SSHAC Level 3 Process
1.2.2 Goals: Stability and Longevity1-8
1.2.3 Interface with Ground Motion Models
1.3 Study Region
1.4 Products of Project
1.4.1 Seismic Source Model for Study Region
1.4.2 Hazard Input Document
1.4.3 Documentation of Technical Bases for All Assessments
1.4.4 Other Key Products
1.4.4.1 Data Evaluation and Data Summary Tables1-13

xi

1.4.4.2 Database of Geologic, Geophysical, and Seismological Data
1.4.4.3 Earthquake Catalog with Uniform Moment Magnitudes
1.4.4.4 Updated Paleoseismicity Data and Guidance1-14
1.4.4.5 Recommendations for Future Applications of SSC Model
2 SSHAC LEVEL 3 ASSESSMENT PROCESS AND IMPLEMENTATION
2.1 Goals and Activities of a SSHAC Assessment Process
2.1.1 Evaluation
2.1.2 Integration
2.2 Roles of CEUS SSC Project Participants
2.3 CEUS SSC Project Organization
2.4 Key Tasks and Activities
2.4.1 Database Development2-9
2.4.2 Identification of Significant Issues2-10
2.4.3 Workshop #1—Key Issues and Available Data2-10
2.4.4 Workshop #2-Alternative Interpretations2-12
2.4.5 Working Meetings
2.4.6 SSC Sensitivity Model Development2-14
2.4.7 Workshop #3-Feedback
2.4.8 SSC Preliminary Model Development
2.4.9 Finalization and Review of SSC Draft and Final Model
2.4.10 Documentation2-19
2.4.10.1 Development of the Hazard Input Document
2.4.10.2 Development of Earlier Draft Report
2.4.10.3 Draft Report Review2-19
2.4.10.4 Final Report Development2-20
2.5 Participatory Peer Review Panel2-20
2.5.1 Roles and Responsibilities2-20
2.5.2 Reviews and Feedback2-20
2.5.3 Fulfiliment of SSHAC-Prescribed Scope of Review of Both Technical and Process issues
2.6 Consistency of CEUS SSC Assessment Process with SSHAC Guidelines2-22
3 EARTHQUAKE CATALOG
3.1 Goals for the Earthquake Catalog Development3-1
3.1.1 Completeness

3.1.2 Uniformity of Catalog Processing
3.1.3 Catalog Review3-3
3.2 Catalog Compilation
3.2.1 Continental-Scale Catalogs3-5
3.2.2 Regional Catalogs3-7
3.2.3 Catalogs from Special Studies
3.2.4 Focal Depth Data3-8
3.2.5 Nontectonic Events
3.2.6 Identification of Unique Earthquake Entries3-9
3.3 Development of a Uniform Moment Magnitude Earthquake Catalog
3.3.1 Approach for Uniform Magnitude and Unbiased Recurrence Estimation
3.3.2 Estimation of E[M] for the CEUS SSC Project Catalog
3.3.2.1 Effect of Magnitude Rounding on Statistical Tests
3.3.2.2 Moment Magnitude Data3-20
3.3.2.3 Estimation of E[M] from Body-Wave Magnitudes
3.3.2.4 Estimation of E[M] from ML Magnitudes
3.3.2.5 Estimation of E[M] from Ms Magnitudes3-29
3.3.2.6 Estimation of E[M] from M_c and M_p Magnitudes
3.3.2.7 Estimation of E[M] from the Logarithm of Felt Area
3.3.2.8 Estimation of E[M] from the Maximum Intensity, Io
3.3.2.9 Uniform Moment Magnitude Catalog of E[M] and N* Values
3.4 Identification of Independent Earthquakes3-37
3.5 Catalog Completeness
A CONCEPTUAL SEISMIC SOURCE CHARACTERIZATION FRAMEWORK
4 1 Needs for a Concentral SSC Framework 4-2
4.1.1.1 orig Tree Approach to Representing Alternatives and Assessing
Uncertainties
4.1.1.1 Examples of Logic Trees4-3
4.1.1.2 Assigning Weights to Logic Tree Branches4-3
4.1.2 Data Identification and Evaluation4-5
4.1.2.1 "Generic" Data Identification to Address Indicators of a Seismic Source4-5
4.1.2.2 Data Evaluation for Particular Seismic Sources: Data Evaluation and Data Summary Tables
4.1.3 Methodology for Identifying Seismic Sources

.

xii

xiii

.

. .

4.1.3.1 Hazard-Informed Approach4-11
4.1.3.2 Conclusions Regarding the Hazard Significance of Various SSC Issues4-13
4.1.3.3 Criteria for Defining Seismic Sources
4.2 Master Logic Tree
4.2.1 Description of Logic Tree Elements
4.2.2 RLME Source Logic Tree
4.2.3 Mmax Zones Logic Tree4-22
4.2.4 Seismotectonic Zones Branch4-24
5 SSC MODEL: OVERVIEW AND METHODOLOGY
5.1 Overview of Spatial and Temporal Models
5.1.1 Spatial Model Considerations
5.1.2 Considerations Regarding Temporal Models
5.1.3 Perspective on CEUS SSC Models
5.2 Maximum Earthquake Magnitude Assessment
5.2.1 Approaches to Mmax Estimation in the CEUS
5.2.1.1 Bayesian Mmax Approach
5.2.1.2 Kijko Approach to Mmax Assessment5-17
5.2.1.3 Weights for the Alternative Mmax Approaches
5.2.1.4 Example Mmax Distributions
5.2.2 Other Mmax Issues
5.3 Earthquake Recurrence Assessment
5.3.1 Smoothing to Represent Spatial Stationarity
5.3.2 Smoothing Approach
5.3.2.1 Development of Penalized-Likelihood Approach and Formulation
5.3.2.2 Application of the Model and Specification of Model Parameters
5.3.2.3 Exploration of Model Results in Parameter Space
5.3.2.4 Consideration of Constant b-Value Kernel Approaches
5.3.2.5 Comparison to EPRI-SOG Approach
5.3.2.6 Assessment of the Lombardi Study
5.3.3 Estimation of Recurrence for RLME Sources
5.3.3.1 Estimation of Occurrence Rates for the Poisson Model
5.3.3.2 Estimation of Occurrence Rates for a Renewal Model
5.3.3.3 Incorporating Uncertainty in the Input
5.3.3.4 RLME Magnitude Distribution5-53

5.4 Assessment of Future Earthquake Characteristics	5-54
5.4.1 Tectonic Stress Regime	5-55
5.4.2 Sense of Slip/Style of Faulting	5-55
5.4.3 Strike and Dip of Ruptures	5-55
5.4.4 Seismogenic Crustal Thickness	5-56
5.4.5 Fault Rupture Area	5-57
5.4.6 Rupture Length-to-Width Aspect Ratio	5-57
5.4.7 Relationship of Rupture to Source Zone Boundaries	5-58
5.5 Predicted Seismic Moment Rate	5-58
6 SSC MODEL: RLME SOURCES AND MMAX ZONES BRANCH	6-1
6.1 RLME Sources	6-1
6.1.1 Charlevoix	6-3
6.1.1.1 Evidence for Temporal Clustering	6-4
6.1.1.2 Localizing Tectonic Features	
6.1.1.3 Geometry and Style of Faulting	6-5
6.1.1.4 RLME Magnitude	6-7
	6.9
6.1.1.5 KLME Recurrence	
6.1.2 Charleston	6-10
6.1.2 Charleston 6.1.2.1 Evidence for Temporal Clustering	6-10 6-1/1
6.1.2.1 Evidence for Temporal Clustering 6.1.2.2 Localizing Feature	6-10 6-11 6-12
6.1.2.1 Evidence for Temporal Clustering 6.1.2.2 Localizing Feature 6.1.2.3 Geometry and Style of Faulting	6-10 6-11 6-12
6.1.2.1 Evidence for Temporal Clustering 6.1.2.1 Evidence for Temporal Clustering 6.1.2.2 Localizing Feature 6.1.2.3 Geometry and Style of Faulting 6.1.2.4 RLME Magnitude	6-10 6-11 6-12 6-12 6-15
6.1.2.1 Evidence for Temporal Clustering 6.1.2.1 Evidence for Temporal Clustering 6.1.2.2 Localizing Feature 6.1.2.3 Geometry and Style of Faulting 6.1.2.4 RLME Magnitude 6.1.2.5 RLME Recurrence	6-10 6-11 6-12 6-12 6-15 6-15
6.1.2.1 Evidence for Temporal Clustering 6.1.2.1 Evidence for Temporal Clustering 6.1.2.2 Localizing Feature 6.1.2.3 Geometry and Style of Faulting 6.1.2.4 RLME Magnitude 6.1.2.5 RLME Recurrence 6.1.3 Cheraw Fault	6-10 6-11 6-12 6-12 6-15 6-17 6-22
6.1.1.5 RLME Recurrence	6-10 6-11 6-12 6-12 6-15 6-17 6-22 6-23
6.1.1.1.5 RLME Recurrence 6.1.2 Charleston 6.1.2.1 Evidence for Temporal Clustering 6.1.2.2 Localizing Feature 6.1.2.3 Geometry and Style of Faulting 6.1.2.4 RLME Magnitude 6.1.2.5 RLME Recurrence 6.1.3 Cheraw Fault 6.1.3 Cheraw Fault 6.1.3.1 Evidence for Temporal Clustering 6.1.3.2 Geometry and Style of Faulting	
6.1.1.5 RLME Recurrence 6.1.2 Charleston 6.1.2.1 Evidence for Temporal Clustering 6.1.2.2 Localizing Feature 6.1.2.3 Geometry and Style of Faulting 6.1.2.4 RLME Magnitude 6.1.2.5 RLME Recurrence 6.1.3 Cheraw Fault 6.1.3.1 Evidence for Temporal Clustering 6.1.3.2 Geometry and Style of Faulting 6.1.3.3 RLME Magnitude	
6.1.1.5 RLME Recurrence 6.1.2 Charleston 6.1.2.1 Evidence for Temporal Clustering 6.1.2.2 Localizing Feature 6.1.2.3 Geometry and Style of Faulting 6.1.2.4 RLME Magnitude 6.1.2.5 RLME Recurrence 6.1.3 Cheraw Fault 6.1.3.1 Evidence for Temporal Clustering 6.1.3.2 Geometry and Style of Faulting 6.1.3.3 RLME Magnitude 6.1.3.4 RLME Recurrence	
6.1.1.5 RLME Recurrence 6.1.2 Charleston 6.1.2.1 Evidence for Temporal Clustering. 6.1.2.2 Localizing Feature 6.1.2.3 Geometry and Style of Faulting 6.1.2.4 RLME Magnitude 6.1.2.5 RLME Recurrence 6.1.3 Cheraw Fault 6.1.3.1 Evidence for Temporal Clustering. 6.1.3.2 Geometry and Style of Faulting 6.1.3.3 RLME Magnitude 6.1.3.4 RLME Magnitude 6.1.3.4 RLME Recurrence 6.1.4 Meers Fault.	
6.1.1.5 RLME Recurrence 6.1.2 Charleston 6.1.2.1 Evidence for Temporal Clustering 6.1.2.2 Localizing Feature 6.1.2.3 Geometry and Style of Faulting 6.1.2.4 RLME Magnitude 6.1.2.5 RLME Recurrence 6.1.3 Cheraw Fault 6.1.3.1 Evidence for Temporal Clustering 6.1.3.2 Geometry and Style of Faulting 6.1.3.3 RLME Magnitude 6.1.3.4 RLME Magnitude 6.1.3.4 RLME Recurrence 6.1.3.4 RLME Recurrence 6.1.4 Meers Fault 6.1.4.1 Evidence for Temporal Clustering	
6.1.1.5 RLME Recurrence 6.1.2 Charleston 6.1.2.1 Evidence for Temporal Clustering 6.1.2.2 Localizing Feature 6.1.2.3 Geometry and Style of Faulting 6.1.2.4 RLME Magnitude 6.1.2.5 RLME Recurrence 6.1.3 Cheraw Fault 6.1.3.1 Evidence for Temporal Clustering 6.1.3.2 Geometry and Style of Faulting 6.1.3.3 RLME Magnitude 6.1.3.4 RLME Magnitude 6.1.4.4 Recurrence 6.1.4.1 Evidence for Temporal Clustering 6.1.4.1 Evidence for Temporal Clustering	
6.1.1.5 RLME Recurrence 6.1.2 Charleston 6.1.2.1 Evidence for Temporal Clustering 6.1.2.2 Localizing Feature 6.1.2.3 Geometry and Style of Faulting 6.1.2.4 RLME Magnitude 6.1.2.5 RLME Recurrence 6.1.3 Cheraw Fault 6.1.3.1 Evidence for Temporal Clustering 6.1.3.2 Geometry and Style of Faulting 6.1.3.3 RLME Magnitude 6.1.3.4 RLME Recurrence 6.1.3.4 RLME Recurrence 6.1.4 Meers Fault 6.1.4.1 Evidence for Temporal Clustering 6.1.4.2 Localizing Feature 6.1.4.3 Geometry and Style of Faulting	
6.1.1.5 RLME Recurrence 6.1.2 Charleston 6.1.2.1 Evidence for Temporal Clustering. 6.1.2.2 Localizing Feature 6.1.2.3 Geometry and Style of Faulting 6.1.2.4 RLME Magnitude 6.1.2.5 RLME Recurrence 6.1.3 Cheraw Fault 6.1.3.1 Evidence for Temporal Clustering. 6.1.3.2 Geometry and Style of Faulting 6.1.3.3 RLME Magnitude 6.1.3.4 RLME Recurrence 6.1.3.4 RLME Recurrence 6.1.4 Meers Fault 6.1.4.1 Evidence for Temporal Clustering. 6.1.4.3 Geometry and Style of Faulting 6.1.4.3 Geometry and Style of Faulting 6.1.4.4 RLME Magnitude	

6.1.5 Reelfoot Rift-New Madrid Fault System6-35
6.1.5.1 Evidence for Temporal Clustering6-40
6.1.5.2 Geometry and Style of Faulting6-42
6.1.5.3 RLME Magnitude6-44
6.1,5.4 RLME Recurrence
6.1.6 Reelfoot Rift—Eastern Rift Margin Fault6-50
6.1.6.1 Evidence for Temporal Clustering6-53
6.1.6.2 Geometry and Style of Faulting6-53
6.1.6.3 RLME Magnitude6-54
6.1.6.4 RLME Recurrence
6.1.7 Reelfoot Rift-Marianna6-57
6.1.7.1 Evidence for Temporal Clustering6-58
6.1.7.2 Geometry and Style of Faulting6-59
6.1.7.3 RLME Magnitude6-60
6.1.7.4 RLME Recurrence
6.1.8 Reelfoot Rift-Commerce Fault Zone6-62
6.1.8.1 Evidence for Temporal Clustering6-63
6.1.8.2 Geometry and Style of Faulting6-64
6.1.8.3 RLME Magnitude6-65
6.1.8.4 RLME Recurrence6-66
6.1.9 Wabash Valley6-68
6.1.9.1 Evidence for Temporal Clustering6-69
6.1.9.2 Geometry and Style of Faulting6-69
6.1.9.3 RLME Magnitude6-72
6.1.9.4 RLME Recurrence6-73
6.2 Mmax Distributed Seismicity Source Zones
6.2.1 Definition of Mmax Zones6-74
6.2.2 Criteria for Defining the MESE/NMESE Boundary6-75
6.3 Maximum Magnitude Distributions for Mmax Distributed Seismicity Sources
6,3.1 Maximum Observed Earthquake Magnitude
6.3.2 Mmax Distributions
6.4 Recurrence Parameters
6.4.1 Rate and b-Value Maps for Single Zone and Two Zones
6.4.2 Comparison of Recurrence Parameters to Catalog6-79

7 SSC MODEL: SEISMOTECTONIC ZONES BRANCH	7-1
7.1 Approaches and Data Used to Define Seismotectonic Zones	
7.2 RLME Sources in the Seismotectonic Zones Branch	7-4
7.3 Seismotectonic Source Zones	7-4
7.3.1 St. Lawrence Rift Zone (SLR)	
7.3.1.1 Background	7-5
7.3.1.2 Basis for Defining Seismotectonic Zone	7-11
7.3.1.3 Basis for Zone Geometry	7-12
7.3.1.4 Basis for Zone Mmax	7-12
7.3.1.5 Future Earthquake Characteristics	
7.3.2 Great Meteor Hotspot Zone (GMH)	7-15
7.3.2.1 Background	
7.3.2.2 Basis for Defining Seismotectonic Zone	
7.3.2.3 Basis for Zone Geometry	
7.3.2.4 Basis for Zone Mmax	7-19
7.3.2.5 Future Earthquake Characteristics	
7.3.3 Northern Appalachian Zone (NAP)	7-21
7.3.3.1 Background	7-21
7.3.3.2 Basis for Defining Seismotectonic Zone	
7.3.3.3 Basis for Zone Geometry	7-24
7.3.3.4 Basis for Zone Mmax	7-24
7.3.3.5 Future Earthquake Characteristics	7-25
7.3.4 Paleozoic Extended Crust (PEZ)	7-25
7.3.4.1 Background	
7.3.4.2 Basis for Defining Seismotectonic Zone	7-32
7,3,4.3 Basis for Zone Geometry	7-33
7.3.4.4 Basis for Zone Mmax	
7.3.4.5 Future Earthquake Characteristics	7-36
7.3.5 Ilinois Basin Extended Basement Zone (IBEB)	7-37
7.3.5.1 Background	7-38
7.3.5.2 Basis for Defining Seismotectonic Zone	
7.3.5.3 Basis for Zone Geometry	
7.3.5.4 Basis for Zone Mmax	
7.3.5.5 Future Earthquake Characteristics	7-41
7.3.6 Reelfoot Rift Zone (RR)	7-42

xvii

7.3.6.1 Background	7-42
7.3.6.2 Basis for Defining Seismotectonic Zone	7-46
7.3.6.3 Basis for Zone Geometry	7-46
7.3.6.4 Basis for Zone Mmax	7-47
7.3.6.5 Future Earthquake Characteristics	7-48
7.3.7 Extended Continental Crust-Atlantic Margin Zone (ECC-AM)	7-48
7.3.7.1 Background	7-49
7.3.7.2 Basis for Defining Seismotectonic Zone	7-53
7.3.7.3 Basis for Geometry	7-54
7.3.7.4 Basis for Mmax	7-54
7.3.7.5 Future Earthquake Characteristics	7-55
7.3.8 Atlantic Highly Extended Crust Zone (AHEX)	7-55
7.3.8.1 Basis for Defining Seismotectonic Zone	7-56
7.3.8.2 Basis for Geometry	7-57
7.3.8.3 Basis for Mmax	7-57
7.3.8.4 Future Earthquake Characteristics	7-57
7.3.9 Extended Continental Crust-Gulf Coast Zone (ECC-GC)	7-58
7.3.9.1 Basis for Defining Seismotectonic Zone	7-58
7.3.9.2 Basis for Zone Geometry	7-59
7.3.9.3 Basis for Zone Mmax	7-62
7.3.9.4 Future Earthquake Characteristics	7-63
7.3.9.5 Possible Paleoliquefaction Features in Arkansas, Louisiana, and Mississippi	7 - 64
7.3.10 Gulf Coast Highly Extended Crust Zone (GHEX)	7 - 65
7.3.10.1 Basis for Defining Seismotectonic Zone	7- <u>6</u> 6
7.3.10.2 Basis for Zone Geometry	
7.3.10.3 Basis for Zone Mmax	
7.3.10.4 Future Earthquake Characteristics	7-67
7.3.11 Oklahoma Aulacogen Zone (OKA)	7-68
7.3.11.1 Basis for Defining Seismotectonic Zone	7-69
7.3.11.2 Basis for Zone Geometry	7-69
7.3.11.3 Basis for Zone Mmax	7-70
7.3.11.4 Future Earthquake Characteristics	7-70
7.3.12 Midcontinent-Craton Zone (MidC)	7-70
7.3.12.1 Background	7-71

7 3 12 2 Basis for Defining Seismotectonic Zone	
7.3.12.2 Basis for Zone Geometry	
7.3.12.5 Dasis for Zong Mmax	
7.3.12.4 Dasis for 2010 Windows	
7.5.12.5 Putule Earlingdane Characterious and Antimum Magnitude Distributed Seismicity	
Sources	7-78
7.4.1 Maximum Observed Earthquake Magnitude	7-78
7.4.2 Mmax Distributions	7-79
7.5 Recurrence Parameters	
7.5.1 Rate and b-Value Maps for Single Zone and Two Zones	7-80
7.5.2 Comparison of Recurrence Parameters to Catalog	7-80
8 DEMONSTRATION HAZARD CALCULATIONS	8-1
8.1 Background on Demonstration Hazard Calculations	8-1
8,2 Demonstration Hazard Calculations	8-2
8.2.1 Central Illinois Site	8-4
8.2.2 Chattanooga Site	8-5
8.2.3 Houston Site	8-6
8.2.4 Jackson Site	8-7
8.2.5 Manchester Site	8-9
8.2.6 Savannah Site	8-9
8.2.7 Topeka Site	8-10
9 USE OF THE CEUS SSC MODEL IN PSHA	9-1
9.1 Overview	
9.2 Hazard input Document (HiD)	
9.3 Implementation Instructions	9-2
9.3.1 Simplifications to Seismic Sources	9-2
9.3.1.1 Charleston RLME	9-3
9.3.1.2 Charlevoix RLME	9-3
9.3.1.3 Cheraw RLME	
9.3.1.4 Commerce Fault Zone RLME	9-5
9.3.1.5 Eastern Rift Margin North RLME	9-5
9.3.1.6 Eastern Rift Margin South RLME	9-5
9.3.1.7 Marianna RLME	
9.3.1.8 Meers RLME	9-6

ς.

xviii

xix

9.3.1 9 New Madrid Fault System RI ME	
	9-7
9.3.1.10 Wabash Valley RLME	9-7
9.3.1.11 Background Sources	9-8
9.3.2 Accessing the SSC Model and Components from the Website	9-8
9.3.3 Accessing Project Databases	9-9
9.3.4 Use of SSC Model with Site-Specific Refinements	9-10
9.4 Hazard Significance	9-10
9.4.1 Data Available to Evaluate the Precision of Seismic Hazard Estimates	9-10
9.4.2 Observed Imprecision in Seismic Hazard Estimates	9-11
9.4.2.1 Area Seismic Sources	9-11
9,4,2.2 RLME Seismic Sources	9-12
9.4.2.3 Ground Motion Equations	9-15
9.4.2.4 Site Response	9-19
9.4.3 Conclusions on the Precision in Seismic Hazard Estimates	9-19
10 REFERENCES	
11 GLOSSARY OF KEY TERMS	11-1
A DESCRIPTION OF THE CEUS SSC PROJECT DATABASE	A-1
A.1 Data Sources	A-2
A.2 Project Database Design and Management	A-3
A.3 Workflow and Data Assessment	A-3
A.3.1 Workflow	A-3
A.3.2 Digital Data	A-4
A.3.2 Digital Data A.3.3 Nondigital Data	A-4 A-4
A.3.2 Digital Data A.3.3 Nondigital Data A.4 Use of Project Database In Model Development	A-4 A-4 A-5
A.3.2 Digital Data A.3.3 Nondigital Data A.4 Use of Project Database in Model Development A.5 Metadata	A-4 A-4 A-5 A-5
A.3.2 Digital Data A.3.3 Nondigital Data A.4 Use of Project Database in Model Development A.5 Metadata A.6 Database Delivery Format	
A.3.2 Digital Data A.3.3 Nondigital Data A.4 Use of Project Database in Model Development A.5 Metadata A.6 Database Delivery Format	A-4 A-4 A-5 A-5 A-6
A.3.2 Digital Data A.3.3 Nondigital Data A.4 Use of Project Database in Model Development A.5 Metadata A.6 Database Delivery Format B EARTHQUAKE CATALOG DATABASE	
A.3.2 Digital Data A.3.3 Nondigital Data A.4 Use of Project Database in Model Development A.5 Metadata A.6 Database Delivery Format BEARTHQUAKE CATALOG DATABASE B.1 CEUS SSC Uniform Moment Magnitude Earthquake Catalog	
A.3.2 Digital Data A.3.3 Nondigital Data A.4 Use of Project Database in Model Development A.5 Metadata A.6 Database Delivery Format BEARTHQUAKE CATALOG DATABASE B.1 CEUS SSC Uniform Moment Magnitude Earthquake Catalog B.2 Moment Magnitude Data	
A.3.2 Digital Data A.3.3 Nondigital Data A.4 Use of Project Database In Model Development A.5 Metadata A.6 Database Delivery Format BEARTHQUAKE CATALOG DATABASE B.1 CEUS SSC Uniform Moment Magnitude Earthquake Catalog B.2 Moment Magnitude Data B.3 Approximate Moment Magnitude Data	A-4 A-4 A-5 A-5 A-5 A-6 B-1 B-1 B-1 B-2 B-3

C DATA EVALUATION TABLES	C-1
Introduction	C-2
D DATA SUMMARY TABLES	D-1
Introduction	D-2
E CEUS PALEOLIQUEFACTION DATABASE, UNCERTAINTIES ASSOCIATED WIT PALEOLIQUEFACTION DATA, AND GUIDANCE FOR SEISMIC SOURCE CHARACTERIZATION	H E-i
E.1 Development of the Paleoliquefaction Database	E-1
E.1.1 Database Structure	E-1
E.1.2 Regional Data Sets	E-4
E.2 Uncertainties Associated with Paleoliquefaction Data	E-24
E.2.1 Collection of Paleoliquefaction Data	E-24
E.2.2 Uncertainties Related to Interpretation of Paleoliquefaction Data	E-35
E.2.3 Recommendations for Future Research	E-43
E.3 Guidance for the Use of Paleoliquefaction Data in Seismic Source Characterization	E-44
E.4 Glossary	E-46
E.5 References	E-49
E.5.1 References Cited in Paleoliquefaction Database	E-49
E.5.2 References Cited in Appendix E	E-54
F WORKSHOP SUMMARIES	F-1
WORKSHOP 1: KEY ISSUES AND AVAILABLE DATA	
DAY 1-TUESDAY, JULY 22, 2008	F-1
DAY 2-WEDNESDAY, JULY 23, 2008	F-10
REFERENCES	F-17
WORKSHOP 2: ALTERNATIVE INTERPRETATIONS	
DAY 1-WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 2009	F18
DAY 2-THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 2009	F-24
DAY 3-FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 2009	F - 29
REFERENCES	F-34
WORKSHOP 3: FEEDBACK	
DAY 1-TUESDAY, AUGUST 25, 2009	F-42

DAY 2-WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 26, 2009......

xxi

.F-49

G BIOGRAPHIES OF PROJECT TEAM
EPRI MANAGEMENTG-2
PROJECT MANAGERG-2
TI TEAMG-3
TECHNICAL SUPPORTG-7
DATABASE MANAGERG-9
PARTICIPATORY PEER REVIEW PANELG-9
SPONSOR REVIEWERSG-14
H CEUS SSC MODEL HAZARD INPUT DOCUMENT (HID)
H.1 IntroductionH-1
H.2 Seismic Source Model Structure and Master Logic Tree
H.3 Mmax Zones Distributed Seismicity SourcesH-2
H.3.1 Division of Study RegionH-2
H.3.2 Location of Boundary of Mesozoic ExtensionH-2
H.3.3 Magnitude Interval Weights for Fitting Earthquake Occurrence Parameters H-2
H.3.4 Mmax Zones
H.3.5 Selsmogenic Crustal ThicknessH-2
H.3.6 Future Earthquake Rupture Characteristics
H.3.7 Assessment of Seismicity Rates
H.3.8 Degree of Smoothing Applied in Defining Spatial Smoothing of Seismicity Rates
H.3.9 Uncertainty in Earthquake Recurrence Rates
H.3.10 Uncertainty in Maximum Magnitude
H.4 Seismotectonic Zones
H.4.1 Alternative Zonation ModelsH-4
H.4.2 Magnitude Interval Weights for Fitting Earthquake Occurrence Parameters H-4
H.4.3 Seismotectonic ZonesH-5
H.4.4 Seismogenic Crustal Thickness
H.4.5 Future Earthquake Rupture CharacteristicsH-5
H.4.6 Assessment of Seismicity RatesH-6
H.4.7 Degree of Smoothing Applied in Defining Spatial Smoothing of Seismicity Rates
H.4.8 Uncertainty in Earthquake Recurrence Rates
H.4.9 Uncertainty in Maximum Magnitude
H.5 RLME Sources

	H.5.1 Charlevoix RLME Seismic Source Model	. H-6
	H.5.2 Charleston RLME Seismic Source Model	H-7
	H.5.3 Cheraw RLME Seismic Source Model	H-9
	H.5.4 Meers RLME Seismic Source Model	H-11
	H.5.5 New Madrid Fault System RLME Seismic Source Model	H-12
	H.5.6 Eastern Rift Margin Fault RLME Seismic Source Model	H-14
	H.5.7 Marianna Zone RLME Seismic Source Model	H-15
	H.5.8 Commerce Fault RLME Seismic Source Model	H-16
	H.5.9 Wabash Valley RLME Seismic Source Model	H-18
		1.4
	/ PPRP REVIEW COMMENTS	12
	CORRESPONDENCE-CONTENTS	 1-0
	Participatory Peer Review Panel (PPRP) Letters	
	Technical Integration (TI) Team and Project Manager (PM) Response to PPRP	
	J MAGNITUDE-RECURRENCE MAPS FOR ALL REALIZATIONS AND ALL	.L.1
•	SOURCE-ZONE CONFIGURATIONS	
	K SCR DATABASE USED TO DEVELOP MMAX PRIOR DISTRIBUTIONS	K-1
	K SCR DATABASE USED TO DEVELOP MMAX PRIOR DISTRIBUTIONS K.1 SCR Earthquake Catalog	K-1 K-1
	K SCR DATABASE USED TO DEVELOP MMAX PRIOR DISTRIBUTIONS K.1 SCR Earthquake Catalog K.2 SCR Crustal Domains	K-1 K-1 K-3
	K SCR DATABASE USED TO DEVELOP MMAX PRIOR DISTRIBUTIONS K.1 SCR Earthquake Catalog K.2 SCR Crustal Domains	K-1 K-1 K-3 L-1
	K SCR DATABASE USED TO DEVELOP MMAX PRIOR DISTRIBUTIONS K.1 SCR Earthquake Catalog K.2 SCR Crustal Domains L QUALITY ASSURANCE	K-1 K-1 K-3 L-1 L-1
	K SCR DATABASE USED TO DEVELOP MMAX PRIOR DISTRIBUTIONS K.1 SCR Earthquake Catalog. K.2 SCR Crustal Domains. L QUALITY ASSURANCE L.1 BACKGROUND. L 2 CEUS SSC PROJECT	K-1 K-1 K-3 L-1 L-1
	K SCR DATABASE USED TO DEVELOP MMAX PRIOR DISTRIBUTIONS	K-1 K-3 L-1 L-1 L-2 L-2
	K SCR DATABASE USED TO DEVELOP MMAX PRIOR DISTRIBUTIONS K.1 SCR Earthquake Catalog	K-1 K-3 L-1 L-1 L-2 L-2
	K SCR DATABASE USED TO DEVELOP MMAX PRIOR DISTRIBUTIONS K.1 SCR Earthquake Catalog	K-1 K-3 L-1 L-1 L-2 L-2 L-3 L-3
	K SCR DATABASE USED TO DEVELOP MMAX PRIOR DISTRIBUTIONS K.1 SCR Earthquake Catalog. K.2 SCR Crustal Domains. L QUALITY ASSURANCE L.1 BACKGROUND. L.2 CEUS SSC PROJECT L.2 Introduction. L.3 BEST BUSINESS PRACTICES L.3.1 General. L 4 CEUS SSC FARTHQUAKE CATALOG DEVELOPMENT.	K-1 K-3 L-1 L-2 L-2 L-3 L-3 L-3
	K SCR DATABASE USED TO DEVELOP MMAX PRIOR DISTRIBUTIONS K.1 SCR Earthquake Catalog. K.2 SCR Crustal Domains. L QUALITY ASSURANCE L.1 BACKGROUND. L.2 CEUS SSC PROJECT L.3 BEST BUSINESS PRACTICES L.3.1 General. L.4 CEUS SSC EARTHQUAKE CATALOG DEVELOPMENT. L 4 1 External Review of Earthquake Catalog.	K-1 K-3 L-1 L-1 L-2 L-2 L-3 L-3 L-3
	K SCR DATABASE USED TO DEVELOP MMAX PRIOR DISTRIBUTIONS K.1 SCR Earthquake Catalog	K-1 K-3 L-1 L-2 L-2 L-3 L-3 L-3 L-3
	K SCR DATABASE USED TO DEVELOP MMAX PRIOR DISTRIBUTIONS K.1 SCR Earthquake Catalog	K-1 K-3 L-1 L-2 L-2 L-3 L-3 L-3 L-3 L-4
	K SCR DATABASE USED TO DEVELOP MMAX PRIOR DISTRIBUTIONS K.1 SCR Earthquake Catalog	K-1 K-3 L-1 L-2 L-2 L-2 L-3 L-3 L-3 L-3 L-4 L-4
	K SCR DATABASE USED TO DEVELOP MMAX PRIOR DISTRIBUTIONS K.1 SCR Earthquake Catalog. K.2 SCR Crustal Domains. L QUALITY ASSURANCE L.1 BACKGROUND. L.2 CEUS SSC PROJECT L.2.1 Introduction. L.3 BEST BUSINESS PRACTICES L.3.1 General. L.4 CEUS SSC EARTHQUAKE CATALOG DEVELOPMENT. L.4.1 External Review of Earthquake Catalog. L.4.2 Simulation Testing. L.4.3 Checks for Consistency in Magnitude Conversion from Intensity L.4.4 Use of Verified Computer Programs. L 5 RECURRENCE ANALYSIS AND SPATIAL SMOOTHING.	K-1 K-3 L-1 L-1 L-2 L-3 L-3 L-3 L-3 L-4 L-4 L-4
	K SCR DATABASE USED TO DEVELOP MMAX PRIOR DISTRIBUTIONS K.1 SCR Earthquake Catalog	K-1 K-3 L-1 L-2 L-2 L-3 L-3 L-3 L-3 L-4 L-4 L-4 L-4
	K SCR DATABASE USED TO DEVELOP MMAX PRIOR DISTRIBUTIONS K.1 SCR Earthquake Catalog	K-1 K-3 L-1 L-2 L-2 L-3 L-3 L-3 L-3 L-4 L-4 L-4 L-4 L-4

xxii

xxiii

L.5.3 Recurrence Comparisons for Portions of a Source Zone	L-5
L.5.4 Examination of Recurrence Maps	L-5
L5.5 Test with a Synthetic Catalog Homogeneous Seismicity	L-5
L5.6 Test for the Adequacy of Eight Maps to Represent Epistemic Uncertainty	L-6
L6 HAZARD CALCULATION SOFTWARE	. L-6
L.6.1 Introduction	L-6
L6.2 Test for the Treatment of Variable b	L-6
L.6.3 Test for the Treatment of Dipping Ruptures Within a Source Zone,	L-6
L.6.4 Tests for Treatment of Epistemic Uncertainty from Sources that Make Small Contribution to Hazard	L-6

LIST OF FIGURES

ure 1.3-1 Map showing the study area and test sites for the CEUS SSC Project
ure 2.3-1 CEUS SSC Project organization2-33
ure 2.3-2 Lines of communication among the participants of the CEUS SSC Project2-34
ure 2.4-1 Essential activities associated with a SSHAC Level 3 or 4 project (Coppersmith et al., 2010)2-35
ure 3.2-1 Areal coverage of the primary earthquake catalog sources. Top: GSC catalog (Halchuk, 2009); bottom: USGS seismic hazard mapping catalog (Petersen et al., 2008). Red line denotes boundary of study region. Blue line denotes portion of each catalog used for development of project catalog
ure 3.2-2 Histogram of M, magnitudes from the GSC SHEEF catalog for the time period 1600-1899 and the region east of longitude –105° and south of latitude 53°3-58
ure 3.2-3 Histogram of ML magnitudes from the GSC SHEEF catalog for the time period 1900-1929 and the region east of longitude –105° and south of latitude 53°3-59
ure 3.2-4 Histogram of M _L magnitudes from the GSC SHEEF catalog for the time period 1930-1979 and the region east of longitude –105° and south of latitude 53°3-60
ure 3.2-5 Histogram of M _L magnitudes from the GSC SHEEF catalog for the time period 1980-2007 and the region east of longitude –105° and south of latitude 53°3-61
ure 3.2-6 Histogram of M _L magnitudes from the revised catalog with GSC as the source for the time period 1928-1979
ure 3.2-7 Map of the CEUS SSC Project catalog showing earthquakes of uniform moment magnitude E[M] 2.9 and larger. Colored symbols denote earthquakes not contained in the USGS seismic hazard mapping catalog
ure 3.3-1 Illustration of equivalence of the M [*] and γ^2 corrections to remove bias in earthquake recurrence relationships estimated from magnitudes with uncertainty
ure 3.3-2 Approximate moment magnitudes from Atkinson (2004b) compared to values of M given in Table B-2 in Appendix B for earthquakes in common
ure 3.3-3 Approximate moment magnitudes from Boatwright (1994) compared to values of M given in Table B-2 in Appendix B for earthquakes in common
ure 3.3-4 Approximate moment magnitudes from Moulis (2002) compared to values of M given in Table B-2 in Appendix B for earthquakes in common
ure 3.3-5 Difference between M_N reported by the GSC and M_N or $m_{Lg(0)}$ reported by the Weston Observatory catalog as a function of time
ure 3.3-6 Spatial distribution of earthquakes with body-wave (m _b , m _{bug} , M _N) and M magnitudes in the CEUS SSC Project catalog for the Midcontinent region. Color codes indicate the source of the body-wave magnitudes
are 3.3-7 m _b -M data for the earthquakes shown on Figure 3.3-6. Red curve shows the preferred offset fit $M = m_b - 0.28$

xxv

Figure 3.3-8 Residuals from offset fit shown on Figure 3.3-7 plotted against earthquake year	3-71
Figure 3.3-9 Spatial distribution of earthquakes with body wave (m _b , m _{blg} , M _N) and M magnitudes in the CEUS SSC Project catalog for the northeastern portion of the study region. Color codes indicate the source of the body-wave magnitudes.	3-72
Figure 3.3-10 m_b -M data for the earthquakes shown on Figure 3.3-9. Red curve shows the preferred offset fit M = m_b – 0.42	3-73
Figure 3.3-11 Residuals from offset fit shown on Figure 3.3-10 plotted against earthquake year	.3-74
Figure 3.3-12 Residuals for GSC data from offset fit shown on Figure 3.3-10 plotted against earthquake year	,3-75
Figure 3.3-13 Residuals for WES data from offset fit shown on Figure 3.3-10 plotted against earthquake year	3-76
Figure 3.3-14 Residuals for data from sources other than GSC or WES from offset fit shown on Figure 3.3-10 plotted against earthquake year	.3-77
Figure 3.3-15 Difference between body-wave magnitudes reported by LDO and those by other sources as a function of year	.3-78
Figure 3.3-16 Spatial distribution of earthquakes with reported GSC body-wave magnitudes. Red and blue symbols indicate earthquakes with both m _b and M magnitudes for m _b ≥ 3.5. Dashed line indicates the portion of the study region considered the "Northeast" for purposes of magnitude scaling	, 3- 79
Figure 3.3-17 M-m₀ as a function of time for m₀ data from the GSC shown on Figure 3.3- 16	.3-80
Figure 3.3-18 Plot of magnitude differences m _{blg} – m(3 Hz) for the OKO catalog	.3-81
Figure 3.3-19 Final m _b -M data set. Vertical dashed lines indicate the magnitude range used to develop the scaling relationship. Diagonal line indicates a one-to-one correlation.	3-82
Figure 3.3-20 Spatial distribution of earthquakes in the CEUS SSC Project catalog with instrumental M _L magnitudes	.3-83
Figure 3.3-21 Spatial distribution of earthquakes in the CEUS SSC Project catalog with instrumental M _L magnitudes and M magnitudes	3-84
Figure 3.3-22 ML-M data from the CEUS SSC Project catalog and robust regression fit to the data	3-85
Figure 3.3-23 Relationship between M_{N} and M_{L} for the GSC data	.3-86
Figure 3.3-24 Data from the northeastern portion of the study region with M_L and M_C or M_D magnitude from catalog sources other than the GSC	3-87
Figure 3.3-25 Data from the northeastern portion of the study region with M _L and M magnitudes from sources other than the GSC	3-88
Figure 3.3-26 Spatial distribution of earthquakes in the CEUS SSC Project catalog with M _s ≥ 3 magnitudes	3-89
Figure 3.3-27 M _S -M data from the CEUS SSC Project catalog and quadratic polynomial fit to the data	3-90
Figure 3.3-28 Spatial distribution of earthquakes in the CEUS SSC Project catalog with $M_C \ge 2.5$ magnitudes	3-91

Figure 3.3-29 Spatial distribution of earthquakes in the CEUS SSC Project catalog with M _c ≥ 2.5 and M magnitudes
Figure 3.3-30 Spatial distribution of earthquakes in the CEUS SSC Project catalog with M _D ≥ 3 magnitudes
Figure 3.3-31 Spatial distribution of earthquakes in the CEUS SSC Project catalog with both M _D and M magnitudes
Figure 3.3-32 Mc-M data from the CEUS SSC Project catalog and linear regression fit to the data
Figure 3.3-33 Spatial distribution of earthquakes with reported Mc and Mp magnitudes3-96
Figure 3.3-34 Comparison of Mc and Mp magnitudes for the LDO and WES catalogs
Figure 3.3-35 Comparison of M _c with M _D for at least one of the two magnitude types reported in the OKO catalog
Figure 3.3-36 Comparison of M _c with M _D for at least one of the two magnitude types reported in the CERI catalog
Figure 3.3-37 Comparison of M _c with M _D for at least one of the two magnitude types reported in the SCSN catalog
Figure 3.3-38 Comparison of M _c with M _D for at least one of the two magnitude types reported in other catalogs for earthquakes in the Midcontinent portion of the study region
Figure 3.3-39 Relationship between M and M _c , M _D , or M _L for the Midcontinent portion of the study region
Figure 3.3-40 Comparison of M _c and M _D magnitudes with M _L magnitudes for the region between longitudes 105°W and 100°W
Figure 3.3-41 Comparison of m _b magnitudes with M _L magnitudes for the region between longitudes 105°W and 100°W
Figure 3.3-42 Comparison of m _b magnitudes with M _C and M _D magnitudes for the region between longitudes 105°W and 100°W
Figure 3.3-43 Spatial distribution of earthquake with In(FA) in the CEUS SSC Project catalog
Figure 3.3-44 Catalog In(FA)-M data and fitted model
Figure 3.3-45 Spatial distribution of earthquakes in the CEUS SSC Project catalog with reported values of I ₀
Figure 3.3-46 I ₀ and M data for earthquakes in the CEUS SSC Project catalog. Curves show locally weighted least-squares fit (Loess) to the data and the relationship published by Johnston (1996b)
Figure 3.3-47 l₀ and m₀ data from the NCEER91 catalog. Plotted are the relationships between l₀ and m₀ developed by EPRI (1988) (EPRI-SOG) and Sibol et al. (1987)3-110
Figure 3.3-48 Categorical model fits of I ₀ as a function and M for earthquakes in the CEUS SSC Project catalog
Figure 3.3-49 Results from proportional odds logistic model showing the probability of individual intensity classes as a function of M
Figure 3.3-50 Comparison of I ₀ and m _b data from the CEUS SSC Project catalog for those earthquakes with reported values of M (M set) and the full catalog (full set). Locally weighted least-squares fits to the two data sets are shown along with the

xxvi

·

xxvii

relationship use to develop the EPRI (1988) catalog and the Sibol et al. (1987) relationship used in the NCEER91 catalog3-113
Figure 3.3-51 Linear fits to the data from Figure 3.3-50 for $I_0 \ge V$
Figure 3.3-52 Comparison of I _o and m _b data from the project, with m _b adjusted for the difference in m _b to M scaling
Figure 3.3-53 Linear fits to the data from Figure 3.3-52 for $I_0 \geq V_{\dots}$
Figure 3.3-54 Composite I_0 -M data set used for assessment of I_0 scaling relationship3-117
Figure 3.3-55 Linear and inverse sigmoid models fit to the project data for $I_0 > IV$ 3-118
Figure 3.4-1 Illustration of process used to identify clusters of earthquakes (from EPRI, 1988, Vol. 1): (a) local and extended time and distance windows, (b) buffer window, and (c) contracted window
Figure 3.4-2 Identification of secondary (dependent) earthquakes inside the cluster region through Poisson thinning (from EPRI, 1988, Vol. 1)
Figure 3.4-3 Comparison of dependent event time and distance windows with results for individual clusters in the project catalog
Figure 3.5-1 Earthquake catalog and catalog completeness regions used in EPRI-SOG (EPRI, 1988)
Figure 3.5-2 CEUS SSC Project earthquake catalog and modified catalog completeness regions
Figure 3.5-3 Plot of year versus location for the CEUS SSC Project earthquake catalog. Red lines indicate the boundaries of the catalog completeness time periods
Figure 3.5-4 (1 of 7) "Stepp" plots of earthquake recurrence rate as a function of time for the individual catalog completeness regions shown on Figure 3.5-2
Figure 3.5-4 (2 of 7) "Stepp" plots of earthquake recurrence rate as a function of time for the individual catalog completeness regions shown on Figure 3.5-2
Figure 3.5-4 (3 of 7) "Stepp" plots of earthquake recurrence rate as a function of time for the individual catalog completeness regions shown on Figure 3.5-2
Figure 3.5-4 (4 of 7) "Stepp" plots of earthquake recurrence rate as a function of time for the individual catalog completeness regions shown on Figure 3.5-2
Figure 3.5-4 (5 of 7) "Stepp" plots of earthquake recurrence rate as a function of time for the individual catalog completeness regions shown on Figure 3.5-2
Figure 3.5-4 (6 of 7) "Stepp" plots of earthquake recurrence rate as a function of time for the individual catalog completeness regions shown on Figure 3.5-2
Figure 3.5-4 (7 of 7) "Stepp" plots of earthquake recurrence rate as a function of time for the individual catalog completeness regions shown on Figure 3.5-2
Figure 4.1.1-1 Example logic tree from the PEGASOS project (NAGRA, 2004) showing the assessment of alternative conceptual models on the logic tree. Each node of the logic tree represents an assessment that is uncertain. Alternative branches represent the alternative models or parameter values, and the weights associated with each branch reflect the TI Team's relative degree of belief that each branch is the correct model or parameter value
Figure 4.1.1-2 Example logic tree from the PVHA-U (SNL, 2008) project showing the treatment of alternative conceptual models in the logic tree

Figure 4.2.1-1 Master logic tree showing the Mmax zones and seismotectonic zones alternative conceptual models for assessing the spatial and temporal characteristics of future earthquake sources in the CEUS	4-42
Figure 4.2.2-1 Example of a logic tree for RLME sources. Shown is the tree for the Marianna RLME source.	4-43
Figure 4.2.2-2 Map showing RLME sources, some with alternative source geometries (discussed in Section 6.1)	4-44
Figure 4.2.3-1 Logic tree for the Mmax zones branch of the master logic tree	4-45
Figure 4.2.3-2 Subdivision used in the Mmax zones branch of the master logic tree. Either the region is considered one zone for purposes of Mmax or the region is divided into two zones as shown: a Mesozoic-and-younger extension (MESE) zone and a non-Mesozoic-and-younger zone (NMESE). In this figure the "narrow" MESE zone is shown	4-46
Figure 4.2.3-3 Subdivision used in the Mmax zones branch of the master logic tree. Either the region is considered one zone for purposes of Mmax or the region is divided into two zones as shown: a Mesozoic-and-younger extension (MESE) zone and a non-Mesozoic-and-younger zone (NMESE). In this figure the "wide" MESE zone is shown	4-47
Eliguro 4.2.4.1(a) Logic tree for the selemeterionic zones branch of the master logic tree	
Figure 4.2.4 $f(a)$ Logic tree for the selemetectoric zones branch of the master logic tree.	
Figure 4.2.4-7 (b) Logic tree for the salariteteterile Zones brand of the matter regreater in Figure 4.2.4-2 Seismotectonic zones shown in the case where the Rough Creek Graben is not part of the Reelfoot Rift (RR), and the Paleozoic Extended Zone is narrow (PEZ-N)	4-50
Figure 4.2.4-3 Seismotectonic zones shown in the case where the Rough Creek Graben is part of the Reelfoot Rift (RR-RCG), and the Paleozoic Extended Zone is narrow (PEZ-N)	4-51
Figure 4.2.4-4 Seismotectonic zones shown in the case where the Rough Creek Graben is not part of the Reelfoot Rift (RR), and the Paleozoic Extended Crust is wide (PEZ-W)	4-52
Figure 4.2.4-5 Seismotectonic zones shown in the case where the Rough Creek Graben is part of the Reelfoot Rift (RR-RCG), and the Paleozoic Extended Crust is wide (PEZ-W)	4-53
Figure 5.2.1-1 Diagrammatic illustration of the Bayesian Mmax approach showing (a) the prior distribution, (b) the likelihood function, and (c) the posterior distribution. The posterior distribution is represented by a discrete distribution (d) for implementation in hazard analysis.	5-72
Figure 5.2.1-2 Diagrammatic illustration of the Bayesian Mmax approach showing (a) the prior distribution, (b) the likelihood function, and (c) the posterior distribution. The posterior distribution is represented by a discrete distribution (d) for implementation in hazard analysis.	5-73
Figure 5.2.1-3 Median values of $m_{max-obr}$ as a function of maximum magnitude, m^{μ} , and sample size N the number of earthquakes > M 4.5.	5-74
	5.75
Figure 5.2.1-4 Histograms of mmax-obs for extended and non-extended superdomains	

xxix

Figure 5.2.1-5 Histograms of m _{max-obs} for Mesozoic-and-younger extended (MESE) superdomains and for older extended and non-extended (NMESE) superdomains
Figure 5.2.1-6 Histograms of $m_{max-obr}$ for Mesozoic-and-younger extended (MESE) superdomains and for older extended and non-extended (NMESE) superdomains using age of most recent extension for the age classification
Figure 5.2.1-7 Histograms of $m_{max-obs}$ for Mesozoic-and-younger extended (MESE) superdomains and for older extended and non-extended (NMESE) superdomains using final sets indicated by asterisks in Tables 5.2.1-1 and 5.2.1-2
Figure 5.2.1-8 Histograms of m _{max-obs} for combined (COMB) superdomains using final sets indicated by asterisks in Table 5.2.1-3
 Figure 5.2.1-9 Bias adjustments from m_{max-obs} to m^t for the three sets of superdomain analysis results presented in Table 5.2.1-4
Mmax is set at the mean of the prior distribution
median value of $m_{max-abs}$ for given m' obtained using Equation 5.2.1-2
Figure 5.2.1-12 Behavior of the cumulative probability function for m'' (Equation 5.2.1-9) for the K-S-B estimator and a value of $m_{max-obs}$ equal to 6
Figure 5.2.1-13 Example Mmax distribution assessed for the Mesozoic-and-younger extended Mmax zone for the case where the zone is "narrow" (MESE-N). Distributions are shown for the Kijko approach and for the Bayesian approach using either the Mesozoic-and-younger extended prior distribution or the composite prior distribution. The final composite Mmax distribution, which incorporates the relative weights, is shown by the red probability distribution.
Figure 5.2.1-14 Example Mmax distribution assessed for the Northern Appalachian seismotectonic zone (NAP). Distributions are shown for the Kijko approach and for the Bayesian approach using either the Mesozcic-and-younger extended prior distribution or the composite prior distribution. Note that the Kijko results are shown in this example for illustration, even though they have zero weight. The final composite Mmax distribution, which incorporates the relative weights, is shown by the red probability distribution.
Figure 5.3.2-1 Likelihood function for rate per unit area in a Poisson process, for multiple values of the earthquake count <i>N</i> : (a) arithmetic scale, and (b) logarithmic scale used to illustrate decreasing COV as N increases
Figure 5.3.2-2 Likelihood function for <i>b</i> -value of an exponential magnitude distribution, for multiple values of the earthquake count <i>N</i> . The value of <i>b</i> is normalized by the maximum-likelihood estimate, which is derived from Equation 5.3.2-5
Figure 5.3.2-3 Histogram of magnitudes in the earthquake catalog used in this section. The minimum magnitude shown (M 2.9) is the lowest magnitude used in these recurrence calculations

Figure 5.3.2-4 Objectively determined values of the penalty function for in(rate) for Case A magnitude weights. Source zones are sorted from smallest to largest. See list of abbreviations for full source-zone names.	5-89
Figure 5.3.2-5 Objectively determined values of the penalty function for beta for Case A magnitude weights	5-90
Figure 5.3.2-6 Objectively determined values of the penalty function for In(rate) for Case B magnitude weights	5-91
Figure 5.3.2-7 Objectively determined values of the penalty function for beta for Case B magnitude weights. Source zones are sorted from smallest to largest	5-92
Figure 5.3.2-8 Objectively determined values of the penalty function for In(rate) for Case E magnitude weights	5-93
Figure 5.3.2-9 Objectively determined values of the penalty function for beta for Case E magnitude weights. Source zones are sorted from smallest to largest.	5-94
Figure 5.3.2-10 Mean map of rate and <i>b</i> -value for ECC-AM calculated using Case A magnitude weights	5-95
Figure 5.3.2-11 Mean map of rate and <i>b</i> -value for ECC-GC calculated using Case A magnitude weights	5-96
Figure 5.3.2-12 Mean map of rate and <i>b</i> -value for ECC-AM calculated using Case B magnitude weights	.5-97
Figure 5.3.2-13 Mean map of rate and <i>b</i> -value for ECC-GC calculated using Case B magnitude weights	.5-98
Figure 5.3.2-14 Mean map of rate and <i>b</i> -value for ECC-AM calculated using Case E magnitude weights	.5-99
Figure 5.3.2-15 Mean map of rate and <i>b</i> -value for ECC-GC calculated using Case E magnitude weights	5-100
Figure 5.3.2-16 Sensitivity of seismic hazard at Manchester site to the strength of the prior on b	5-101
Figure 5.3.2-17 Sensitivity of seismic hazard at Topeka site to the strength of the prior on b	5-102
Figure 5.3.2-18 Sensitivity of seismic hazard at Manchester site to the choice of magnitude weights5	5-103
Figure 5.3.2-19 Sensitivity of seismic hazard at Topeka site to the choice of magnitude weights	5-104
Figure 5.3.2:20 Sensitivity of seismic hazard from source NAP at Manchester site to the eight alternative recurrence maps for Case B magnitude weights	5-105
Figure 5.3.2-21 Sensitivity of seismic hazard from source MID-C-A at Topeka site to the eight alternative recurrence maps for Case B magnitude weights	5-106
Figure 5.3.2-22 Mean recurrence-parameter map for the study region under the highest weighted source-zone configuration in the master logic tree. See Sections 6.3 and 7.5 for all mean maps	5-107
Figure 5.3.2-23 Map of the uncertainty in the estimated recurrence parameters, expressed as the coefficient of variation of the rate (left) and the standard deviation of the <i>b</i> -value (right) for the study region, under the highest weighted source-zone configuration in the master logic tree. See Appendix J for all maps of uncertainty	5-108

xxxi

Figure 5.3.2-24 First of eight equally likely realizations of the recurrence-parameter map for the study region under the highest weighted source-zone configuration in the master logic tree. See Appendix J for maps of all realizations for all source-zone configurations
Figure 5.3.2-25 Eighth of eight equally likely realizations of the recurrence-parameter map for the study region under the highest weighted source-zone configuration in the master logic tree. See Appendix J for maps of all realizations for all source-zone configurations
Figure 5.3.2-26 Map of geographic areas considered in the exploration of model results5-111
Figure 5.3.2-27 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for the USGS Eastern Tennessee area using Case A magnitude weights. The error bars represent the 16%–84% uncertainty associated with the data, computed using the Weichert (1980) procedure
Figure 5.3.2-28 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for the USGS Eastern Tennessee area using Case B magnitude weights
Figure 5.3.2-29 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for the USGS Eastern Tennessee area using Case E magnitude weights
Figure 5.3.2-30 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for the central New England area using Case A magnitude weights
Figure 5.3.2-31 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for the central New England area using Case B magnitude weights
Figure 5.3.2-32 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for the central New England area using Case E magnitude weights
Figure 5.3.2-33 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for the Nemaha Ridge area using Case A magnitude weights
Figure 5.3.2-34 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for the Nemaha Ridge area using Case B magnitude weights5-119
Figure 5.3.2-35 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for the Nemaha Ridge area using Case E magnitude weights
Figure 5.3.2-36 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for the Miami, FL, area using Case A magnitude weights
Figure 5.3.2-37 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for the Miami, FL, area using Case B magnitude weights
Figure 5.3.2-38 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for the Miami, FL, area using Case E magnitude weights
Figure 5.3.2-39 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for the St. Paul, MN, area using Case A magnitude weights
Figure 5.3.2-40 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for the St. Paul, MN, area using Case B magnitude weights
Figure 5.3.2-41 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for the St. Paul, MN, area using Case E magnitude weights
Figure 5.3.2-42 Recurrence parameters for the ECC-AM, MID-C–A, and NAP seismotectonic source zones and Case A magnitude weights computed using an objective adaptive kernel approach

Figure 5.3.3-1 Likelihood distribution for rate parameter λ derived using Equation 5.3.3-1 for N = 2 and T = 2,000 years. Top: normalized probability density function for λ . Bottom: resulting cumulative distribution function. Dashed lines show the cumulative probability levels for the Miller and Rice (1983) discrete approximation of a continuous probability distribution.	.5-128
Figure 5.3.3-2 Uncertainty distributions for the age of Charleston RLMEs	.5-129
Figure 5.4.4-1 Spatial distribution of earthquakes in the CEUS SSC Project catalog. Solid lines indicate the boundaries of the seismotectonic source zones (narrow interpretation)	.5-130
Figure 5.4.4-2 Spatial distribution of earthquakes in the CEUS SSC Project catalog with good quality depth determinations used for assessing crustal thickness. Solid lines indicate the boundaries of the seismotectonic source zones (narrow Interpretation)	.5-131
Figure 5.4.4-3 Distribution of better-guality focal depths in Mmax source zones	.5-132
Figure 5.4.4-4 (1 of 3) Distribution of better-quality focal depths in seismotectonic source	.5-133
Figure 5.4.4-4 (2 of 3) Distribution of better-quality focal depths in seismotectonic source	5-134
Figure 5.4.4-4 (3 of 3) Distribution of better-quality focal depths in seismotectonic source	5-135
Figure 6.1-1 Map showing the RLME sources characterized in the CEUS SSC model. Detailed alternatives to the source geometries are shown on figures associated with each RLME discussion.	.6-111
Figure 6.1-2a Map showing the RLME sources and seismicity from the CEUS SSC earthquake catalog. Some of the RLMEs occur in regions of elevated seismicity, but others do not.	.6-112
Figure 6.1-2b Close-up of the Wabash Valley and New Madrid/Reelfoot Rift RLME sources and seismicity from the CEUS SSC earthquake catalog. Some of the RLMEs occur in regions of elevated seismicity, but others do not	.6-113
Figure 6.1.1-1 Logic tree for the Charlevoix RLME source.	.6-114
Figure 6.1.1-2 Seismicity and tectonic features of the Charlevoix RLME	.6-115
Figure 6.1.1-3 Magnetic and gravity anomaly maps of the Charlevoix RLME	.6-116
Figure 6.1.2-1a Logic tree for the Charleston RIME source	.6-117
Figure 6.1.2-1b Logic free for the Charleston RIME source	.6-118
Figure 6.1.2-2 Charleston RLME source zones with (a) total magnetic anomaly and (b)	.6-119
Figure 6.1.2.3 Destulated faults and tectonic features in the Charleston region	6-120
Figure 6.1.2-0 Postulated faults and tectoric features in the local Charleston area	8-121
Figure 6.1.2-5 Postulated faults and tectonic features in the local orialisation area	6-122
Citation 6.4.2 Sh Doctulated faulte and toptonic features in the local Charlester area with	
Charleston RLME source zones	.6-123
Figure 6.1.2-6 Schematic diagram showing contemporary, maximum, and minimum constraining age sample locations	.6-124

xxxiii

Figure 6.1.2-7 Charleston space-time diagram of earthquakes interpreted from paleoliquefaction, contemporary-ages-only scenario
Figure 6.1.2-8 Charleston space-time diagram of earthquakes interpreted from paleoliquefaction, all-ages scenario
Figure 6.1.2-9 Distribution of liquefaction from earthquake A, contemporary-ages-only scenario
Figure 6.1.2-10 Distribution of liquefaction from earthquake B, contemporary-ages-only scenario
Figure 6.1.2-11 Distribution of liquefaction from earthquake C, contemporary-ages-only scenario
Figure 6.1.2-12 Distribution of liquefaction from earthquake D, contemporary-ages-only scenario
Figure 6.1.2-13 Distribution of liquefaction from earthquake E, contemporary-ages-only scenario
Figure 6.1.2-14 Distribution of liquefaction from earthquake A, all-ages scenario
Figure 6.1.2-15 Distribution of liquefaction from earthquake B, all-ages scenario
Figure 6.1.2-16 Distribution of liquefaction from earthquake C, all-ages scenario6-134
Figure 6.1.2-17 Distribution of liquefaction from earthquake D, all-ages scenario
Figure 6.1.2-18 Distribution of liquefaction from earthquake E, all-ages scenario
Figure 6,1,2-19 Uncertainty distributions for the age of Charleston RLMEs
Figure 6.1.3-1 Logic tree for the Cheraw fault RLME source
Figure 6.1.3-2 Map (c) and hillshade relief images (a, b, and d) showing location of mapped Cheraw fault, possible northeast extension, and paleoseismic locality
Figure 6.1.3-3 Cheraw RLME source relative to (a) total magnetic anomaly and (b) residual isostatic gravity data
Figure 6.1.4-1 Meers fault location
Figure 6.1.4-2 Logic tree for the Meers fault source
Figure 6.1.5-1 Logic tree for the NMFS RLME source
Figure 6.1.5-2 Map showing seismicity and major subsurface structural features in the New Madrid region
Figure 6.1.5-3 Map showing geomorphic and near-surface tectonic features in the New Madrid region and locations of NMFS RLME fault sources
Figure 6.1.5-4 Rupture segments (a) and models (b) for the New Madrid faults from Johnston and Schweig (1998) and (c) the NMFS RLME fault sources
Figure 6.1.5-5 Map of NMSZ showing estimated ages and measured sizes of liquefaction features
Figure 6.1.5-6 Earthquake chronology for NMSZ from dating and correlation of liquefaction features at sites (listed at top) along N-S transect across region
Figure 6.1.5-7 Probability distributions for the age of the AD 900 and AD 1450 NMFS RLMEs6-149
Figure 6.1.5-8 Liquefaction fields for the 1811-1812, AD 1450, and AD 900 earthquakes as interpreted from spatial distribution and stratigraphy of sand blows

Figure 6.1.6-1a Logic tree for the Reelfoot Rift–Eastern Rift Margin South RLME source. Two options for the southern extent of the ERM-S are considered: ERM-SCC includes the Crittenden County fault zone, and ERM-SRP includes the postulated zone of deformation based on fault picks identified in a high-resolution seismic profile along the Mississippi River	
Figure 6.1.6-1b Logic tree for the Reelfoot Rift-Eastern Rift Margin North RLME source 6-152	2
Figure 6.1.6-2 Map showing structural features and paleoseismic investigation sites along the eastern margin of the Reelfoot rift. The inset map shows the locations of inferred basement faults that border and cross the Reelfoot rift (Csontos et al., 2008) and the inferred Joiner Ridge–Meeman-Shelby fault (JR-MSF; Odum et al., 2010).	3
Figure 6.1.6-3 Maps showing surficial geology and locations of subsurface investigations at (a) Meeman-Shelby Forest State Park locality and (b) Union City site (MSF and UC on Figure 6.1.6-2), Modified from Cox et al. (2008) and Odum et al. (2010),6-154	ł
Figure 6.1.6-4 Figure showing the timing of events along the eastern Reelfoot nft margin. Modified from Cox (2009)6-155	5
Figure 6.1.7-1 Logic tree for the Reelfoot rift-Marianna RLME source	3
Figure 6.1.7-2 Map showing tectonic features and locations of paleollquefaction sites in the vicinity of Marianna, Arkansas6-157	7
Figure 6.1.7-3 Map showing liquefaction features near Daytona Beach lineament southwest of Marianna, Arkansas	3
Figure 6.1.8-1 Logic tree for the Commerce Fault Zone RLME source	9
Figure 6.1.8-2 Map showing tectonic features, seismicity, and paleoseismic localities along the Commerce Fault Zone RLME source	כ
Figure 6.1.8-3 Location of the Commerce geophysical lineament and Commerce Fault Zone RLME source relative to the (a) regional magnetic anomaly map and (b) regional gravity anomaly map	1
Figure 6.1.8-4 Space-time diagram showing constraints on the location and timing of late Pleistocene and Holocene paleoearthquakes that may be associated with the Commerce Fault Zone RLME source	2
Figure 6.1.9-1 Logic tree for the Wabash Valley RLME source	3
Figure 6.1.9-2 Map showing seismicity, subsurface structural features, paleoearthquake energy centers, and postulated neotectonic deformation in the Wabash Valley region of southern Illinois and southern Indiana	4
Figure 6.1.9-3 Wabash Valley RLME source relative to (a) magnetic anomaly, and (b) residual isostatic gravity data6-165	5
Figure 6.2-1 Map showing the two Mmax zones for the "narrow" interpretation of the Mesozoic-and-younger extended zone6-166	6
Figure 6.2-2 Map showing the two Mmax zones for the "wide" interpretation of the Mesozoic-and-younger extended zone6-167	7
Figure 6.3.1-1 Distributions for minar-obs for the Mmax distributed seismicity source zones6-168	B
Figure 6.3.2-1 Mmax distributions for the study region treated as a single Mmax zone6-16	9
Figure 6.3.2-2 Mmax distributions for the MESE-N Mmax zone	0

Figure 6.3.2-3 Mmax distributions for the MESE-W Mmax zone
Figure 6.3.2-4 Mmax distributions for the NMESE-N Mmax zone6-172
Figure 6.3.2-5 Mmax distributions for the NMESE-W Mmax zone6-173
Figure 6.4.1-1 Mean map of rate and b-value for the study region under the source-zone configuration, with no separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case A magnitude weights
Figure 6.4.1-2 Mean map of rate and b-value for the study region under the source-zone configuration, with no separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case B magnitude weights
Figure 6.4.1-3 Mean map of rate and b-value for the study region under the source-zone configuration, with no separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case E magnitude weights
Figure 6.4.1-4 Mean map of rate and b-value for the study region under the source-zone configuration, with separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended, narrow geometry for MESE; Case A magnitude weights
Figure 6.4.1-5 Mean map of rate and b-value for the study region under the source-zone configuration, with separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended, narrow geometry for MESE; Case B magnitude weights
Figure 6.4.1-6 Mean map of rate and b-value for the study region under the source-zone configuration, with separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended, narrow geometry for MESE; Case E magnitude weights
Figure 6.4.1-7 Mean map of rate and b-value for the study region under the source-zone configuration, with separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended, wide geometry for MESE; Case A magnitude weights
Figure 6.4.1-8 Mean map of rate and b-value for the study region under the source-zone configuration, with separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended, wide geometry for MESE; Case B magnitude weights
Figure 6.4.1-9 Mean map of rate and b-value for the study region under the source-zone configuration, with separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended, wide geometry for MESE: Case E magnitude weights
Figure 6.4.2-1 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for study region using Case A magnitude weights. The error bars represent the 16%-84% uncertainty associated with the data, computed using the Weichert (1980) procedure
Figure 6.4.2-2 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for study region using Case B magnitude weights. The error bars represent the 16%–84% uncertainty associated with the data, computed using the Weichert (1980) procedure
Figure 6.4.2-3 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for study region using Case E magnitude weights. The error bars represent the 16%–84% uncertainty associated with the data, computed using the Weichert (1980) procedure
Figure 6.4.2-4 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for MESE-N using Case A magnitude weights. The error bars represent the 16%–84% uncertainty associated with the data, computed using the Weichert (1980) procedure
Figure 6.4.2-5 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for MESE-N using Case B magnitude weights. The error bars represent the 16%–84% uncertainty associated with the data, computed using the Weichert (1980) procedure

N

Figure 6.4.2-6 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for MESE-N using Case E magnitude weights. The error bars represent the 16%–84% uncertainty associated with the data, computed using the Weichert (1980) procedure
Figure 6.4.2-7 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for MESE-W using Case A magnitude weights. The error bars represent the 16%–84% uncertainty associated with the data, computed using the Weichert (1980) procedure
Figure 6.4.2-8 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for MESE-W using Case B magnitude weights. The error bars represent the 16%–84% uncertainty associated with the data, computed using the Weichert (1980) procedure
Figure 6.4.2-9 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for MESE-W using Case E magnitude weights. The error bars represent the 16%–84% uncertainty associated with the data, computed using the Weichert (1980) procedure
Figure 6.4.2-10 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for NMESE-N using Case A magnitude weights. The error bars represent the 16%–84% uncertainty associated with the data, computed using the Weichert (1980) procedure
Figure 6.4.2-11 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for NMESE-N using Case B magnitude weights. The error bars represent the 16%–84% uncertainty associated with the data, computed using the Weichert (1980) procedure
Figure 6.4.2-12 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for NMESE-N using Case E magnitude weights. The error bars represent the 16%–84% uncertainty associated with the data, computed using the Weichert (1980) procedure
Figure 6.4.2-13 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for NMESE-W using Case A magnitude weights. The error bars represent the 16%–84% uncertainty associated with the data, computed using the Weichert (1980) procedure
Figure 6.4.2-14 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for NMESE-W using Case B magnitude weights. The error bars represent the 16%–84% uncertainty associated with the data, computed using the Weichert (1980) procedure
Figure 6.4.2-15 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for NMESE-W using Case E magnitude weights. The error bars represent the 16%–84% uncertainty associated with the data, computed using the Weichert (1980) procedure
Figure 7.1-1 Seismotectonic zones shown in the case where the Rough Creek graben is not part of the Reelfoot rift (RR) and the Paleozoic Extended Crust is narrow (PEZ- N)
Figure 7.1-2 Seismetectonic zones shown in the case where the Rough Creek graben is part of the Reelfoot nft (RR_RCG) and the Paleozoic Extended Crust is narrow (PEZ-N)
Figure 7.1-3 Seismotectonic zones shown in the case where the Rough Creek graben is not part of the Reelfoot rift (RR) and the Paleozoic Extended Crust is wide (PEZ-W)7-85
Figure 7.1-4 Seismotectonic zones shown in the case where the Rough Creek graben is part of the Reelfoot rift (RR_RCG) and the Paleozoic Extended Crust is wide (PEZ- W)
Figure 7.1-5 Example of comparing seismotectonic zones with magnetic map developed as part of the CEUS SSC Project7-87
Figure 7.1-6 Example of comparing seismotectonic zones with isostatic gravity map developed as part of the CEUS SSC Project

xxxvi

٩,

xxxvii

Figure 7.1-7 Map of seismicity based on the earthquake catalog developed for the CEUS SSC Project
Figure 7.1-8 Map showing example comparison of seismotectonic zones with seismicity. Note the non-uniform spatial distribution of seismicity within the zones. Spatial smoothing of a- and b-values accounts for these spatial variations
Figure 7.3-1 Logic tree for the seismotectonic zones branch of the master logic tree
Figure 7.3.1-1 Significant earthquakes and paleoseismology of the SLR seismotectonic zone
Figure 7.3.1-2 Tectonic features of the SLR seismotectonic zone
Figure 7.3.1-3 Magnetic and gravity anomaly maps of the SLR seismotectonic zone
Figure 7.3.2-1 Significant earthquakes and paleoselsmic study area in the region of the GMH seismotectonic zone
Figure 7.3.2-2 Igneous rocks attributed to the GMH seismotectonic zone
Figure 7.3.2-3 Relocated hypocentral depths and crustal depth of the GMH seismotectonic zone
Figure 7.3.2-4 Magnetic and gravity anomaly maps of the GMH seismotectonic zone
Figure 7.3.3-1 Seismicity of the NAP seismotectonic zone
Figure 7.3.3-2 Magnetic and gravity anomaly maps of the NAP seismotectonic zone
Figure 7.3.4-1 Seismicity and tectonic features of the PEZ seismotectonic zone
Figure 7.3.4-2 Magnetic and gravity anomaly maps of the PEZ seismotectonic zone
Figure 7.3.5-1 Map showing seismicity, subsurface Paleozoic and basement structures, and postulated energy centers for prehistoric earthquakes
Figure 7.3.5-2 Map showing alternative boundaries for Precambrian (proto-Illinois basin) rift basins
Figure 7.3.5-3 Maps showing the IBEB source zone boundaries, seismicity, and prehistoric earthquake centers relative to (a) regional magnetic anomalies and (b) regional gravity anomalies7-105
Figure 7.3.6-1 Map of seismicity and geomorphic features and faults showing evidence for Quatemary neotectonic deformation and reactivation. Inset map shows basement structures associated with the Reelfoot rift
Figure 7.3.6-2 Maps showing geophysical anomalies in the Reelfoot rift region
Figure 7.3.7-1 Mesozoic basins within the ECC-AM zone7-108
Figure 7.3.7-2 Seismicity within the ECC-AM and AHEX zones
Figure 7.3,7-3 Magnetic and gravity data for ECC-AM and AHEX zones7-110
Figure 7.3.7-4 Estimated locations of the 1755 M 6.1 Cape Ann earthquake7-111
Figure 7.3.8-1 Correlation of interpreted transitional crust with the East Coast magnetic anomaly
Figure 7.3.9-1 The ECC-GC seismotectonic zone7-113
Figure 7.3.10-1 The GHEX seismotectonic zone
Figure 7.3.11-1 The OKA seismotectonic zone and regional gravity and magnetic data7-115
Figure 7.3.12-1 Simplified tectonic map showing the distribution of principal basement faults, rifts, and sutures in the Midcontinent

 Figure 7.3.12-2 Maps showing major basement structural relation rotative is (c) regional
 Figure 7.3.12-3 Seismic zones and maximum observed earthquakes in the MidC zone
 Figure 7.3.12-4 Alternative MidC source zone configurations
 Figure 7.4.1-1 (1 of 3) Distributions for m_{max-obs} for the seismotectonic distributed seismicity source zones
 seismicity source zones
 Figure 7.4.1-1 (2 of 3) Distributions for m_{max-obt} for the seismotectonic distributed seismicity source zones
Figure 7.4.1-1 (3 of 3) Distributions for m_{mx-obt} for the seismotectonic distributed seismicity source zones Figure 7.4.2-1 Mmax distributions for the AHEX seismotectonic zone 7-122 Figure 7.4.2-1 Mmax distributions for the AHEX seismotectonic zone 7-123 Figure 7.4.2-2 Mmax distributions for the ECC_AM seismotectonic zone 7-124 Figure 7.4.2-3 Mmax distributions for the ECC_GC seismotectonic zone 7-125 Figure 7.4.2-4 Mmax distributions for the GHEX seismotectonic zone 7-126 Figure 7.4.2-5 Mmax distributions for the GHEX seismotectonic zone 7-127 Figure 7.4.2-6 Mmax distributions for the IBEB seismotectonic zone 7-128 Figure 7.4.2-6 Mmax distributions for the IBEB seismotectonic zone 7-129 Figure 7.4.2-8 Mmax distributions for the MidC-A seismotectonic zone 7-129 Figure 7.4.2-9 Mmax distributions for the MidC-B seismotectonic zone 7-130 Figure 7.4.2-10 Mmax distributions for the MidC-D seismotectonic zone 7-132 Figure 7.4.2-11 Mmax distributions for the NAP seismotectonic zone 7-133
Figure 7.4.1-1 (3 of 3) Distributions for $m_{mxx-obs}$ for the seismotectonic distributed 7-122 Figure 7.4.2-1 Mmax distributions for the AHEX seismotectonic zone 7-123 Figure 7.4.2-2 Mmax distributions for the ECC_AM seismotectonic zone 7-124 Figure 7.4.2-3 Mmax distributions for the ECC_GC seismotectonic zone 7-124 Figure 7.4.2-4 Mmax distributions for the ECC_GC seismotectonic zone 7-125 Figure 7.4.2-5 Mmax distributions for the GHEX seismotectonic zone 7-126 Figure 7.4.2-6 Mmax distributions for the IBEB seismotectonic zone 7-127 Figure 7.4.2-6 Mmax distributions for the IBEB seismotectonic zone 7-128 Figure 7.4.2-6 Mmax distributions for the MidC-A seismotectonic zone 7-129 Figure 7.4.2-7 Mmax distributions for the MidC-B seismotectonic zone 7-130 Figure 7.4.2-9 Mmax distributions for the MidC-C seismotectonic zone 7-131 Figure 7.4.2-10 Mmax distributions for the MidC-D seismotectonic zone 7-132 Figure 7.4.2-11 Mmax distributions for the NAP seismotectonic zone 7-133
Figure 7.4.2-1 Mmax distributions for the AHEX seismotectonic zone
Figure 7.4.2-1 Mmax distributions for the AHEX seismotectonic zone
Figure 7.4.2-2 Mmax distributions for the ECC_AM seismotectonic zone
Figure 7.4.2-3 Mmax distributions for the ECC_GC seismotectonic zone .7-125 Figure 7.4.2-3 Mmax distributions for the GHEX seismotectonic zone .7-126 Figure 7.4.2-5 Mmax distributions for the GHEX seismotectonic zone .7-126 Figure 7.4.2-6 Mmax distributions for the GMH seismotectonic zone .7-127 Figure 7.4.2-6 Mmax distributions for the IBEB seismotectonic zone .7-128 Figure 7.4.2-7 Mmax distributions for the MidC-A seismotectonic zone .7-129 Figure 7.4.2-8 Mmax distributions for the MidC-B seismotectonic zone .7-130 Figure 7.4.2-9 Mmax distributions for the MidC-C seismotectonic zone .7-131 Figure 7.4.2-10 Mmax distributions for the MidC-D seismotectonic zone .7-132 Figure 7.4.2-11 Mmax distributions for the NAP seismotectonic zone .7-133
Figure 7.4.2-3 Mmax distributions for the GHEX seismotectonic zone
Figure 7.4.2-5 Mmax distributions for the GMH seismotectonic zone
Figure 7.4.2-6 Mmax distributions for the IBEB seismotectonic zone
Figure 7.4.2-7 Mmax distributions for the MidC-A seismotectonic zone
Figure 7.4.2-9 Mmax distributions for the MidC-B seismotectonic zone
Figure 7.4.2-9 Mmax distributions for the MidC-C seismotectonic zone
Figure 7.4.2-10 Mmax distributions for the MidC-D seismotectonic zone
Figure 7.4.2-10 Mmax distributions for the NAP seismotectonic zone
Figure 1.4.2-11 minux distribution of the first state
Figure 7.4.2-12 Mmax distributions for the OKA seismotectonic zone
Figure 7.4.2-13 Mmax distributions for the PEZ_N seismotectonic zone
Figure 7.4.2-14 Mmax distributions for the PEZ_W seismotectonic zone
Figure 7.4.2-15 Mmax distributions for the RR seismotectonic zone
Figure 7.4.2-16 Mmax distributions for the RR_RCG seismotectonic zone
Figure 7.4.2-17 Mmax distributions for the SLR seismotectonic zone
Figure 7.5.1-1 Mean map of rate and b-value for the study region under the source-zone
configuration with narrow interpretation of PEZ, Rough Creek graben associated
with Midcontinent; Case A magnitude weights
Figure 7.5.1-2 Mean map of rate and b-value for the study region under the source-zone
with Midcontinent: Case B magnitude weights
Figure 7.5.1.3 Mean map of rate and b-value for the study region under the source-zone
configuration with narrow interpretation of PEZ, Rough Creek graben associated
with Midcontinent; Case E magnitude weights
Figure 7.5.1-4 Mean map of rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the source-zone
with Reelfoot rift; Case A magnitude weights

xxxix

Figure 7.5.1-5 Mean map of rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the source-zone configuration with narrow interpretation of PEZ, Rough Creek graben associated with Reelfoot rift; Case B magnitude weights7-144
Figure 7.5.1-6 Mean map of rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the source-zone configuration with narrow interpretation of PEZ, Rough Creek graben associated with Reelfoot rift; Case E magnitude weights
Figure 7.5.1-7 Mean map of rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the source-zone configuration with wide interpretation of PEZ, Rough Creek graben associated with Midcontinent; Case A magnitude weights
Figure 7.5.1-8 Mean map of rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the source-zone configuration with wide interpretation of PEZ, Rough Creek graben associated with Midcontinent; Case B magnitude weights
Figure 7.5.1-9 Mean map of rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the source-zone configuration with wide interpretation of PEZ, Rough Creek graben associated with Midcontinent; Case E magnitude weights
Figure 7.5.1-10 Mean map of rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the source- zone configuration with wide interpretation of PEZ, Rough Creek graben associated with Reelfoot rift; Case A magnitude weights
Figure 7.5.1-11 Mean map of rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the source- zone configuration with wide interpretation of PEZ, Rough Creek graben associated with Reelfoot rift; Case B magnitude weights
Figure 7.5.1-12 Mean map of rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the source- zone configuration with wide interpretation of PEZ, Rough Creek graben associated with Reelfoot rift; Case E magnitude weights
Figure 7.5.2-1 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for AHEX using Case A magnitude weights. No earthquake counts are shown because this source zone contains no seismicity.
Figure 7.5.2-2 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for AHEX using Case B magnitude weights. No earthquake counts are shown because this source zone contains no seismicity
Figure 7.5.2-3 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for AHEX using Case E magnitude weights. No earthquake counts are shown because this source zone contains no seismicity
Figure 7.5.2-4 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for ECC_AM using Case A magnitude weights. The error bars represent the 16%–84% uncertainty associated with the data, computed using the Weichert (1980) procedure
Figure 7.5.2-5 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for ECC_AM using Case B magnitude weights. Error bars as in Figure 7.5.2-4.
Figure 7.5.2-6 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for ECC_AM using Case E magnitude weights. Error bars as in Figure 7.5.2-4.
Figure 7.5.2-7 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for ECC_GC using Case A magnitude weights. Error bars as in Figure 7.5.2-4.
Figure 7.5.2-8 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for ECC_GC using Case B magnitude weights. Error bars as in Figure 7.5.2-4.
Figure 7.5.2-9 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for ECC_GC using Case E magnitude weights. Error bars as in Figure 7.5.2-4

Figure 7.5.2-10 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for GHEX using Case A magnitude weights. Error bars as in Figure 7.5.2-4.	7-161
Figure 7.5.2-11 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for GHEX using Case B magnitude weights. Error bars as in Figure 7.5.2-4.	7-162
Figure 7.5.2-12 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for GHEX using Case E magnitude weights. Error bars as in Figure 7.5.2-4.	7-163
Figure 7.5.2-13 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for GMH using Case A magnitude weights. Error bars as in Figure 7.5.2-4.	7-164
Figure 7.5.2-14 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for GMH using Case B magnitude weights. Error bars as in Figure 7.5.2-4.	7-165
Figure 7.5.2-15 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for GMH using Case E magnitude weights. Error bars as in Figure 7.5.2-4.	7-166
Figure 7.5.2-16 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for IBEB using Case A magnitude weights. Error bars as in Figure 7.5.2-4.	7-167
Figure 7.5.2-17 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for IBEB using Case B magnitude weights. Error bars as in Figure 7.5.2-4.	7-168
Figure 7.5.2-18 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for IBEB using Case E magnitude weights. Error bars as in Figure 7.5.2-4.	7-169
Figure 7.5.2-19 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for MidC-A using Case A magnitude weights. Error bars as in Figure 7.5.2-4.	7-170
Figure 7.5.2-20 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for MidC-A using Case B magnitude weights. Error bars as in Figure 7.5.2-4.	7-171
Figure 7.5.2-21 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for MidC-A using Case E magnitude weights. Error bars as in Figure 7.5.2-4.	7-172
Figure 7.5.2-22 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for MidC–B using Case A magnitude weights. Error bars as in Figure 7.5.2-4.	7-173
Figure 7.5.2-23 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for MidC-B using Case B magnitude weights. Error bars as in Figure 7.5.2-4.	7-174
Figure 7.5.2-24 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for MidC–B using Case E magnitude weights. Error bars as in Figure 7.5.2-4.	7-175
Figure 7.5.2-25 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for MidC–C using Case A magnitude weights. Error bars as in Figure 7.5.2-4.	7-176
Figure 7.5.2-26 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for MidC-C using Case B magnitude weights, Error bars as in Figure 7.5.2-4.	7 - 177
Figure 7.5.2-27 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for MidC–C using Case E magnitude weights. Error bars as in Figure 7.5.2-4.	7-178
Figure 7.5.2-28 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for MidC–D using Case A magnitude weights. Error bars as in Figure 7.5.2-4.	.7-179
Figure 7.5.2-29 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for MidC–D using Case B magnitude weights. Error bars as in Figure 7.5.2-4.	7-180
Figure 7.5.2-30 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for MidC–D using Case E magnitude weights. Error bars as in Figure 7.5.2-4.	7-181
Figure 7.5.2-31 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for NAP using Case A magnitude weights. Error bars as in Figure 7.5.2-4.	.7-182

xli

Figure 7.5.2-32 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for NAP using Case B magnitude weights. Error bars as in Figure 7.5.2-4	
Figure 7.5.2-33 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for NAP using Case E magnitude weights. Error bars as in Figure 7.5.2-4	
Figure 7.5.2-34 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for OKA using Case A magnitude weights. Error bars as in Figure 7.5.2-4	
Figure 7.5.2-35 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for OKA using Case B magnitude weights. Error bars as in Figure 7.5.2-4	
Figure 7.5.2-36 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for OKA using Case E magnitude weights. Error bars as in Figure 7.5.2-4	
Figure 7.5.2-37 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for PEZ_N using Case A magnitude weights. Error bars as in Figure 7.5.2-4.	
Figure 7.5.2-38 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for PEZ_N using Case B magnitude weights. Error bars as in Figure 7.5.2-4	I
Figure 7.5.2-39 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for PEZ_N using Case E magnitude weights. Error bars as in Figure 7.5.2-4.)
Figure 7.5.2-40 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for PEZ_W using Case A magnitude weights. Error bars as in Figure 7.5.2-4.	
Figure 7,5.2-41 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for PEZ_W using Case B magnitude weights. Error bars as in Figure 7.5.2-4.	!
Figure 7.5.2-42 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for PEZ_W using Case E magnitude weights. Error bars as in Figure 7.5.2-4.	}
Figure 7.5.2-43 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for RR using Case A magnitude weights. Error bars as in Figure 7.5.2-4.	ŀ
Figure 7.5.2-44 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for RR using Case B magnitude weights. Error bars as in Figure 7.5.2-4.	5
Figure 7.5.2-45 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for RR using Case E magnitude weights. Error bars as in Figure 7.5.2-4	3
Figure 7.5.2-46 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for RR_RCG using Case A magnitude weights. Error bars as in Figure 7.5.2-4.	7
Figure 7.5.2-47 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for RR_RCG using Case B magnitude weights. Error bars as in Figure 7.5.2-4.	3
Figure 7.5.2-48 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for RR_RCG using Case E magnitude weights. Error bars as in Figure 7.5.2-4.	9
Figure 7.5.2-49 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for SLR using Case A magnitude weights. Error bars as in Figure 7.5.2-4.	D
Figure 7.5.2-50 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for SLR using Case B magnitude weights. Error bars as in Figure 7.5.2-4	1
Figure 7.5.2-51 Comparison of model-predicted earthquake counts for SLR using Case E magnitude weights. Error bars as in Figure 7.5.2-4	2
Figure 8.1-1 Map showing the study area and seven test sites for the CEUS SSC Project 8-20	8
Figure 8.1-2 Mean VS profile for shallow soil site	9
Figure 8.1-3 Mean VS profile for deep soil site8-3	0

Figure 8.1-4 Mean amplification factors for shallow soil site	8-31
Figure 8.1-5 Mean amplification factors for deep soil site	8-32
Figure 8.2-1a Central Illinois 10 Hz rock hazard: mean and fractile total hazard	8-33
Figure 8.2-1b Central Illinois 1 Hz rock hazard: mean and fractile total hazard	8-34
Figure 8,2-1c Central Illinois PGA rock hazard: mean and fractile total hazard	8-35
Figure 8.2-1d Central Illinois 10 Hz rock hazard: total and contribution by RLME and background	8-36
Figure 8.2-1e Central Illinois 1 Hz rock hazard: total and contribution by RLME and background	8-37
Figure 8.2-1f Central Illinois PGA rock hazard: total and contribution by RLME and background	8-38
Figure 8.2-1g Central Illinois 10 Hz rock hazard: contribution by background source	8-39
Figure 8.2-1h Central Illinois 1 Hz rock hazard: contribution by background source	8-40
Figure 8.2-1i Central Illinois PGA rock hazard: contribution by background source	8-41
Figure 8.2-1j Central Illinois 10 Hz rock hazard: comparison of three source models	8-42
Figure 8.2-1k Central Illinois 1 Hz rock hazard: comparison of three source models	8-43
Figure 8.2-11 Central Illinois PGA rock hazard: comparison of three source models	8-44
Figure 8.2-1m Central Illinois 10 Hz shallow soil hazard: total and total and contribution by RLME and background	8-45
Figure 8.2-1n Central Illinois 1 Hz shallow soil hazard: total and contribution by RLME and background	8-46
Figure 8.2-1o Central Illinois PGA shallow soil hazard: total and contribution by RLME and background	8-47
Figure 8.2-1p Central Illinois 10 Hz deep soil hazard: total and contribution by RLME and background	8-48
Figure 8.2-1q Central Illinois 1 Hz deep soil hazard: total and contribution by RLME and background	8-49
Figure 8.2-1r Central Illinois PGA deep soil hazard: total and contribution by RLME and background	8-50
Figure 8.2-1s Central Illinois 10 Hz hazard: comparison of three site conditions	8-51
Figure 8.2-1t Central Illinois 1 Hz hazard: comparison of three site conditions	8-52
Figure 8.2-1u Central Illinois PGA hazard: comparison of three site conditions	8-53
Figure 8.2-1v Central Illinois 10 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to seismotectonic vs. Mmax zones	8-54
Figure 8.2-1w Central Illinois 1 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to seismotectonic vs. Mmax zones	8-55
Figure 8.2-1x Central Illinois 10 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to Mmax for source IBEB	8-56
Figure 8.2-1y Central Illinois 1 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to Mmax for source IBEB	8-57
Figure 8.2-1z Central Illinois 10 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to smoothing options	8-58
Figure 8.2-1aa Central Illinois 1 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to smoothing options	8-59
Figure 8.2-1bb Central Illinois 10 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to eight realizations for source IBEB, Case A	8-60

xliii

Figure 8.2-1cc Central Illinois 10 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to eight realizations for source IBEB, Case B
Figure 8:2-1dd Central Illinois 10 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to eight realizations for source IBEB, Case E
Figure 8.2-1ee Central Illinois 1 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to eight realizations for source IBEB, Case A
Figure 8.2-1ff Central Illinois 1 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to eight realizations for source IBEB, Case B
Figure 8.2-1gg Central Illinois 1 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to eight realizations for source IBEB, Case E
Figure 8.2-2a Chattanooga 10 Hz rock hazard: mean and fractile total hazard8-66
Figure 8.2-2b Chattanooga 1 Hz rock hazard: mean and fractile total hazard8-67
Figure 8.2-2c Chattanooga PGA rock hazard: mean and fractile total hazard
Figure 8.2-2d Chattanooga 10 Hz rock hazard: total and contribution by RLME and background
Figure 8:2-2e Chattanooga 1 Hz rock hazard: total and contribution by RLME and background
Figure 8.2-2f Chattanooga PGA rock hazard: total and contribution by RLME and background
Figure 8.2-2g Chattanooga 10 Hz rock hazard: contribution by background source
Figure 8.2-2h Chattanooga 1 Hz rock hazard; contribution by background source
Figure 8.2-2i Chattanooga PGA rock hazard: contribution by background source8-74
Figure 8.2-2j Chattanooga 10 Hz rock hazard: comparison of three source models
Figure 8.2-2k Chattanooga is 1 Hz rock hazard: comparison of three source models
Figure 8.2-2I Chattanooga PGA rock hazard: comparison of three source models8-77
Figure 8.2-2m Chattancoga 10 Hz shallow soil hazard: total and contribution by RLME and background
Figure 8.2-2n Chattanooga 1 Hz shallow soil hazard: total and contribution by RLME and background
Figure 8.2-20 Chattanooga PGA shallow soll hazard: total and contribution by RLME and background
Figure 8.2-2p Chattanooga 10 Hz deep soil hazard: total and contribution by RLME and background
Figure 8.2-2q Chattanooga 1 Hz deep soil hazard: total and contribution by RLME and background
Figure 8.2-2r Chattanooga PGA deep soll hazard: total and contribution by RLME and background
Figure 8.2-2's Chattanooga 10 Hz hazard: comparison of three site conditions
Figure 8.2-2t Chattanooga 1 Hz hazard: comparison of three site conditions
Figure 8.2-2u Chattanooga PGA hazard: comparison of three site conditions
Figure 8.2-2v Chattanooga 10 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to seismotectonic vs. Mmax
201658-8/

Figure 8.2-2w Chattanooga 1 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to seismotectonic vs. Mmax zones8-86
Figure 8.2-2x Chattanooga 10 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to Mmax for source PEZ-N
Figure 8.2-2y Chattanooga 1 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to Mmax for source PEZ-N
Figure 8.2-2z Chattanooga 10 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to smoothing options8-9
Figure 8.2-2aa Chattanooga 1 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to smoothing options
Figure 8.2-2bb Chattanooga 10 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to eight realizations for source PEZ-N, Case A
Figure 8.2-2cc Chattanooga 10 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to eight realizations for source PEZ-N, Case B
Figure 8.2-2dd Chattenooga 10 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to eight realizations for source PEZ-N, Case E
Figure 8.2-2ee Chattanooga 1 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to eight realizations for source PEZ-N, Case A
Figure 8.2-2ff Chattanooga 1 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to eight realizations for source PEZ-N, Case B
Figure 8.2-2gg Chattanooga 1 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to eight realizations for source PEZ-N, Case E
Figure 8.2-3a Houston 10 Hz rock hazard: mean and fractile total hazard
Figure 8.2-3b Houston 1 Hz rock hazard: mean and fractile total hazard8-100
Figure 8.2-3c Houston PGA rock hazard: mean and fractile total hazard8-101
Figure 8.2-3d Houston 10 Hz rock hazard: total and contribution by RLME and background
Figure 8.2-3e Houston 1 Hz rock hazard: total and contribution by RLME and background
Figure 8.2-3f Houston PGA rock hazard: total and contribution by RLME and background 8-104
Figure 8.2-3g Houston 10 Hz rock hazard: contribution by background source
Figure 8.2-3h Houston 1 Hz rock hazard: contribution by background source
Figure 8.2-3i Houston PGA rock hazard: contribution by background source
Figure 8.2-3j Houston 10 Hz rock hazard: comparison of three source models
Figure 8.2-3k Houston is 1 Hz rock hazard: comparison of three source models8-109
Figure 8.2-3I Houston PGA rock hazard: comparison of three source models8-110
Figure 8.2-3m Houston 10 Hz shallow soil hazard: total and contribution by RLME and background
Figure 8.2-3n Houston 1 Hz shallow soil hazard: total and contribution by RLME and background
Figure 8.2-3o Houston PGA shallow soil hazard: total and contribution by RLME and background
Figure 8.2-3p Houston 10 Hz deep soil hazard: total and contribution by RLME and background
Figure 8.2-3q Houston 1 Hz deep soil hazard: total and contribution by RLME and background

xlv

.

Figure 8.2-3r Houston PGA deep soil hazard: total and contribution by RLME and background
Figure 8.2-3s Houston 10 Hz hazard: comparison of three site conditions8-117
Figure 8.2-3t Houston 1 Hz hazard: comparison of three site conditions8-118
Figure 8.2-3u Houston PGA hazard: comparison of three site conditions
Figure 8.2-3v Houston 10 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to seismotectonic vs. Mmax zones8-120
Figure 8.2-3w Houston 1 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to seismotectonic vs. Mmax zones8-121
Figure 8.2-3x Houston 10 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to Mmax for source GHEX8-122
Figure 8.2-3y Houston 1 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to Mmax for source GHEX
Figure 8.2-3z Houston 10 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to smoothing options
Figure 8.2-3aa Houston 1 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to smoothing options
Figure 8.2-3bb Houston 10 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to eight realizations for source GHEX, Case A
Figure 8.2-3cc Houston 10 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to eight realizations for source GHEX, Case B
Figure 8.2-3dd Houston 10 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to eight realizations for source GHEX, Case E
Figure 8.2-3ee Houston 1 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to eight realizations for source GHEX, Case A
Figure 8.2-3ff Houston 1 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to eight realizations for source GHEX, Case B
Figure 8.2-3gg Houston 1 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to eight realizations for source GHEX, Case E8-131
Figure 8.2-4a Jackson 10 Hz rock hazard: mean and fractile total hazard
Figure 8.2-4b Jackson 1 Hz rock hazard: mean and fractile total hazard
Figure 8.2-4c Jackson PGA rock hazard: mean and fractile total hazard
Figure 8.2-4d Jackson 10 Hz rock hazard: total and contribution by RLME and background
Figure 8.2-4e Jackson 1 Hz rock hazard: total and contribution by RLME and background8-136
Figure 8,2-4f Jackson PGA rock hazard: total and contribution by RLME and background 8-137
Figure 8.2-4g Jackson 10 Hz rock hazard: contribution by background source
Figure 8.2-4h Jackson 1 Hz rock hazard: contribution by background source
Figure 8.2-4I Jackson PGA rock hazard: contribution by background source
Figure 8.2-4j Jackson 10 Hz rock hazard: comparison of three source models8-141
Figure 8.2-4k Jackson is 1 Hz rock hazard: comparison of three source models
Figure 8.2-4I Jackson PGA rock hazard: comparison of three source models
Figure 8.2-4m Jackson 10 Hz shallow soil hazard: total and contribution by RLME and background
Figure 8.2-4n Jackson 1 Hz shallow soil hazard: total and contribution by RLME and background8-145

¢

Figure 8.2-4o Jackson PGA shallow soil hazard: total and contribution by RLME and background	8-146
Figure 8.2-4p Jackson 10 Hz deep soil hazard: total and contribution by RLME and background	.8-147
Figure 8.2-4q Jackson 1 Hz deep soil hazard: total and contribution by RLME and background	8-148
Figure 8.2-4r Jackson PGA deep soil hazard: total and contribution by RLME and background	8-149
Figure 8.2-4s Jackson 10 Hz hazard: comparison of three site conditions	8-150
Figure 8.2-4t Jackson 1 Hz hazard: comparison of three site conditions	8-151
Figure 8.2-4u Jackson PGA hazard: comparison of three site conditions	8-152
Figure 8.2-4v Jackson 10 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to seismotectonic vs. Mmax zones	8-153
Figure 8.2-4w Jackson 1 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to seismotectonic vs. Mmax zones	8-154
Figure 8.2-4x Jackson 10 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to Mmax for source ECC-GC	8-155
Figure 8.2-4y Jackson 1 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to Mmax for source ECC-GC	8-156
Figure 8.2-4z Jackson 10 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to smoothing options	8-157
Figure 8.2-4aa Jackson 1 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to smoothing options	8-158
Figure 8.2-4bb Jackson 10 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to eight realizations for source ECC-GC, Case A	
Figure 8.2-4cc Jackson 10 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to eight realizations for source ECC-GC, Case B	8-160
Figure 8.2-4dd Jackson 10 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to eight realizations for source ECC-GC, Case E	8-161
Figure 8.2-4ee Jackson 1 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to eight realizations for source ECC-GC, Case A	8-162
Figure 8.2-4ff Jackson 1 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to eight realizations for source ECC- GC, Case B	8-163
Figure 8.2-4gg Jackson 1 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to eight realizations for source ECC-GC, Case E	8-164
Figure 8.2-5a Manchester 10 Hz rock hazard: mean and fractile total hazard	8-165
Figure 8.2-5b Manchester 1 Hz rock hazard: mean and fractile total hazard	8-166
Figure 8.2-5c Manchester PGA rock hazard: mean and fractile total hazard	8-167
Figure 8.2-5d Manchester 10 Hz rock hazard: total and contribution by RLME and background	8-168
Figure 8.2-5e Manchester 1 Hz rock hazard: total and contribution by RLME and background	8-169
Figure 8.2-5f Manchester PGA rock hazard: total and contribution by RLME and background	8-170
Figure 8.2-5g Manchester 10 Hz rock hazard: contribution by background source	8-171
Figure 8.2-5h Manchester 1 Hz rock hazard: contribution by background source	8-172
Figure 8.2-5i Manchester PGA rock hazard: contribution by background source	8-173
Figure 8.2-5 Manchester 10 Hz rock hazard: comparison of three source models	8-174

xlvi

xlvii

Figure 8.2-5k Manchester is 1 Hz rock hazard: comparison of three source models	8-175
Figure 8.2-5I Manchester PGA rock hazard: comparison of three source models	8-176
Figure 8.2-5m Manchester 10 Hz shallow soil hazard: total and contribution by RLME and background	8-177
Figure 8.2-5n Manchester 1 Hz shallow soil hazard: total and contribution by RLME and background	8-178
Figure 8.2-5o Manchester PGA shallow soil hazard: total and contribution by RLME and background	8-179
Figure 8.2-5p Manchester 10 Hz deep soil hazard: total and contribution by RLME and background	8-180
Figure 8.2-5q Manchester 1 Hz deep soil hazard: total and contribution by RLME and background	8-181
Figure 8.2-5r Manchester PGA deep soil hazard: total and contribution by RLME and background	8-182
Figure 8.2-5s Manchester 10 Hz hazard: comparison of three site conditions	.8-183
Figure 8.2-5t Manchester 1 Hz hazard: comparison of three site conditions	.8-184
Figure 8.2-5u Manchester PGA hazard: comparison of three site conditions	.8-185
Figure 8.2-5v Manchester 10 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to seismotectonic vs. Mmax zones	8-186
Figure 8.2-5w Manchester 1 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to seismotectonic vs. Mmax	
	.8-187
Figure 8.2-5x Manchester 10 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to Mmax for source NAP	.8-188
Figure 8.2-59 Manchester 1 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to Mmax for source NAP	.8-189
Figure 8.2-52 Manchester 10 Hz rock nazard: sensitivity to smoothing options	.8-190
Figure 8.2-5bb Manchester 10 Hz rock hazard; sensitivity to smoothing options NAP. Case A	.8-192
Figure 8.2-5cc Manchester 10 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to eight realizations for source NAP. Case B	.8-193
Figure 8.2-5dd Manchester 10 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to eight realizations for source NAP, Case E	.8-194
Figure 8.2-5ee Manchester 1 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to eight realizations for source NAP, Case A	.8-195
Figure 8.2-5ff Manchester 1 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to eight realizations for source NAP, Case B	.8-196
Figure 8.2-5gg Manchester 1 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to eight realizations for source NAP, Case E	.8-197
Figure 8.2-6a Savannah 10 Hz rock hazard: mean and fractile total hazard	.8-198
Figure 8.2-6b Savannah 1 Hz rock hazard: mean and fractile total hazard	.8-199
Figure 8.2-6c Savannah PGA rock hazard: mean and fractile total hazard	.8-200
Figure 8.2-6d Savannah 10 Hz rock hazard: total and contribution by RLME and background	.8-201

Figure 8.2-6e Savannah 1 Hz rock hazard: total and contribution by RLME and background
Figure 8.2-6f Savannah PGA rock hazard: total and contribution by RLME and background8-203
Figure 8.2-6g Savannah 10 Hz rock hazard: contribution by background source
Figure 8.2-6h Savannah 1 Hz rock hazard: contribution by background source
Figure 8.2-6i Savannah PGA rock hazard: contribution by background source
Figure 8.2-6j Savannah 10 Hz rock hazard: comparison of three source models
Figure 8.2-6k Savannah is 1 Hz rock hazard: comparison of three source models
Figure 8.2-6I Savannah PGA rock hazard: comparison of three source models
Figure 8.2-6m Savannah 10 Hz shallow soll hazard: total and contribution by RLME and background
Figure 8.2-6n Savannah 1 Hz shallow soil hazard: total and contribution by RLME and background
Figure 8.2-6o Savannah PGA shallow soil hazard: total and contribution by RLME and background
Figure 8.2-6p Savannah 10 Hz deep soil hazard: total and contribution by RLME and background8-213
Figure 8.2-6q Savannah 1 Hz deep soil hazard: total and contribution by RLME and background
Figure 8.2-6r Savannah PGA deep soil hazard: total and contribution by RLME and background
Figure 8.2-6s Savannah 10 Hz hazard: comparison of three site conditions
Figure 8.2-6t Savannah 1 Hz hazard: comparison of three site conditions
Figure 8.2-8u Savannah PGA hazard: comparison of three site conditions
Figure 8.2-6v Savannah 10 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to selsmotectonic vs. Mmax zones
Figure 8,2-6w Savannah 1 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to seismotectonic vs. Mmax zones8-220
Figure 8.2-6x Savannah 10 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to Mmax for source ECC-AM8-221
Figure 8.2-6y Savannah 1 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to Mmax for source ECC-AM
Figure 8.2-6z Savannah 10 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to smoothing options
Figure 8.2-6aa Savannah 1 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to smoothing options
Figure 8.2-8bb Savannah 10 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to eight realizations for source ECC-AM, Case A
Figure 8.2-6cc Savannah 10 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to eight realizations for source ECC-AM, Case B
Figure 8.2-8dd Savannah 10 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to eight realizations for source ECC-AM, Case E
Figure 8.2-8ee Savannah 1 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to eight realizations for source ECC-AM, Case A
Figure 8.2-6ff Savannah 1 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to eight realizations for source ECC-AM, Case B

7

xlix

Figure 8.2-6gg Savannah 1 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to eight realizations for source ECC-AM, Case E8-230
Figure 8.2-7a Topeka 10 Hz rock hazard: mean and fractile total hazard8-231
Figure 8.2-7b Topeka 1 Hz rock hazard: mean and fractile total hazard
Figure 8.2-7c Topeka PGA rock hazard: mean and fractile total hazard
Figure 8.2-7d Topeka 10 Hz rock hazard: total and contribution by RLME and background
Figure 8.2-7e Topeka 1 Hz rock hazard: total and contribution by RLME and background8-235
Figure 8.2-7f Topeka PGA rock hazard: total and contribution by RLME and background 8-236
Figure 8.2-7g Topeka 10 Hz rock hazard: contribution by background source
Figure 8.2-7h Topeka 1 Hz rock hazard: contribution by background source
Figure 8.2-7i Topeka PGA rock hazard: contribution by background source
Figure 8.2-7; Topeka 10 Hz rock hazard: comparison of three source models
Figure 8.2-7k Topeka is 1 Hz rock hazard: comparison of three source models
Figure 8.2-71 Topeka PGA rock hazard: comparison of three source models
Figure 8.2-7m Topeka 10 Hz shailow soil hazard: total and contribution by RLME and background8-243
Figure 8.2-7n Topeka 1 Hz shallow soil hazard: total and contribution by RLME and background8-244
Figure 8.2-70 Topeka PGA shallow soil hazard: total and contribution by RLME and background8-245
Figure 8.2-7p Topeka 10 Hz deep soil hazard: total and contribution by RLME and background8-246
Figure 8.2-7q Topeka 1 Hz deep soil hazard: total and contribution by RLME and background8-247
Figure 8.2-7r Topeka PGA deep soil hazard: total and contribution by RLME and background
Figure 8.2-7s Topeka 10 Hz hazard: comparison of three site conditions
Figure 8.2-7t Topeka 1 Hz hazard: comparison of three site conditions
Figure 8.2-7u Topeka PGA hazard: comparison of three site conditions
Figure 8.2-7v Topeka 10 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to seismotectonic vs. Mmax zones8-252
Figure 8.2-7w Topeka 1 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to seismotectonic vs. Mmax zones8-253
Figure 8.2-7x Topeka 10 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to Mmax for source MidC-A
Figure 8.2-7y Topeka 1 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to Mmax for source MidC-A
Figure 8.2-7z Topeka 10 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to smoothing options
Figure 8.2-7aa Topeka 1 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to smoothing options
Figure 8.2-7bb Topeka 10 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to eight realizations for source MidC-A, Case A8-258
Figure 8.2-7cc Topeka 10 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to eight realizations for source MidC-A, Case B

•

source	Figure 8.2-7dd Topeka 10 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to eight realizations for source MidC-A, Case E8	-260
8-231 8-232	Figure 8.2-7ee Topeka 1 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to eight realizations for source MidC-A, Case A	-261
8-233	Figure 8.2-7ff Topeka 1 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to eight realizations for source MidC- A. Case B	-262
8-234	Figure 8.2-7gg Topeka 1 Hz rock hazard: sensitivity to eight realizations for source MidC-A. Case F	⊦ 263
eckground8-235	Figure 9.3-1 1 Hz sensitivity to rupture orientation at Savannah for the Charleston	
ackground 8-236	regional source	9-24
8-237	Figure 9.3-2 10 Hz sensitivity to rupture orientation at Savannah for the Charleston	0.25
	regional source	, 5- 25
	Figure 9.3-3 1 Hz sensitivity to seismogenic inickness at Manchester for the Orlanovoix	.9-26
s8-240	Figure 9.3-4 10 Hz sensitivity to seismogenic thickness at Manchester for the Charlevoix	.9-27
8-242 .ME and	Figure 9.3-5 1 Hz sensitivity to rupture orientation (dip) at Manchester for the Charlevoix area source	.9-28
8-243 IE and	Figure 9.3-6 10 Hz sensitivity to rupture orientation (dip) at Manchester for the Charlevoix area source	.9-29
8-244 NE and	Figure 9.3-7 1 Hz sensitivity to seismogenic thickness at Topeka for the Cheraw fault	.9-30
8-245 E and	Figure 9.3-8 10 Hz sensitivity to seismogenic thickness at Topeka for the Cheraw fault source	.9-31
8-246 and	Figure 9.3-9 1 Hz sensitivity to rupture orientation (dip) at Topeka for the Cheraw fault	.9-32
8-247 and	Figure 9.3-10 10 Hz sensitivity to rupture orientation at Topeka for the Cheraw fault	.9-33
8-248 8-249	Figure 9.3-11 1 Hz sensitivity to seismogenic thickness at Jackson for the Commerce	.9-34
	Figure 9.3-12 10 Hz sensitivity to seismogenic thickness at Jackson for the Commerce	.9-35
nax zones8-252	Figure 9.3-13 1 Hz sensitivity to seismogenic thickness at Jackson for the ERM-N area	. 9 -36
lax zones8-253 C-A8-254	Figure 9.3-14 10 Hz sensitivity to seismogenic thickness at Jackson for the ERM-N area	
-A8-255 8-256	Figure 9.3-15 1 Hz sensitivity to seismogenic thickness at Jackson for the ERM-S area	.9-38
8-257	Figure 9.3-16 10 Hz sensitivity to seismogenic thickness at Jackson for the ERM-S area	.9-39
8-258	Figure 9.3-17 1 Hz sensitivity to selsmogenic thickness at Jackson for the Marianna area	.9-40
	Figure 9.3-18 10 Hz sensitivity to seismogenic thickness at Jackson for the Marianna area source	.9-41

.

· · ·

1

li

Figure 9.3-19 1 Hz sensitivity to seismogenic thickness at Topeka for the Meers fault and OKA area sources
Figure 9.3-20 1 Hz sensitivity to seismogenic thickness at Houston for the Meers fault and OKA area sources
Figure 9.3-21 10 Hz sensitivity to seismogenic thickness at Topeka for the Meers fault and OKA area sources
Figure 9.3-22 10 Hz sensitivity to seismogenic thickness at Houston for the Meers fault and OKA area sources
Figure 9.3-23 1 Hz sensitivity to rupture orientation at Houston for the OKA area source9-46
Figure 9.3-24 10 Hz sensitivity to rupture orientation at Houston for the OKA area source 9-47
Figure 9.3-25 1 Hz sensitivity to rupture orientation (dip) at Topeka for the OKA area source
Figure 9.3-26 1 Hz sensitivity to rupture orientation (dip) at Houston for the OKA area source
Figure 9.3-27 10 Hz sensitivity to rupture orientation (dip) at Topeka for the OKA area source
Figure 9.3-28 10 Hz sensitivity to rupture orientation (dip) at Houston for the OKA area source
Figure 9.3-29 1 Hz sensitivity to rupture orientation (dip) at Topeka for the Meers fault source
Figure 9.3-30 1 Hz sensitivity to rupture orientation (dip) at Houston for the Meers fault source
Figure 9.3-31 10 Hz sensitivity to rupture orientation (dip) at Topeka for the Meers fault source
Figure 9.3-32 10 Hz sensitivity to rupture orientation (dip) at Houston for the Meers fault source
Figure 9.3-33 1 Hz sensitivity to seismogenic thickness at Jackson for the NMFS fault sources
Figure 9.3-34 10 Hz sensitivity to seismogenic thickness at Jackson for the NMFS fault sources
Figure 9.3-35 1 Hz sensitivity to seismogenic thickness at Central Illinois for the Wabash Valley area source
Figure 9.3-36 10 Hz sensitivity to seismogenic thickness at Central Illinois for the Wabash Valley area source
Figure 9.3-37 1 Hz sensitivity to rupture orientation (dip) at Central Illinois for the Wabash Valley area source
Figure 9.3-38 10 Hz sensitivity to rupture orientation (dip) at Central Illinois for the Wabash Valley area source
Figure 9.3-39 1 Hz sensitivity to fault ruptures vs. point source for the Central Illinois site from the Mid C-A background source
Figure 9.3-40 10 Hz sensitivity to fault ruptures vs. point source for the Central Illinois site from the Mid C–A background source
Figure 9.4-1 COV _{MH} from EPRI (1989) team sources vs. ground motion amplitude for seven test sites: PGA (top), 10 Hz SA (middle), and 1 Hz SA (bottom)

Figure 9.4-2 COV _{MH} from EPRI (1989) team sources vs. seismic hazard (i.e., annual frequency of exceedance) for seven test sites: PGA (top), 10 Hz SA (middle), and 1 9-Hz SA (bottom)	9-65
Figure 9.4-3 COV _{MH} from selsmic source experts (PEGASOS project) vs. amplitude (top) and annual frequency (bottom)	9-66
Figure 9.4-4 COV _k and COV _{MH} from Charleston alternatives for PGA, plotted vs. PGA amplitude (top) and hazard (bottom). COV _{MH} is the total COV of mean hazard; see Table 9.4-2 for other labels for curves.	9-67
Figure 9.4-5 COV _K and COV _{MH} from Charleston alternatives for 10 Hz, plotted vs. 10 Hz amplitude (top) and hazard (bottom). COV _{MH} is the total COV of mean hazard; see Table 9.4-2 for other labels for curves.	9-68
Figure 9.4-6 COV _k and COV _{MH} from Charleston alternatives for 1 Hz, plotted vs. 1 Hz amplitude (top) and hazard (bottom). COV _{MH} is the total COV of mean hazard; see Table 9.4-2 for other labels for curves.	9-69
Figure 9.4-7 COV _k and COV _{MH} of total hazard from New Madrid for 1 Hz, plotted vs. 1 Hz amplitude (top) and hazard (bottom). COV _{MH} is the total COV; see the text for other labels for curves.	9-70
Figure 9.4-8 PGA hazard curves for Manchester test site	9 -71
Figure 9.4-9 COV _{MH} of PGA hazard at Manchester site from ground motion equation vs.	9-72
Figure 9.4-10 COV of PGA hazard at Manchester site from ground motion equation vs. hazard	9-73
Figure 9.4-11 COV of 10 Hz hazard at Manchester site from ground motion equations vs. hazard	9-74
Figure 9.4-12 COV of 1 Hz hazard at Manchester site from ground motion equations vs. hazard	9-75
Figure 9.4-13 1 Hz spectral acceleration hazard curves for Manchester test site	9-76
Figure 9.4-14 COV _{MH} of PGA hazard at Chattanooga from ground motion equation vs. hazard	9-77
Figure 9.4-15 COV _{MH} of 10 Hz hazard at Chattanooga from ground motion equation vs. hazard	9-78
Figure 9.4-16 COV _{MH} of 1 Hz hazard at Chattanooga site from ground motion equation vs. hazard	9-79
Figure 9.4-17 PGA hazard curves for Savannah test site	9-80
Figure 9.4-18 COV _{MH} of PGA hazard at Savannah site from ground motion equations vs. hazard	9-81
Figure 9.4-19 COV _{MH} of 10 Hz hazard at Savannah site from ground motion equations vs. hazard	9-82
Figure 9.4-20 COV _{MH} of 1 Hz hazard at Savannah site from ground motion equations vs. hazard	9-83
Figure 9.4-21 PGA hazard curves for Columbia site	9-84
Figure 9.4-22 COV _{MH} of PGA hazard at Columbia from ground motion equations vs.	9-85

liii

Figure 9.4-23 COV _{MH} of 10 Hz hazard at Columbia from ground motion equations vs.	.9-86
Figure 9.4-24 COV _{MH} of 1 Hz hazard at Columbia from ground motion equations vs. hazard	.9-87
Figure 9.4-25 COV _{MH} of PGA hazard at Chattanooga (New Madrid only) vs, hazard	9-88
Figure 9,4-26 COV _{MH} of 10 Hz hazard at Chattanooga (New Madrid only) vs. hazard	9-89
Figure 9,4-27 COV _{MH} of 1 Hz hazard at Chattanooga (New Madrid only) vs. hazard	9-90
Figure 9.4-28 COV _{MH} for PGA and 1 Hz SA vs. ground motion amplitude resulting from alternative ground motion experts, PEGASOS project	.9-91
Figure 9.4-29 COV _{MH} for PGA and 1 Hz SA vs. mean hazard from alternative ground motion experts, PEGASOS project	.9-92
Figure 9.4-30 COV _{HAZ} from ground motion equations vs. mean hazard for Chattanooga	.9-93
Figure 9.4-31 COV _{MH} from ground motion equations vs. mean hazard for Central Illinois	.9-94
Figure 9.4-32 COV _{MH} from soil experts vs. PGA and 1 Hz SA, PEGASOS project	.9-95
Figure 9.4-33 COV _{MH} from soil experts vs. mean hazard for PGA and 1 Hz SA, PEGASOS project	.9-96
Figure 9.4-34 COV _{MN} resulting from site response models vs. mean hazard for four sites, 1 Hz (top) and 10 Hz (bottom)	.9-97
Figure 11-1 Geologic time scale (Walker and Geissman, 2009)	11-10
Figure A-1 GEBCO elevation data for the CEUS study area (BODC, 2009)	A-22
Figure A-2 CEUS SSC independent earthquake catalog	A-24
Figure A-3 Bedrock geology and extended crust after Kanter (1994)	A-26
Figure A-4 Crustal provinces after Rohs and Van Schmus (2007)	. A-28
Figure A-5 Geologic map of North America	. A-31
Figure A-8 Locations of geologic cross sections in the CEUS	A-33
Figure A-7 Precambrian crustal boundary after Van Schmus et al. (1996)	A-35
Figure A-8a Precambrian geology and features after Reed (1993)	. A-37
Figure A-8b Explanation of Precambrian geology and features after Reed (1993)	. A-38
Figure A-9 Precambrian provinces after Van Schmus et al. (2007)	. A-40
Figure A-10 Precambrian units after Whitmeyer and Karlstrom (2007)	. A-42
Figure A-11 Surficial materials in the conterminous United States after Soller et al. (2009)	. A-44
Figure A-12 Basement and sediment thickness in the USGS Crustal Database for North America. Symbol size represents overlying sediment thickness (km); symbol color represents basement thickness (km).	. A-46
Figure A-13 Top of basement P-wave seismic velocity in the USGS Crustal Database for North America	. A-47
Figure A-14 Sediment thickness for North America and neighboring regions	. A-49
Figure A-15 Physiographic divisions of the conterminous United States after Fenneman	
and Johnson (1946)	. A-51
Figure A-16 CEUS SSC free-air gravity anomaly grid. Shaded relief with 315-degree azimuth and 30-degree inclination applied	. A-54

Figure A-17 CEUS SSC free-air gravity anomaly grid. Shaded relief with 180-degree azimuth and 30-degree inclination applied	A-55
Figure A-18 CEUS SSC complete Bouguer gravity anomaly grid with free-air gravity anomaly in marine areas. Shaded relief with 315-degree azimuth and 30-degree inclination applied.	A-56
Figure A-19 CEUS SSC complete Bouguer gravity anomaly grid with free-air gravity anomaly in marine areas. Shaded relief with 180-degree azimuth and 30-degree inclination applied	A-57
Figure A-20 CEUS SSC residual isostatic gravity anomaly grid. Shaded relief with 315- degree azimuth and 30-degree inclination applied.	A-58
Figure A-21 CEUS SSC residual isostatic gravity anomaly grid Shaded relief with 180- degree azimuth and 30-degree inclination applied.	A-59
Figure A-22 CEUS SSC regional isostatic gravity anomaly grid	A-60
Figure A-23 CEUS SSC first vertical derivative of residual isostatic gravity anomaly grid	A-61
Figure A-24 CEUS SSC first vertical derivative of Bouguer gravity anomaly grid with free-air anomaly in marine areas	A-62
Figure A-25 CEUS SSC complete Bouguer (with marine free-air) gravity anomaly grid low pass filtered at 240 km	A-63
Figure A-26 CEUS SSC complete Bouguer (with marine free-air) gravity anomaly grid high pass filtered at 240 km. Shaded relief with 315-degree azimuth and 30-degree inclination applied	A-64
Figure A-27 CEUS SSC complete Bouguer (with marine free-air) gravity anomaly grid high pass filtered at 240 km. Shaded relief with 180-degree azimuth and 30-degree inclination applied	A-65
Figure A-28 CEUS SSC complete Bouguer (with marine free-air) gravity anomaly grid high pass filtered at 120 km. Shaded relief with 315-degree azimuth and 30-degree inclination applied	A-66
Figure A-29 CEUS SSC complete Bouguer (with marine free-air) gravity anomaly grid high pass filtered at 120 km. Shaded relief with 180-degree azimuth and 30-degree inclination applied.	A-67
Figure A-30 CEUS SSC complete Bouguer (with marine free-air) gravity anomaly grid upward continued to 40 km	A-68
Figure A-31 CEUS SSC complete Bouguer (with marine free-air) gravity anomaly grid minus the complete Bouguer (with marine free-air) gravity anomaly upward continued to 40 km. Shaded relief with 315-degree azimuth and 30-degree inclination applied	A-69
Figure A-32 CEUS SSC complete Bouguer (with marine free-air) gravity anomaly grid minus the complete Bouguer (with marine free-air) gravity anomaly upward continued to 40 km. Shaded relief with 180-degree azimuth and 30-degree inclination applied.	A-70
Figure A-33 CEUS SSC complete Bouguer (with marine free-air) gravity anomaly grid upward continued to 100 km	A-71
Figure A-34 CEUS SSC complete Bouguer (with marine free-air) gravity anomaly grid minus the complete Bouguer (with marine free-air) gravity anomaly anomaly	

liv

lv

upward continued to 100 km. Shaded relief with 315-degree azimuth and 30-degree inclination applied	
Figure A-35 CEUS SSC complete Bouguer (with marine free-air) gravity anomaly grid minus the complete Bouguer (with marine free-air) gravity anomaly upward continued to 100 km. Shaded relief with 180-degree azimuth and 30-degree inclination applied	
Figure A-36 CEUS SSC horizontal derivative of residual isostatic gravity anomaly grid A-74	
Figure A-37 CEUS SSC horizontal derivative of first vertical derivative of residual isostatic gravity anomaly grid	
Figure A-38 Corrected heat flow values from the SMU Geothermal Laboratory Regional Heat Flow Database (2008)	· ·
Figure A-39 CEUS SSC total intensity magnetic anomaly grid (Ravat et al., 2009). Shaded relief with 315-degree azimuth and 30-degree inclination applied	
Figure A-40 CEUS SSC total intensity magnetic anomaly grid (Ravat et al., 2009). Shaded relief with 180-degree azimuth and 30-degree inclination applied	
Figure A-41 CEUS SSC differentially reduced to pole magnetic anomaly grid (Ravat, 2009). Shaded relief with 315-degree azimuth and 30-degree inclination applied A-82	
Figure A-42 CEUS SSC differentially reduced to pole magnetic anomaly grid (Ravat, 2009). Shaded relief with 180-degree azimuth and 30-degree inclination applied	
Figure A-43 CEUS SSC tilt derivative of differentially reduced to pole magnetic anomaly grid (degrees) (Ravat, 2009)	
Figure A-44 CEUS SSC horizontal derivative of tilt derivative of differentially reduced to pole magnetic anomaly grid (radians) (Ravat, 2009)	
Figure A-45 CEUS SSC tilt derivative of differentially reduced to pole magnetic anomaly grid (Ravat, 2009)	
Figure A-46 CEUS SSC amplitude of analytic signal magnetic anomaly grid (Ravat, 2009)	
Figure A-47 CEUS SSC paleoliquefaction database A-89	
Figure A-48 CEUS SSC compilation of seismic reflection and seismic refraction lines A-91	
Figure A-49 USGS National Seismic Hazard Maps (Petersen et al., 2008) A-93	
Figure A-50 USGS NSHM ground motion hazard at spectral acceleration of 1 hz with 2% probability of exceedance in 50 years (Petersen et al., 2008)	
Figure A-51 USGS NSHM ground motion hazard at spectral acceleration of 1 hz with 5% probability of exceedance in 50 years (Petersen et al., 2008)	
Figure A-52 USGS NSHM ground motion hazard at spectral acceleration of 1 hz with 10% probability of exceedance in 50 years (Petersen et al., 2008)	
Figure A-53 USGS NSHM ground motion hazard at spectral acceleration of 3 hz with 2% probability of exceedance in 50 years (Petersen et al., 2008)	
Figure A-54 USGS NSHM ground motion hazard at spectral acceleration of 3 hz with 5% probability of exceedance in 50 years (Petersen et al., 2008)	. F-
Figure A-55 USGS NSHM ground motion hazard at spectral acceleration of 3 hz with 10% probability of exceedance in 50 years (Petersen et al., 2008)	
Figure A-56 USGS NSHM ground motion hazard at spectral acceleration of 5 hz with 2% probability of exceedance in 50 years (Petersen et al., 2008)	

Figure A-57 USGS NSHM ground motion hazard at spectral acceleration of 5 hz with 5% probability of exceedance in 50 years (Petersen et al., 2008)
Figure A-58 USGS NSHM ground motion hazard at spectral acceleration of 5 hz with 10% probability of exceedance in 50 years (Petersen et al., 2008)
Figure A-59 USGS NSHM peak ground acceleration with 2% probability of exceedance in 50 years (Petersen et al., 2008)
Figure A-60 USGS NSHM peak ground acceleration with 5% probability of exceedance in 50 years (Petersen et al., 2008)
Figure A-61 USGS NSHM peak ground acceleration with 10% probability of exceedance in 50 years (Petersen et al., 2008)
Figure A-62 Deformation of the North American Plate interior using GPS station data (Calais et al., 2008)
Figure A-63 Stress measurement update for the CEUS (Hurd, 2010) A-110
Figure A-64 CEUS SSC Project study area boundary A-112
Figure A-65 USGS Quaternary fault and fold database (USGS, 2006) A-114
Figure A-66 Quaternary features compilation for the CEUS (Crone and Wheeler, 2000; Wheeler, 2005; USGS, 2010)
Figure A-67 CEUS Mesozoic rift basins after Benson (1992) A-118
Figure A-68 CEUS Mesozoic rift basins after Dennis et al. (2004) A-120
Figure A-69 CEUS Mesozoic rift basins after Schlische (1993) A-122
Figure A-70 CEUS Mesozoic rift basins after Withjack et al. (1998) A-124
Figure A-71 RLME zones for the CEUS A-126
Figure A-72 Mesozoic and non-Mesozoic zones for the CEUS, wide interpretation A-128
Figure A-73 Mesozoic and non-Mesozoic zones for the CEUS, narrow interpretation A-129
Figure A-74 CEUS seismotectonic zones model A A-130
Figure A-75 CEUS seismotectonic zones model B A-131
Figure A-76 CEUS seismotectonic zones model C A-132
Figure A-77 CEUS seismotectonic zones model D A-133
Figure E-1 Map of CEUS showing locations of regional data sets included in the CEUS SSC Project pateoliquefaction database, including New Madrid seismic zone and surrounding region; Marianna, Arkansas, area; St. Louis region; Wabash Valley seismic zone and surrounding region; Arkansas-Louisiana-Mississippi region; Charleston seismic zone; Atlantic Coastal region and the Central Virginia seismic zone; Newburyport, Massachusetts, and surrounding region; and Charlevoix seismic zone and surrounding region
Figure E-2 Diagram illustrating size parameters of liquefaction features, including sand blow thickness, width, and length; dike width; and sill thickness, as well as some of the diagnostic characteristics of these features
Figure E-3 Diagram illustrating sampling strategy for dating of liquefaction features as well as age data, such as 14C maximum and 14C minimum, used to calculate preferred age estimates and related uncertainties of liquefaction features
Figure E-4 GIS map of New Madrid seismic zone and surrounding region showing portions of rivers searched for earthquake-induced liquefaction features by M.

lvi

.

lvii

Tuttle, R. Van Arsdale, and J. Vaughn and collaborators (see explanation); information contributed for this report. Map projection is USA Contiguous Albers Equal Area Conic, North America Datum 1983
Figure E-5 GIS map of New Madrid seismic zone and surrounding region showing locations of liquefaction features for which there are and are not radiocarbon data. Map projection is USA Contiguous Albers Equal Area Conic, North America Datum 1983
Figure E-6 GIS map of New Madrid seismic zone and surrounding region showing locations of liquefaction features that are thought to be historical or prehistoric in age or whose ages are poorly constrained. Map projection is USA Contiguous Albers Equal Area Conic, North America Datum 1983.
Figure E-7 GIS map of New Madrid seismic zone and surrounding region showing preferred age estimates of liquefaction features; features whose ages are poorly constrained are excluded. Map projection is USA Contiguous Albers Equal Area Conic, North America Datum 1983.
Figure E-8 GIS map of New Madrid seismic zone and surrounding region showing measured thicknesses of sand blows. Map projection is USA Contiguous Albers Equal Area Conic, North America Datum 1983
Figure E-9 GIS map of New Madrid seismic zone and surrounding region showing preferred age estimates and measured thicknesses of sand blows. Map projection is USA Contiguous Albers Equal Area Conic, North America Datum 1983
Figure E-10 GIS map of New Madrid seismic zone and surrounding region showing measured widths of sand dikes. Map projection is USA Contiguous Albers Equal Area Conic, North America Datum 1983
Figure E-11 GIS map of New Madrid seismic zone and surrounding region showing preferred age estimates and measured widths of sand dikes. Map projection is USA Contiguous Albers Equal Area Conic, North America Datum 1983.
Figure E-12 GIS map of New Madrid seismic zone and surrounding region illustrating preferred age estimates and measured thicknesses of sand blows as well as preferred age estimates and measured widths of sand dikes for sites where sand blows do not occur. Map projection is USA Contiguous Albers Equal Area Conic, North America Datum 1983
Figure E-13 GIS map of Marianna, Arkansas, area showing seismicity and locations of paleoliquefaction features relative to mapped traces of Eastern Reelfoot rift margin fault, White River fault zone, Big Creek fault zone, Marianna escarpment, and Daytona Beach lineament. Map projection is USA Contiguous Albers Equal Area Conic, North America Datum 1983.
Figure E-14 (A) Trench log and (B) ground-penetrating radar profile, showing vertical sections of sand blows and sand dikes at Daytona Beach SE2 site along the Daytona Beach lineament southwest of Marianna, Arkansas. Vertical scale of GPR profile is exaggerated (modified from AI-Shukri et al., 2009).
Figure E-15 GIS map of Marianna, Arkansas, area showing locations of liquefaction features for which there are and are not radiocarbon data. Map projection is USA Contiguous Albers Equal Area Conic, North America Datum 1983.
Figure E-16 GIS map of Marianna, Arkansas, area showing locations of liquefaction features that are thought to be historical or prehistoric in age or whose ages are poorly constrained. To date, no liquefaction features thought to have formed during

1811-1812 earthquakes have been found in area. Map projection is USA Contiguous Albers Equal Area Conic, North America Datum 1983
Figure E-17 GIS map of Marianna, Arkansas, area showing preferred age estimates of liquefaction features; features whose ages are poorly constrained are excluded. Map projection is USA Contiguous Albers Equal Area Conic, North America Datum 1983
Figure E-18 GIS map of Marianna, Arkansas, area showing measured thicknesses of sand blows. Map projection is USA Contiguous Albers Equal Area Conic, North America Datum 1983.
Figure E-19 GIS map of Marianna, Arkansas, area showing preferred age estimates and measured thicknesses of sand blows. Map projection is USA Contiguous Albers Equal Area Conic, North America Datum 1983 E-86
Figure E-20 GIS map of Marlanna, Arkansas, area showing measured widths of sand dikes. Map projection is USA Contiguous Albers Equal Area Conic, North America Datum 1983
Figure E-21 GIS map of Marianna, Arkansas, area showing preferred age estimates and measured widths of sand dikes. Map projection is USA Contiguous Albers Equal Area Conic, North America Datum 1983E-88
Figure E-22 GIS map of St. Louis, Missouri, region showing seismicity and portions of rivers searched for earthquake-induced liquefaction features by Tuttle and collaborators; information contributed for this report. Map projection is USA Contiguous Albers Equal Area Conic, North America Datum 1983.
Figure E-23 GIS map of St. Louis, Missouri, region showing locations of liquefaction features, including several soft-sediment deformation structures, for which there are and are not radiocarbon data. Map projection is USA Contiguous Albers Equal Area Conic, North America Datum 1983
Figure E-24 GIS map of St. Louis, Missouri, region showing locations of liquefaction features that are thought to be historical or prehistoric in age or whose ages are poorly constrained. Map projection is USA Contiguous Albers Equal Area Conic, North America Datum 1983
Figure E-25 GIS map of St. Louis, Missouri, region showing preferred age estimates of liquefaction features; features whose ages are poorly constrained, including several that are prehistoric in age, are not shown. Map projection is USA Contiguous Albers Equal Area Conic, North America Datum 1983 E-92
Figure E-26 GIS map of St. Louis, Missouri, region showing measured thicknesses of sand blows at similar scale as used in Figure E-8 of sand blows in New Madrid seismic zone. Note that few sand blows have been found in St. Louis region. Map projection is USA Contiguous Albers Equal Area Conic, North America Datum 1983
Figure E-27 GIS map of St. Louis, Missouri, region showing preferred age estimates and measured thicknesses of sand blows. Map projection is USA Contiguous Albers Equal Area Conic, North America Datum 1983 E-94
Figure E-28 GIS map of St. Louis, Missouri, region showing measured widths of sand dikes at similar scale as that used in Figure E-10 for sand dikes in New Madrid seismic zone. Map projection is USA Contiguous Albers Equal Area Conic, North America Datum 1983

Figure E-29 GIS map of St. Louis, Missouri, region showing measured widths of sand dikes at similar scale as that used in Figures E-42 and E-48 for sand dikes in the Newburyport and Charlevoix regions, respectively. Map projection is USA Contiguous Albers Equal Area Conic, North America Datum 1983.	E-96	•
Figure E-30 GIS map of St. Louis, Missouri, region showing preferred age estimates and measured widths of sand dikes. Map projection is USA Contiguous Albers Equal Area Conic, North America Datum 1983	E-97	
Figure E-31 GIS map of Wabash Valley seismic zone and surrounding region showing portions of rivers searched for earthquake-induced liquefaction features (digitized from McNulty and Obermeier, 1999). Map projection is USA Contiguous Albers Equal Area Conic, North America Datum 1983	E-98	
Figure E-32 GIS map of Wabash Valley seismic zone and surrounding region showing measured widths of sand dikes at similar scale as that used in Figures E-10 and E- 11 for sand dikes in New Madrid selsmic zone. Map projection is USA Contiguous Albers Equal Area Conic, North America Datum 1983.	E-99	
Figure E-33 GIS map of Wabash Valley region of Indiana and Illinois showing preferred age estimates and paleoearthquake interpretation. Map projection is USA Contiguous Albers Equal Area Conic, North America Datum 1983.	. E-100	
Figure E-34 GIS map of Arkansas-Louisiana-Mississippi (ALM) region showing paleoliquefaction study locations. Map projection is USA Contiguous Albers Equal Area Conic, North America Datum 1983	. E-101	
Figure E-35 GIS map of Charleston, South Carolina, region showing locations of paleoliquefaction features for which there are and are not radiocarbon dates. Map projection is USA Contiguous Albers Equal Area Conic, North America Datum 1983.	.E-102	
Figure E-36 GIS map of Charleston, South Carolina, region showing locations of historical and prehistoric liquefaction features. Map projection is USA Contiguous Albers Equal Area Conic, North America Datum 1983.	. E-103	
Figure E-37 Map of Atlantic coast region showing areas searched for paleoliquefaction features by Gelinas et al. (1998) and Amick, Gelinas, et al. (1990). Rectangles indicate 7.5-minute quadrangles in which sites were investigated for presence of paleoliquefaction features. The number of sites investigated is shown within that quadrangle, if known. Orange and yellow indicate quadrangles in which paleoliquefaction features were recognized.	. E-104	
Figure E-38 Map of Central Virginia seismic zone region showing portions of rivers searched for earthquake-induced liquefaction features by Obermeier and McNulty (1998)	. E-105	
Figure E-39 GIS map of Newburyport, Massachusetts, and surrounding region showing seismicity and portions of rivers searched for earthquake-induced liquefaction features (Gelinas et al., 1998; Tuttle, 2007, 2009). Solid black line crossing map represents Massachusetts-New Hampshire border. Map projection is USA Contiguous Albers Equal Area Conic, North America Datum 1983.	. E-106	
Figure E-40 GIS map of Newburyport, Massachusetts, and surrounding region showing locations of liquefaction features for which there are and are not radiocarbon dates. Map projection is USA Contiguous Albers Equal Area Conic, North America Datum 1983.	. E-107	

Figure E-41 GIS map of Newburyport, Massachusetts, and surrounding region showing locations of liquefaction features that are thought to be historical or prehistoric in age or whose ages are poorly constrained. Map projection is USA Contiguous Albers Equal Area Conic, North America Datum 1983
Figure E-42 GIS map of Newburyport, Massachusetts, and surrounding region showing measured widths of sand dikes. Map projection is USA Contiguous Albers Equal Area Conic, North America Datum 1983
Figure E-43 GIS map of Newburyport, Massachusetts, and surrounding region showing preferred age estimates and measured widths of sand dikes. Map projection is USA Contiguous Albers Equal Area Conic, North America Datum 1983
Figure E-44 Map of Charlevoix seismic zone and adjacent St. Lawrence Lowlands showing mapped faults and portions of rivers along which reconnaissance and searches for earthquake-induced liquefaction features were performed. Charlevoix selsmic zone is defined by concentration of earthquakes and locations of historical earthquakes northeast of Quebec City. Devonian impact structure in vicinity of Charlevoix seismic zone is outlined by black dashed line. Taconic thrust faults are indicated by solid black lines with sawteeth on upper plate; lapetan rift faults are shown by solid black lines with hachure marks on downthrown side (modified from Tuttle and Atkinson, 2010).
Figure E-45 GIS map of Charlevoix seismic zone and surrounding region showing locations of liquefaction features, including several soft-sediment deformation structures, for which there are and are not radiocarbon data. Note the location of 1988 M 5.9 Saguenay earthquake northwest of the Charlevoix seismic zone. Map projection is USA Contiguous Albers Equal Area Conic, North America Datum 1983
Figure E-46 GIS map of Charlevoix seismic zone and surrounding region showing locations of liquefaction features that are modern, historical, or prehistoric in age, or whose ages are poorly constrained. Map projection is USA Contiguous Albers Equal Area Conic, North America Datum 1983
Figure E-47 GIS map of Charlevoix seismic zone and surrounding region showing preferred age estimates of liquefaction features; features whose ages are poorly constrained are excluded. Map projection is USA Contiguous Albers Equal Area Conic, North America Datum 1983.
Figure E-48 GIS map of Charlevoix seismic zone and surrounding region showing measured widths of sand dikes. Map projection is USA Contiguous Albers Equal Area Conic, North America Datum 1983
Figure E-49 GIS map of Charlevoix seismic zone and surrounding region showing preferred age estimates and measured widths of sand dikes. Map projection is USA Contiguous Albers Equal Area Conic, North America Datum 1983
Figure E-50 Photograph of moderate-sized sand blow (12 m long, 7 m wide, and 14 cm thick) that formed about 40 km from epicenter of 2001 M 7.7 Bhuj, India, earthquake (from Tuttle, Hengesh, et al., 2002), combined with schematic vertical section illustrating structural and stratigraphic relations of sand blow, sand dike, and source layer (modified from Sims and Garvin, 1995)
Figure E-51 Tree trunks buried and killed by sand blows, vented during 1811-1812 New Madrid earthquakes (from Fuller, 1912)

Figure E-52 Large sand-blow crater that formed during 2002 M 7.7 Bhuj, India, earthquake. Backpack for scale. Photograph: M. Tuttle (2001).	E-119
Figure E-53 Sand-blow crater that formed during 1886 Charleston, South Carolina, earthquake. Photograph: J.K. Hillers (from USGS Photograph Library)	E-120
Figure E-54 Photograph of sand blow and related sand dikes exposed in trench wall and floor in New Madrid seismic zone. Buried soil horizon is displaced downward approximately 1 m across two dikes. Clasts of soil horizon occur within dikes and overlying sand blow. Degree of soil development above and within sand blow suggests that it is at least several hundred years old and formed prior to 1811-1812 New Madrid earthquakes. Organic sample (location marked by red flag) from crater fill will provide close minimum age constraint for formation of sand blow. For scale, each colored intervals on shovel handle represents 10 cm. Photograph: M. Tuttle	E-121
Figure E-55 Sand dikes, ranging up to 35 cm wide, originate in pebbly sand layer and intrude overlying diamicton, These features were exposed in cutbank along Cahokia Creek about 25 km northeast of downtown St. Louis (from Tuttle, 2000)	E-122
Figure E-56 Photograph of small diapirs of medium sand intruding base of overlying deposit of interbedded clayey silt and very fine sand, and clasts of clayey silt in underlying medium sand, observed along Ouelle River in Charlevoix seismic zone. Sand diapirs and clasts probably formed during basal erosion and foundering of clayey silt due to liquefaction of the underlying sandy deposit. Red portion of shovel handle represents 10 cm (modified from Tuttle and Atkinson, 2010)	E-123
 Figures E-57 (A) Load cast formed in laminated sediments of Van Norman Lake during 1952 Kern County, California, earthquake. Photograph: J. Sims (from Sims, 1975). (B) Load cast, pseudonodules, and related folds formed in laminated sediment exposed along Malbale River in Charlevolx seismic zone. Sand dikes crosscutting these same laminated sediments occur at a nearby site. For scale, each painted interval of the shovel handle represents 10 cm (modified from Tuttle and Atkinson, 2010). 	E-124
Figure E-58 Log of sand blow and uppermost portions of related sand dikes exposed in trench wall at Dodd site in New Madrid seismic zone. Sand dikes were also observed in opposite wall and trench floor. Sand blow buries pre-event A horizon, and a subsequent A horizon has developed in top of sand blow. Radiocarbon dating of samples collected above and below sand blow brackets its age between 490 and 660 yr BP. Artifact assemblage indicates that sand blow formed during late Mississippian (300–550 yr BP or AD 1400–1670) (modified from Tuttle, Collier, et al., 1999).	E-125
Figures E-59 (A) Photograph of earthquake-induced liquefaction features found in association with cultural horizon and pit exposed in trench wall near Blytheville, Arkansas, in New Madrid seismic zone. Photograph: M. Tuttle. (B) Trench log of features shown in (A). Sand dike formed in thick Native American occupation horizon containing artifacts of early Mississippian cultural period (950–1,150 yr BP). Cultural pit dug into top of sand dike contains artifacts and charcoal used to constrain minimum age of liquefaction features (modified from Tuttle and Schweig, 1995).	E-126
Figure E-60 In situ tree trunks such as this one buried and killed by sand blow in New Madrid seismic zone offer opportunity to date paleoearthquakes to the year and season of occurrence. Photograph: M. Tuttle.	E-127

Figure E-61 Portion of dendrocalibration curve illustrating conversion of radiocarbon age to calibrated date in calendar years. In example, 2-sigma radiocarbon age of 2,280– 2.520 BP is converted to calibrated date of 770–380 BC (from Tuttle, 1999) E-128
Figure E-62 Empirical relation developed between A horizon thickness of sand blows and years of soil development in New Madrid region. Horizontal bars reflect uncertainties in age estimates of liquefaction features; diamonds mark midpoints of possible age ranges (from Tuttle et al., 2000)
Figure E-63 Diagram illustrating earthquake chronology for New Madrid seismic zone for past 5,500 years based on dating and correlation of liquefaction features at sites (listed at top) across region from north to south. Vertical bars represent age estimates of individual sand blows, and horizontal bars represent event times of 138 yr BP (AD 1811-1812); 500 yr BP ± 150 yr; 1,050 yr BP ± 100 yr; and 4,300 yr BP ± 200 yr (modified from Tuttle, Schweig, et al., 2002; Tuttle et al., 2005) E-130
Figure E-64 Diagram illustrating earthquake chronology for New Madrid seismic zone for past 2,000 years, similar to upper portion of diagram shown in Figure E-63. As in Figure E-63, vertical bars represent age estimates of individual sand blows, and horizontal bars represent event times. Analysis performed during CEUS SSC Project derived two possible uncertainty ranges for timing of paleoearthquakes, illustrated by the darker and lighter portions of the colored horizontal bars, respectively: 503 yr BP ± 8 yr or 485 yr BP ± 85 yr, and 1,110 yr BP ± 40 yr or 1055 ± 95 yr (modified from Tuttle, Schweig, et al., 2002)
Figure E-65 Maps showing spatial distributions and sizes of sand blows and sand dikes attributed to 500 and 1,050 yr BP events. Locations and sizes of liquefaction features that formed during AD 1811-1812 (138 yr BP) New Madrid earthquake sequence shown for comparison (modified from Tuttle, Schweig, et al., 2002)
 Figure E-68 Liquefaction fields for 138 yr BP (AD 1811-1812); 500 yr BP (AD 1450); and 1,050 yr BP (AD 900) events as interpreted from spatial distribution and stratigraphy of sand blows (modified from Tuttle, Schweig, et al., 2002). Ellipses define areas where similar-age sand blows have been mapped. Overlapping ellipses indicate areas where sand blows are composed of multiple units that formed during sequence of earthquakes. Dashed ellipse outlines area where historical sand blows are composed of four depositional units. Magnitudes of earthquakes in 500 yr BP and 1,050 yr BP are inferred from comparison with 1811-1812 liquefaction fields. Magnitude estimates of December (D), January (J), and February (F) main shocks and large aftershocks taken from several sources; rupture scenario from Johnston and Schweig (1996; modified from Tuttle, Schweig, et al., 2002).
Figure E-67 Empirical relation between earthquake magnitude and epicentral distance to farthest known sand blows induced by instrumentally recorded earthquakes (modified from Castilla and Audemard, 2007)
Figure E-68 Distances to farthest known liquefaction features indicate that 500 and 1,050 yr BP New Madrid events were at least of M 6.7 and 6.9, respectively, when plotted on Ambraseys (1988) relation between earthquake magnitude and epicentral distance to farthest surface expression of liquefaction. Similarity in size distribution of historical and prehistoric sand blows, however, suggests that paleoearthquakes were comparable in magnitude to 1811-1812 events or M ~7.6 (modified from Tuttle, 2001)
Figure H-1-1 Region covered by the CEUS SSC model

lxiii

Figure H-2-1 Master logic tree for the CEUS SSC model	H-45
Figure H-3-1 Logic tree for the Mmax zones branch of the master logic tree	.H-46
Figure H-3-2 Mesozoic extended (MESE-W) and non-extended (NMESE-W) Mmax zones for the "wide" interpretation	.H-47
Figure H-3-3 Mesozoic extended (MESE-N) and non-extended (NMESE-N) Mmax zones for the "narrow" interpretation	.H-48
Figure H-4-1(a) Logic tree for the seismotectonic zones branch of the master logic tree	H-49
Figure H-4-1(b) Logic tree for the seismotectonic zones branch of the master logic tree	H-50
Figure H-4-2 Seismotectonic zones shown in the case where the Rough Creek Graben is not part of the Reelfoot Rift (RR) and the Paleozoic Extended zone is narrow (PEZ-N)	H-51
Figure H-4-3 Seismotectonic zones shown in the case where the Rough Creek Graben is part of the Reelfoot Rift (RR-RCG) and the Paleozoic Extended zone is narrow (PEZ-N)	H-52
Figure H-4-4 Seismotectonic zones shown in the case where the Rough Creek Graben is not part of the Reelfoot Rift (RR) and the Paleozoic Extended zone is wide (PEZ- W)	.H-53
Figure H-4-5 Selsmotectonic zones shown in the case where the Rough Creek Graben is part of the Reelfoot Rift (RR-RCG) and the Paleozoic Extended zone is wide (PEZ-W)	.H-54
Figure H-5-1 Logic tree for the RLME source branch of the master logic tree	H-55
Figure H-5-2 Location of RLME sources in the CEUS SSC model	H-56
Figure H-5, 1-1 Logic tree for Charlevoix RLME source	H-57
Figure H-5.1-2 Charlevoix RLME source geometry	H-58
Figure H-5.2-1(a) Logic tree for Charleston RLME source	H-59
Figure H-5.2-1(b) Logic tree for Charleston RLME source	H-60
Figure H-5.2-2 Charleston RLME alternative source geometries	H-61
Figure H-5.3-1 Logic tree for Cheraw RLME source	H-62
Figure H-5.3-2 Cheraw RLME source geometry	H-63
Figure H-5.4-1 Logic tree for Meers RLME source	H-64
Figure H-5.4-2 Meers RLME source geometries	H-65
Figure H-5.5-1 Logic tree for NMFS RLME source	H-66
Figure H-5.5-2 New Madrid South (NMS) fault alternative RMLE source geometries: Blytheville Arch-Bootheel Lineament (BA-BL) and Blytheville Arch-Blytheville fault zone (BA-BFZ)	H-67
Figure H-5.5-3 New Madrid North (NMN) fault alternative RMLE source geometries: New Madrid North (NMN_S) and New Madrid North plus extension (NMN_L)	H-68
Figure H-5.5-4 Reelfoot Thrust (RFT) fault alternative RMLE source geometries: Reelfoot thrust (RFT_S) and Reelfoot thrust plus extensions (RFT_L)	H-69
Figure H-5.6-1 Logic tree for ERM-S RLME source	H-70
Figure H-5.6-2 Logic tree for ERM-N RLME source	H-71
Figure H-5.6-3 ERM-S RLME source geometries	H-72

Figure H-5.6-4 ERM-N RLME source geometry	H-73
Figure H-5.7-1 Logic tree for Marianna RLME source	H•74
Figure H-5.7-2 Marianna RLME source geometry	H-75
Figure H-5.8-1 Logic tree for Commerce Fault Zone RLME source	H-76
Figure H-5.8-2 Commerce RLME source geometry	H-77
Figure H-5.9-1 Logic tree for Wabash Valley RLME source	H-78
Figure H-5.9-2 Wabash Valley RLME source geometry	H-79
Figure J-1 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with no separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case A magnitude weights: Realization 1	J-2
Figure J-2 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with no separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case A magnitude weights: Realization 2	J-3
Figure J-3 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with no separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case A magnitude weights: Realization 3	J-4
Figure J-4 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with no separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case A magnitude weights: Realization 4	J-5
Figure J-5 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with no separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case A magnitude weights: Realization 5	J-6
Figure J-6 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with no separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case A magnitude weights: Realization 6	J-7
Figure J-7 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with no separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case A magnitude weights: Realization 7	<i></i> J-8
Figure J-8 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with no separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case A magnitude weights: Realization 8	J-9
Figure J-9 Map of the coefficient of variation of the rate and the standard deviation of the b-value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with no separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case A magnitude weights	J-10
Figure J-10 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with no separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case B magnitude weights: Realization 1	J-11
Figure J-11 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with no separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case B magnitude weights: Realization 2	J-12
Figure J-12 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with no separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case B magnitude weights: Realization 3	J-13

lxiv

lxv ·

Figure J-13 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with no separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case B magnitude weights: Realization 4	J-14
Figure J-14 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with no separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case B magnitude weights: Realization 5	J-15
Figure J-15 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with no separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case B magnitude weights: Realization 6	J-16
Figure J-16 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with no separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case B magnitude weights: Realization 7	J-17
Figure J-17 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with no separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case B magnitude weights: Realization 8	J-18
Figure J-18 Map of the coefficient of variation of the rate and the standard deviation of the <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with no separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case B magnitude weights	J-19
Figure J-19 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with no separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case E magnitude weights: Realization 1	J-20
Figure J-20 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with no separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case E magnitude weights: Realization 2	J-21
Figure J-21 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with no separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case E magnitude weights: Realization 3	J-22
Figure J-22 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with no separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case E magnitude weights: Realization 4	J-23
Figure J-23 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with no separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case E magnitude weights: Realization 5	J-24
Figure J-24 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with no separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case E magnitude weights: Realization 6	J-25
Figure J-25 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with no separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case E magnitude weights: Realization 7	J-26
Figure J-26 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with no separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case E magnitude weights: Realization 8	J-27
Figure J-27 Map of the coefficient of variation of the rate and the standard deviation of the <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with no separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case E magnitude weights	J-28

Figure J-28 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case A magnitude weights: Realization 1	J-29
Figure J-29 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmex zonation, with separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case A magnitude weights: Realization 2	J-30
Figure J-30 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case A magnitude weights: Realization 3	J-31
Figure J-31 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case A magnitude weights: Realization 4	J-32
Figure J-32 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case A magnitude weights: Realization 5	J-33
Figure J-33 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case A magnitude weights: Realization 6	J-34
Figure J-34 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case A magnitude weights: Realization 7	J-35
Figure J-35 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case A magnitude weights: Realization 8	J-36
Figure J-36 Map of the coefficient of variation of the rate and the standard deviation of the <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case A magnitude weights	J-37
Figure J-37 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case B magnitude weights: Realization 1	J-38
Figure J-38 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case B magnitude weights: Realization 2	.,J-39
Figure J-39 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case B magnitude weights: Realization 3	J-40
Figure J-40 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case B magnitude weights: Realization 4	J-41
Figure J-41 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case B magnitude weights: Realization 5	J-42
Figure J-42 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case B magnitude weights: Realization 6	J-43
-	

lxvii

Figure J-43 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case B magnitude weights: Realization 7
Figure J-44 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case B magnitude weights: Realization 8J-45
Figure J-45 Map of the coefficient of variation of the rate and the standard deviation of the <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case B magnitude weightsJ-46
Figure J-46 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case E magnitude weights: Realization 1J-47
Figure J-47 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case E magnitude weights: Realization 2
Figure J-48 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case E magnitude weights: Realization 3J-49
Figure J-49 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case E magnitude weights: Realization 4
Figure J-50 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case E magnitude weights: Realization 5J-51
Figure J-51 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case E magnitude weights: Realization 6J-52
Figure J-52 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case E magnitude weights: Realization 7J-53
Figure J-53 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case E magnitude weights: Realization 8J-54
Figure J-54 Map of the coefficient of variation of the rate and the standard deviation of the <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case E magnitude weights
Figure J-55 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case A magnitude weights: Realization 1J-56
Figure J-56 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with separation of Mesozolc extended and non-extended; Case A magnitude weights: Realization 2J-57
Figure J-57 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case A magnitude weights: Realization 3J-58

Figure J-58 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case A magnitude weights: Realization 4	J-59
Figure J-59 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case A magnitude weights: Realization 5	J-60
Figure J-60 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case A magnitude weights: Realization 6	J-61
Figure J-61 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case A magnitude weights: Realization 7	J-62
Figure J-62 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case A magnitude weights: Realization 8	J-63
Figure J-63 Map of the coefficient of variation of the rate and the standard deviation of the <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case A magnitude weights	J-64
Figure J-64 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case B magnitude weights: Realization 1	J-65
Figure J-65 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case B magnitude weights: Realization 2	J-66
Figure J-66 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case B magnitude weights; Realization 3	J-67
Figure J-67 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case B magnitude weights: Realization 4	J-68
Figure J-68 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case B magnitude weights: Realization 5	J-69
Figure J-69 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case B magnitude weights: Realization 6	J-70
Figure J-70 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case B magnitude weights: Realization 7	J-71
Figure J-71 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case B magnitude weights: Realization 8	J-72
Figure J-72 Map of the coefficient of variation of the rate and the standard deviation of the <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case B magnitude weights	J-73

lxix

.

.

.

Figure J-73 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case E magnitude weights: Realization 1J-	74
Figure J-74 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case E magnitude weights: Realization 2J-	75
Figure J-75 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case E magnitude weights: Realization 3J-	-76
Figure J-76 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case E magnitude weights: Realization 4J-	.77
Figure J-77 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with separation of Mesozolc extended and non-extended; Case E magnitude weights: Realization 5J-	-78
Figure J-78 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case E magnitude weights: Realization 6J-	-7 9
Figure J-79 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case E magnitude weights: Realization 7J.	-80
Figure J-80 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case E magnitude weights: Realization 8	-81
Figure J-81 Map of the coefficient of variation of the rate and the standard deviation of the <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the Mmax zonation, with separation of Mesozoic extended and non-extended; Case E magnitude weightsJ.	-82
Figure J-82 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with narrow interpretation of PEZ; Case A magnitude weights: Realization 1J	-83
Figure J-83 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with narrow interpretation of PEZ; Case A magnitude weights: Realization 2	-84
Figure J-84 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with narrow Interpretation of PEZ; Case A magnitude weights: Realization 3J	-85
Figure J-85 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with narrow interpretation of PEZ; Case A magnitude weights: Realization 4	1-86
Figure J-86 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with narrow interpretation of PEZ; Case A magnitude weights: Realization 5J	1-87
Figure J-87 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with narrow interpretation of PEZ; Case A magnitude weights: Realization 6	I-88

Figure J-88 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with narrow interpretation of PEZ; Case A magnitude weights: Realization 7J-	-89
Figure J-89 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with narrow interpretation of PEZ; Case A magnitude weights: Realization 8:J-	-90
Figure J-90 Map of the coefficient of variation of the rate and the standard deviation of the <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with narrow interpretation of PEZ; Case A magnitude weightsJ-	-91
Figure J-91 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with narrow interpretation of PEZ; Case B magnitude weights: Realization 1J-	-92
Figure J-92 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with narrow interpretation of PEZ; Case B magnitude weights: Realization 2J.	-93
Figure J-93 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with narrow interpretation of PEZ; Case B magnitude weights: Realization 3J.	-94
Figure J-94 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with narrow interpretation of PEZ; Case B magnitude weights: Realization 4J.	-95
Figure J-95 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with narrow interpretation of PEZ; Case B magnitude weights: Realization 5	-96
Figure J-96 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with narrow interpretation of PEZ; Case B magnitude weights: Realization 6J.	-97
Figure J-97 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with narrow interpretation of PEZ; Case B magnitude weights: Realization 7	-98
Figure J-98 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with narrow interpretation of PEZ; Case B magnitude weights: Realization 8	-99
Figure J-99 Map of the coefficient of variation of the rate and the standard deviation of the b-value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with narrow interpretation of PEZ; Case B magnitude weights	100
Figure J-100 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with narrow interpretation of PEZ; Case E magnitude weights: Realization 1	101
Figure J-101 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with narrow interpretation of PEZ; Case E magnitude weights: Realization 2	102
Figure J-102 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with narrow interpretation of PEZ; Case E magnitude weights: Realization 3	103

lxxi

Figure J-103 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with narrow interpretation of PEZ; Case E magnitude weights: Realization 4J-104
Figure J-104 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with narrow interpretation of PEZ; Case E magnitude weights: Realization 5J-105
Figure J-105 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with narrow interpretation of PEZ; Case E magnitude weights: Realization 6J-106
Figure J-106 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with narrow interpretation of PEZ; Case E magnitude weights: Realization 7J-107
Figure J-107 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with narrow interpretation of PEZ; Case E magnitude weights: Realization 8J-108
Figure J-108 Map of the coefficient of variation of the rate and the standard deviation of the <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with narrow Interpretation of PEZ; Case E magnitude weightsJ-105
Figure J-109 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with narrow interpretation of PEZ; Case A magnitude weights: Realization 1J-110
Figure J-110 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with narrow interpretation of PEZ; Case A magnitude weights: Realization 2J-11 ⁻
Figure J-111 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with narrow interpretation of PEZ; Case A magnitude weights: Realization 3J-112
Figure J-112 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with narrow interpretation of PEZ; Case A magnitude weights: Realization 4J-113
Figure J-113 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with narrow interpretation of PEZ; Case A magnitude weights: Realization 5J-114
Figure J-114 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with narrow interpretation of PEZ; Case A magnitude weights: Realization 6J-115
Figure J-115 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with narrow interpretation of PEZ; Case A magnitude weights: Realization 7J-116
Figure J-116 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with narrow interpretation of PEZ; Case A magnitude weights: Realization 8J-117
Figure J-117 Map of the coefficient of variation of the rate and the standard deviation of the <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with narrow interpretation of PEZ; Case A magnitude weightsJ-118

Figure J-118 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with narrow interpretation of PEZ; Case B magnitude weights: Realization 1J-119
Figure J-119 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with narrow interpretation of PEZ; Case B magnitude weights: Realization 2J-120
Figure J-120 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with narrow interpretation of PEZ; Case B magnitude weights: Realization 3J-121
Figure J-121 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with narrow interpretation of PEZ; Case B magnitude weights: Realization 4J-122
Figure J-122 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with narrow interpretation of PEZ; Case B magnitude weights: Realization 5J-123
Figure J-123 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic. zonation, with narrow interpretation of PEZ; Case B magnitude weights: Realization 6
Figure J-124 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with narrow Interpretation of PEZ; Case B magnitude weights: Realization 7J-125
Figure J-125 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with narrow interpretation of PEZ; Case B magnitude weights: Realization 8J-126
Figure J-126 Map of the coefficient of variation of the rate and the standard deviation of the <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with narrow interpretation of PEZ; Case B magnitude weightsJ-127
Figure J-127 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with narrow interpretation of PEZ; Case E magnitude weights: Realization 1
Figure J-128 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with narrow interpretation of PEZ; Case E magnitude weights: Realization 2J-129
Figure J-129 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with narrow interpretation of PEZ; Case E magnitude weights: Realization 3
Figure J-130 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with narrow interpretation of PEZ; Case E magnitude weights: Realization 4J-131
Figure J-131 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with narrow interpretation of PEZ; Case E magnitude weights: Realization 5J-132
Figure J-132 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with narrow interpretation of PEZ; Case E magnitude weights: Realization 6

lxxii

lxxiii

Figure J-133 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with narrow interpretation of PEZ; Case E magnitude weights: Realization 7J-134
Figure J-134 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with narrow interpretation of PEZ; Case E magnitude weights: Realization 8J-135
Figure J-135 Map of the coefficient of variation of the rate and the standard deviation of the <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with narrow interpretation of PEZ; Case E magnitude weightsJ-136
Figure J-136 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with wide interpretation of PEZ; Case A magnitude weights: Realization 1 J-137
Figure J-137 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with wide interpretation of PEZ; Case A magnitude weights: Realization 2J-138
Figure J-138 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with wide interpretation of PEZ; Case A magnitude weights: Realization 3 J-139
Figure J-139 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with wide interpretation of PEZ; Case A magnitude weights: Realization 4 J-140
Figure J-140 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with wide interpretation of PEZ; Case A magnitude weights: Realization 5J-141
Figure J-141 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with wide interpretation of PEZ; Case A magnitude weights: Realization 6 J-142
Figure J-142 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with wide interpretation of PEZ; Case A magnitude weights: Realization 7 J-143
Figure J-143 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with wide interpretation of PEZ; Case A magnitude weights: Realization 8 J-144
Figure J-144 Map of the coefficient of variation of the rate and the standard deviation of the <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with wide interpretation of PEZ; Case A magnitude weightsJ-145
Figure J-145 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with wide interpretation of PEZ; Case B magnitude weights: Realization 1J-146
Figure J-146 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with wide interpretation of PEZ; Case B magnitude weights: Realization 2J-147
Figure J-147 Map of the rate and b-value for the study region under the selsmotectonic zonation, with wide interpretation of PEZ; Case B magnitude weights: Realization 3J-148
Figure J-148 Map of the rate and b-value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with wide interpretation of PEZ; Case B magnitude weights: Realization 4J-149
Figure J-149 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with wide interpretation of PEZ; Case B magnitude weights: Realization 5 J-150
Figure J-150 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with wide interpretation of PEZ; Case B magnitude weights: Realization 6J-151
Figure J-151 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with wide interpretation of PEZ; Case B magnitude weights: Realization 7 J-152
Figure J-152 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with wide interpretation of PEZ; Case B magnitude weights: Realization 8 J-153
· ,

Figure J-153 Map of the coefficient of variation of the rate and the standard deviation of the <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with wide interpretation of PEZ; Case B magnitude weightsJ-154
Figure J-154 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with wide interpretation of PEZ; Case E magnitude weights: Realization 1 J-155
Figure J-155 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with wide interpretation of PEZ; Case E magnitude weights: Realization 2 J-156
Figure J-156 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with wide interpretation of PEZ; Case E magnitude weights: Realization 3 J-157
Figure J-157 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with wide interpretation of PEZ; Case E magnitude weights: Realization 4 J-158
Figure J-158 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with wide interpretation of PEZ; Case E magnitude weights: Realization 5 J-159
Figure J-159 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with wide interpretation of PEZ; Case E magnitude weights: Realization 6 J-160
Figure J-160 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with wide interpretation of PEZ; Case E magnitude weights: Realization 7 J-161
Figure J-161 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with wide interpretation of PEZ; Case E magnitude weights: Realization 8 J-162
Figure J-162 Map of the coefficient of variation of the rate and the standard deviation of the <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with wide interpretation of PEZ; Case E magnitude weights
Figure J-163 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with wide interpretation of PEZ; Case A magnitude weights: Realization 1 J-164
Figure J-164 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with wide interpretation of PEZ; Case A magnitude weights: Realization 2J-165
Figure J-165 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with wide interpretation of PEZ; Case A magnitude weights: Realization 3 J-166
Figure J-166 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with wide Interpretation of PEZ; Case A magnitude weights: Realization 4 J-167
Figure J-167 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with wide interpretation of PEZ; Case A magnitude weights: Realization 5 J-168
Figure J-168 Map of the rate and b-value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with wide interpretation of PEZ; Case A magnitude weights: Realization 6 J-169
Figure J-169 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with wide interpretation of PEZ; Case A magnitude weights: Realization 7 J-170
Figure J-170 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with wide interpretation of PEZ; Case A magnitude weights: Realization 8 J-171
Figure J-171 Map of the coefficient of variation of the rate and the standard deviation of the <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the selsmotectonic zonation, with wide interpretation of PEZ; Case A magnitude weightsJ-172
Figure J-172 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with wide interpretation of PEZ; Case B magnitude weights: Realization 1 J-173

,

lxxv

Figure J-173 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with wide interpretation of PEZ; Case B magnitude weights: Realization 2 J-174
Figure J-174 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the selsmotectonic zonation, with wide interpretation of PEZ; Case B magnitude weights: Realization 3 J-175
Figure J-175 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with wide interpretation of PEZ; Case B magnitude weights: Realization 4 J-176
Figure J-176 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with wide interpretation of PEZ; Case B magnitude weights: Realization 5 J-177
Figure J-177 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with wide interpretation of PEZ; Case B magnitude weights: Realization 6 J-178
Figure J-178 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with wide interpretation of PEZ; Case B magnitude weights: Realization 7 J-179
Figure J-179 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with wide interpretation of PEZ; Case B magnitude weights: Realization 8J-180
Figure J-180 Map of the coefficient of variation of the rate and the standard deviation of the <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the selsmotectonic zonation, with wide interpretation of PEZ; Case B magnitude weightsJ-181
Figure J-181 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the selsmotectonic zonation, with wide interpretation of PEZ; Case E magnitude weights: Realization 1 J-182
Figure J-182 Map of the rate and b-value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with wide interpretation of PEZ; Case E magnitude weights: Realization 2 J-183
Figure J-183 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with wide interpretation of PEZ; Case E magnitude weights: Realization 3J-184
Figure J-184 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with wide interpretation of PEZ; Case E magnitude weights: Realization 4 J-185
Figure J-185 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with wide interpretation of PEZ; Case E magnitude weights: Realization 5 J-186
Figure J-186 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with wide interpretation of PEZ; Case E magnitude weights: Realization 6 J-187
Figure J-187 Map of the rate and b-value for the study region under the selsmotectonic zonation, with wide Interpretation of PEZ; Case E magnitude weights: Realization 7 J-188
Figure J-188 Map of the rate and <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with wide interpretation of PEZ; Case E magnitude weights: Realization 8 J-189
Figure J-189 Map of the coefficient of variation of the rate and the standard deviation of the <i>b</i> -value for the study region under the seismotectonic zonation, with wide interpretation of PEZ; Case E magnitude weightsJ-190
Figure K-1 Comparison of relationships between number of reporting stations and moment magnitude presented in Johnston et al. (1994) and Johnston (1996b) K-41
Figure K-2 Comparison of relationships between isoseismal areas and moment magnitude presented in Johnston et al. (1994) and Johnston (1996b)

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.2-1 Technical Meetings Conducted as Part of the CEUS SSC Project	2-29
Table 2.2-2 Contributors to the CEUS SSC Project	2-30
Table 3.2-1 Summary of Earthquakes Added–USGS Earthquake Catalog by Time Period	3-44
Table 3.2-2 Summary of Earthquakes Added–USGS Earthquake Catalog by Source	3-45
Table 3.3-1 Conversion Relationships Used-Develop Uniform Moment Magnitudes E[M]	3-46
Table 3.4-1 Comparison of CEUS SSC Catalog Declustering Results Obtained Using the EPRI (1988) Approach with the Gardner Knopoff (1974) Approach	3-47
Table 3.5-1 Probability of Detection and Equivalent Periods of Completeness for the CEUS for Magnitude Weighting Case A	3-48
Table 3.5-2 Probability of Detection and Equivalent Periods of Completeness for the CEUS for Magnitude Weighting Case B	3-51
Table 3.5-3 Probability of Detection and Equivalent Periods of Completeness for the CEUS for Magnitude Weighting Case E ,	3-54
Table 4.1.2-1 Sample table indicating particular types of data that can be considered in the identification and characterization of seismic sources (Table 2, ANSI/ANS-2.27- 2008)	4-26
Table 4.1.2-2 Sample table identifying the types of data that can be considered for characterizing different types of seismic sources, and an evaluation of the relative usefulness or credibility of the various data types (Budnitz et al., 1997)	4-27
Table 4.1.2-3 Table showing the "generic" (not source-specific) evaluation of data to address indicators of a unique seismic source. The table indicates the TI Team's assessment of the types of data that can be used to address the indicators and their relative usefulness.	4-28
Table 4.1.2-4 Example of Data Evaluation Table for the Illinois Basin–Extended Basement Zone (IBEB)	4-34
Table 4.1.2-5 Example of Data Summary Table for the Extended Continental Crust- Atlantic Margin (ECC-AM) and Atlantic Highly Extended Crust (AHEX) Zones	4-35
Table 4.1.3-1 Criteria Used to Define the Seismotectonic Zones and Mmax Zones	4-37
Table 4.2.2-1 RLME Sources	4-38
Table 4.2.4-1 Seismotectonic Zones	4-39
Table 5.2.1-1 Mesozoic-and-Younger Extended Superdomains (MESE)	5-60
Table 5.2.1-2 Older Extended and Non-Extended Superdomains (NMESE)	5-61
Table 5.2.1-3 Composite SCR Superdomains (COMP)	5-62
Table 5.2.1-4 Results of Analyses of Updated SCR Superdomains	5-63

lxxvii

Table 5.2.1-5 Source Zones, P(m ^o > 8%) Values, and Weights on Kijko (2004) K-S-B Estimates
Table 5.2.1.6 Mmax Distributions for the Two Example Seismic Sources
Table 5.3.2.1 Alternative Cases Considered for the Magnitude-Dependent Weights
Table 5.3.3-1 Miller and Rice (1983) Discrete 5-Point Approximation to a Continuous
Probability Distribution and the Woolileo Point Osed in This Ordey
Table 5.4-1 Assessment of Default Characteristics of Fullule Earlinguakes in the OECOmmune of
Table 5.4-2 Characteristics of Future Earthquakes for Individual Seismic Courses
Table 5.4-3 Estimates of D ₉₀ for Individual Seismic Source Zones.
Table 6.1-1 Summary of Data Used to Assess RLIVIE Recurrence Prequencies
Table 6.1.1-1 Charlevoix RLME Recurrence Frequency
Table 6.1.2-1 Summary of Interpreted Charleston Earthquake Ages and Sizes from "Contemporary Ages Only" Scenario
Table 6.1.2-2 Summary of Interpreted Charleston Earthquake Ages and Sizes from "All Ages" Scenario
Table 6.1.2-3 Charleston Liquefaction Feature Ages Used to Assess Ages of Prehistoric
Earthquakes
Table 6.1.2-4 Charleston RLME Recurrence Frequency for Poisson Model
Table 6.1.2-5 Charleston RLME Recurrence Frequency for Renewal Model
Table 6.1.3-1 Range of Cheraw Fault Estimated Magnitudes (M)
Table 6.1.3-2 Cheraw RLME In-Cluster Recurrence Frequency
Table 6.1.3-3 Cheraw RLME In-Cluster Slip Rates6-89
Table 6.1.3-4 Cheraw RLME Out-of-Cluster Recurrence Frequency
Table 6.1.3-5 Cheraw RLME Out-of-Cluster Slip Rates
Table 6.1.4-1 Range of Estimated Meers Fault Earthquake Magnitudes (M)
Table 6.1.4-2 Meers RLME In-Cluster Recurrence Frequency
Table 6.1.4-3 Meers RLME Out-of-Cluster Recurrence Frequency
Table 6.1.5-1 Preferred Ages for Paleoearthquakes in the New Madrid Region ¹ 6-92
Table 6.1.5-2 Magnitude Comparisons for New Madrid 1811-1812 Earthquake
Sequence
Table 6.1.5-3 Liquefaction Constraints on Age of AD 1450 NMFS RLME
Table 6.1.5-4 Liquefaction Constraints on Age of AD 900 NMFS RLME
Table 6.1.5-5 NMFS In-Cluster RLME Recurrence Frequency-Poisson Model
Table 6.1.5-6 NMFS In-Cluster RLME Recurrence Frequency-Renewal Model
Table 6.1.5-7 NMFS Out-of-Cluster RLME Recurrence Frequency—Poisson Model
Table 6.1.6-1 Range of ERM-S Estimated Magnitudes (M)6-97
Table 6.1.6-2 Range of ERM-N Estimated Magnitudes (M)6-98
Table 6.1.6-3 ERM-S RLME Recurrence Frequency
Table 6.1.6-4 ERM-N RLME Recurrence Frequency
Table 6.1.7-1 Marianna RLME Recurrence Frequency6-99

Table 6.1.8-1 Range of Commerce Fault Zone RLME Estimated Magnitudes (M)	6-100
Table 6 1 8-2 Commerce Fault Zone RLME Recurrence Frequency	6-101
Table 6.1.9-1 Liquefaction Evidence for Prehistoric Earthquakes in the Southern Illinois	
Basin	6-102
Table 6.1.9-2 Wabash RLME Recurrence Frequency	6-109
Table 6.2-1 Alternative Mmax Zonation Models	6-109
Table 6.3.2-1 Maximum Magnitude Distributions for Mmax Distributed Seismicity Sources	6-110
Table 7.1-1 Data Summary and Data Evaluation Tables for Seismotectonic Zones in Appendices C and D	7-81
Table 7.4.2-1 Maximum Magnitude Distributions for Seismotectonic Distributed Seismicity Sources	7-82
Table 8.1-1 Description of Seven Test Sites	8-13
Table 8.2.1-1 Mean and Select Fractiles for Rock Hazard at Central Illinois: Digital Data for Figures 8.2-1a through 8.2-1c	8 <u>-</u> 14
Table 8.2.2-1 Mean and Select Fractiles for Rock Hazard at Chattanooga: Digital Data for Figures 8.2-2a through 8.2-2c	8-16
Table 8.2.3-1 Mean and Select Fractiles for Rock Hazard at Houston: Digital Data for Figures 8.2-3a through 8.2-3c	8-18
Table 8.2.4-1 Mean and Select Fractiles for Rock Hazard at Jackson: Digital Data for Figures 8.2-4a through 8.2-4c	8-20
Table 8.2.5-1 Mean and Select Fractiles for Rock Hazard at Manchester: Digital Data for Figures 8.2-5a through 8.2-5c	8-22
Table 8.2.6-1 Mean and Select Fractiles for Rock Hazard at Savannah: Digital Data for Figures 8.2-6a through 8.2-6c	8-24
Table 8.2.7-1 Mean and Select Fractiles for Rock Hazard at Topeka: Digital Data for Figures 8.2-7a through 8.2-7c	8-26
Table 9.4-1 Available Information for Determining the Precision of Mean Hazard	9-21
Table 9.4-2 Summary of an Example Logic Tree Representing Uncertainties for the Charleston Seismic Zone	9-21
Table 9.4-3 Basic Weights Given in EPRI (2004) for Ground Motion Equations	9-22
Table 9.4-4 Ground Motion Equations and Weights Used in USGS 2008 National Hazan Map for CEUS	d 9-23
Table 9.4-5 Minimum COV _{MH} Values Observed in Seismic Hazard	9-23
Table A-1 CEUS SSC GIS Database	A-7
Table B-1 Earthquake Catalog	B-6
Table B-2 Moment Magnitude Data	B-312
Table B-3 Approximate Moment Magnitude Data	B-324
Table C-5.4 Data Evaluation Future Earthquake Characteristics	C-3
Table C-6.1.1 Data Evaluation Charlevoix RLME	C-§
Table C-6.1.2 Data Evaluation Charleston RLME	C-14
Table C-6.1.3 Data Evaluation Cheraw Fault RLME	C-30

lxxix

Table C-6.1.4 Data Evaluation Oklahoma Aulacogen RLME	C-36
Table C-6.1.5 Data Evaluation Reelfoot Rift-New Madrid Fault System RLMEs	C-42
Table C-6.1.6 Data Evaluation Reelfoot Rift-Eastern Margin Fault(s) RLMEs	C-51
Table C-6.1.7 Data Evaluation Reelfoot Rift-Marianna RLME	C-62
Table C-6.1.8 Data Evaluation Reelfoot Rift-Commerce Fault Zone RLME	C-67
Table C-6.1.9 Data Evaluation Wabash Valley RLME	C-75
Table C-7.3.1 Data Evaluation St. Lawrence Rift Zone	C-83
Table C-7.3.2 Data Evaluation Great Meteor Hotspot Zone	C-92
Table C-7.3.3 Data Evaluation Northern Appalachian Zone	C-99
Table C-7.3.4 Data Evaluation Paleozoic Extended Crust Zone	C-105
Table C-7.3.5 Data Evaluation Illinois Basin-Extended Basement Zone	C-112
Table C-7.3.6 Data Evaluation Reelfoot Rift Zone	C-124
Tables C-7.3.7/7.3.8 Data Evaluation Extended Continental Crust-Atlantic	C-131
Tables C-7.3.9/7.3.10 Data Evaluation Extended Continental Crust-Gulf Coast	C-138
Table C-7.3.12 Data Evaluation Midcontinent-Craton Zone	C-146
Table D-5.4 Data Summary Future Earthquake Characteristics	D-3
Table D-6.1.1 Data Summary Charlevoix RLME	D-10
Table D-6.1.2 Data Summary Charleston RLME	D-17
Table D-6.1.3 Data Summary Cheraw Fault RLME	D-35
Table D-6.1.4 Data Summary Oklahoma Aulacogen RLME	D-38
Table D-6.1.5 Data Summary Reelfoot Rift-New Madrid Seismic Zone (NMSZ) Regi	on D-44
Table D-6.1.9 Data Summary Wabash Valley RLME	D-92
Table D-7.3.1 Data Summary St. Lawrence Rift Zone (SLR)	D-121
Table D-7.3.2 Data Summary Great Meteor Hotspot Zone (GMH)	D-141
Table D-7.3.3 Data Summary Northern Appalachian Zone (NAP)	D-151
Table D-7.3.4 Data Summary Paleozoic Extended Crust Zone	D-163
Table D-7.3.7 Data Summary Extended Continental Crust Zone-Atlantic Margin (EC	C-
AM)	D-191
Table D-7.3.9 Data Summary Extended Continental Crust Zone-Gulf Coast (ECC-G	C) D-225
Table D-7.3.12 Data Summary Midcontinent-Craton Zone (MidC)	D-240
Table E-1.2-1. Summary of Information on Liquefaction Features in Regional Data S	ets E-5
Table E-1.2-2 Summary of Type and Prevalence of Paleoliquefaction Features	E-7
Table E-2.1.3. Summary of Dating Techniques Used in Paleoliquefaction Studies	E-30
Table E-2.2. Uncertainties Related to Interpretation of Paleoearthquake Parameters.	E-36
Table 1: Key Questions and Topics That Workshop 2 Presenters Were Asked to Address	F-35
Table H-3-1 Weighted Alternative Selsmogenic Crustal Thickness Values for Mmax Zones	H-20
Table H-3-2 Aleatory Distributions for Characterization of Future Farthquake Runture	
for Mmax Zones	

Table H-3-3 Maximum Magnitude Distributions for Mmax Distributed Seismicity Sources	H-20
Table H-4-1 Seismotectonic Source Zones	H-21
Table H-4-2 Weighted Alternative Seismogenic Crustal Thickness Values for Seismotectonic Zones	H-21
Table H-4-3 Aleatory Distributions for Characterization of Future Earthquake Ruptures for Selsmotectonic Zones	., H-22
Table H-4-4 Maximum Magnitude Distributions for Seismotectonic Distributed Seismicity Sources	H-24
Table H-5.1-1 Charlevoix RLME Magnitude Distribution	. H-25
Table H-5.1-2 Annual Frequencies for Charlevoix RLME Events Data Set 1: 1870 and 1663	.H-25
Table H-5.1-3 Annual Frequencies for Charlevoix RLME Events Data Set 2: 3 Earthquakes in 6–7 kyr BP	.H-25
Table H-5.1-4 Annual Frequencies for Charlevoix RLME Events Data Set 3: 4 Earthquakes in 9.5–10.2 kyr BP	. H-26
Table H-5.2-1 Charleston RLME Magnitude Distribution	.H-26
Table H-5.2-2 Annual Frequencies for Charleston RLME Events Poisson Model, 2,000- Year Time Period Earthquakes 1886, A, B, and C	. H-2 6
Table H-5.2-3 Annual Frequencies for Charleston RLME Events Poisson Model, 5,500- Year Time Period Earthquakes 1886, A, B, and C	. H-2 7
Table H-5.2-4 Annual Frequencies for Charleston RLME Events Poisson Model, 5,500- Year Time Period Earthquakes 1886, A, B, C, and D	.H-27
Table H-5.2-5 Annual Frequencies for Charleston RLME Events Poisson Model, 5,500- Year Time Period Earthquakes 1886, A, B, C, and E	. H-2 7
Table H-5.2-6 Annual Frequenciss for Charleston RLME Events Poisson Model, 5,500- Year Time Period Earthquakes 1886, A, B, C, D, and E	.H-28
Table H-5.2-7 Annual Frequencies for Charleston RLME Events BPT Renewal Model, α = 0.3, 2,000-Year Time Period Earthquakes 1886, A, B, and C	.H-28
Table H-5.2-8 Annual Frequencies for Charleston RLME Events BPT Renewal Model, α = 0.5, 2,000-Year Time Period Earthquakes 1886, A, B, and C	H-28
Table H-5.2-9 Annual Frequencies for Charleston RLME Events BPT Renewal Model, α = 0.7, 2,000-Year Time Period Earthquakes 1886, A, B, and C	H-29
Table H-5.2-10 Annual Frequencies for Charleston RLME Events BPT Renewal Model, α = 0.3, 5,500-Year Time Period Earthquakes 1886, A, B, and C	H-29
Table H-5.2-11 Annual Frequencies for Charleston RLME Events BPT Renewal Model, α = 0.5, 5,500-Year Time Period Earthquakes 1886, A, B, and C	H-29
Table H-5.2-12 Annual Frequencies for Charleston RLME Events BPT Renewal Model, α = 0.7, 5,500-Year Time Period Earthquakes 1886, A, B, and C	H-30
Fable H-5.2-13 Annual Frequencies for Charleston RLME Events BPT Renewal Model, α = 0.3, 5,500-Year Time Period Earthquakes 1886, A, B, C, and D	H-30
Fable H-5.2-14 Annual Frequencies for Charleston RLME Events BPT Renewal Model, α = 0.5, 5,500-Year Time Period Earthquakes 1886, A, B, C, and D	H-30

lxxx

lxxxi

Table H-5.2-15 Annual Frequencies for Charleston RLME Events BPT Renewal Model, α = 0.7, 5,500-Year Time Period Earthquakes 1886, A, B, C, and D	H-31
Table H-5.2-16 Annual Frequencies for Charleston RLME Events BPT Renewal Model, α = 0.3, 5,500-Year Time Period Earthquakes 1886, A, B, C, and E	H-31
Table H-5.2-17 Annual Frequencies for Charleston RLME Events BPT Renewal Model, α = 0.5, 5,500-Year Time Period Earthquakes 1886, A, B, C, and E	H-31
Table H-5.2-18 Annual Frequencies for Charleston RLME Events BPT Renewal Model, α = 0.7, 5,500-Year Time Period Earthquakes 1888, A, B, C, and E	H-32
Table H-5.2-19 Annual Frequencies for Charleston RLME Events BPT Renewal Model, α = 0.3, 5,500-Year Time Period Earthquakes 1886, A, B, C, D, and E	H-32
Table H-5.2-20 Annual Frequencies for Charleston RLME Events BPT Renewal Model, α = 0.5, 5,500-Year Time Period Earthquakes 1886, A, B, C, D, and E	H-32
Table H-5.2-21 Annual Frequencies for Charleston RLME Events BPT Renewal Model, α = 0.7, 5,500-Year Time Period Earthquakes 1886, A, B, C, D, and E	H-33
Table H-5.3-1 Cheraw RLME Magnitude Distribution	H-33
Table H-5.3-2 Annual Frequencies for Cheraw RLME Events In-Cluster Case, Data Set: 2 Earthquakes in 20–25 kyr	. H-33
Table H-5,3-3 Annual Frequencies for Cheraw RLME Events In-Cluster Case, Data Set: 3 Earthquakes in 20–25 kyr	.H-34
Table H-5.3-4 Slip Rates for Cheraw Fault In-Cluster Case, Data Set: 3.2-4.1 m in 20- 25 kyr	. H - 34
Table H-5.3-5 Annual Frequencies for Cheraw RLME Events Out-of-Cluster Case, Time Between Clusters	.H-34
Table H-5.3-6 Slip Rates for Cheraw Fault Out-of-Cluster Case, Data Set: 7–8 m in 0.4– 2.0 myr	.H-35
Table H-5.4-1 Meers RLME Magnitude Distribution	.H-35
Table H-5,4-2 Annual Frequencies for Meers RLME Events In-Cluster Case	.H-35
Table H-5.4-3 Annual Frequencies for Meers RLME Events Out-of-Cluster Case	. H-3 6
Table H-5.5-1 NMFS RLME Magnitude Distribution	. H-3 6
Table H-5.5-2 Annual Frequencies for NMFS RLME Events In-Cluster Case, Poisson Model	.H-36
Table H-5.5-3 Annual Frequencies for NMFS RLME Events In-Cluster Case, BPT Model, α = 0.3	H-37
Table H-5.5-4 Annual Frequencies for NMFS RLME Events In-Cluster Case, BPT Model, $\alpha = 0.5$	H-37
Table H-5.5-5 Annual Frequencies for NMFS RLME Events In-Cluster Case, BPT Model, α = 0.7	H-37
Table H-5.5-6 Annual Frequencies for NMFS RLME Events Out-of-Cluster Case, Poisson Model	H-38
Table H-5.6-1 ERM-S RLME Magnitude Distribution	H-38
Table H-5.6-2 ERM-N RLME Magnitude Distribution	H-38
Table H-5.6-3 Annual Frequencies for ERM-S RLME Events Data Set: 2 Earthquakes in 17.7–21.7 kyr	H-39

Table H-5.6-4 Annual Frequencies for ERM-S RLME Events Data Set: 3 Earthquakes in 17.7–21.7 kyr	H-39
Table H-5,6-5 Annual Frequencies for ERM-S RLME Events Data Set: 4 Earthquakes in 17.7–21.7 kyr	H-3 9
Table H-5.6-6 Annual Frequencies for ERM-N RLME Events Data Set: 1 Earthquake in 12–35 kyr	H-40
Table H-5.6-7 Annual Frequencies for ERM-N RLME Events Data Set: 2 Earthquakes in 12–35 kvr	H-40
Table H-5.7-1 Marianna RLME Magnitude Distribution	H-40
Table H-5.7-2 Annual Frequencies for Marianna RLME Events Data Set: 3 Earthquakes in 9.6–10.2 kyr	H-41
Table H-5.7-3 Annual Frequencies for Marianna RLME Events Data Set: 4 Earthquakes in 9.6-10.2 kyr	H-41
Table H-5.8-1 Commerce RLME Magnitude Distribution	H-41
Table H-5.8-2 Annual Frequencies for Commerce RLME Events Data Set: 2 Earthquakes in 18.9–23.6 kyr	H-42
Table H-5.8-3 Annual Frequencies for Commerce RLME Events Data Set: 3 Earthquakes in 18.9–23.6 kyr	H-42
Table H-5.9-1 Wabash RLME Magnitude Distribution	H-42
Table H-5.9-2 Annual Frequencies for Wabash RLME Events Data Set: 2 Earthquakes in 11–13 kyr	H-43
PPRP Comment Response Table(App	endix I)
Table K-1 SCR Earthquake Catalog	K-5
Table K-2 SCR Domains Updated from Johnston et al. (1994)	K-34

lxxxii

lxxxiii

甲 号証 (Central and Eastern United States Seismic Source Characterization for Nuclear Facilities)の訳

「原子力施設のための中東部合衆国震源特性」

要約(ix)

...

この報告書は、中東部合衆国(CEUS)の新しい震源特性(SSC)モデルについて記 したものです。この報告書は、電力研究所(RPRI)作成のレポートNP-4726「中東 部合衆国のための地震ハザードの方法論」(1986年11月発行)とローレンス・リバモ ア国立研究所モデルである「東部とロッキー山脈地域の69の原子力発電所の地震ハザー ドの特徴」(バーンルーター他 1989年発行)に代わるものになります。CEUS S SC プロジェクトの目的は、上級地震ハザード分析委員会(SSHAC)レベル3評価 手続において使用することになる中東部合衆国の新しい震源モデルを発展させることにあ ります。SSHAC手続の目標は、既存の観測記録、モデルや方法論に関し、技術的に弁 護可能な解釈理論の中心と骨格、適用範囲を示すことにあります。確率論的地震ハザード へ向けて入力するのは、震源特性と増幅特性の2つです。これら2つの内容は、特定のサ イトにおける確率論的ハザード結果(ないし地震ハザード曲線)を計算することにより求 めて来ました。この報告書では、新しい震源特性モデルを提示します。

ĉ

後略