

DOCKETED
USNRC

September 13, 2001 (5:48PM)

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
RULEMAKINGS AND
ADJUDICATIONS STAFF

September 7, 2001

Re: Duke Cogema Stone & Webster (Savannah River Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility), Docket No. 070-03098-ML; ASLBP No. 01-790-01-ML

To all Parties:

Enclosed are two documents:

- 1) GANE's Reply to DCS and NRC Staff's Oppositions to Motion to Dismiss Licensing Proceeding
- 2) Recurrence rates of large earthquakes in the South Carolina Coastal Plain based on paleoliquefaction data

The latter was attached as Exhibit 5 to GANE Contentions Opposing a License for Duke Cogema Stone & Webster to Construct a Plutonium Fuel Factory at Savannah River Site dated August 13, 2001. Enclosed is a clean photocopy to replace the faxed version provided at initial filing. The charts in particular are rendered significantly more clearly in the copy enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

Glenn Carroll
Coordinator

Enclosures (2)

1512

September 7, 2001

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

Before Administrative Judges:

Thomas S. Moore, Chairman

Charles N. Kelber

Peter S. Lam

In the Matter of)
)
)

DUKE COGEMA STONE & WEBSTER)

(Savannah River Mixed Oxide Fuel)
Fabrication Facility))
_____)

Docket No. 0-70-03098-ML

ASLBP No. 01-790-01-ML

**GEORGIANS AGAINST NUCLEAR ENERGY'S
REPLY TO DCS AND NRC STAFF'S OPPOSITIONS TO
MOTION TO DISMISS LICENSING PROCEEDING**

Georgians Against Nuclear Energy ("GANE") hereby replies to the oppositions filed by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission ("NRC" or "Commission") Staff and Duke Cogema Stone & Webster ("DCS") to GANE's Motion to Dismiss Licensing Proceeding, or in the Alternative, Hold it in Abeyance (August 13, 2001).¹ Their responses only serve to confirm that by docketing an incomplete license application and by proposing to issue an Environmental Impact Statement ("EIS") without first evaluating whether the proposed MOX fabrication facility will operate in compliance with NRC regulations for

¹ NRC Staff Answer to Georgians Against Nuclear Energy's Motion to Dismiss Licensing Proceeding or, in the Alternative, Hold In Abeyance (August 28, 2001) ("NRC Response"); Duke Cogema Stone & Webster's Answer to Georgians Against Nuclear Energy's Motion to Dismiss Licensing Proceeding or, in the Alternative, Hold In Abeyance (August 21, 2001) ("DCS Response").

protection of public health and the environment, the Staff has strayed far outside the bounds of its own regulations and the National Environmental Policy Act ("NEPA").

I. THE COMMISSION HAS NOT EXPLICITLY RULED ON THE LEGALITY OF DCS'S INCOMPLETE LICENSE APPLICATION.

The NRC Staff argues that the Licensing Board lacks jurisdiction to address the legality of DCS's partial license application, because it would require review of determinations made by the NRC Commissioners in the Notice of Opportunity for Hearing and subsequent referral orders. Staff Response at 2. DCS also claims that the Commission has "clearly acknowledged the acceptability of" DCS's partial filing. DCS Response at 7.

The situation is not as clear-cut as presented by the Staff and DCS. Although the Commission issued a notice of hearing on DCS's construction authorization application, and subsequently set a schedule for the hearing in CLI-01-13, in neither document did the Commission explicitly address the issues of the completeness of DCS's license application or the legality of the NRC Staff's schedule for its environmental review. Given the lack of precedents on plutonium processing licenses, it is not reasonable to suppose that the Commission was even aware of these issues when it approved the Staff's proposal to publish the Notice of Opportunity for Hearing.

Moreover, the Notice of Opportunity for Hearing, which governs the scope of the Licensing Board's authority, *see* Staff Response at 4, *citing Commonwealth Edison Co.* (Zion Station, Units 1 and 2), ALAB-616, 12 NRC 419, 426 (1980), cannot fairly be read to bar the Licensing Board from considering the completeness of the license application. At two places in the Notice of Hearing, the NRC states that the subject of the hearing is

“the DCS application” for authority to construct a MOX fuel fabrication facility.² The Part 70 regulations provide for only one type of “application” related to a plutonium processing factory: an application for a license to possess and use special nuclear materials. *See* 10 C.F.R. § 70.21(a)(1). The required contents for this single application are set forth in § 70.22, which comprehensively requires that the application must include design information required by § 70.22(f) as well as “the other information” required by § 70.22(a)-(e) and (g)-(n). If the subject of the hearing is “the DCS application,” then it reasonably falls within the Licensing Board’s purview to determine whether the contents of that application are in accordance with NRC regulations in 10 C.F.R. § 70.22, or whether the contents are so incomplete that the proceeding should not go forward now.

In any event, it is the Licensing Board’s prerogative in the first instance to rule on the scope of its jurisdiction. *Kansas Gas & Electric Co.* (Wolf Creek Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1), ALAB-321, 3 NRC 293, 298 (1976), *aff’d*, CLI-77-1, 5 NRC 1 (1977). If the Licensing Board concludes that it lacks authority to rule on GANE’s Motion, the appropriate remedy is not to deny the motion as argued by the Staff and DCS, but to refer it to the NRC Commissioners. *See* Staff Response at 2, DCS Response at 3.

II. DCS’ FILING OF AN INCOMPLETE LICENSE APPLICATION VIOLATES NRC’S PART 70 REQUIREMENTS.

In its Motion to Dismiss, GANE demonstrated that DCS’s construction authorization application should not have been docketed, and is not ready to go forward

² *See* 66 Fed. Reg. 19,994 (April 18, 2001) (“The NRC has accepted the construction authorization request for docketing, and, accordingly, is providing this notice of opportunity for hearing *on the DCS application*”); 66 Fed. Reg. at 19,995 (“The NRC has now accepted the CAR for docketing, and, accordingly, is providing this notice of opportunity for hearing *on the DCS application* for authority to construct a MOX fuel fabrication facility.”) (emphasis added)

to a hearing, because it does not constitute the full license application for construction and operation that is required by 10 C.F.R. § 70.22. The Staff and DCS respond initially by mischaracterizing GANE's argument as a claim that the regulations do not sanction the approval of construction separately from the approval of operation. Staff Response at 4-6, DCS Response at 3-7. GANE does not contend that the NRC is barred from approving construction before it approves operation. Obviously, the regulations contemplate that the Commission will approve construction before it approves operation, and that operation will not be licensed until the adequacy of construction has been approved. The separation of the construction and operation approval functions within the licensing review process, however, does not mean that DCS is entitled to seek NRC approval of construction before it has submitted a complete application for construction and operation.

The Staff tries to avoid conceding that DCS's license application is incomplete, by arguing that the CAR does not constitute a license application or any part of one. Staff Response at 6 (DCS "is not currently seeking an SNM [special nuclear materials] license.") But the Staff does not point to any NRC regulation that allows DCS to seek anything other than a license to possess and use special nuclear material, or to submit anything other than a complete license application that covers both construction and operation. The Staff's *ad hoc* creation of a new category of application called a "construction authorization request" violates the cardinal principal of administrative law that an agency is bound by its own regulations. See *Union of Concerned Scientists v. NRC*, 711 F.2d 370, 381 (D.C. Cir. 1983) and cases cited therein.

Notably, while the Staff concedes at page 4 that DCS must submit a completed license application at least nine months before commencement of construction, the Staff fails to explain how or when DCS will satisfy the requirement. The Staff's proposed schedule anticipates that DCS will submit the so-called "license application" (*i.e.*, the application for authorization to operate the facility) July 31, 2002. *See* MOX Review Schedule, Exhibit 3 to GANE's Motion to Dismiss. This is only three months before the Staff issues its decision on the CAR, which presumably would open the way for construction to begin. Thus, the Staff's interpretation of the regulations yields an unlawful result and contradicts the Staff's own assertion in its Response.

DCS argues that GANE's interpretation of the governing regulations is "overly formalistic and illogical," and "would establish a procedural requirement that would serve no useful purpose." DCS Response at 5. To the contrary, it is far from illogical for the NRC to require the submission of a complete license application for construction and operation at the outset of a licensing review for a plutonium processing facility. As discussed in GANE's Motion to Dismiss, the Commission's decision to establish design and construction-related requirements for plutonium processing plants was based on its concern for the unusual level of danger posed by such facilities. *See* Motion to Dismiss at 16-17. These requirements were *added* to the body of operation-related information already required for a license application. Moreover, in order to ensure the availability of sufficient time to complete the safety review of the entire license application before commencement of construction, the Commission required that the completed license application must be submitted at least six months before construction; and later expanded that period to nine months in order to ensure the provision of adequate time for an

environmental review as well. *See* Motion to Dismiss at 17. For the Staff to now declare that these regulations permit the Staff to accept a partial license application and conduct a truncated safety and environmental review, in order to expedite the issuance of permission to construct the facility, undermines and contradicts the Commission's original intent to establish an especially rigorous licensing review process for plutonium processing plants.

Moreover, as demonstrated in GANE's Motion to Dismiss at pages 18-19, as a practical matter it is difficult to perform an adequate review of the adequacy of the proposed MOX facility's design, without detailed information on the operation that the design is expected to support. Neither DCS nor the Staff even acknowledges GANE's assertions regarding this difficulty, let alone responds to it.³

In any event, it is not necessary for GANE to defend the reasonableness of duly promulgated regulations. If DCS does not wish to comply with the regulations by filing an incomplete license application, it must seek an exemption under 10 C.F.R. § 1239(b).

III. THE STAFF'S PROPOSED REVIEW PROCESS VIOLATES NEPA.

Neither the Staff nor DCS disputes the proposition that the NRC must comply with NEPA to the "fullest extent possible" by taking a "hard look" at potential

³ In a footnote, DCS argues that GANE's interpretation of the regulations would "produce nonsensical consequences," because the information required by 10 C.F.R. § 70.22(f) is duplicative of the other information required in § 70.22, albeit more general and less detailed. DCS Response at 6. This incorrect argument shows a fundamental misunderstanding of the regulations. Plutonium processing plants are the only special nuclear materials facilities for which the NRC requires approval of design and construction in addition to approval of operation. The information needed to approve design and construction is required in § 70.22. Such design and construction information is not required by any of the other subsections of § 70.22, which relate only to approval of possession and use. There is no redundancy between subsection (f) and the other subsections of § 70.22.

environmental impacts of a proposed nuclear facility. See GANE Motion to Dismiss at 20, citing *Natural Resources Defense Council v. Morton*, 458 F.2d 827, 838 (D.C. Cir. 1972). The Staff does not explain, nor could it, how the NRC could be deemed to have taken the requisite “hard look” by issuing an EIS that fails to address the project’s compliance with NRC regulations for protection of public health and safety and the environment during operation of the facility.

The Staff attempts to defend itself by arguing that completion of the safety review is not required by NRC’s Part 51 regulations. Staff Response at 7. According to the Staff, “the requirements on the timing and scope of an EIS are independent from the Commission’s obligations under the AEA.” *Id.* In support of this argument, the Staff cites a portion of 10 C.F.R. § 51.71(d), which provides that “[w]hile satisfaction of Commission standards and criteria pertaining to radiological effects will be necessary to meet the licensing requirements of the Atomic Energy Act, the analysis will, for the purposes of NEPA, consider the radiological effects of the proposed action and alternatives.” This provision, however, merely clarifies that an EIS must go beyond merely stating that a proposed nuclear facility meets NRC regulations for control of radiological exposures, and must also address the actual radiological impacts.

Moreover, the Staff ignores other language in § 51.71(d) which is more to the point:

Due consideration will be given to compliance with environmental quality standards and requirements that have been imposed by Federal, State, regional, and local agencies having responsibility for environmental protection, including applicable zoning and land-use regulations and water pollution limitations or requirements promulgated or imposed pursuant to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

It is absurd to suggest, along the lines of the Staff's reasoning, that an EIS for a plutonium processing factory would have to address compliance with local zoning ordinances, yet would not be required to address whether the project complied with NRC regulations for the protection of the environment from radiological pollution.

The Staff also ignores 10 C.F.R. § 70.21(f), which requires that an application for a license to possess and use special nuclear material for processing and fuel fabrication must be filed at least *nine months* prior to commencement of construction of the plant or facility in which the activity will be conducted. As stated in the preamble to that rule, the nine-month lead time is required "[I]n order to assure that an opportunity is provided for full consideration of environmental effects before site preparation is begun." Final Rule, Prohibition of Site Preparation and Related Activities, 37 Fed. Reg. 5,745 (March 21, 1972). Thus, NRC regulations do in fact contemplate that a completed license application will be filed in plenty of time to evaluate the project's compliance with NRC safety requirements before the EIS is issued and construction is allowed to commence.⁴

IV. COMMENCEMENT OF THE HEARING SHOULD AWAIT THE COMPLETION OF THE HEARING FILE AND ISSUANCE OF THE MOU BETWEEN NRC AND DOE.

The Staff argues that if and when an order is issued granting a hearing and directing the compilation of a hearing file, the hearing file need only include those documents that are "available at the time." Staff Response at 8; *see also* DCS Response

⁴ Both the Staff and DCS point to the NRC's Part 52 early site permitting process as an example of a situation in which the Commission has approved issuance of an EIS for a nuclear facility, before the safety review pertaining to operation has been completed. Staff Response at 7, DCS Response at 8. However, the Part 52 provisions for "banking" of nuclear power plant sites that may never be used is a far cry from a proposal to construct and operate an actual nuclear facility.


at 10. Once again, the Staff disregards its governing regulations, which explicitly require the hearing file to include "the application," not a convenient portion of the application. They also require the hearing file to include "any NRC environmental impact statement or assessment relating to the application." There is no prospect that a completed license application or an SER on the completed license application will be issued before the year 2004. Moreover, issuance of the EIS should be postponed until the Staff's safety review is completed. Given the extended time that must elapse before a hearing file can be completed in compliance with the law, it makes no sense to go forward with the proceeding now.

The NRC Staff and DCS also argue that commencement of the hearing need not await the issuance of a Memorandum of Understanding between NRC and DOE. NRC Response at 8, DCS Response at 12. The Staff concedes that NRC and DOE have overlapping jurisdiction on some issues, but fails to state what they are. Instead, the NRC criticizes GANE for failing to "present any regulatory requirements in Part 70 or elsewhere that would require that such an MOU be completed as a prerequisite to going forward with actions for which the NRC is responsible." Staff Response at 8. Indeed, given the novel and complex situation this NRC / DOE collaboration presents, GANE can hardly be expected to analyze what has eluded definition by both responsible agencies thus far. Since the NRC has refused to disclose virtually any information about the contents of the MOU, of course GANE is unable to specify the precise ways in which it could affect the applicability of NRC regulations. Under the circumstances, the examples of categories of issues gleaned by GANE through limited correspondence from the Staff, *see* Motion to Dismiss at 24, should suffice.

V. CONCLUSION

The history of the NRC's regulations for the construction and operation of plutonium processing plants shows that the Commission intended to strengthen safety requirements for these particularly dangerous facilities by adding design and construction criteria to existing criteria for safe operation. The Commission also intended to ensure that the environmental review would cover all issues of regulatory compliance by requiring submission of a completed license application at least nine months before construction commences. Rather than comply with the letter or the spirit of these requirements, the Staff has applied them in an arbitrary, selective and piecemeal way for the purpose of relaxing, truncating and expediting the licensing process for the proposed MOX plant. The Staff's interpretation of the regulations has no basis in law or logic, and must be rejected. To hold otherwise would not only violate the law, but also severely prejudice GANE's right to a meaningful hearing on this license application.

Respectfully submitted,



Glenn Carroll⁵
for Georgians Against Nuclear Energy
139 Kings Highway
Decatur, GA 30030
404-378-4263

Dated September 7, 2001
in Decatur, Georgia

⁵ This Reply was prepared with substantial assistance from GANE's legal adviser, Diane Curran.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
by Georgians Against Nuclear Energy
(Docket # 70-3098, ASLBP # 01-790-01-ML)

I hereby certify that copies of GANE's Reply to DCS and NRC Staff's Opposition to Motion to Dismiss Licensing Proceeding were sent to the following list via e-mail with paper copies served via U.S. Postal Service First Class Mail.

Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff
Secretary
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555
hearingdocket@nrc.gov

Administrative Judge Thomas S. Moore
Chairman
Atomic Safety & Licensing Board
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555
tsm2@nrc.gov

Administrative Judge Charles N. Kelber
Atomic Safety & Licensing Board
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555
cnk@nrc.gov

Administrative Judge Peter S. Lam
Atomic Safety & Licensing Board
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555
psl@nrc.gov

John T. Hull, Esq.
Office of the General Counsel
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555
jth@nrc.gov


Donald J. Silverman, Esq.
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius
1800 M Street N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
dsilverman@morganlewis.com
apolonsky@morganlewis.com

Ruth Thomas, President
Environmentalists, Inc.
1339 Sinkler Road
Columbia, SC 29206

Donald J. Moniak
Blue Ridge Environmental Defense
League
P.O. Box 3487
Aiken, SC 29802
donmoniak@earthlink.net

Edna Foster
120 Balsam Lane
Highlands, NC 28741
emfoster@gte.net

Respectfully submitted,



Glenn Carroll
for Georgians Against Nuclear Energy
September 7, 2001 in Decatur, Georgia

Recurrence rates of large earthquakes in the South Carolina Coastal Plain based on paleoliquefaction data

Pradeep Talwani

Department of Geological Sciences, University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina

William T. Schaeffer

West Columbia, South Carolina

Abstract. We present a reanalysis of results of 15 years of paleoliquefaction investigations in the South Carolina Coastal Plain. All earlier radiocarbon age data and locations of organic material collected by various investigators were reviewed and recalibrated to obtain a uniform data set. The calibrated dates and the spatial extent of the sandblows having similar dates were used to estimate ages and magnitudes of prehistoric earthquake episodes. The results of this analysis suggest seven episodes (episodes A-G) of prehistoric liquefaction in the past 6000 years and two possible scenarios for their occurrence. In the first scenario, three seismic sources exist within the Coastal Plain of South Carolina; at Charleston (A, B, E, and G) with magnitudes $M 7+$, Georgetown (C and F), and Bluffton (D) with magnitudes $M \sim 6$. In the second scenario, episodes C and D are combined into one episode, episode C'. In this scenario all earthquakes occurred at Charleston and with $M 7+$. Episodes A and B seem to be more representative of the earthquake cycle and suggest a recurrence time of 500-600 years for $M 7+$ earthquakes at Charleston. The recurrence times and magnitudes for episodes C and D are estimated at ≥ 2000 years and ~ 6.0 , respectively. The older episodes are less frequent, a fact that may be attributable to times of low ground water table. Before ~ 6000 years B.P., the ground water table was too low to permit observable liquefaction features to develop at the surface.

1. Introduction

Historical records, including over 2000 accounts, of felt earthquakes in South Carolina go back as far as 1698 [Bollinger and Visvânathan, 1977; Visvânathan, 1980]. To extend the historical record further back in time, paleoseismological investigations, started more than a decade ago, identified and dated paleoliquefaction features preserved in the shallow Coastal Plain sediments (Figure 1). Sand expulsion features known as sandblows, which result from seismically induced liquefaction, are preserved in the shallow sediments of the South Carolina Coastal Plain (SCCP) and provide information that can be used to construct the prehistoric earthquake record. Since the discovery of the first prehistoric sandblow in South Carolina [Cox and Talwani, 1983], there have been concerted efforts to document the extent of these sandblows in South Carolina (section 2). The information from these investigations helps to assess the potential seismic hazard in South Carolina. In this study we present an analysis of the spatial and temporal extent of these liquefaction data, in order to obtain the recurrence times and estimate magnitudes of prehistoric earthquakes that formed the sandblows.

2. Early Studies

The first systematic search of a paleoliquefaction feature in South Carolina was conducted by Cox [1984] and led to the

discovery of a sandblow at Warrens Crossroads located ~ 40 km west of Charleston, South Carolina, which was caused by the 1886 earthquake (Figure 1). Detailed mapping and soil sampling showed the source sand to be a clean, white, mica-rich sand layer approximately 2.7 m thick and located ~ 2.3 m below the surface [Cox and Talwani, 1983]. Shallow trenching at this site showed that the sandblow formed by the upward movement of sand toward the surface along a feeder dike that widened from 20 cm at the base of the trench to approximately 0.6 m at the ground surface. Clasts of surface soil had slumped into the sandblow shortly after it developed. Even though this study did not uncover any pre-1886 features, it suggested that sandblows and other structures can be preserved in the soils of the SCCP and that areas which experienced liquefaction during the 1886 earthquake might contain sandblows that developed in prehistoric earthquakes of magnitude similar to that of the 1886 earthquake [Cox, 1984].

This discovery was followed by intensive studies by the U.S. Geological Survey in the mid-1980s, by Ebasco Services in the early 1990s, and by the University of South Carolina sporadically since 1983. These studies were primarily aimed at discovering the spatial extent of paleoliquefaction features and developing criteria for their identification. S. F. Obermeier and R. E. Weems of the U.S. Geological Survey and their coworkers were the first to discover sandblows that predated 1886. Following their initial discovery of a prehistoric sandblow at Hollywood, they discovered several additional sandblows in other parts of the SCCP [Obermeier et al., 1987]. D. C. Amick, R. Gelinis, and their coworkers from Ebasco Services discovered other sandblows in the SCCP and extended the search for

Copyright 2001 by the American Geophysical Union.

Paper number 2000JB900398.
0148-0227/01/2000JB900398\$09.00




Figure 1. Dashed line encloses area of pronounced craterlet activity associated with the 1886 earthquake [from Dutton, 1889]. Reports (R) of liquefaction features extend to Columbia and Georgetown [Seeber and Armbruster, 1981] and to Sand Hills near Liberty Hill [Floyd, 1969]. Liquefaction features associated with the 1886 earthquake were discovered at Warren's Crossroads (W) and at Bluffton (BLUF-A). Triangles show the location of paleoliquefaction sites in the North Carolina and South Carolina Coastal Plain from which datable material associated with prehistoric earthquakes was obtained. Abbreviations are as follows: Bluffton, BLUF; Colony Gardens, COLGAR; Conway, CON; Four Hole Swamp, FHS; Gapway, GW; Georgetown, GEO; Hollywood, HOL; Malpherous, MAL; Martin Marietta, MM; Myrtle Beach, MYR; Sampit, SAM; South Port, North Carolina, SPT; and Ten Mile Hill, TMH. Holocene ground water table data obtained from Murrell's Inlet (MI), Santee River Delta (SR), and Wilmington Island, Georgia (WI), are described in the text.

paleoliquefaction to other locations along the Atlantic seashore [Amick, 1990; Amick *et al.*, 1990]. C. P. and K. Rajendran of the University of South Carolina discovered new sandblows near Bluffton and the Four Hole Swamp [Rajendran and Talwani, 1993; Talwani *et al.*, 1993], while Schaeffer [1996] discovered four at Gapway.

To use the liquefaction features for seismic hazard assessment, they must be dated. Abundant vegetation in the SCCP commonly makes it possible to collect organic material for radiocarbon dating. Most of the early dates came from a drainage ditch near Hollywood, South Carolina [Talwani and Cox [1985], Weems *et al.* [1986]; Table 1]. Subsequently, Weems *et al.* [1988] and Weems and Obermeier [1990] obtained dates from sandblows covering an areal extent of ~25,000 km² in the SCCP. These data provided loose constraints on the ages and number of prehistoric earthquakes. To tighten the age constraints, Amick *et al.* [1990] obtained multiple dates at new sites discovered by them and of features originally discovered by Obermeier *et al.* [1990]. Additional dates at four locations in the Bluffton area were obtained by Talwani *et al.* [1993]. More recently, additional data were obtained in the Georgetown and Charleston areas, including the newly discovered sites at Gapway and Four Hole Swamp [Schaeffer, 1996] (Figure 1).

At each location one or more sandblows were encountered and as many as six datable samples were recovered from a single sandblow. In Tables 1 and 2, various locations of sandblows are referred to as "sites" (treating the four Bluffton

locations as one site), and the sandblows are referred to as "features." The original names of sandblows assigned by the author(s) have been preserved. A total of 121 radiocarbon ages including 35 accelerator mass spectrometer (AMS) ages (Table 1) were obtained from 54 sandblows at 14 sites (Figure 1).

3. Methodology

The radiocarbon age of a sample can provide a minimum, contemporary, or maximum age estimate of the earthquake that caused the liquefaction, depending on the stratigraphic position of the sample and its cross-cutting relationship with elements of the sandblow. Radiocarbon dates reported by earlier workers had not been calibrated to account for fluctuations in atmospheric ¹⁴C over time. In order to merge all of the age data collected by various workers the stratigraphic positions of the samples within the sandblows were reexamined, and conventional radiocarbon ages were recalibrated.

3.1. Dating Paleoliquefaction Features

Two methods discussed by Amick *et al.* [1990] were used to determine the age of the sandblows. The first method determines the relative age of the sandblow using weathering criteria, and the second determines its absolute age by radiometric dating of organic-rich samples. The relative age of a sandblow can usually be determined by examining the location of the sandblow and the thickness of the overlying soil profile, the

Table 1. Sources of Radiocarbon Dates^a

Site	Number of Features	Data Source ^b						Total
		1	2	3	4	5	6	
SPT	1			1				1
CON	1			1				1
MYR	3			1	2			3
MM	1				2			2
GEO	3			1	6			7
GW	2						7	7
OLIN	2			1	5			6
SAM	9				11		10	21
FHS	1						1	1
TMH	6			1	10		2	13
HOL	8	7	11	2				20
COLGAR	1				2			2
MAL	1				6			6
BLUF	15			1	7	23		31

^aThe numbers of radiocarbon dates are shown under each data source. The sites are shown in Figure 1: Southport, North Carolina (SPT), Conway (CON), Myrtle Beach (MYR), Martin Marietta (MM), Georgetown (GEO), Gapway (GW), Olin, Sampit (SAM), Four Hole Swamp (FHS), Ten Mile Hill (TMH), Hollywood (HOL), Colony Gardens (COLGAR), Malpherous (MAL), and Bluffton (BLUF).

^bReferences: 1, Talwani and Cox [1985]; 2, Weems et al. [1986]; 3, Weems and Obermeier [1990]; 4, Amick et al. [1990]; 5, Talwani et al. [1993]; 6, Talwani et al. [1999].

degree of staining, and the amount of weathering of the materials within the sandblow. In general, older sandblows have thicker overlying soil profiles, and the sediments in them are usually more heavily stained compared to the younger sandblows. Cross-cutting relationships can also be used to establish the relative age of one feature with respect to another.

The absolute age of a sandblow is obtained by ¹⁴C dating of organic material recovered from within it. The absence of organics in borehole samples of sediments from below and near the sandblows (Cox [1984] and other unpublished data) allows us to conclude that all organics found in the sandblow came from above and were not a part of the ejected sand from below. Figure 2, modified from Amick [1990], illustrates how the stratigraphic position of samples in and around the sandblow can be used to infer its age and establish the minimum age and maximum age constraints. In Table 2 the sample location is described with respect to the stratigraphic setting in the sandblow. (For an excellent discussion of the morphology of a sandblow, see Obermeier et al. [1990].) "Contemporary" is used to describe the date of formation of the sandblow. The dates of pieces of leaves, bark, and wood that have been washed or blown into the sandblow shortly after its formation (item 1 in Figure 2) are interpreted as the best contemporary age estimates. For every sandblow, using the criteria described in Figure 2, we decided if the dates of organic samples were indicative of maximum, minimum, or contemporary age estimates of the ages of the earthquakes. These data gave broad ranges for the date of the earthquake. Then the contemporary ages were used in the calculations of dates of earthquake episodes (section 5).

3.2. Calibration of Radiocarbon Ages

In this study the ¹⁴C dates determined from samples recovered during this study and previous studies were calibrated to obtain their calendar ages. The necessity for the calibration arises because the conventional ¹⁴C date is determined assuming that the amount of atmospheric ¹⁴C has remained constant

over time. However, studies of tree ring samples have shown that the atmospheric ¹⁴C has fluctuated over timescales of hundreds to thousands of years [Geyh and Schleicher, 1990]. In the calibration process the radiocarbon date is compared with the calibrated timescale curve. This was accomplished using the computer program CALIB v3.0.3c developed by Stuiver and Reimer [1993]. In the calibration program, intercept values of $\pm 1\sigma$ and $\pm 2\sigma$ are obtained for each calibrated age. When determining the interpreted age for the calibrated ¹⁴C age dates, the 1σ range was used. In paleoseismological literature both 2σ ages [e.g., Tuttle and Schweig, 1996] and 1σ ages [e.g., Bell et al., 1999] have been used to estimate the ages of prehistoric earthquakes. The 2σ ages have wider ranges, and those for two distinct events hundreds of years apart may overlap. Since the main objective of our analyses was to identify different prehistoric earthquakes and establish their ages, we chose a shorter range for correlation and used 1σ ages. The 1σ ranges provide a more rigorous test for correlation and are less likely to lead to spurious correlations.

4. Results

We examined the descriptions and figures and other relevant data for all the sandblows from which samples of organic material had been collected. Using the criteria given in section 3.1, each date was interpreted to be associated with the minimum, maximum, or contemporary age estimate of the causative earthquake. Each radiocarbon age date was calibrated (section 3.2). All the age relationships (Table 2) are the same as given by the original authors, except for those used by Rajendran and Talwani [1993] for Bluffton. Their field notes and figures were reanalyzed, and the revised age relationships are used in this study.

We discuss the data for the sites from northeast to southwest (Figure 1 and Table 2). Data from Sampit (Figure 3) are used to illustrate our approach. We discuss the age of the sandblow associated with each earthquake from the relative dates of the sample(s). For example, at some locations several samples were recovered from one sandblow, thus providing tighter age constraints (e.g., SAM-2A, SAM-2B, SAM-2C, and SAM-2D are four samples with contemporary ages from the sandblow Sampit Middle Right (SPMR) at the Sampit site).

4.1. Northern Sites

4.1.1. Southport, North Carolina, and Conway, South Carolina. These two are the northernmost sites (Figure 1) where datable material was recovered [Weems et al., 1988; Weems and Obermeier, 1990]. Pieces of charcoal embedded deeply in intensely deformed soil profiles at Southport, North Carolina, and Conway yielded maximum ages of 9743 \pm 167/-208 years B.P. and 6530 \pm 204/-172 years B.P., respectively (Table 2).

4.1.2. Myrtle Beach. The Myrtle Beach site, ~10 km north of Myrtle Beach, South Carolina (MYR in Figure 1), is the northernmost site having a contemporary date of a sandblow in the SCCP. This site was investigated by Amick et al. [1990] and Weems and Obermeier [1990]. They identified three different sandblows at this site, and depending on the degree of staining and the thickness of the overlying soil profile, they were interpreted as not being associated with the 1886 Charleston earthquake. This interpretation is supported by ¹⁴C age dates (Table 2). The calibrated dates suggest that at least two episodes of liquefaction occurred at this site. A stem recovered




Figure 2. Schematic cross section of a sandblow crater that has intruded the soil profile and location of organic material used for radiocarbon dating. Bh is an organic-rich soil horizon. Clasts of Bh soil fall and are trapped with extruded clean sand within the crater. These are overlain by a bedded sequence of backfilled sand and organic material (item 5). The age of liquefaction episodes can be estimated by radiometric dating of organic materials that can be stratigraphically related to the liquefaction features. The most accurate age estimates are from radiometric dating of organic debris such as leaves, pine needles, bark, or small branches that were washed or blown into the liquefaction crater shortly after its formation (item 1). These are labeled "contemporary" ages. The ^{14}C ages of roots that have grown into the sandblow (item 2a) or the overlying soil profile (items 2b and 2c) provide minimum ages for the liquefaction episode. Minimum ages are also derived from forest-fire-derived charcoal from the shallow soil profile (item 6) overlying the feature. To be useful, this "new burn" charcoal must clearly be within the overlying soils that postdate feature formation. Maximum ages can be obtained from roots cut by the feature (item 3a), humate organic-rich soil (Bh) clasts that are isolated from contamination because of their depth in the feature (item 3b), or by organic material from soil clasts that predate liquefaction and collapsed into the deeper part of the crater during liquefaction (item 3c). Maximum age constraints can also be obtained by dating forest-fire-derived charcoal which was washed or blown into the crater after its formation (item 4). While wood from within the feature, especially the bedded sequence, can provide an accurate age constraint for the feature, charcoal is biologically inert, and before being washed into the bedded sequence, it can reside at or near the ground surface for hundreds or even thousands of years following a forest fire. Consequently, this type of sample only provides a maximum age constraint on the time of liquefaction. Modified from Amick [1990].

from the washed-in sand in the crater of feature 3 suggests that the earthquake causing liquefaction occurred $\sim 1568 + 310/-246$ years B.P. (MYR-3, Table 2). Features 1 and 3 lie adjacent to each other with the same A horizon profile. The maximum age of an earthquake inferred from a humate clast in feature 1 overlaps the inferred contemporary age of MYR-3 and could possibly be associated with that episode, and not be representative of a younger one. A piece of "new burn" charcoal recovered from the overlying soil profile in feature 2 (MYR-2) suggests a liquefaction episode older than $5297 + 353/-469$ years B.P., and this is certainly different from the $1568 + 310/-246$ years B.P. liquefaction episode.

4.1.3. Martin Marietta. The Martin Marietta site (MM in Figure 1) is approximately 5 km south of the Myrtle Beach site. Here Amick *et al.* [1990] discovered three sandblows, but only one yielded organic material suitable for ^{14}C dating. One sample was a piece of tree bark from the lower portion of the central vent, which yielded a contemporary age for the liquefaction event. A sample of a humate-rich soil clast from the upper part of the sandblow, above the small clast zone, yielded a maximum age for the earthquake causing the liquefaction.

The calibrated dates indicate that at least one liquefaction episode occurred $\sim 1809 + 177/-257$ years B.P. (MM-1A, Table 2). Field observations suggest that the tree bark associated with the contemporary age and the overlapping organic-rich soil clast are associated with the same episode.

4.1.4. Georgetown. The Georgetown site (GEO in Figure 1) is located approximately 35 km southwest of the Martin Marietta site and ~ 15 km north of the city of Georgetown. Amick *et al.* [1990] identified four sandblows at this site, all having similar staining and overlying soil profiles, which indicates that they developed about the same time. Features A, B, and C yielded four, two, and one organic samples, respectively, suitable for ^{14}C dating (Table 2). A root sample (GEO-2A) which had grown into feature B yielded a modern ^{14}C age, and it was interpreted as new growth and not used for age determination.

Interpreted calibrated ^{14}C age dates indicate two or possibly three episodes of liquefaction at this site. One episode occurred $\sim 945 + 223/-209$ years B.P., on the basis of the contemporary date of a piece of wood recovered from within feature A (GEO-1D, Table 2). Field relations of the samples suggest that the overlapping minimum ages for GEO-1B and GEO-1C are associated with the same earthquake. Stratigraphic relationships indicate the occurrence of one or two other liquefaction episodes at this site. A minimum age constraint from sample GEO-2B indicates a liquefaction episode older than $2908 + 337/-161$ years B.P., and a maximum age constraint from sample GEO-3 indicates a liquefaction episode younger than $2739 + 25/-257$ years B.P. It is possible that GEO-3 represents the same episode indicated by GEO-1D.

4.1.5. Gapway. The Gapway site, discovered by Schaeffer [1996], is located ~ 60 km southwest of Myrtle Beach and approximately 20 km northwest of Georgetown (Figure 1). It contains four sandblows, two of which yielded datable samples (Figure 4). Four samples were recovered from Gapway A: A root that cuts the south boundary of the sandblow yielded a minimum ^{14}C age, (GW-1B, Table 2), and a second root that cuts the north boundary provided a minimum age (GW-1D). Two charcoal samples from the bedded sequence in the sandblow provided maximum ages (GW-1A and GW-1C). These ages indicate that this sandblow developed during a liquefaction episode that occurred between $1985 + 68/-88$ years B.P. (GW-1B) and $3623 + 67/-146$ years B.P. (GW-1C, Table 2).

Three samples from Gapway D indicate that one episode of liquefaction occurred at this site $\sim 4985 + 218/-113$ years B.P. A twig from the bedded sequence yielded a contemporary ^{14}C age date (GW-2C), and a root which cut the north boundary of the feature yielded a minimum ^{14}C age which is considered a poor minimum age constraint. Small pieces of detrital charcoal from the bedded sequence of this sandblow were individually too small for age dating, so the pieces were combined to form a bulk detrital charcoal sample that yielded a maximum age of $4321 + 88/-164$ years B.P. (GW-2B). Normally, a maximum age would be older than the corresponding contemporary age.




Figure 3. Plot of calibrated ages for Sampit site. Triangles, minimum ages; circles, contemporary ages; squares, maximum ages; short vertical lines, 1σ ranges. The features (Sampit North (SPN), Sampit Middle Right (SPMR), Sampit Middle Left (SPML), Sampit South (SPS), Big White Left (BWL), and Big White Right (BWR)) are separated by bold vertical lines, and multiple samples from a single feature are designated by the letters A, B, ... (see also Table 2). Data from SAM-3A provide a maximum age constraint for SPMR and a minimum age constraint for SPML.

In this case the maximum age sample GW-2B is younger than the corresponding contemporary age sample GW-2C. Since this sandblow shows no signs of a second episode of liquefaction, and since sample GW-2B is a bulk soil sample, it could possibly have been contaminated with young material.

4.1.6. Olin. The Olin site is located ~50 km southwest of the Myrtle Beach site and approximately 20 km northwest of the city of Georgetown (Figure 1). Amick *et al.* [1990] discussed two sandblows identified by them and by Weems and Obermeier [1990] (Table 2). The degree of staining and the thickness of the overlying soil profile suggest that the sandblows at this site predated the 1886 Charleston earthquake. Five samples from feature A were dated by Amick *et al.* [1990], and one from feature B was dated by Weems and Obermeier [1990]. Analysis of the calibrated ^{14}C ages indicates that one liquefaction episode occurred ~1533 +452/-360 years B.P. This age was obtained from a sample of tree bark from within the sandblow, which yielded a contemporary ^{14}C age (OLIN-1C). Two tap root samples that cut the right boundary of the feature yielded bracketing minimum ^{14}C ages (OLIN-1A and OLIN-1B). Two charcoal samples from feature A yielded bracketing maximum ^{14}C age dates (OLIN-1E and OLIN-1D). Sample OLIN-2 indicates only the occurrence of a liquefaction event younger than 1511 +58/-157 years B.P., which does not distinguish its age from the age of the earthquake associated with feature A.

4.1.7. Sampit. Amick *et al.* [1990] and Talwani *et al.* [1999] studied six sandblows at the Sampit site, which is located ~1 km south of Olin, and analyzed 21 samples of organic material (Figures 1, 3, and 4 and Table 2). In the northern portion of this site a bark sample from the large clast zone in Sampit North (SPN; Amick *et al.* [1990]), yielded a contemporary ^{14}C age (SAM-1). Restudy of this site by Talwani *et al.* [1999] did not discover any additional datable samples. We

interpret the contemporary calibrated age date to indicate that this sandblow was formed ~521 +102/-39 years B.P. (SAM-1).

Two sandblows in the middle part of the drainage ditch at Sampit were identified as Sampit Middle Right (SPMR) and Sampit Middle Left (SPML) by Amick *et al.* [1990]. Sampit Middle Right (SPMR) is located adjacent and to the south of SPML (Figure 4). They recovered four samples for ^{14}C dating: Two bark samples (SAM-2A and SAM-2B, Table 2) from the clast zone yielded contemporary ^{14}C age dates, and a bark sample (SAM-2C) from the bedded sequence in SPMR yielded a contemporary ^{14}C age date. Amick *et al.* [1990] identified a small crater-shaped sandblow within the main one, and on the basis of staining, they interpreted the smaller sandblow to have formed about the same time as the main feature. A bark sample (SAM-2D) from the smaller sandblow yielded a contemporary age.

The four contemporary ages define the approximate time that SPMR developed. The 1σ age range of SAM-2D does not overlap those of the other three samples, possibly because SAM-2D was recovered from a smaller feature that was located within the main sandblow and that probably predates it.

Sampit Middle Left (SPML) is adjacent to and north of SPMR (Figure 4). A sample of a root that had grown into the feature was analyzed by Amick *et al.* [1990] and yielded a minimum ^{14}C age date (SAM-3A). Amick *et al.* [1990] also found evidence of a younger, small sand dike that had intruded SPML and cut the root (SAM-3A). This indicates the root was in place prior to the sand dike intrusion. The degree of staining of the sand dike and SPMR are similar, which was interpreted as showing that both developed about the same time. Therefore this sample represents not only a minimum age for SPML but also a maximum age for SPMR. Talwani *et al.* [1999]




Figure 4. Schematic maps of the (top) Gapway and (bottom) Sampit sites showing locations of features in the drainage ditches.

recovered a sample of wood from the top of SPML, which is believed to have been deposited in the crater sometime after it formed. This sample provides a minimum ^{14}C age (SAM-3B). The clear cross-cutting relations that were observed between BWL (discussed later) and SPML were interpreted to show that SPML is older than SAM-5A. The young age of SAM-3B suggests that it was derived from spoil that fell onto the surface of the sandblow and therefore does not reflect an age constraint for it. The minimum age SPML indicates that it developed during a liquefaction episode older than 1165 ± 100 –105 years B.P. (SAM-3A). Since the upper portion of the south boundary of BWL (described below) cuts the upper portion of the north boundary of SPML, this cross-cutting relationship indicates that SPML existed prior to the formation of BWL.

Sampit South (SPS) is in the southern portion of the Sampit site (Figure 4). Amick *et al.* [1990] recovered four samples from it. Two charcoal samples (SAM-4C and SAM-4D) from the bedded sequence yielded maximum ages, a carbonized wood sample from the bedded sequence (SAM-4B) yielded a con-

temporary ^{14}C age date, and a root sample that had grown into SPS (SAM-4A) yielded a minimum age. Field observations of the location of this sample (SAM-4A) suggest that it is associated with the same episode. Analysis of the calibrated age dates indicate that SPS developed during a liquefaction episode that occurred around 1561 ± 302 –221 years B.P. (SAM-4B, Figure 3). This episode is bracketed by two maximum ages, SAM-4C and SAM-4D.

In a later study, Schaeffer [1996] discovered two more sandblows in the central portion of the Sampit site (Big White Left and Big White Right). Big White Left (BWL) is located north of and adjacent to SPML. Schaeffer [1996] recovered three samples for ^{14}C dating: A bark sample yielded a contemporary ^{14}C age (SAM-5A), a root (SAM-5B) recovered from BWL yielded a minimum ^{14}C age, and a third sample was a piece of wood from stump H2 (SAM-9), around which BWL developed. Since the stump predates development of this feature, the wood sample is a maximum age constraint for BWL (SAM-9).

Big White Right (BWR) is located ~3 m to the south of SPML and yielded three datable samples. A root that had grown into BWR yielded a minimum ^{14}C age (SAM-6A), a second root recovered from another part of this feature yielded a minimum ^{14}C age (SAM-6B), and charcoal recovered from within it yielded a maximum ^{14}C age date (SAM-6C). Upon inspection of the calibrated ages from BWR it was found that the minimum age sample, SAM-6B, has an older age than the maximum age sample, SAM-6C. The exact cause of this discrepancy is not known, but it is suspected that a labeling error occurred either at the testing laboratory or during the field preparation of these two samples. Since a reliable maximum age is not available, the analysis of the calibrated ages indicates that BWL is older than 925 ± 21 –131 years B.P. (SAM-6A, Table 2).

Summarizing, dates of the paleoliquefaction features and their cross-cutting relations at Sampit suggest at least three episodes of earthquake activity (Figure 3). SAM-1, collected from the northern part of the drainage ditch, is associated with an earthquake that occurred around 500 years B.P. The four samples from SPML (SAM-2A to SAM-2D) and one from BWL (SAM-5A) and bracketing ages at BWR (SAM-6A and SAM-6C) argue for an event that occurred ~1000 years B.P. The cross-cutting relationship of BWL with SPML suggests that SPML (SAM-3) is associated with an earthquake older than BWL (SAM-5) and SPML (SAM-2). The minimum age of SPML (SAM-3A) and the maximum age of BWL (SAM-9) could be associated with the earthquake that yielded a contemporary age at SPS (SAM-4B), 1561 ± 302 –221 years B.P.

4.2. An Inland Sandblow

The Four Hole Swamp (FHS) site is located approximately 23 km northwest of Summerville (Figure 1) near the intersection of highways 78 and 178. This site is situated on a Pleistocene age beach ridge composed of clean, fine-to-medium-grained sand. A sandblow at this site was discovered by C. P. Rajendran (unpublished data, 1993). A bark sample collected from within it (FHS-1, Table 2) yielded a contemporary age of 1659 ± 70 –107 years B.P., which was taken to be the age of the paleoliquefaction event [Talwani *et al.*, 1999]. Schaeffer [1996] found no new datable samples.

4.3. Central (Charleston) Sites

4.3.1. Ten Mile Hill. In the Charleston area many sandblows formed near Ten Mile Hill in 1886 (Figure 1), but because of extensive urbanization and thick vegetation, direct evidence of the sandblows is obscured. *Amick et al.* [1990] discovered four sandblows in a drainage ditch ~1.6 km north of the Charleston Air Force Base (CAFB). Another feature near CAFB was studied by *Weems and Obermeier* [1990]. During a recent study by *Talwani et al.* [1999], anomalous sand was encountered in a hole drilled for standard penetration tests ~0.8 km north of the CAFB. A shallow trench (~1.5 m deep) at this location provided two datable samples.

Four contemporary ages for features A and C of *Amick et al.* [1990] and Airport (ARP) of *Weems and Obermeier* [1990] (TMH-1A, TMH-1B, TMH-3, and TMH-5, Table 2) all suggest that an episode of liquefaction occurred between 3400 and 3700 years B.P. TMH-1D gave an anomalously younger contemporary age, whereas TMH-4A and TMH-4B bracket an older event between ~5400 and 6600 years B.P., and TMH-2A and TMH-2B provide minimum ages.

TMH-6A, collected from the shallow trench, consisted of pieces of wood sieved from clayey sand and is possibly contaminated. It gave a contemporary (?) age of $1299 \pm 47/-21$ years B.P. (TMH-6A). The second sample consisted of pieces of charcoal sieved from a few pounds of silty clay, yielded an age of $4038 \pm 46/-109$ years B.P. (TMH-6B), and is interpreted as a maximum age. It possibly represents the age of the enclosing clay layer.

4.3.2. Hollywood. Several sandblows in a drainage ditch just north of Hollywood (HOL in Figure 1) and located ~30 km to the west of Charleston provided samples at seven locations (*Talwani and Cox* [1985], *Weems et al.* [1986, 1988], and *Weems and Obermeier* [1990]; Table 2). Contemporary ages were obtained from HOL-6A with a strong minimum age constraint for an earthquake at ~600 years B.P. (HOL-6B). Four samples from site 2 (HOL-7A to HOL-7D) and one from Hollywood XIV (HOL-8) gave contemporary age dates for an earthquake between ~1000 and 1200 years B.P. The other sandblows provided broad minimum or maximum age constraints. For example, HOL-1A to HOL-1E support the occurrence of one or more earthquakes between ~1500 and 4000 years B.P. At another site the dates obtained for HOL-2A and HOL-2B suggest an earthquake that occurred before 3200 years B.P.

At the Hollywood XIII site the ages of samples HOL-3A and HOL-3B argue for an earthquake between ~4700 and 7900 years B.P.; elsewhere, the sample HOL-4 did not provide any age constraint. HOL-5A and HOL-5B provide weak constraints for an event (events) between 1700 and 4768 years B.P.

Thus the data from Hollywood suggest at least four prehistoric earthquakes. Well-constrained ages identify an earthquake between ~500 and 600 years B.P. (HOL-6A and HOL-6B) and another one between ~1000 and 1200 years B.P. (HOL-7A to HOL-7D and HOL-8). Weak constraints suggest an event between ~1500 and 4100 years B.P. (HOL-1A and HOL-1E) and between ~1700 and 4800 years B.P. (HOL-5B and HOL-5A). Finally, an earthquake with poorly constrained age may have occurred between ~4700 and 7900 years B.P. (HOL-3B and HOL-3A).

4.4. Southern Sites

Samples from six sites south of Charleston (Figure 1) provide ages of liquefaction episodes similar to those near

Charleston and the northern sites. From north to south they are Colony Gardens (COLGAR), Malpherous (MAL), and Bluffton A-D (Figure 1).

4.4.1. Colony Gardens. Colony Gardens (COLGAR in Figure 1) is the closest of the southern liquefaction sites to Charleston. *Amick et al.* [1990] identified several sandblows, the largest approximately 3 m in width, comparable to some of the larger features discovered at Ten Mile Hill. A piece of wood recovered from a unit of interbedded sand and organics gave a contemporary age of $958 \pm 100/-34$ years B.P. (Table 2). A second piece of wood recovered from a soil clast provided a tight maximum age constraint of $1263 \pm 31/-124$ years B.P. Thus the data from Colony Gardens support a prehistoric earthquake occurring around 1000 years B.P.

4.4.2. Malpherous. Six samples from one heavily stained sandblow provided age constraints, but no contemporary age data [*Amick et al.*, 1990] at Malpherous (MAL in Figure 1). The inferred age of one earthquake, between ~5300 and 6300 years B.P., is constrained by a large root that had grown into the sandblow and provided a minimum age constraint (MAL-1A) (Table 2) and a small charcoal sample from within a soil clast that had collapsed into the same feature, which provided a maximum age constraint (MAL-1B). Three splits of a humate clast gave redundant maximum ages (MAL-1D to MAL-1F). Younger roots from MAL-1C provided minimum age constraints that were not useful.

4.4.3. Bluffton. Four liquefaction sites near Bluffton were named BLUF-A to BLUF-D. BLUF-A and BLUF-B were originally discovered by *Obermeier et al.* [1987]. *Amick et al.* [1990] reinvestigated BLUF-A and BLUF-B and discovered BLUF-C. *Talwani et al.* [1993] reinvestigated BLUF-A to BLUF-C and discovered BLUF-D, ~6 km east of the earlier sites. Thus, for the various sites, samples analyzed by one or more investigators provide redundancy and better age constraints. The age relation used by *Rajendran and Talwani* [1993] were reanalyzed using the criteria in section 3.1, and the revised relationships are given in Table 2.

Amick et al. [1990] dated organic material in four sandblows at site BLUF-A (features A-1, A-2, A-3, and A-4) and, for the first three, obtained contemporary ages corresponding to the 1886 Charleston earthquake (Table 2). At the fourth location (feature A-4) they obtained a minimum calibrated age of $301 \pm 167/-301$ years B.P. (BLUF-4A) and a contemporary calibrated age of $598 \pm 741/-93$ years B.P. (BLUF-4B). These ages are close to the contemporary age of *Weems and Obermeier* [1990] for the same feature, $547 \pm 103/-36$ years B.P. (BLUF-4C). *Talwani et al.* [1993] discovered seven sandblows at BLUF-A, four of which provided no datable samples and one of which (identified in Table 2 as BLUF-4E) was the same as that studied earlier by *Weems and Obermeier* [1990] and *Amick et al.* [1990] (feature A-4). In feature A-4, *Talwani et al.* [1993] also found a new burn charcoal in the sands overlying the feature that yielded a minimum calibrated age of $376 \pm 132/-87$ years B.P. (BLUF-4D). A piece of charcoal within the sandblow yielded a maximum radiocarbon age of $656 \pm 471/-105$ years B.P. (BLUF-4E). These dates further constrain the ages obtained by *Amick et al.* [1990] (BLUF-4A and BLUF-4B) and *Weems and Obermeier* [1990] (BLUF-4C). Thus, at BLUF-A, feature A-4 yielded contemporary ages of 550–600 years B.P. (BLUF-4B and BLUF-4C), and these ages were bracketed by minimum ages of 301 years B.P. (BLUF-4A) and 376 years B.P. (BLUF-4D) and a maximum age of 656 years B.P. (BLUF-4E). Roots in clasts in another sandblow at

BLUF-A, feature A-6, provided a minimum age of $1213 \pm 85/-148$ years B.P. (BLUF-6A), and an aggregate of charcoals from two locations within the sandblow gave a maximum age of $1072 \pm 191/-103$ years B.P. (BLUF-6B). Because of the aggregation the age of BLUF-6B does not provide a tight constraint. The age of the sample from BLUF-6A suggests an earthquake older than ~ 1200 years B.P. At feature A-7 a "fresh" piece of charcoal within the sandblow yielded a probable contemporary age of $532 \pm 108/-36$ years B.P. (BLUF-7).

At BLUF-B, Talwani *et al.* [1993] investigated five sandblows; four yielded datable samples. Sandblow feature B-9 had been earlier investigated by Amick *et al.* [1990] and was identified as their site BD. In this study, that sandblow is identified as feature B-5 and provided four calibrated ages. The two studies provided two minimum ages (BLUF-5B and BLUF-5D) and two maximum ages (BLUF-5A and BLUF-5C), bracketing the age of the liquefaction episode between ~ 1780 and 2140 years B.P. One of the three organic samples at feature B-8 yielded a modern date. Of the other two, a piece of bark in the bedding sequence yielded a contemporary age of $527 \pm 22/-20$ years B.P. (BLUF-8B) whereas a new burn piece of charcoal (BLUF-8A) gave a minimum radiocarbon age of $121 \pm 190/-121$ years B.P. Charcoal in feature B-9 gave a maximum age of $1327 \pm 89/-49$ years B.P. At site B-10, charcoal in the soil profile cut by the sandblow (BLUF-10A) gave a maximum age of $1874 \pm 123/-157$ years B.P., whereas charcoal within it (BLUF-10B) gave a maximum age of $697 \pm 91/-42$ years B.P. Summarizing, at BLUF-B we have evidence of two or possibly three prehistoric earthquakes: an earthquake that occurred between ~ 500 and 600 years B.P. (BLUF-8B, and bracketing maximum age, BLUF-10B), loose constraint for an event younger than ~ 1300 years B.P. (BLUF-9), and an older earthquake between ~ 1800 and 2150 years B.P. (BLUF-5B and BLUF-5A).

At BLUF-C, wood from feature C-11 yielded a contemporary age of $532 \pm 110/-40$ years B.P. (BLUF-11), and charcoal in the sandblows and a new burn charcoal in the redeveloped soil profile in feature C-12 provided bracketing ages between ~ 2300 and 700 years B.P. (BLUF-12A and BLUF-12B). These loosely constrain the timing of one or more earthquakes.

At BLUF-D, four sandblows were discovered by Talwani *et al.* [1993], from which a piece of charcoal within the bedding sequence provided a maximum age of $4190 \pm 224/-251$ years B.P. (BLUF-13), and no datable material was obtained from the second feature. Two radiocarbon samples from feature D-14 indicate that an earthquake occurred ~ 3400 years B.P. on the basis of a contemporary date of a piece of wood from within the bedding sequence (BLUF-14A) and of a piece of charcoal in a clast in the sandblow (BLUF-14B).

Five samples were recovered from feature D-15. Three charcoal samples (BLUF-15B, BLUF-15D, and BLUF-15E) provide maximum ages ranging from ~ 4264 to 4766 years B.P. BLUF-15A was a sample from a root in the feature and provided a minimum age of ~ 1400 years B.P. BLUF-15C consisted of a sample of brownish charcoal or wood in the sandblow. It provided a contemporary age of $3354 \pm 115/-188$ years B.P. Thus data from all three sandblows at BLUF-D (features D-13 to D-15) suggest the occurrence of an earthquake ~ 3400 years B.P. Next all the calibrated ages given in Table 2 were analyzed for recurrence rates and seismogenic sources (section 5).

5. Dates and Magnitudes of Prehistoric Earthquakes

To determine the dates and estimate the magnitudes of prehistoric earthquakes, we examined the calibrated ages and stratigraphic positions of samples from the various sandblows throughout the Coastal Plain of South Carolina. For each sandblow we obtained an estimate of its age from the radiocarbon data and stratigraphic setting. When contemporary ages were available, they were interpreted to be the age of the causative paleoearthquake. Ages of other sandblows were based on maximum and minimum age constraints discussed in section 4. Once all the age data for all the sandblows were in hand, they were compared with each other and used to obtain the dates of earthquake episodes that caused them. Contemporary ages and corroborative age constraints, where available, were binned together according to the following criteria. Overlapping 1σ ranges of contemporary dates were interpreted to indicate a single earthquake episode. The estimated age of the episode is calculated from the weighted averages of the overlapping contemporary ages. An absence of overlapping 2σ ranges of contemporary dates was interpreted to indicate different earthquake episodes. The maximum and minimum ages were used to provide constraints. If a particular sandblow had both maximum and minimum age ranges that overlapped the range of contemporary 1σ ages, they are referred to as tight-bracketing age constraints. If the range of 1σ maximum and minimum ages did not overlap the range of 1σ contemporary ages, they are referred to as loose-bracketing age constraints. If only a maximum or a minimum age was available for a particular sandblow, it was referred to as a tight or loose age constraint depending on if the corresponding range of 1σ ages overlapped the contemporary age ranges or not.

We use earthquake episodes because it is not possible to determine if a specific liquefaction feature is associated with only one mainshock or with the mainshock and its aftershocks. The analysis identified seven prehistoric episodes (episodes A-G), which are discussed below. The dates of formation of sandblows at various sites were compared with each other to infer the date of the earthquake episode. The data for each episode are presented in Figures 5a-5g, wherein samples from a site are identified in accordance with Table 2. For each episode the contemporary dates and tight-bracketing constraints are plotted once and were used to define its age. In some cases, loose-bracketing constraints and the loose constraints could apply to more than one episode, and they are included in figures for more than one episode. For example, the ages of BLUF-12A and BLUF-12B provide loose constraints for the dates of episodes B, C, and D. Here they are included with data for episode D (Figure 5d). However, only locations that provided contemporary or tight-bracketing dates for each episode are shown in Figure 6.

Various empirical methods have been suggested to estimate the magnitude of an earthquake from paleoliquefaction data [see, e.g., Ambraseys, 1988; Tuttle, 1994; Obermeier and Pond, 1999]. We chose a simple method that is probably more applicable to the SCCP and compared our results with the empirical method of Ambraseys [1988].

The areal extent of liquefaction features associated with a particular prehistoric episode was compared with the areal distribution of sandblows associated with the 1886 earthquake to estimate the size of the prehistoric earthquake. For contemporary sandblows occurring in the northern, central, and south-




Figure 5a. Age data used to obtain the age of episode A (546 ± 17 years B.P.). Symbols are defined in Figure 3. Locations of samples providing contemporary ages and tight-bracketing ages are shown in Figure 6. BLUF-4A to BLUF-4D and BLUF-7; BLUF-8B and BLUF-10B; and BLUF-11 are samples from BLUF-A, BLUF-B, and BLUF-C, respectively. The thick horizontal lines bracket the interpreted age of the episode.

ern parts of the SCCP the assigned magnitude is $M 7+$ (comparable with the 1886 earthquake). Smaller magnitudes were assigned to episodes with smaller areal distribution of sandblows. Obermeier *et al.* [1990] argue that the sandblows discovered by them were caused by earthquakes stronger than m_b 5.5 (based on their estimate of the threshold magnitude for liquefaction in the SCCP). When we encountered liquefaction features of a particular age at more than one site, but with smaller areal extent than the 1886 Charleston earthquake, we have assigned a minimum magnitude $M 6.0$.

On the basis of over 100 data points, Ambraseys [1988] found that moment magnitude M for any earthquake was related to the maximum epicentral distance R_e , measured from the adopted epicenter to the most distant site where there was clear evidence of liquefaction-induced ground failure. He found that the equation

$$M = -0.31 + 2.65 \times 10^{-8} R_e + 0.99(\log R_e),$$

where R_e (in centimeters), represented the upper limit for R_e as a function of M .

The 1886 Charleston earthquake caused widespread liquefaction, and sandblows formed hundreds of kilometers from Charleston [Dutton, 1889; Seeber and Armbruster, 1981]. Besides the meizoseismal area, liquefaction features described as "sinkholes" were found at four locations over a hundred kilometers west of Charleston, along the coast near Georgetown, and inland near Columbia [Dutton, 1889; Seeber and Armbruster, 1981] and in Sand Hills near Liberty Hill [Floyd, 1992] (Figure 1). After the discovery of a sandblow associated with the 1886 earthquake near Warren's Crossroads (Cox [1984]; Figure 1), intensive search over the SCCP for other 1886 sandblows was not very successful. Only three other sandblows associated with the 1886 earthquake were discovered near Bluffton (BLUF-1, BLUF-2, and BLUF-3, Table 2). Comparing the felt area and the areal extent of various intensity values




Figure 5b. Age data used to obtain the age of episode B (1021 ± 30 years B.P.). Symbols are defined in Figure 3. Locations of samples providing contemporary ages and tight-bracketing ages are shown in Figure 6. BLUF-6A, BLUF-6B, and BLUF-9A are samples from BLUF-A and BLUF-B, respectively. The thick horizontal lines bracket the interpreted age of the episode.




Figure 5c. Age data used to obtain the age of episode C (1648 ± 74 years B.P.). Symbols are defined in Figure 3. Locations of samples providing contemporary ages and tight-bracketing ages are shown in Figure 6.

for the 1886 Charleston earthquake with those of other earthquakes in stable continental regions, Johnston [1996] assigned it a magnitude $M 7.3 \pm 0.26$. Assuming that the current seismicity defines the source of the 1886 Charleston earthquake and considering reports of liquefaction near Columbia (160 km) and Liberty Hill (180 km), application of Ambraseys' [1988] formula yields estimates of 7.3 and 7.4, respectively, values comparable to Johnston's [1996] estimates. The estimated magnitudes and dates of prehistoric earthquakes that caused liquefaction were combined to estimate the recurrence times of large earthquakes in the South Carolina Coastal Plain.

5.1. Episode A

Seven contemporary ages between ~ 500 and 600 years B.P. with overlapping 1σ ranges were obtained from samples at Sampit in the north (SAM-1), Hollywood near Charleston (HOL-6A), and BLUF-A (BLUF-4B, BLUF-4C, and BLUF-7), BLUF-B (BLUF-8B), and BLUF-C (BLUF-11) in the south (Figures 5a and 6). The weighted average of the seven dates (including uncertainties) is 546 ± 17 years B.P., which is

the age we assign episode A. Tight-bracketing constraint to this age was obtained from three samples from BLUF-B (BLUF-4A (minimum), BLUF-4D (minimum), and BLUF-4E (maximum)). Tight constraints were also obtained from Hollywood (HOL-6B (minimum)) and BLUF-B (BLUF-10B (maximum)). Loose constraints were obtained from Myrtle Beach and Olin (MYR-1 and OLIN-2). As contemporary ages were obtained from locations in the north, the middle, and the south (Figure 6) we interpret the earthquake(s) associated with episode A to be at least as large as the 1886 episode and centered near Charleston and assign it a magnitude $M 7+$. On the basis of the epicentral distance (110 km) to the most distant sandblow (BLUF-C, Figure 6a), Ambraseys' [1988] formula gives $M 7.0$.

5.2. Episode B

Twelve contemporary ages between ~ 900 and 1200 years B.P. with overlapping 1σ ranges were obtained from Georgetown (GEO-1D), Sampit (SAM-2A to SAM-2D and SAM-5A) in the northern part of the SCCP, Hollywood (HOL-7A to




Figure 5d. Age data used to obtain the age of episode D ($1754-2177$ years B.P.). Symbols are defined in Figure 3. Locations of samples providing contemporary ages and tight-bracketing ages are shown in Figure 6. BLUF-5A to BLUF-5D and BLUF-6A; and BLUF-12A, and BLUF-12B are samples from BLUF-B and BLUF-C, respectively. The thick horizontal lines bracket the interpreted age of the episode.




Figure 5e. Age data used to obtain the age of episode E (3548 ± 66 years B.P.). Symbols are defined in Figure 3. Locations of samples providing contemporary ages and tight-bracketing ages are shown in Figure 6. BLUF-14A, BLUF-14B, and BLUF-15A to BLUF-15E are samples from BLUF-D. The thick horizontal lines bracket the interpreted age of the episode.

HOL-7D and HOL-8) near Charleston, and Colony Gardens (COLGAR-1B) in the southern part of SCCP (Figures 5b and 6). The weighted average of the 12 dates was 1021 ± 30 years B.P., which is the age we assign to episode B. The interpreted age of episode B is tightly constrained by bracketing ages at Georgetown (GEO-1B and GEO-1C), Sampit (SAM-6A and SAM-6C), Colony Gardens (COLGAR-1A), and BLUF-A (BLUF-6A and 6B), by another three maximum ages (Figures 5b and 6), and, loosely, by one maximum and two minimum ages.

In view of the occurrence of contemporary ages from locations in the northern, the middle, and the southern sites along the coast (Figure 6) we interpret episode B to be as large as the Charleston 1886 episode and to be dated 1021 ± 30 years B.P. and also located near Charleston and assign it a magnitude $M 7+$. Application of *Ambraseys'* [1988] formula, with an epicentral distance of 110 km to Georgetown (GEO in Figure 6b), gives $M 7.0$.

5.3. Episode C

Five contemporary ages between ~ 1500 and 1800 years B.P. with overlapping 1σ ranges were obtained from samples at Myrtle Beach (MYR-3), Martin Marietta (MM-1A), Olin (OLIN-1C), and Sampit (SAM-4B) sites in the north and from Four Hole Swamp (FHS-1), ~ 50 km northwest of the Charleston area (Figures 5c and 6). The weighted average of the five contemporary dates was 1648 ± 74 years B.P., which is the age we assign to episode C. The interpreted age of episode C is tightly constrained by bracketing ages at Olin (OLIN-1A, OLIN-1B, and OLIN-1E) and Sampit (SAM-4A, SAM-4C, and SAM-4D) and by a maximum value at Martin Marietta (MM-1B) and a minimum value at Sampit (SAM-3A). In view of the absence of any contemporary or tightly bracketing age near Charleston, or at southern sites, we interpret episode C to be associated with a seismic source in the north. Because of the smaller areal extent of sandblows associated with episode C




Figure 5f. Age data used to obtain the age of episode F (5038 ± 166 years B.P.). Symbols are defined in Figure 3. Locations of samples providing contemporary ages and tight-bracketing ages are shown in Figure 6. The thick horizontal lines bracket the interpreted age of the episode.




Figure 5g. Age data used to obtain the age of episode G (5300–6300 years B.P.). Symbols are defined in Figure 3. Locations of samples providing contemporary ages and tight-bracketing ages are shown in Figure 6. The thick horizontal lines bracket the interpreted age of the episode.

(Figure 6) we interpret the magnitude to be smaller than that of the 1886 episode and assign it a magnitude of M 6.0. Assuming a northern source midway between the Sampit and Myrtle Beach sites (SAM and MYR in Figure 6), an epicentral distance of 35 km, suggests M 6.3 using *Ambraseys'* [1988] formula. If we estimate the source to be midway between Four Hole Swamp and Myrtle Beach (FHS and MYR), we get M 6.8.

5.4. Episode D

We do not have convincing evidence for episode D lying between ~1700 and 2200 years B.P. Evidence of episode D is inferred primarily from tight-bracketing ages from four samples from BLUF-B (BLUF-5A to BLUF-5D), a maximum value at BLUF-C (BLUF-12A), and a minimum value at BLUF-A (BLUF-6A) (Figures 5d and 6). Because evidence of episode D is limited to the southern sites (Figure 6), we interpret it to be associated with a southern source near Bluffton, and because of the limited areal extent of the sandblows we assign it a magnitude M 6.0. The age is inferred to lie between ~1754 and 2177 years B.P. Application of *Ambraseys'* [1988] formula, and assuming an epicentral distance of 10 km yields M 5.7.

Although no evidence of episode C or episode D was found near Charleston, we cannot rule out the alternative scenario that episode C (the evidence for which was found at northern sites and near Four Hole Swamp) (Figure 6) and episode D (the evidence for which was found near Bluffton) (Figure 6) were associated with one (or two) larger earthquake(s), centered near Charleston. If the age of episode C is 1648 ± 74 years B.P. and the age of episode D is 1966 ± 212 years B.P., then they are statistically different at 1σ level but the same at 2σ level. Alternatively, if we assume that they were in fact associated with a single large episode C', the weighted mean of their ages is 1683 ± 70 years B.P. Because episode C' incorporates ages of sandblows to the north (near Georgetown), the northwest (near Four Hole Swamp), and the south (near Bluffton) of Charleston, we ascribe the episode to the Charleston source. We attribute the absence of contemporary sandblows near Charleston to their being obliterated by successive earthquakes or to our having just not found them. We assign epi-

sode C' a magnitude M 7+ on the basis of the spatial extent of contemporary sandblows. Assuming the epicenter to lie near Charleston, and epicentral distance to MYR, using *Ambraseys'* [1988] formula suggests M 7.2. We retain the episodes C and D scenario and the episode C' scenario as likely interpretations of the data.

5.5. Episode E

Six contemporary ages between ~3300 and 3700 years B.P. with overlapping 1σ ranges were obtained from three locations near Ten Mile Hill (TMH-1, TMH-3, and TMH-5), located near Charleston, and from BLUF-D (BLUF-14A and BLUF-15C). These dates were constrained by a minimum age near Georgetown (GEO-2B) and a maximum age near Gapway (GW-1C) in the north; a minimum age near Ten Mile Hill (TMH-2A), a maximum age near Hollywood (HOL-1A) near Charleston; and a maximum age at BLUF-D (BLUF-15B) in the south (Figures 5e and 6). The weighted average of these contemporary ages is 3548 ± 66 years B.P., which is the age we assign to episode E.

Because evidence for episode E was found at sites in the north, middle, and south, we interpret the size of this (these) earthquake(s) to be at least as big as the 1886 Charleston earthquake and its location to be near Charleston, and we assign it a magnitude M 7+. Using *Ambraseys'* [1988] formula and a distance of 100 km (distance to BLUF-D), we get M 7.0.

5.6. Episode F

Episode F has been inferred from one contemporary age for a sample at Gapway (GW-2C) and tight-bracketing constraint from Hollywood (HOL-3B) and from loose maximum constraints from Hollywood (HOL-3A) and Conway (CON-1) and loose minimum constraints from Georgetown (GEO-2B) and Ten Mile Hill (TMH-2A) (Figures 5f and 6). The two ages obtained from HOL-3A and HOL-3B do not provide a tight age constraint for episode F and could be evidence for a later earthquake (episode G). The age of episode F is 5038 ± 166 years B.P., based on one contemporary age with possibly a northern source. We ascribe it a magnitude M ~6.0.




Figure 6: Locations of sites where contemporary (solid circles) and tight-bracketing age (crosses) data were obtained for episodes A–G.

5.7. Episode G

The age of this liquefaction episode is not defined by any contemporary ages. It is determined from tight-bracketing age constraints at Ten Mile Hill (TMH-4A and TMH-4B) near Charleston and at Malherous (MAL-1A and MAL-1B) to the south (Figures 5g and 6). Tight maximum age is provided by a sample from Conway (CON-1), and tight minimum age constraint is provided by a sample from Myrtle Beach (MYR-2). Loose age constraints are provided by samples from Hollywood (HOL-3A and HOL-3B); their ages could also be evi-

dence of episode F. Other samples from Malherous (MAL-1E and MAL-1F) and Southport, North Carolina, provide loose constraints. The assigned age of episode G (5300–6300 years B.P.) is estimated from the tight constraint provided by MAL-1A and MAL-1B and slightly looser constraint provided by TMH-4A and TMH-4B. We assign it a magnitude M 7+ and place it near Charleston because evidence of this episode was found in northern, middle, and southern sites. Application of *Ambraseys'* [1988] formula and a distance of 140 km to MYR give M 7.2.




Figure 6. (continued)

6. Discussion

Calibrated ages of radiocarbon samples from sandblows at multiple sites in South Carolina suggest the occurrence of seven prehistoric earthquakes, large enough to cause liquefaction. The inferred ages of these episodes are 546 ± 17 , 1021 ± 30 , 1648 ± 74 , $1754-2177$, 3548 ± 66 , 5038 ± 166 , and $5300-6300$ years B.P. Age ranges are used when the age is based primarily on bracketing ages.

The analysis presented in section 5 leads to two scenarios for the inferred prehistoric seismicity. In the first, there are three possible seismic source zones: One is located near Charleston,

another is located near Georgetown (northern source), and the third is located near Bluffton (southern source). The second scenario involves all earthquakes occurring in the Charleston seismic zone. The timing of the earthquakes in the two scenarios is summarized in Table 3.

The possibility of a source zone outside of the Charleston area has been suggested earlier. For example, *Weems and Obermeier* [1990] suggested that the older ages (>5750 years B.P.) at Conway and (>8770 years B.P.) at Southport, North Carolina, might be evidence of a northern source. *Amick and Gelinas* [1991] attributed (our) episode C to a northern source.




Figure 6. (continued)

Rajendran and Talwani [1993] attributed (our) episode D to a southern source.

Historical accounts clearly show that the 1886 earthquake occurred near Charleston. Evidence of episodes A (546 ± 17 years B.P.), B (1021 ± 30 years B.P.), C' (1683 ± 70 years B.P.), E (3548 ± 66 years B.P.), and G ($5300-6300$ years B.P.) is present in the northern, middle, and southern sites (Figure 6). These are also interpreted to be Charleston events, and we assign them magnitudes comparable to the Charleston 1886 earthquake, i.e., $M 7+$.

Evidence of episode C comes primarily from northern sites and one inland site (FHS) with no corroborative ages from southern or Charleston sandblows. In scenario 1 we assign it a northern source, with $M \sim 6.0$. Episode D is based primarily on bracketing ages for sandblows at BLUF-B and BLUF-C. We assign it a southern source with $M \sim 6.0$. If episode C and D are associated with one episode C', then its magnitude is also $M \sim 7+$. Episode F is based primarily on a contemporary age at Gapway (GW-2C), $4985 \pm 218/-113$ years B.P., which is statistically different from the inferred age of episode G, 5800 ± 500 years B.P. at the 1σ level and the same at the 2σ level. Two samples from Hollywood (HOL-3A and HOL-3B) provide loose age constraints, for both episodes F and G. If they are associated with episode G, then episode F is inferred only from data from Gapway and Conway, i.e., only the northern sites. In this scenario (scenario 1) we assign a magnitude $M \sim 6.0$ to the northern source. If HOL-3A and HOL-3B are associated with episode F, then we assign a larger magnitude to

episode F, $M 7+$ (scenario 2). Clearly, more data are needed to resolve between the two scenarios presented above.

6.1. Ages of Prehistoric Earthquakes and Sea Levels

In the South Carolina Coastal Plain all evidence of prehistoric earthquakes is based on studies of seismically induced liquefaction features. An essential requirement for the development of the sandblows is the presence of a saturated unconsolidated source sand horizon and a shallow ground water table (about $<3-4$ m deep for the various sandblows investigated in this study). A priori, we have no way of knowing the depth of the ground water table at the time of the prehistoric earthquakes. Except for the inland site at Four Hole Swamp the other sandblows are in beach ridges within $\sim 20-30$ km from the present coast line. So we make a simple assumption that the prehistoric ground water table levels were directly related to the corresponding age sea levels, data for which are available.

Prehistoric sea levels have been studied by several workers. Fairbanks [1989] provided a continuous and detailed record of the sea level offshore of Barbados over the past 17,000 years. Sea level was ~ 10 m lower than present sea level at ~ 6000 years B.P. and considerably lower before that. If the ground water table at liquefaction sites was correspondingly deeper than today, it would be difficult for liquefaction to occur and reach the surface, because the water-table would be too deep. Therefore the "clock" started at ~ 6000 years B.P., possibly

Table 3. Two Scenarios for Paleoequake Ages and Source Zones

Liquefaction Episode	Age, years B.P.	Scenario 1		Scenario 2	
		Source	Magnitude ^a	Source	Magnitude ^a
1886 AD	113	Charleston	7.3	Charleston	7.3
A	546 ± 17	Charleston	7+	Charleston	7+
B	1021 ± 30	Charleston	7+	Charleston	7+
C	1648 ± 74	northern part	~ 6.0	...	—
C'	1683 ± 70	Charleston	7+
D	1966 ± 212	southern part	~ 6.0	...	—
E	3548 ± 66	Charleston	7+	Charleston	7+
F	5038 ± 166	northern part	~ 6.0	Charleston	7+
G	5800 ± 500	Charleston	7+	Charleston	7+

^aMagnitude is M_w ; 1886 magnitude is from Johnston [1996].




Figure 7. Depths below mean high water (MHW) level inferred to represent late Holocene sea levels for the SCCP, from Scott *et al.* [1995] (solid circles) and from DePratter and Howard [1981] (stippled pattern). Age data from DePratter and Howard [1981] were calibrated before plotting. The times of episodes A–G are shown by solid vertical lines for comparison.

explaining the age of the oldest liquefaction episode indicated by all of the studies conducted to date.

Evidence of late Holocene sea level fluctuations have been identified in the South Carolina and Georgia Coastal Plains [DePratter and Howard, 1981; Colquhoun and Brooks, 1986; Gayes *et al.*, 1993; Scott *et al.*, 1995]. These studies identified a highstand during the past 6000 years of relative sea level between ~4500 and 3100 years B.P. DePratter and Howard [1981] used historical data together with dated archaeological artifacts, submerged in-place tree stumps, and numerous buried trees in northeast Georgia near Wilmington Island and neighboring South Carolina (Figure 1). They found that the sea level reached -1.5 to -2 m mean sea level (msl) by ~4500 years B.P., began to lower ~3100 years B.P., was -3 to -4 m for ~500–600 years, and then rose to its present levels around 2400 years B.P. Gayes *et al.* [1993] obtained a relative sea level curve from tidal wetland deposits of Murrell's Inlet, South Carolina, 30 km northeast of Georgetown (Figure 1). They also found a sea level highstand between ~5300 and 3600 years B.P. [Gayes *et al.*, 1993, Figure 6, p. 159] wherein water oscillated from -3 m about 5300 years B.P. to -1 m msl by 4280 years B.P. and then fell to -3 m by 3600 years B.P. before rising again to its present position. At the Santee River delta (25 km south of Georgetown) they present evidence for deepening of sea level to about -5 – -6 m msl during the period from 3200 to 2000 years B.P. They attribute the lower differential Holocene submergence to sediment loading by the Santee delta. Scott *et al.* [1995] added micropaleontologic constraints to the results of Gayes *et al.* [1993] and confirmed their conclusions. Colquhoun and Brooks [1986] developed a Holocene sea level curve for the southeastern United States through a study of marsh stratigraphy and archeological sites in marsh and interriversine areas from near Georgetown to Savannah, Georgia. They also found a sea level rise from about -4 m about 5000 years B.P. with a highstand (-1 m msl) ~4000 years B.P. Their data showed several fluctuations in sea level and were not well constrained.

The effect of ground water level on the formation of sandblows is examined by comparing prehistoric sea level curves with the times of episodes A–G (Figure 7). Both at Murrell's

Inlet [Scott *et al.*, 1995] and near Savannah, Georgia [DePratter and Howard, 1981], there was a highstand higher than about -2 m msl of relative sea level from ~4500 to 3100 years B.P., a lowstand lower than about -3 to -4 m msl from 3000 to 2400 years B.P., and shallower water levels, higher than -2 m msl for the past 2000 years. We note that at the time of occurrence of episodes A, B, C, and D (and C') the water levels were shallower than -2 m msl, thus making widespread liquefaction possible for Charleston-type events (episodes A and B) or smaller local earthquakes (episodes C and D). If the ground-water levels between 3000 and 2000 years B.P. in other parts of the SCCP were also low, as at Santee (-5 to -6 m msl), we would not expect liquefaction features to reach the surface, providing a possible explanation for the absence of sandblows of that age. The absence of sandblows older than episode G could be due to water levels being too low to cause liquefied sands to reach the surface and not due to an absence of earthquakes.

The inferred occurrence of only one earthquake (episode E) in the 3000 year period between episodes A–D and episodes F and G could be due to temporal clustering of seismicity, fluctuation water levels, or their evidence having been obliterated. Our data do not allow us to distinguish between these alternatives. Thus, for estimating recurrence rates of prehistoric earthquakes based on paleoliquefaction events we consider the paleoliquefaction record to be complete for the past 2000 years. Because the paleoliquefaction record may not be complete for the period between ~5800 and 2000 years B.P., the recurrence intervals between older paleoliquefaction events may not be representative of the paleoliquefaction rates in the SCCP. Thus, in estimating the recurrence rates of earthquakes in the SCCP we place greater emphasis on the data for the past 2000 years B.P., i.e., up to episode D.

6.2. Recurrence Rates

In estimating the recurrence rate for scenario 1 we assume that the liquefaction observed near Georgetown and dated at ~1650 years B.P. (episode C) resulted from an earthquake on a northern source. We further assume that episode D, which occurred ~2000 years B.P., was associated with a southern

source near Bluffton. In this scenario no earthquakes occurred in the Charleston source at 1650 or 2000 years B.P. Thus, in the past 2000 years we have three earthquakes located near Charleston; 1886 A.D., 546 years B.P., and 1021 years B.P. with an average recurrence rate of 454 ± 21 years. The next known (older) earthquake associated with liquefaction occurred ~ 3550 years B.P. (Table 3). Evidence for any (?) earthquake(s) between ~ 2000 and 3550 years B.P. could be missing. If we assume that we have one missing earthquake midway between 2000 and 3550 years B.P. (for which there is no record of a liquefaction feature), the mean recurrence rate for the Charleston source is $\sim 859 \pm 532$ years. If we assume two equally spaced missing earthquakes between 2000 and 3550 years B.P., the mean recurrence rate for the Charleston source zone is 687 ± 405 years. For the northern and southern sources, on the basis of one event each in the past 2000 years, we assign a recurrence rate of 2000 years for M 6.0 earthquakes.

For scenario 2 (Table 3) we assume that there was only one earthquake associated with liquefaction between ~ 1000 and 2000 years B.P. and that it occurred at the Charleston source at 1683 years B.P. (episode C'). In this scenario there are four Charleston earthquakes before 2000 years B.P. (1886 A.D., 546 years B.P., 1021 years B.P., and 1683 years B.P.), with a mean recurrence interval of 523 ± 100 years B.P. In anticipation of additional data we suggest a recurrence rate between 500 and 600 years for M 7+ earthquakes at Charleston and ~ 2000 years for M 6.0 events at the northern and southern sources in the SCCP.

Acknowledgments. The studies reported here were supported by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission. We are very grateful to Russell Wheeler, Anthony (Tony) Crone, and Buddy Schweig of the U.S. Geological Survey and Tish Tuttle for an in-depth review and helpful suggestions. We also acknowledge the following paleoseismologists whose work in the SCCP has contributed to this study: from the University of South Carolina, John Cox, C. P. and Kusala Rajendran, and David Amick (also of Ebasco Services), Bobby Gelinas (Ebasco Services), and from the U.S. Geological Survey, Steve Obermeier and Rob Weems. We thank Ron Marple and Linyue Chen for help with the figures and Lynn Hubbard for word processing.

References

- Ambraseys, N. N., Engineering seismology, *Earthquake Eng. Struct. Dyn.*, 17, 1-105, 1988.
- Amick, D. C., Paleoliquefaction investigations along the Atlantic Seaboard with emphasis on the prehistoric earthquake chronology of coastal South Carolina, Ph.D. thesis, Univ. of S. C., Columbia, 1990.
- Amick, D. C., and R. Gelinas, The search for evidence of large prehistoric earthquakes along the Atlantic Seaboard, *Science*, 251, 655-658, 1991.
- Amick, D. C., R. Gelinas, G. Maurath, R. Cannon, D. Moore, E. Billington, and H. Kemppinen, Paleoliquefaction features along the Atlantic Seaboard, *Tech. Rep. NUREG/CR-5613*, 146 pp., Nucl. Regul. Comm., Washington, D. C., 1990.
- Bell, J. W., C. M. dePolo, A. R. Ramelli, A. M. Sarna-Wojcicki, and C. E. Meyer, Surface faulting and paleoseismic history of the 1932 Cedar Mountain earthquake area, West-Central Nevada, and its implications for modern tectonics of the Walker Lane, *Geol. Soc. Am. Bull.*, 111, 791-807, 1999.
- Bollinger, G. A., and T. R. Visvanathan, The seismicity of South Carolina prior to 1886, in *Studies Related to the Charleston, South Carolina, Earthquake of 1886: A Preliminary Report*, edited by D. W. Rankin, *U.S. Geol. Surv. Prof. Pap.*, 1028, 33-42, 1977.
- Colquhoun, D. J., and M. J. Brooks, New evidence from the southeastern U.S. for eustatic components in the late Holocene sea levels, *Geoarchaeology*, 1, 275-291, 1986.
- Cox, J. H. M., Paleoseismology studies in South Carolina, M.S. thesis, Univ. of S. C., Columbia, 1984.
- Cox, J., and P. Talwani, Paleoseismic studies in the 1886 Charleston earthquake meizoseismal area (abstract), *Geol. Soc. Am. Abstr. Programs*, 16, 130, 1983.
- DePratter, C. B., and J. D. Howard, Evidence for a sea-level lowstand between 4500 and 2400 years B.P. on the Southeast Coast of the United States, *J. Sediment. Petrol.*, 51, 1287-1296, 1981.
- Dutton, C. E., The Charleston earthquake of August 31, 1886, in *U.S. Geological Survey Ninth Annual Report 1887-1888*, pp. 203-528, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., Washington, D. C., 1889.
- Fairbanks, R. G., A 17,000-year glacio-eustatic sea level record: Influence of glacial melting rates on the Younger Dryas event and deep-ocean circulation, *Nature*, 342, 637-642, 1989.
- Floyd, J. W., 1886 earthquake in S.C. described, in *History and Homes of Liberty Hill South Carolina*, edited by L. Johnston, pp. 77-79, Kershaw County Hist. Soc., Camden, S. C., 1992.
- Gayes, P. T., D. B. Scott, E. S. Collins, and D. D. Nelson, A late-Holocene sea-level fluctuation in South Carolina in quaternary coasts of the United States: Marine and lacustrine systems, *SEPM Spec. Publ.*, 48, 155-160, 1993.
- Geyh, M. A., and H. Schleicher, *Absolute Age Determination: Physical and Chemical Dating Methods and Their Application*, 503 pp., Springer-Verlag, New York, 1990.
- Johnston, A. C., Seismic moment assessment of earthquakes in stable continental regions, III, New Madrid 1811-1812, Charleston 1886 and Lisbon 1755, *Geophys. J. Int.*, 126, 314-344, 1996.
- Obermeier, S. F., and E. C. Pond, Issues in using liquefaction features for paleoseismic analysis, *Seismol. Res. Lett.*, 70, 34-58, 1999.
- Obermeier, S. F., R. E. Weems, and R. B. Jacobson, Earthquake-induced liquefaction features in the coastal South Carolina region, *U.S. Geol. Surv. Open File Rep.* 87-504, 1987.
- Obermeier, S. F., R. B. Jacobson, J. P. Smoot, R. E. Weems, G. S. Gohn, J. E. Monroe, and D. S. Powars, Earthquake-induced liquefaction features in the coastal setting of South Carolina and in the fluvial setting of the New Madrid Seismic Zone, *U.S. Geol. Surv. Prof. Pap.*, 1504, 44 pp., 1990.
- Rajendran, C. P., and P. Talwani, Paleoseismic indicators near Bluffton, South Carolina: An appraisal of their tectonic implications, *Geology*, 21, 987-990, 1993.
- Schaeffer, W. T., Paleoliquefaction investigations near Georgetown, South Carolina, M.S. thesis, Univ. of S. C., Columbia, 1996.
- Scott, D. B., P. T. Gayes, and E. S. Collins, Mid-Holocene precedent for a future rise in sea-level along the Atlantic Coast of North America, *J. Coastal Res.*, 11, 615-622, 1995.
- Seeber, L., and J. G. Armbruster, The 1886 Charleston, South Carolina earthquake and the Appalachian detachment, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 86, 7874-7894, 1981.
- Stuiver, M., and P. J. Reimer, CALIB user's guide revision 3.0.3., *Quat. Res. Cent. AK-60*, 34 pp., Univ. of Wash., Seattle, 1993.
- Talwani, P., and J. Cox, Paleoseismic evidence for recurrence of earthquakes near Charleston, South Carolina, *Science*, 229, 379-381, 1985.
- Talwani, P., C. P. Rajendran, K. Rajendran, and S. Madabhushi, Assessment of seismic hazard associated with earthquake source in the Bluffton-Hilton Head area, *Tech. Rep., SCUREF Task Order 41*, 85 pp., Univ. of S. C., Columbia, 1993.
- Talwani, P., D. C. Amick, and W. T. Schaeffer, Paleoliquefaction studies in the South Carolina Coastal Plain, *Tech. Rep. NUREG/CR-6619*, 109 pp., Nucl. Regul. Comm., Washington, D. C., 1999.
- Tuttle, M. P., The liquefaction method for assessing paleoseismicity, *Tech. Rep. NUREG/CR-6258*, 38 pp., Nucl. Regul. Comm., Washington, D. C., 1994.
- Tuttle, M. P., and E. S. Schweig, Recognizing and dating prehistoric liquefaction features: Lessons learned in the New Madrid Seismic Zone, central United States, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 101, 6171-6178, 1996.
- Visvanathan, T. R., Earthquakes in South Carolina, 1698-1975, *S. C. Geol. Surv. Bull.*, 40, 61 pp., 1980.
- Weems, R. E., and S. F. Obermeier, The 1886 Charleston earthquake: An overview of geological studies, in *Proceedings of the 17th Water Reactor Safety Information Meeting: NUREG/CP-0105*, vol. 2, pp. 289-313, Nucl. Regul. Comm., Washington, D. C., 1990.
- Weems, R. E., S. F. Obermeier, M. J. Pavich, G. S. Gohn, and M. Rubin, Evidence for three moderate to large prehistoric Holocene earthquakes near Charleston, South Carolina, in *Proceedings of the 3rd U.S. National Conference on Earthquake Engineering, Charleston*,

South Carolina, vol. 1, pp. 3-13, Earthquake Eng. Res. Inst., Oakland, Calif., 1986.

Weems, R. E., R. B. Jacobson, S. F. Obermeier, G. S. Gohn, and R. Meyer, New radiocarbon ages from earthquake-induced liquefaction features in the lower Coastal Plain of the Carolinas (abstract), *Geol. Soc. Am. Abstr. Programs*, 20, 322, 1988.

W. T. Schaeffer, 122 Woodside Parkway, West Columbia, SC 29170.
(williamschaeffer@hotmail.com)

P. Talwani, Department of Geological Sciences, University of South Carolina, 701 Sumter Street, EWSC Room 517, Columbia, SC 29208.
(talwani@prithvi.seis.sc.edu)

(Received February 11, 2000; revised August 31, 2000;
accepted November 2, 2000.)