RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY NATIONAL SEISMIC HAZARD MAPPING PROGRAM FOR THE 2014 UPDATE OF THE NATIONAL SEISMIC HAZARD MAPS

Edited by William R. Lund

PGA with 2% in 50 year PE. BC rock. 2008 USGS
This open-file release makes information available to the public that may not conform to UGS technical, editorial, or policy standards; this should be considered by an individual or group planning to take action based on the contents of this report. The Utah Department of Natural Resources, Utah Geological Survey, makes no warranty, expressed or implied, regarding its suitability for a particular use. The Utah Department of Natural Resources, Utah Geological Survey, shall not be liable under any circumstances for any direct, indirect, special, incidental, or consequential damages with respect to claims by users of this product.
CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION ........................................................................................................................................................................... 1
BACKGROUND ............................................................................................................................................................................. 1
BRPEWGGII PROCESS ................................................................................................................................................................... 1
BRPEWGGII SEISMIC HAZARD ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS ........................................................................................ 2
  Seismology Issues ........................................................................................................................................................................ 3
     Issue S1—Magnitude Frequency Relations for BRP Faults ................................................................................................. 3
     Issue S2—Smoothing of Background Seismicity .................................................................................................................. 3
     Issue S3—Historic Earthquake Rates .......................................................................................................................... 3
     Issue S4—Magnitude Uncertainties for Seismic Catalogs ............................................................................................... 4
  Geology Issues .............................................................................................................................................................................. 4
     Issue G1—Earthquake Magnitudes for BRP Faults .............................................................................................................. 4
     Issue G2—Modeling Antithetic Fault Pairs ..................................................................................................................... 5
     Issue G3—Slip Rate Uncertainties ................................................................................................................................... 5
     Issue G4—Normal Fault Dips in the BRP ....................................................................................................................... 5
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .................................................................................................................................................................... 6
REFERENCES .................................................................................................................................................................................. 6
APPENDICES .................................................................................................................................................................................. 11
  Appendix A. List of Presentations on BRPEWGG II Seismic-Hazard Issues ................................................................. 11
  Appendix B. Compilation of BRPEWGG II Presentations ............................................................................................. 17

TABLES

Table 1. Members of the Basin and Range Province Earthquake Working Group II ................................................................. 2
INTRODUCTION

This report presents the consensus recommendations of the Basin and Range Province Earthquake Working Group II (BRPEWG II) to the U.S. Geological Survey National Seismic Hazard Mapping Program (NSHMP) regarding eight Basin and Range Province (BRP) seismic-hazard issues important to the U.S. Geological Survey’s (USGS) 2014 update of the National Seismic Hazard Maps (NSHMs). The staff of the NSHMP formulated the eight seismic-hazard issues (four seismologic and four geologic) presented to the BRPEWG II for consideration. The BRPEWG II was jointly convened under the auspices of the Western States Seismic Policy Council (WSSPC), the USGS, and the Utah Geological Survey (UGS).

BACKGROUND

BRPEWG II follows upon BRPEWG I (Lund, 2006; http://ugspub.nr.utah.gov/publications/open_file_reports/OFR-477.pdf) convened in 2006, in response to WSSPC Policy Recommendation (PR) 04-5, which advocated creating a broad-based group of technical experts to evaluate five BRP seismic-hazard issues important to the 2007 update of the NSHMs. Those issues were identified at the Basin and Range Province Seismic Hazard Summit II (Lund, 2005; http://ugspub.nr.utah.gov/publications/misc_pubs/MP-05-2.pdf). WSSPC PR 04-5 was subsequently updated, and is currently WSSPC PR 10-5 Basin and Range Province Working Group(s) (http://www.wsspc.org/policy/files/Adopted/Adopted_PR_10-5_BRPEWG.pdf). It was in response to WSSPC PR 10-5 that 28 technical experts (table 1) familiar with the geology, seismology, and paleoseismology of the BRP convened as the BRPEWG II on November 14-16, 2011, at the offices of the UGS in Salt Lake City, Utah. The membership of BRPEWG II was drawn from several BRP state geological surveys, federal government agencies, academic institutions, seismological laboratories, and geotechnical consulting firms. Additional information on the BRPEWG process is available on the UGS web page at http://geology.utah.gov/ghp/workgroups/brpewg.htm.

BRPEWGII PROCESS

The charge given to the BRPEWG II by WSSPC PR 10-5 was to:

• Bring together subject-matter experts to discuss evidence of and evaluate eight seismic-hazard issues (four seismologic and four geologic) important to the 2014 update of the NSHMs.
• Define strategies for resolving seismic-hazard issues, and where possible, establish a consensus recommendation(s) to the USGS on each issue for the 2014 update of the NSHMs.
• Where consensus is not possible, outline research programs to resolve outstanding technical questions that the USGS can use when setting future research priorities.

To achieve these goals, two discussion leaders were identified for each seismic-hazard issue (table 1, appendix A). The role of the discussion leaders was to frame their issue succinctly for BRPEWG II as a whole, facilitate discussion during their session, and guide the BRPEWG II to a consensus recommendation(s) to the USGS for the 2014 NSHMs update. Each of the eight sessions lasted approximately two-and-a-half hours, followed by a ninth session used to review and finalize the recommendations generated during the meeting. The discussion leaders organized their sessions as they thought appropriate; however, a generally consistent format was employed for all of the sessions. That format consisted
of one to several short (15-20 minute) presentations (appendices A and B) either by the discussion leaders or by other subject-matter experts attending the BRPEWG II to frame the issue and present available relevant data. The presentations were followed by open discussion to further explore the issue and elicit opinions from the BRPEWG II as a whole, and finally the end of the session was used to formulate a consensus recommendation(s) to the USGS. Staff from the UGS took careful notes during each session and prepared this meeting summary.

Table 1. Members of the Basin and Range Province Earthquake Working Group II.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Issue Leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, John</td>
<td>University of Nevada, Reno</td>
<td>S4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabasz, Walter</td>
<td>University of Utah Seismograph Stations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biasi, Glenn</td>
<td>University of Nevada, Reno</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowman, Steve</td>
<td>Utah Geological Survey</td>
<td>UGS Liaison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brune, Jim</td>
<td>University of Nevada, Reno</td>
<td>S2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crane, Tony</td>
<td>U.S. Geological Survey</td>
<td>G4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dePolo, Craig</td>
<td>Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DuRoss, Chris</td>
<td>Utah Geological Survey</td>
<td>G1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold, Ryan</td>
<td>U.S. Geological Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haller, Kathy</td>
<td>U.S. Geological Survey</td>
<td>G2, G3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hecker, Suzanne</td>
<td>U.S. Geological Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hylland, Mike</td>
<td>Utah Geological Survey</td>
<td>G2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love, David</td>
<td>New Mexico Geological Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lund, William</td>
<td>Utah Geological Survey</td>
<td>Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moschetti, Morgan</td>
<td>U.S. Geological Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mueller, Chuck</td>
<td>U.S. Geological Survey</td>
<td>S3, S4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olig, Susan</td>
<td>URS Corporation</td>
<td>G1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peartree, Phil</td>
<td>Arizona Geological Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pechmann, Jim</td>
<td>University of Utah Seismograph Stations</td>
<td>S1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personius, Steve</td>
<td>U.S. Geological Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petersen, Mark</td>
<td>U.S. Geological Survey</td>
<td>S2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philips, Bill</td>
<td>Idaho Geological Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schwartz, Dave</td>
<td>U.S. Geological Survey</td>
<td>S1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stickney, Mike</td>
<td>Montana Bureau of Mines and Geology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesnousky, Steve</td>
<td>University of Nevada, Reno</td>
<td>G3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wittke, Seth</td>
<td>Wyoming Geological Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wills, Chris</td>
<td>California Geological Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wong, Ivan</td>
<td>URS Corporation</td>
<td>S3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BRPEWG II SEISMIC HAZARD ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The BRPEWG II arrived at the following consensus recommendations through a deliberative process. The BRPEWG II relied on the broad technical expertise and experience of its members when considering how the eight BRP seismic-hazard issues posed by the NSHMP should be addressed in the 2014 NSHM update. Where appropriate, BRPEWG II also made recommendations for long-term research that will permit further refinement of the NSHMs beyond the 2014 update.
Seismology Issues

**Issue S1:** How should the magnitude-frequency relations for a single BRP fault be characterized? Do existing seismological data help define these relationships?

Recommendations to the USGS for the 2014 NSHMs update:

- The BRPEWG II supports the current USGS approach to modeling recurrence rates of moderate-size independent earthquakes (M 5.0 to 6.5). This approach is based entirely on earthquake catalog data, and is applied to both fault-specific sources and the background source. The BRPEWG II does not recommend the use of models that define recurrence rates for these earthquakes based on slip rates or recurrence intervals for large surface-faulting earthquakes on major faults.
- For earthquakes of $M \geq 6.5$, the frequency-magnitude distribution along most BRP faults is currently modeled using a 67% weight for the maximum magnitude model and a 33% weight for the USGS Gutenberg-Richter (floating exponential) model. Although this weighting is somewhat arbitrary, the BRPEWG II sees no compelling reason to change it at the present time. However, it recommends that the USGS explore the effects of different weightings on hazard, for example 90% maximum magnitude and 10% USGS Gutenberg-Richter.
- It is essential that the methodologies used for constructing fault-specific magnitude-frequency recurrence models used in the NSHMs be fully documented. The USGS is urged to publish these methodologies, including a comparison to other models used in state-of-the-practice probabilistic seismic hazard analyses.

Long-term recommendation:

- Conduct research on frequency-magnitude relations for single faults including, for example, the appropriate b-value for exponential distributions.

**Issue S2:** How should the “smoothing” of seismicity be handled in the NSHMs? The current NSHMs use a radial smoothing process, but recent precarious rock studies in California and western Nevada suggest that anisotropic smoothing (i.e., along faults) might be more appropriate. If anisotropic smoothing is used, should it be applied universally across the entire BRP?

Recommendation to the USGS for the 2014 NSHMs update:

- Further investigate isotropic and anisotropic smoothing methods and parameters. Test the predictive power of these methods, where feasible, and use this information to help optimize parameters (including smoothing distance) that define the smoothing functions. The USGS should compare precarious balanced rock data in this assessment. Whether or not the USGS implements anisotropic or other methodological changes to smoothing will/should depend on results of the above-mentioned investigations, testing, and validation.

**Issue S3:** Does the rate of earthquakes represented on the NSHMs need to match the rate of historical earthquakes? If not, what level of mismatch is acceptable?

Recommendations for the 2014 NSHMs update:

A comparison of historical and modeled seismicity rates for the northern and more seismically active part of the USGS "Basin and Range" region (California east of the Sierra Nevada Mountains, Nevada, western half of Utah, southeastern Oregon, southern half of Idaho, and westernmost Wyoming and Montana) shows that modeled seismicity rates generally exceed historical rates (creating a seismic "bulge") across a broad range of moment magnitude ($M_w$), although the bulge is greatest in the $M_w$ 6-7 range. Assuming a 50% characteristic and 50% Gutenberg-Richter recurrence model distribution (NSHMP definitions) in the crustal fault model produces the strongest bulge—a factor of about three near $M_w$ 6.6. By adjusting various modeling assumptions (for example, 67% characteristic and 33% Gutenberg-Richter), it is possible to reduce the bulge to a factor of two or smaller. Short-term recommendations to the USGS NSHMP include:

- Quantify the uncertainty in the historical seismicity rates (for example, by plotting error bars).
- Redo the historical versus modeled seismicity comparison for the northern Basin and Range, excluding the seismicity in the Yellowstone region, to determine what effect that has on the size of the bulge.
- The USGS is already considering several updates for the Intermountain West (IMW) hazard model that will affect modeled seismicity rates including: 1) improving fault inventories, 2) changing dips for crustal faults, 3), modeling fault intersections, 4) computing characteristic magnitudes from area rather than length for some faults, 5) adjusting the weights to the characteristic versus Gutenberg-Richter models and/or including a $b = 0$ branch, and 6) using regionalized b-values. The BRPEWG II recommends tracking how these possible chang-
es to the hazard model will affect seismicity rates.

**Long-term recommendation:**

- To address the mismatch between modeled and observed seismicity rates in California, the Uniform California Earthquake Rupture Forecast, version 3 (UCERF3) Project ([http://www.wgcep.org/node/47](http://www.wgcep.org/node/47)) is currently developing a new model that allows complex multi-fault interactions. The BRPEWG II recommends following UCERF3 progress, and evaluating the applicability of such models for the rest of the western United States.

**Issue S4:** What are the sources and levels of uncertainty in the earthquake magnitudes contained in the seismicity catalogs used for the BRP in the NSHMs?

**Recommendations to the USGS for the 2014 NSHMs update:**

- Clarify the historical relation between regional network catalogs and the Preliminary Determination of Epicenters (PDE) Bulletin (USGS, 2010).
- Consider using network locations for past earthquakes in authoritative network regions if they differ from the PDE and are of higher quality.
- Since the USGS relies heavily on the PDE catalog (unless there is a specialized regional study) to determine background seismicity, the question of source and level of uncertainty needs to be assessed by the USGS for many regions, including the IMW and the Walker Lane belt, with help as needed from regional network operators.
- The Tinti and Mulargia (1985) adjustment to earthquake rates may have comparable size but opposite sign from the adjustment due to magnitude conversions. The statistical methodology used by the NSHMP for addressing bias in earthquake rates should be carefully reviewed for internal consistency.

**Long-term recommendations:**

- Encourage regional networks to:
  - Use station corrections in $M_L$ determinations.
  - Carefully document changes in magnitude determination practices (past and future), and whenever changes have been (are) made, to develop/recommend relations between the old and new system, and to $M_w$.
  - Assign version numbers to catalogs for quality control and referencing.
- Encourage efforts to improve regional catalogs, including:
  - Review magnitudes of past earthquakes, starting with the largest events and thoughtfully assign uncertainties to reviewed magnitudes.
  - Compare catalogs.
  - Use state-of-the-art techniques to relocate events.

**Geology Issues**

**Issue G1:** How should we calculate maximum characteristic magnitude ($M_{\text{max}}$) for BRP faults based on surface-rupture lengths, fault areas, and available displacement data (an $M_{\text{max}}$ of 7.5 is currently in the NSHMs based on the magnitude of the 1959 Hebgen Lake earthquake)? What is the source or explanation of the discrepancy between $M$ calculated using surface-rupture length versus using the average or maximum displacement (site bias, underestimation of surface rupture length, other?)? How should the discrepancy in the magnitude determined from these two measurements be handled in the NSHMs?

**Recommendations to the USGS for the 2014 NSHMs update:**

- Capping $M_{\text{max}}$ for BRP faults in the NSHMs:
  - Keep the present $M_W$ 7.5 ± 0.2 cap on $M_{\text{max}}$ for BRP normal faults, but revise the documentation for the physical basis for the cap to be the $M_W$ 7.5 1887 Sonora, Mexico earthquake (Bakun, 2006; Suter, 2006).
  - Consider segmented or other alternative rupture models where paleoseismic studies provide good evidence for differences in rupture patterns and behavior along a fault (e.g., West Cache, Steens, Lost River, Lemhi, Mission, Sangre de Cristo, and others).
- Best approach to determining $M_{\text{max}}$ for BRP faults in the NSHMs:
  - Use the same approach for determining $M_{\text{max}}$ for strike-slip faults in the BRP as is used for strike-slip faults in California (Petersen and others, 2008).
  - There are significant epistemic uncertainties in determining $M_{\text{max}}$ for BRP normal faults due to possible scaling differences for the low-strain rate environment, normal slip earthquakes, and larger events. To better address these uncertainties, consider using multiple regression relations from the following list to determine $M_{\text{max}}$ for BRP faults in the NSHMs:
    » Wells and Coppersmith (1994) –
SRL for all fault types
» Anderson and others (1996) – SRL for all fault types and slip rate
» Wells and Coppersmith (1994) – SRL for normal faults
» Stirling and others (2002) – censored instrumental
» Wells and Coppersmith (1994) – RA for all fault types

(SRL = surface rupture length; RA = fault rupture area)

Long-term recommendation:
• Sponsor research to update or develop empirical regressions on magnitude appropriate for BRP normal faults.

Issue G2: How should antithetic fault pairs be modeled in the NSHMs? For example, what is the relation and seismogenic significance of antithetic fault pairs such as the East and West Cache faults, and strands of the Salt Lake City segment of the Wasatch fault and the West Valley fault zone?

Recommendations to the USGS for the 2014 NSHMs update:
• Explore using metrics (such as fault length, topographic relief, and overlap) to guide selection of master and subsidiary faults.
  – Evaluate dataset for overlapping relations to select the master fault based on length.
  – Evaluate using aspect ratio (length/width) for individual antithetic fault pairs.
  – Where data allow, structural throw should be used rather than topographic relief.
  – Evaluate using length times throw as a parameter for selecting the master fault.
• Use subsurface data (e.g., seismic reflection) where available to guide master fault selection.
• Where available data do not give a clear indication of the master versus subsidiary fault, model both alternatives using a logic tree approach.
• Use rupture area (rather than surface rupture length) to determine magnitude for truncated faults.
• Conduct sensitivity studies on the impact on ground motions of antithetic fault pairs in urban areas.
• Develop and test a methodology for modeling antithetic fault pairs and present those results at the USGS IMW workshop in summer 2012.

Issue G3: The USGS seeks guidance on how to estimate the uncertainty for the slip rates on BRP normal-slip faults, especially for faults that have little or no slip-rate data. The method used in California to estimate the uncertainty has varied the upper and lower bounds of the slip rate by plus-or-minus 50%. Thus, the uncertainty bounds for a fault that has a slip rate of 5 mm/yr would be 7.5 mm/yr and 2.5 mm/yr. Do these bounding values encompass the fifth and ninety-fifth percentiles for this fault?

Recommendations to the USGS for the 2014 NSHMs update:
• Engage state geological survey scientists to contribute and review slip-rate uncertainty for IMW sources.
• Conduct sensitivity studies of ground motions that incorporate assigned slip rates for sources in the IMW.
• Test assigned parameters and present results at the USGS IMW workshop in summer 2012.

Issue G4: Based on the recommendations from BRPEWG I (Lund, 2006), the current NSHMs use a dip of 50° ± 10° for normal faults in the BRP. Are the 50° dip value and the ± 10° uncertainty range valid and acceptable to cover the probable range of dips for BRP normal faults?

Recommendations to the USGS for the 2014 NSHMs update:
• Following a review of published data summarizing the dips of normal faults in the BRP and worldwide, the BRPEWG II concludes that a dip of 50° ± 15° best represents the range of dips for normal faults in the BRP. The BRPEWG II recommends this range be used in updates of the NSHMs; the 50° value defines the mean dip value and the ± 15° range represents the 5th and 95th percentiles.
• For those faults having geological, geophysical, seismological, or geodetic data that convincingly constrains a specific fault’s dip within the seismogenic crust, the NSHMs should use these fault-specific data to calculate the fault’s hazard.
• The BRPEWG II recommends that the USGS evaluate the impact of increasing the range of recommended fault dips (from ± 10° to ± 15°) on the overall hazard.
• The BRPEWG II recommends that the USGS evaluate whether the range in fault dips determined from global data is better represented by non-Poissonian distribution around the mean value versus assuming a simple Poisson distribution.
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APPENDIX A

LIST OF PRESENTATIONS ON BRPEWG II SEISMIC-HAZARD ISSUES

1Sessions and presentations are listed in the order that they occurred during the BRPEWG II meeting.
2See appendix B for a compilation of available BRPEWG II presentations.
SESSION S1

How should the magnitude-frequency relations for a single BRP fault be characterized? Do existing seismological data help define these relationships?

Session Leaders

David Schwartz, U.S. Geological Survey, Menlo Park, California
Jim Pechmann, University of Utah Seismograph Stations, Salt Lake City, Utah

Presentations

Pechmann
Introduction and specific questions

Petersen
Magnitude-frequency distribution for NSHM’s

Hecker
Evaluating frequency-magnitude models for individual faults using a global data set of slip at a point (Power Point not available)

Arabasz
Observed seismicity and recurrence modeling on the Wasatch fault (revisited)

Biasi
Fault-specific magnitude-frequency distributions

SESSION G1

How should we calculate maximum characteristic magnitude (M_{max}) for BRP faults based on surface-rupture lengths, fault areas, and available displacement data (an M_{max} of 7.5 is currently in the NSHMs based on the magnitude of the 1959 Hebgen Lake earthquake)? What is the source or explanation of the discrepancy between M calculated using surface-rupture length versus using the average or maximum displacement (site bias, underestimation of surface rupture length, other?)? How should the discrepancy in the magnitude determined from these two measurements be handled in the NSHMs?

Session Leaders

Susan Olig, URS Corporation, Oakland, California
Chris DuRoss, Utah Geological Survey, Salt Lake City, Utah
Presentations

Olig
Calculating moment magnitudes for Basin and Range Province faults

Haller
Magnitude in the NSHM

Olig/DuRoss
Issue G1 – Part 1: Capping \( M_{\text{max}} \) (Putting a lid on \( M_{\text{max}} \) for long, unsegmented, normal-slip BRP faults)

DuRoss
Issue G1 – Part 2: Calculating moment magnitudes for Basin and Range Province faults—Case study: Wasatch fault zone (WFZ)

dePolo
Estimating surface lengths for prehistoric ruptures in the Basin and Range Province

Biasi
Pre-historic earthquake displacement

Hecker
Stress-drop scaling in the Western Cordillera: Evidence for a dependence on fault maturity (Presentation not available in compilation)

SESSION S2

How should the “smoothing” of seismicity be handled in the NSHMs? The current NSHMs use a radial smoothing process, but recent precarious rock studies in California and western Nevada suggest that anisotropic smoothing (i.e., along faults) might be more appropriate. If anisotropic smoothing is used, should it be applied universally across the entire BRP?

Session Leaders

Mark Petersen, U.S. Geological Survey, Denver, Colorado
Jim Brune, University of Nevada Reno, Nevada Seismological Laboratory, Reno, Nevada

Presentations

Moschetti/Petersen
BRPEWG Issue S2: Smoothing parameters for NSHM

Brune
PBRs [Precariously Balanced Rocks] and seismic hazard

Brune
Background seismicity
SESSION G2

How should antithetic fault pairs be modeled in the NSHMs? For example, what is the relation and seismogenic significance of antithetic fault pairs such as the East and West Cache faults, and strands of the Salt Lake City segment of the Wasatch fault and the West Valley fault zone?

Session Leaders

Kathy Haller, U.S. Geological Survey, Denver, Colorado

Mike Hylland, Utah Geological Survey, Salt Lake City, Utah

Presentation

Haller/Hylland Modeling graben-bounding faults in the NSHMs

SESSION S3

Does the rate of earthquakes represented on the NSHMs need to match the rate of historical earthquakes? If not, what level of mismatch is acceptable?

Session Leaders

Ivan Wong, URS Corporation, Oakland, California


Presentations

Wong Does the rate of earthquakes represented on the NSHMs need to match the rate of historical earthquakes?

Mueller Does the rate of earthquakes represented on the NSHMs need to match the rate of historical earthquakes – USGS WUS hazard model

SESSION G3

The USGS seeks guidance on how to estimate the uncertainty for the slip rates on BRP normal-slip faults, especially for faults that have little or no slip-rate data. The method used in California to estimate the uncertainty has varied the upper and lower bounds of the slip rate by plus-or-minus 50%. Thus, the uncertainty bounds for a fault that has a slip
rate of 5 mm/yr would be 7.5 mm/yr and 2.5 mm/yr. Do these bounding values encompass the fifth and ninety-fifth percentiles for this fault?

Session Leaders
Kathy Haller, U.S. Geological Survey, Denver, Colorado
Steve Wesnousky, University of Nevada Reno, Reno, Nevada

Presentation
Haller Addressing slip-rate uncertainty in the NSHM

SESSION S4

What are the sources and levels of uncertainty in the earthquake magnitudes contained in the seismicity catalogs used for the BRP in the NSHMs?

Session Leaders
John Anderson, University of Nevada Reno, Nevada Seismological Laboratory, Reno, Nevada

Presentations
Anderson BRPEWG II introduction to Issue S4 – magnitude uncertainty
Mueller Why it matters
Arabasz University of Utah earthquake catalog—magnitude “uncertainties” and comparison with the NSHM catalog
Stickney Montana regional seismograph network magnitude issues
Anderson/Biasi Nevada’s catalog

SESSION G4

Based on the recommendations from BRPEWG I (Lund, 2006), the current NSHMs use a dip of 50° ± 10° for normal faults in the BRP. Are the 50° dip value and the ± 10° uncertainty range valid and acceptable to cover the probable range of dips for BRP normal faults?
Session Leader

Tony Crone, U.S. Geological Survey, Denver, Colorado

Presentation

Crone  Dip angles for Basin and Range normal faults
APPENDIX B

COMPILATION OF BRPEWG II PRESENTATIONS

1See appendix A for a list of presentations in this compilation.

Compilation is available at