IC/98/2

United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization
and
International Atomic Energy Agency
THE ABDUS SALAM INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR THEORETICAL PHYSICS

DETERMINISTIC SEISMIC ZONING OF EASTERN CUBA

Leonardo Alvarez[1]
Centro Nacional de Investigaciones Sismológicas, Cuba
and
The Abdus Salam International Centre for Theoretical Physics, SAND Group, Trieste, Italy,

Franco Vaccari
Gruppo Nazionale per la Difesa dai Terremoti, Italy
and
Department of Earth Sciences, University of Trieste, Trieste, Italy

and

Giuliano F. Panza
Department of Earth Sciences, University of Trieste, Trieste, Italy
and
The Abdus Salam International Centre for Theoretical Physics, SAND Group, Trieste, Italy.

MIRAMARE – TRIESTE
January 1998

[1]Regular Associate of the ICTP.

ABSTRACT

A deterministic seismic zoning of Cuba is performed by modelling, with modal summation, the complete P-SV and SH waves fields generated by point-source earthquakes buried in flat layered anelastic media. The results of the computation, performed for periods greater than 1 second, are presented in two sets of maps of maximum displacement (d_{max}), maximum velocity (v_{max}) and design ground acceleration (DGA), obtained using two different criteria in the definition of the input magnitude: (1) values reported in the earthquake catalogue (M_{obs}) and (2) values determined from seismotectonic considerations (M_{max}). A comparison with the results of a previous probabilistic seismic zoning is made to test the possibility of making intensity - ground motion conversion with the aid of log-linear regressions.

1. INTRODUCTION

Cuba, part of the North American plate, is at the boundary with the Caribbean one, where an approximately sinistral transcurrent movement is dominant. The known seismic history begins with the Spanish settlements in the XVI century, and since that time several major and large earthquakes were reported in Greater Antilles. In particular, eastern Cuba, where Santiago de Cuba city has been partially destroyed several times since its foundation, is the part of the Cuban territory most affected by earthquakes. The remaining part of the territory is affected by intraplate seismicity that reaches maximum epicentral intensity of VIII degrees (MSK seismic intensity scale).

Seismic zoning began with a deterministic approach based on felt intensities (Alvarez, 1970, Chuy et al., 1983), and the map presented by Chuy et al. (1983) has been used for a long time in the antiseismic building code in Cuba. In the middle of the 80's a qualitative change is due to the introduction of probabilistic approaches (Rubio, 1985, Alvarez and Bune, 1985). The majority of the subsequent studies are based on the methodology introduced by Alvarez and Bune (1985) and discussed by Alvarez (1995). The detailed seismic zoning for the sitting of nuclear power plants, radioactive waste deposits and hydroelectric complexes, summarised in the new proposal for the seismic building code (Chuy and Alvarez, 1995), are made following the probabilistic approach. Finally, a new probabilistic investigation following GSHAP philosophy has been performed (Rodríguez et al., 1998).

The parameter commonly used in Cuba for hazard description is the macroseismic intensity because there are no records of acceleration or any other ground motion parameter during strong or felt earthquakes. Therefore, to obtain hazard estimates in terms of acceleration or other ground motion parameter, it is necessary to follow an indirect way to transform macroseismic intensity into ground motion parameters.

A way to estimate seismic ground motion parameters is complete waveform modelling. In this paper we formulate a new deterministic seismic zoning of eastern Cuba, made by modelling P-SV and SH wave fields with the modal summation method (Panza, 1985; Panza and Suhadolc, 1987; Florsch et al., 1991), following a methodology that is discussed in Costa et al. (1993).

The validity of the use of log-linear transformations between ground motion parameters and intensity for Cuban conditions is controlled by studying the relationships between our results, based on ground motion modelling and the results of Rodríguez et al. (1998) based on calculated intensity.

2.SEISMICITY DATA

We use an unpublished earthquake catalogue for the period from 1502 to 1994 for the region between 67°-85°W and 16°-24°N. The magnitude of all historical earthquakes has been determined by the inversion of intensity data through the adjustment of an elliptical model of isoseismals (Alvarez and Chuy, 1985). The magnitudes of earthquakes in the catalogue are Ms, m_b, M_I (estimated from macroseismic data), M_D (estimated from signal duration) and K_r - energetic class (Rautian, 1964). The conversion relationships to Ms are: $M_I \cong M_D \cong Ms$, $Ms=1.51m_b-3.69$, $Ms=0.48K_r-2.11$ (Alvarez et al., 1990). In Fig. 1 the map of epicenters for $Ms \geq 5$ is presented: the seismicity of the region is mainly shallow ($h \leq 70$Km) with the presence of deeper foci ($70 < h \leq 220$Km) only in the eastern part of Hispaniola island (the second largest island in Fig. 1).

The region considered in this study [18°-24° N, 72°-78° W] comprises eastern Cuba and surrounding territories. The catalogue for this zone is characterised by a good pre-instrumental part (XVI-XIX centuries) followed by an instrumental part complemented with macroseismic epicenters of weaker, instrumentally non recorded events. The instrumental catalogue is based until 1967 on locations made by the worldwide network and only after 1967 the determination of local epicenters by Cuban stations begins, with variable quality in time.

The studied region is divided into cells of 0.2° x 0.2° and the maximum observed magnitudes M_{obs} of the earthquakes which occurred within each cell is determined. These data are smoothed following the procedure described in Costa et al. (1993). The obtained smoothed seismicity is intersected with the seismic source zones (SSZ) derived from the map of seismogenetic zones of Cuba and its surroundings, shown in Fig. 2 (Cotilla and Alvarez, 1996). This map is an updated version of a seismotectonic map of Cuba based mainly on remote sensing techniques complemented with geological, tectonical and seismological data (Cotilla and Alvarez, 1991). As a result, a smoothed map M_{obs} is obtained (Fig. 3).

Taking into account the great difference between the space distribution of M_{obs} and of M_{max}, the maximum possible magnitude expected from seismotectonic considerations (Cotilla and Alvarez, 1996), it has been decided to make the calculation considering both M_{obs} and M_{max}.

3. FOCAL MECHANISM IN THE REGION

For the definition of the focal mechanism of each SSZ, we have collected all the available data about fault plane solutions and CMT determinations for the region. In such a way we assembled 46 solutions (Table 1), corresponding to 30 earthquakes or groups of earthquakes that cover all the SSZ delineated for the interplate seismicity zone (Fig. 4). For each SSZ we select the more reliable solution as the typical mechanism to be used in the modelling of the seismic motion. Nevertheless, for the intraplate SSZ no focal mechanism or CMT solutions are available, and the expected mechanisms have been chosen only on the base of general considerations on the geodynamics of the region.

4. STRUCTURAL MODEL

The uppermost 150 Km of the structural model are shown in Fig. 5 and represent a modification of the P and S waves velocities model used for earthquake hypocenter's location (MINBAS, 1989). The density values are adapted from those proposed by Orihuela and Cuevas (1993). Since Q values are not available in the literature we assumed standard values of Q_α=200 and Q_β=100 for all the layers.

5. RESULTS

The calculation of synthetic signals has been performed following the procedure described by Costa et al. (1993). The maximum frequency used is 1 Hz, because the available details about input structure and source properties don't warrant the computation of synthetic signals at higher frequencies. All seismograms are scaled to the magnitude associated to the relevant cell using the scaling law of Gusev (1983) as reported by Aki (1987). For each point of the 0.2°x0.2° grid we select the maximum values of displacement (d_{max}) and velocity (v_{max}), and we draw a set of maps of d_{max} (**Fig.** 6) and v_{max} (**Fig.** 7).

As pointed out by Panza et al. (1997), the maximum ground accelerations are observed for frequencies greater than 1 Hz, i.e. outside of the range considered. The extension to larger frequencies can be made using standard or, if available, local response spectra (Panza et al., 1996). This suggestion is supported by the results obtained by Youngs et al. (1997) for subduction earthquakes (50-200 Km, M=6.5-8.5) and Sadigh et al. (1997) for shallow earthquakes (10-50 Km, M=5.5-7.5), on the dependence of the ratio MSV/PGA (MSV - maximum spectral value of response spectra and PGA - peak ground acceleration) with respect to magnitude and distance. These authors obtain values of MSV/PGA between 1 and 2 for periods from 0.1 to about 1 second, with an abrupt fall to values of 0.1-0.2 for periods of the order of 3 seconds. For periods between 0.8-1.2 seconds the ratio MSV/PGA varies in the range (0.7-1.2), which means that in the period range in which we compute the a_{max} values the peak ground acceleration is comparable to the maximum of the response spectra. The results obtained with the use of the design ground acceleration (DGA) as defined by Eurocode8 (1993) are presented in Fig. 8.

6. DISCUSSION

Due to the lack of recordings of strong events, in Cuba the common practice (Alvarez, 1995) for the estimation of ground motion parameters is to use log-linear transformations of macroseismic intensity. Quite popular is to use the regressions obtained by Trifunac and Brady (1975), even if until present it has not been possible to make any test on their effective applicability to the Cuban territory.

We cannot obtain an empirical "first hand" correlation between maximum felt intensity, I_{max}, and "calculated by modelling" ground motion parameters as was done by Panza et al. (1997) in other parts of the world, since there is no updated map of I_{max} for the region. Nevertheless, for the studied part of Cuba, there is a recent probabilistic seismic hazard assessment (Rodríguez et al., 1998) made using the same seismic source zones and seismotectonical, M_{max}, values that we used in this paper. Rodríguez et al., (1998) processed the data with two methods, the well-known Cornell's and McGuire's approaches. From their original data, we have prepared two maps of I_{max} (Fig. 9). The expected I_{max} for Cornell's approach is, in 37% of the cases, one degree larger than the one determined with McGuire's approach. In general, the use of M_{max} gives ground motion values that are twice the one obtained using M_{obs}, and this, roughly speaking, corresponds to a difference of one degree in intensity. Therefore the probabilistic treatment of intensity attenuation of McGuire's approach seems to reduce the hazard estimates, and makes them quite close to observations.

For both data sets of expected I_{max} values, and the ground motion parameters determined in section 5 for the case of M_{max}, [I_{max}(Cornell) vs. (d_{max}, v_{max}, DGA)] (data set 1) and [I_{max}(McGuire) vs. (d_{max}, v_{max}, DGA)] (data set 2), we calculate the logarithmic average value of the ground motion corresponding to each value of the macroseismic intensity, and from these data, the regression lines of the kind

$$lg(y) = a + b * I$$

by the least squares method. The obtained values for the parameters a and b are presented in **Table** 2.

Although the kind of data used by Trifunac and Brady (1975) (observed intensities and ground motion parameters) and Panza et al. (1997) (observed intensities and modelled ground motion parameters) is different from the data used here (modelled intensities and modelled ground motion parameters), it is quite instructive to make a comparison among the different relationships.

For data set 2, the original values (not averaged) for d_{max} and v_{max}, as well as the regression lines are shown in **Figs.** 10 and 11, with the 95% confidence interval for the mean. As a comparison we have plotted also the relationships obtained by Trifunac and Brady (1975) and Panza et al. (1997).

The Panza et al. (1997) regression lines (3 and 4 in the figures) **fit quite well with our** data for velocity but not for displacement. On the other hand, the Trifunac and Brady (1975) regression (2 in figures) predicts higher ground motion values in both cases, slightly outside the 95% confidence interval. Nevertheless, the Trifunac and Brady (1975) relationship for peak horizontal acceleration agrees quite well with our DGA data converted to MSV (Fig. 12). The same agreement is obtained with the curves for MSV that can be deduced from the relationships of Panza et al (1997).

Taking into account the previous discussion it can be said that the obtained relationships between ground motion parameters and macroseismic intensity can be applied for reliable prediction of ground motion values in the intensity range from VII to X.

7. CONCLUSIONS

The deterministic seismic zonation of eastern Cuba is made under two alternative hypotheses:

(a) The maximum possible magnitudes of earthquakes in each seismic zone are determined by the known seismic history (M_{obs}).
(b) The maximum possible magnitudes of earthquakes in each seismic zone are determined from seismotectonical criteria (M_{max}).
The results are presented in a set of maps giving the space distribution of important ground motion parameters (d_{max}, v_{max} and DGA).
The ground motion values obtained in the hypothesis (b) are compared with the results of a previous probabilistic study to obtain the parameters of log-linear regressions ground motion (d_{max}, v_{max}, DGA) - intensity (I_{max}). These regressions may be used for a reliable estimation of ground motion parameters in intensity range from VII to X.

Acknowledgments

This work was done within the framework of the Associateship Scheme of the Abdus Salam International Centre for Theoretical Physics, Trieste, Italy.

REFERENCES

AKI, K., *Strong motion seismology.* In: *Strong Ground Motion Seismology, NATO ASI Series, Series C: Mathematical and Physical Sciences, vol. 204* (ed. Erdik, M.Ö and Toksöz, M. N.)(D. Reidel Publishing Company, Dordrecht, 1987) pp.3-41.

ALVAREZ, H. (1970), *Intensidad sísmica de Cuba,* In: *Atlas Nacional de Cuba* (Inst. Geografía ACC, Inst. Geografía AC de la URSS, La Habana, Moscú) pp. 20.

ALVAREZ, L. (1985), *Seismicity of Eastern Cuba* (in Russian) Ph.D. Thesis, Inst. of Physics of the Earth, Acad. Of Sci. of the USSR, Moscow, 181 pp.

ALVAREZ, L. (1995), *SACUDIDA, versión 2.0. Un programa para la estimación de la peligrosidad sísmica* (Editorial ACADEMIA, La Habana) 64 pp.

ALVAREZ, L. and BUNE, V. I. (1985), *Seismic shakeability of eastern Cuba (in Russian).* Fizika Zemli, *10,* pp. 3-12.

ALVAREZ, L. and CHUY, T., *Isoseismal model for Greater Antilles*, In *Proceedings of the 3rd. International Symposium on the Analysis of Seismicity and on Seismic Risk, Liblice Castle, Czechoslovakia, June 17-22* (Ed. Academia, Prague, 1985) pp. 134-141.

ALVAREZ, L., MIJAILOVA, R. S., VOROBIOVA, E., CHUY, T. ZHAKIRDZHANOVA, G. N., PEREZ, E. R., RODIONOVA, L. M., ALVAREZ, H. and MIRZOEV, K. M. (1990), *Terremotos de Cuba y áreas aledañas*, Internal Report, National Centre for Seismological Research, Ministry of Science, Technology and Environment, Cuba, 78 pp.

ALVAREZ, L., SERRANO, M., RUBIO, M., CHUY, T. and GONZALEZ, B. (1984), *El terremoto del 19 de febrero de 1976. Pilón, región oriental de Cuba*, Investigaciones Sismológicas en Cuba, *5*, pp. 5-60.

CALAIS, E. (1990), *Relations cinématique déformation le long d'une limite de plaques en coulissage: la frontière nord Caraibe de Cuba a Hispaniola*, Ph.D. Thesis, Univ. of Nice, 296 pp.

CHUY, T. and ALVAREZ, L. (1995), *Zonación sísmica de Cuba con fines de la norma sismorresistente cubana*, Internal Report, National Centre for Seismological Research, Ministry of Science, Technology and Environment, Cuba, 23 pp.

CHUY, T., GONZALEZ, B. E. and ALVAREZ, L. (1983), *Sobre la peligrosidad sísmica en Cuba*, Investigaciones Sismológicas en Cuba, *4*, pp. 37-52.

COSTA, G., PANZA, G. F., SUHADOLC, P. and VACCARI, F. (1993), *Zoning of the Italian territory in terms of expected peak ground acceleration derived from complete synthetic seismograms*, Journal of Applied Geophysics, *30*, pp. 149-160.

COTILLA, M. and ALVAREZ, L. (1991), *Principios del mapa sismotectónico de Cuba* Revista Geofísica del Instituto Panamericano de Geografía e Historia, *35*, pp. 113-124.

COTILLA, M and ALVAREZ, L. (1996), *Mapa de zonas sismogeneradoras de Cuba y regiones adyacentes*, Informe, Fondos del Centro Nacional de Investigaciones Sismológicas, Ministerio de Ciencia Tecnología y Medio Ambiente, Cuba.

EUROCODE 8 (1993), *Eurocode 8 structures in seismic regions-design - part 1: general and building*, Doc TC250/SC8/N57A.

FLORSCH, N. FÄH, D., SUHADOLC, P. and PANZA, G. F. (1991), *Complete synthetic seismograms for high-frequency multimode SH-waves*, Pure and Applied Geophys., *136*, pp. 529-560.

GUSEV, A. A. (1983), *Descriptive statistical model of earthquake source radiation and its application to an estimation of short period strong motion*, Geophys. J. R. Astron. Soc., *74*, pp. 787-800.

MINBAS (1989), *Investigaciones complejas para la ubicación de una central electronuclear en la provincia Holguín. Tomo 1: Trabajos Sismológicos. Libro 9, parte 2: Informe sobre los materiales del procesamiento de la red de estaciones sismológicas.* Internal Report, Ministry of Basic Industry, Cuba, 360 pp.

MENDIGUREN, J. A. (1966), *Focal mechanism and pressure axis direction in Central America and South America*, Bull. Of the Intern. Inst. of Seism. and Earthq. Eng., *3*, pp. 1-20.

MOLNAR, P. and SYKES, L. R. (1969), *Tectonics of the Caribbean and Middle America regions from focal mechanism and seismicity*, Geol. Soc. Amer. Bull., *80*, pp. 1639-1684.

ORIHUELA, N. and CUEVAS, J. L. (1993), *Modelaje sismogravimétrico de perfiles regionales del Caribe central*, Revista Ingeniería, Universidad Central de Venezuela, 8, pp. 55-73.

PANZA, G. F. (1985), *Synthetic seismograms: the Rayleigh waves modal summation*, J. Geophys. Res., *58*, pp. 125-145.

PANZA, G. F., CAZZARO, R. and VACCARI, F. (1997), *Correlation between macroseismic intensities and seismic ground motion parameters*, ICTP Pre-print No. IC/97/88.

PANZA, G. F. and SUHADOLC, P., *Complete strong motion synthetics*, In *Seismic strong motion synthetics, Computational techniques 4* (ed. Bolt B. A.)(Academic Press, 1987) pp. 153-204

PANZA, G. F., VACCARI, F., COSTA, G., SUHADOLC, P. and FÄH, D. (1996), *Seismic input modelling for zoning and microzoning*, Earthquake Spectra, *12*, pp. 529-566.

RAUTIAN, T.G. (1964), *About the determination of the energy of earthquakes for distances until 3000 Km (in Russian)*. Trudi Instituta Fiziki Zemli, *32(199)*, pp. 88-93.

RODRIGUEZ, M., ALVAREZ, L. and GARCIA, J. (1998), *Estimaciones probabilísticas de la peligrosidad sísmica en Cuba*, Submitted to: Revista Geofísica del Instituto Panamericano de Geografía e Historia.

RUBIO, M., *The assessment of seismic hazard for the Republic of Cuba*, In *Proceedings of the 3rd. International Symposium on the Analysis of Seismicity and on Seismic risk, Liblice Castle, Czechoslovakia, June 17-22*, (Ed. Academia, Prague,1985) pp. 424-431.

RUBIO, M. (1985a), *The assessment of seismic hazard for the Republic of Cuba*. Ph.D. Thesis, Institute of Geophysics, Science Academy of Czechoslovakia, Prague.

SADIGH, K., CHANG, C.-J., EGAN, J.A., MAKDISI, F. and YOUNGS, R.R. (1997), *Attenuation relationships for shallow crustal earthquakes based on California strong motion*, Seism. Res. Lett., *68*, pp. 58-73.

STAUDER, W. and BOLLINGER, G. A. (1964), *The S wave project for focal mechanism studies: Earthquakes of 1962*, Bull. Seism. Soc. of Amer., *54*, pp. 2199-2208.

TRIFUNAC, M. D. and BRADY, A. G. (1975), *On the correlation of seismic intensity scales with the peaks of recorded strong ground motions*, Bull. Seism. Soc. Amer., *65*, pp. 139-162.

WICKENS, J.W. and HODGSON, J.H. (1967), *Computer re-evaluation of earthquake mechanism solutions*. Department of Energy, Mines and Resources, Ottawa.

YOUNGS, R. R., CHIOU, S.-J., SILVA, W. J. and HUMPHREY, J. R. (1997), *Strong ground motion attenuation relationships for subduction zone earthquakes*, Seism. Res. Lett., *68*, pp. 58-73.

Table 1. Focal mechanisms in the region (16°-24°N, 72°-82°W). We give all available solutions. Original data have been reprocessed to unify the representation of fault plane solutions; in each case the two orthogonal planes are presented. Az –azimuth, D – dip, Ra – Rake, Q – quality of solution, h – depth in Km, La – North Latitude, Lo – West Longitude, Date – day/month/year, Time – hour:minute:second, Ms and m_b – magnitudes, R – bibliographic reference [WH – Wickens and Hodgson (1967), MS – Molnar and Sykes (1969), SB – Stauder and Bollinger (1964), R – Rubio (1985a), AS – Alvarez et al. (1984), A –Alvarez (1985), M – Mendiguren (1966), C – Calais (1990), N – NEIS, C – University of Harvard CMT solutions].

No	Date	Time	La	Lo	h	Ms	m_b	R	Q	Az1	D1	Ra1	Az2	D2	Ra2
01	09/07/56	09:56:13.7	20.01	72.98	54	6.4	-	WH	B	343	70	17	247	75	158
02	20/04/62	05:47:51.1	20.50	72.13	0	6.8	-	WH	B	90	71	96	287	22	104
02a	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	MS	B	234	47	44	110	60	128
02b	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	SB	-	86	46	96	279	46	98
03	25/07/62	04:37:42.9	18.90	81.19	64	6.0	-	WH	B	271	89	6	180	86	178
03a	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	MS	A	81	90	10	351	80	90
03b	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	SB		77	60	8	344	84	150
04	03/09/71	13:19:30.3	17.96	81.66	16	-	4.7	R	C	250	31	-5	344	88	-120
05	11/04/72	11:56:54.9	19.09	80.74	19	5.0	4.7	AS	B	75	88	-20	165	70	-178
05a	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	R	C	302	68	42	201	48	165
06	03/08/73	15:44:25.5	19.97	73.05	24	-	5.2	R	C	316	28	-55	99	68	-106
07	19/02/76	13:59:59	19.87	76.87	15	5.7	5.2	AS	B	80	80	4	356	86	170
07a	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	A	B	346	80	64	233	28	154
07b	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	R	B	192	82	132	290	47	11
08a	23/02/76	21:58:46.5	19.84	77.12	17	4.6	4.9	R	C	319	69	19	221	69	157
08b	24/02/76	11:28:34.2	19.84	77.12	24	-	4.8	R	C	228	36	-1	327	85	-125
08*	Compound	solution	19.84	77.12	-	-	-	AS	B	310	60	-71	95	35	-120
09	17/10/76	00:09:44.3	19.74	75.48	33	4.1	4.9	R	C	294	52	27	187	79	138
10	18/11/78	03:04:26.9	18.65	73.39	13	4.7	4.9	R	C	8	34	-62	156	60	-118
11	13/11/78	03:43:13.0	19.85	76.02	0	4.7	5.1	R	C	289	53	50	162	52	130
11a	-	-	20.18	76.6	15	-	-	H	A	190	26	127	330	69	73
12	08/02/80	20:38:52.0	19.58	75.56	53	4.2	4.9	R	C	248	88	-15	339	75	-177
12a	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	C	C	70	40	25	320	74	137
13a	22/12/70	17:09:56.0	19.92	75.29	34	-	4.7	R	C	292	45	5	199	86	135
13b	20/05/73	03:00:09.3	19.71	75.58	33	-	4.5	R	C	294	52	26	187	70	138
13c	11/10/68	02:38:24.0	19.88	75.92	48	-	4.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
13d	16/02/69	23:07:28.0	19.92	75.74	23	-	4.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
13e	16/03/70	22:48:52.0	20.14	74.6	89	-	4.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
13*	Compound	solution	19.91	75.59	-	-	-	AS	B	248	58	26	144	70	145
14*	57-66	11_events	19.00	72.00	50	-	-	M	B	276	69	27	172	56	155
15	29/09/76	09:52:34.9	18.91	80.65	50	4.9	5.2	R	C	93	90	0	13	90	0
16	26/02/78	05:07:22.5	18.20	76.52	23	3.9	4.9	R	C	326	81	26	234	68	170
17	25/05/92	16:55:04.1	19.61	77.82	33	7.0	6.3	N	A	182	80	12	90	78	170
17a	-	-	19.84	77.70	15	-	-	H	B	248	43	-1	339	89	-133
18	01/09/85	01:00:55.2	19.75	75.30	5	5.1	5.1	C	C	70	54	46	310	54	146
18a	-	-	19.67	75.20	10	-	-	H	A	61	38	100	228	53	82
19	26/09/85	08:03:24.5	18.37	71.96	8	3.9	4.8	C	C	100	27	53	320	69	107
20	12/11/88	03:34:48.7	18.15	76.64	20	4.7	5.4	H	B	306	72	87	135	18	98
21	12/02/89	14:26:50.2	19.98	74.52	25	4.3	5.2	H	A	286	29	43	157	71	112
22	16/08/84	03:09:45.9	18.24	81.62	10	5.0	5.0	H	A	323	32	-96	150	58	-86
23	22/05/90	20:35:38.0	19.79	76.07	15	4.8	5.0	H	A	290	43	27	179	72	130
24	26/08/90	07:53:45.2	19.43	78.04	15	5.2	5.7	H	B	166	42	-135	39	62	-57
25	04/09/90	08:03:04.2	19.86	75.58	15	4.5	5.2	H	B	302	21	21	192	83	109
26	26/08/91	10:01:59.2	19.05	80.97	10	5.2	5.3	H	B	258	77	12	175	79	166
27	27/06/92	14:16:23.2	18.81	80.64	15	5.0	5.3	H	A	165	85	-178	75	88	-5
28	19/01/93	17:11:13	18.69	76.97	15	-	5.71	H	A	282	33	23	172	77	121
29	02/03/94	03:38:04.6	19.95	72.67	34	5.0	5.2	H	B	110	68	12	16	79	157
30	27/06/95	10:10:02.2	18.82	81.78	15	5.7	5.8	H	A	352	71	-163	257	74	-20
30a	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	N	A	357	84	-169	266	79	-6

Table 2. Parameters of the regression lines (d_{max}, v_{max}, DGA) vs. I_{max}. σ_a and σ_b are the dispersions of the estimated parameters and r is the correlation coefficient: a) for data set 1, b) for data set 2.

a)

y	A	σ_a	b	σ_b	R
D_{max}	-1.889	0.326	0.308	0.036	0.993
V_{max}	-2.204	0.545	0.364	0.060	0.987
DGA	-0.980	0.418	0.335	0.046	0.991

b)

y	A	σ_a	b	σ_b	r
D_{max}	-1.451	0.237	0.275	0.028	0.990
V_{max}	-2.134	0.340	0.376	0.040	0.989
DGA	-0.856	0.153	0.338	0.018	0.997

FIGURE CAPTIONS

Fig. 1. Map of epicenters from 1502 until present in Cuba and neighbouring territories. Open circles - shallow events, full circles - intermediate depth events.

Fig. 2. Map of seismogenetic zones with M_{max} values (Cotilla and Alvarez, 1996). The seismic source zones in the Cuban Island are about 10 Km wide. Therefore they are represented by lines. 1.- $4.5<M_{max}\leq 5$, 2.- $5<M_{max}\leq 5.5$, 3.- $5.5<M_{max}\leq 6$; 4.- $6<M_{max}\leq 6,5$; 5.- $6.5<M_{max}\leq 7$, 6.- $7<M_{max}\leq 7.5$, 7.- $7.5<M_{max}\leq 8$, 8.- $8<M_{max}$

Fig. 3. Map obtained by smoothing the maximum observed magnitudes M_{obs}.

Fig. 4. Focal mechanisms for the studied region divided in four groups: single - only one fault plane solution (FPS); multiple - more than one FPS determination from several sources; compound - compound mechanism of several earthquakes; CMT - a centroid-moment tensor solution is also available. A code corresponding to columns R and No in Table 1 identifies each FPS.

Fig. 5. Uppermost 150 Km of the structural model used for the computation of synthetic signals.

Fig. 6. Maximum expected displacement d_{max}:(a) from M_{obs}, (b) from M_{max}.

Fig. 7. Maximum expected velocity v_{max}: (a) from M_{obs}, (b) from M_{max}.

Fig.8. Expected design ground acceleration (DGA) according to Eurocode 8: (a) from M_{obs}, (b) from M_{max}.

Fig. 9. Space distribution of I_{max} prepared from the original data of the probabilistic seismic hazard assessment (Rodríguez et al., 1998): (a) Cornell's approach (data set 1), (b) McGuire's approach (data set 2).

Fig. 10. Relationship d_{max} (from M_{max}) vs. I_{max} for data set 2. 1 - regression line obtained by least squares method, the 95% confidence intervals of the mean are represented by bars, 2 - Trifunac and Brady (1975) relationship for the horizontal component of motion, 3 - Panza et al. (1997) relationship for ING

data, 4 - the same as 3 but for ISG data.

Fig. 11. Relationship v_{max} (from M_{max}) vs. I_{max} for data set 2. 1, 2, 3 and 4 - the same as in Fig. 10.

Fig. 12. Relationship MSV (from M_{max}) vs. I_{max} For data set 2. 1 - the same as in Fig. 10, 2 - Trifunac and Brady (1975) relationships for peak horizontal acceleration, 3 - Panza et al. (1997) relationship for DGA (converted to MSV) for ING data, 4 - the same for ISG data.



Fig.1



Fig.2


Magnitude
] 7.75 - 8.00]
] 7.25 - 7.50]
] 7.00 - 7.25]
] 6.75 - 7.00]
] 6.50 - 6.75]
] 6.00 - 6.50]
] 5.50 - 6.00]
] 5.00 - 5.50]
] 0.00 - 5.00]
−80
−78
−76
−74
−72
18
20
22
24

Fig.3


SINGLE
MULTIPLE
COMPOUND
CMT
-82 -80 -78 -76 -74 -72
22 20 18
R-4
R-15
R-16
R-9
R-6
WH-4
C-19
R-10
WH-3
AS-5
R-5
SB-3
MS-3
AS-7
A-7
R-7
R-12
C-12
WH-2
SB-2
MS-2
R-8a
AS-8*
R-8b
R-13b
R-13a
M-14*
AS-13*
H-26
H-30
H-27
H-24
H-17
H-11
H-25
H-18
H-21
H-29
H-23
H-22
H-28
H-20

Fig.4



Fig. 5


Displacement (cm)
15 – 30
7 – 15
4 – 7
2 – 4
1 – 2
0 – 1
21.80
21.00
20.20
19.40
−78.00
−77.20
−76.40
−75.60
−74.80

Fig.6a


Displacement (cm)
30 — 60
15 — 30
7 — 15
4 — 7
2 — 4
1 — 2
21.80
21.00
20.20
19.40
−78.00
−77.20
−76.40
−75.60
−74.80

Fig.6b


Velocity (cm/s)
30 – 60
15 – 30
8 – 15
3 – 8
1 – 3
0 – 1
−78.00
−77.20
−76.40
−75.60
−74.80
21.80
21.00
20.20
19.40

Fig.7a


Velocity (cm/s)
60 – 120
30 – 60
15 – 30
8 – 15
3 – 8
1 – 3
21.80
21.00
20.20
19.40
–78.00
–77.20
–76.40
–75.60
–74.80

Fig.7b


DGA (g)
0.15 – 0.30
0.07 – 0.15
0.04 – 0.07
0.02 – 0.04
0.00 – 0.02
21.80
21.00
20.20
19.40
−78.00
−77.20
−76.40
−75.60
−74.80

Fig.8a



DGA (g)
] 0.30 – 0.60]
] 0.15 – 0.30]
] 0.07 – 0.15]
] 0.04 – 0.07]
] 0.02 – 0.04]
21.80
21.00
20.20
19.40
-78.00
-77.20
-76.40
-75.60
-74.80

Fig.8b



Fig.9a



Fig.9b



Fig.10



Fig.11



Fig.12