



Unified Structural Representation (USR) of the Southern California Crust and Upper Mantle



3D velocity structure has a primary control on the intensity and distribution of hazardous ground shaking

- Rupture nucleation & dynamics
- Wave propagation
- Wave guides & focusing
- Wave amplification & resonance


1994 Northridge (M6.7) Earthquake, CA




PERCEIVED SHAKING	Not felt	Weak	Light	Moderate	Strong	Very strong	Severe	Violent	Extreme
POTENTIAL DAMAGE	none	none	none	Very light	Light	Moderate	Moderate/Heavy	Heavy	Very Heavy
PEAK ACC. (%g)	<.17	.17-1.4	1.4-3.9	3.9-9.2	9.2-18	18-34	34-65	65-124	>124
PEAK VEL. (cm/s)	<0.1	0.1-1.1	1.1-3.4	3.4-8.1	8.1-16	16-31	31-60	60-116	>116
INSTRUMENTAL INTENSITY	I	II-III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X+

3D velocity structures are inherently complex, presenting challenges in their representation

- Velocity structure is heterogeneous over a wide range of scales
- Velocity measurements vary in type, abundance, scale, and frequency
- Tectonically active regions generally have complex structures that reflect a long geologic history



SCEC Unified Structural Representation (USR)





- An object-oriented, 3D description of crust and upper mantle velocity and fault structure in southern California
- The USR development workflow seeks to use the best available data and techniques to constrain velocity structure, and to ensure internal consistency of model components

California tectonic history

California represents a portion of a much larger, long-lived plate boundary



- convergent plate boundary tectonics originate at least as early as the Carboniferous (Antler Orogeny)
- “*California tectonics*” generally initiated in the Jurassic with accretion of island arc terrains and east directed subduction



California tectonic history

This history defines the primary “fabric” of California




- **Arc** – Sierra Nevada Block & associated igneous terrains [Jurassic – Cretaceous granitoid rocks]
- **Forearc basin** - Great Valley Sequence [Jurassic – Paleocene forearc basin deposits]
- **Accretionary complex** - Franciscan Complex [Jurassic – Paleocene accretionary prism and oceanic crustal rocks, highP – lowT metamorphism]



California velocity structure

California is characterized by a paired set of high and low velocity regions running through the center of the state.

- High velocity arc
- Low velocity forearc
- High velocity rocks associated with subducted lithosphere




Lin et al., (2010)

California velocity structure


However, this patterns is substantially modified in southern California.

- “Capture” of the Monterey micro plate by Pacific plate motions: rifting and transtension along southern California in the Miocene
- Transition to modern transpressional tectonics in the late Miocene to Pliocene



Lin et al., (2010)

California plate tectonics (Atwater, 2011)




Structure of the California Crust

Depth to the Moho

Crustal thickness

- Continental crust is generally thickest beneath mountain ranges, most of which have felsic igneous sections.
- Crust is generally thinner in areas of crustal extension due to rifting and transform plate tectonics. These areas include many of the major sedimentary basins.





Tape et al., (2010)




Basin structure of the California Crust

Coastal basins

- Southern California coastal basins (Los Angeles, Ventura-Santa Barbara, Santa Maria) formed during early Tertiary transtension associated with block rotations.
- Late Tertiary thrusting and sedimentation led to further basin subsidence.






SCEC Unified Structural Representation (USR)



USR development workflow begins with the definition of geological and geophysical horizons that represent important velocity interfaces.


Volumetric description of basin sediments




Süss & Shaw (2003)

Geological & geophysical surfaces in velocity modeling



Geologic section




Velocity model



Industry sonic logs






Compensated Sonic Log Tool




Süss & Shaw (2003)


Industry sonic logs



Defining the basement surface



Defining the basement surface




➤ 3D seismic surveys


➤ *10,000 wells*

Basement structure in the SCEC CVM/USR

Basement structure is defined by surface geology, seismic reflection and refraction surveys, wellbore data, and potential field measurements.






Basement structure and faults




Faults locally offset the basement and other geological horizons, and thus influence velocity structure.

SCEC Unified Structural Representation (USR)




SCEC Community Fault Model (CFM)

3D description of active faults that are deemed capable of generating moderate to large earthquakes



Community Fault Model (CFM)




- integrates many types of data that constrain fault geometries
- interpolated and extrapolated fault patches
- alternative fault representations


Plesch et al., (2005)

CFM 5.0 – many faults are more highly segmented, and include more precise segment linkages based on *Q*fault traces and seismicity.

San Jacinto fault zone




Faulted basement surface




The locations and displacements of major faults are represented in the geologic surfaces that comprise the USR.

Basement structure in the SCEC CVM-H




w/o faults



w/ faults

CVM-H (LA basin)







SCEC Unified Structural Representation (USR) Workflow

1) Definition of geological and geophysical horizons

2) Incorporation of fault locations and displacements

3) Parameterization of sediment velocities




SCEC CVMS 4.0 – Sediment Velocities

(Magistrale, Day, Clayton, & Graves, 2000, 2005)


- V_p is defined at stratigraphic boundaries as a function of depth(Z) and age (T) using Faust's law:

$$v_{\text{int}} = \alpha(ZT)^{1/6}$$

- relation is calibrated using well control
- V_p is linearly interpolated between stratigraphic horizons



CVM-S – Rule based






Magistrale et al., (2000)

*Additional parameters
to constrain velocity
structure*

Velocity gradients as a function of total basin depth


Salton Trough




Lovely et al., (2007)

Velocity as a function of depth and total basin depth

Salton Trough






Velocity parameterization through geostatistical interpretation



Industry velocity data


Los Angeles Velocity Model

SP - Sonic velocities




Velocity parameterization through kriging

Velocity data in Inner California Borderlands




Rivero et al., 2004

Variance analysis





Define correlation ellipsoid




Velocity parameterization through kriging

Velocity interpolation based on spatially weighted mean




Rivero et al., 2004


Rule-based model




Geostatistical model




Depth slices through parameterized model




-600m




-1600m




-2600m



-3600m




-4600m



-5600m


Süss & Shaw (2003)



Lithologic control on velocity


- Vp low in shales
- Vp high in sands

Süss & Shaw (2003)




Depositional systems


Basinfloor fan deposits resolved in velocity model of the LA basin



Velocity slice at 3600m




upper fan shelf slope
lower fan submarine high



Süss & Shaw (2003)

Developing Vs and r models for basins

Co-registered Vp and r models are developed using empirical relations among these properties



Brocher et al., 2005

The best parameterization approach depends on local structure and abundance of velocity measurements

Geostat based ♦♦





Rule based (D)

Rule based (D & D) ♦

Vp (m/s)



SCEC Unified Structural Representation (USR) Workflow




1) Definition of geological and geophysical horizons

2) Incorporation of fault locations and displacements

3) Parameterization of sediment velocities

4) Embed basins in consistent crust and upper mantle V models


Crustal models



- To ensure internal consistency between basin and crustal velocity representations, basin structures are used as input for V_p and V_s tomographic (travel-time based) models
- Models were developed using the inversion code SIMULPS (Thurber, 1993) and travel time P and S-P picks from the Southern California Seismic Network to determine gridded V_p and V_p/V_s models with linear interpolation between adjacent nodes.

After Hauksson et al. (2000)





Mantle models



- Mantle structure was modeled using teleseismic surface wave data, recorded by the California Integrated Seismic Network (CISN)
- 114 large earthquakes ($M > 6.0$) to derive phase velocity variations
- Basin and crustal models were used as inputs
- Moho surface defined boundary between crust and upper mantle models

After Tanimoto (UCSB)

SCEC Unified Structural Representation (USR) Workflow



1) Definition of geological and geophysical horizons


2) Incorporation of fault locations and displacements

3) Parameterization of sediment velocities

4) Embed basins in crust and upper mantle V models


5) Iteration of velocity models using 3D waveform tomography

3D adjoint waveform tomography updates




Full inversion uses more than 200 events, requiring 6800 wavefield simulations, implemented in 16 tomographic iterations.

6–30 s period



Tape et al., (2009)


3D waveform tomography (F3DT)




Lee, E.-J., P. Chen, T. H. Jordan, P. B. Maechling, M. A. M. Denolle, and G. C. Beroza (2014), Full-3-D tomography for crustal structure in Southern California based on the scattering-integral and the adjoint-wavefield methods, *J. Geophys. Res. Solid Earth*, 119, doi:10.1002/2014JB011346.

SCEC USR Components

- Basin structures
- Crustal tomographic models
- Teleseismic upper mantle models
- Waveform tomography improvements



Geotechnical Layer (GTL)



Shaw et al., (2013)

- GTL's are shallow (< 300 m) velocity descriptions that are necessary for many local seismological and engineering applications.
- The USR/CVM has an optional GTL overlay based on V_{s30} measurements.

Geotechnical Layer (GTL)

$$V_S(z) = f(z)V_{ST} + g(z)V_{S30}$$

$$V_P(z) = f(z)V_{PT} + g(z)P(V_{S30})$$

Where z' is depth, V_{ST} and V_{PT} are S- and P-wave velocities extracted from the crustal velocity model at depth z_T , $P()$ is the Brocher (2005) P-wave velocity scaling law, and:


$$z = z'/z_T$$

$$f(z) = z + b(z - z^2)$$

$$g(z) = a - az + c(z^2 + 2z - 3z)$$

After Ely et al.

Geotechnical Layer (GTL)





Shaw et al., (2013)

- This process ensure smooth transitions between GTL and underlying model components


SCEC USR Components


- Basin structures
- Crustal tomographic models
- Teleseismic upper mantle models
- Waveform tomography improvements
- GTL






300m






0m






CVMH 11.9 Vs


-500m





-1000m






CVMH 11.9 Vs

-2000m






CVMH 11.9 Vs

-15000m






SCEC USR - CVMH




Inner Borderlands



Salton Trough





Basin velocity profiles







Basin velocity profiles



Basin velocity profiles



SCEC Unified Structural Representation (USR) Workflow



1) Definition of geological and geophysical horizons

2) Incorporation of fault locations and displacements



3) Parameterization of sediment velocities

4) Embed basins in crust and upper mantle V models

5) Iteration of velocity models using 3D waveform tomography

6) Evaluating model performance & applications

Evaluating the Community Models



Comparison of recorded data (black traces) and synthetics (red traces) for station RUS


Average goodness-of-fit (perfect fit = 100) at 0.1-0.5 Hz for synthetics relative to data.

Olsen et al.

M7.8 ShakeOut Simulations in Alternative 3D Seismic Velocity Models


Rob Graves, USGS

- Panels below show peak ground velocity simulated for the three alternative CVMs. The plot at left (CVM-S4) is the original ShakeOut result from Graves et al (2008). The middle panel uses the CVM-Si23 update to CVM-S4 and the right panel is from CVM-H11.9.0.
- Along the fault, the general pattern is similar for all three models and is dominated by rupture directivity toward the Northwest.
- Other features are present in some models but not all. For example, both CVM-S4 and CVM-Si23 show strong amplification in San Bernardino, whereas CVM-H11.9.0 shows only modest amplification. On the other hand, both CVM-Si23 and CVM-H11.9.0 show strong amplification in the area north of San Fernando (Santa Clarita-Fillmore basin), but this feature is not present in CVM-S4.
- The Los Angeles basin region shows very strong amplification for CVM-S4 with PGV exceeding 50 cm/s throughout most of the basin, and reaching nearly 200 cm/s in the Whittier-Narrows region connecting the San Gabriel and LA basins. The level of amplification is noticeably reduced in CVM-Si23, and it is significantly reduced in CVM-H11.9.0.




Strong ground motion forecasting

(a) Mw 7.9 scenario thrust earthquake




Strong ground motion forecasting

(b) Peak ground velocity using SoCal-1D



(c) Peak ground velocity using CVM-H






Tape et al., (2014)

t = 108 s

t = 72 s




t = 36 s

SoCal1D



Tape et al., (2014)

USR/CVM-H



Developing Unified Structural Representations is a collaborative effort

John H. Shaw¹, Andreas Plesch¹, Carl Tape^{1,2}, M. Peter Suess³, Tom Jordan⁴, Geoffrey Ely⁴, Egill Hauksson⁵, Jeroen Tromp⁶, Toshiro Tanimoto⁷, Robert Graves⁸, Kim Olsen⁹, Craig Nicholson⁷, Phil Maechling⁴, Carlos Rivero¹⁰, Peter Lovely¹¹, Charles M. Brankman¹², and Jason Munster¹³

¹Department of Earth & Planetary Sciences, Harvard University, 20 Oxford St., Cambridge, MA, USA, 02138 // shaw@eps.harvard.edu // 617 495-8008

²University of Alaska Fairbanks, Geophysical Institute, 903 Koyukuk Drive, Fairbanks, AK, USA, 99775-7320

³Department of Geosciences, Tübingen University, Hölderlinstr. 12, 72074 Tübingen, Germany

⁴Southern California Earthquake Center, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, USA, 90089-0742

⁵Seismological Laboratory, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA, USA, 91125

⁶Department of Geosciences, Princeton University, Guyot Hall, Princeton, NJ, USA, 08544

⁷Department of Earth Science, 1006 Webb Hall, University of California Santa Barbara, CA, USA, 93106-9630

⁸U.S. Geological Survey, 525 South Wilson Avenue, Pasadena, CA, USA, 91106


⁹Dept. Geological Sciences, MC-1020, 5500 Campanile Dr., San Diego State University, San Diego, CA, USA, 92182-1020

¹⁰Chevron North America E&P, Gulf of Mexico Regional Team, Houston, TX, USA, 77002

¹¹Chevron ETC – ESD, 1500 Louisiana, 28077, Houston, TX, USA, 77002

¹²IHRDC, 535 Boylston Street, Boston, MA, USA, 02116

¹³School of Engineering and Applied Sciences, Harvard University, 29 Oxford St., Cambridge, MA, USA, 02138



SCEC ERI Workshop

Monday 3:30-6:30pm: **3D Structural Velocity Modeling/USR Framework**

Goal: This afternoon's exercises are designed to familiarize you with the components of 3D structural velocity models, including basin structures, faults, and velocity parameterizations. We will accomplish this using the SCEC Unified Structural Representation (USR) for southern California and two tools developed to access and use this model: SCEC VDO, and interactive 3D visualization tool, and UCVM, which allows you to extract velocity values from these models.

Schedule

3:30 pm: Laptop setup, virtual box instructions

3:45pm: SCEC-VDO: Structural components

Basics: navigation, loading plugins and datasets

Visualizing faults: SCEC CFM

Visualizing geologic surfaces: Basement and Moho surfaces

Exercise: Examining faults that affect the Basement surface

SCEC ERI Workshop

Monday 3:30-6:30pm: **3D Structural Velocity Modeling/USR Framework**

4:15pm: SCEC-VDO: Exploring velocity models

Examining velocity cross-sections

Examining velocity maps

Exercise: Comparing velocity structures and geologic surfaces

4:45 – 5pm: BREAK

5pm: UCVM

Introduction to the UCVM framework

Plotting cross sections and maps

Exercise: Comparing alternative velocity parameterizations

Extracting 1-D velocity profiles

Exercise Evaluating basin velocity structures

6:30 Conclude

Challenges in USR development


- Consistent representations of other seismic parameters (e.g., attenuation)
- Frequency dependence of velocity and other seismic properties
- Representing small scale velocity heterogeneity (stochastic approaches)
- Incorporating new local constraints on velocity structure in 3D waveform tomographic inversions
- Maintaining and distributing a growing inventory of models and model iterations

High-frequency velocity structure

Plesch, Shaw, Jordan, Song (2014)

The CVM-H was parameterized using a smoothed version of sonic log data.

Comparison of the CVM-H 11.9 with the original log data reveals the nature of high-frequency velocity structure that is not captured by the model, but can be represented statistically.




Stochastic Descriptions of Basin Velocity Structure from Analyses of Sonic Logs and the SCEC Community Velocity Model (CVM-H)

A. Plesch, J. H. Shaw , T. Jordan, X. Song

Results:

- LA basin wide analysis shows a **6.5% overall variability in V_p** relative to CVM-H for the small (7m) length scale, and that the variability distribution is not Gaussian.
- variogram analyses reveals a (maximum) **vertical correlation distance for V_p of 80-100m**
- analyses of clustered wells in Wilmington field data (right) shows **horizontal correlation distance for V_p of $\approx 1000\text{m}$** .



Wilmington field: 70 well paths on 7km x 2.5km with data, >1.1 million samples of interval travel times by logging tools (converted to V_p); logs in yellow and tops as spheres