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**Abstract**

We present a new empirical ground motion model, commonly referred to as an attenuation relationship, which we developed as part of the PEER Next Generation Attenuation of Ground Motion (NGA) Project. Using a common database of worldwide strong motion recordings, we selected a subset of ground motion data and predictor variables that we believed were appropriate for use in developing our model. Consistent with the requirements of the PEER NGA Project, we developed both a median and aleatory uncertainty model for peak ground acceleration (PGA), peak ground velocity (PGV), peak ground displacement (PGD), and response spectral acceleration (PSA) and displacement (SD) for oscillator periods ranging from 0.01–10.0 s, magnitudes ranging from 4.0–8.0, and distances ranging from 0–200 km. We consider these models to be valid for use in the western United States and in other similar tectonically active regions of shallow crustal faulting worldwide. A comparison of our NGA model with our previous ground motion models (Campbell, 1997; Campbell and Bozorgnia, 1994, 2003) showed that the biggest differences in these models occur for sites located at small-to-moderate distances from large-magnitude earthquakes or near reverse faults with surface rupture, where the NGA model predicts lower ground motion, and for sites located on the hanging wall of dipping strike-slip and normal faults, where the NGA model predicts higher ground motion. We also found that the standard deviation is no longer a direct function of magnitude, which increases aleatory uncertainty for large-magnitude earthquakes and decreases it for small-magnitude earthquakes for stiff sites, compared to our previous models. However, the dependence of the standard deviation on nonlinear site effects in our new model can lead to less aleatory uncertainty for soft sites even at large magnitudes as compared to our previous models.
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ABSTRACT

We present a new empirical ground motion model, commonly referred to as an attenuation relationship, which we developed as part of the PEER Next Generation Attenuation of Ground Motion (NGA) Project. Using a common database of worldwide strong motion recordings, we selected a subset of ground motion data and predictor variables that we believed were appropriate for use in developing our model. Consistent with the requirements of the PEER NGA Project, we developed both a median and aleatory uncertainty model for peak ground acceleration (PGA), peak ground velocity (PGV), peak ground displacement (PGD), and response spectral acceleration (PSA) and displacement (SD) for oscillator periods ranging from 0.01–10.0 s, magnitudes ranging from 4.0–8.0, and distances ranging from 0–200 km. We consider these models to be valid for use in the western United States and in other similar tectonically active regions of shallow crustal faulting worldwide. A comparison of our NGA model with our previous ground motion models (Campbell, 1997, 2000, 2001; Campbell and Bozorgnia, 1994, 2003a, 2003b, 2003c, 2004) showed that the biggest differences in these models occur for sites located at small-to-moderate distances from large-magnitude earthquakes or near reverse faults with surface rupture, where the NGA model predicts lower ground motion, and for sites located on the hanging wall of dipping strike-slip and normal faults, where the NGA model predicts higher ground motion. We also found that the standard deviation is no longer a direct function of magnitude, which increases aleatory uncertainty for large-magnitude earthquakes and decreases it for small-magnitude earthquakes for stiff sites, compared to our previous models. However, the dependence of the standard deviation on nonlinear site effects in our new model can lead to less aleatory uncertainty for soft sites even at large magnitudes as compared to our previous models.
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1 Introduction

1.1 SCOPE OF THE PEER NGA PROJECT

The PEER Next Generation of Ground Motion Attenuation Project (the “PEER NGA Project”) is a research initiative conducted by the Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center Lifelines Program in partnership with the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), the Southern California Earthquake Center (SCEC), and the Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E). According to Power et al. (2006), the objective of the PEER NGA Project is to develop updated empirical ground motion models (attenuation relationships) through a comprehensive and highly interactive research program. The model development was supported by other project components that included: (1) development of an updated and expanded PEER database of recorded ground motions, (2) supporting research projects to provide constraints on the selected functional forms of the ground motion models, and (3) interactions throughout the development process to provide input and reviews from both the scientific research community and the engineering user community. An overview of the PEER NGA Project components, process, and products is presented in Power et al. (2006). The PEER NGA database is available at http://peer.berkeley.edu/nga/index.html.

Under the auspices of the PEER NGA Project, updated empirical ground motion models were developed for shallow crustal earthquakes for use in the western United States through a comprehensive and highly interactive research program that involved the following components: (1) development of separate sets of ground motion models by five teams (the “developers”); (2) development of an updated and expanded PEER ground motion database to provide the recorded ground motion data and the supporting metadata on the causative earthquakes, source-to-site travel paths, and local site conditions needed by the developers for their empirical regression
analyses; (3) a number of supporting research projects, including theoretical simulations of rock motions, soil site response, and basin response, to provide an improved scientific basis for evaluating functional forms and determining constraints on the ground motion models; and (4) a series of workshops, working group meetings, developer meetings, and external review that provided input into and review of the project results by both the scientific research community and the engineering user community.

1.2 OBJECTIVES OF THE PEER NGA PROJECT


To meet the needs of earthquake engineering design practice, all NGA models were required to be applicable to the following conditions (Power et al., 2006): (1) they should include the ground motion parameters of peak ground acceleration, velocity, and displacement (PGA, PGV, PGD) and 5%-damped elastic pseudo-absolute response spectral acceleration (PSA) for a minimum set of periods ranging from 0–10 s; (2) they should model the average horizontal motion as well as motions in the strike-normal (SN) and strike-parallel (SP) directions, although this latter requirement was eventually postponed to a later phase of the project; (3) they should be valid for shallow crustal earthquakes with strike-slip, reverse, and normal mechanisms in the western United States; (4) they should be valid for moment magnitudes ranging from 5.0–8.5; (5) they should be valid for distances ranging from 0–200 km; and (6) they should incorporate a commonly used site classification scheme, such as that defined in the National Earthquake Hazard Reduction Program (NEHRP) (e.g., BSSC, 2004).

The main technical issues that were addressed in the NGA model development and supporting research included: (1) rupture-directivity effects, although this was eventually postponed to a later phase of the project; (2) the effects of polarization of near-field motion in
terms of strike-normal and strike-parallel effects, although this too was eventually postponed to a later phase of the project; (3) footwall and hanging-wall effects for dipping faults; (4) style-of-faulting effects, including strike-slip, reverse, and normal mechanisms; (5) depth of faulting, especially potential differences between buried and surface rupture; (6) source effects, such as static stress drop, rupture area, and aspect ratio; (6) site amplification effects relative to a reference “rock” site condition; (7) 3-D sedimentary basin amplification effects; (8) uncertainties in predictor variables; (9) treatment of missing values of predictor variables; and (10) dependencies of standard errors on magnitude, distance, and soil type.

The remainder of this report summarizes the development of the Campbell-Bozorgnia NGA empirical ground motion model (EGMM), hereafter referred to as the CB-NGA model.
2 Strong Motion Database

The database used for this study was a subset of the PEER strong motion database that was updated as part of the PEER NGA Project. This database can be downloaded from the PEER website at http://peer.berkeley.edu/nga/index.html. The database includes strong motion recordings intended to represent free-field site conditions (e.g., large buildings were excluded). However, we applied additional criteria for deciding whether a recording should be used. For example, recordings from this database were used if they met the following general criteria: (1) the earthquake was within the shallow continental lithosphere (crust) in a region considered to be tectonically active; (2) the recording was at or near ground level with no known embedment effects; (3) the earthquake had enough recordings to reliably represent the mean ground motion, although this criterion was relaxed for larger earthquakes in order to retain these important recordings; and (4) the earthquake or recording was considered to be reliable (see below for earthquakes and recordings that were excluded because of reliability issues).

To ensure that the ground motion predictions represented as closely as possible the above criteria, for purposes of our analysis we excluded from the PEER database: (1) recordings having only one horizontal component or only a vertical component, which precluded us from calculating the geometric mean of the two horizontal components; (2) recording sites having no measured or estimated 30-m shear-wave velocity, which precluded us from modeling shallow site effects; (3) earthquakes having no rake angle, focal mechanism, or plunge (dip) of the maximum compressive stress ($P$) and minimum compressive stress ($T$) axes, which precluded us from modeling style-of-faulting effects; (4) earthquakes having the hypocenter or a significant amount of the fault rupture located in the lower crust, in an oceanic plate, or in a stable continental region, which was not consistent with the desired tectonic regime; (5) the Lamont Doherty Geologic Observatory recordings from the 1999 Düzce, Turkey, earthquake, which we considered to be unreliable because of their very unusual spectral shapes; (6) recordings from
instruments designated quality “D” from the 1999 Chi-Chi, Taiwan, earthquake according to the quality designation of Lee et al. (2001), which we considered to be unreliable because of their poor quality; (7) an aftershock located in the immediate vicinity of the inferred main-shock rupture plane, which we considered potentially to have below-average stress drops, but not an event “triggered” by the main shock (e.g., the 1992 Big Bear earthquake), which we considered to have a similar stress regime as the main shock; (8) an earthquake considered to be poorly recorded, which we defined as an earthquake with (a) $M < 5.0$ and $N < 5$, (b) $5.0 \leq M < 6.0$ and $N < 3$, or (c) $6.0 \leq M < 7.0$, $R_{rup} > 60$ km and $N < 2$, where $M$ is moment magnitude and $N$ is the number of recordings (note that singly recorded earthquakes with $M \geq 7.0$ and $R_{rup} \leq 60$ km were retained because of their significance); (9) a recording site considered not representative of free-field conditions, which we defined as an instrument located (a) in the basement of a building, (b) below the ground surface, or (c) on a dam, except an abutment, other than the Pacoima Dam upper-left abutment which has well-documented topographic effects; and (10) recordings from the Tarzana Cedar Hill Nursery, which has been shown to exhibit strong topographic effects.

A list of the selected earthquakes and recording sites used in the development of the CB-NGA model is given in Appendix A. This list contains 1561 recordings from 64 earthquakes. The distribution of the recordings with respect to magnitude and distance is shown in Figure 2.1.
Fig. 2.1 Distribution of recordings with respect to earthquake magnitude and rupture distance.
3 Ground Motion Model

The functional forms used to develop the CB-NGA model were developed or confirmed using classical data exploration techniques, such as analysis of residuals. Candidate functional forms were developed or selected through numerous iterations to capture the observed trends in the recorded ground motion data. The final functional forms included those developed by ourselves, those taken from the literature, those derived from theoretical studies, and those proposed by the other developers during the numerous interaction meetings that were held throughout the PEER NGA Project. Final forms were chosen based on (1) their simplicity, although this was not an overriding factor; (2) their sound seismological basis; (3) their unbiased residuals; and (4) their ability to be extrapolated to values of magnitude, distance, and other predictor variables that are important to engineering applications, such as probabilistic seismic hazard analysis (PSHA).

Item 4 was the most difficult to meet, because the data did not always allow the functional forms of some predictor variables to be developed empirically. For such cases, theoretical constraints were used to define these functional forms based on the supporting studies conducted as part of the PEER NGA Project.

During the development of the functional forms, the regression analysis was performed in two stages using a subset of oscillator periods and the two-step regression procedure of Boore et al. (1993) and Joyner and Boore (1993) except that each step used nonlinear rather than linear regression analysis. In Stage 1, all of those mathematical terms involving individual recordings (so-called intra-event terms) were fit by the method of nonlinear least squares using all of the selected recordings, in which each earthquake was forced to have a zero mean residual by including an inter-event term, or regression coefficient, for each earthquake. These terms included \( f_{\text{dist}} \), \( f_{\text{hug}} \), \( f_{\text{she}} \), and \( f_{\text{sed}} \) in the CB-NGA model given below. In Stage 2, all of those functional forms involving the earthquake source were fit using the method of weighted least squares and the inter-event terms from Stage 1 as the database, in which each inter-event term
was assigned a weight that was inversely proportional to its variance from Stage 1. These terms included $f_{mag}$ and $f_{fl}$ in the CB-NGA model given below. This two-step analysis allowed us to decouple the intra-event and inter-event terms, which made the regression analysis much more stable and allowed us to independently evaluate and model magnitude-scaling effects at large magnitudes. Once the functional forms of all of the mathematical terms were established, the final regression analysis was performed for the entire range of oscillator periods using random-effects regression analysis (Abrahamson and Youngs, 1992).

3.1 EMPIRICAL GROUND MOTION MODEL

This section summarizes the CB-NGA empirical ground motion model (EGMM). Subsections include the definition of the strong motion parameter used in the model, the functional form of the median ground motion model, the functional form of the aleatory uncertainty model, and the model results.

3.1.1 Strong Motion Parameter

The strong motion component used in the CB-NGA model is not the traditional geometric mean of the two horizontal components that has been used in previous models. Previously, the geometric mean was calculated as the square root of the product (or, alternatively, the mean of the logarithms) of the peak ground motion parameters of the two as-recorded orthogonal horizontal components. This geometric mean, which we refer to as the geometric mean of the as-recorded horizontal component, is dependent on the orientation of the sensors as installed in the field. This means that the ground motion measure could differ for the same 3-D wave field depending on the orientation of the sensors. This dependence on sensor orientation is most pronounced for strongly correlated ground motion, which often occurs at oscillator periods of one second and longer.

The PEER NGA Project opted to use an alternative definition of the ground motion measure that is independent of sensor orientation. It is based on a set of geometric means computed from the as-recorded orthogonal horizontal motions after rotating them through a non-redundant angle of 90° (Boore et al., 2006). A single period-independent rotation is used, in
which the angle is chosen that minimizes the spread of the rotation-dependent geometric means over the usable range of oscillator periods. Period-independence ensures that the proper correlation between spectral ordinates is maintained. There is a distribution of geometric means to choose from using this approach (one for each of the 90 discrete rotation angles). The PEER NGA Project selected the 50th-percentile, or what is called GMRotI50 by Boore et al. (2006), as being the most appropriate for engineering use. We refer to GMRotI50 simply as the geometric mean throughout this report unless it is important to distinguish it from the geometric mean of the as-recorded horizontal components, in which case we refer to it as the geometric mean of the rotated horizontal components.

Boore et al. (2006) used the entire PEER strong motion database to compare the new geometric mean with the old geometric mean and showed that it is systematically larger than the previous one, but only by a small amount (less than 3% on average). We made this same comparison for our selected NGA database and found the two to differ by no more than 2% and generally by less than 1% (see Section 4.1). We also carried out a regression analysis on the as-recorded component of the geometric mean database and found that the regression results were very close to those reported in this chapter (Bozorgnia et al., 2006). The theoretical advantage of the new measure is that it removes sensor orientation as a contributor to aleatory uncertainty. Instead, this latter component of uncertainty is explicitly added back when an estimate of the arbitrary horizontal component (Baker and Cornell, 2006), or what some refer to as the randomly oriented horizontal component, of ground motion is required (see Sections 3.4.1 and 4.1).

The strong motion parameters addressed in this study are peak ground acceleration (PGA), peak ground velocity (PGV), peak ground displacement (PGD), and 5%-damped elastic pseudo-absolute acceleration response spectra (PSA) at 21 oscillator periods ranging from 0.01–10.0 s. The specific oscillator periods included in the CB-NGA model are 0.01, 0.02, 0.03, 0.05, 0.075, 0.1, 0.15, 0.2, 0.25, 0.3, 0.4, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0, 1.5, 2.0, 3.0, 4.0, 5.0, 7.5, and 10.0 s.

### 3.1.2 Median Ground Motion Model

The CB-NGA median ground motion model is given by the general equation

\[
\ln \hat{Y} = f_{\text{mag}} + f_{\text{dis}} + f_{\text{flt}} + f_{\text{mag}} + f_{\text{site}} + f_{\text{sed}}
\]  

(3.1)

where the magnitude term is given by
\[ f_{\text{mag}} = \begin{cases} 
 c_0 + c_1 M; & M \leq 5.5 \\
 c_0 + c_1 M + c_2 (M - 5.5); & 5.5 < M \leq 6.5, \\
 c_0 + c_1 M + c_2 (M - 5.5) + c_3 (M - 6.5); & M > 6.5 
\end{cases} \]

The distance term is given by
\[ f'_{\text{dis}} = (c_4 + c_5 M) \ln \left( \sqrt{R^2_{\text{rup}} + c^2_{\text{rup}}} \right), \]

The style-of-faulting term is given by
\[ f_{\text{fl}} = c_7 F_{\text{rup}} f_{\text{fl},Z} + c_9 F_{\text{NM}}, \]

The hanging-wall term is given by
\[ f_{\text{hung}} = c_9 f_{\text{hung},R} f_{\text{hung},M} f_{\text{hung},Z} f_{\text{hung},\delta}, \]

\[ f_{\text{hung},R} = \begin{cases} 
 1; & R_{\text{JB}} = 0 \\
 \max \left( R_{\text{rup}}, \sqrt{R^2_{\text{rup}} + 1} - R_{\text{JB}} \right) / \max \left( R_{\text{rup}}, \sqrt{R^2_{\text{rup}} + 1} \right); & R_{\text{JB}} > 0, Z_{\text{TOR}} < 1, \\
 \left( R_{\text{rup}} - R_{\text{JB}} \right) / R_{\text{rup}}; & R_{\text{JB}} > 0, Z_{\text{TOR}} \geq 1
\end{cases} \]

\[ f_{\text{hung},M} = \begin{cases} 
 0; & M \leq 6.0 \\
 2 (M - 6.0); & 6.0 < M < 6.5, \\
 1; & M \geq 6.5
\end{cases} \]

\[ f_{\text{hung},Z} = \begin{cases} 
 0; & Z_{\text{TOR}} \geq 20 \\
 (20 - Z_{\text{TOR}}) / 20; & 0 \leq Z_{\text{TOR}} < 20
\end{cases} \]

\[ f_{\text{hung},\delta} = \begin{cases} 
 1; & \delta \leq 70 \\
 (90 - \delta) / 20; & \delta > 70
\end{cases} \]

The shallow site response term is given by
\[
\begin{align*}
\ln Y &= c_{10} \ln \left( \frac{V_{S30}}{k_1} \right) + k_2 \left\{ \ln \left[ A_{1100} + c \left( \frac{V_{S30}}{k_1} \right)^n \right] - \ln [A_{1100} + c] \right\}; \quad V_{S30} < k_1 \\
 f_{site} &= (c_{10} + k_2 n) \ln \left( \frac{V_{S30}}{k_1} \right); \quad k_1 \leq V_{S30} < 1100 , (3.11) \\
 f_{sed} &= \begin{cases} \\
 c_{11} (Z_{2.5} - 1); & Z_{2.5} < 1 \\
 0; & 1 \leq Z_{2.5} \leq 3. \\
 c_{12} k_3 e^{-0.75 \left[ 1 - e^{-0.25 (Z_{2.5} - 3)} \right]}; & Z_{2.5} > 3.
\end{cases}
\end{align*}
\]

and the deep site response term is given by

In the above equations, $\ln Y$ is the natural logarithm of the median value of PGA (g), PGV (cm/s), PGD (cm), or PSA (g) defined in terms of the new geometric mean measure GMRotI50; $M$ is moment magnitude; $R_{RUP}$ (km) is closest distance to the coseismic rupture plane; $R_{JB}$ (km) is closest distance to the surface projection of the coseismic rupture plane (so-called Joyner-Boore distance); $F_{RV}$ is an indicator variable representing reverse and reverse-oblique faulting, where $F_{RV} = 1$ for $30^\circ < \lambda < 150^\circ$ and $F_{RV} = 0$ otherwise, and $\lambda$ is rake angle, defined as the average angle of slip measured in the plane of rupture between the strike direction and the slip vector (e.g., Lay and Wallace, 1995); $F_{NM}$ is an indicator variable representing normal and normal-oblique faulting, where $F_{NM} = 1$ for $-150^\circ < \lambda < -30^\circ$ and $F_{NM} = 0$ otherwise; $Z_{TOR}$ (km) is depth to the top of the coseismic rupture plane; $\delta$ ($^\circ$) is average dip of the rupture plane; $V_{S30}$ (m/s) is average shear-wave velocity in the top 30 m of the site profile; $A_{1100}$ (g) is the value of PGA on rock with $V_{S30} = 1100$ m/s; $Z_{2.5}$ (km) is depth to the 2.5 km/s shear-wave velocity horizon (sediment depth); $c = 1.88$ and $n = 1.18$ are period-independent, theoretically constrained model coefficients; $k_i$ are period-dependent, theoretically constrained model coefficients; and $c_i$ are empirically derived model coefficients.

### 3.1.3 Aleatory Uncertainty Model

The CB-NGA aleatory uncertainty model is given by the general random effects equation

\[
\ln \hat{Y}_{ij} = \ln \hat{\bar{Y}}_{ij} + \eta_i + \epsilon_{ij} \quad (3.13)
\]
where $\eta_i$ is the random effect (otherwise known as the inter-event variation or source term) for the $i$th earthquake, and $\ln Y_i$, $\ln Y_j$ and $\varepsilon_{ij}$ are the median estimate, the observed value, and the intra-event variation of the $j$th recording for the $i$th earthquake, respectively. The $\eta_i$ and $\varepsilon_{ij}$ are assumed to be independent normally distributed variates with variances $\tau^2$ and $\sigma^2$.

In order to evaluate the validity of our median ground motion model, it is useful to relate $\eta_i$ and $\varepsilon_{ij}$ to the total model residual, defined as the difference between the observed and predicted value of $\ln Y$. Given this definition of a residual, the total model residual from Equation (3.13) is calculated as

$$r_y = \eta_i + \varepsilon_{ij} = \ln Y_i - \ln \bar{Y}_j$$

(3.14)

from which the inter-event and intra-event residuals are defined by the equations (Abrahamson and Youngs, 1992)

$$r_i^{[\text{inter}]} = \eta_i = \frac{\tau^2 \sum_{j=1}^{N_i} r_{ij}}{N_i \tau^2 + \sigma^2}$$

(3.15)

$$r_i^{[\text{intra}]} = \varepsilon_{ij} = r_{ij} - r_i^{[\text{inter}]}$$

(3.16)

where $N_i$ is the number of recordings of the $i$th earthquake. Note that in the random effects model, the proportion of the total residual that is attributed to an event is given by the ratio $\tau^2/(N_i \tau^2 + \sigma^2)$.

In this section we present an alternative formulation to the calculation of aleatory uncertainty that arises from the explicit incorporation of nonlinear site effects in the median ground motion model (Abrahamson and Silva, 2007). As rock PGA increases, the nonlinear behavior of relatively soft sites (i.e., sites with $V_{530} < k_i$ in the CB-NGA model) will cause a diminution in site response at short periods, which can actually result in de-amplification in some cases. As rock PGA decreases, the more linear behavior of these soft sites will cause an increase in site response. This self-compensating behavior reduces the variability of PGA and short-period PSA on soft sites that are subjected to relatively large ground motion as compared to hard sites or to soft sites that are subjected to relatively low ground motion. These effects are especially significant for NEHRP site classes D and E.

The total aleatory standard deviation of the geometric mean is given by the equation

$$\sigma_r = \sqrt{\sigma^2 + \tau^2}$$

(3.17)
The intra-event and inter-event variances in Equation (3.17) are defined by the relationships

\[ \sigma^2 = \sigma^2_{\ln Y} + \alpha^2 \sigma^2_{\ln A_{100}} + 2\alpha \rho \sigma_{\ln Y} \sigma_{\ln A_{100}} \]  
\[ \tau^2 = \tau^2_{\ln Y} + \alpha^2 \tau^2_{\ln A_{100}} + 2\alpha \rho \tau_{\ln Y} \tau_{\ln A_{100}} \]  

where \( \sigma_{\ln Y} \) and \( \sigma_{\ln A_{100}} \) are the intra-event standard deviations of \( \ln Y \) and \( \ln A_{100} \) (ln PGA) from the regression analysis (i.e., the standard errors of regression), \( \tau_{\ln Y} \) and \( \tau_{\ln A_{100}} \) are the inter-event standard deviations of \( \ln Y \) and \( \ln A_{100} \) from the regression analysis; \( \sigma_{\ln Y_0} \) is the intra-event standard deviation of \( \ln Y \) on rock \( (V_{S30} = 1100 \text{ m/s}) \) at the base of the site profile; \( \sigma_{\ln A_{100}} \) is the intra-event standard deviation of \( \ln A_{100} \) at the base of the site profile; \( \rho_\sigma \) and \( \rho_\tau \) are the correlation coefficients between the intra-event and inter-event residuals of \( \ln Y \) and \( \ln A_{100} \); and \( \alpha \) is the rate of change (modeled correlation) between the shallow site response term \( f_{\text{site}} \) and \( \ln A_{100} \). For all intents and purposes, \( \sigma_{\ln Y}, \sigma_{\ln A_{100}}, \tau_{\ln Y} \) and \( \tau_{\ln A_{100}} \) can be assumed to represent the aleatory uncertainty in the linear site response of ground motion because of the dominance of such recordings in the database.

The intra-event variances of \( \ln Y \) and \( \ln A_{100} \) at the base of the site profile are given by the equations

\[ \sigma^2_{\ln Y_0} = \sigma^2_{\ln Y} - \sigma^2_{\ln A_{100}} \]  
\[ \sigma^2_{\ln A_{100}} = \sigma^2_{\ln A_{100}} - \sigma^2_{\ln A_{100}} \]

where \( \sigma_{\ln A_{100}} \) is the standard deviation of the linear part of the shallow site response term \( f_{\text{site}} \). According to W. Silva (personal communication, 2007), \( \sigma_{\ln A_{100}} = 0.3 \) for all oscillator periods, based on the site response analyses reported by Silva (2005). The inter-event variances of \( \ln Y \) and \( \ln A_{100} \) are not reduced by the value of \( \sigma^2_{\ln A_{100}} \), since this latter variance is considered to represent only intra-event aleatory uncertainty in the properties of the shallow site profile.

The rate of change (modeled correlation) between the shallow site response term and rock PGA is given by the partial derivative

\[ \alpha = \frac{\partial f_{\text{site}}}{\partial \ln A_{100}} = \begin{cases} k_2 A_{100} \left[ \left( \frac{V_{S30}}{k_1} \right)^n - 1 \right] - \left[ A_{100} + c \right]^{-1} & V_{S30} < k_1 \\ 0 & V_{S30} \geq k_1 \end{cases} \]  

Choi and Stewart (2005) also found a dependence of the intra-event standard deviation on \( V_{S30} \). They found that softer sites tended to have lower standard deviations than stiffer sites.
Since these authors did not include ground motion amplitude as a parameter in their aleatory uncertainty model, the difference in the standard deviations that they found might be due, at least in part, to the nonlinear site effects embodied in Equations (3.18) to (3.22). We investigated this by binning our intra-event residuals into $V_{S30}$ ranges representing NEHRP site classes C ($V_{S30} = 360 – 760$ m/s) and D ($V_{S30} = 180 – 360$ m/s) and by performing a hypothesis test to see if the differences in the mean residuals for PGA and PSA at periods of 0.2, 1.0, and 3.0 s were statistically significant. We found that the mean residuals for each of the velocity bins were not significantly different from zero (no bias) and that the residual standard deviations of each of the bins were within about 0.03 of each other (an insignificant difference). Therefore, we did not find it necessary to make the standard deviations of the linear ground motion predictions dependent on the value of $V_{S30}$.

We did find both a slight positive bias in the mean residuals and a larger difference in the residual standard deviations between bins when we included only those sites with measured values of $V_{S30}$. The differences in the standard deviations were generally consistent with the results of Choi and Stewart (2005), who only used sites with measured values of $V_{S30}$. The bias in the mean residuals suggests that ground motion amplitudes might be underpredicted by the CB-NGA model by as much as 10% at some oscillator periods. However, further study is needed before we would recommend adjusting our model for possible differences in the predicted amplitudes of ground motion between sites with estimated and measured values of $V_{S30}$, particularly since there is likely to be a correlation between sites with measured shear-wave velocities and recordings with relatively high levels of ground motion, due to the engineering significance of such recordings.

It is important to note that intra-event and inter-event standard deviations were not found to be a significant function of magnitude as has been the case in many past studies. The previously observed dependence of aleatory variability on magnitude by us (Campbell and Bozorgnia, 1994, 2003a, 2003b, 2003c, 2004) and other researchers might largely have been an artifact of the use of poorly recorded events near the upper- and lower-magnitude limits of the data range. The larger number of events and high-quality recordings for both small- and large-magnitude earthquakes in the present study has allowed us to adopt more restrictive selection criteria, especially with respect to the minimum number of recordings for small-magnitude earthquakes, which has significantly improved the analysis and reduced the inter-event and intra-
event variability of these events. The increase in the number of well-recorded earthquakes at large magnitudes has resulted in a better, albeit somewhat increased, estimate of intra-event variability for such events. Our findings are consistent with those of Choi and Stewart (2005) who, in a careful investigation of the residuals of several empirical ground motion models, did not find compelling evidence for either a magnitude-dependent or distant-dependent inter-event or intra-event standard deviation, once the dependence on $V_{530}$ was taken into account.

The relatively large variability of ground motion close to the 2004 (M 6.0) Parkfield earthquake led Shakal et al. (2006) to suggest that a distance-dependent standard deviation may be important to consider when predicting ground motion close to faults. The PGA from this earthquake within a few kilometers of the surface trace of the causative fault ranged from around 0.13g to over 1.8g, depending on where the recording was located. Upon further investigation, we found that the standard deviation associated with the Parkfield recordings, although larger at close distances, was not larger than that predicted by the CB-NGA model and, therefore, we do not believe that this uncertainty should be increased at short distances. What is evident from the Parkfield earthquake is that the recordings that were located within the relatively wide San Andreas fault zone had very low accelerations and velocities compared to those located just outside of this zone. Pitarka et al. (2006) attributed this to the relatively low shear-wave velocity and relatively high attenuation in the fault gouge within this zone.

### 3.1.4 Regression Results

The median ground motion model coefficients determined in this study for PGA, PGV, PGD, and PSA at the 21 oscillator periods ranging from 0.01–10.0 s are listed in Table 3.1. The aleatory standard deviations and correlation coefficients are listed in Table 3.2. Note that the constants $c = 1.88$ and $n = 1.18$ are the same for all oscillator periods, as indicated in the footnote to Table 3.1. Also note that there are some combinations of parameter values for which the calculated value of PSA at $T < 0.2$ s falls below the value of PSA at $T = 0.01$ s (PGA). Since this is an artifact of the regression analysis and is not physically possible given the definition of pseudo-absolute acceleration, the calculated value of PSA should be set equal to the value of PSA at $T = 0.01$ s when this situation occurs.
3.2 JUSTIFICATION OF FUNCTIONAL FORMS

This section presents justification for the selected functional forms in the median ground motion model. Subsections include a discussion of the magnitude term, the distance term, the style-of-faulting term, the hanging-wall term, the shallow site response term, and the deep site response term. Plots of residuals versus each of the predictor variables included in the model are used to confirm the validity of each of these terms. Plots are shown for PGA, PGV, and PSA at periods of 0.2, 1.0, 3.0, and 10.0 s. Note that a positive residual indicates underprediction by our model and a negative residual indicates overprediction by our model.

3.2.1 Magnitude Term

The trilinear functional form used to model $f_{mag}$ was derived from an analysis of residuals. This functional form was used to model the observed decrease in the degree of magnitude scaling with increasing magnitude at short distances, commonly known as saturation (Campbell, 1981), using a piecewise linear function rather than the more commonly used quadratic function. The piecewise linear scaling model for $M > 6.5$ allows greater control of large-magnitude scaling and, unlike the quadratic scaling model, decouples this scaling from that of smaller magnitudes, allowing more flexibility in determining how ground motions scale with the size of an earthquake. Stochastic simulations demonstrated that the trilinear model was able to fit the magnitude-scaling characteristics of ground motion just as well as the quadratic model over the magnitude range of interest in this study.

The regression analysis using the trilinear magnitude term produced a tendency for oversaturation at the shorter periods of ground motion for large magnitudes and short distances. This behavior, which had been noted in previous studies, but not considered to be reliable, was reinforced by some recent well-recorded large-magnitude earthquakes, including the 1999 (M 7.5) Kocaeli earthquake in Turkey, the 1999 (M 7.6) Chi-Chi earthquake in Taiwan, and the 2002 (M 7.9) Denali earthquake in Alaska. Although some seismologists believe that such a reduction in short-period ground motion is possible for very large earthquakes (e.g., Schmiedes and Archuleta, 2007), this behavior was not found to be statistically significant because of the limited number of near-source recordings from large earthquakes.
Other functional forms were either found to be too difficult to constrain empirically (e.g., the hyperbolic tangent function used by Campbell, 1997, 2000, 2001) or could not be reliably extrapolated to magnitudes as large as $M_{\text{8.5}}$ (e.g., the quadratic function used by many other investigators) as required by the PEER NGA Project. It is interesting to note that in our previous spectral acceleration model (Campbell and Bozorgnia, 2003a, 2003b, 2003c, 2004), we found it necessary to force magnitude saturation at all periods in order to make the regression analysis converge. In the CB-NGA model, this constraint was not necessary nor was it warranted at moderate-to-long periods.

During review of the NGA models, one of the reviewers was concerned that many of the large earthquakes in the PEER database had ground motions that were biased low because of a potentially biased distribution of recordings with respect to tectonic environment, source-site azimuth, and the location of large asperities. He did, however, support the notion that short-period ground motion should “saturate” with magnitude near the fault. This was later verified by Frankel (2007) using broadband ground motion simulations of extended fault sources. Halldorsson and Papageorgiou (2005) also found a breakdown in self-similar magnitude scaling of high-frequency ground motion from worldwide “interplate” earthquakes above $M_{\text{6.3}}$, which caused them to add a parameter to significantly decrease high-frequency magnitude scaling at large magnitudes in their specific barrier model. They attributed this deviation to a decrease in “effective” source area and/or irregularities in the rupture kinematics. This supports the Hanks and Bakun (2002) finding that the rupture area of shallow continental earthquakes is less dependent on magnitude above about $M_{\text{6.7}}$, which they attributed to a breakdown in self-similar magnitude scaling after coseismic rupture extends the full width of the seismogenic zone, consistent with the $L$ (length) rupture model of Scholz (1982). Douglas (2002) also found empirical evidence in support of the $L$-model’s inferred near-source magnitude-scaling characteristics for PGA and PGV. Schmedes and Archuleta (2007) used kinematic ground motion simulations of a strike-slip fault with large aspect ratio (length/width) to show that PGV increases to a maximum at a critical epicentral distance and then decreases to an asymptotic level beyond a critical distance along the fault related to the rupture width. Di Toro et al. (2006) gave a possible physical reason for a breakdown in self similarity. They concluded from investigations of exhumed faults and from laboratory experiments in granitoids (tonalities) that dynamic shear resistance becomes low at 10 km depths when coseismic slip exceeds around 1 m
due to friction-induced melting on the fault surface. According to Wells and Coppersmith (1994), 1 m of displacement corresponds to an earthquake of approximately $M_{6.7-6.9}$.

The observations noted above could possibly be interpreted as possible evidence for oversaturation of ground motion with magnitude. However, considering the weak statistical evidence for oversaturation in our analyses, the general support of the USGS and other seismologists that short-period ground motion can saturate, and the lack of scientific consensus in support of oversaturation, we conservatively decided to constrain $f_{\text{mag}}$ to remain constant (i.e., saturate) at $M > 6.5$ and $R_{\text{rup}} = 0$ when oversaturation was predicted by the regression analysis. This constraint was equivalent to setting $c_3 = -c_1 - c_2 - c_5 \ln(c_6)$ in Equation (3.2).

Jack Boatwright of the USGS (written communication, 2005) developed a simple seismological model that showed that the far-field magnitude-scaling coefficient of $\log\text{PGA}$ and $\log \text{SA}$ at short periods for earthquakes of $M > 6.7$, where ground motion can be expected to saturate with magnitude at close distances, should be less than about $0.38 \Delta M$. Converting our large-magnitude-scaling coefficient ($c_3$) from a natural to a common logarithm, we get a far-field ($R_{\text{rup}} = 200$ km) magnitude-scaling coefficient of about $0.25 \Delta M$ for $\log\text{PGA}$ and $\log \text{SA}$ at $T = 0.2$ s, where our model saturates. Our model does not predict near-source magnitude saturation at moderate-to-long spectral periods, but if we assume saturation, we get a far-field magnitude-scaling coefficient of about $0.29 \Delta M$ for $\log \text{SA}$ at $T = 1.0$ and $3.0$ s, very similar to that at shorter periods. All of these magnitude-scaling coefficients satisfy the upper-bound threshold suggested from Boatwright’s simple seismological model. Figures 3.1 and 3.2 show the dependence of inter-event and intra-event residuals on magnitude. In these and all subsequent figures, plots labeled SA refer to the pseudo-absolute acceleration parameter PSA.

### 3.2.2 Distance Term

Our previous model (Campbell and Bozorgnia, 1994, 2003a, 2003b, 2003c, 2004), which was developed for distances of 60 km and less, had a constant rate of attenuation with magnitude. Since the PEER NGA Project required that the ground motion predictions be valid to distances of 200 km, we found it was important to add a magnitude-dependent geometrical attenuation term to $f_{\text{dis}}$, similar to that used by Abrahamson and Silva (1997), in order to fit both small- and large-magnitude recordings. Another advantage of the Abrahamson-Silva functional form over
our old functional form is that it transfers the magnitude-dependent attenuation term from inside the square-root term in Equation (3.3) to outside this term, which made the nonlinear regression analysis more stable.

Jack Boatwright of the USGS (written communication, 2005) developed a simple seismological model that showed that the magnitude-dependent geometrical attenuation coefficient ($c_5$) should be less than 0.17. We obtained a value close to this in our regression analysis, but the coefficient varied randomly with period. As a result, we chose to set $c_5 = 0.17$ in our final model. The magnitude-independent rate of attenuation predicted by $f_{dis}$, represented by the coefficient $c_4$ in the CB-NGA model, includes the effects of anelastic as well as geometrical attenuation. For this reason, we predict higher overall geometrical attenuation rates than the values of $-1$ for a point-source (M 5.0) and $-0.5$ for an infinitely long fault (M 8.0) predicted by Boatwright’s simple seismological model. For these same magnitudes, we get values of about $-1.3$ and $-0.8$ for PGA and PSA at $T = 0.2$ s and $-1.2$ and $-0.6$ for PSA at $T = 1.0$ and $3.0$ s, which, as expected, are consistently higher than the theoretical values for geometrical attenuation alone.

Frankel (2007) used broadband ground-motion simulations of extended fault sources to show that the distance decay of response spectral ordinates was consistent with the functional form of the CB-NGA model for magnitudes of 6.5 and 7.5 and distances ranging from about 2–100 km. Figure 3.3 shows the dependence of intra-event residuals on distance.

### 3.2.3 Style-of-Faulting Term

The functional form used to model $f_{ft}$ was determined from an analysis of residuals. It introduces a new parameter ($Z_{TOR}$) that represents whether or not coseismic rupture extends to the surface. This new parameter was found to be important for modeling reverse-faulting events. Ground motions were found to be significantly higher for reverse faults when rupture did not propagate to the surface no matter whether this rupture was on a blind thrust fault or on a fault with previous surface rupture. When rupture broke to the surface or to very shallow depths, ground motions for reverse faults were found to be comparable on average to those for strike-slip faults. Some strike-slip ruptures with partial or weak surface expression also appeared to have higher-than-average ground motions (e.g., the 1995 Kobe, Japan, earthquake), but there were
many counter examples in the database. Some of these discrepancies could be due to the ambiguity in identifying coseismic surface rupture for strike-slip events. As a result, we decided that additional study would be needed to resolve these discrepancies before it was possible to consider $Z_{TOR}$ as a parameter for strike-slip faulting.

Somerville and Pitarka (2006) give both empirical and theoretical evidence to support their conclusions that ground motions from earthquakes that break the ground surface are weaker than those from buried events. Dynamic rupture simulations show that if a weak zone exists at shallow depths, rupture of the shallow part of the fault will be controlled by velocity strengthening, with larger slip weakening distance, larger fracture energy, larger energy absorption from the crack tip, lower rupture velocity, and lower slip velocity than at greater depths on the fault. These properties lead to lower ground motions for surface faulting than for buried faulting. The field and laboratory results of Di Toro et al. (2006) also indicate that this phenomenon might extend to intermediate depths as well due to melting on the fault surface during large coseismic slip. If this were true, we possibly could expect this phenomenon to occur for all earthquakes of large enough slip (about 1 m according to Di Toro et al.). However, this phenomenon is interrelated with magnitude-scaling effects (see Section 3.2.1), so it might be that the presence of a weak shallow layer adds to this effect for surface-rupturing earthquakes.

The model coefficient for normal faulting was found to be only marginally significant at shorter periods, but significant at longer periods. We were concerned that the long-period effects were due to systematic differences in sediment depth, since many of these events occurred in a geological and tectonic environment that might be associated with shallow depths to hard rock (e.g., Italy and Greece). This seems to be corroborated by Ambraseys et al. (2005), who found that strike-slip and normal-faulting ground motions from similar regions in Europe and the Middle East had similar spectral amplitudes at moderate-to-long periods. As a result, we constrained the relatively small normal-faulting factor ($F_{NM}$) found at short periods ($-12\%$) to go to zero at longer periods.

Figure 3.4 shows the dependence of inter-event residuals on depth to top of rupture. Figure 3.5 shows the dependence of inter-event residuals on rake angle, with vertical grey lines showing the model we used for partitioning rake angle in terms of strike-slip (SS), reverse (RV), and normal (NM) faulting mechanisms.
3.2.4 Hanging-Wall Term

The functional form used to model \( f_{\text{hsg}} \) was determined from an analysis of residuals with additional constraints to limit its range of applicability. The functional form for \( f_{\text{hsg},R} \), the term used to model the distance-dependence of \( f_{\text{hsg}} \), is our modified version of the hanging-wall term originally suggested by Chiou and Youngs (2007). In our version, we force hanging-wall effects to have a smooth transition between the hanging wall and the footwall, even at small values of \( Z_{\text{TOR}} \), which avoids an abrupt drop in the predicted ground motion as one crosses the fault trace from the hanging wall to the footwall. The original Chiou-Youngs model only smoothed out the transition from the hanging wall to the footwall when the fault was buried. In its preliminary review of the NGA models for PEER, the USGS pointed out that there is very little data to support such an abrupt drop from the hanging wall to the footwall over what can amount to only a few meters distance, and that providing a smooth transition from the hanging wall to the footwall would allow for some uncertainty in the location of the actual fault trace. We also included the additional terms \( f_{\text{hsg},M} \), \( f_{\text{hsg},Z} \), and \( f_{\text{hsg},\delta} \) to phase out hanging-wall effects at small magnitudes, large rupture depths, and large rupture dips, where the residuals suggested that these effects are either negligible or cannot be resolved with the data.

Unlike our previous model, we have included hanging-wall effects for normal-faulting earthquakes in our current NGA model. Although the statistical evidence for hanging-wall effects for normal faults is weak in our regression analysis, we found that it was consistent with the better-constrained hanging-wall effects for reverse faults. Furthermore, Jim Brune (personal communication, 2006) has noted that hanging-wall effects similar to those for reverse faults have been observed in foam rubber modeling of normal-faulting earthquakes in laboratory experiments and is consistent with the limited amount of precarious rock observations on the hanging wall of normal faults with documented historical and Holocene rupture in the basin and range province of the United States. Also, in a recent study on broadband simulations of ground motion in the basin and range, Collins et al. (2006) found a hanging-wall factor for normal-faulting earthquakes that is similar to the one we found empirically for reverse-faulting earthquakes. It should be noted that, unlike a reverse fault, the hanging wall of a normal fault will typically lie beneath the range front valley where most of the population is located (e.g., Reno, Nevada, and Salt Lake City, Utah).
No single predictor variable can be used to represent the hanging-wall term. Instead, Figure 3.6 shows the dependence of intra-event residuals on the hanging-wall factor. This factor is defined as the product of $f_{\text{hang,}R}$, $f_{\text{hang,}M}$, $f_{\text{hang,}Z}$, and $f_{\text{hang,}d}$ in Equation (3.6).

### 3.2.5 Shallow Site Response Term

The linear part of the functional form used to model $f_{\text{site}}$ is similar to that originally proposed by Boore et al. (1994) and Borcherdt (1994) and later adopted by Boore et al. (1997) and Choi and Stewart (2005), among others. One difference from these earlier studies is that we hold the site term to be constant to the term for $V_{S30} = 1100$ m/s when site velocities are greater than this value. This constraint was imposed based on an analysis of residuals that indicated that ground motion at long periods and high values of $V_{S30}$ were underpredicted when this constraint was not applied. This constraint should have probably been applied at a smaller value of $V_{S30}$ at long periods, but that would have complicated the use of the nonlinear site term (i.e., the limiting value of $V_{S30}$ would have been less than $k_1$ for some oscillator periods). Since there are only a limited number of recordings with site velocities greater than 1100 m/s, we believe that a more refined constraint is unwarranted at this time.

The nonlinear part of the site term was constrained from theoretical studies conducted as part of the PEER NGA Project, since the empirical data were insufficient to constrain the complex nonlinear behavior of the softer soils. After including the linear part of $f_{\text{site}}$ in the model, the residuals clearly exhibited a bias when plotted against rock PGA ($A_{1100}$), consistent with the nonlinear behavior of PGA and PSA at shorter periods. However, because of the relatively small number of recordings, the residuals alone could not be used to determine how this behavior varied with $V_{S30}$, ground motion amplitude, and oscillator period. Instead, a nonlinear site response model developed by Walling and Abrahamson (2006), based on 1-D equivalent-linear site response simulations conducted by Silva (2005), was used to constrain the functional form and the nonlinear model coefficients $k_1$, $k_2$, $n$, and $c$ in Equation (3.11). This approach is supported by Kwok and Stewart (2006) who found that theoretical site factors from 1-D equivalent-linear site response analyses were able to capture the average effects of soil nonlinearity when used in conjunction with empirical ground motion models to estimate a reference rock spectrum.
The linear behavior of the CB-NGA model was calibrated by empirically fitting $c_{10}$ in the regression analysis. This explicit incorporation of nonlinear site effects is believed to be superior to the approach used in our previous models (Campbell and Bozorgnia, 1994, 2003a, 2003b, 2003c, 2004; Campbell, 1997, 2000, 2001), which implicitly modeled these effects by making the near-source attenuation term a function of site conditions.

Walling and Abrahamson (2006) developed two sets of nonlinear model coefficients, one set representing dynamic soil properties (i.e., strain-dependent shear modulus reduction and damping curves) developed by EPRI (1993) and another set representing dynamic soil properties developed by Silva et al. (1999), which they refer to as the peninsular range or PEN curves. Neither our residuals nor the empirical site factors compiled by Power et al. (2004) could distinguish between these two alternative models, although a slightly lower aleatory standard deviation favored the PEN model. On the advice of Walt Silva, we selected the PEN model because it represents a wider range of regional site conditions than the EPRI model.

Figure 3.7 shows the dependence of intra-event residuals on 30-m shear-wave velocity and rock PGA. Vertical lines on this plot show the partitioning of $V_{s30}$ into the five NEHRP site classes (BSSC, 2004). Figure 3.8 shows the dependence of intra-event residuals on rock PGA.

### 3.2.6 Deep Site Response Term

The functional form used to model $f_{sed}$ has two parts: (1) a term to model 3-D basin effects for $Z_{2.5} > 3.0$ km and (2) a term to model shallow-sediment effects for $Z_{2.5} < 1.0$ km. We modeled the basin term from theoretical studies conducted as part of the PEER NGA Project. We modeled the shallow sediment term based on an analysis of residuals. The residuals after including $f_{site}$ clearly indicated that long-period ground motion increased with sediment depth up to around $Z_{2.5} = 1.0$ km, leveled off, then increased again at $Z_{2.5} > 3.0$ km. We surmise that the observed decrease in long-period ground motion for sites with shallow sediment depths might be the result of relatively lower long-period site amplification effects compared to sites with deep sediment depths and the same values of $V_{s30}$. We found that the data were sufficient to empirically constrain this trend.

The trend for $Z_{2.5} > 3.0$ km, which is due presumably to 3-D basin effects, was based on too few data to empirically determine how these effects could be extrapolated with sediment
depth and oscillator period. Instead, this trend was constrained using the sediment depth model developed by Day et al. (2006) for $Z_{1.5}$ and later by Day (personal communication, 2006) for $Z_{2.5}$ from theoretical ground motion simulations of the 3-D response of the Los Angeles, San Gabriel, and San Fernando basins in southern California. These authors also found that ground motions scaled strongly with depth between depths of 1.0 and 3.0 km, whereas we did not find any trend in the residuals over this depth range. We believe that this scaling is apparently accounted for by other parameters in our model (most likely $V_{s30}$). For example, it is below a depth of 3.0 km that we find a strong correlation between $Z_{2.5}$ and $V_{s30}$ in the PEER database. It is also possible that the ground motion simulations are dominated by 1-D effects at depths shallower than about 3.0 km, which are adequately modeled by $f_{site}$.

Day et al.’s model was developed for oscillator periods of 2.0 s and greater, but these authors developed relationships for their model coefficients which allowed us to extrapolate them to shorter periods. In order to remove any bias that this extrapolation might cause, we included an additional model coefficient ($c_{12}$) in Equation (3.12) to empirically adjust the theoretical model coefficient $k_1$ (Day et al.’s $a_2$ coefficient). This additional coefficient was found to increase from about one half for PGA to around unity for PSA at longer periods. Once $c_{12}$ obtained unity in the regression analysis, it was constrained to unity at longer periods. Because the Day et al. model was applied only at large sediment depth, their first term (involving their $a_i$ coefficient) was found to be negligible and was dropped from our deep site response term.

The finite value of $c_{12}$ at short periods causes the CB-NGA model to predict some (albeit weak) amplification at these periods. Although counter-intuitive to many seismologists’ expectations, these results are generally consistent with the empirical results of Campbell (1997, 2000, 2001) and Field (2000), although Campbell did not find any significant amplification at oscillator periods of less than 0.5 s. Figure 3.9 shows the dependence of intra-event residuals on sediment depth.

3.3 TREATMENT OF MISSING VALUES

When predictor variables for selected recordings were missing from the PEER database, they were either estimated or the regression analysis involving the terms that contained those
variables was performed using only those recordings for which the values were available. These recordings were still used in the regression analyses that involved other predictor variables, for which these missing values were not an issue. Sediment depth ($Z_{2.5}$) was the only predictor variable that had missing values and no available estimates to substitute. There were two predictor variables ($R_{RUP}$ and $V_{S30}$) for which missing values were replaced with estimated values. When direct measurements of $V_{S30}$ for California sites were missing, estimates were provided by Wills and Clahan (2005) using statistical relationships between $V_{S30}$ and geologic units. When direct measurements of $V_{S30}$ for Taiwan sites were missing, Brian Chiou (written communication, 2006) provided estimates of $V_{S30}$ using relationships among $V_{S30}$, site elevation, and generalized geologic site categories.

The 1992 (M 6.5) Big Bear earthquake was the only M $\geq$ 6.0 event in our database that was missing values for $R_{RUP}$. In this case, we used the values for $R_{SEIS}$ from our previous model. Because the depth to the top of rupture was around 3.0 km, the two distance measures could be considered equivalent. For those selected events with M < 6.0, we used hypocentral distance as an estimate of $R_{RUP}$ because of their relatively small source dimensions.
Table 3.1 Coefficients for CB-NGA median ground motion model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$T$</th>
<th>$c_0$</th>
<th>$c_1$</th>
<th>$c_2$</th>
<th>$c_3$</th>
<th>$c_4$</th>
<th>$c_5$</th>
<th>$c_6$</th>
<th>$c_7$</th>
<th>$c_8$</th>
<th>$c_9$</th>
<th>$c_{10}$</th>
<th>$c_{11}$</th>
<th>$c_{12}$</th>
<th>$k_1$</th>
<th>$k_2$</th>
<th>$k_3$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-1.715</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>-0.530</td>
<td>-0.262</td>
<td>-2.118</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td>-0.120</td>
<td>0.490</td>
<td>1.058</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.610</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>-1.186</td>
<td>1.839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-1.680</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>-0.530</td>
<td>-0.262</td>
<td>-2.123</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td>-0.120</td>
<td>0.490</td>
<td>1.102</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.610</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>-1.219</td>
<td>1.840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-1.552</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>-0.530</td>
<td>-0.262</td>
<td>-2.145</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td>-0.120</td>
<td>0.490</td>
<td>1.174</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.610</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>-1.273</td>
<td>1.841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-1.209</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>-0.530</td>
<td>-0.267</td>
<td>-2.199</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td>-0.120</td>
<td>0.490</td>
<td>1.272</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.610</td>
<td>1054</td>
<td>-1.346</td>
<td>1.843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>-0.657</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>-0.530</td>
<td>-0.302</td>
<td>-2.277</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>7.09</td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td>-0.120</td>
<td>0.490</td>
<td>1.438</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.610</td>
<td>1086</td>
<td>-1.471</td>
<td>1.845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.314</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>-0.530</td>
<td>-0.324</td>
<td>-2.318</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>8.05</td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td>-0.099</td>
<td>0.490</td>
<td>1.604</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.610</td>
<td>1032</td>
<td>-1.624</td>
<td>1.847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-0.133</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>-0.530</td>
<td>-0.339</td>
<td>-2.309</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>8.79</td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td>-0.048</td>
<td>0.490</td>
<td>1.928</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.610</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>-1.931</td>
<td>1.852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>-0.486</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>-0.446</td>
<td>-0.398</td>
<td>-2.220</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
<td>0.490</td>
<td>2.194</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.610</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>-2.188</td>
<td>1.856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-0.890</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>-0.362</td>
<td>-0.458</td>
<td>-2.146</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>6.58</td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.490</td>
<td>2.351</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.700</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>-2.381</td>
<td>1.861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>-1.171</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>-0.294</td>
<td>-0.511</td>
<td>-2.095</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.490</td>
<td>2.460</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.750</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>-2.518</td>
<td>1.865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>-1.466</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>-0.186</td>
<td>-0.592</td>
<td>-2.066</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.490</td>
<td>2.587</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.850</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>-2.657</td>
<td>1.874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-2.569</td>
<td>0.656</td>
<td>-0.304</td>
<td>-0.536</td>
<td>-2.041</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.490</td>
<td>2.544</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.883</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>-2.669</td>
<td>1.883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>-4.844</td>
<td>0.972</td>
<td>-0.578</td>
<td>-0.406</td>
<td>-2.000</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.490</td>
<td>2.133</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>-2.401</td>
<td>1.906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-6.406</td>
<td>1.196</td>
<td>-0.772</td>
<td>-0.314</td>
<td>-2.000</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.490</td>
<td>1.571</td>
<td>0.150</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>-1.955</td>
<td>1.929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-8.692</td>
<td>1.513</td>
<td>-1.046</td>
<td>-0.185</td>
<td>-2.000</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.161</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.490</td>
<td>0.406</td>
<td>0.253</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>-1.025</td>
<td>1.974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>-9.701</td>
<td>1.600</td>
<td>-0.978</td>
<td>-0.236</td>
<td>-2.000</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.371</td>
<td>-0.456</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>-0.299</td>
<td>2.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>-10.556</td>
<td>1.600</td>
<td>-0.638</td>
<td>-0.491</td>
<td>-2.000</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>-0.820</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>-11.212</td>
<td>1.600</td>
<td>-0.316</td>
<td>-0.770</td>
<td>-2.000</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>-11.684</td>
<td>1.600</td>
<td>-0.070</td>
<td>-0.986</td>
<td>-2.000</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>-12.505</td>
<td>1.600</td>
<td>-0.070</td>
<td>-0.656</td>
<td>-2.000</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>-13.087</td>
<td>1.600</td>
<td>-0.070</td>
<td>-0.422</td>
<td>-2.000</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.744</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $c = 1.88$ and $n = 1.18$ for all periods; PGA and PSA have units of g; PGV and PGD have units of cm/s and cm, respectively.
Table 3.2 Standard deviations and correlation coefficients for CB-NGA aleatory uncertainty model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period $T$ (s)</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>$\sigma_T$ for $V_{S30} \geq k_1$</th>
<th>Correlation Coeff.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\sigma_{lnY}$</td>
<td>$\tau_{lnY}$</td>
<td>$\sigma_c$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.478</td>
<td>0.219</td>
<td>0.166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.480</td>
<td>0.219</td>
<td>0.166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.489</td>
<td>0.235</td>
<td>0.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.510</td>
<td>0.258</td>
<td>0.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.520</td>
<td>0.292</td>
<td>0.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.531</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>0.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.532</td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td>0.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.534</td>
<td>0.249</td>
<td>0.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.534</td>
<td>0.240</td>
<td>0.191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.544</td>
<td>0.215</td>
<td>0.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.541</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>0.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.550</td>
<td>0.214</td>
<td>0.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.568</td>
<td>0.227</td>
<td>0.221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.568</td>
<td>0.255</td>
<td>0.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.564</td>
<td>0.296</td>
<td>0.222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.571</td>
<td>0.296</td>
<td>0.226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.558</td>
<td>0.326</td>
<td>0.229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.576</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>0.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.601</td>
<td>0.359</td>
<td>0.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>0.628</td>
<td>0.428</td>
<td>0.271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.667</td>
<td>0.485</td>
<td>0.290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGA</td>
<td>0.478</td>
<td>0.219</td>
<td>0.166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGV</td>
<td>0.484</td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td>0.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGD</td>
<td>0.667</td>
<td>0.485</td>
<td>0.290</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Geometric mean defined as GMRotI50 by Boore et al. (2006).
2 Arbitrary horizontal component of Baker and Cornell (2006); also known as randomly oriented component.
3 See Equations (3.14)–(3.19) for the calculation of $\sigma_T$ for $V_{S30} < k_1$. 
Fig. 3.1 Dependence of inter-event residuals on earthquake magnitude.
Fig. 3.2 Dependence of intra-event residuals on earthquake magnitude.
Fig. 3.3 Dependence of intra-event residuals on rupture distance.
Fig. 3.4 Dependence of inter-event residuals on depth to top of rupture.
Fig. 3.5  Dependence of inter-event residuals on rake angle and style of faulting for strike-slip (SS), normal (NM), and reverse (RV) faults.
Fig. 3.6 Dependence of intra-event residuals on hanging-wall factor.
Fig. 3.7 Dependence of intra-event residuals on 30-m shear-wave velocity.
Fig. 3.8 Dependence of intra-event residuals on rock PGA.
4 Alternative Horizontal Components

During the course of the PEER NGA Project, we had an opportunity to ask several structural engineers what strong motion components besides the geometric mean and the arbitrary horizontal component addressed in Section 3.1.1 would be of interest. In response, they expressed interest in the vertical component and in the horizontal component(s) that could be considered to represent the largest horizontal ground motion. The vertical component will be investigated in a subsequent NGA project and will not be discussed here. However, in order to investigate which horizontal component might correspond to the largest ground motion, we used our selected NGA database, the one we used to develop our NGA model, to analyze several alternative horizontal components in addition to the geometric mean, referred to here as the arbitrary horizontal component, the maximum horizontal component, the maximum rotated horizontal component, and the strike-normal horizontal component. For completeness, we also analyzed the minimum horizontal component and the strike-parallel horizontal component. We also provide statistics between the new geometric mean (GMRotI50) and the geometric mean used in past studies.

4.1 GEOMETRIC MEAN

The definition of the geometric mean used in the PEER NGA Project (GMRotI50) and that used in past studies was discussed in Section 3.1.1. In this section we provide the actual statistics between these two ground motion measures. To determine how the old geometric mean differs from the new geometric mean, we calculated its logarithmic ratio with respect to the new geometric mean and averaged it over all recordings (i.e., over all magnitudes and distances). From this logarithmic ratio we calculated a mean, maximum, minimum, and standard deviation for each oscillator period. The results of this analysis are summarized in Table 4.1. Figure 4.1
shows a plot of these ratios with respect to oscillator period, where the vertical bar represents the median plus and minus one standard deviation.

Table 4.1 shows that the exponential of the mean logarithmic ratio (median ratio) of the old geometric mean is generally constant with oscillator period at a value of about 0.99. The standard deviation in natural log units increases only slightly from 0.07 to 0.11 over this same period range. The median ratio and the standard deviation for PGV is 0.99 and 0.08, respectively. However, the minimum and maximum median ratios for a given period indicate that the difference between these two geometric means can be large for individual recordings. We also carried out an independent regression analysis on the geometric mean of two as-recorded horizontal components as part of a study on inelastic response spectra and found that the median results are very close to the median results on the new geometric mean (GMRotI50) presented in this report (Bozorgnia et al., 2006).

### 4.2 Arbitrary Horizontal Component

We define the arbitrary horizontal component as the expected value of the peak amplitude from the two as-recorded orthogonal horizontal traces (Baker and Cornell, 2006). Although this expected value (taken with respect to its logarithm) is identical to the geometric mean of the as-recorded horizontal components and virtually identical to the geometric mean of the rotated horizontal component (Table 4.1), its standard deviation is not. Baker and Cornell (2006) pointed out that many engineering applications require a probabilistic estimate of the arbitrary horizontal component, not the geometric mean. In such a case, even though no adjustment of the median is required, the larger standard deviation associated with the arbitrary horizontal component will lead to a larger probabilistic estimate of ground motion.

Boore (2005) showed that the aleatory variance of the arbitrary horizontal component, which he called the component-to-component variability, can be calculated from the equation

\[
\sigma_c^2 = \frac{1}{4N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} (\ln Y_{1j} - \ln Y_{2j})^2
\]  

(4.1)

where the subscripts 1 and 2 refer to the two individual horizontal components of the recording from which the geometric mean was calculated, \( j \) is an index representing the recording number, and \( N \) is the total number of recordings. We used this equation to calculate the values of \( \sigma_c \).
associated with the selected NGA database we used to develop our NGA model. These values are summarized in Table 3.2. The total standard deviation corresponding to this component as calculated from Equation (4.3) is also shown in this table for comparison with that of the geometric mean.

4.3 MAXIMUM HORIZONTAL COMPONENT

We define the maximum and minimum horizontal components of ground motion as the largest and smallest peak amplitudes of the two as-recorded orthogonal horizontal acceleration traces. To determine how these components differ from the geometric mean, we calculated their logarithmic ratios with respect to the geometric mean and averaged them over all recordings (i.e., over all magnitudes and distances). From these logarithmic ratios we calculated a mean, maximum, minimum, and standard deviation for each oscillator period. The results of this analysis are summarized in Table 4.2. Figure 4.1 shows a plot of the ratios for the maximum horizontal component with respect to oscillator period, where the vertical bar represents the median plus and minus one standard deviation. As with all of the analyses in this chapter, these calculations were carried out using the selected NGA database we used to develop our NGA model.

Table 4.2 shows that the exponential of the mean logarithmic ratio (median ratio) of the maximum horizontal component generally increases with oscillator period from a value of 1.12 at short periods to 1.23 at long periods. The standard deviation in natural log units generally increases from 0.10 to 0.14 over this same period range. The median ratio and the standard deviation for PGV is 1.15 and 0.12, respectively. The median ratio of the minimum horizontal component generally decreases with period from a value of 0.89 at short periods to 0.78 at long periods. Its standard deviation generally increases from 0.16 to 0.26 over this same period range. The median ratio and standard deviation for PGV is 0.85 and 0.16, respectively. These results are very similar to those found by Beyer and Bommer (2006) using a somewhat different database for oscillator periods ranging up to 5.0 s, the longest period investigated by these authors.
4.4 MAXIMUM ROTATED HORIZONTAL COMPONENT

The maximum rotated horizontal component of ground motion is defined as the largest peak amplitude of a suite of orthogonal horizontal acceleration traces that have been rotated through a non-redundant angle of 90°. This can be considered a worst-case scenario for the peak ground motion averaged over all magnitudes and distances. This component was not available for our NGA database, but considering that our median ratios for the maximum arbitrary horizontal component were very similar to those of Beyer and Bommer (2006), we believe that the ratios for the maximum rotated horizontal component found by these authors can serve as a good representation of the ratios we would expect from our database. Beyer and Bommer calculated the logarithmic ratio of this component with respect to the geometric mean and averaged it over all recordings (i.e., over all magnitudes and distances) as we did for the maximum horizontal component. From these logarithmic ratios, they calculated a mean and standard deviation for each oscillator period. These results are summarized in Table 4.3, where they are compared to our results for the maximum horizontal component from Table 4.1. Figure 4.1 shows a plot of the ratios for the maximum rotated horizontal component with respect to oscillator period, where the vertical bar represents the median plus and minus one standard deviation.

Table 4.3 shows that the median ratio of the maximum rotated horizontal component generally increases with oscillator period from a value of 1.20 at short periods to 1.34 at long periods (in this case to an oscillator period of 5.0 s). The standard deviation in natural log units generally increases from 0.09 to 0.14 over this same period range. While the standard deviations are similar to those found for the maximum horizontal component, the median ratios are found to be as much as 12% larger on average.

4.5 STRIKE-NORMAL HORIZONTAL COMPONENT

The strike-normal (SN) and strike-parallel (SP) horizontal components of ground motion are defined as the peak amplitudes of the two orthogonal horizontal components after rotating them to azimuths that are normal to and parallel to the strike of the rupture plane. To determine how these components differ from the geometric mean, we calculated their logarithmic ratios with respect to the geometric mean and averaged them over all recordings (i.e., over all magnitudes
and distances). From these logarithmic ratios we calculated a mean, maximum, minimum, and standard deviation for each oscillator period. The results are summarized in Table 4.4. Figure 4.1 shows a plot of the ratios for the SN component with respect to oscillator period, where the vertical bar represents the median plus and minus one standard deviation.

Table 4.4 shows that on average the median ratios of the SN and SP components are within a few percent of the geometric mean, except at the longest periods, where the SN component is 5% higher and the SP component is 8% lower than the geometric mean. The standard deviation in natural log units generally increases from 0.15 at short periods to 0.30 at long periods for the SN component and from 0.15 at short periods to 0.37 at long periods for the SP component. These results are similar to those of Beyer and Bommer (2006). The standard deviations at short periods are about the same as those for the minimum horizontal component, but those at long periods are much larger. The biggest difference between these components and the maximum and minimum horizontal components is in their extreme values. At long periods, the largest median ratios reach values as high as 6.9 and 6.1 for the SN and SP components, respectively, whereas the largest ratios for the maximum and minimum horizontal components do not exceed values of 1.8 and 1.3, respectively. The extreme values are relatively constant at around 1.6–1.8 up to an oscillator period of 3.0 s, after which they steadily increase to their maxima at 10.0 s.

The larger dispersion and larger extreme values of the SN and SP components at long periods no doubt reflect the relatively strong azimuthal dependence of these components that results from source directivity. The near unity median ratios for these two components indicates that on average (i.e., averaged over all magnitudes and distances) neither of them show a strong tendency to be the largest horizontal component. However, this changes at small distances, large magnitudes, and long periods where empirical source directivity effects have been shown to become important (e.g., Howard et al., 2005; Spudich et al., 2004; Spudich and Chiou, 2006; Somerville et al., 1997). Rowshandel (2006) also found directivity effects to be important at long periods, but did not investigate their dependence on magnitude and distance. For conditions most conducive to directivity, all of these authors have shown that the long-period SN component of PSA can be more than a factor of two higher than the geometric mean for a site located in the forward-directivity direction.
We investigated the potential impact of magnitude and distance on the SN and SP components in our NGA database by repeating our analysis for earthquakes with $M \geq 6.5$ and recordings with $R_{RUP} < 5$ km, $5 \leq R_{RUP} < 10$ km, $10 \leq R_{RUP} < 20$ km, and $R_{RUP} \geq 20$ km. These results are summarized in Table 4.5. Figure 4.1 shows a plot of the ratios for the SN component ($M \geq 6.5, R_{RUP} < 5$ km) with respect to oscillator period, where the vertical bar represents the median plus and minus one standard deviation. The most significant effects are found for the shortest distance bin, where the median ratio for the SN component generally increases from a value of 1.06 at short periods to 1.24 at long periods and the median ratio for the SP component generally decreases from 0.88 at short periods to 0.67 at long periods. The biggest effect is for oscillator periods greater than 1.0 s. Although these effects are not trivial, they raise the question of why we are not seeing larger ratios. We believe that there are at least three reasons for this: (1) we are not including the potential effects of directivity on the geometric mean ground motion, (2) we include all source-site azimuths and are, therefore, averaging over forward- and backward-directivity directions, which Somerville et al. (1997), Spudich et al. (2004), and Rowshandel (2006) have found to have counteracting effects, and (3) we are combining recordings from strike-slip and reverse earthquakes, whereas Howard et al. (2005) found that maximum forward-directivity effects from reverse faults are not necessarily closely aligned with the SN component. These effects are complicated and require more research. Therefore, the explicit inclusion of directivity effects will be addressed in a future NGA project.

4.6 CALCULATION FROM GEOMETRIC MEAN

There are two adjustments that need to be made to the CB-NGA model in order to use it to estimate one of the alternative strong motion components (designated $Y_{Comp}$) discussed in the previous sections. The first adjustment is to the median model and is given by the equation

$$\ln Y_{Comp} = \hat{Y} + \ln Y_{Comp/GM}$$

(4.2)

where $\ln \hat{Y}$ is the median estimate of the geometric mean from Equation (3.1) and $\ln Y_{Comp/GM}$ is the median estimate of the ratio of $Y_{Comp}$ to the geometric mean given in Table 3.2 and in Tables 4.1–4.4. Note that the median ratio of the arbitrary horizontal component is unity (i.e., $\ln Y_{Comp/GM} = 0$) so that no adjustment is necessary.

The second adjustment is to the aleatory uncertainty model and is given by the equation
\[ \sigma_{\text{Comp}} = \sqrt{\sigma_r^2 + \sigma_{\text{Comp}/GM}^2} \]  

where \( \sigma_r \) is the total standard deviation of the geometric mean given in Equation (3.14) and \( \sigma_{\text{Comp}/GM} \) is the standard deviation of the logarithmic ratio of \( Y_{\text{Comp}} \) to the geometric mean given in Table 3.2 and in Tables 4.1–4.4. The standard deviation of the arbitrary horizontal component \( (\sigma_{\text{Comp}}) \) listed in Table 3.2 was calculated in this manner from Equation (4.3) by setting \( \sigma_{\text{Comp}/GM} = \sigma_c \).
Table 4.1 Ratio between geometric mean of as-recorded horizontal components and new geometric mean averaged over all magnitudes and distances.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period $T$ (s)</th>
<th>Geometric Mean of As-Recorded Horizontal Components</th>
<th>Geometric Mean of As-Recorded Horizontal Components</th>
<th>Geometric Mean of As-Recorded Horizontal Components</th>
<th>Geometric Mean of As-Recorded Horizontal Components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Median$^{(1)}$</td>
<td>Max.</td>
<td>Min.</td>
<td>$\sigma_{Comp}^{(2)}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.988</td>
<td>1.207</td>
<td>0.158</td>
<td>0.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.988</td>
<td>1.177</td>
<td>0.158</td>
<td>0.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.990</td>
<td>1.230</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>0.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.992</td>
<td>1.233</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>0.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.990</td>
<td>1.212</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>0.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.992</td>
<td>1.305</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>0.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.990</td>
<td>1.286</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>0.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.989</td>
<td>1.242</td>
<td>0.155</td>
<td>0.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.989</td>
<td>1.238</td>
<td>0.172</td>
<td>0.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.990</td>
<td>1.348</td>
<td>0.173</td>
<td>0.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.991</td>
<td>1.301</td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td>0.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.985</td>
<td>1.319</td>
<td>0.363</td>
<td>0.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.989</td>
<td>1.350</td>
<td>0.509</td>
<td>0.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.986</td>
<td>1.280</td>
<td>0.663</td>
<td>0.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.988</td>
<td>1.314</td>
<td>0.598</td>
<td>0.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.985</td>
<td>1.237</td>
<td>0.675</td>
<td>0.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.989</td>
<td>1.258</td>
<td>0.524</td>
<td>0.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.989</td>
<td>1.298</td>
<td>0.615</td>
<td>0.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>0.988</td>
<td>1.272</td>
<td>0.560</td>
<td>0.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.981</td>
<td>1.276</td>
<td>0.433</td>
<td>0.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGA</td>
<td>0.988</td>
<td>1.207</td>
<td>0.158</td>
<td>0.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGV</td>
<td>0.988</td>
<td>1.304</td>
<td>0.622</td>
<td>0.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGD</td>
<td>0.981</td>
<td>1.276</td>
<td>0.433</td>
<td>0.107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Median is calculated as the exponential of the mean logarithmic ratio.
2 Standard deviation is calculated with respect to logarithmic ratio in natural log units.
Table 4.2  Ratio between maximum and minimum horizontal components and geometric mean averaged over all magnitudes and distances.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period $T$ (s)</th>
<th>Maximum Horizontal Component</th>
<th>Minimum Horizontal Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Median$^{(1)}$</td>
<td>Max.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>1.117</td>
<td>1.686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>1.118</td>
<td>1.692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>1.116</td>
<td>1.696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>1.114</td>
<td>1.663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>1.113</td>
<td>1.663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>1.117</td>
<td>1.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1.129</td>
<td>1.669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>1.133</td>
<td>1.689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.140</td>
<td>1.813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>1.147</td>
<td>1.734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>1.154</td>
<td>1.865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.160</td>
<td>1.973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.168</td>
<td>1.777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.179</td>
<td>1.720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.174</td>
<td>1.774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.179</td>
<td>1.785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.179</td>
<td>1.738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.193</td>
<td>1.744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.191</td>
<td>1.781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>1.225</td>
<td>1.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1.233</td>
<td>1.770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGA</td>
<td>1.117</td>
<td>1.686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGV</td>
<td>1.145</td>
<td>1.697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGD</td>
<td>1.233</td>
<td>1.770</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^1$ Median is calculated as the exponential of the mean logarithmic ratio.

$^2$ Standard deviation is calculated with respect to logarithmic ratio in natural log units.
Table 4.3 Ratio between maximum horizontal and maximum rotated horizontal components and geometric mean averaged over all magnitudes and distances.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period $T$ (s)</th>
<th>Maximum Horizontal Component</th>
<th>Maximum Rotated Component$^{(1)}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Median$^{(2)}$</td>
<td>$\sigma_{\text{comp}}^{(3)}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>1.117</td>
<td>0.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>1.118</td>
<td>0.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>1.116</td>
<td>0.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>1.114</td>
<td>0.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>1.113</td>
<td>0.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>1.117</td>
<td>0.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1.129</td>
<td>0.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>1.133</td>
<td>0.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.140</td>
<td>0.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>1.147</td>
<td>0.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>1.154</td>
<td>0.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.160</td>
<td>0.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.168</td>
<td>0.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.179</td>
<td>0.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.174</td>
<td>0.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.179</td>
<td>0.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.179</td>
<td>0.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.193</td>
<td>0.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.191</td>
<td>0.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGA</td>
<td>1.117</td>
<td>0.098</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 From Beyer and Bommer (2006).
2 Median is calculated as the exponential of the mean logarithmic ratio.
3 Standard deviation is calculated with respect to logarithmic ratio in natural log units.
Table 4.4 Ratio between strike-normal and strike-parallel horizontal components and geometric mean averaged over all magnitudes and distances.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period ($T$ (s))</th>
<th>Strike-Normal Component</th>
<th>Strike-Parallel Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Median$^{(1)}$</td>
<td>Max.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.980</td>
<td>1.569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.981</td>
<td>1.569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.982</td>
<td>1.572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.983</td>
<td>1.569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.987</td>
<td>1.540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.993</td>
<td>1.584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.990</td>
<td>1.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.992</td>
<td>1.883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.986</td>
<td>1.719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.985</td>
<td>2.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.981</td>
<td>1.699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.974</td>
<td>1.808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.974</td>
<td>1.729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.980</td>
<td>1.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.986</td>
<td>1.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.991</td>
<td>1.738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.965</td>
<td>1.651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.965</td>
<td>2.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.954</td>
<td>3.638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>5.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1.056</td>
<td>6.914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGA</td>
<td>0.980</td>
<td>1.569</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Median is calculated as the exponential of the mean logarithmic ratio.
2 Standard deviation is calculated with respect to logarithmic ratio in natural log units.
Table 4.5 Median ratio between strike-normal and strike-parallel horizontal components and geometric mean for $M \geq 6.5$ and four distance bins.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period $T$</th>
<th>Strike-Normal Component</th>
<th>Strike-Parallel Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0–5</td>
<td>5–10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>1.057</td>
<td>1.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>1.058</td>
<td>1.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>1.071</td>
<td>1.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>1.086</td>
<td>1.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>1.087</td>
<td>1.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>1.053</td>
<td>1.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1.035</td>
<td>1.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>1.061</td>
<td>0.978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.067</td>
<td>1.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>1.068</td>
<td>1.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>1.069</td>
<td>1.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.041</td>
<td>1.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.053</td>
<td>1.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.101</td>
<td>1.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.163</td>
<td>1.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.142</td>
<td>1.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.183</td>
<td>1.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.241</td>
<td>1.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.234</td>
<td>1.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>1.179</td>
<td>1.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1.221</td>
<td>1.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGA</td>
<td>1.057</td>
<td>1.026</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All distances are in kilometers.
Fig. 4.1 Ratios of alternative horizontal components to new geometric mean.
5 Evaluation of Alternative Predictor Variables

The PEER NGA database contains dozens of predictor (independent) variables, many of which have not previously been available to the developers of empirical ground motion models. They were included in the database based on the advice of the NGA Working Groups and the developers. We began our selection process by first selecting parameters that had been found to be important from past studies. These parameters included moment magnitude (M), one or more of the fault distance measures (R_{JB}, R_{RUP}, R_{SEIS}), indicator variables for style of faulting (F_{RV} and F_{NM}), hanging-wall parameters (derived from the distance measures R_{RUP} and R_{JB}), 30-m shear-wave velocity (V_{S30}), and one or more of the sediment depth parameters (Z_{1.0}, Z_{1.5}, Z_{2.5}). We also evaluated and identified several other parameters that had not been used in previous studies, based on an analysis of residuals and the results of similar analyses conducted by the other developers. Based on this evaluation, we selected one additional predictor variable, the depth to the top of coseismic rupture (Z_{TOR}), to include in our model. We also used this evaluation to help select and modify the functional forms used in the CB-NGA model, as discussed in Chapter 3.

5.1 DISTANCE MEASURES

At first we intended to evaluate all three distance measures in order to select which one might be best for modeling near-source attenuation. However, the Campbell distance measure (R_{SEIS}), which had been used in our previous model (Campbell and Bozorgnia, 1994, 2003a, 2003b, 2003c, 2004), was not available for many earthquakes until late in the project. Therefore, in its absence, we selected rupture distance (R_{RUP}) as our preferred distance measure with the intent that we would look at the other distance measures at a latter date. However, because of the time-consuming process of finding appropriate functional forms and in evaluating the relatively large
number of potential predictor variables that were made available to us, we did not have a chance to evaluate these other distance measures and continued to use $R_{RUP}$.

### 5.2 SEDIMENT DEPTH PARAMETERS

We evaluated all three of the sediment depth parameters that were provided in the PEER database. In the preliminary two-stage regression analyses, this was done after including the shallow site response term $f_{site}$ in the empirical ground motion model in order to capture any sediment depth effects that were not accounted for by $V_{S30}$. These parameters represented depths to the 1.0, 1.5 and 2.5 km/s shear-wave velocity horizon, referred to as $Z_{1.0}$, $Z_{1.5}$ and $Z_{2.5}$, respectively. We found that $Z_{1.0}$ showed the least correlation with the residuals at all sediment depths that were clearly visible for the other sediment depth parameters. The parameters $Z_{1.5}$ and $Z_{2.5}$ showed equally good correlation with the residuals at large sediment depths, but $Z_{2.5}$ clearly exhibited the strongest correlation with the residuals at shallow sediment depths. As a result, we used $Z_{2.5}$ as the best overall parameter to represent both the shallow ($Z_{2.5} < 1.0$ km) and deep ($Z_{2.5} > 3.0$ km) sediment depth effects.

We note that there is some degree of uncertainty in using $f_{dep}$ for $Z_{2.5} > 3.0$ km outside of the Los Angeles area for which it was theoretically developed (Day, 2005; Day et al., 2005). Since sediment depths were only available for the Los Angeles, Imperial Valley, and San Francisco areas, we also caution the user in the use of $f_{dep}$ for even shallow sediment depths for areas outside of these regions. Regional differences were mitigated somewhat by the inclusion of $c_{12}$ in the regression analysis, which was based on recordings in both the Los Angeles and San Francisco areas. Empirical relationships between $Z_{2.5}$ and the other sediment depth parameters are provided in Section 6.3.5.

### 5.3 SOURCE PARAMETERS

We spent the greatest amount of time exploring parameters that could explain and model the reduced degree of magnitude scaling that we observed in the inter-event residuals for $M > 6.5$. This scaling is critical because it determines how the CB-NGA model extrapolates to the larger magnitudes of greatest interest in engineering. We plotted the inter-event residuals against
several source and fault parameters, including geologic slip rate, static stress drop, rupture area, depth to top of coseismic rupture, and aspect ratio. Aspect ratio \((AR)\) is defined as the ratio of rupture length to rupture width. We introduced \(AR\) to the other developers as a possible parameter for quantifying the observed change in magnitude scaling at large magnitudes based on the study by Hanks and Bakun (2002), who found a bilinear relationship between \(M\) and the logarithm of rupture area for large continental strike-slip earthquakes. They found that for earthquakes with \(M \geq 6.7\) rupture area scales with magnitude consistent with the \(L\)-model of Scholz (1982). Douglas (2002) also showed empirically that the near-source magnitude-scaling characteristics of PGA and PGV were consistent with the \(L\)-model. Since this model assumes that rupture width \((W)\) is constant, Douglas’s result implies that ground motion should scale differently for large \(AR\). Schmedes and Archuleta (2007) came to a similar conclusion based on kinematic simulations of large strike-slip earthquakes.

Residual plots indicated that the inter-event terms were only weakly correlated with geologic slip rate, static stress drop, and rupture area. Although we did not perform a statistical test, the large scatter and weak trends exhibited by these plots led us to conclude that these parameters would not be good predictors of the change in magnitude scaling that was observed at large magnitudes, nor could they explain why some earthquakes had higher inter-event terms than others. However, we did find that the inter-event terms were strongly correlated with aspect ratio, at least for \(AR > 2\). Increasing values of \(AR\) were clearly found to correspond to decreasing inter-event terms and, therefore, to lower amplitudes of PGA and short-period PSA. Based on this observation, we tentatively adopted \(AR\) as a parameter in our model to explain the change in magnitude scaling for \(AR > 2\) and \(M > 6.5\) for strike-slip faulting. However, this approach was later abandoned after further study led us to question the values of \(AR\) in the PEER database.

In order to test the reliability of \(AR\) as a predictor variable, we developed several plots that compared the values of \(AR\) in the PEER NGA database with those inferred from: (1) characteristic earthquakes of similar magnitude in the seismic source model developed for the 2002 National Seismic Hazard Mapping Project (NSHMP) (Frankel et al., 2002; Cao et al., 2003) and (2) from several commonly used magnitude versus rupture area relationships (e.g., Wells and Coppersmith, 1994; Hanks and Bakun, 2002; WGCEP, 2003). One of these plots for Type A faults in California is shown in Figure 5.1, where the solid black squares are the aspect
ratios from the NGA database, and the open symbols are the aspect ratios from the NSHMP fault database for northern California (diamonds) and southern California (triangles). The magnitude rupture area relationships of Wells and Coppersmith (1994), Hanks and Bakun (2002), and WGCEP (2003), which was developed by Bill Ellsworth in 2002, are identified as WC94, HB02 and EL02, respectively, in these plots. These relationships were evaluated for a maximum fault width of 15 km and for a minimum aspect ratio of 1.5.

The plots of $AR$ versus magnitude indicated that the aspect ratios from the PEER database were systematically lower than those inferred from both the 2002 NSHMP seismic source model and the selected magnitude-area relationships for $M > 7.0$ strike-slip events. Based on these results, we concluded that there might be either a bias in the values of $AR$ in the PEER database or an inconsistency in the way that rupture dimensions were being estimated in the PEER database and the existing magnitude-area relationships. This latter concern was confirmed for the 2002 Denali earthquake ($M$ 7.9), which was later found to have an aspect ratio that was at least twice that given in the PEER database (Rowe et al., 2004). We found that such a discrepancy could lead to a significant underprediction of ground motion for large earthquakes when values of $AR$ from the 2002 NSHMP source model were used with a ground motion model that had been developed from values of $AR$ in the PEER NGA database.

Although we still believe that $AR$ shows great promise in explaining the reduced degree of magnitude scaling at large magnitudes (e.g., Douglas, 2002; Schmedes and Archuleta, 2007), we concluded that it was premature to use it in our model until the above-noted discrepancies in the $AR$ values could be resolved. Instead, we prefer for the time being to adopt the alternative trilinear magnitude-scaling model discussed in the Chapter 3, which we believe does not suffer from this same discrepancy and indirectly takes into account the observed effects of $AR$. We also note that earthquakes with large $AR$ tend to be associated with large surface displacements, so that our buried reverse-faulting term that predicts relatively lower short-period ground motions for events with surface faulting inherently takes into account the possible effects of $AR$.

We note that shortly before this report was written, the aspect ratio in the PEER strong motion database for the Denali earthquake was significantly increased by decreasing the rupture width from 30 to 15 km, more consistent with estimates of seismogenic rupture width based largely on seismicity constraints (e.g., Rowe et al., 2004). Unfortunately, this change came too late for us to reconsider using $AR$ as a predictor variable in the CB-NGA model. Besides, Figure
5.1 indicates that other earthquakes in the PEER database in all likelihood suffer from the same discrepancy, so that our general observation is still valid.

### 5.4 DEPTH TO TOP OF RUPTURE

An analysis of residuals also indicated that the inter-event terms for reverse faulting were strongly dependent on whether there was coseismic surface rupture (i.e., whether $Z_{TOR} > 0$). When rupture propagated to the surface, the inter-event terms for reverse faults were found to be similar to those for strike-slip faults. When coseismic rupture was buried, the inter-event terms and, thus, the ground motion for reverse faults were found to be significantly higher than those for strike-slip faults. There is a hint that there also might be a difference in the inter-event terms for strike-slip faults with and without coseismic surface rupture. Such a difference would appear to be supported by Bouchon et al. (2006), who after analyzing the Bam recording from the shallow, predominantly strike-slip 2003 Bam (Iran) earthquake, concluded that the lack of significant surface rupture during this event might have been related to the extremely high rupture velocity, which they estimated to be equivalent to the Rayleigh-wave speed (i.e., 92% of the shear-wave speed). These authors also note that rupture velocities approaching the Raleigh-wave speed produce larger ground motions.

Unfortunately, the relationship between surface rupture and ground motion amplitude for strike-slip faults is masked by large scatter and significant inconsistencies by whether, in fact, the observed rupture was coseismic, triggered, or post-seismic. The 1995 Kobe earthquake is a good example of this inconsistency. That part of the Kobe rupture on Awaji Island was clearly visible at the surface, whereas that part beneath the city of Kobe was buried. The earthquake was flagged as having coseismic surface rupture in the PEER database, because of the surface rupture on Awaji Island, even though most of the strong motion recordings were closer to that part of the rupture that was buried. Because of this, we concluded that it would be impossible to model the potential effect of coseismic surface rupture for strike-slip faults until a more careful review of this parameter could be performed for the strike-slip events in the PEER database.
5.5 RAKE ANGLE

Rather than use indicator variables defined in terms of rake angle to represent the style of faulting, we plotted the Stage 1 residuals directly in terms of rake angle to see if it were possible to use this angle directly. While we could see clear clusters of relatively high and relatively low residuals that corresponded with the rake angle bins used to define the indicator variables, there was no apparent continuous trend that could be modeled. As a result, we decided to continue our use of indicator variables. The analysis did confirm the reasonableness of the rake angle bins that had been used to define the style-of-faulting categories in the PEER database. Furthermore, our classification of earthquakes as strike slip, reverse, and normal using these rake angle bins was found to be identical to that used by Boore and Atkinson (2007) using an alternative classification based on the plunge (dip) of the maximum compressive stress ($P$) and minimum compressive stress ($T$) axes. In their scheme, based on a proposal by Zoback (1992), strike-slip faulting is defined as an event with a $P$ and $T$ axis plunge less than or equal to 40°, reverse faulting is defined as an event with a $T$ axis plunge greater than 40°, and normal faulting is defined as an event with a $P$ axis plunge greater than 40°.

5.6 DIP ANGLE

We found a weak, but significant, trend of increasing ground motion with the average dip of the rupture plane for both reverse and strike-slip faults, but we were not convinced that this trend could be justified scientifically after discussing it with several seismologists. Figure 5.2 shows the dependence of inter-event residuals on rupture dip. There is a suggestion that inter-event residuals are biased high (an underprediction by the model) for rupture dips greater than 0 and less than about 75°. However, because this trend could not be explained seismologically, we did not include rupture dip as a parameter in the CB-NGA model at this time other than as a filter to phase out hanging-wall effects for steeply dipping faults. We will reconsider it in the future when there is more seismological consensus on its effects.

The strongest argument in favor of including rupture dip as a predictor variable was for reverse faults, where the inter-event terms implied that ground motion amplitude systematically increases with increasing rupture dip and, presumably, higher normal stresses on the rupture
plane. However, when we included dip as a parameter for reverse faults, we found that it led to the prediction of smaller ground motion for shallow-dipping, surface-rupturing reverse faults than for strike-slip faults, which we thought might be biased by our inability to distinguish between buried and surface-rupturing strike-slip faults in the current PEER database. The potential impact of rupture dip should be a topic of future research.

Fig. 5.1 Comparison of relationships between aspect ratio and earthquake magnitude.
Fig. 5.2 Dependence of inter-event residuals on dip angle.
6 Guidance to Users

Because of the relatively complex nature of the CB-NGA functional forms and because of the inclusion of many new predictor variables, this chapter presents guidelines to users on how to evaluate the model for engineering applications. Covered topics include general limits of applicability, calculating PGA on rock, accounting for unknown predictor variables, estimating epistemic uncertainty, estimating spectral displacement and PGD, and use in the National Seismic Hazard Mapping Project (NSHMP).

6.1 GENERAL LIMITS OF APPLICABILITY

Generally speaking, the CB-NGA model is considered to be valid for shallow continental earthquakes occurring in worldwide active tectonic regimes for which the following conditions apply: (1) $M > 4.0$; (2) $M < 8.5$ for strike-slip faulting, 8.0 for reverse faulting, and 7.5 for normal faulting; (3) $R_{RUP} = 0 – 200$ km; (4) $V_{S30} = 150 – 1500$ m/s, corresponding to NEHRP site classes B, C, D and E; (4) $Z_{2.5} = 0 – 10$ km; (5) $Z_{TOR} = 0 – 15$ km; and (6) $\delta = 15 – 90^\circ$.

Practically speaking, the CB-NGA model is not uniformly valid over the entire range of predictor variables listed above. Statistical prediction errors are smallest for parameter values near their mean and increase as these values diverge from this mean (e.g., see Campbell, 2004). These errors can become very large when the model is extrapolated beyond the data limits of the predictor variable and should be used with caution under such conditions. The applicable range of some predictor variables have been extended beyond the limits of the data when the model has been constrained theoretically.
6.1.1 Magnitude

The upper-magnitude limits for strike-slip and reverse faulting are dictated by the requirements of the PEER NGA Project. The largest magnitudes for each of these faulting categories were 0.3–0.6 magnitude units smaller than these limits. Although not a requirement by the PEER NGA Project, we have recommended a similar extrapolation for normal faulting. We believe that such an extrapolation can be justified because of the careful selection of an appropriate magnitude-scaling term. Nonetheless, any extrapolation is associated with additional epistemic uncertainty (see discussion below). The lower-magnitude limit is about 0.3 magnitude units below the smallest magnitude used in the analysis.

6.1.2 Distance

The distance limit of 200 km was also dictated by the PEER NGA Project. The rate of attenuation out to this distance is reasonably well constrained, except at the smaller magnitudes where data are only complete to 100–150 km. Careful selection of an appropriate attenuation term allows extrapolation, even for the smaller magnitudes, out to 200 km, although it is unlikely that such distant earthquakes will have much impact on the results of a seismic hazard analysis. Because both geometrical and anelastic attenuation is modeled by a pseudo-geometrical attenuation term, there might be a tendency to overestimate ground motion beyond about 100 km, especially at the smaller magnitudes. This overprediction at small magnitudes is exacerbated by the tendency to selectively process only those strong motion recordings with relatively high ground motion amplitudes at moderate-to-large distances.

6.1.3 Shear-Wave Velocity

Even though our selected NGA database included a limited number of recording sites with $V_{s30} < 180$ m/s, such soft-soil sites or even sites with higher velocities might have other conditions (e.g., shallow Bay Mud over rock) that make site response more complicated than our simple nonlinear soil model would predict. For that reason, we caution the use of the CB-NGA model for NEHRP site class E sites. Furthermore, the 1-D equivalent-linear simulations that
were used to derive the nonlinear soil model become unreliable at shear strains in excess of about 1%. However, if neither of these conditions exists, the model might be valid for \( V_{530} < 180 \) m/s because of its theoretical basis and the lack of any significant bias in the intra-event residuals (Fig. 3.7). Otherwise, we recommend that a site response analysis be conducted. There is only one recording site in our database that would be classified as a NEHRP site class A site, which is insufficient to determine whether the model can be extrapolated beyond \( V_{530} > 1500 \) m/s. Note also that even though the shallow site response term is held constant for \( V_{530} > 1100 \) m/s, there is still a tendency for the CB-NGA model to underestimate ground motion for oscillator periods greater than 1.0 s for NEHRP site class B sites. The shallow site response term included in our model is intended to provide an approximate empirical estimate of site response. We strongly recommend that a site-specific study be conducted for important engineering applications.

### 6.1.4 Sediment Depth

The sediment depth limit used in the 3-D basin response analyses that formed the basis for our sediment depth term for \( Z_{2.5} > 3.0 \) km was about 6 km. However, the model might be valid beyond this depth limit (up to about 10 km) because of its theoretical basis. It is possible, although improbable, that the value of \( V_{530} \) could be inconsistent with the value of \( Z_{2.5} \) for very shallow sediment depths. There are two cases where this might occur: (1) when \( V_{530} \) is extrapolated to values exceeding 2500 m/s, in which case \( Z_{2.5} = 0 \) and (2) when \( Z_{2.5} \) becomes very small, in which case \( V_{530} \) must be large enough to adequately represent the top 30 m of the soil column. This first case should never occur based on our recommendation that the model should not be extrapolated beyond \( V_{530} = 1500 \) m/s. For small values of both \( V_{530} \) and \( Z_{2.5} \), it is possible that a site resonance condition will occur, which is not predicted by our model. In this case, we strongly recommended that a site-specific site response analysis be conducted.

### 6.1.5 Depth to Top of Rupture

The 15 km limit for the depth to top of rupture is based on an analysis of residuals that showed that the inter-event residuals were generally unbiased out to this depth (Fig. 3.4). The inter-event residuals suggested that our model might underpredict ground motion at short-to-mid periods for
$Z_{TOR} > 13$ km, but the data are insufficient to establish a trend. Therefore, until we can acquire additional deep earthquake data to better constrain this possible depth dependence, we recommend that the CB-NGA model should not be used for rupture depths greater than about 15 km. By any definition, this depth limit constrains the modeled earthquakes to occur in the shallow lithosphere (crust).

### 6.1.6 Dip Angle

The dip of the rupture plane is used only to determine when hanging-wall effects are phased out at $\delta > 70^\circ$. The broader range of dip angles is given to represent the range of values used in the analysis.

### 6.1.7 Tectonic Regime

Even if an earthquake is shallow, there is some uncertainty in deciding whether an earthquake is located within the continental lithosphere. Continental means that the earthquake must occur within continental crust rather than oceanic crust. Earthquakes that occur on land or on the continental shelf and have focal depths of less than about 25 km can generally be considered to occur within continental lithosphere. There is also some uncertainty in deciding if a region can be considered an active tectonic regime. A general rule of thumb is that a region can be classified as active if it is not otherwise identified as a Stable Continental Region or SCR (e.g., Johnston, 1996; Campbell, 2004), although regional studies should be used to confirm this.

### 6.2 ESTIMATING ROCK PGA

It might appear at first that the shallow site response term given by Equation (3.11) is non-unique, because it requires an estimate of rock PGA ($A_{100}$). However, in no case does the model coefficient $k_1$, the threshold value of $V_{S30}$ at which $f_{site}$ becomes linear, exceed the 1100 m/s value used to define rock PGA. Therefore, rock PGA can be calculated using only the second (linear) term in Equation (3.11), which does not require an estimate of $A_{100}$. This estimate can then be substituted back into $f_{site}$ for purposes of calculating ground motion, including PGA,
when $V_{S30} < k_i$. Consistent with the way that the CB-NGA aleatory uncertainty model was developed, the median estimate of $A_{1100}$ should be used to estimate ground motion on other site conditions even if this estimate is for a level of aleatory uncertainty larger or smaller than the median.

### 6.3 ESTIMATING UNKNOWN PREDICTOR VARIABLES

There will be instances in which the user will not know the value of one or more of the predictor variables. Simply substituting a default value for such a parameter can lead to biased results and an underestimation of uncertainty. The more rigorous approach is to estimate or assume reasonable estimates for the mean values of these parameters, assign them subjective weights, and model them as additional epistemic uncertainty (e.g., using a logic tree). If a parameter is estimated from a model rather than from data, it also might be associated with additional aleatory uncertainty. The determination of whether parameter estimates are subject to aleatory or epistemic uncertainty is beyond the scope of this report and is left to the user. However, some guidance on the selection and estimation of unknown or uncertain predictor variables is provided below.

#### 6.3.1 Magnitude and Distance

If $M$ or $R_{RUP}$ are unknown, these parameters can be estimated from other magnitude and distance measures (e.g., Scherbaum et al., 2004). However, it is preferable to directly include in the seismic hazard analysis one or more 3-D models of the potential rupture planes of the relevant seismic sources in order to properly account for epistemic and aleatory uncertainty in the estimated distances and, for reverse faults, to take into account potential hanging-wall effects.

#### 6.3.2 Shear-Wave Velocity

If $V_{S30}$ is unknown, it can be estimated from the NEHRP site class (BSSC, 2004; Campbell, 2004; Bozorgnia and Campbell, 2004) or from the geological unit associated with the site, either using correlations developed during development of the PEER database (NGA, 2005; Wills and
Clahan, 2005) or other correlations available in the literature (Wills and Silva, 1998; Wills et al., 2000). If NEHRP site classes are used, we recommend that either the boundary values or the geometric mean of the boundary values of $V_{S30}$ be used because of the logarithmic relationship between site amplification and $V_{S30}$. Our recommended values of $V_{S30}$ for NEHRP site classes E, DE, D, CD, C, BC, and B are 150, 180, 255, 360, 525, 760, and 1070 m/s, respectively.

### 6.3.3 Style of Faulting and Dip Angle

If style of faulting or rupture dip is unknown, weights should be assigned to alternative estimates of the predictor variables $F_{RV}$, $F_{NM}$, and $\delta$ based on the orientation and dip of the proposed rupture plane and its relationship to the regional tectonic stress regime.

### 6.3.4 Depth to Top of Rupture

If the depth to the top of coseismic rupture ($Z_{TOR}$) is unknown, its aleatory distribution can be estimated probabilistically using the approach of Youngs et al. (2003). If that approach is considered to be too complicated, a simpler empirical approach can be used in which the likelihood of surface rupture is probabilistically estimated using the logistic regression model of Wells and Coppersmith (1993). In this approach, the probability of principal surface rupture is given by the equation

$$P(\text{slip}) = \frac{e^{f_{\text{slip}}}}{1 + e^{f_{\text{slip}}}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (6.1)

where

$$f_{\text{slip}} = -12.51 + 2.053M$$  \hspace{1cm} (6.2)

This probability can then be used to weight two alternative logic-tree branches that define whether or not surface rupture occurs. For the branch where surface rupture is assumed to occur, the user should set $f_{\text{flt},Z} = 0$ in Equation (3.5). For the branch where surface rupture is not assumed to occur, the user should set $f_{\text{flt},Z} = 1$ in this equation. In either case, the user should conservatively set $f_{\text{hng},Z} = 1$ in Equation (3.9), since the actual value of $Z_{TOR}$ is unknown. If the more rigorous approach of Youngs et al. (2003) is used, a distribution of $Z_{TOR}$ values will be simulated and $f_{\text{flt},Z}$ and $f_{\text{hng},Z}$ should be set accordingly.
6.3.5 Sediment Depth

If the depth to the 2.5 km/s velocity horizon is unknown, it can be estimated from one of the other sediment depth parameters, if known, using the following relationships developed using data from the PEER database:

\[
Z_{2.5} = 0.519 + 3.595 Z_{1.0}, \quad \sigma_Z = 0.711 \tag{6.3}
\]
\[
Z_{2.5} = 0.636 + 1.549 Z_{1.5}, \quad \sigma_Z = 0.864 \tag{6.4}
\]

where all depths are in kilometers.

However, if none of these depths are known, sediment depth is the only parameter that could possibly be assigned a default value unless it is known or expected that it is either less than 1.0 km or greater than 3.0 km. If sediment depth effects are not expected to be important, \(V_{530}\) alone can serve as a reasonable representative of both shallow and deep site response, and \(Z_{2.5}\) can be set to a default value of 2 km (actually any value between 1 and 3 km). If sediment depth effects are expected to be important, then reasonable alternative values for \(Z_{2.5}\) and their associated weights should be used to evaluate this parameter.

6.4 ESTIMATING EPISTEMIC UNCERTAINTY

Although magnitude saturation of short-period ground motion at short distances limits the median predicted value of near-source ground motion at large magnitudes, these predictions are based on a limited number of recordings. As a result, there is additional epistemic uncertainty in the near-source median predictions that might not be adequately captured by the use of multiple empirical ground motion models. Modeling this additional epistemic uncertainty is a current topic of research. We intend to use bootstrapping methods to evaluate epistemic uncertainty in the predicted ground motion from our model once this research is completed.

We recommend that the current practice of exclusively using multiple ground motion models to model epistemic uncertainty in predicted ground motion should be abandoned. A preliminary comparison of the NGA models indicates that there are ranges of magnitude and distance, and probably other parameters as well, for which there is very little variability between these relationships. We believe that such implied “agreement” is not representative of a lack of uncertainty, but rather an artifact of using a limited number of models to estimate ground motion.
We recommend that the user consider developing a separate epistemic uncertainty model that represents the true uncertainty in the ground motion estimates from these relationships. Such models should consider the additional epistemic uncertainties discussed above. Specific guidance on modeling epistemic uncertainty is available in Budnitz et al. (1997) and Bommer et al. (2005). However, if the user does not want to develop an independent epistemic uncertainty model, we recommend using the model proposed by the USGS for use in the 2007 update of the National Seismic Hazard Maps (NSHMP, 2007), where epistemic uncertainty is based on the number of earthquakes in a series of magnitude-distance bins in the NGA databases used by two of the developers. This model is given by the equation

\[
\ln Y_{unc} = \ln \hat{Y} + \Delta \ln \hat{\bar{Y}}
\]  

(6.5)

where \(\ln Y_{unc}\) is the predicted value of \(\ln Y\) incorporating epistemic uncertainty, \(\ln \hat{Y}\) is the median ground motion predicted from Equation (3.1), and \(\Delta \ln \hat{\bar{Y}}\) is an incremental value of median ground motion intended to represent approximately one standard deviation of the epistemic probability ground motion distribution. The unmodified median prediction is given a weight of 0.630, and the lower- and upper-bound median predictions are each given a weight of 0.185. The epistemic uncertainty given by this model is applied in addition to the inherent uncertainty in the use of multiple ground motion models and to the aleatory uncertainty model given in Section 3.1.3. The tentative values of \(\Delta \ln \hat{\bar{Y}}\) recommended by the USGS are listed in Table 6.1. The final values will be published in the final version of NSHMP (2007).

### 6.5 ESTIMATING SPECTRAL DISPLACEMENT AND PGD

A surge in the design and construction of high-rise condominium buildings and base-isolated structures in the last few years has brought about a renewed interest in the prediction of long-period spectral displacement and PGD. Both of these parameters represent oscillator periods that have been largely ignored by the developers of ground motion models in the past or, if not ignored, have not been properly constrained either empirically or theoretically. It is for this reason that the PEER NGA Project required the developers to provide models for PGD and spectral acceleration out to periods of 10 s. In this section, we provide some guidance and justification for the PGD and long-period PSA components of the CB-NGA model.
6.5.1 Spectral Displacement

The number of recordings in our NGA database that have oscillator periods within the useable bandwidth fall off significantly for oscillator periods exceeding a few seconds. At $T = 10$ s only 506 of the original 1561 selected recordings and 21 of the original 64 selected earthquakes remain, covering magnitudes in the range $6.5 \leq M \leq 7.9$. Nearly 70% of these remaining recordings come from the Chi-Chi earthquake. Therefore, as mentioned previously, we used a simple seismological model (Atkinson and Silva, 2000) to help constrain our $M < 6.5$ magnitude-scaling term at long periods. The question addressed below is whether these constraints and the empirical constraints at larger magnitudes produce reasonable estimates of 5%-damped spectral displacement (SD). An example of the spectral displacements predicted by the CB-NGA model is shown in Figure 6.1.

Faccioli et al. (2004) collected digital recordings from Europe, Japan, and Taiwan that they considered to be valid up to oscillator periods of 10 s. Their Figure 2 gives plots of the average and plus-one standard deviation SD that were derived from these recordings for three magnitude bins and two distance bins. We compared this figure with our Figure 6.1 and found that their empirically derived spectral shapes and inferred magnitude scaling are very similar to those predicted from the CB-NGA model for NEHRP site class D. This is consistent with their predominant use of recordings from soil sites, which are subject to strong amplification at long periods. For example, our model predicts over two times higher spectral ordinates at $T = 10$ s for NEHRP site class D site conditions as compared to BC site conditions.

Faccioli et al. (2004) also show that the theoretical estimate of SD at $T = 10$ s calculated from a simple one-sided displacement pulse in the time domain is equal to PGD for spectra that have become independent of period at long periods. This is a fundamental property of a viscously damped single-degree-of-freedom system and can be shown mathematically from the equation of motion to occur at $T \rightarrow \infty$ (e.g., Hudson, 1979). Figure 12 of Faccioli et al. predicts that this limit actually occurs at a period that is about six times the half duration of the one-sided displacement pulse, or three times the period of the corresponding two-sided velocity pulse, and is relatively independent of the shape of this pulse. These authors also show that the relationship of Somerville (2003) relating the duration of the strike-normal forward-directivity velocity pulse to magnitude, when used with their theoretical model, closely matches the average displacement
spectra from the digital recordings out to a distance of 30 km. The Somerville relationship is given by the equation

$$\log 2t_o = -3.17 + 0.5M$$ (6.6)

where $t_o$ (s) is the half duration of the one-sided displacement pulse.

Since the above equation represents the duration of a directivity pulse, it likely provides a lower bound to the corner period at which the displacement spectra should become independent of magnitude. In order to get a more representative range of possible corner periods, we also look to the values predicted from the Atkinson and Silva (1997, 2000) two-corner and Brune (1970, 1972) one-corner source models. The longer-period corner for the Atkinson and Silva two-corner source model is given by the equation

$$\log 2T_o = -2.18 + 0.5M$$ (6.7)

where $T_o$ (s) is the corner period. The corner period for the Brune source model (e.g., Boore, 2003) can be represented by the equation

$$\log 2T_o = -2.55 + 0.5M$$ (6.8)

for $\beta_o = 3.5$ km/s, $\Delta\sigma = 100$ bars, and seismic moment (dyne-cm) defined by the equation

$$\log M_o = 1.5M + 16.05,$$ based on the western North America source model proposed by Campbell (2003).

Both the empirical and theoretical displacement spectra given by Faccioli et al. (2004) indicate that the midpoint of the range over which the displacement spectra roll over to a constant value is equal to about $3t_o$. Substituting this value into Equation (6.6) and evaluating the corner periods given by Equations (6.7) and (6.8), results in the following range of periods at which SD might be expected to become independent of period: 0.3–2.1 s for $M = 5.0$, 1.0–6.6 s for $M = 6.0$, 3.2–21 s for $M = 7.0$, and 10–66 s for $M = 8.0$. These estimates suggest that SD should become independent of period for $T < 10$ s and $M < 6.5$, as predicted by the CB-NGA model.

Based on the above discussion, we believe that the CB-NGA model does provide a reasonable representation of the amplitude and shape of the long-period displacement spectrum based on both empirical and theoretical considerations. Additional verification is given in the discussion on PGD and its relationship to SD in the next section. Nonetheless, the user should use discretion when using this model to estimate spectral acceleration, velocity, and displacement for $T > 5.0$ s until further empirical and theoretical verification becomes available.
6.5.2 Peak Ground Displacement

Empirical estimates of PGD are notoriously unreliable because of their sensitivity to long-period noise, low-pass filter parameters, and accelerogram processing errors. Nonetheless, we provide model coefficients for PGD in Table 3-1 based on a mathematical relationship between long-period oscillator response and PGD. The resulting PGD ground motion model is intended for evaluation purposes only at this time and should not be used for engineering design until further empirical and theoretical verification becomes available.

Faciolli et al (2004) show both empirically and theoretically that for displacement spectra that have attained a constant value independent of period at $T = 10$ s, the value of SD at this oscillator ($SD_{10}$) is a reasonable approximation to PGD. This is a fundamental property of a viscously damped single-degree-of-freedom system and can be shown mathematically from the equation of motion to occur at $T \to \infty$ (e.g., Hudson, 1979). This behavior is achieved in the CB-NGA model for earthquakes of $M < 7$. Therefore, the prediction of $SD_{10}$ at these magnitudes can be used potentially as an estimate of PGD. However, for larger events, where $SD_{10}$ has not obtained a constant value, we need to adjust the predicted value of $SD_{10}$ in order to be able to obtain an estimate of PGD. We do this by (1) comparing our model’s near-fault magnitude-scaling properties with scaling relationships between fault-rupture displacement and magnitude and (2) comparing our model’s far-field magnitude-scaling properties with simple seismological theory.

Consistent with the finding of Faccioli et al. (2004), Tom Heaton of Caltech (personal communication, 2006) suggested that near-source PGD and SD at long periods should scale with fault slip. According to the empirical relationships of Wells and Coppersmith (1994), fault slip scales as $10^{bM}$, where $b = 0.69$ for the average value of fault-rupture displacement ($AD$) and $b = 0.82$ for the maximum value of fault-rupture displacement ($MD$) for magnitudes in the range $5.6 \leq M \leq 8.1$. Averaging these two estimates of $b$ gives a magnitude-scaling coefficient for fault-rupture displacement ($D$) of $b = 0.76$. This value is nearly identical to the $M < 6.5$ magnitude-scaling coefficient for $SD_{10}$ in our model once we set $R_{RUP} = 0$ to represent a near-fault location and convert our scaling coefficient to a common logarithm by dividing by $\ln(10)$.

Wells and Coppersmith (1994) found empirically that $D$ and fault-rupture length ($L$) have similar magnitude-scaling characteristics. Hanks and Bakun (2002) used this property, which is
consistent with the $L$-model of Scholz (1982), to justify their empirically revised revision of the Wells and Coppersmith magnitude rupture area ($A$) relationship for $M \geq 6.7$. The $L$-model also predicts that once rupture has reached the full width of the fault, which can be expected to occur at $M \geq 6.7$ for large strike-slip earthquakes, $A$ should scale with $L$. We used the observation that $D$, $L$, and $A$ all have about the same value of $b$ to infer a magnitude-scaling coefficient for spectral displacement at large magnitudes where $SD_{10}$ has not yet attained a constant value in the CB-NGA model. Hanks and Bakun found that $b = 0.75$ in their revised $A$ vs. $M$ relationship for $M \geq 6.7$. That value is virtually identical to the value we found for $SD_{10}$ at $M < 6.5$ ($b = 0.77$).

This implies that we can set our large earthquake magnitude-scaling coefficient to match our small earthquake magnitude-scaling coefficient for purposes of deriving a ground motion model for PGD from the model for $SD_{10}$ at large magnitudes. This is equivalent to setting $c_3 = c_2$ in Equation (3.2).

If we further assume that $D$ is a reasonable proxy for PGD near the fault, we can use the magnitude-scaling relationships of Wells and Coppersmith (1994) to compare estimates of $AD$ and $MD$ with our estimates of PGD from $SD_{10}$ after setting $c_3 = c_2$ in Equation (3.2). The predicted value of PGD from the CB-NGA model represents an average over the rupture plane, which is expected to be closer to the value of $AD$ rather than $MD$. Wells and Coppersmith show that $AD$ is on average 0.5 times the value of $MD$. Therefore, if we assume $AD = 0.5 MD$, take the geometric mean of $AD$ from the two Wells and Coppersmith magnitude-scaling relationships, correct for the average partitioning of the displacement into its spatial components, and evaluate the predicted median value of $SD_{10}$ from our model for $V_{S30} = 620$ m/s (generic rock) and $R_{rup} = 0$ (near-fault conditions), we get the comparison shown in Table 6.2 between the value of PGD estimated from geologic observations of fault-rupture displacement and the near-fault value of PGD inferred from the adjusted CB-NGA model for $SD_{10}$. This table gives predictions from the CB-NGA model both with and without setting $c_3 = c_2$, identified by the terms adjusted and unadjusted in the table. The adjusted model is the one we propose to use to estimate PGD.

The comparison in Table 6.2 shows that the near-fault predictions of PGD derived from the adjusted ground motion model for $SD_{10}$ are consistent with geologic estimates of fault-rupture displacement. The adjustment accounts for the observation that $SD_{10}$ is still increasing and has not yet attained its asymptotic value of PGD for $M > 7$. The evaluation of our model for generic rock site conditions is somewhat arbitrary. Generic rock was selected as an average
estimate of the likely site conditions for which observations of AD and MD were made. Softer or harder site conditions would lead to estimates of spectral acceleration that are higher or lower than those obtained for generic rock. However, the magnitude scaling would remain the same.

Another check of the reasonableness of our proposed PGD model is to compare it with the far-field magnitude scaling of PGD inferred from simple seismological theory. Faccioli et al. (2004) show that the far-field value of PGD estimated from a Brune omega-square source spectrum (Brune 1970, 1972) can be related to moment magnitude by the equation

$$\log \text{PGD} = -4.46 + \frac{1}{3} \log \Delta \sigma + M - \log R_{\text{HYP}}$$

(6.9)

where PGD (cm) is maximum displacement, $\Delta \sigma$ (MPa) is stress drop, and $R_{\text{HYP}}$ (km) is hypocentral distance. If we evaluate this equation for $\Delta \sigma = 2$ MPa and $R_{\text{HYP}} = 100$ km (far-field conditions) and evaluate our $SD_{10}$ model for $R_{\text{RUP}} = 100$ km (far-field conditions) and $V_{S30} = 620$ m/s (generic rock), we obtain the comparison shown in Table 6.3 between the far-field value of PGD estimated from simple seismological theory and the far-field value of PGD inferred from the CB-NGA model for $SD_{10}$. This table gives predictions from the CB-NGA model both with and without setting $c_3 = c_2$, identified by the terms adjusted and unadjusted in the table. The adjusted model is the one we propose to use to estimate PGD.

The comparison in Table 6.3 shows that the far-field predictions of PGD derived from the adjusted ground motion model for $SD_{10}$ are consistent with estimates based on simple seismological theory. The 2 MPa stress drop was chosen to make the comparison as close as possible, but it is not an unreasonable value considering that observed values range between 1 and 10 MPa and that it falls within a factor of 1.5 of the often-quoted average of 3 MPa (Hanks and Bakun, 2002). The evaluation of the CB-NGA model for generic rock site conditions is consistent with the near-fault predictions given above. The good agreement of the two estimates over the magnitude range $5.0 \leq M \leq 8.5$ is the direct result of the agreement of the far-field magnitude-scaling coefficients from the Brune and CB-NGA models (i.e., $b = 1.0$).

6.6 USE IN THE NATIONAL SEISMIC HAZARD MAPPING PROJECT

The USGS National Seismic Hazard Mapping Project (NSHMP) is currently in the process of revising the national seismic hazard maps for release in September 2007. Because the empirical
ground motion models that the USGS used in the 2002 maps for the western United States were revised as part of the PEER NGA Project, the USGS convened an independent expert panel in September 2006 to review the NGA models together with their supporting documentation. This included the documentation that the developers provided in response to USGS and California Geological Survey (CGS) questions prior to the panel’s review (Appendix B). The panel was asked to make recommendations on if and how the NGA models should be implemented in the NSHMP. One of the items evaluated by the panel was whether any weight should be given to each developer’s previous ground motion model or whether there was sufficient scientific bases and documentation to give the new models 100% weight. The panel, referred to as the “Tiger Team” by the USGS, found sufficient documentation and justification to recommend that our NGA model should be considered to supersede our previous model (Campbell and Bozorgnia, 2003a, 2003b, 2003c, 2004) in the 2007 revision of the National Seismic Hazard Maps and should be given a relative weight of 100% compared to our previous model.

As pointed out by the Tiger Team, the main issues that the USGS faced in implementing the CB-NGA model have to do with the difficulty in predicting the depth to the top of coseismic rupture ($Z_{TOR}$) and the depth of the sedimentary column ($Z_{25}$). Neither of these predictor variables can be reliably estimated on a national or even regional scale. As a result, the USGS asked us to recommend how to implement our model when these parameters were unknown. We recommended that $Z_{25}$ should be set equal to 2.0 km consistent with the general guidelines given in Section 6.3.5, recognizing that this depth was not needed for a relatively wide range of parameter values (i.e., for $1.0 \leq Z_{25} \leq 3.0$ km). We recommended that a probability distribution of rupture depths (or as a minimum the more simplified empirical approach for estimating rupture depths) described in Section 6.3.4 should be used to account for the epistemic uncertainty associated with $Z_{TOR}$, recognizing that this is an important new parameter that significantly impacts estimated ground motion for surface-rupturing earthquakes on reverse faults. As this report was being written, the USGS had not yet decided exactly how the CB-NGA model would be evaluated in terms of the new predictor variables.

We believe that the USGS and CGS questions and our answers referred to above are relevant to all users, since they provide additional insights into the reasons behind some of the critical decisions we made in the course of constructing the CB-NGA model as well as some important aspects of our model that would otherwise go unnoticed. Of particular interest are the
many residual plots that we produced that further demonstrated the validity and robustness of our model. Our response to these questions as they specifically relate to our model is provided in Appendix B. In all of the residual plots in Appendix B, inter-event and intra-event residuals are defined by the equations given in Section 3.2. Since the sum of the intra-event and inter-event residuals are very nearly zero, we interchangeably use the term inter-event residual and source term in the discussion in Appendix B.

It should be noted that the residuals given in Appendix B are defined in terms of the version of the regression equation (after smoothing the coefficients) that predicted oversaturation. We believe that these unadjusted residuals are a better representation of the behavior of the model than are the residuals after we constrain the model to saturate when it predicts oversaturation. Constraining the model to saturate always increases the ground motion and, therefore, will always cause a bias in $\ln \hat{Y}$ by an amount equal to $(c_3 - c'_3)M$, where $c'_3$ is the model coefficient $c_3$ after constraining the model to saturate. As a result, we do not believe that we should add to this bias by biasing the residuals as well for purposes of answering the USGS and CGS questions. In those plots where we want to emphasize this bias, we also show an adjusted baseline that is calculated by subtracting the bias from the original zero baseline.
Table 6.1 Incremental values of median ground motion in epistemic uncertainty model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M</th>
<th>$R_{RUP}$ (km)</th>
<th>$\Delta \ln \hat{Y}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.0 – 5.9</td>
<td>$\leq 10$</td>
<td>0.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0 – 5.9</td>
<td>10 – 30</td>
<td>0.210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0 – 5.9</td>
<td>$\geq 30$</td>
<td>0.245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0 – 6.9</td>
<td>$\leq 10$</td>
<td>0.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0 – 6.9</td>
<td>10 – 30</td>
<td>0.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0 – 6.9</td>
<td>$\geq 30$</td>
<td>0.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\geq 7.0$</td>
<td>$\leq 10$</td>
<td>0.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\geq 7.0$</td>
<td>10 – 30</td>
<td>0.360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\geq 7.0$</td>
<td>$\geq 30$</td>
<td>0.310</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.2 Comparison of near-fault estimates of PGD.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M</th>
<th>Estimated PGD from fault-rupture displacement (m)</th>
<th>Estimated near-fault PGD from CB-NGA model (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unadjusted</td>
<td>Adjusted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>7.91</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.3  Comparison of far-field estimates of PGD.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M</th>
<th>Estimated PGD from seismological theory (cm)</th>
<th>Estimated far-field PGD from 10 s spectral displacement (cm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unadjusted</td>
<td>Adjusted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>13.81</td>
<td>8.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>43.69</td>
<td>22.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>138.15</td>
<td>58.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 6.1 Dependence of spectral displacement on magnitude for strike-slip faulting, $R_{RUP} = 0$, and $Z_{2.5} = 2.0$ km.
7 Model Evaluation

In this chapter, we present example calculations that allow the user to review the ground motion values predicted by the CB-NGA model and to verify their own implementation of the model. We also present a series of plots that show the predicted ground motion scales with the predictor variables and compare the CB-NGA predictions with our previous model.

7.1 EXAMPLE CALCULATIONS

Tables 7.1 and 7.2 give example calculations for PGA (i.e., \( T = 0.01 \) s), PGV, and PSA at oscillator periods of 0.2, 1.0, and 3.0 s to assist in verifying the implementation of the CB-NGA model presented in this report. Also included in these tables are estimates of PGV from our 1997 model (Campbell, 1997, 2000, 2001) and estimates of PGA and PSA from our 2003 model (Campbell and Bozorgnia, 2003a, 2003b, 2003c, 2004). These models are identified as CB-NGA, C97 and CB03, respectively, in these tables. Tables 7.1 and 7.2 give ground motions for strike-slip and reverse faulting, respectively.

Ground motion estimates in Tables 7.1 and 7.2 are given for moment magnitudes of 5.0 and 7.0. The depth to the top of the coseismic rupture was assumed to be 5.0 km for the \( M = 5.0 \) scenario and zero for the \( M = 7.0 \) scenario. For the reverse-faulting scenario, the calculation points are located on the hanging wall (HW) of a 45°-dipping fault and are, therefore, subject to hanging-wall effects. The dip of the rupture plane of the strike-slip scenario is assumed to be 90°. For both scenarios, the calculation points are located along a line perpendicular to the strike of the fault. The rupture width (i.e., the down-dip extent of rupture) was calculated from the rupture area assuming \( W = \sqrt{A} \), where the rupture area was calculated from the equation (Wells and Coppersmith, 1994)

\[
\log A = (M - 4.07) / 0.98
\]  

(7.1)
where $A$ has units of square kilometers. If the calculated value of $W$ exceeded the assumed seismogenic width of the fault, it was set equal to this width. The maximum depth of the seismogenic rupture zone was assumed to be 15 km. The depth to the top of the seismogenic rupture zone (for purposes of calculating $R^\text{SEIS}$) was taken as the minimum of the depth to the top of rupture or 3.0 km. A summary of the values of the parameters used to develop Tables 7.1 and 7.2 are listed in Tables 7.3 and 7.4, respectively. Note that the Campbell (1997, 2000, 2001) model was evaluated for generic rock and adjusted to NEHRP BC site conditions using the site factor for one-second PSA given by Campbell and Bozorgnia (2003a, 2003b, 2003c, 2004).

### 7.2 SCALING WITH PREDICTOR VARIABLES

In this section we give a series of plots that demonstrate how the CB-NGA median ground motion, aleatory uncertainty, and median spectra models scale with the predictor variables included in the models. Unless otherwise noted, the models are evaluated for strike-slip faulting, $Z^\text{TOR} = 0$, $V_{s30} = 760$ m/s (NEHRP BC site conditions), and $Z_{2.5} = 2.0$ km.

#### 7.2.1 Median Model

All of the plots for the CB-NGA median ground motion model show scaling relations for six ground motion parameters: PGA, PGV, and PSA at oscillator periods of 0.2, 1.0, 3.0, and 10.0 s. PGA is equivalent to PSA at $T = 0.01$ s. Scaling of ground motion with rupture distance ($R^\text{RUP}$) is given in Figure 7.1. Scaling of ground motion with magnitude ($M$) is given in Figure 7.2. Scaling of ground motion with near-source distance showing the effects of style-of-faulting, hanging wall, and footwall is given in Figure 7.3. Scaling of shallow site amplification ($f^\text{site}$) with rock PGA ($A_{100}$) for NEHRP B ($V_{s30} = 1070$ m/s), C ($V_{s30} = 525$ m/s), D ($V_{s30} = 255$ m/s), and E ($V_{s30} = 150$ m/s) site conditions is given in Figure 7.4. Scaling of NEHRP short-period site coefficient $F^a$ (evaluated for $T = 0.2$ s) for NEHRP site classes C, D, and E with PGA for NEHRP BC site conditions is given in Figure 7.5. Scaling of NEHRP mid-period site coefficient $F^a$ for NEHRP site classes C, D, and E with PGA on NEHRP BC site conditions is given in Figure 7.6. Finally, scaling of deep site amplification ($f^\text{sed}$) with sediment depth ($Z_{2.5}$) is given in Figure 7.7. Figures 7.5 and 7.6 also show, for comparison, the NEHRP site coefficients $F^a$.

### 7.2.2 Aleatory Uncertainty Model

We present two sets of plots for the CB-NGA aleatory uncertainty model. The dependence of the total standard deviation ($\sigma_T$) on rock PGA ($A_{100}$) is given in Figure 7.8. The dependence of all of the standard deviation measures ($\sigma$, $\tau$, $\sigma_c$, $\sigma_T$, and $\sigma_{comp}$) on oscillator period is given in Figure 7.9. In this case $Comp$ represents the arbitrary horizontal component as defined in Chapter 4 of this report.

### 7.2.3 Median Response Spectra

Plots of median response spectra (PSA) are used to demonstrate the scaling of spectral amplitude and spectral shape with magnitude, distance, and site conditions. Scaling of PSA with rupture distance ($R_{RUP}$) is given in Figure 7.10. Scaling of PSA with magnitude ($M$) is given in Figure 7.11. Scaling of PSA with style of faulting and rupture depth is given in Figure 7.12 for sites located on the hanging wall (HW) and footwall (FW) of a 45°-dipping fault. Scaling of PSA with NEHRP site class is given in Figure 7.13. Scaling of PSA with sediment depth ($Z_{2.5}$) for NEHRP D site conditions is given in Figure 7.14. Finally, scaling of near-source spectral displacement (SD) with magnitude for NEHRP site classes B, C, D, and E is given in Figure 6.1

### 7.3 COMPARISON WITH PREVIOUS MODELS

In this section, we compare the predictions from our new model, identified as CB-NGA, with those from our previous models, identified as CB03 (Campbell and Bozorgnia, 2003a, 2003b, 2003c, 2004) and C97 (Campbell, 1997, 2000, 2001). The C97 model is used to evaluate PGV, which was not included as a parameter in the CB03 model. Unless otherwise noted, we evaluated all of the ground motion models using the parameter values given in Table 7.4, with the exception that we set $Z_{Tom} = 0$ for all magnitudes in the CB-NGA model, and we set
$F_{RF} = 0.5$ and $F_{TH} = 0.5$ to represent generic reverse faulting in the CB03 model. We evaluated the CB03 model for NEHRP D site conditions by setting $S_{VFS} = 0$, $S_{SR} = 0$, and $S_{FR} = 0$. Some of the comparisons have been shown to distances of 200 km even though the CB03 and C97 models were developed using data to 60 km, and we have recommended that they not be used for distances greater than 100 km. We do this because many users do not place constraints on empirical ground motion models when using them in a probabilistic seismic hazard analysis (PSHA), regardless of the author’s recommendations.

Figures 7.15 and 7.16 show comparisons of ground motion scaling with rupture distance and earthquake magnitude for PGA, PGV, and PSA at oscillator periods of 0.2, 0.5, 1.0, and 3.0 s. The next six figures show comparisons of spectral scaling with (1) rupture distance for NEHRP BC site conditions (Fig. 7.17); (2) earthquake magnitude for NEHRP BC site conditions (Fig. 7.18); (3) rupture distance for NEHRP D site conditions (Fig. 7.19); (4) earthquake magnitude for NEHRP D site conditions (Fig. 7.20); (5) style of faulting, hanging wall/footwall site locations, and rupture depth for reverse faults (Fig. 7.21), and (6) style of faulting and hanging-wall/footwall site locations for normal and strike-slip faults (Fig. 7.22). The next two figures show comparisons of the total standard deviation for $R_{RUP} = 0$ and either NEHRP BC site conditions (Fig. 7.23) or NEHRP B, C, D, and E site conditions (Fig. 7.24). These latter comparisons are given as a function of magnitude, as this is the most common form of the CB03 and C97 aleatory uncertainty models used in practice.

Figures 7.15–7.20 show that the differences between our NGA and previous ground motion models are generally small, within the range of magnitudes and distances common to both databases (i.e., $M = 5.0–6.5$ and $R_{RUP} = 10–60$ km) for NEHRP BC and NEHRP D site conditions. The biggest differences occur at smaller and larger magnitudes, where data were previously sparse or nonexistent. This is most apparent at intermediate distances from large-magnitude earthquakes, where the new functional form predicts a greater rate of attenuation and, therefore, a lower level of ground motion than the previous functional forms. These differences are largely due to us forcing saturation at $R_{SEIS} = 0$ for all ground motion parameters, regardless of the oscillator period, while at the same time constraining the rate of attenuation to be independent of magnitude in our previous models. The biggest difference is for PGV, where the more complete PEER database and new functional form has resulted in magnitude and distance scaling characteristics that are more similar to those found at longer periods than before. The
new functional form is supported both empirically by the additional strong motion recordings from $M \geq 7.0$ earthquakes in the PEER database and theoretically by the broadband ground motion simulation results of Frankel (2007).

Figure 7.21 shows that the difference between our NGA and CB03 response spectral predictions are relatively small for a site located on the footwall (FW) or hanging wall (HW) of a surface-rupturing reverse fault at a distance of 5 km from a major earthquake. However, our NGA model predicts higher short-period spectral acceleration when such an event is buried (i.e., does not have surface rupture), since our previous model did not distinguish between reverse-faulting earthquakes with surface and buried fault rupture.

Figure 7.22 shows the same comparison as in Figure 7.21 except for normal and strike-slip faults. In this case, there is no distinction between earthquakes with surface or buried rupture in our new model. Now our NGA model predicts significantly higher ground motion than the CB03 model at short and mid periods, because of the inclusion of hanging-wall effects. This represents a worst-case scenario for strike-slip faults, which will typically have much steeper rupture planes than used in this comparison. Our NGA model predicts that hanging-wall effects phase out for dip angles greater than 70°.

Figure 7.23 shows that in all cases the total standard deviation from the CB-NGA model for NEHRP BC site conditions is smaller at small magnitudes and larger at large magnitudes as compared to those of the CB03 and C97 models. This transition from smaller to larger standard deviation occurs between magnitudes of 5.0 and 6.0, depending on the ground motion parameter. Figure 7.24 shows that the difference in standard deviation is strongly dependent on NEHRP site class. At short periods, where the standard deviation is a strong function of $V_{s30}$ and $A_{100}$ (rock PGA), the total standard deviation of the CB-NGA model for the softer sites can be smaller than that of the CB03 and C97 models at large magnitudes. The upward curvature observed in the CB-NGA values at small magnitudes is due to the smaller value of $A_{100}$ at these magnitudes. The comparison in Figure 7.24 is much different for other distances and site locations. For example, at large distances, the CB-NGA curves coalesce to look like the curves in Figure 7.23. For sites on the hanging wall of a reverse fault, the higher ground motion in the CB-NGA model leads to a greater separation of the curves.
### Table 7.1 Example calculations for 90°-dipping strike-slip fault.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$R_{rup}$ (km)</th>
<th>$R_{jb}$</th>
<th>$R_{seis}$</th>
<th>$M = 5.0$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PSA, 0.01s (g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$R_{jb}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>199.9</td>
<td>200.0</td>
<td>200.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$R_{rup}$ (km)</th>
<th>$R_{jb}$</th>
<th>$R_{seis}$</th>
<th>$M = 7.0$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PSA, 0.01s (g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$R_{jb}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>199.9</td>
<td>200.0</td>
<td>200.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$R_{rup}$ (km)</th>
<th>$R_{jb}$</th>
<th>$R_{seis}$</th>
<th>$M = 5.0$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PSA, 0.2s (g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$R_{jb}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>199.9</td>
<td>200.0</td>
<td>200.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.1—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$R_{RUP}$ (km)</th>
<th>$M = 5.0$</th>
<th>$M = 7.0$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$R_{JB}$</td>
<td>$R_{SEIS}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CB-NGA</td>
<td>CB03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSA, 3.0s (g)</td>
<td>PSA, 3.0s (g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>199.9</td>
<td>200.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$R_{RUP}$ (km)</th>
<th>$R_{JB}$</th>
<th>$R_{SEIS}$</th>
<th>$R_{JB}$</th>
<th>$R_{SEIS}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CB-NGA</td>
<td>C97</td>
<td>CB-NGA</td>
<td>C97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PGV (cm/s)</td>
<td></td>
<td>PGV (cm/s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.525</td>
<td>9.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>3.558</td>
<td>3.708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>2.323</td>
<td>2.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>1.067</td>
<td>0.829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>0.592</td>
<td>0.420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.264</td>
<td>0.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>199.9</td>
<td>200.0</td>
<td>0.118</td>
<td>0.058</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.2  Example calculations for hanging wall of 45°-dipping reverse fault.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$R_{RUP}$ (km)</th>
<th>$R_{JB}$</th>
<th>$R_{SEIS}$</th>
<th>$M = 5.0$</th>
<th>$R_{JB}$</th>
<th>$R_{SEIS}$</th>
<th>$M = 7.0$</th>
<th>$R_{JB}$</th>
<th>$R_{SEIS}$</th>
<th>$R_{JB}$</th>
<th>$R_{SEIS}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PSA, 0.01s (g)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PSA, 0.01s (g)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PSA, 0.01s (g)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CB-NGA</td>
<td>CB03</td>
<td></td>
<td>CB-NGA</td>
<td>CB03</td>
<td></td>
<td>CB-NGA</td>
<td>CB03</td>
<td></td>
<td>CB-NGA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.7615</td>
<td>0.8191</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.6899</td>
<td>0.8216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.5940</td>
<td>0.7892</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.4058</td>
<td>0.6187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.2308</td>
<td>0.2834</td>
<td>0.2458</td>
<td>0.3079</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.1093</td>
<td>0.1586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.3160</td>
<td>0.1444</td>
<td>0.0461</td>
<td>0.0938</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.6661</td>
<td>0.0938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>0.0893</td>
<td>0.0951</td>
<td>0.0344</td>
<td>0.0453</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>0.0344</td>
<td>0.0453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>0.0396</td>
<td>0.0459</td>
<td>0.1093</td>
<td>0.1586</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>0.6661</td>
<td>0.0938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>0.0210</td>
<td>0.0267</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>0.0861</td>
<td>0.0938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0088</td>
<td>0.0128</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0181</td>
<td>0.0217</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>199.9</td>
<td>200.0</td>
<td>0.0037</td>
<td>0.0061</td>
<td>199.4</td>
<td>200.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>199.4</td>
<td>200.0</td>
<td>0.0037</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$R_{RUP}$ (km)</th>
<th>$R_{JB}$</th>
<th>$R_{SEIS}$</th>
<th>$PSA, 0.2s (g)$</th>
<th>$R_{JB}$</th>
<th>$R_{SEIS}$</th>
<th>$PSA, 0.2s (g)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CB-NGA</td>
<td>CB03</td>
<td></td>
<td>CB-NGA</td>
<td>CB03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.7023</td>
<td>1.4571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.5940</td>
<td>1.4527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.2308</td>
<td>0.2834</td>
<td>0.1093</td>
<td>0.1586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.3160</td>
<td>0.1444</td>
<td>0.1093</td>
<td>0.1586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>0.0893</td>
<td>0.0951</td>
<td>0.1093</td>
<td>0.1586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>0.0396</td>
<td>0.0459</td>
<td>0.1093</td>
<td>0.1586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>0.0210</td>
<td>0.0267</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0088</td>
<td>0.0128</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>199.9</td>
<td>200.0</td>
<td>0.0037</td>
<td>0.0061</td>
<td>199.4</td>
<td>200.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$R_{RUP}$ (km)</th>
<th>$R_{JB}$</th>
<th>$R_{SEIS}$</th>
<th>$PSA, 1.0s (g)$</th>
<th>$R_{JB}$</th>
<th>$R_{SEIS}$</th>
<th>$PSA, 1.0s (g)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CB-NGA</td>
<td>CB03</td>
<td></td>
<td>CB-NGA</td>
<td>CB03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.6195</td>
<td>0.7032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.5299</td>
<td>0.7093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.0262</td>
<td>0.0659</td>
<td>0.4337</td>
<td>0.6492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.0342</td>
<td>0.0292</td>
<td>0.2846</td>
<td>0.4756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>0.0224</td>
<td>0.0198</td>
<td>0.1729</td>
<td>0.2594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>0.0104</td>
<td>0.0101</td>
<td>0.0806</td>
<td>0.1389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>0.0058</td>
<td>0.0062</td>
<td>0.0513</td>
<td>0.0858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0026</td>
<td>0.0032</td>
<td>0.0288</td>
<td>0.0441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>199.9</td>
<td>200.0</td>
<td>0.0012</td>
<td>0.0016</td>
<td>0.0164</td>
<td>0.0227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_{RUP}$ (km)</td>
<td>$R_{JB}$</td>
<td>$R_{SEIS}$</td>
<td>PSA, 3.0s (g)</td>
<td>$R_{JB}$</td>
<td>$R_{SEIS}$</td>
<td>PSA, 3.0s (g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PSA, 3.0s (g)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PSA, 3.0s (g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CB-NGA</td>
<td>CB03</td>
<td></td>
<td>CB-NGA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.1251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.1070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.00542</td>
<td>0.00509</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.00298</td>
<td>0.00261</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>0.00196</td>
<td>0.00177</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>0.00091</td>
<td>0.00091</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>0.00051</td>
<td>0.00055</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.00023</td>
<td>0.00028</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>199.9</td>
<td>200.0</td>
<td>0.00010</td>
<td>0.00015</td>
<td>199.4</td>
<td>200.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$R_{RUP}$ (km)</th>
<th>$R_{JB}$</th>
<th>$R_{SEIS}$</th>
<th>PGV (cm/s)</th>
<th>$R_{JB}$</th>
<th>$R_{SEIS}$</th>
<th>PGV (cm/s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CB-NGA</td>
<td>C97</td>
<td></td>
<td>CB-NGA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>63.275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>53.958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.336</td>
<td>12.830</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>4.546</td>
<td>4.850</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>2.968</td>
<td>2.653</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>1.363</td>
<td>0.958</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td>0.459</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.338</td>
<td>0.166</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>199.9</td>
<td>200.0</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>199.4</td>
<td>200.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.3 Parameter values used for strike-slip faulting scenario given in Table 7.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$F_{NM}$</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>$F_{RV}$</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_{RV}$</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>$F_{TH}$</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\delta$</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>$\delta$</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Z_{TOR}$ ($M = 7.0$)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>$S_{VFS}$</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Z_{TOR}$ ($M = 5.0$)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>$S_{SR}$</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$V_{S30}$</td>
<td>760.0</td>
<td>$S_{FR}$</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Z_{2.5}$</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>$S_{BC}$</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site location</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Site location</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 7.4 Parameter values used for reverse-faulting scenario given in Table 7.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$F_{NM}$</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>$F_{RV}$</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_{RV}$</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>$F_{TH}$</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\delta$</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>$\delta$</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Z_{TOR}$ ($M = 7.0$)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>$S_{VFS}$</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Z_{TOR}$ ($M = 5.0$)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>$S_{SR}$</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$V_{S30}$</td>
<td>760.0</td>
<td>$S_{FR}$</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Z_{2.5}$</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>$S_{BC}$</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site location</td>
<td>HW</td>
<td>Site location</td>
<td>HW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 7.1  Ground motion scaling with rupture distance.
Fig. 7.2  Ground motion scaling with earthquake magnitude.
Fig. 7.3 Ground motion scaling with style of faulting and hanging-wall/footwall site locations for $M = 7.0$. Positive distances denote site locations on hanging-wall, and negative distances denote site locations on footwall.
Fig. 7.4 Shallow site amplification scaling with rock PGA.
Fig. 7.5 NEHRP site coefficient $F_a$ scaling with PGA on NEHRP BC site conditions.
Fig. 7.6 NEHRP site coefficient $F_v$ scaling with PGA on NEHRP BC site conditions.
Fig. 7.7  Deep site amplification scaling with depth to 2.5 km velocity horizon.
Fig. 7.8 Total standard deviation scaling with rock PGA.
Fig. 7.9 Standard deviation scaling with oscillator period for $M = 7.0$ and $R_{UP} = 10$ km.
Fig. 7.10  Spectral acceleration scaling with rupture distance.
Fig. 7.11 Spectral acceleration scaling with earthquake magnitude.
Fig. 7.12 Spectral acceleration scaling with style of faulting, hanging-wall/footwall site locations, and rupture depth for $M = 6.5$ and $R_{RUP} = 5$ km.
Fig. 7.13  Spectral acceleration scaling with shallow site conditions for $R_{UP} = 10$ km.
Fig. 7.14 Spectral acceleration scaling with sediment depth for $M = 7.0$, $R_{RUP} = 10$ km, and NEHRP D site conditions.
Fig. 7.15 Comparison of ground motion scaling with rupture distance between CB-NGA and CB03 and C97 (PGV) ground motion models for NEHRP BC site conditions.
Fig. 7.16 Comparison of ground motion scaling with earthquake magnitude between CB-NGA and CB03 and C97 (PGV) ground motion models for NEHRP BC site conditions.
Fig. 7.17 Comparison of spectral acceleration scaling with rupture distance between CB-NGA and CB03 ground motion models for NEHRP BC site conditions.
Fig. 7.18 Comparison of spectral acceleration scaling with earthquake magnitude between CB-NGA and CB03 ground motion models for NEHRP BC site conditions.
Fig. 7.19 Comparison of spectral acceleration scaling with rupture distance between CB-NGA and CB03 ground motion models for NEHRP D site conditions.
Fig. 7.20 Comparison of spectral acceleration scaling with earthquake magnitude between CB-NGA and CB03 ground motion models for NEHRP D site conditions.
Fig. 7.21 Comparison of spectral acceleration scaling with style of faulting, hanging-wall/footwall site locations, and rupture depth between CB-NGA and CB03 ground motion models for reverse faults, $M = 6.5$, $R_{rup} = 5$ km, and $\delta = 45^\circ$. 
Fig. 7.22 Comparison of spectral acceleration scaling with style of faulting and hanging-wall/footwall site locations between CB-NGA and CB03 ground motion models for normal and strike-slip faults, $M = 6.5$, $R_{UP} = 5$ km, and $\delta = 45^\circ$. 
Fig. 7.23 Comparison of total standard deviations between CB-NGA and CB03 and C97 (PGV) ground motion models for NEHRP BC site conditions and $R_{RUP} = 0$. 
Fig. 7.24 Comparison of total standard deviations between CB-NGA and CB03 and C97 (PGV) ground motion models for NEHRP B, C, D, and E site conditions and $R_{RUP} = 0$. 
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Appendix A: Summary of Strong Motion Database Used in the Analysis
Table A.1  Summary of strong motion database used in the analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Record No</th>
<th>Event No</th>
<th>Event Name</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Station Code</th>
<th>Station Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Kern County</td>
<td>7.36</td>
<td>24303</td>
<td>LA - Hollywood Stor FF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Parkfield</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>1016</td>
<td>Cholame - Shandon Array #12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Parkfield</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>1014</td>
<td>Cholame - Shandon Array #5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Parkfield</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>1015</td>
<td>Temblor pre-1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Parkfield</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>1438</td>
<td>Castaic - Old Ridge Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Lytle Creek</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>24278</td>
<td>Cedar Springs Pumphouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Lytle Creek</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>Cedar Springs, Allen Ranch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Lytle Creek</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Colton - So Cal Edison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Lytle Creek</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>Devil's Canyon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Lytle Creek</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>24303</td>
<td>LA - Hollywood Stor FF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Lytle Creek</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>24271</td>
<td>Lake Hughes #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Lytle Creek</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>Puddingstone Dam (Abutment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Lytle Creek</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>Santa Anita Dam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Lytle Creek</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>Wrightwood - 6074 Park Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>San Fernando</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>2516 Via Tejon PV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>San Fernando</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Anza Post Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>San Fernando</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Buena Vista - Taft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>San Fernando</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>Carbon Canyon Dam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>San Fernando</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>24278</td>
<td>Castaic - Old Ridge Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>San Fernando</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>Cedar Springs Pumphouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>San Fernando</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>Cedar Springs, Allen Ranch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>San Fernando</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Colton - So Cal Edison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>San Fernando</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>Fairmont Dam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>San Fernando</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>Fort Tejon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>San Fernando</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>Gormon - Oso Pump Plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>San Fernando</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>12331</td>
<td>Hemet Fire Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>San Fernando</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>Isabella Dam (Aux Abut)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>San Fernando</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>24303</td>
<td>LA - Hollywood Stor FF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>San Fernando</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>24271</td>
<td>Lake Hughes #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>San Fernando</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>Lake Hughes #12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>San Fernando</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Lake Hughes #4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>San Fernando</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Lake Hughes #9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>San Fernando</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>1041</td>
<td>Maricopa Array #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>San Fernando</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>1042</td>
<td>Maricopa Array #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>San Fernando</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>1043</td>
<td>Maricopa Array #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>San Fernando</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>Palmdale Fire Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>San Fernando</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>Pearblossom Pump</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>San Fernando</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>Port Hueneme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>San Fernando</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>Puddingstone Dam (Abutment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>San Fernando</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>San Juan Capistrano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>San Fernando</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>San Onofre - So Cal Edison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>San Fernando</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>Santa Anita Dam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>San Fernando</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>1027</td>
<td>Tehachapi Pump</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>San Fernando</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>Upland - San Antonio Dam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>San Fernando</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>1102</td>
<td>Wheeler Ridge - Ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>San Fernando</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows Dam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>San Fernando</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>Wrightwood - 6074 Park Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Managua, Nicaragua-01</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>3501</td>
<td>Managua, ESSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Friuli, Italy-01</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>8002</td>
<td>Barcis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Friuli, Italy-01</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>8004</td>
<td>Codoipo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Friuli, Italy-01</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>8005</td>
<td>Conegliano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Friuli, Italy-01</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>8007</td>
<td>Feltrre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Friuli, Italy-01</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>8012</td>
<td>Tolmezzo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Gazli, USSR</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>9201</td>
<td>Karakyr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Tabas, Iran</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Bajestan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Tabas, Iran</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Boshrooyeh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Tabas, Iran</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>9102</td>
<td>Dayhook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Tabas, Iran</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Ferdows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Tabas, Iran</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Kashmar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Tabas, Iran</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Sedeh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Tabas, Iran</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>9101</td>
<td>Tabas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Coyote Lake</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>57217</td>
<td>Coyote Lake Dam (SW Abut)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Coyote Lake</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>47379</td>
<td>Gilroy Array #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Coyote Lake</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>47380</td>
<td>Gilroy Array #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Coyote Lake</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>47381</td>
<td>Gilroy Array #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Coyote Lake</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>57382</td>
<td>Gilroy Array #4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Coyote Lake</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>57383</td>
<td>Gilroy Array #6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Coyote Lake</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>57191</td>
<td>Halls Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Coyote Lake</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>47315</td>
<td>SJB Overpass, Bent 3 g.l.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Coyote Lake</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>47315</td>
<td>SJB Overpass, Bent 5 g.l.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Coyote Lake</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>47126</td>
<td>San Juan Bautista, 24 Polk St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Norcia, Italy</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>Bevagna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Norcia, Italy</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>Cascia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Norcia, Italy</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>Spoletto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>6616</td>
<td>Aeropuerto Mexicali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>6618</td>
<td>Agrarias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>5054</td>
<td>Bonds Corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>5060</td>
<td>Brawley Airport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>5053</td>
<td>Calexico Fire Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>5061</td>
<td>Calipatria Fire Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>6604</td>
<td>Cerro Prieto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>6621</td>
<td>Chihuahua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>5066</td>
<td>Coachella Canal #4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>6622</td>
<td>Compuertas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>6605</td>
<td>Delta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>1136</td>
<td>EC County Center FF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>1336</td>
<td>EC Meloland Overpass FF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>5056</td>
<td>El Centro Array #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>El Centro Array #10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>5058</td>
<td>El Centro Array #11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>El Centro Array #12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>5059</td>
<td>El Centro Array #13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>5057</td>
<td>El Centro Array #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>El Centro Array #4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>El Centro Array #5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>5158</td>
<td>El Centro Array #6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>5028</td>
<td>El Centro Array #7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>El Centro Array #8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>5165</td>
<td>El Centro Differential Array</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>5055</td>
<td>Holtville Post Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>11023</td>
<td>Niland Fire Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>5051</td>
<td>Parachute Test Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>5052</td>
<td>Plaster City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>6619</td>
<td>SAHOP Casa Flores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>Superstition Mtn Camera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>6610</td>
<td>Victoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>11369</td>
<td>Westmorland Fire Sta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Livermore-01</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>58219</td>
<td>APEEL 3E Hayward CSUH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Livermore-01</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>57064</td>
<td>Fremont - Mission San Jose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Livermore-01</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>57187</td>
<td>San Ramon - Eastman Kodak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Livermore-01</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>57134</td>
<td>San Ramon Fire Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Livermore-01</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>57063</td>
<td>Tracy - Sewage Treatm Plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Anza (Horse Canyon)-01</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>5044</td>
<td>Anza - Pinyon Flat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Anza (Horse Canyon)-01</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>5045</td>
<td>Anza - Terverwiller Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Anza (Horse Canyon)-01</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>5160</td>
<td>Anza Fire Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Anza (Horse Canyon)-01</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>5049</td>
<td>Borrego Air Ranch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Anza (Horse Canyon)-01</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>5047</td>
<td>Rancho De Anza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Mammoth Lakes-01</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>54099</td>
<td>Convict Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Mammoth Lakes-01</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>54214</td>
<td>Long Valley Dam (Upr L Abut)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Mammoth Lakes-01</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>54301</td>
<td>Mammoth Lakes H. S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Victoria, Mexico</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>6604</td>
<td>Cerro Prieto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Victoria, Mexico</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>6621</td>
<td>Chihuahua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Victoria, Mexico</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>6619</td>
<td>SAHOP Casa Flores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Victoria, Mexico</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>6624</td>
<td>Victoria Hospital Sotano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Irpinia, Italy-01</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>Arienzo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Irpinia, Italy-01</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>Auletta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Irpinia, Italy-01</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>Bagnoli Irpinio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Irpinia, Italy-01</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>Bisaccia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Irpinia, Italy-01</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>Bovino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Irpinia, Italy-01</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>Calitri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Irpinia, Italy-01</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>Mercato San Severino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Irpinia, Italy-01</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>Rionero In Vulture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Irpinia, Italy-01</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>Storno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Irpinia, Italy-01</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>Torre Del Greco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Irpinia, Italy-01</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>Tricarico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Corinth, Greece</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>Corinth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Westmorland</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>5060</td>
<td>Brawley Airport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Westmorland</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>11023</td>
<td>Niland Fire Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Westmorland</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>5051</td>
<td>Parachute Test Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Westmorland</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>5062</td>
<td>Salton Sea Wildlife Refuge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Westmorland</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>Superstition Mtn Camera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Westmorland</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>11369</td>
<td>Westmorland Fire Sta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Coalinga-01</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>46314</td>
<td>Cantua Creek School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Coalinga-01</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>36229</td>
<td>Parkfield - Cholame 12W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Coalinga-01</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>36452</td>
<td>Parkfield - Cholame 1E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Coalinga-01</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>36230</td>
<td>Parkfield - Cholame 2E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Coalinga-01</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>36228</td>
<td>Parkfield - Cholame 2WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Coalinga-01</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>36450</td>
<td>Parkfield - Cholame 3E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Coalinga-01</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>36410</td>
<td>Parkfield - Cholame 3W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Coalinga-01</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>36412</td>
<td>Parkfield - Cholame 4AW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Coalinga-01</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>36411</td>
<td>Parkfield - Cholame 4W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Coalinga-01</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>36227</td>
<td>Parkfield - Cholame 5W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Coalinga-01</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>36451</td>
<td>Parkfield - Cholame 6W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Coalinga-01</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>36226</td>
<td>Parkfield - Cholame 8W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Coalinga-01</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>36407</td>
<td>Parkfield - Fault Zone 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Coalinga-01</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>36444</td>
<td>Parkfield - Fault Zone 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>336</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Coalinga-01</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>36453</td>
<td>Parkfield - Fault Zone 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>337</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Coalinga-01</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>36138</td>
<td>Parkfield - Fault Zone 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Coalinga-01</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>36456</td>
<td>Parkfield - Fault Zone 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>339</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Coalinga-01</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>36445</td>
<td>Parkfield - Fault Zone 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Coalinga-01</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>36457</td>
<td>Parkfield - Fault Zone 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>341</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Coalinga-01</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>36413</td>
<td>Parkfield - Fault Zone 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>342</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Coalinga-01</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>36408</td>
<td>Parkfield - Fault Zone 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>343</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Coalinga-01</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>36414</td>
<td>Parkfield - Fault Zone 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>344</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Coalinga-01</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>36454</td>
<td>Parkfield - Fault Zone 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>345</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Coalinga-01</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>36431</td>
<td>Parkfield - Fault Zone 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>346</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Coalinga-01</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>36449</td>
<td>Parkfield - Fault Zone 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>347</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Coalinga-01</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>36443</td>
<td>Parkfield - Fault Zone 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>348</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Coalinga-01</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>36415</td>
<td>Parkfield - Gold Hill 1W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>349</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Coalinga-01</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>36421</td>
<td>Parkfield - Gold Hill 2E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Coalinga-01</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>36416</td>
<td>Parkfield - Gold Hill 2W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Coalinga-01</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>36439</td>
<td>Parkfield - Gold Hill 3E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>352</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Coalinga-01</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>36420</td>
<td>Parkfield - Gold Hill 3W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>353</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Coalinga-01</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>36433</td>
<td>Parkfield - Gold Hill 4W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>354</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Coalinga-01</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>36434</td>
<td>Parkfield - Gold Hill 5W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>355</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Coalinga-01</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>36432</td>
<td>Parkfield - Gold Hill 6W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>356</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Coalinga-01</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>36422</td>
<td>Parkfield - Stone Corral 2E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>357</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Coalinga-01</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>36437</td>
<td>Parkfield - Stone Corral 3E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>358</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Coalinga-01</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>36438</td>
<td>Parkfield - Stone Corral 4E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>359</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Coalinga-01</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>36455</td>
<td>Parkfield - Vineyard Cany 1E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Coalinga-01</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>36448</td>
<td>Parkfield - Vineyard Cany 1W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>362</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Coalinga-01</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>36447</td>
<td>Parkfield - Vineyard Cany 2W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>363</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Coalinga-01</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>36176</td>
<td>Parkfield - Vineyard Cany 3W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Latitude</td>
<td>Longitude</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>364</td>
<td>Coalinga-01</td>
<td>36.36</td>
<td>116.2</td>
<td>Parkfield - Vineyard Cany 4W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>366</td>
<td>Coalinga-01</td>
<td>36.36</td>
<td>116.2</td>
<td>Parkfield - Vineyard Cany 6W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>368</td>
<td>Coalinga-01</td>
<td>36.36</td>
<td>116.2</td>
<td>Pleasant Valley P.P. - yard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>369</td>
<td>Coalinga-01</td>
<td>36.36</td>
<td>116.2</td>
<td>Slack Canyon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>437</td>
<td>Borah Peak, ID-01</td>
<td>87.68</td>
<td>119.99</td>
<td>CPP-610</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>439</td>
<td>Borah Peak, ID-01</td>
<td>87.68</td>
<td>119.99</td>
<td>TAN-719</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>446</td>
<td>Morgan Hill</td>
<td>90.61</td>
<td>118.49</td>
<td>APEEL 1E - Hayward</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>447</td>
<td>Morgan Hill</td>
<td>90.61</td>
<td>118.49</td>
<td>Agnews State Hospital</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>448</td>
<td>Morgan Hill</td>
<td>90.61</td>
<td>118.49</td>
<td>Anderson Dam (Downstream)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>449</td>
<td>Morgan Hill</td>
<td>90.61</td>
<td>118.49</td>
<td>Capitola</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450</td>
<td>Morgan Hill</td>
<td>90.61</td>
<td>118.49</td>
<td>Corralitos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>451</td>
<td>Morgan Hill</td>
<td>90.61</td>
<td>118.49</td>
<td>Coyote Lake Dam (SW Abut)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>452</td>
<td>Morgan Hill</td>
<td>90.61</td>
<td>118.49</td>
<td>Foster City - APEEL 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>453</td>
<td>Morgan Hill</td>
<td>90.61</td>
<td>118.49</td>
<td>Fremont - Mission San Jose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>454</td>
<td>Morgan Hill</td>
<td>90.61</td>
<td>118.49</td>
<td>Gilroy - Gavilan Coll.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>455</td>
<td>Morgan Hill</td>
<td>90.61</td>
<td>118.49</td>
<td>Gilroy Array #1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>456</td>
<td>Morgan Hill</td>
<td>90.61</td>
<td>118.49</td>
<td>Gilroy Array #2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>457</td>
<td>Morgan Hill</td>
<td>90.61</td>
<td>118.49</td>
<td>Gilroy Array #3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>458</td>
<td>Morgan Hill</td>
<td>90.61</td>
<td>118.49</td>
<td>Gilroy Array #4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>459</td>
<td>Morgan Hill</td>
<td>90.61</td>
<td>118.49</td>
<td>Gilroy Array #6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>460</td>
<td>Morgan Hill</td>
<td>90.61</td>
<td>118.49</td>
<td>Gilroy Array #7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>461</td>
<td>Morgan Hill</td>
<td>90.61</td>
<td>118.49</td>
<td>Halls Valley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>462</td>
<td>Morgan Hill</td>
<td>90.61</td>
<td>118.49</td>
<td>1656 Hollister Diff Array #1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>463</td>
<td>Morgan Hill</td>
<td>90.61</td>
<td>118.49</td>
<td>1656 Hollister Diff Array #3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>464</td>
<td>Morgan Hill</td>
<td>90.61</td>
<td>118.49</td>
<td>1656 Hollister Diff Array #4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>465</td>
<td>Morgan Hill</td>
<td>90.61</td>
<td>118.49</td>
<td>1656 Hollister Diff Array #5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>466</td>
<td>Morgan Hill</td>
<td>90.61</td>
<td>118.49</td>
<td>Hollister Diff. Array</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>467</td>
<td>Morgan Hill</td>
<td>90.61</td>
<td>118.49</td>
<td>San Juan Bautista, 24 Polk St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>471</td>
<td>Morgan Hill</td>
<td>90.61</td>
<td>118.49</td>
<td>San Justo Dam (L. Abut)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>472</td>
<td>Morgan Hill</td>
<td>90.61</td>
<td>118.49</td>
<td>San Justo Dam (R. Abut)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>473</td>
<td>Morgan Hill</td>
<td>90.61</td>
<td>118.49</td>
<td>UCSC Lick Observatory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>474</td>
<td>Morgan Hill</td>
<td>90.61</td>
<td>118.49</td>
<td>SF Intern. Airport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>475</td>
<td>Morgan Hill</td>
<td>90.61</td>
<td>118.49</td>
<td>San Justo Dam (L. Abut)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>476</td>
<td>Morgan Hill</td>
<td>90.61</td>
<td>118.49</td>
<td>San Justo Dam (R. Abut)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>477</td>
<td>Lazio-Abruzzo, Italy</td>
<td>91.62</td>
<td>118.5</td>
<td>Atina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>478</td>
<td>Lazio-Abruzzo, Italy</td>
<td>91.62</td>
<td>118.5</td>
<td>Garigliano-Centrale Nucleare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>479</td>
<td>Lazio-Abruzzo, Italy</td>
<td>91.62</td>
<td>118.5</td>
<td>Isermia-San'Agapito</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>480</td>
<td>Lazio-Abruzzo, Italy</td>
<td>91.62</td>
<td>118.5</td>
<td>Pontecorvo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>481</td>
<td>Lazio-Abruzzo, Italy</td>
<td>91.62</td>
<td>118.5</td>
<td>Roccannonfina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>495</td>
<td>Nahanni, Canada</td>
<td>97.6</td>
<td>118.5</td>
<td>Site 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496</td>
<td>Nahanni, Canada</td>
<td>97.6</td>
<td>118.5</td>
<td>Site 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>497</td>
<td>Nahanni, Canada</td>
<td>97.6</td>
<td>118.5</td>
<td>Site 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>498</td>
<td>Hollister-04</td>
<td>98.6</td>
<td>118.5</td>
<td>1656 Hollister Diff Array #1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>499</td>
<td>Hollister-04</td>
<td>98.6</td>
<td>118.5</td>
<td>1656 Hollister Diff Array #3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501</td>
<td>Hollister-04</td>
<td>98.6</td>
<td>118.5</td>
<td>47189 SAGO South - Surface</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>511</td>
<td>N. Palm Springs</td>
<td>101.6</td>
<td>118.5</td>
<td>5224 Anza - Red Mountain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>512</td>
<td>N. Palm Springs</td>
<td>101.6</td>
<td>118.5</td>
<td>5231 Anza - Tule Canyon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513</td>
<td>N. Palm Springs</td>
<td>101.6</td>
<td>118.5</td>
<td>5160 Anza Fire Station</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>514</td>
<td>N. Palm Springs</td>
<td>101.6</td>
<td>118.5</td>
<td>5073 Cabazon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>515</td>
<td>N. Palm Springs</td>
<td>101.6</td>
<td>118.5</td>
<td>754 Colton Interchange - Vault</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>516</td>
<td>N. Palm Springs</td>
<td>101.6</td>
<td>118.5</td>
<td>5157 Cranston Forest Station</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>517</td>
<td>N. Palm Springs</td>
<td>101.6</td>
<td>118.5</td>
<td>12149 Desert Hot Springs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>518</td>
<td>N. Palm Springs</td>
<td>101.6</td>
<td>118.5</td>
<td>5069 Fun Valley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>519</td>
<td>N. Palm Springs</td>
<td>101.6</td>
<td>118.5</td>
<td>12331 Hemet Fire Station</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520</td>
<td>N. Palm Springs</td>
<td>101.6</td>
<td>118.5</td>
<td>23321 Hesperia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>521</td>
<td>N. Palm Springs</td>
<td>101.6</td>
<td>118.5</td>
<td>5043 Hurkey Creek Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>522</td>
<td>N. Palm Springs</td>
<td>101.6</td>
<td>118.5</td>
<td>5067 Indio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>523</td>
<td>N. Palm Springs</td>
<td>101.6</td>
<td>118.5</td>
<td>12026 Indio - Coachella Canal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>524</td>
<td>N. Palm Springs</td>
<td>101.6</td>
<td>118.5</td>
<td>22170 Joshua Tree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>525</td>
<td>N. Palm Springs</td>
<td>101.6</td>
<td>118.5</td>
<td>22713 Landers Fire Station</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>526</td>
<td>N. Palm Springs</td>
<td>101.6</td>
<td>118.5</td>
<td>5071 Morongo Valley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527</td>
<td>N. Palm Springs</td>
<td>101.6</td>
<td>118.5</td>
<td>13198 Murrieta Hot Springs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>528</td>
<td>N. Palm Springs</td>
<td>101.6</td>
<td>118.5</td>
<td>5070 North Palm Springs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>529</td>
<td>N. Palm Springs</td>
<td>101.6</td>
<td>118.5</td>
<td>12025 Palm Springs Airport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>531</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>N. Palm Springs</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>12168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>532</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>N. Palm Springs</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>23497</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>533</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>N. Palm Springs</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>13123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>534</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>N. Palm Springs</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>12204</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>535</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>N. Palm Springs</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>22022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>536</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>N. Palm Springs</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>5230</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>537</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>N. Palm Springs</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>12206</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>538</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>N. Palm Springs</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>5038</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>539</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>N. Palm Springs</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>13172</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>N. Palm Springs</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>5072</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>541</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>N. Palm Springs</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>13199</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>542</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>N. Palm Springs</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>13201</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>543</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Chalfant Valley-01</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>54100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>544</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Chalfant Valley-01</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>54171</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>545</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Chalfant Valley-01</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>54424</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>546</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Chalfant Valley-01</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>54703</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>547</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Chalfant Valley-01</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>54428</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>548</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Chalfant Valley-02</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>54100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>549</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Chalfant Valley-02</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>54171</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Chalfant Valley-02</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>54424</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>551</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Chalfant Valley-02</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>54099</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>552</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Chalfant Valley-02</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>54703</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>553</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Chalfant Valley-02</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>54214</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>554</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Chalfant Valley-02</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>54214</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>555</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Chalfant Valley-02</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>54704</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>556</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Chalfant Valley-02</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>1661</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>557</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Chalfant Valley-02</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>54101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>558</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Chalfant Valley-02</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>54428</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>586</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>New Zealand-02</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>113A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>587</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>New Zealand-02</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>589</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>24461</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>590</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>24402</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>591</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>90088</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>592</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>90093</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>593</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>24087</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>594</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>90069</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>595</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>90094</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>596</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>90014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>597</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>90013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>598</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>90061</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>951</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>951</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>602</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>90012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>90052</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>604</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>90053</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>605</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>90057</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>606</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>607</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>90040</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>608</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>90081</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>609</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>24277</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>610</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>24278</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>90078</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>612</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>90068</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>613</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>90070</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>614</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>90079</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>615</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>14368</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>616</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>90066</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>617</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>13122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>618</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>90002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>619</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>709</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>620</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>90063</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>90065</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>622</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>90073</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>12331</td>
<td>Hemet Fire Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>624</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>13197</td>
<td>Huntington Beach - Lake St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>625</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>14196</td>
<td>Inglewood - Union Oil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>626</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>14403</td>
<td>LA - 116th St School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>627</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>24157</td>
<td>LA - Baldwin Hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>628</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>90054</td>
<td>LA - Centinela St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>629</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>24389</td>
<td>LA - Century City CC North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>630</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>24390</td>
<td>LA - Century City CC South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>631</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>90015</td>
<td>LA - Chalon Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>632</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>90033</td>
<td>LA - Cypress Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>634</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>90034</td>
<td>LA - Fletcher Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>635</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>24303</td>
<td>LA - Hollywood Stor FF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>636</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>90016</td>
<td>LA - N Farning Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>637</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>90032</td>
<td>LA - N Figueroa St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>638</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>90021</td>
<td>LA - N Westmoreland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>639</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>24400</td>
<td>LA - Obregon Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>640</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>90022</td>
<td>LA - S Grand Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>641</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>90091</td>
<td>LA - Saturn St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>642</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>90023</td>
<td>LA - W 70th St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>643</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>90017</td>
<td>LA - Wonderland Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>644</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>14395</td>
<td>LB - Harbor Admin FF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>645</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>90080</td>
<td>LB - Orange Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>646</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>14242</td>
<td>LB - Rancho Los Cerritos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>647</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>14241</td>
<td>LB - Recreation Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>648</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>90060</td>
<td>La Crescenta - New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>649</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>90074</td>
<td>La Habra - Briarchff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>650</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>90072</td>
<td>La Puente - Rimgrove Av</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>651</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>24271</td>
<td>Lake Hughes #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>652</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>90084</td>
<td>Lakewood - Del Amo Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>653</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>24526</td>
<td>Lancaster - Med Off FF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>654</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>90045</td>
<td>Lawndale - Osage Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>655</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>24055</td>
<td>Leona Valley #5 - Ritter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>656</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>24309</td>
<td>Leona Valley #6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>657</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>90050</td>
<td>Malibu - Las Flores Canyon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>658</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>24396</td>
<td>Malibu - Point Dume Sch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>659</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>90051</td>
<td>Malibu - W Pacific Cst Hwy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>661</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>90062</td>
<td>Mill Creek, Angeles Nat For</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>662</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>24283</td>
<td>Moorpark - Fire Sta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>663</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>24399</td>
<td>Mt Wilson - CIT Seis Sta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>664</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>90009</td>
<td>N Hollywood - Coldwater Can</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>665</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>24279</td>
<td>Newhall - Fire Sta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>666</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>90056</td>
<td>Newhall - W Pico Canyon Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>667</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>90003</td>
<td>Northridge - 17645 Saticoy St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>668</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>Norwalk - Imp.Hwy, S Grnd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>669</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>Orange Co. Reservoir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>670</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>90049</td>
<td>Pacific Palisades - Sunset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>671</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>24088</td>
<td>Pacoima Kagel Canyon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>672</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>90005</td>
<td>Pacoima Kagel Canyon USC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>673</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>90007</td>
<td>Panorama City - Roscoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>674</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>80046</td>
<td>Pasadena - Brown Gym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>677</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>80047</td>
<td>Pasadena - CIT Calif Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>678</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>80051</td>
<td>Pasadena - CIT Indust. Rel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>681</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>80048</td>
<td>Pasadena - CIT Lura St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>683</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>90095</td>
<td>Pasadena - Old House Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>684</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>90047</td>
<td>Playa Del Rey - Saran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>685</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>23525</td>
<td>Pomona - 4th &amp; Locust FF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>686</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>23497</td>
<td>Rancho Cucamonga - FF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>687</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>90044</td>
<td>Rancho Palos Verdes - Luconia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>688</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>13123</td>
<td>Riverside Airport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>689</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>24274</td>
<td>Rosamond - Goode Ranch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>690</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>90019</td>
<td>San Gabriel - E Grand Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>691</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>24401</td>
<td>San Marino - SW Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>692</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>90077</td>
<td>Santa Fe Springs - E Joslin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>693 113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>90048</td>
<td>Santa Monica - Second St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>694 113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>90010</td>
<td>Studio City - Coldwater Can</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>695 113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>90006</td>
<td>Sun Valley - Roscoe Blvd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>696 113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>90008</td>
<td>Sun Valley - Sunland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>697 113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>90058</td>
<td>Sunland - Mt Gleason Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>698 113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>24514</td>
<td>Sylmar - Olive View Med FF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>699 113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>90001</td>
<td>Sylmar - Sayre St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>701 113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>90082</td>
<td>Terminal Island - S Seaside</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>702 113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>90038</td>
<td>Torrance - W 226th St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>703 113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>24047</td>
<td>Vasquez Rocks Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>704 113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>90071</td>
<td>West Covina - S Orange Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>706 113</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows Dam upstream</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>707 114</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-02</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>24461</td>
<td>Alhambra - Fremont School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>708 114</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-02</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>24402</td>
<td>Altadena - Eaton Canyon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>709 114</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-02</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>14368</td>
<td>Downey - Co Maint Bldg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710 114</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-02</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>14196</td>
<td>Inglewood - Union Oil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>711 114</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-02</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>14403</td>
<td>LA - 116th St School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>712 114</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-02</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>24157</td>
<td>LA - Baldwin Hills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>713 114</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-02</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>24303</td>
<td>LA - Hollywood Stor FF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>714 114</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-02</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>24400</td>
<td>LA - Obregon Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>715 114</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-02</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>24399</td>
<td>Mt Wilson - CIT Seis Sta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>716 114</td>
<td>Whittier Narrows-02</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>24401</td>
<td>San Marino - SW Academy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>718 115</td>
<td>Superstition Hills-01</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>5210</td>
<td>Wildlife Liquef. Array</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>719 116</td>
<td>Superstition Hills-02</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>5060</td>
<td>Brawley Airport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>720 116</td>
<td>Superstition Hills-02</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>5061</td>
<td>Calipatria Fire Station</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>721 116</td>
<td>Superstition Hills-02</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>1335</td>
<td>El Centro Imp. Co. Cent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>722 116</td>
<td>Superstition Hills-02</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>9401</td>
<td>Kornblum Road (temp)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>723 116</td>
<td>Superstition Hills-02</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>5051</td>
<td>Parachute Test Site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>724 116</td>
<td>Superstition Hills-02</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>5052</td>
<td>Plaster City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>725 116</td>
<td>Superstition Hills-02</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>9400</td>
<td>Poe Road (temp)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>726 116</td>
<td>Superstition Hills-02</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>5062</td>
<td>Salton Sea Wildlife Refuge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>727 116</td>
<td>Superstition Hills-02</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>Superstition Mtn Camera</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>728 116</td>
<td>Superstition Hills-02</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>11369</td>
<td>Westmorland Fire Sta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>729 116</td>
<td>Superstition Hills-02</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>5210</td>
<td>Wildlife Liquef. Array</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>731 118</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>58373</td>
<td>APEEL 10 - Skyline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>732 118</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1002</td>
<td>APEEL 2 - Redwood City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>733 118</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>58393</td>
<td>APEEL 2E Hayward Muir Sch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>734 118</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>58219</td>
<td>APEEL 3E Hayward CSUH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>735 118</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>58378</td>
<td>APEEL 7 - Pulgas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>736 118</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1161</td>
<td>APEEL 9 - Crystal Springs Res</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>737 118</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>57066</td>
<td>Agnews State Hospital</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>738 118</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>Alameda Naval Air Stn Hanger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>739 118</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>Anderson Dam (Downstream)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>740 118</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>Anderson Dam (L.About)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>741 118</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>BRAN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>742 118</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1210</td>
<td>Bear Valley #1, Fire Station</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>743 118</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1479</td>
<td>Bear Valley #10, Webb Residence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>744 118</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1481</td>
<td>Bear Valley #12, Williams Ranch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>745 118</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1483</td>
<td>Bear Valley #14, Upper Butts Rn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>746 118</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1474</td>
<td>Bear Valley #5, Callens Ranch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>747 118</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1476</td>
<td>Bear Valley #7, Pinnacles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>749 118</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1005</td>
<td>Berkeley - Strawberry Canyon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750 118</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>58471</td>
<td>BerkeleyLBL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>751 118</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1687</td>
<td>Calaveras Reservoir</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>752 118</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>47125</td>
<td>Capitola</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>753 118</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>57007</td>
<td>Corralitos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>754 118</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>57504</td>
<td>Coyote Lake Dam (Downst)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>755 118</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>57217</td>
<td>Coyote Lake Dam (SW Abut)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>756 118</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Dublin - Fire Station</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>757 118</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>58664</td>
<td>Dumbarton Bridge West End FF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>758 118</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1662</td>
<td>Emeryville - 6363 Christie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>759 118</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>58375</td>
<td>Foster City - APEEL 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>760</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>Foster City - Menhaden Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>761</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>Fremont - Emerson Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>762</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>Fremont - Mission San Jose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>763</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>Gilroy - Gavilan Coll.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>764</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>Gilroy - Historic Bldg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>765</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>Gilroy Array #1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>766</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>Gilroy Array #2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>767</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>Gilroy Array #3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>768</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>Gilroy Array #4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>769</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>Gilroy Array #6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>Golden Gate Bridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>771</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>Halls Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>772</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>Hayward - BART Sta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>773</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>Hollister - South &amp; Pine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>774</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>Hollister Diff. Array</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>775</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>LGPC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>776</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>Larkspur Ferry Terminal (FF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>777</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>Lower Crystal Springs Dam dwnt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>778</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>Monterey City Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>779</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>Oakland - Outer Harbor Wharf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>780</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>Oakland - Title &amp; Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>781</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>Olema - Point Reyes Station</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>782</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>Palo Alto - 1900 Embarc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>783</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>Palo Alto - SLAC Lab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>784</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>Piedmont Jr High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>785</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>Point Bonita</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>786</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>Richmond City Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>787</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>SAGO South - Surface</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>788</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>SF - 1295 Shafter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>789</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>SF - Diamond Heights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>790</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>SF - Pacific Heights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>791</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>SF - Presidio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>792</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>SF Intern. Airport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>793</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>Salinas - John &amp; Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>794</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>San Jose - Santa Teresa Hills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>795</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>Saratoga - Aloha Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>796</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>Saratoga - W Valley Coll.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>797</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>So. San Francisco, Sierra Pt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>798</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>Sunnyvale - Colton Ave.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>799</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>Sunol - Forest Fire Station</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>Treasure Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>UCSC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>802</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>UCSC Lick Observatory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>803</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>WAHO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>804</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>Woodside</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>805</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>Yerba Buena Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>806</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>Los Gatos - Lexington Dam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>807</td>
<td>Griva, Greece</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>Kilkis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>808</td>
<td>Erzican, Turkey</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>Erzincan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>809</td>
<td>Cape Mendocino</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>Cape Mendocino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>810</td>
<td>Cape Mendocino</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>Eureka - Myrtle &amp; West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>811</td>
<td>Cape Mendocino</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>Fortuna - Fortuna Blvd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>812</td>
<td>Cape Mendocino</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>Petrolia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>813</td>
<td>Cape Mendocino</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>Rio Dell Overpass - FF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>814</td>
<td>Cape Mendocino</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>Shelter Cove Airport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>815</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>Amboy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>816</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>Anaheim - W Ball Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>817</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>Arcadia - Arcadia Av</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>818</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>Arcadia - Campus Dr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>819</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>Baker Fire Station</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>820</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>Baldwin Park - N Holly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Latitude</td>
<td>Longitude</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>838</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>34.9852</td>
<td>-116.2053</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>839</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>34.9853</td>
<td>-116.2054</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>840</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>34.9858</td>
<td>-116.2056</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>841</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>34.9859</td>
<td>-116.2057</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>842</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>34.9863</td>
<td>-116.2059</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>843</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>34.9866</td>
<td>-116.2061</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>844</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>34.9868</td>
<td>-116.2062</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>845</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>34.9869</td>
<td>-116.2064</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>846</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>34.9874</td>
<td>-116.2067</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>847</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>34.9875</td>
<td>-116.2068</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>848</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>34.9876</td>
<td>-116.2069</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>849</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>34.9877</td>
<td>-116.2070</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>850</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>34.9879</td>
<td>-116.2071</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>851</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>34.9882</td>
<td>-116.2072</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>852</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>34.9883</td>
<td>-116.2073</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>853</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>34.9884</td>
<td>-116.2074</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>854</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>34.9885</td>
<td>-116.2075</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>855</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>34.9886</td>
<td>-116.2076</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>856</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>34.9887</td>
<td>-116.2077</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>857</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>34.9888</td>
<td>-116.2078</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>858</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>34.9889</td>
<td>-116.2079</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>859</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>34.9890</td>
<td>-116.2080</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>860</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>34.9891</td>
<td>-116.2081</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>861</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>34.9892</td>
<td>-116.2082</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>862</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>34.9893</td>
<td>-116.2083</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>863</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>34.9894</td>
<td>-116.2084</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>864</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>34.9895</td>
<td>-116.2085</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>865</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>34.9896</td>
<td>-116.2086</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>866</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>34.9897</td>
<td>-116.2087</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>867</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>34.9898</td>
<td>-116.2088</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>868</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>34.9899</td>
<td>-116.2089</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>869</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>34.9900</td>
<td>-116.2090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>870</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>34.9901</td>
<td>-116.2091</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>871</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>34.9902</td>
<td>-116.2092</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>872</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>34.9903</td>
<td>-116.2093</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>873</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>34.9904</td>
<td>-116.2094</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>874</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>34.9905</td>
<td>-116.2095</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>875</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>34.9906</td>
<td>-116.2096</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>876</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>34.9907</td>
<td>-116.2097</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>877</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>34.9908</td>
<td>-116.2098</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>878</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>34.9909</td>
<td>-116.2099</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>879</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>34.9910</td>
<td>-116.2100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>880</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>34.9911</td>
<td>-116.2101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>881</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>34.9912</td>
<td>-116.2102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>882</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>34.9913</td>
<td>-116.2103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>883</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>34.9914</td>
<td>-116.2104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>884</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>34.9915</td>
<td>-116.2105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>885</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>34.9916</td>
<td>-116.2106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>886</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>34.9917</td>
<td>-116.2107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>887</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>34.9918</td>
<td>-116.2108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>888</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>34.9919</td>
<td>-116.2109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>889</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>34.9920</td>
<td>-116.2110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>890</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>34.9921</td>
<td>-116.2111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>891</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>34.9922</td>
<td>-116.2112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>892</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>34.9923</td>
<td>-116.2113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>893</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>34.9924</td>
<td>-116.2114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>894</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>34.9925</td>
<td>-116.2115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>895</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>34.9926</td>
<td>-116.2116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>896</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>34.9927</td>
<td>-116.2117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>897</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>34.9928</td>
<td>-116.2118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>898</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>34.9929</td>
<td>-116.2119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>899</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>34.9930</td>
<td>-116.2120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>34.9931</td>
<td>-116.2121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>901</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Big Bear-01</td>
<td>34.9932</td>
<td>-116.2122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>902</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Big Bear-01</td>
<td>34.9933</td>
<td>-116.2123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>903</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Big Bear-01</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>12626 Desert Shores</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>904</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Big Bear-01</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>24575 Elizabeth Lake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>905</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Big Bear-01</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>13122 Featherly Park - Maint</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>906</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Big Bear-01</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>12331 Hemet Fire Station</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>907</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Big Bear-01</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>23583 Hesperia - 4th &amp; Palm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>908</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Big Bear-01</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>12026 Indio - Coachella Canal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>909</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Big Bear-01</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>12543 Indio - Riverside Co Fair Grnds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>910</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Big Bear-01</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>22170 Joshua Tree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>911</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Big Bear-01</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>24592 LA - City Terrace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>912</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Big Bear-01</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>24611 LA - Temple &amp; Hope</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>913</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Big Bear-01</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>24605 LA - Univ. Hospital</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>914</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Big Bear-01</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>12624 Lake Cachula</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>915</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Big Bear-01</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>11625 Mecca - CVWD Yard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>916</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Big Bear-01</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>23572 Mt Baldy - Elementary Sch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>917</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Big Bear-01</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>13160 Newport Bch - Irvine Ave. F.S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>918</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Big Bear-01</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>11591 North Shore - Durmid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>919</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Big Bear-01</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>11613 North Shore - Salton Sea Pk HQ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>920</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Big Bear-01</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>12025 Palm Springs Airport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>921</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Big Bear-01</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>23584 Pear Blossom - Pallet Creek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>922</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Big Bear-01</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>23597 Phelan - Wilson Ranch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>923</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Big Bear-01</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>12168 Puerta La Cruz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>924</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Big Bear-01</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>23598 Rancho Cucamonga - Deer Can</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Big Bear-01</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>23497 Rancho Cucamonga - FF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>926</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Big Bear-01</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>13123 Riverside Airport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>927</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Big Bear-01</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>12636 Sage - Fire Station</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>928</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Big Bear-01</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>11628 Salton City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>929</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Big Bear-01</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>23542 San Bernardino - E &amp; Hospitality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>930</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Big Bear-01</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>12202 San Jacinto - Valley Cemetary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>931</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Big Bear-01</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>14578 Seal Beach - Office Bldg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>932</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Big Bear-01</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>12206 Silent Valley - Poppet Flat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>933</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Big Bear-01</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>12630 Snow Creek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>934</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Big Bear-01</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>13172 Temecula - 6th &amp; Mercedes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>935</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Big Bear-01</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>13199 Winchester Bergman Ran</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>936</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Big Bear-01</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>23573 Wrightwood - Nielson Ranch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>937</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Big Bear-01</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>23574 Wrightwood - Swarthout</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>938</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Big Bear-01</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>22074 Yermo Fire Station</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>939</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>24461 Alhambra - Fremont School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>940</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>25169 Anacapa Island</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>941</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>90088 Anaheim - W Ball Rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>942</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>24576 Anaverde Valley - City R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>943</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>24310 Antelope Buttes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>944</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>90099 Arcadia - Arcadia Av</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>945</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>90093 Arcadia - Campus Dr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>946</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>24087 Arleta - Nordhoff Fire Sta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>947</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>90069 Baldwin Park - N Holly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>948</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>90004 Bell Gardens - Jaboneria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>949</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>90014 Beverly Hills - 12520 Mulhol</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>950</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>90013 Beverly Hills - 14145 Mulhol</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>951</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>90061 Big Tujunga, Angeles Nat F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>952</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>90087 Brea - S Flower Av</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>953</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>90086 Buena Park - La Palma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>954</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>90059 Burbank - Howard Rd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>955</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>25282 Camarillo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>956</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>90053 Canoga Park - Topanga Can</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>957</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>90057 Canyon Country - W Lost Cany</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>958</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>90040 Carson - Catskill Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>959</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>90081 Carson - Water St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>960</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>24278 Castaic - Old Ridge Route</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>961</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>90078 Compton - Castlegate St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>962</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>90068 Covina - S Grand Ave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>963</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>90070 Covina - W Badillo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>964</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>90079 Downey - Birchdale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>965</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>14368 Downey - Co Maint Bldg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Zip Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>969</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>Duarte - Mel Canyon Rd.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>970</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>El Monte - Fairview Av</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>971</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>Elizabeth Lake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>972</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>Featherly Park - Maint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>973</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>Garden Grove - Santa Rita</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>974</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>Glendale - Las Palmas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>975</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>Glendora - N Oakbank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>976</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>Hacienda Heights - Colima</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>977</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>Hemet - Ryan Airfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>978</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>Hollywood - Willoughby Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>979</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>Huntington Bch - Waikiki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>980</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>Huntington Beach - Lake St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>981</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>Inglewood - Union Oil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>982</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>Jensen Filter Plant Generator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>983</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>LA - 116th St School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>984</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>LA - Baldwin Hills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>985</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>LA - Brentwood VA Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>987</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>LA - Centinela St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>988</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>LA - Century City CC North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>989</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>LA - Chalon Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>990</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>LA - City Terrace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>991</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>LA - Cypress Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>993</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>LA - Fletcher Dr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>994</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>LA - Griffith Park Observatory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>995</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>LA - Hollywood Stor FF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>996</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>LA - N Faring Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>997</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>LA - N Figueroa St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>998</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>LA - N Westmoreland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>999</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>LA - Obregon Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>LA - Pico &amp; Sentous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1001</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>LA - S Grand Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1003</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>LA - Saturn St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1004</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>LA - Sepulveda VA Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1005</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>LA - Temple &amp; Hope</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1006</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>LA - UCLA Grounds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1007</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>LA - Univ. Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1008</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>LA - W 15th St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>LA - Wonderland Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1012</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>LA 00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1013</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>LA Dam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1014</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>LB - City Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1015</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>LB - Rancho Los Cerritos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1016</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>La Crescenta - New York</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1017</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>La Habra - Briarcliff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1018</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>La Puente - Rimgrove Av</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1019</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>Lake Hughes #1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1020</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>Lake Hughes #12A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1021</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>Lake Hughes #4 - Camp Mend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1022</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>Lake Hughes #4B - Camp Mend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1023</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>Lake Hughes #9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1024</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>Lakewood - Del Amo Blvd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1025</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>Lancaster - Fox Airfield Grnd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1026</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>Lawndale - Osage Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1027</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>Leona Valley #1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1028</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>Leona Valley #2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1029</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>Leona Valley #3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1030</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>Leona Valley #4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1031</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>Leona Valley #5 - Ritter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1032</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>Leona Valley #6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1033</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>Littlerock - Brainard Can</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1034</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>Malibu - Point Dume Sch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1035</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>Manhattan Beach - Manhattan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1036</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>Mojave - Hwys 14 &amp; 58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1037</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>34237 Mojave - Oak Creek Canyon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1038</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>90011 Montebello - Bluff Rd.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1039</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>24283 Moorpark - Fire Sta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1040</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>23572 Mt Baldy - Elementary Sch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1041</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>24399 Mt Wilson - CIT Seis Sta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1042</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>90009 N Hollywood - Coldwater Can</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1043</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>24586 Neenach - Sacatarra Ck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1044</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>24279 Newhall - Fire Sta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1045</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>90056 Newhall - W Pico Canyon Rd.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1046</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>13160 Newport Bch - Irvine Ave. F.S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1047</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>13610 Newport Bch - Newp &amp; Coast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1048</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>90083 Northridge - 17645 Saticoy St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1049</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>90049 Pacific Palisades - Sunset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1050</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>24207 Pacoima Dam (downstr)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1052</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>24088 Pacoima Kagel Canyon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1053</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>24521 Palmdale - Hwy 14 &amp; Palmdale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1054</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>99999 Pardee - SCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1055</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>90095 Pasadena - N Sierra Madre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1056</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>23597 Phelan - Wilson Ranch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1057</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>90047 Playa Del Rey - Saran</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1058</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>25148 Point Mugu - Laguna Peak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1059</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>25281 Port Hueneme - Naval Lab.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1060</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>23598 Rancho Cucamonga - Deer Can</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1061</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>14404 Rancho Palos Verdes - Hawth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1062</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>90044 Rancho Palos Verdes - Luconia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1063</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>77 Rinaldi Receiving Sta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1064</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>13123 Riverside Airport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1065</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>14405 Rolling Hills Est-Rancho Vista</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1066</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>24092 Rosamond - Airport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1067</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>23672 San Bernardino - CSUSB Gr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1068</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>5245 San Bernardino - Co Service Bldg - Freefield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1069</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>23542 San Bernardino - E &amp; Hospitality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1070</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>90019 San Gabriel - E Grand Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1071</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>12673 San Jacinto - CDF Fire Sta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1072</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>24401 San Marino - SW Academy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1073</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>14159 San Pedro - Palos Verdes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1074</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>24644 Sandberg - Bald Mtn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1075</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>25091 Santa Barbara - UCSB Goleta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1076</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>90077 Santa Fe Springs - E Joslin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1077</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>24538 Santa Monica City Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1078</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>5108 Santa Susana Ground</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1079</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>14578 Seal Beach - Office Bldg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1080</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>90055 Simi Valley - Katherine Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1082</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>90006 Sun Valley - Roscoe Blvd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1083</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>90058 Sunland - Mt Gleason Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1084</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>74 Sylmar - Converter Sta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1085</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>75 Sylmar - Converter Sta East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1086</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>24514 Sylmar - Olive View Med FF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1088</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>90082 Terminal Island - S Seaside</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1089</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>5081 Topanga - Fire Sta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1090</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>90089 Tustin - E Sycamore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1091</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>24047 Vasquez Rocks Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1092</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>25340 Ventura - Harbor &amp; California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1093</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>90090 Villa Park - Serrano Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1094</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>90071 West Covina - S Orange Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1095</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>90075 Whittier - S. Alta Dr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1096</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>23590 Wrightwood - Jackson Flat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1097</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>23573 Wrightwood - Nielson Ranch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1098</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>23574 Wrightwood - Swarthout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100</td>
<td>Kobe, Japan</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>99999 Abeno</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1101</td>
<td>Kobe, Japan</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>99999 Amagasaki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1102</td>
<td>Kobe, Japan</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>99999 Chihaya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1103</td>
<td>Kobe, Japan</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>99999 FUK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1104</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>Kobe, Japan</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>Fukushima</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1105</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>Kobe, Japan</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>HIK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1106</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>Kobe, Japan</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>KJMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1107</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>Kobe, Japan</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>Kakogawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1108</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>Kobe, Japan</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>Kobe University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1109</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>Kobe, Japan</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>MZH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1110</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>Kobe, Japan</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>Morigawachi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1111</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>Kobe, Japan</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>Nishi-Akashi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1112</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>Kobe, Japan</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>OKA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1113</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>Kobe, Japan</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>OSAJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1114</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>Kobe, Japan</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>Port Island (0 m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1115</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>Kobe, Japan</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>Sakai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1116</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>Kobe, Japan</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>Shin-Osaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1117</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>Kobe, Japan</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1118</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>Kobe, Japan</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>Tadoka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1119</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>Kobe, Japan</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>Takarazuka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1120</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>Kobe, Japan</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>Takatori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1121</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>Kobe, Japan</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>Yae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1122</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>Kozani, Greece-01</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>Florina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1123</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>Kozani, Greece-01</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>Kardista</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1124</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>Kozani, Greece-01</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>Kozani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1125</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>Dinar, Turkey</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>Cardak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1126</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>Dinar, Turkey</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>Dinar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1127</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>Ambarli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1128</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>Arcelik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1129</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>Ataköy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1130</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>Balikesir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1131</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>Botas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1132</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>Bursa Sivil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1133</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>Bursa Tofas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1134</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>Cekmece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1135</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>Düzce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1136</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>Eregli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1137</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>Fatih</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1138</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>Geyikli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1139</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>Hava Alani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1140</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>İstanbul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1141</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>Izmit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1142</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>Iznik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1143</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>Kutahya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1144</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>Maslak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1145</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>Meçidiyeköy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1146</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>Tekirdag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1147</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>Yarımca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1148</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>Zeytinburnu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1149</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1150</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1151</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1152</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1153</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1154</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1155</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1156</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1157</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1158</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1159</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1160</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1161</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1162</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1163</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1164</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1165</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1166</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1198</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1199</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1201</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1202</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1203</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1204</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1205</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1206</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1207</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1208</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1209</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1210</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1211</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1212</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1213</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1214</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1215</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1216</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1217</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1218</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1220</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1221</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1222</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1223</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1224</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1225</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1226</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1227</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1228</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1229</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1230</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1231</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1232</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1233</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1234</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1235</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1236</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1237</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1238</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1239</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1240</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1241</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1242</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1243</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1244</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1245</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1246</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1247</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1248</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>9999917</td>
<td>CHY109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>CHY116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1256</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>HWA002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1257</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>HWA003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1258</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>HWA005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1259</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>HWA006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1260</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>HWA007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1261</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>HWA009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1262</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>HWA011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1263</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>HWA012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1264</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>HWA013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1265</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>HWA014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1266</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>HWA015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1267</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>HWA016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>GRO No.</td>
<td>Code No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1268</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>HWA017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1269</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>HWA019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1270</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>HWA020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1271</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>HWA022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1272</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>HWA023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1273</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>HWA024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1274</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>HWA025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1275</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>HWA026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1276</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>HWA027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1277</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>HWA028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1278</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>HWA029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1279</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>HWA030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1280</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>HWA031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1281</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>HWA032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1282</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>HWA033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1283</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>HWA034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1284</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>HWA035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1285</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>HWA036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1286</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>HWA037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1287</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>HWA038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1288</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>HWA039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1289</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>HWA041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1290</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>HWA043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1291</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>HWA044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1292</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>HWA045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1293</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>HWA046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1294</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>HWA048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1295</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>HWA049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1296</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>HWA050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1297</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>HWA051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>HWA055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1301</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>HWA056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1302</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>HWA057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1303</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>HWA058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1304</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>HWA059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1305</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>HWA060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1306</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>HWA062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1307</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>ILA001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1308</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>ILA002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1309</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>ILA003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1310</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>ILA004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1311</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>ILA005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1312</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>ILA006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1313</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>ILA007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1314</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>ILA008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1315</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>ILA010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1316</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>ILA012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1317</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>ILA013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1318</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>ILA014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1319</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>ILA015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1320</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>ILA016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1321</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>ILA021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1322</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>ILA024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1323</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>9999917</td>
<td>ILA027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1324</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>ILA030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1325</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>ILA031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1326</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>9999917</td>
<td>ILA032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1327</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>9999917</td>
<td>ILA035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1328</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>ILA036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1329</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>ILA037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1330</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>9999917</td>
<td>ILA039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1331</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>ILA041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1332</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>ILA042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Latitude</td>
<td>Longitude</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1333</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>999999917</td>
<td>ILA043</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1334</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>ILA044</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1335</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>ILA046</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1336</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>ILA048</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1337</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>ILA049</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1338</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>ILA050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1339</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>ILA051</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1340</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>ILA052</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1341</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>ILA054</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1342</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>ILA055</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1343</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>ILA056</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1344</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>ILA059</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1345</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>ILA061</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1346</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>ILA062</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1347</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>ILA063</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1348</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>ILA064</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1349</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>ILA066</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1350</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>ILA067</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1351</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>KAU001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1352</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>KAU003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1353</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>KAU006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1354</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>KAU007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1355</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>KAU008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1356</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>KAU010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1357</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>KAU011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1358</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>KAU012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1359</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>KAU015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1360</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>KAU018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1361</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>KAU020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1362</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>KAU022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1363</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>KAU030</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1364</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>KAU032</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1365</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>KAU033</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1366</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>KAU037</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1367</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>KAU038</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1368</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>KAU044</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1369</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>KAU046</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1370</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>KAU047</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1371</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>KAU048</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1372</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>KAU050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1373</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>KAU054</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1374</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>KAU057</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1375</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>KAU058</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1376</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>KAU062</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1377</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>KAU063</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1378</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>KAU064</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1379</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>KAU066</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1380</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>KAU069</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1381</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>KAU073</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1382</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>KAU074</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1383</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>KAU075</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1384</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>KAU077</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1385</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>KAU078</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1386</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>KAU081</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1387</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>KAU082</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1388</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>KAU083</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1389</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>KAU085</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1390</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>KAU086</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1391</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>KAU087</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1392</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>KAU088</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1393</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>NST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1394</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>NST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1395</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TAP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1396</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TAP003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1411</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>1412</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>1413</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1418</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>1419</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>1420</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1425</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>1426</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>1427</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1436</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>1437</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>1438</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1447</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>1448</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>1449</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1454</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>1455</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>1456</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1464</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>1465</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>1466</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1473</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>1476</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A - 19
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>City, Province</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1481</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TCU038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1482</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TCU039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1483</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TCU040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1484</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TCU042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1485</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TCU045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1486</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TCU046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1487</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TCU047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1488</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TCU048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1489</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TCU049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1490</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TCU050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1491</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TCU051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1492</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TCU052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1493</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TCU053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1494</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TCU054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1495</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TCU055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1496</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TCU056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1497</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TCU057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1498</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TCU059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1499</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TCU060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TCU061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1501</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TCU063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1502</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TCU064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1503</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TCU065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1504</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TCU067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1505</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TCU068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1506</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TCU070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1507</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TCU071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1508</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TCU072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1509</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TCU074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1510</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TCU075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1511</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TCU076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1512</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TCU078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1513</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TCU079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1515</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TCU082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1516</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TCU083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1517</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TCU084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1518</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TCU085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1519</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TCU087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1520</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TCU088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1521</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TCU089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1522</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TCU092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1523</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TCU094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1524</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TCU095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1525</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TCU096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1526</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TCU098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1527</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TCU100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1528</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TCU101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1529</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TCU102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1530</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TCU103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1531</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TCU104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1532</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TCU105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1533</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TCU106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1534</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TCU107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1535</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TCU109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1536</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TCU110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1537</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TCU111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1538</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TCU112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1539</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TCU113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1540</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TCU115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1541</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TCU116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1542</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TCU117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1543</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TCU118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1544</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>TCU119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A - 20
<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1545</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>999999 TCU120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1546</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>999999 TCU122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1547</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>999999 TCU123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1548</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>999999 TCU128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1549</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999936 TCU129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1550</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>999999 TCU136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1551</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>999999 TCU138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1552</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>999999 TCU140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1553</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>999999 TCU141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1554</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>999999 TCU145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1555</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>999999 TCU147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1557</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>999999 TTN001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1558</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>999999 TTN002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1559</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>999999 TTN003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1560</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>999999 TTN004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1561</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>999999 TTN005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1562</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>999999 TTN006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1563</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>999999 TTN007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1564</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>999999 TTN008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1565</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>999999 TTN009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1566</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>999999 TTN010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1567</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>999999 TTN012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1568</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>999999 TTN013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1569</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>999999 TTN014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1570</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>999999 TTN015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1572</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>999999 TTN018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1573</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>999999 TTN020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1574</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>999999 TTN022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1575</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>999999 TTN023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1576</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>999999 TTN024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1577</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>999999 TTN025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1578</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>999999 TTN026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1579</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>999999 TTN027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1580</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>999999 TTN028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>999999 TTN031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1582</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>999999 TTN032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1583</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>999999 TTN033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1584</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>999999 TTN036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1585</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>999999 TTN040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1586</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>999999 TTN041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1587</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>999999 TTN042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1588</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>999999 TTN044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1589</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>999999 TTN045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1590</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>999999 TTN046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1592</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>999999 TTN048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>999999 TTN050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>999999 TTN051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1598</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>99999917 WTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1599</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>Duzce, Turkey</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>999999 Ambarli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>Duzce, Turkey</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>999999 Arcelik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1601</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>Duzce, Turkey</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>999999 Aslan R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1602</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>Duzce, Turkey</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>999999 Bolu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1603</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>Duzce, Turkey</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>999999 Bursa Tofas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1604</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>Duzce, Turkey</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>999999 Cekmece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1605</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>Duzce, Turkey</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>999999 Duzce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1606</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>Duzce, Turkey</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>999999 Fatih</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1608</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>Duzce, Turkey</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>999999 Hava Aliani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1609</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>Duzce, Turkey</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>999999 Kocamustafapaba Tomb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1610</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>Duzce, Turkey</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>999999 Kutahya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1619</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>Duzce, Turkey</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>999999 Mudurnu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1620</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>Duzce, Turkey</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>999999 Sakarya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1621</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>Duzce, Turkey</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>999999 Yarimca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1626</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>Sitka, Alaska</td>
<td>7.68</td>
<td>2714 Sitka Observatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Latitude</td>
<td>Longitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1627</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>Caldiran, Turkey</td>
<td>37.21</td>
<td>7.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1628</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>St Elias, Alaska</td>
<td>27.34</td>
<td>7.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1629</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>St Elias, Alaska</td>
<td>27.28</td>
<td>7.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1630</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>Upland</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>99999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1631</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>Upland</td>
<td>23.25</td>
<td>5.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1632</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>Upland</td>
<td>23.497</td>
<td>5.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1633</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>Manjil, Iran</td>
<td>7.37</td>
<td>99999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1634</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>Manjil, Iran</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>7.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1636</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>Manjil, Iran</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>7.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1637</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>Manjil, Iran</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>7.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1638</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>Manjil, Iran</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>7.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1639</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>Manjil, Iran</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>7.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1640</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>Manjil, Iran</td>
<td>99999</td>
<td>7.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1641</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>Sierra Madre</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>24.402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1642</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>Sierra Madre</td>
<td>123.11</td>
<td>5.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1643</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>Sierra Madre</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>5.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1644</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>Sierra Madre</td>
<td>24.400</td>
<td>5.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1645</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>Sierra Madre</td>
<td>24.399</td>
<td>5.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1646</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>Sierra Madre</td>
<td>5.296</td>
<td>5.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1647</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>Sierra Madre</td>
<td>24.401</td>
<td>5.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1649</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>Sierra Madre</td>
<td>24.047</td>
<td>5.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1740</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>Little Skull Mtn,NV</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>99999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1741</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>Little Skull Mtn,NV</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>99999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1742</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>Little Skull Mtn,NV</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>99999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1743</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>Little Skull Mtn,NV</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>99999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1744</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>Little Skull Mtn,NV</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>99999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1745</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>Little Skull Mtn,NV</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>99999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1746</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>Little Skull Mtn,NV</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>99999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1747</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>Little Skull Mtn,NV</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>99999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1759</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>5.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1761</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>24.402</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1762</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>21.081</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1763</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>5.044</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1764</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>5.222</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1765</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>24.087</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1766</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>32.075</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1767</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>12.674</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1768</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>23.559</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1769</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>5.402</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1770</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>22.791</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1771</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>5.271</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1772</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>5.398</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1773</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>5.073</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1776</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>12.149</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1777</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>5.526</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1778</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>14.368</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1779</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1780</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>13.122</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1782</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>5.075</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1783</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>24.577</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1784</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>11.684</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1785</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>5.069</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1786</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>22.074</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1787</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>5.9999</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1788</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>12.331</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1789</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>23.583</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1790</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>13.197</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1791</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>12.026</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1792</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>12.543</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1794</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>22.170</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1795</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>12.647</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1796</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>14.043</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1797</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>24.592</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1798</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>14787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1799</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>24400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>24612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1801</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>24611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1802</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>14560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1803</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>5408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1804</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>24271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1805</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>5029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1806</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>5030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1807</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>5396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1808</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>5409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1809</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>11625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1810</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>5162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1811</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>5076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1812</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>5071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1813</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>24279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1814</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>13160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1815</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>5295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1816</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>11591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1817</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>24088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1818</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1819</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>24691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>23525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1821</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>13123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1822</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>11628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1823</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>5331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1824</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>23542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1825</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>5339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1826</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>5337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1827</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>5330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1828</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>5328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1829</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>5371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>12204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1831</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>5300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>12630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1833</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>24763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1834</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>13172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>22161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>5031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>5072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1838</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>14840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1839</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>23573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>5282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1842</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>Yountville</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1843</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>Yountville</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1844</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>Yountville</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>Yountville</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>Yountville</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1847</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>Yountville</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1848</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>Yountville</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1849</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>Yountville</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>Yountville</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>Yountville</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1852</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>Yountville</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>Yountville</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1854</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>Yountville</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>Yountville</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>Yountville</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>Yountville</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>Yountville</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1859</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>Yountville</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>Yountville</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>Yountville</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863</td>
<td>Yountville</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>Yountville</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866</td>
<td>Yountville</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867</td>
<td>Yountville</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1868</td>
<td>Big Bear-02</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>23788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1869</td>
<td>Big Bear-02</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>5341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>Big Bear-02</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>5265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>Big Bear-02</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>5075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>Big Bear-02</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>23957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>Big Bear-02</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>12331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>Big Bear-02</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>23583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>Big Bear-02</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>5161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Big Bear-02</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>13924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>Big Bear-02</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>5294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>Big Bear-02</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>12904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>Big Bear-02</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>22959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>Big Bear-02</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Big Bear-02</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>5409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td>Big Bear-02</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>5162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>Big Bear-02</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>5076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>Big Bear-02</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>13927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>Big Bear-02</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>13925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>Big Bear-02</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>5071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>Big Bear-02</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>5295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>Big Bear-02</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>23958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>Big Bear-02</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>5037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>Big Bear-02</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>13915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>Big Bear-02</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>5331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>Big Bear-02</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>23542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>Big Bear-02</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>5339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>Big Bear-02</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>5329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>Big Bear-02</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>5337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>Big Bear-02</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>5327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>Big Bear-02</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>5330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898</td>
<td>Big Bear-02</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>5373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>Big Bear-02</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>23898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Big Bear-02</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>5328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>Big Bear-02</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>23780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>Big Bear-02</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>5336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>Big Bear-02</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>5300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>Big Bear-02</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>5300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>Big Bear-02</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>13930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>Big Bear-02</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>5031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>Big Bear-02</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>5072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>Big Bear-02</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>5282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>Big Bear-02</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>22074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Big Bear-02</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>23920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>Mohawk Val, Porto</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>Mohawk Val, Porto</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>1133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>Mohawk Val, Porto</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>1133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>Mohawk Val, Porto</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>1133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>Mohawk Val, Porto</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>Mohawk Val, Porto</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>Anza-02</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>2467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>Anza-02</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>5044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>Anza-02</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>5222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>Anza-02</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>5160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>Anza-02</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>12919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>Anza-02</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>22791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>Anza-02</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>5220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>Anza-02</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>5073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>Anza-02</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>5053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Zip Code</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Zip Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>Gulf of California</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>5054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>Gulf of California</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>5053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>Gulf of California</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>5061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>Gulf of California</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>Gulf of California</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>Gulf of California</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>5058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>Gulf of California</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>5028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>Gulf of California</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>5055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>Gulf of California</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>5272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>Gulf of California</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>5052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>Gulf of California</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>5273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>CA/Baja Border Area</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>5060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>CA/Baja Border Area</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>5053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>CA/Baja Border Area</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>5061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>CA/Baja Border Area</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>CA/Baja Border Area</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>CA/Baja Border Area</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>5058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>CA/Baja Border Area</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>5028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>CA/Baja Border Area</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>5055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>CA/Baja Border Area</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>5062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>1756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>1755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>47729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>1720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>1689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>1753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>1750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>57064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>47006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>47381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>57383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>1678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>1754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>1797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>47524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>1697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>1784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>1745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>1758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2031</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>1787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2032</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>1749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2033</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>47762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2034</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>1675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2036</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>57600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2037</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>57604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2038</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>1742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2039</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>47126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>57748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2041</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>48906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2042</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>1695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2043</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>1688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2044</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>1684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2045</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>1739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2046</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>1752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2047</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>Yorba Linda</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>13066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2048</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>Yorba Linda</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>13068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2049</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>Yorba Linda</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>13849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2050</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>Yorba Linda</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>13873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2051</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>Yorba Linda</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>24941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2052</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>Yorba Linda</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>13099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2053</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>Yorba Linda</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>13100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2054</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>Yorba Linda</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>13878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2055</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>Yorba Linda</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>13880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Depth</td>
<td>Latitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2056</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>Yorba Linda</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>13879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2057</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>Yorba Linda</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>13881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2058</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>Yorba Linda</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>13079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2089</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>Nenana Mountain, Alaska</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>FA02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2090</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>Nenana Mountain, Alaska</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>2797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2091</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>Nenana Mountain, Alaska</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>ps07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2092</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>Nenana Mountain, Alaska</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>ps07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2093</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>Nenana Mountain, Alaska</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>ps09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2107</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>Denali, Alaska</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2109</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>Denali, Alaska</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>FA02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2110</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>Denali, Alaska</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>2797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2111</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>Denali, Alaska</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>R109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2112</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>Denali, Alaska</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>ps08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2113</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>Denali, Alaska</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>ps09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2114</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>Denali, Alaska</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>ps10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2115</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>Denali, Alaska</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>ps11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2116</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>Denali, Alaska</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>ps12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2119</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Big Bear City</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>5222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2120</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Big Bear City</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>5073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2121</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Big Bear City</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>5341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2122</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Big Bear City</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>5265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2123</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Big Bear City</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>5075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2124</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Big Bear City</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>5161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2125</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Big Bear City</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>5294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2126</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Big Bear City</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>5029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2127</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Big Bear City</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2128</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Big Bear City</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>5396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2129</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Big Bear City</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>5162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2130</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Big Bear City</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>5076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2131</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Big Bear City</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>5071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2132</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Big Bear City</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>5295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2133</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Big Bear City</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2134</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Big Bear City</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>5032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2135</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Big Bear City</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>5296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2136</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Big Bear City</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>5245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2137</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Big Bear City</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>5331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2138</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Big Bear City</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>5339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2139</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Big Bear City</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>5329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2140</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Big Bear City</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>5327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2141</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Big Bear City</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>5320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2142</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Big Bear City</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>5373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2143</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Big Bear City</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>5328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2144</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Big Bear City</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>5371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2145</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Big Bear City</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>5336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2146</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Big Bear City</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>5036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2147</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Big Bear City</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>5300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2148</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Big Bear City</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>5300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2149</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Big Bear City</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>5435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2150</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Big Bear City</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>5423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2151</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Big Bear City</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>5031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2152</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Big Bear City</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>5072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2153</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Big Bear City</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>5282</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Response to Questions by the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) and California Geological Survey (CGS)
This appendix presents our response to USGS and CGS questions that were submitted to the NGA model developers in advance of the September 25, 2006, USGS independent expert panel review workshop. Only those questions and responses that pertain either specifically or generically to the CB-NGA model are presented. While most of the responses listed in this appendix were written by the authors, the responses to Questions B.12, B.13 and B.14 were taken in whole or in part from written responses by Norm Abrahamson (written communication, 2006).

B.1 USGS QUESTION #1

Do you consider your ground motion prediction equations appropriate for seismic hazard assessments of California and throughout the western U.S.? Please explain. If you had left out international data and only used California data would you get a significantly different answer? Please explain.

There are really two issues to address regarding this question. The first issue is the potential difference between extensional and non-extensional tectonic regimes and the second issue is the potential difference between different geographic regions. The first issue regarding different tectonic regimes is important since much of California is in a non-extensional tectonic regime whereas most of the remainder of the western U.S. (WUS) is in an extensional tectonic regime. This issue is addressed by showing plots of inter-event residuals versus magnitude segregated by tectonic regime. The second issue is addressed by showing plots of inter-event residuals versus magnitude and intra-event residuals versus distance ($R_{rup}$) and 30m shear-wave velocity ($V_{S30}$), all segregated by geographic region.

B.1.1 Regional Distribution of Database

Before responding to the question, we would first like to summarize the geographical distribution of our database. The distribution of the database by magnitude, distance and geographic region is given in Figure B.1. The regions identified in this figure are California, the WUS outside of California, Alaska and Taiwan. All other regions are combined into a single category called Other. Figure B.1 clearly shows that the database for $M < 7.3$ events is dominated by strong motion recordings from California. The limited amount of WUS data fall within the data cloud for California. At larger magnitudes, the data from Taiwan, Alaska, and the Other regions predominate. The extent to which the different geographic regions might have influenced our model is discussed below.

B.1.2 Distribution of Inter-Event Residuals by Geographic Region

The distribution of the inter-event residuals (source terms) by geographic region plotted against magnitude is shown in Figures B.2–B.5 for PGA and PSA at periods of 0.2, 1.0 and 3.0s,
respectively. One might argue that the residuals show a slight bias towards underpredicting ground motions for California earthquakes. But the average residuals for California indicate that there is only a +5% bias in the predicted ground motions at short periods and a +9% bias in the predicted ground motions at long periods. The biggest biases are for Alaska, where ground motions are overpredicted at all periods, and the WUS, where ground motions are grossly overpredicted at long periods. The Taiwan (i.e., 1999 Chi-Chi) earthquake (M 7.6) is overpredicted at short periods but is well-predicted at long periods. Of course, these biases are based on the assumption that the magnitude scaling predicted by the model is correct.

A second concern is whether the magnitude scaling at large magnitudes is biased. It appears that the California bias might be larger for events with M > 6.7. If this is true, the magnitude scaling would need to be adjusted. However, there are only five California earthquakes between M = 6.7 and 7.4, which are not enough to constrain magnitude scaling at large magnitudes. It is primarily the Alaska earthquakes that are responsible for offsetting the California events. We see no reason why these Alaska events are not a suitable analogue for California. In fact, many seismologists have used the 2002 Denali (M 7.9) earthquake as a prototype for a large earthquake on the San Andreas Fault. One of the more spectacular results is the very low residuals (near –1.0) at periods of 1.0 and 3.0s for two WUS earthquakes. A potential reason for this bias is discussed in the next section.

**B.1.3 Distribution of Inter-Event Residuals by Tectonic Regime**

The distribution of the inter-event residuals (source terms) by tectonic regime plotted against magnitude is shown in Figures B.6–B.9 for PGA and PSA at periods of 0.2, 1.0 and 3.0s, respectively. It should be noted that the classification of a region as extensional or non-extensional was taken directly from the PEER database. In this database, the 1999 Kocaeli (M 7.5) and 1999 Duzce (M 7.1) earthquakes, both from western Turkey, and the 1992 Landers (M 7.3) and the 1999 Hector Mine (M 7.1) earthquakes, both from the Mojave Desert in California, are classified as coming from a non-extensional regime. Art Frankel of the USGS and John Anderson of the University of Nevada (Reno) have suggested that both of these regions might be extensional rather than non-extensional.¹

The figures show that there does not appear to be a significant bias between extensional and non-extensional regimes at short periods. Nor does there appear to be a bias associated with the four earthquakes of questionable tectonic regime classification. One of the more spectacular results is the very low residuals (near –1.0) at 1.0 and 3.0s periods for two WUS earthquakes: 1983 Borah Peak (M 6.9) and 1992 Little Skull Mtn. (M 5.7). Both events occurred in the extensional tectonic regime of the Basin and Range Province and have residuals at short periods that are not out of line with the other earthquakes. Both of these earthquakes occurred in a region dominated by volcanic rock, possibly at or very near the surface, which is likely to have a very shallow sediment depth (i.e., a small value of Z25). However, our database does not

¹ After this response was written, Paul Spudich and Dave Boore of the USGS investigated the four earthquakes in question and determined that they occurred within a non-extensional regime.
contain estimates of sediment depth for the sites that recorded these earthquakes. Our model predicts very low long-period ground motions for sites with $Z_{2.5} < 1$ km, which might explain the observed biases. Because of this, we did not allow these events to bias the normal-faulting factor at long periods in our model. See the discussion of this issue in the main text of the report.
B.1.4 Distribution of Intra-Event Residuals by Distance and 30m Shear-Wave Velocity

The distribution of the intra-event residuals by geographic region plotted against distance (\( R_{RUP} \)) is shown in Figures B.10–B.13 for PGA and PSA at periods of 0.2, 1.0 and 3.0s, respectively. The plots are shown in terms of log distance to be consistent with how the parameter is used in the regression and to emphasize those recordings at short distances that are of greater engineering interest. These figures indicate that there does not appear to be a regional bias in any of the residuals.

The distribution of the intra-event residuals by geographic region plotted against 30m shear-wave velocity (\( V_{S30} \)) is shown in Figures B.14–B.17. Similar to the plots with distance, these figures indicate that there does not appear to be a regional bias in any of the residuals, except for a tendency to underpredict 3.0s spectral accelerations at \( V_{S30} >1000 \) m/s in both California and Taiwan. The reason for this underprediction is unknown at the present time. It is interesting to note that in general the model seems valid for predicting ground motions for NEHRP E sites, even though we have recommended in our report that the user exercise caution when predicting ground motions for such low-velocity sites. We made this recommendation to bring attention to the fact that the shaking response of some NEHRP E sites is problematic at high values of ground motion and are best addressed using site-specific response analyses.

B.1.5 Conclusion

Based on the results and discussion presented above, we believe that our empirical ground motion model is appropriate for predicting ground motions in California for purposes of seismic hazard assessment. Its validity in the WUS is more problematic, because there are only three earthquakes in our database that are outside of California and all three come from the extensional Basin and Range Province. Two of these events have long-period ground motions that are grossly overpredicted at long periods, which we attribute to shallow sediments of unknown depth. Aside from these two earthquakes, we believe that our residuals show that our ground-motion predictions do not appear to have a significant regional bias and that earthquakes from regions outside of California and the WUS are appropriate for estimating ground motions in these regions.\(^2\)

The question of whether our results would have been significantly different had we used only California data is difficult to answer without the painstaking task of re-running our analysis and re-interpreting the results. This question gets at the appropriateness of our predicted magnitude scaling at \( M > 6.7 \), which is based on only five California earthquakes, the largest being 7.4. We believe that the five California earthquakes in our database within this magnitude range are insufficient to constrain magnitude scaling at large magnitudes, so we would not recommend re-running our analysis with only California earthquakes. Assuming the same magnitude scaling predicted by our model, we find a bias of only 5–9\%, depending on period, in the predicted California ground motions, which we do not find to be significant. We do

\(^2\) The USGS Tiger Team came to the same conclusion.
acknowledge that the magnitude scaling at large magnitudes is less certain than that at smaller magnitudes, which is appropriately addressed by increasing the epistemic uncertainty at these magnitudes. In our opinion, restricting the database to the few California earthquakes at $M > 6.7$ would more likely significantly bias the magnitude scaling and, therefore, the median predictions of ground motion at large magnitudes at the expense of reducing both the aleatory and epistemic uncertainty.

Fig. B.1  Plot of the distribution of recordings with respect to magnitude, distance and geographic region for the Campbell-Bozorgnia (CB06) NGA database. The regions identified in the legend include: California, the western United States outside of California, Alaska, Taiwan, and all other regions.
Fig. B.2  Plot of inter-event residuals for PGA for the Campbell and Bozorgnia (CB06) NGA model showing their distribution with respect to geographic region.
Fig. B.3  Plot of inter-event residuals for 0.2s spectral acceleration for the Campbell and Bozorgnia (CB06) NGA model showing their distribution with respect to geographic region.
Fig. B.4  Plot of inter-event residuals for 1.0s spectral acceleration for the Campbell and Bozorgnia (CB06) NGA model showing their distribution with respect to geographic region.
Fig. B.5  Plot of inter-event residuals for 3.0s spectral acceleration for the Campbell and Bozorgnia (CB06) NGA model showing their distribution with respect to geographic region.
Fig. B.6  Plot of inter-event residuals for PGA for the Campbell and Bozorgnia (CB06) NGA model showing their distribution with respect to tectonic regime.
Fig. B.7  Plot of inter-event residuals for 0.2s spectral acceleration for the Campbell and Bozorgnia (CB06) NGA model showing their distribution with respect to tectonic regime.
Fig. B.8  Plot of inter-event residuals for 1.0s spectral acceleration for the Campbell and Bozorgnia (CB06) NGA model showing their distribution with respect to tectonic regime.
Fig. B.9. Plot of inter-event residuals for 3.0s spectral acceleration for the Campbell and Bozorgnia (CB06) NGA model showing their distribution with respect to tectonic regime.
Fig. B.10 Plot of intra-event residuals for PGA for the Campbell and Bozorgnia (CB06) NGA model showing their distribution with respect to distance.
Fig. B.11  Plot of intra-event residuals for 0.2s spectral acceleration for the Campbell and Bozorgnia (CB06) NGA model showing their distribution with respect to distance.
Fig. B.12  Plot of intra-event residuals for 1.0s spectral acceleration for the Campbell and Bozorgnia (CB06) NGA model showing their distribution with respect to distance.
Fig. B.13  Plot of intra-event residuals for 3.0s spectral acceleration for the Campbell and Bozorgnia (CB06) NGA model showing their distribution with respect to distance.
Fig. B.14  Plot of intra-event residuals for PGA for the Campbell and Bozorgnia (CB06) NGA model showing their distribution with respect to 30m shear-wave velocity. Also shown for reference are the ranges of $V_{S30}$ corresponding to NEHRP site categories A–E.
Fig. B.15  Plot of intra-event residuals for 0.2s spectral acceleration for the Campbell and Bozorgnia (CB06) NGA model showing their distribution with respect to 30m shear-wave velocity. Also shown for reference are the ranges of $V_{s30}$ corresponding to NEHRP site categories A–E.
Fig. B.16  Plot of intra-event residuals for 1.0s spectral acceleration for the Campbell and Bozorgnia (CB06) NGA model showing their distribution with respect to 30m shear-wave velocity. Also shown for reference are the ranges of $V_{s30}$ corresponding to NEHRP site categories A–E.
Fig. B.17  Plot of intra-event residuals for 3.0s spectral acceleration for the Campbell and Bozorgnia (CB06) NGA model showing their distribution with respect to 30m shear-wave velocity. Also shown for reference are the ranges of $V_{S30}$ corresponding to NEHRP site categories A–E.
B.2 USGS QUESTION #2

Do you feel that your equations have adequately accounted for epistemic and aleatory uncertainties to be used for public policy? Please explain. How do you suggest that the USGS account for the epistemic uncertainties in the ground motion relations in the national maps?

Because of the increase in the number of earthquakes and recording sites in the PEER database, we were able to apply stricter criteria to the selection of the data we used in the development of our NGA empirical ground motion model (see our report for a description of these criteria). One of the consequences of the larger number of events and recordings was to get a better estimate of the inter-event and intra-event aleatory uncertainties at both small and large magnitudes. These refined estimates of uncertainty led us to propose inter-event and intra-event standard deviations that are independent of magnitude. The result was to increase uncertainty at large magnitudes and decrease uncertainty at small magnitudes compared to our previous model (Campbell and Bozorgnia, 2003a). The question, which we address below, is whether this change in aleatory uncertainty is warranted.

The PEER NGA Project also led to an increased degree of similarity in the new NGA models. This increased similarity is due mainly to the availability of a comprehensive database, supporting studies, and ample opportunity for Developer interaction. There is still epistemic uncertainty in the actual subset of data used, in the functional forms (especially magnitude scaling and nonlinear site response), and in the use of supporting data to constrain the models (see each Developer’s NGA report). In particular, the data selection criteria were quite different amongst the various developers in terms of, for example, whether only near-source recordings should be used and whether aftershocks should be included. Nevertheless, this uncertainty has been reduced from that implied by the previous models. The question, which will be addressed below, is whether the NGA models as a whole sufficiently represent the epistemic uncertainty in the median ground motions.

B.2.1 Aleatory Uncertainty

We believe that the better constrained magnitude-independent aleatory uncertainty predicted by our NGA model is appropriate and well-constrained, even at close distances. This latter conclusion has come under question because of the apparent increased scatter in near-fault ground motions from the 2004 Parkfield (M 6.0) earthquake. The large number of near-source recordings from this earthquake appears to show that intra-event uncertainty might increase very near the fault (e.g., see Figure B.18). No other earthquake has provided such a large number of near-fault recordings with which to address this issue, except possibly the 1999 Chi-Chi (M 7.6) earthquake, which we address below. Scientifically, it makes sense that ground motions might become more variable as one approaches the causative fault due to such factors as rupture complexity (e.g., asperities), fault zone effects (e.g., wave guides and focusing), directivity effects, and more variable site response. However, the question is whether it is larger than that calculated for a large number of earthquakes and a large range of distances, as done for our NGA model.
There is very little data with which to address this issue in our database, but some does exist (Figure B.19). To estimate what the impacts of these effects might be on near-fault aleatory uncertainty, we first looked at the variability of the ground motions from the 2004 Parkfield earthquake for PGA and PSA at periods of 0.2, 1.0 and 3.0s. We found that variability in ground motions did seem to increase within about 10 km of the rupture (e.g., see Figure B.18), but only by a relatively modest amount (around 10%). However, our intra-event residuals within this same distance range (Figure B.19) for all earthquakes as a whole and for the Chi-Chi earthquake in particular do not show this same effect, as shown by our intra-event residuals plotted in terms of linear distance for \( R_{RUP} < 50 \) (Figures B.20–B.23). The intra-event residuals for the Taiwan region in these figures are from the Chi-Chi earthquake.

One possible explanation for the discrepancy between the near-fault variability in the Parkfield earthquake and that in the Chi-Chi earthquake and the database as a whole is the treatment of site effects. The Parkfield earthquake was evaluated without accounting for site effects, since site characteristics such as \( V_{S30} \) are not generally known, whereas site effects have been removed from the intra-event residuals of the Chi-Chi earthquake and the database as a whole. The complexity of the geological conditions in the vicinity of the Parkfield earthquake could easily explain the larger degree of variability that was observed. Until the cause of the increased near-fault variability in the 2004 Parkfield earthquake is better understood, we do not recommend altering our aleatory uncertainty model based on this one earthquake, when the Chi-Chi earthquake and our database as a whole do not show increased ground-motion variability near the fault.\(^3\)

### B.2.2 Epistemic Uncertainty

The intent of the PEER NGA Project was to obtain a better estimate of modeling uncertainty by providing all of the developers with a common comprehensive database. Although we believe that this goal was achieved, we also believe that the decreased variability in the median predictions from the NGA models that resulted from this process does not necessarily provide an appropriate characterization of the actual epistemic uncertainty in these models. As a result, we recommend that a separate epistemic uncertainty model should be developed and used in conjunction with our model. Norm Abrahamson has proposed a simplified statistical method for estimating such an epistemic model based on the number of earthquakes and recordings in a set of magnitude-distance bins; see Equation 2 of Chiou-Youngs response to this question. The following table shows the application of Equation 2 to the C-B data set. The Tau and Sigma used for this calculation are 0.219 and 0.478, respectively.

---

\(^3\) Since this response was written there have been some studies that have indicated that some of the increase in the scatter at short periods is due to unusually low ground motions in the fault zone due to increased attenuation (see main text of the report).
Table B.1 Application of Equation (2) to the C-B data set.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M and R_{RUP} Range</th>
<th>Average M</th>
<th>Median R_{RUP}</th>
<th>n_{Eq}</th>
<th>n_{Sites}</th>
<th>\sigma_{\ln[PGA(M,r)]}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M &lt; 5, R_{RUP} &lt; 10</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M &lt; 5, 10 \leq R_{RUP} &lt; 30</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>0.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 \leq M &lt; 6, R_{RUP} &lt; 10</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 \leq M &lt; 6, 10 \leq R_{RUP} &lt; 30</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>0.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 \leq M &lt; 6, R_{RUP} \geq 30</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>0.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 \leq M &lt; 7, R_{RUP} &lt; 10</td>
<td>6.49</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 \leq M &lt; 7, 10 \leq R_{RUP} &lt; 30</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>0.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 \leq M &lt; 7, R_{RUP} \geq 30</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>0.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M \geq 7, R_{RUP} &lt; 10</td>
<td>7.40</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M \geq 7, 10 \leq R_{RUP} &lt; 30</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M \geq 7, R_{RUP} \geq 30</td>
<td>7.39</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>0.065</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although this table provides a rough idea of what the epistemic uncertainty related to the selection of the data set is, it can’t be evaluated when there are no data. Also, the degree of calculated uncertainty is strongly dependent on the bin sizes. We can probably use these results for something very simple, but the bootstrap and jackknife methods that Bob Youngs has proposed are the best means of assessing epistemic uncertainty.

**B.1.3 Conclusion**

Based on the above discussion, we conclude that our aleatory model is sufficient but that epistemic uncertainty as represented by the suite of NGA models is insufficient for determining ground motions to be used for engineering applications or for public policy (e.g., for developing national seismic hazard maps).
Fig. B.18  Plot of PGA from the 2004 Parkfield earthquake (Dave Boore, written communication) compared to ground-motion predictions from the Campbell-Bozorgnia NGA (CB06) and 2003 (CB03) empirical ground motion models.
Fig. B.19 Plot of the distribution of recordings with respect to magnitude, distance and geographic region for the Campbell-Bozorgnia (CB06) NGA database. The regions identified in the legend include: California, the western United States outside of California, Alaska, Taiwan, and all other regions.
Fig. B.20  Plot of intra-event residuals for PGA for the Campbell and Bozorgnia (CB06) NGA model showing their distribution with respect to geographic region at near-fault distances.
Fig. B.21  Plot of intra-event residuals for 0.2s spectral acceleration for the Campbell and Bozorgnia (CB06) NGA model showing their distribution with respect to geographic region at near-fault distances.
Fig. B.22  Plot of intra-event residuals for 1.0s spectral acceleration for the Campbell and Bozorgnia (CB06) NGA model showing their distribution with respect to geographic region at near-fault distances.
Fig. B.23  Plot of intra-event residuals for 3.0s spectral acceleration for the Campbell and Bozorgnia (CB06) NGA model showing their distribution with respect to geographic region at near-fault distances.
B.3 USGS QUESTION #3

*When will you be able to provide the other spectral accelerations that were planned early in the process?*

The current report addresses PGA, PGV, PGD and spectral accelerations for the full minimum set of periods for NGA models from zero to 10 seconds: 0.01, 0.02, 0.03, 0.05, 0.075, 0.1, 0.15, 0.2, 0.25, 0.3, 0.4, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0, 1.5, 2.0, 3.0, 4.0, 5.0, 7.5, and 10.0 seconds.

B.4 USGS QUESTION #4

*Do you feel that the USGS could use your prediction equations with distance dependent uncertainties to account for directivity effects? Please explain. When will you provide these uncertainties?*

As you know, the currently-developed NGA models do not incorporate directivity parameters. Studies in progress are evaluating effects of directivity on the average horizontal component and the fault-strike-normal and fault-strike-parallel components of spectral accelerations. Paul Spudich is working with the NGA developers using a directivity parameterization developed by Spudich et al. (2004) based on isochrone theory as well as the directivity parameterization developed by Somerville et al. (1997). Jennie Watson-Lamprey has begun a separate study to evaluate directivity effects on the average horizontal component in terms of a distance-dependent sigma using a hypocenter-independent directivity parameterization. The studies of directivity effects have had to receive a lower priority than completing the basic NGA models for the average horizontal component.

We recognize the need for a simple representation of directivity effects that can be applied in national ground motion mapping and hope that the studies in progress will result in or can be approximated by a simple representation for use in mapping. However, the studies to date have not established the magnitude of the directivity effects and we are not far enough long to estimate the future schedule. We hope to have a better indication of the magnitude of the effects and the schedule by the time of the September 25 review meeting and will be happy to provide a status report at the meeting.4


---

4 The USGS Tiger Team concluded that directivity effects on the geometric mean horizontal ground motion was likely to be minimal and that, because of lack of any progress on this issue, directivity should not be included in the USGS national seismic hazard maps.
B.5 USGS QUESTION #5

Buried rupture versus surface rupture. Somerville and Pitarka (2006) find no significant difference in source terms, on average, between surface and buried ruptures for periods of 0.2 sec and shorter. Yet the NGA relations that do include terms for depth to top of rupture, predict significant differences between surface faulting and buried faulting at all periods. This discrepancy should be explained. It appears to me that the difference in surface and buried ruptures cited in Somerville and Pitarka (2006) may be at least partly due to the differences in the period of the forward directivity pulses. The buried ruptures used in their paper have magnitudes between 6.4 and 7.0, whereas the surface rupture events have magnitudes between 6.5 and 7.6 and produce forward directivity pulses with longer periods, on average.

In response to this question, we first summarize how each of the NGA models treats the depth to top of rupture ($Z_{TOR}$) parameter in their model. This is followed by some general comments regarding the Somerville and Pitarka (2006) paper.

B.5.1 Treatment of Buried Rupture in NGA Models

The Campbell and Bozorgnia (CB06) model uses $Z_{TOR}$ to distinguish between buried and surface faulting for reverse-faulting events only, with buried faulting resulting in higher ground motions. The effect is constant for source depths greater than 1 km and phases out for source depths less than 1 km and for mid-to-long periods. In essence, this term replaces the reverse and thrust faulting factor used in the Campbell and Bozorgnia (2003a) model, except that surface-faulting events are now excluded from this effect. This is tantamount to phasing out the source-depth effect for large magnitude earthquakes, which are more likely to have surface rupture.

B.5.2 Comments on Somerville and Pitarka (2006) Paper

Somerville and Pitarka (2006) provide both empirical and theoretical evidence to support their conclusion that ground motions from earthquakes that break the ground surface are weaker than ground motions from buried faulting events. Granted, the empirical evidence shown in their Figure 2 is weak at short periods, but as is pointed out, the comparison depends on only a few earthquakes with different magnitude ranges. The NGA results, for those models that include source depth as a parameter, are based on a larger number of earthquakes that include events with magnitudes less than those used by Somerville and Pitarka and, as a result, are statistically more robust.

The most compelling evidence of weaker ground motions from surface faulting events comes from their dynamic simulations and from similar modeling results by others. These simulations show that, if a weak zone exists at shallow depths, rupture of the shallow part of the fault will be controlled by velocity strengthening, with larger slip weakening distance, larger fracture energy, larger energy absorption from the crack tip, lower rupture velocity, and lower

---

5 This response has been edited to restrict the discussion to the Campbell-Bozorgnia NGA model.
slip velocity than at greater depths on the fault. These properties lead to lower ground motions for surface faulting than for buried faulting events. If a weak shallow zone does not exist, then similar short-period ground motions would be expected for surface and buried faulting, as indicated in the top two panels of their Figure 6. The weaker the shallow zone, the greater the expected difference between surface and buried faulting. One possible reason for a shallow weak zone is the presence of thick fault gauge, which has been shown from rock mechanics experiments to cause velocity strengthening, similar to the ground motion simulations.

**B.5.3 Conclusion**

The issue of whether buried faulting events have stronger ground motions than surface faulting events is currently a topic of intense study by the scientific community and cannot be considered resolved at this time. However, considering the empirical, theoretical and laboratory results summarized by Somerville and Pitarka (2006), it is plausible that this effect exists, but that its effects are subject to large epistemic uncertainty. This uncertainty is reflected in the diverse treatment of this effect in the NGA models, which would appear to be consistent with the state of knowledge within the scientific community at this time.

We didn’t find a strong relationship between ground motion and depth to top of rupture ($Z_{TOR}$) in the data that we used to develop our model, except for reverse-faulting events. In order to demonstrate this, we plot our inter-event residuals versus depth to top of rupture in Figures B.24–B.27 for PGA and spectral acceleration at periods of 0.2, 1.0 and 3.0s, respectively. This depth is taken to be hypocentral depth for earthquakes with magnitudes less than about 6.0, since no direct estimate of $Z_{TOR}$ was available. There is some indication in Figures B.24 and B.25 that events with $Z_{TOR} > 10–12$ km are systematically underpredicted at short periods. The four deepest events that control this observation are the two Whittier Narrows earthquakes and two events from Anza. All four of these events use hypocentral depth as a proxy for depth to top of rupture. Actual values of $Z_{TOR}$ would be smaller and might reduce the observed trend.

The possible bias seen in the inter-event residuals at short periods appears to phase out at long periods (Figures B.26 and B.27). So if the depth effect is real, it seems to be limited to short periods. Although it is tempting to add a factor to increase short-period ground motions for $Z_{TOR} > 10–12$ km, we believe that it is premature to include it at this time, at least based on our database, since the effect is controlled by only four earthquakes of $M < 6.0$ from two specific regions in southern California for which we do not have a direct estimate of $Z_{TOR}$. That is not to say that we wouldn’t expect higher ground motions at depth, only that its importance for moderate-to-large earthquakes is not sufficiently resolved at this time, except for reverse faults.
Fig. B.24  Plot of inter-event residuals for PGA versus depth to top of rupture for the Campbell and Bozorgnia (CB06) NGA model. The symbols represent different styles of faulting as indicated in the legend.
Fig. B.25  Plot of inter-event residuals for 0.2s spectral acceleration versus depth to top of rupture for the Campbell and Bozorgnia (CB06) NGA model. The symbols represent different styles of faulting as indicated in the legend.
Fig. B.26  Plot of inter-event residuals for 1.0s spectral acceleration versus depth to top of rupture for the Campbell and Bozorgnia (CB06) NGA model. The symbols represent different styles of faulting as indicated in the legend.
Fig. B.27  Plot of inter-event residuals for 3.0s spectral acceleration versus depth to top of rupture for the Campbell and Bozorgnia (CB06) NGA model. The symbols represent different styles of faulting as indicated in the legend.
B.6 USGS QUESTION #6

Too many predictive variables. The [previous question] points out the danger of using too many predictive variables. For example, magnitude-dependent effects may be confused with a depth to top of faulting effect. Larger events are more likely to rupture the surface. Also, rupture aspect ratio is correlated with magnitude, so it is not obvious these two effects can be separated using the available data.

B.6.1 Finding the Right Balance of Predictive Variables

There is a trade-off between using too few and too many predictive variables in an empirical ground motion model. Using too few predictive variables will lead to models that have higher aleatory uncertainty and that are less useful in many engineering applications. Using too many predictive variables can lead to models that also have higher aleatory uncertainty and that are less reliable (e.g., because of potential correlation between variables and poorly constrained coefficients). Both of these situations should be avoided and each NGA model did so in its own way. Our method for avoiding these two situations is described below.

We used a two-stage regression analysis to develop an appropriate functional form for the terms in our model before we applied the more comprehensive, but less transparent, random effects analysis to develop the final results (see the discussion in the main body of our report). This allowed us to evaluate the statistical significance of each term (a combination of coefficients, predictive variables, and functional forms) as we added it to the model as well as to evaluate its correlation with other terms in the model. We used an analysis of residuals to determine which terms should be included in the model in order not to exclude any important effects. Aside from a few exceptions, we only included coefficients that provided a reasonable degree of confidence (around 16% or better) and that were not strongly correlated with other coefficients in the model. Exceptions to this rule were made when a coefficient was statistically significant for some oscillator periods but not for others or when seismologists and engineers queried at USGS workshops and other scientific meetings over the course of the last few years believed that a modeled effect should be included even though there was insufficient data to constrain it. In the former case, the term was allowed to smoothly phase out with period, even though it was not statistically significant for many of the phase-out periods. In the second case, the coefficient was assigned a value based on an analogous parameter or on theoretical considerations.

Coefficients for those terms that were constrained in the model included: (1) hanging-wall effects for strike-slip and normal faults, (2) nonlinear soil effects, and (3) 3-D basin effects. For hanging-wall effects, the limited hanging-wall data from normal faults confirmed that these effects were similar on average to those empirically derived for reverse faults, as suggested by Jim Brune from foam rubber modeling. There was insufficient data to confirm these effects for dipping strike-slip faults, but Jim Brune could provide no seismological reason why such faults should not also be subject to hanging-wall effects. Nonlinear soil effects are well documented by observations and nonlinear site-response analyses and accepted by both seismologists and
geotechnical engineers. Model residuals, when plotted against PGA, definitely showed behavior consistent with nonlinear soil effects, but the data were insufficient to develop a functional form. Therefore, theoretical site-response analyses were used to constrain this term. 3-D basin effects were also visible in the data, but like the nonlinear soil effects, the data were insufficient to develop a functional form. Therefore, theoretical 3-D basin response analyses were used to constrain this term. More details and references regarding this topic can be found in the main body of our report.

Although we were reasonably successful at avoiding strong correlations between coefficients and predictor variables, there were two important variables for which this correlation could not be avoided, as discussed in the main body of our report. These two variables were sediment depth (\(Z_{2.5}\)) and 30m shear-wave velocity (\(V_{S30}\)). The two variables were found to be strongly correlated for \(Z_{2.5} < 3\) km, which meant that only one of these parameters was needed to model local site conditions. Since we selected \(V_{S30}\) as the primary site-response variable (for consistency with engineering applications), we used it to model site-response and allowed \(Z_{2.5}\) to enter the model for sediment depths greater than 3 km, where the model residuals indicated that this effect was significant at moderate-to-long periods. The residuals also indicated that an additional sediment-depth term was needed for \(Z_{2.5} < 1\) km. Therefore, the sediment-depth terms were used only to provide an additional site effect when \(V_{S30}\) was found to be insufficient to model local soil conditions. More details and references regarding this topic can be found in the main body of our report.

B.6.2 Discussion of Specific Cited Examples

The question provides three examples where having too many predictive variables might make the model unreliable: (1) the potential correlation between magnitude scaling and the effects of depth to top of rupture, (2) the fact that larger earthquakes are more likely to rupture to the surface, and (3) the correlation between magnitude scaling and aspect ratio.

In our NGA model, the depth to top of rupture is used only to distinguish between reverse-faulting effects for earthquakes that rupture to the surface and those that do not. In essence, it allows large surface-rupturing reverse events to scale with magnitude similar to strike-slip and normal events. An analysis of residuals indicated that if this distinction was not made, either reverse-faulting effects would have been underestimated for the majority of the reverse earthquakes in the database or the magnitude-scaling for large strike-slip and normal events would have lead to an underestimation of ground motion for these events. Even at that, because of our decision to constrain the model to saturate when the analysis predicted oversaturation at large magnitudes and close distances, our model overestimates, on average, the short-period ground motions from the large surface-rupturing reverse earthquakes. Therefore, we believe that by allowing ground motions to be different between surface-rupturing and buried reverse earthquakes we have avoided biasing the reverse-faulting term and the magnitude-scaling effects for strike-slip and normal events.
We agree that larger earthquakes are more likely to rupture to the surface than smaller earthquakes, so there is indeed a correlation between magnitude scaling at large magnitudes and surface rupture. However, as noted above, we included a surface-faulting term only to determine when we applied an additional reverse-faulting factor to the predicted ground motions. We did not use it to change the magnitude-scaling term. As indicated above, our buried vs. surface-faulting term impacted the magnitude scaling for large earthquakes only to the extent that, had we not allowed this difference, the model would have predicted even a greater degree of oversaturation than it did. As it stands, the oversaturation predicted by the model (before constraining it to saturate) was reasonably small and not statistically significant, giving us a stronger justification for forcing saturation in our model.

As indicated in our report, we considered using aspect ratio in our model (in fact, we were the ones who first introduced it), but we decided not to when we discovered a discrepancy between the magnitude-dependence of the aspect ratios in the NGA database and those in the 2002 source model developed by the USGS and CGS. However, this is a separate issue than the one that you raised regarding the correlation between surface rupture and aspect ratio. Granted, surface-rupturing events are the ones with the largest aspect ratios. This simply means that one has to be careful not to adversely bias the magnitude-scaling term when aspect ratio is included in the model. We found that we could have just as easily accounted for the reduced magnitude-scaling at large magnitudes included in our model (for all styles of faulting) by not reducing the magnitude scaling at large magnitudes, but instead adding aspect ratio as a predictor variable. In other words, either one modeling approach or the other could be used. We chose to change the magnitude scaling rather than include aspect ratio as a predictor variable in our model for the reason specified above.

B.6.3 Conclusion

We believe that we avoided the pitfall of including too few or too many predictive variables in our NGA model by carefully reviewing each added term (coefficient) for its statistical significance and its lack of correlation with other terms (coefficients) in the model. We only included a predictor variable in the model when it was statistically significant or when it was supported by theoretical modeling or recommended by seismologists or engineers. Even in such cases, the model residuals were reviewed to see that they were consistent with the added term or, at least, did not violate it. Many predictor variables were reviewed through an analysis of residuals to ensure that no important variable was excluded. Therefore, we believe that we have not included too few or too many predictive variables in our NGA model.
B.7 USGS QUESTION #7

Foot wall term. Chang et al. (BSSA Dec. 2004) shows that there is a dip in residuals of the Chi-Chi footwall motions (at distances less than 15 km) when they are plotted as a function of nearest distance to rupture. This is caused by the fact that the distance to the center of the rupture is farther than the nearest distance for footwall sites. Is this relative dip of footwall ground motions accommodated in the functional forms used in NGA? If not, this could artificially lower ground motions in the distance ranges greater than 15 km. The dip in Chi Chi ground motions is also observed when using RJB. This dip does not appear to be present in the Northridge data. This calls into question the utility of the Chi Chi records for predicting ground motions for large events in other regions (see below).

B.7.1 Comments on Chang et al. (2004) Paper

Chang et al. (2004) developed an empirical ground motion model for the 1999 Chi-Chi earthquake using only hanging-wall and footwall stations in order to evaluate the impact of hanging-wall effects during this earthquake. They did this by fitting simultaneously a single relationship to both sets of data, then plotting the residuals from the relationship versus distance to look for hanging-wall effects. No adjustment for site effects was made. The bias in their residuals, suggesting overprediction of ground motions on the footwall at short distances, is visible in their Figures 4–6. We believe that this apparent bias does not necessarily represent a bias in the footwall ground motions for distances less than 15 km. Rather, it is likely caused by the requirement that the relationship must fit simultaneously the close-in hanging-wall and footwall recordings; thereby, overpredicting the footwall ground motions and underpredicting the hanging-wall ground motions. Had an appropriate hanging-wall term been included in the relationship, this apparent bias would have been reduced, if not completely eliminated. To demonstrate that this bias does not appear in our model, we show our residuals for the Chi-Chi earthquake below.

B.7.2 Residuals for Chi-Chi Earthquake

We plot the intra-event residuals from our NGA model for the Chi-Chi earthquake in Figures B.28–B.31 for PGA and PSA at periods of 0.2, 1.0 and 3.0s, respectively. The data are identified as being on the hanging-wall, the footwall, off the edge of the fault to the north in the direction of rupture, and off the edge of the fault to the south in the opposite direction of rupture. The horizontal dashed line shows the adjusted baseline after taking into account the inter-event (source) term and the overprediction resulting from constraining our model to saturate (as opposed to oversaturate) at short periods (see the main body of our report). A positive value for this adjusted baseline indicates an overprediction by the model (i.e., most of the points fall below this line). All of the figures show that overall the intra-event residuals are relatively unbiased with respect to distance, except for a few large-distant stations to the south. However, there is an interesting trend at large distances that will become evident below.
In order to understand how the residuals are impacted by azimuth, we plot only those residuals for stations located on the hanging-wall and the footwall in Figures B.32–B.35 for PGA and PSA at periods of 0.2, 1.0 and 3.0s, respectively. The distance range in these plots is more restricted than in the previous plots because of the limitation in the physical dimensions of Taiwan in the east-west direction. The bias noted by Chang et al. (2004) is not evident in these figures, although there is a tendency to overestimate the ground motion for footwall sites at distances greater than about 10–15 km, except for the 3.0s period, where the opposite trend is observed. This bias is particularly strong at short periods when the residuals are compared to the adjusted baseline. There is no noticeable bias in the hanging-wall sites except for a slight overprediction at short periods and at 3.0s with respect to the adjusted baseline.

Similar plots for stations located off the edge of the rupture to the north and to the south are shown in Figures B.36–B.39 for PGA and PSA at periods of 0.2, 1.0 and 3.0s, respectively. These figures indicate that the residuals are relatively unbiased out to distances of around 40–50 km, but display an interesting trend at larger distances. In particular, the residuals to the north (in the direction of rupture) beyond this distance show a decreased rate of attenuation and an underprediction of ground motion; whereas, the residuals to the south (in the opposite direction of rupture) show an increased rate of attenuation compared to the average trend. This could be caused by either anisotropic crustal properties or source directivity effects or both. We are not aware of any study that has addressed this issue. For PGA and the 0.2s spectral acceleration, the source term compensates completely for the underprediction of ground motions to the north at the expense of grossly overpredicting ground motions to the south. For the longer periods, the source term biases the predictions towards the northern stations, almost completely compensating for any potential underprediction to the north, at the expense of overpredicting ground motions to the south.

B.7.3 Conclusion

Our intra-event residual plots for the Chi-Chi earthquake do not show the biases in the footwall and hanging-wall residuals at short distances that were observed in the Chang et al. (2004) residual plots. As noted above, this bias was likely caused by these authors not including a hanging-wall term in their ground motion model. In fact, we find no bias with distance overall out to a distance of at least 100 km and no significant bias in the hanging-wall residuals out to the 60-km limit of the data, except at 3.0s period where the more distant hanging-wall ground motions are overpredicted. Footwall sites are overpredicted beyond a distance of 10–15 km, except at 3.0s period where they are underpredicted. We do find a bias in the rate of attenuation between stations located to the north and to the south for distances greater than about 40–50 km, which will need additional study to explain. Forcing saturation in our model generally causes it to overpredict ground motion at short periods, even for hanging wall sites. At longer periods, the predictions are biased towards the relatively higher ground motions to the north. In conclusion, we believe that our results confirm the utility in using the Chi-Chi recordings for predicting ground motion from large events in regions outside of Taiwan.
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**Fig. B.28** Plot of the PGA intra-event residuals from the Campbell-Bozorgnia NGA model for the Chi-Chi mainshock. Recordings are identified as being on the hanging-wall (cyan inverted triangles), on the footwall (green diamonds), off the edge of the fault to the north in the direction of rupture (blue circles), and off the edge of the fault to the south in the opposite direction of rupture (red triangles). The horizontal dashed grey line represents the adjusted baseline after accounting for the source term and the additional bias caused by disallowing oversaturation, where a positive value represents an overprediction by the model (in this case a significant overprediction).
Fig. B.29  Plot of the 0.2s spectral acceleration intra-event residuals from the Campbell-Bozorgnia NGA model for the Chi-Chi mainshock. The symbols and dashed grey line are the same as in Figure B.28.
Fig. B.30  Plot of the 1.0s spectral acceleration intra-event residuals from the Campbell-Bozorgnia NGA model for the Chi-Chi mainshock. The symbols and dashed grey line are the same as in Figure B.28.
Fig. B.31  Plot of the 3.0s spectral acceleration intra-event residuals from the Campbell-Bozorgnia NGA model for the Chi-Chi mainshock. The symbols and dashed grey line are the same as in Figure B.28.
Fig. B.32  Plot of the PGA intra-event residuals from the Campbell-Bozorgnia NGA model for the Chi-Chi mainshock. Recordings are identified as being on the hanging-wall (blue circles) or on the footwall (red triangles). Footwall distances are plotted as negative values for clarity. The vertical solid grey line demarks the transition from the hanging wall to the footwall. The horizontal dashed grey line represents the adjusted baseline after accounting for the source term and the additional bias caused by disallowing oversaturation, where a positive value represents an overprediction by the model (in this case a significant overprediction).
Fig. B.33  Plot of the 0.2s spectral acceleration intra-event residuals from the Campbell-Bozorgnia NGA model for the Chi-Chi mainshock. Recordings are identified as being on the hanging-wall (blue circles) or on the footwall (red triangles). The symbols and solid and dashed grey lines are the same as in Figure B.32.
Fig. B.34  Plot of the 1.0s spectral acceleration intra-event residuals from the Campbell-
Bozorgnia NGA model for the Chi-Chi mainshock. Recordings are identified as
being on the hanging-wall (blue circles) or on the footwall (red triangles). The
symbols and solid and dashed grey lines are the same as in Figure B.32.
Fig. B.35 Plot of the 3.0s spectral acceleration intra-event residuals from the Campbell-Bozorgnia NGA model for the Chi-Chi mainshock. Recordings are identified as being on the hanging-wall (blue circles) or on the footwall (red triangles). The symbols and solid and dashed grey lines are the same as in Figure B.32.
Fig. B.36  Plot of the PGA intra-event residuals from the Campbell-Bozorgnia NGA model for the Chi-Chi mainshock. Recordings are identified as being off the edge of the fault to the north in the direction of rupture (blue circles) or off the edge of the fault to the south in the opposite direction of rupture (red triangles). Southern distances are plotted as negative values for clarity. The vertical solid grey line demarks the transition from the northern sites to the southern sites. The horizontal dashed grey line represents the adjusted baseline after accounting for the source term and the additional bias caused by disallowing oversaturation, where a positive value represents an overprediction by the model (in this case a significant overprediction).
Fig. B.37  Plot of the 0.2s spectral acceleration intra-event residuals from the Campbell-Bozorgnia NGA model for the Chi-Chi mainshock. The symbols and grey solid and dashed lines are the same as in Figure B.36.
Fig. B.38  Plot of the 1.0s spectral acceleration intra-event residuals from the Campbell-Bozorgnia NGA model for the Chi-Chi mainshock. The symbols and grey solid and dashed lines are the same as in Figure B.36.
Fig. B.39  Plot of the 3.0s spectral acceleration intra-event residuals from the Campbell-Bozorgnia NGA model for the Chi-Chi mainshock. The symbols and grey solid and dashed lines are the same as in Figure B.36.
B.8 USGS QUESTION #8

Scaling with magnitude. For high frequencies (≥ 5hz), the spectral accelerations for close-in sites (< 10 km JB distance) are far higher for Superstition Hills, Landers, and Kobe earthquakes, than for the Kocaeli earthquake. Here [we] have chosen only strike slip earthquakes. This suggests there are regional differences in stress drop for strike slip earthquakes.

B.8.1 Comments on Regional Differences in Stress Drop

We acknowledge that there are likely to be regional differences in stress drop. The question is whether such differences lead to a bias in the predicted ground motions in regions where the empirical ground motion model will be applied. The earthquakes that you mention come from a variety of tectonic environments. The Kocaeli and Superstition Hills earthquakes occurred in a transtensional stress regime. The Landers earthquake also occurred in what is probably a transtensional stress regime (John Anderson, USGS Workshop, Reno, NV, 2006). The Kobe earthquake occurred in a transpressional stress regime. Seismologists would likely expect the stress drops to be the largest in a transpressional stress regime and smallest in a transtensional stress regime. Of course, there is a large degree of variability in stress drops within a given tectonic environment, so a comparison of a few earthquakes is not really sufficient to derive general conclusions. Nonetheless, in the next section we look to see if there is a systematic bias in our NGA model predictions for these four earthquakes.

B.8.2 Comparison of Model Predictions

In the development of our model, we looked at possible differences in ground motion due to tectonic environment by comparing inter-event residuals (source terms) between extensional and non-extensional tectonic regimes after including coefficients for style of faulting. We didn’t find any bias in the residuals of either group, which suggested that, at least for our dataset, there was no systematic difference between these two tectonic regimes that wasn’t accounted for by the style-of-faulting factors. In fact, what little effect we saw indicated that ground motions in extensional regimes were possibly larger. However, John Anderson (USGS Workshop, Reno, NV, 2006) has disagreed with the assignment of extensional and non-extensional regimes to several California earthquakes in the NGA database based on the original assessment by Spudich et al. (1997, 1999). He suggests, for example, that earthquakes in the Mojave Desert (e.g., 1992 Landers and 1999 Hector Mine) should be classified as extensional. If this were to be confirmed, we are not sure what difference it would make in our assessment of extensional versus non-extensional tectonic regimes.6

Rather than look at the absolute value of ground motion, as was suggested in the question, we again look at the residuals for the earthquakes you have mentioned to see if there is

---

6 In a subsequent investigation, Paul Spudich and Dave Boore determined that the 1992 Landers, 1999 Kocaeli, and 1999 Hector Mine earthquakes likely occurred in a strike-slip (non-extensional) stress regime.
a systematic bias in the predictions from our NGA model that is consistent with the statement in the question. Absolute values can be deceiving, since they do not take into account differences in predictor variables, such as magnitude and local soil conditions, between earthquakes. In Figure B.40 we plot the intra-event residuals for PGA versus rupture distance for the 1995 Kobe, 1992 Landers, 1999 Kocaeli, and 1987 Superstition Hills earthquakes over the full range of distances used in our model to see how well the model fits the data overall. Also shown on this plot is the adjusted baselines for these same events after accounting for the inter-event residuals (source term) and the additional bias caused by constraining the model to saturate when oversaturation was predicted. The negative adjusted baselines indicate underprediction by the model. A larger negative baseline implies a larger underprediction.

Looking at the adjusted baselines, Figure B.40 shows that all four events are underpredicted overall, with the Kobe and Superstition Hills events having the largest underprediction and the Landers and Kocaeli events having the largest underprediction. The other interesting observation is that PGA is underpredicted relative to other intra-event residuals for these four earthquakes between distances of around 65–125 km, where one might expect increased ground motions from crustal reflections. (This effect becomes negligible at longer periods). Our functional form does not allow for differences in geometrical attenuation from such reflections because of their complexity and variability with respect to period. Figure B.41 shows a similar plot for $R_{JB} \leq 20$ km. This plot extends to a larger distance than was suggested so that there would be enough recordings to make a meaningful comparison. In this distance range, the comparison is quite different than that over all distances. Comparing the intra-event residuals with the adjusted baselines, the Superstition Hills earthquake is clearly underpredicted, but the predictions for the other three earthquakes all appear to be relatively unbiased. Similar results are found for 0.2s spectral acceleration as shown in Figures B.42 and B.43.

If differences in stress drop were causing the differences noted in the question and observed in the residual plots for short-period ground motions, these differences should be diminished at longer periods. To test this hypothesis, we show the same residual plots as above for the 1.0 and 3.0s spectral accelerations in Figures B.44–B.47. Again, all of the events are underpredicted overall, but now the largest underprediction is for the Kobe earthquake for 1.0s period (Figure B.44) and the Landers earthquake for 3.0s period (Figure B.46), while the other events are all moderately underpredicted with the smallest underprediction occurring for the Kocaeli event. This ranking for the Kocaeli earthquake does not seem to support the idea that the short-period differences for this event are the result of an unusually low stress drop. At 3.0s, the Landers event is underpredicted at distances beyond about 130 km. Within 20 km, Kocaeli is overpredicted, Kobe is underpredicted, and the other two events are relatively unbiased compared to their adjusted baselines.

**B.8.3 Conclusion**

We did not find any significant difference in ground motions between extensional and non-extensional tectonic regimes based on an analysis of residuals after accounting for differences due to style of faulting (see Section B.1). Our residuals also indicate that all four events that
were mentioned in the question are underpredicted by our model, so the Kocaeli earthquake is not unique in this regard, nor does it appear to be an outlier. The Kobe earthquake has the largest underprediction in our model, which might be consistent with it occurring in a transpressional stress regime. However, it also had a relatively large hypocentral depth (17 km) and its rupture was buried, at least along its northern reaches where most of the recordings were located, which might have also contributed to this underprediction. At short periods, the Superstition Hills earthquake, which also had a buried rupture, is underpredicted by our model by about the same amount as the Kobe earthquake. Therefore, one might argue that the relative differences between the residuals for these four earthquakes could be explained by whether they had buried versus surface faulting rather than whether they were affected by regional differences in stress drop. We found this to be the case for reverse faults, but we believed that the data were too ambiguous to allow us to apply such a factor to strike-slip earthquakes at the present time.

Our analysis of residuals suggests that our results either do not support the observation that, for high frequencies, the spectral accelerations for close-in sites (<10 km JB distance) are far higher for Superstition Hills, Landers, and Kobe earthquakes than for the Kocaeli earthquake or that these differences have been reasonably captured in our model. Although we agree that there could be regional differences in stress drop and stress regime for strike slip earthquakes, and our residuals possibly support this, we also believe that this might be just as easily modeled by accounting for differences between buried versus surface faulting. Under the hypothesis that ground motions should be larger in transpressional stress regimes (presumably due to larger stress drops), large strike-slip earthquakes in California from the Big Bend north would be underpredicted by our model; whereas, under the hypothesis that ground motions are smaller for surface-faulting events, these earthquakes would be overpredicted by our model. By not specifically attempting to model one hypothesis over the other, our model allows for the possibility of both hypotheses with a corresponding increase in aleatory variability, which we believe reasonably reflects the uncertainty expressed within the scientific community.


Fig. B.40 Plot of the PGA intra-event residuals from the Campbell-Bozorgnia NGA model for the Kobe (blue circles), Landers (red triangles), Kocaeli (green diamonds), and Superstition Hills (cyan inverted triangles) earthquakes for $R_{RUP} \leq 200$ km. The horizontal dashed lines represent the adjusted baseline for these same earthquakes after accounting for the source term and the additional bias caused by disallowing oversaturation, where a negative value represents an underprediction by the model.
Fig. B.41 Plot of the PGA intra-event residuals from the Campbell-Bozorgnia NGA model for the Kobe (blue circles), Landers (red triangles), Kocaeli (green diamonds), and Superstition Hills (cyan inverted triangles) earthquakes for $R_{jb} \leq 20$ km. The dashed lines are the same as in Figure B.40.
Fig. B.42  Plot of the 0.2s spectral acceleration intra-event residuals from the Campbell-Bozorgnia NGA model for the Kobe (blue circles), Landers (red triangles), Kocaeli (green diamonds), and Superstition Hills (cyan inverted triangles) earthquakes for $R_{RUP} \leq 200$ km. The horizontal dashed lines represent the adjusted baseline for these same earthquakes after accounting for the source term and the additional bias caused by disallowing oversaturation, where a negative value represents an underprediction by the model.
Fig. B.43  Plot of the 0.2s spectral acceleration intra-event residuals from the Campbell-Bozorgnia NGA model for the Kobe (blue circles), Landers (red triangles), Kocaeli (green diamonds), and Superstition Hills (cyan inverted triangles) earthquakes for $R_{jb} \leq 20$ km. The dashed lines are the same as in Figure B.42.
Fig. B.44 Plot of the 1.0s spectral acceleration intra-event residuals from the Campbell-Bozorgnia NGA model for the Kobe (blue circles), Landers (red triangles), Kocaeli (green diamonds), and Superstition Hills (cyan inverted triangles) earthquakes for $R_{RUP} \leq 200$ km. The horizontal dashed lines represent the adjusted baseline for these same earthquakes after accounting for the source term and the additional bias caused by disallowing oversaturation, where a negative value represents an underprediction by the model.
Fig. B.45  Plot of the 1.0s spectral acceleration intra-event residuals from the Campbell-Bozorgnia NGA model for the Kobe (blue circles), Landers (red triangles), Kocaeli (green diamonds), and Superstition Hills (cyan inverted triangles) earthquakes for $R_{sh} \leq 20$ km. The dashed lines are the same as in Figure B.44.
Fig. B.47  Plot of the 3.0s spectral acceleration intra-event residuals from the Campbell-Bozorgnia NGA model for the Kobe (blue circles), Landers (red triangles), Kocaeli (green diamonds), and Superstition Hills (cyan inverted triangles) earthquakes for $R_{RUP} \leq 200$ km. The horizontal dashed lines represent the adjusted baseline for these same earthquakes after accounting for the source term and the additional bias caused by disallowing oversaturation, where a negative value represents an underprediction by the model.
Fig. B.48  Plot of the 3.0s spectral acceleration intra-event residuals from the Campbell-Bozorgnia NGA model for the Kobe (blue circles), Landers (red triangles), Kocaeli (green diamonds), and Superstition Hills (cyan inverted triangles) earthquakes for $R_{jb} \leq 20$ km. The dashed lines are the same as in Figure B.47.
Changes from previous attenuation relations. There are substantial differences in ground motions from moderate-sized (M6.5) earthquakes at distances of 15-30 km between the NGA relations and the previous relations from the same authors (using the same site conditions). Since there doesn’t appear to be very much new data in this magnitude and distance range, why the large differences? An egregious example is Boore-Atkinson (2006) compared to Boore, Joyner and Fumal (1996) for 1 sec S.A. for $R_{JB}=0$ and $M=6.5$. There is about a factor of two decrease for BA (2006) compared to Boore et al. 1996. Why?

Comparison of NGA and 2003 Models

Figures 3 and 4 in the main body of our report show that the predictions of PGA from our previous model (CB03) (Campbell and Bozorgnia, 2003a) are very similar to those from our NGA model (CB06) for $V_{S30}=760$ m/s (NEHRP BC site conditions) and $M=6.5$ at all distances of interest. This is largely due to two important properties of the CB03 model: (1) it had a factor for adjusting predictions from generic rock ($V_{S30}=620$ m/s) to NEHRP BC site conditions, which avoided an overprediction of NEHRP BC ground motions and (2) it incorporated magnitude saturation, which was found to be an important property of the CB06 model based on a much larger dataset. Figures 11 and 12 in the main body of our report show similar results for 1.0s spectral acceleration. The biggest differences between the two models are in the predictions for magnitudes of 7.0 and above, for which there was a paucity of data in the previous database. This issue is addressed in the next section.

Differences in Magnitude and Distance Scaling for $M > 7.0$

The primary difference in the magnitude and distance scaling characteristics of the CB03 and CB06 models is at large magnitudes ($M > 7.0$). Two factors cause this difference: (1) there was very little data to constrain this scaling in the previous model and (2) the previous model forced magnitude saturation while at the same time fixing the rate of attenuation to be independent of magnitude. This latter property caused the attenuation to be too flat in the critical 10–30 km distance range mentioned in the question and, as a result, forced too much magnitude scaling at large magnitudes. This was possible because of the lack of data in this magnitude and distance range in the previous database. The relatively large number of recordings for large magnitudes in the PEER database, especially at near-source distances, clearly indicated that we needed to change our functional form to accommodate an attenuation rate that was dependent on magnitude (flattening with increasing magnitude), thus leading to the large difference in the two models at large magnitudes and short distances.

To show that this revision in our NGA model is supported by the available data, please refer to Figures B.20–B.23 in Section B.2. These figures show the near-source intra-event residuals for our NGA model for PGA and PSA at periods of 0.2, 1.0 and 3.0s, respectively. There are no trends in these data that would indicate a bias in our predictions over the critical 15–30 km distance range mentioned in the question. Of course, this only proves that that the...
attenuation rate is unbiased. There is still the issue of magnitude scaling, which can decrease or increase the predictions at all distances for a given magnitude. This issue is discussed at length in Section B.1 and will not be repeated here.

B.9.3 Conclusion

We find that the predictions of ground motion from our NGA (CB06) and previous (CB03) empirical ground motion models are similar for $M = 6.5$ and $V_{s30} = 760$ m/s at all distances. This is due to two factors: (1) we incorporated magnitude saturation in our previous model as in our NGA model and (2) we provided a factor for adjusting ground motions from generic rock to NEHRP BC site conditions in our previous model. Furthermore, the intra-event residuals from our NGA model show that our revised functional form that predicts magnitude-dependent attenuation is supported by the NGA database, even though it leads to large differences between our NGA and previous models at $M > 7.0$.

B.10 USGS QUESTION #10

Site Amplification. It appears that most of the NGA developers used a similar functional form for the site amplification. How much of the coefficients are derived from numerical modeling and how much are from actually fitting the data? Obviously, using the same functional forms can cause underestimation of the uncertainty.

All of the developers used $V_{s30}$ for shallow site classification. We consider this to be a major advancement, because it allows an unambiguous use of the NGA ground motion models with the NEHRP site categories. This ambiguity has led to unintentional biases in the USGS national seismic hazard maps in the past. For all four models, the linear amplification is modeled as a linear function of the logarithm of $V_{s30}$. So the linear amplification does use the same functional form for all of the models. This functional form has been used successfully in both the United States and Japan by many authors to model linear site-response effects.

While all of the developers included nonlinearity in their models, they did so in different ways. Even those that used the same nonlinear site term found different linear site coefficients (see Section B.17). Therefore, in conclusion, we believe that the difference in nonlinear site terms and in linear site coefficients has not artificially constrained the degree of epistemic uncertainty reflected by the models.

B.11 USGS QUESTION #11

Unique aspects of Chi Chi mainshock. The fact that the Chi-Chi aftershocks do not show the same anomalously low high-frequency excitation in the near-source region (< 30 km) as the mainshock (Wang et al., Dec. 2004 BSSA) combined with the observation that regional and teleseismic spectra of the aftershocks and mainshock scale as expected for a constant stress drop model (Frankel, 2006, SSA annual meeting), indicates that there is a bias in the near-source recordings of the Chi-Chi earthquake. This may be due to the low accelerations near the north
end of the rupture and/or footwall effects described [in a previous question]. We have previously noted the possible bias introduced by a higher number of stations located near the north end of the rupture compared to the south end. It is worth noting that Kanno et al. (June 2006 BSSA) exclude the Chi Chi mainshock data from their new attenuation relations for Japan (which include some California data), citing propagation differences between Taiwan and Japan. The Kanno et al. (2006) relations appear to be significantly higher than the NGA ones, for large magnitudes and close-in distances.

There are four issues raised in this question: (1) that Wang et al. (2004) found anonymously low high-frequency (short-period) ground motions in the near-source region of the Chi-Chi mainshock as compared to its aftershocks, (2) that there might be a bias in the short-period ground motions near the fault because of low accelerations near the north end of the rupture and/or because of footwall effects, (3) that Kanno et al. (2006) excluded Chi-Chi mainshock data from their new empirical ground motion model for Japan, citing possible tectonic differences between Taiwan and Japan, and (4) that the Kanno et al. model appears to predict significantly higher ground motion than the NGA models at large magnitudes and close distances. Each of these issues is discussed below.

**B.11.1 Results of Wang et al. (2004) Implying Differences Between Mainshock and Aftershocks**

Wang et al. (2004) compared observed ground motions from the mainshock and five large aftershocks of the 1999 Chi-Chi (M 7.6) earthquake with predictions from four older empirical ground motion models. They concluded that the observed aftershock motions are in reasonable agreement with the predictions, particularly at distances of 10–30 km, which is in marked contrast to the motions from the mainshock, which are much lower than the predicted motions for periods less than 1.0s. They also concluded that the aftershock motions at distances of 10–30 km are somewhat lower than the predictions, suggesting that the ground motion possibly attenuates more rapidly in this region of Taiwan than it does in the areas represented by these older models.

We did not include Chi-Chi aftershocks in the development of our NGA model, so their specific behavior is not relevant with respect to our predictions. However, the relative difference between these aftershocks and the mainshock, especially at short periods, is potentially important and is addressed here. These authors’ conclusions are based on comparing the residuals with respect to a set of older ground motion models, so all that these results really indicate is that the previous models are not consistent with the short-period magnitude scaling from these earthquakes, either because there is a problem with the magnitude scaling predicted by the models or because there is something different in the short-period behavior of the mainshock. So these results by themselves are equivocal for concluding whether the short-period ground motions from the Chi-Chi mainshock are unusually low with respect to other earthquakes of similar size.
Wang et al. also brought up the possibility that the ground motions might attenuate more rapidly in this part of Taiwan than they do in the areas it is compared with (primarily California). We have addressed that issue in Sections B.3, B.7 and B.9, where we show plots that indicate that there is no overall bias in the intra-event residuals with respect to distance in Taiwan (i.e., the Chi-Chi earthquake) or any of the other regions identified in these plots. There are, however, azimuthal differences in the Chi-Chi ground motions as discussed in the next section.

B.11.2 Bias in Short-Period Ground Motions Near the Fault

The question suggests that there might be a bias in the short-period ground motions from the Chi-Chi earthquake near the fault because of low accelerations near the north end of the rupture and/or because of footwall effects. The issue regarding footwall effects was addressed in Section B.7. Figures B.28–B.29 of that response show that there is no overall positive bias (underprediction) in PGA or 0.2s spectral acceleration with respect to distance. The only bias is a general overprediction of ground motions once the inter-event residual (source term) is taken into account. However, as Figures B.36 and B.36, there are relatively strong azimuthal effects that appear to be consistent with your observations. To better address these effects, we have re-plotted these figures over a shorter distance range of 0–40 km in Figures B.49 and B.50. For purposes of comparison, we also show similar plots for 1.0 and 3.0s spectral accelerations in Figures B.51 and B.52.

Figures B.49 and B.50 clearly show that short-period ground motions in the northern direction at distances of 30 km and less are overpredicted by our model, whereas those to the south are underpredicted by our model, relative to the Chi-Chi earthquake as a whole. This is consistent with the observation that short-period ground motions to the north are lower than those to the south. Interestingly, this effect fades out at 1.0s (Figure B.51) and the opposite effect occurs at 3.0s (Figure B.52). This shift from relatively low short-period ground motions to relatively high long-period ground motions to the north is consistent with both directivity (rupture was primarily to the north) and the increased fault displacement along the northern part of the rupture.

Given that the near-source biases mentioned in the question are confirmed by our residuals, the question remains whether they biased our near-source predictions. Again, we refer to the figures referenced in the previous section, which clearly show that there is no overall bias in our predictions at either near-source or far-source distances. This is due to the large number of recordings from this earthquake, which as a whole provide an unbiased estimate of ground-motion attenuation.

B.11.3 Decision by Kanno et al. (2006) to Exclude Chi-Chi Data

Kanno et al. (2006) chose to exclude recordings from the Chi-Chi earthquake, even though they included recordings from California, the United States, and Turkey, citing three different investigators suggestions that the short-period ground motions from this earthquake were anonymously low. They performed no independent analyses. They offered two reasons why this
might have been the case: (1) that Taiwan is located on a much-fractured continental margin and (2) that seismic wave propagation may be different than in other regions of the crust. We showed in the previous two sections that the second reason is not valid for our dataset. The first observation might be true, but that does not necessarily imply lower attenuation in Taiwan as compared to other active tectonic regions, again as demonstrated by our database.

The Kanno et al. model does appear to predict higher values of PGA than the NGA models for shallow earthquakes at large magnitudes and close distances. These estimates are generally consistent with those predicted by the previous U.S. models (e.g., see their Figure 12 for a comparison with the Boore et al., 1997, model). This is no surprise, since these authors used a traditional magnitude-dependent functional form with the parameter that controls the magnitude scaling at close distances (their $e_1$) fixed at a value of 0.5 based on previous studies. Furthermore, their magnitude scaling at large magnitudes is linear, whereas most of the recent models have used a quadratic relation, which predicts decreasing magnitude scaling with increasing magnitude at all distances.

By fixing $e_1$ and using linear magnitude scaling, these authors did not allow their large-magnitude data at either short or long distances to have much influence on the behavior of their model in this critical magnitude range. To show how this decision has biased their predictions, we refer the reader to their Figure 16c, which plots their inter-event residuals versus magnitude for the shallow events. This figure shows that events with magnitudes between 6.5 and 7.0 are generally underpredicted by their model, whereas those with magnitudes of 7.0 and greater (7 events, including 4 from California) are generally overpredicted by their model. A model that predicts less magnitude scaling for $M > 6.5$, as our NGA model does, would likely reduce or eliminate this bias.

### B.11.4 Conclusion

Based on the discussion provided in the previous sections, we conclude that the Chi-Chi earthquake has not biased the short-period predictions in our NGA model either at near-source or far-source distances. In fact, once the inter-event residuals are taken into account, our model generally overpredicts these short-period ground motions. That is not to say that there are not strong azimuthally dependent attenuation effects, only that there is sufficient data at all azimuths and distances to provide a relatively unbiased estimate of the overall rate of attenuation during this earthquake. Our results also show that overall attenuation during the Chi-Chi earthquake is consistent with our model as well as with the data we used from other regions.
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Fig. B.49  Plot of the PGA intra-event residuals from the Campbell-Bozorgnia NGA model for the Chi-Chi mainshock. Recordings are identified as being off the edge of the fault to the north in the direction of rupture (blue circles) or off the edge of the fault to the south in the opposite direction of rupture (red triangles). Southern distances are plotted as negative values for clarity. The vertical solid grey line demarks the transition from the northern sites to the southern sites. The horizontal dashed grey line represents the adjusted baseline after accounting for the source term and the additional bias caused by disallowing oversaturation, where a positive value represents an overprediction by the model (in this case a significant overprediction).
Fig. B.50  Plot of the 0.2s spectral acceleration intra-event residuals from the Campbell-Bozorgnia NGA model for the Chi-Chi mainshock. The symbols and grey solid and dashed lines are the same as in Figure B.49.
Fig. B.51  Plot of the 1.0s spectral acceleration intra-event residuals from the Campbell-Bozorgnia NGA model for the Chi-Chi mainshock. The symbols and grey solid and dashed lines are the same as in Figure B.49.
Fig. B.52  Plot of the 3.0s spectral acceleration intra-event residuals from the Campbell-Bozorgnia NGA model for the Chi-Chi mainshock. The symbols and grey solid and dashed lines are the same as in Figure B.49.
B.12 CGS QUESTION #1

What is the scientific rational for the upper limit of magnitudes: 8.0 for dip-slip and 8.5 for strike-slip? As far as we know, the upper limit on dip-slip faulty style is 7.6 Chi-Chi and for strike-slip it is 7.9 Denali (and Denali has only one record in the near-field).

In the past, published ground motion models often gave limits on the range of magnitudes for which the model was considered to be applicable based on the empirical data set used to derive the models, but these limits were generally ignored in the application of the models in PSHA. Since the users of the models (often people with no ground motion expertise) are going to extrapolate them to magnitudes outside the range of the empirical data, the PEER NGA Project decided that it would be better to have the model developers decide how their models should be extrapolated.

The specified upper limits on magnitude have nothing to do with the applicable limits of the data. In practice, the models will be applied to whatever magnitudes are included in the source characterization. Using the USGS WG02 model, the largest magnitudes for strike-slip earthquakes in Northern California are larger than M 8. For example, for rupture of all four segments of the northern San Andreas, the mean characteristic magnitude can be as large as 8.1. Including aleatory variability about this mean magnitude of 0.24 units leads to a M 8.34 earthquake. Therefore, if the WG02 source model is going to be used in a PSHA, ground motions are needed for strike-slip earthquakes up to M 8.34. This value was rounded to M 8.5 for the PEER NGA Project. For reverse earthquakes, reverse faults in California can have mean characteristic magnitudes in the high M 7 range. For example, the Little Salmon fault has a mean characteristic magnitude of 7.75. Again, including the aleatory variability leads to a magnitudes as large as 8.0.

We recognized that the empirical data would not constrain the ground motion models at these large magnitudes. To help the developers constrain the extrapolation to these very large magnitudes, suites of numerical simulations for rock site conditions were conducted based on 1-D kinematic models. The set of simulation exercises and a summary of the magnitude scaling resulting from these simulations are given in Somerville et al. (2006).

These simulations were not as useful as we had hoped because the resulting magnitude scaling was not consistent between the three groups that conducted the simulations (URS, Pacific Engineering, and UNR). Additional work is being conducted to improve the numerical simulations to address the short-comings from the NGA study, but this work is expected to take several years.

In conclusion, it should be the responsibility of the developers, not the users, to use the information provided during the PEER NGA Project and their expertise in ground motions to extrapolate their empirical models to the very large magnitudes demanded by the latest PSHA models.
B.13 CGS QUESTION #2

*What is the justification for the upper and lower level of periods 0.01 to 10 sec (0.1 to 100 Hz)?*  
All analog type instruments like SMA-1 have a limit of about 20 Hz (0.05 sec), and it is about 50 Hz for the new digital. For the long-period part, most data before Northridge were processed up to about 5 secs. Only starting with Hector Mine we can justify 10 sec as a cut-off.

As with the magnitude limits discussed in Section B.12, the specified limits on period have nothing to do with the applicable limits of the data. In practice, response spectra are required to cover very high frequencies (e.g., for equipment) and very long periods (e.g., for high rise buildings, bridges and tanks). If we only develop the ground motion models for periods that are well constrained by the empirical data, then these spectra will have to be extrapolated to high frequencies and long periods for individual projects. In the past, this extrapolation has been done in inconsistent ways. In many cases, the spectra are extrapolated by people without expertise in ground motions. Therefore, we decided that it would be better to have the NGA developers do the extrapolation to high frequencies and long periods.

To assist the NGA developers, the 1-D rock site simulations discussed in Section B.12 provided spectral values that covered the specified period range. In addition, scaling of long period spectra values based on 3-D basin simulations were also provided.

In conclusion, it should be the responsibility of the developers to use this information and their expertise in ground motions to extrapolate their empirical models to the high frequencies and long periods demanded by engineers.

In order to judge whether our model predicts reasonable spectral values at long periods, we plotted the displacement spectra predicted by our model out to 10s. Although the overall shape of the spectra looked reasonably good, we could see that the long-period spectral behavior at magnitudes less than around 6.5 were not in line with what one might expect from simple seismological theory. In order to better constrain the model at long periods and small magnitudes, we looked at the predicted displacement spectra from ground-motion simulations. Figure B.53 gives an example of the displacement spectra predicted by our model. The predictions above M 6.5 are generally constrained by the empirical data, so it is only the smaller magnitudes that have been constrained from seismological theory.
Fig. B.53  Relative displacement spectra predicted by the Campbell-Bozorgnia NGA model for a distance of 10 km, NEHRP BC site conditions, and strike-slip faulting.
B.14 CGS QUESTION #3

Strong motion data are biased toward larger motions at large distances, but data truncation at 60-80 km is really very restrictive. For example, it basically eliminates basin effect, which is extremely important in Southern California (Hector Mine, Landers). How can you justify applicability of the equations up to 200 km by using data set that practically doesn’t have surface waves?

The 200 km upper limit on the distance has nothing to do with the applicable limits of the data. In practice, the ground motion models are used for large distances regardless of the limits of applicability that the developers may state. Since the ground motion models will be extrapolated to large distances, we decided that it would be better to have the NGA developers do the extrapolation to large distances. To assist the developers, 1-D rock simulations (as discussed in Section B.12) were provided out to distances of 200 km. The Green’s functions for two of three sets of simulations include surface waves, but only for rock site conditions (e.g., no surface waves due to basin response).

In addition, an analysis of attenuation from network data (Boatwright, 2005) was provided that could be used to guide the extrapolation to large distances. Finally, the developers were provided recordings from digital accelerograms from several magnitude 5 earthquakes out to distances of several hundred kilometers that could be used to constrain the attenuation at large distances (Dave Boore, written communication, 2005).

A few developers opted to truncate the distance used to select the database at a value less than the required 200 km. However, those developers used additional data, such as broadband and other network data, to extrapolate their models to larger distances.

We were initially concerned that using data out to 200 km would result in a bias in our prediction of near-source ground motions. As a result, we first truncated the database at 60 km as in our 2003 model and performed our analysis. We then added the remaining data and repeated the analysis. The comparison showed that the near-source predictions were not significantly impacted by the more distant data. The largest effect was a much more moderate degree of oversaturation at large magnitudes and short distances when data from all distances were used. Since we chose not to allow oversaturation in our model, we thought that a database that minimized this behavior was preferable over one that did not. Of course, as suggested in this question, including such data also increased the number of recordings that contributed to our sediment depth (i.e., 3-D basin) term. One adverse impact of using the more distant data is our belief that our model might underpredict the amount of attenuation for the smaller earthquakes, but this only impacts ground motion of little engineering importance. This impact is due in part to the selectiveness of only processing earthquakes and/or recordings with the largest ground motions, especially for earthquakes with magnitudes less than around 6.0.
B.15  CGS QUESTION #4

What is the current thinking on large distance data with amplitudes below 0.5% g recorded at non-strong motion networks? It was a long discussion at a couple of meetings and justification for use of these data, and they are not even mentioned in the current reports?

The discussions you refer to centered on the validity of these ground motions, considering they potentially come from instruments whose response is flat to velocity rather than acceleration. Such data would require differentiation to obtain acceleration. None of the developers explicitly used such data in their regression analyses. In fact, including data other than that provided through the PEER database development team (the so-called “flatfile”) was strictly forbidden. However, data other than that provided by the PEER NGA Project was used to various degrees by some developers to help constrain their models, which was allowed. We did not use any data other than that provided by the PEER NGA Project team (the so-called flatfile) in the development of our model, so the small-amplitude data you refer to did not influence our model.

B.16  CGS QUESTION #5

What is the seismological justification for using non-linearity in it current form? Is it in accordance to what is known about non-linearity in strong motion:

- Non-linearity is only proven for amplitudes of ground motion higher than 20-30% g in some earthquakes. (Loma Prieta, Northridge, Chi-Chi), but does not show up for examples in records or Whittier Narrows (Beresnev, 2002).
- Non-linearity is a frequency dependent phenomenon shown to take place for frequencies 1.0-5.0 Hz (Field, 2000)
- Empirical results of Choi & Stewart (2005) for 5% damped response spectral acceleration show large degree of non-linearity for Vs30<180 m/s, rapidly decreasing with increasing Vs30.

The developers used different approaches to modeling the nonlinearity. All of the approaches are consistent with what is “known” about nonlinear behavior in strong motion; however, what the developers consider to be “known” may be different between the different developers. In each case, the developers checked that the nonlinearity in their models is consistent with their selected subset of the empirical data. But these data are not sufficient to constrain the nonlinear soil behavior at large ground motions and soft sites, so most of the modelers reverted to modeling to some extent to define the models in this region.

Because NEHRP E sites can be subject to unique site-response characteristics, we have recommended that our model not be used for values of $V_{s30}$ less than 180 m/sec, unless the user believes that his site will not be subject to such unique site-response characteristics.
All three reports use Choi and Stewart (2005) for the site amplification effect but the coefficients for the linear part vary: it is 0.36 in B&A, 0.34 in C&B, and 0.48 in C&Y. Why is it so different if it is based on the same source?

Note that all of these coefficients are actually negative to accommodate a reference site velocity in the denominator of the site velocity term. Not all of the developers used Choi and Stewart (2005) for their site-amplification term as indicated in Section B.16, so one would not necessarily expect them to also have the same linear site term. This term will depend on the degree of nonlinearity predicted by the model, the reference site velocity, the selected database, and other factors.

The four models all determine the linear site term from the empirical data. Since the models use different empirical subsets, the linear terms will be different. For example, Chiou-Youngs and Abrahamson-Silva include the Chi-Chi aftershocks in the determination of the site response, but Boore-Atkinson and Campbell-Bozorgnia do not include these aftershocks. Given the large number of recordings from the Chi-Chi aftershocks, this data set difference could lead to a significant difference in the linear site terms.

Our linear soil coefficients of -0.34 and -0.73 for PGA and 1.0s spectral acceleration are very similar to the values of -0.37 and -0.70 originally derived by Boore et al. (1997). Although this doesn’t prove our values are correct, it does imply that the non-linear site model we adopted from Walling and Abrahamson (2006) probably has not strongly biased our linear site term. We also checked our residuals and found, at least for NEHRP D and stiffer sites for which we consider our model valid, that our nonlinear site term removed the tendency for our linear model to overpredict short-period ground motions on NEHRP C and D sites at the largest observed values of PGA without underpredicting at smaller values of PGA.
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