

# Seismic Activity in the Northern Ontario Portion of the Canadian Shield: Annual Progress Report for the Period January 01 – December 31, 2013

**NWMO-TR-2015-10**

**December 2015**

**J. Adams<sup>1</sup>**

**J.A. Drysdale<sup>1</sup>**

**S.J. Hayek<sup>1</sup>**

**V. Peci<sup>2</sup>**

**S. Halchuk<sup>1</sup>**

**P. Street<sup>1</sup>**

<sup>1</sup> Canadian Hazards Information Service,  
Geological Survey of Canada  
Natural Resources Canada  
Government of Canada

<sup>2</sup> V.Peci under contract

**nwmo**

NUCLEAR WASTE  
MANAGEMENT  
ORGANIZATION

SOCIÉTÉ DE GESTION  
DES DÉCHETS  
NUCLÉAIRES

**Nuclear Waste Management Organization**  
22 St. Clair Avenue East, 6<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Toronto, Ontario  
M4T 2S3  
Canada

Tel: 416-934-9814  
Web: [www.nwmo.ca](http://www.nwmo.ca)

# **Seismic Activity in the Northern Ontario Portion of the Canadian Shield: Annual Progress Report for the Period January 01 – December 31, 2013**

**NWMO-TR-2015-10**

December 2015

**J. Adams<sup>1</sup>**  
**J.A. Drysdale<sup>1</sup>**  
**S.J. Hayek<sup>1</sup>**  
**V. Peci<sup>2</sup>**  
**S. Halchuk<sup>1</sup>**  
**P. Street<sup>1</sup>**

<sup>1</sup> Canadian Hazards Information Service,  
Geological Survey of Canada,  
Natural Resources Canada  
Government of Canada

<sup>2</sup> V. Peci under contract

This report has been prepared under contract to NWMO. The report has been reviewed by NWMO, but the views and conclusions are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of the NWMO.

All copyright and intellectual property rights belong to NWMO.

### Document History

Title:	Seismic Activity in the Northern Ontario Portion of the Canadian Shield: Annual Progress Report for the Period January 01 – December 31, 2013		
Report Number:	NWMO-TR-2015-10		
Revision:	R000	Date:	December 2015
Canadian Hazards Information Service, Geological Survey of Canada, Natural Resources Canada, Government of Canada			
Authored by:	J. Adams, J.A. Drysdale, S.J. Hayek, V. Peci, S. Halchuk and P. Street		
Verified by:	J.A. Drysdale		
Approved by:	J Adams		
Nuclear Waste Management Organization			
Reviewed by:	Richard Crowe		
Accepted by:	Mark Jensen		



## ABSTRACT

**Title:** Seismic Activity in the Northern Ontario Portion of the Canadian Shield: Annual Progress Report for the Period January 01 – December 31, 2013  
**Report No.:** NWMO-TR-2015-10  
**Author(s):** J. Adams<sup>1</sup>, J.A. Drysdale<sup>1</sup>, S.J. Hayek<sup>1</sup>, V. Peci<sup>2</sup>, S. Halchuk<sup>1</sup> and P. Street<sup>1</sup>  
**Company:** <sup>1</sup>Canadian Hazards Information Service, Geological Survey of Canada, Natural Resources Canada, Government of Canada  
<sup>2</sup>V. Peci under contract  
**Date:** December 2015

### Abstract

The Canadian Hazards Information Service (CHIS), a part of the Geological Survey of Canada (GSC), continues to conduct a seismic monitoring program in the northern Ontario and eastern Manitoba portions of the Canadian Shield. This program has been on-going since 1982 and is currently supported by a number of organizations, including the NWMO. A key objective of the monitoring program is to observe and document earthquake activity in the Ontario portion of the Canadian Shield. This report summarizes earthquake activity for the year 2013.

CHIS maintains a network of sixteen seismograph stations to monitor low levels of background seismicity in the northern Ontario and eastern Manitoba portions of the Canadian Shield. Core stations are located at: Sioux Lookout (SOLO), Thunder Bay (TBO), Geraldton (GTO), Kapuskasing (KAPO), Eldee (EEO), and Chalk River (CRLO). These are augmented by the CHIS network of temporary stations at: Sutton Inlier (SILO), McAlpine Lake (MALO), Kirkland Lake (KILO), Sudbury (SUNO), Atikokan (ATKO), Experimental Lake (EPLO), Pickle Lake (PKLO), and Pukaskwa National Park (PNPO). The digital data from a temporary station at Victor Mine (VIMO), supported by the diamond mine industry, and a station at Pinawa (ULM), which has funding from the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty Organization (CTBTO), are also used in this monitoring program.

All the stations are operated by CHIS and transmit digital data in real-time via satellite to a central acquisition hub in Ottawa. CHIS-staff in Ottawa integrate the data from these stations with those of the Canadian National Seismograph Network and provide monthly reports of the seismic activity in northern Ontario.

During 2013, 70 events were located. Their magnitude ranged from 0.9  $m_N$  to 3.8  $m_N$ . The largest event with a magnitude of 3.8  $m_N$  occurred 66 km north of Chapleau, ON. The most westerly event in the area being studied was a  $m_N$  2.4 event, located 62 km west of Red Lake ON. The pattern of seismicity for 2013 is similar to the seismicity patterns of the previous years, although the regions near Kapuskasing and west of North Bay had no events. The 70 events located in 2013 compares with the 57 events located in 2012, 79 events located in 2011, 118 events in 2010, 82 events in 2009, and 114 events in 2008.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
<b>ABSTRACT .....</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>1. INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. STATION OPERATIONS .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2.1 CANADIAN NATIONAL SEISMOGRAPH NETWORK.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2.2 OPERATION STATISTICS .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3. EARTHQUAKES .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>4. LOCATION ACCURACY IN NORTHERN ONTARIO .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>4.1 PARAMETERS.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>4.2 LIMITATIONS.....</b>	<b>7</b>
4.2.1 Focal Depth .....	8
4.2.2 Velocity Models .....	9
<b>5. MAGNITUDE CALCULATION .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>6. EARTHQUAKE OCCURRENCE RATES.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>7. MINING-INDUCED ACTIVITY .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>8. SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>REFERENCES .....</b>	<b>12</b>

## **LIST OF TABLES**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
Table 1: Located Local Earthquakes, January - December 2013 .....	13
Table 2: NWMO Supported Stations Operating During 2013 .....	15
Table 3: Depths Derived using Rg-phases and Regional Depth Phase Method (RDPM) for Moderate-sized Events for 2013 .....	16
Table 4: Mining-Induced Seismic Events $m_N \geq 2.5$ and Greater, January - December 2013 .....	18

## **LIST OF FIGURES**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
Figure 1: Earthquakes in Northern Ontario and Adjacent Areas, 2013 .....	19
Figure 2: Earthquakes in Northern Ontario and Adjacent Areas, 1982-2013 .....	20
Figure 3: Earthquakes $m_N \geq 3$ in Northern Ontario and Adjacent Areas, 1982-2013 .....	21
Figure 4: Earthquakes in Eastern Canada, 2013 .....	22
Figure 5: Earthquakes in Eastern Canada, 1982-2013 .....	23
Figure 6: Earthquakes and Blasts in Northern Ontario and Adjacent Areas, 2013 .....	24
Figure 7: Earthquakes in Northern Ontario and Adjacent Areas for 2013 and prior years .....	25
Figure 8: Rg Surface Waves from the $m_N$ 2.4 on 2013/12/27, 44 km NE of Atikokan ON .....	26
Figure 9: Observed and Synthetic Waveforms from the $m_N$ 3.8 on 2013/02/19, 66 km north of Chapleau ON .....	27
Figure 10: Recurrence Curves for Northern Ontario .....	28

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The Canadian Hazards Information Service (CHIS), a part of the Geological Survey of Canada (GSC) continues to conduct a seismic monitoring program in the northern Ontario and eastern Manitoba portions of the Canadian Shield. This program has been ongoing since 1982 and is currently supported by a number of organizations, including the NWMO. A key objective of the monitoring program is to observe and document earthquake activity in the Ontario portion of the Canadian Shield. This report summarizes earthquake activity for the year 2013.

To record the seismic activity, CHIS operates sixteen seismic monitoring stations in the Ontario and southeast Manitoba portions of the Canadian Shield (Figure 1). The activity in southeast Manitoba is of interest because the crust is geologically similar to the Ontario part of the Canadian Shield. The core stations supported by the NWMO are located at: Sioux Lookout (SOLO), Thunder Bay (TBO), Geraldton (GTO), Kapuskasing (KAPO), Eldee (EEO), and Chalk River (CRLO). In addition, there is data from the station at Pinawa (ULM), operated by CHIS with funding by the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty Organization (CTBTO) (<http://www.ctbto.org>).

These data are supplemented by a temporary network of CHIS stations at Sutton Inlier (SILO), McAlpine Lake (MALO), Kirkland Lake (KILO), Sudbury (SUNO), Atikokan (ATKO), Experimental Lake (EPLO), Pickle Lake (PKLO), Pukaskwa National Park (PNPO), and Victor Mine (VIMO), which started as a joint venture established between 2003 and 2005 using equipment partly funded by Industry Canada's FedNor program and partly contributed from the POLARIS Consortium (<http://www.polarisnet.ca>), but has been incorporated into CHIS.

All stations record real-time, continuous, digital data, which are transmitted by satellite to the data laboratory in Ottawa and are available for the monitoring of this region, as are all the data from the entire Canadian National Seismograph Network (CNSN) and data from other POLARIS initiatives.

Relevant data were requested and read from some US stations, including EYMN, a station near the Canada/US border in Ely, Minnesota, USA. The data is received through the Earthworm data exchange system. Although data from this station is routinely requested for events that have already been identified on a CNSN station, it is not scanned by CHIS for new events. The addition of the U.S. data has mainly helped locate events in the sparsely-seismic Atikokan region.

Since around 2009/2010, USArray ([www.usarray.org](http://www.usarray.org)) has installed stations in the U.S. just south of the area of interest for this study. The array is being moved eastward, year by year, and during 2013 stations ceased operating in the region to the east of Lake Michigan but continued in lower Michigan and in southern Ontario. Data from these stations could be read to improve the locations of the events identified in this report (particularly the events along the border). The data could also be scanned to look for new events, to lower the threshold in the border regions. Currently this is outside the scope of this contract.

Earthquake size is expressed by magnitude. Almost all earthquakes in this series of annual reports will have magnitudes calculated on the Nuttli scale (see section 5), which is used by CHIS

for moderate-sized earthquakes in eastern Canada<sup>1</sup>. Magnitudes calculated on the Nuttli scale are formally written  $m_N$  or  $m_{bLG}$ . The former notation will be used in this report.

The frequency of earthquakes of a given magnitude is a logarithmic function of magnitude: for each magnitude 4.0 earthquake in a region, one can expect approximately 10 magnitude 3 earthquakes, 100 magnitude 2 earthquakes, 1000 magnitude 1 earthquakes, etc. Thus there is a great benefit to being able to detect the many smaller earthquakes happening in northern Ontario to learn something about the distribution and rate of the less common large earthquakes that could happen in the future and are of engineering design interest.

During this twelve-month period 70 earthquakes were located. Their magnitude ranged from 0.9  $m_N$  to 3.8  $m_N$ . The largest event, with a magnitude of 3.8  $m_N$ , occurred 66 km north of Chapleau, ON, while the second largest,  $m_N$  2.8 event, was located in the James Bay region 76 km SW from Wemindji, QC (see Figure 1). The 70 events located in 2013 compares with the 57 events located in 2012, 79 events located in 2011, 118 events in 2010, 82 events in 2009, and 114 events in 2008.

The CNSN is able to locate all earthquakes of magnitude 3.5 and above anywhere within Canada, except in some parts of the high Arctic. Across northern Ontario this was lowered to approximately magnitude 3 with the installation of the core stations in 1982. Since then, the smaller earthquakes in the study area were located largely as a result of the additional data provided by the dedicated network added after 2003, resulting in a slightly reduced location threshold for the northeastern portion of the region. Earthquakes located in the study area during 2013 and the cumulative seismic activity in eastern Canada since the inception of the program in 1982 are illustrated by a series of maps in Figures 1-6, and the 2013 events are tabulated in Table 1. The year-end station operation statistics are given in Table 2, earthquakes with determined depths are listed in Table 3 and mining-induced seismic events of magnitude 2.5  $m_N$  and greater are tabulated in Table 4.

## 2. STATION OPERATIONS

### 2.1 CANADIAN NATIONAL SEISMOGRAPH NETWORK

More than 3500 earthquakes are located in Canada every year. CHIS operates approximately 150 instruments, called seismographs, across the country to detect and locate these events. Together, these instruments make up the Canadian National Seismograph Network. Each network site, or "station", consists of a small computer and a very sensitive seismograph that can record ground movement of less than one nanometre per second. The location of these stations is particularly important. They need to be located where bedrock is exposed at the surface and as far as possible from noise such as traffic, heavy industry and trains. Natural background noises, such as waves on nearby oceans or lakes, are also avoided and heavily wooded areas are unsuitable, because the ground vibrates when the wind shakes the trees. All these factors can hide, or "mask" the very small signals produced by earthquakes. The goal of the National Seismograph Network Operations is to support the detection and location of all earthquakes above magnitude 3.5 in Canada and its offshore areas, and above magnitude 2.5

---

<sup>1</sup> The Richter or local magnitude  $m_L$  is used for small events when amplitudes are not available from at least one station that is farther than 50 km from the epicentre.

in regions of enhanced socio-economic importance, such as urban areas, hydrocarbon development zones, nuclear power plant sites, and short-term aftershock survey areas.

CHIS also receives and archives all the data from the POLARIS stations. Together, approximately three and a half Gigabytes per day of digital network data are acquired, quality controlled, processed, archived, and disseminated by the National Seismology Data Centre. At the time of writing this report, 3494 earthquakes had been located in Canada during the year 2013. Only 34 of these occurred in the study region and were over magnitude 2.

## 2.2 OPERATION STATISTICS

Station operation statistics for ULM, SOLO, TBO, GTO, KAPO, EEO, CRLO, SILO, VIMO, MALO, KILO, SUNO, EPLO, ATKO, PKLO, and PNPO are shown in Table 2. Data capture was in excess of 96% for six of the seven core seismograph station and above 92% for 6 of the 9 temporary stations.

Many of the solar powered sites, including MALO, EPLO, ATKO, PKLO, PNPO and SUNO, experienced power failure and had poor telecommunications during the winter months, particularly January, February, November and December. SILO dropped out in 2010 due to faulty components at the site. As this site is quite remote, no maintenance trip to this site was made in 2013.

Details of the outages at each station are provided in the Notes section of Table 2.

## 3. EARTHQUAKES

A total of 70 earthquakes were located in the study area during 2013. The events from the year are listed in Table 1 and plotted in Figure 1. The largest event, with a magnitude of 3.8  $m_N$ , occurred 66 km north of Chapleau, ON, on February 19<sup>th</sup>.

Due to increased station density in the northern part of the province beginning in 2003, the magnitude location threshold has decreased in this region of the country from about  $m_N$  3, down to approximately  $m_N$  2. Although smaller earthquakes (less than magnitude 2) can be located with the current network, the accuracy of the event locations decreases with decreasing event magnitude and with increasing distance from the nearby stations of the network. Also, the catalogue of events less than  $m_N$  2 is not complete; that is to say, particularly in regions of poorer coverage, it is assumed that events smaller than  $m_N$  2 have been missed.

The effects of this lowered threshold can be seen particularly in the James Bay region where 220 events were located since 2004, which works out to approximately 24 events per year. This compares to the 42 events located in the same region since the beginning of this study in 1982 until the end of 2003, making an average of two events per year. Note that at the peak of the network (from 2004 to 2009 when the most stations were operational in the region), the number of events recorded in this region peaked at 32 events per year on average. In 2013, 11 events were located in this region, including the second largest event recorded in the study area this year.

The station coverage means that the portions of the study area that are in Manitoba, Minnesota and extreme northwestern Ontario are less well monitored than the rest of northern Ontario. Hence, the lack of earthquakes located there need not represent a lack of natural seismicity.

In 2008 the POLARIS FedNor project came to an end and stations had to be closed. Eight stations were chosen to be closed initially, with the poorest stations (based on poor uptime statistics, or the high noise levels at the site) chosen so as to have the smallest effect on the location threshold. Two additional sites were closed in 2010. The location threshold may have been somewhat affected for the last four years compared with the previous years, although 2012's low seismicity rate may simply be due to the natural fluctuation of seismicity year to year.

More ex-FedNor stations could be closed in the next few years and this will lead to a threshold closer to pre-2003 (pre-FedNor) levels. At some time, decisions will be required as to (a) whether more low-magnitude earthquake data is still required *and* the remaining FedNor stations be funded, or whether the pre-2003 threshold level would be adequate for the future, and (b) whether a lower threshold is required over the entire study area, or a more focussed approach should be used.

The 70 earthquakes from 2013 compare to previous years as follows:

Year	No. of events	No. of stations
2013	70	16
2012	57	16
2011	79	16
2010	118	16
2009	82	18
2008	114	26
2007	68	26
2006	83	26
2005	103	26
2004	79	20
2003	45	14
2002	45	7

Although the number of events fluctuates from year to year, it can be seen that the number of located events increased between 2003 and 2005, due to the increase in coverage provided by the FedNor stations, which in turn has lowered the location threshold in the area. In 2012, the rate of seismicity was lower than the average since 2005 (approximately 90 events per year). This low rate of seismicity was noticed in other parts of eastern Canada. As neither the network of stations in northern Ontario, nor the method of analysis changed from 2011, it suggests that this is simply part of the natural yearly fluctuation. The 2013 rate is closer to the average rate.

In general, the pattern of activity for 2013 followed that of the previous years. The largest event, with a magnitude of 3.8  $m_N$ , occurred 66 km north of Chapleau, ON, on February 19<sup>th</sup>, close to a  $m_N$  3.9 event on September 22<sup>nd</sup> 2012, a  $m_N$  3.0 event on October 17<sup>th</sup> 2012 and three  $m_N$  2+ events in November 2012. A  $m_N$  2.4 event followed on March 23<sup>rd</sup> 2013. The 2013 Chapleau events are part of a mini-swarm of events that began in 2012. A comparison of the waveforms indicated that the 2012 events in the Chapleau series were from various distinct locations within the general region; it is recommended that that analysis be repeated in a few years after some more nearby events have been located. The Chapleau region had seen only a few events prior to 2012, and none prior to 1982. While 2012 might have marked the beginning of recent activity, the sparse activity in our catalogue could also be due to: a) the poor coverage of this region prior to the 1982 commencement of this northern Ontario project restricting the detection of small (magnitude ~2.5) events; b) the low rate of larger events in the region (for magnitude



3.5+); and c) the quality of the data available prior to the installation of the continuous, digital network (circa 1990 - 2000).

A minor swarm (10 events, largest was  $m_N$  2.5) occurred 50 km northwest of Atikokan on October 17-19<sup>th</sup>, and was followed by two more events in the next 18 days. This area was active at a lower rate in 2012.

Figure 2 shows all the earthquakes that have been located in northern Ontario and surrounding area, since the inception of the northern Ontario seismic program in 1982. A total of 1272 earthquakes are documented during this period.

Figure 3 shows only those events that are magnitude 3 or greater recorded in the study area during the same time period of 32 years (69 events). The pattern of all seismicity echoes the pattern of the larger events, though the Thunder Bay – Atikokan area, which is active with many small earthquakes, has not yet had an event above magnitude 3.

Figure 4 illustrates the seismic activity in eastern Canada in year 2013. As can be clearly observed, the number of earthquakes documented in northern Ontario represents one of the lower densities in eastern Canada. This figure also indicates the generally low level of seismic activity in southern Ontario. Note that the threshold of completeness varies across eastern Canada, with the southern more populated areas having completeness thresholds down to  $m_N$  2.5 or even lower in some areas, and less populated areas like northern Quebec being complete to only about  $m_N$  3.

Figure 5 shows all the activity in eastern Canada for the entire monitoring period of 1982 - 2013. This figure also shows relatively few earthquakes of magnitude greater than 3 in northern Ontario as compared to the Ottawa and St. Lawrence valleys and the Appalachians of eastern Canada. Within the southern half of northern Ontario, the central part (Hearst-Nipigon) has fewer earthquakes than the eastern or western parts. In the northern half of northern Ontario, James Bay (and southern Hudson Bay) appears to be more active than the onshore region. Ma et al. (2008) suggest that the reason for this earthquake activity in the James Bay region is linked with deep structures reactivated by hot spots.

Figure 6 shows the earthquakes located in the study area in 2013 together with some mine blasts for the same year. Many mine blasts are repetitive (same location at similar times each day) and are dismissed without being located by the analyst, based on their experience. Events that occur at unusual times or in unusual places are investigated as mining-induced events or as potential earthquakes. It can be difficult or even impossible to distinguish between blasts, earthquakes and mining-induced events solely on the basis of the recorded waveforms. Hence confirmation is sought for unusual events from any nearby mine or quarry, a time-consuming process that is further complicated by possible construction blasts. On plots like Figure 6 any proximity of blast and earthquake symbols leads to checking as to whether a blast might have been misidentified as an earthquake. In 2013 one such proximity led to the re-examination of the August 22<sup>nd</sup> earthquake near GTO. This is still considered an earthquake, based on its waveforms, it occurring late in the day for surface blasting, and the absence of any nearby mine or quarry.

Figure 7 shows the earthquakes located in the study area in 2013 together with all known earthquakes. The representation, using red-filled circles for the 2013 earthquakes and open grey circles for the prior activity, makes it easy to judge which 2013 earthquakes happened in regions of prior seismicity, as well as, which areas of past activity did not have an earthquake in

2013. Three of these “quiet” areas are evident: the northwest trend of seismicity east of KAPO, the region south of SUNO and EEO, and the region northeast of PKLO.

As in the past, a strong Rg-phase was present on many events. Rg-phases are a feature of shallow earthquakes, mine blasts, and mining-induced events. For many of these events over the past years, no known operating mines are located nearby, and the time of day on some of these events are not within daylight hours when surface mines, construction crews or quarries would be blasting. These facts support that the events are earthquakes, but with a shallow source.

Figure 8 shows an earthquake that occurred northwest of Atikokan on December 27<sup>th</sup>, 2013 which exhibited strong Rg-phases. The presence of this phase indicates that the depth of the event must have been shallow: less than 5 km in depth. (See Section 4.2.1 for further discussion on depth).

Depths of moderate-sized events in eastern Canada cannot be directly calculated unless there are at least three stations within 50 km of the epicentre. Station spacing in northern Ontario tends to average from 200 km to 300 km. However, using the Regional Depth Phase Modelling (RDPM) method and the presence of Rg phases, depths of some events have been determined. The actual and synthetic waveforms from the station at KAPO are shown for the  $m_N$  3.8 earthquake which occurred 66 km north of Chapleau, ON on February 19<sup>th</sup>, 2013 in Figure 9. The waveforms from this station indicate a depth of 8.0 km, which is the same depth as for the nearby  $m_N$  3.9 event on September 22<sup>nd</sup> 2012.

Recurrence curves for the study area for the year 2013 and for the period of 1987 to the end of 2013 (27 years of data) are shown in Figure 10 and are discussed in more detail in Section 6.

Data for all stations are available in continuous data archive files at CHIS. All the archived data can be accessed on-line on the CHIS AutoDRM web site at:

<http://www.earthquakescanada.nrcan.gc.ca/stndon/AutoDRM/index-eng.php>

Individual event files can be accessed at:

<http://www.earthquakescanada.nrcan.gc.ca/stndon/NWFA-ANFO/index-eng.php>

The data are available in SEED, GSE, CA and INT format. SEED and GSE are the standard formats in seismology, as is the AutoDRM protocol. CA is a format developed and used at CHIS and INT is an integer format. Descriptions of all these formats are also available on the web sites.

## **4. LOCATION ACCURACY IN NORTHERN ONTARIO**

### **4.1 PARAMETERS**

The minimum requirements to locate an earthquake are 3 stations and 5 phases (P-wave, S-wave). The four basic (independent) parameters calculated for any earthquake location are latitude, longitude, depth and origin time. Additional phases are required in order to estimate the uncertainty of the location. Some events may have aftershocks that are visible on less than 3 stations, sometimes only on the single closest station. In these cases judgement is used to label the event an aftershock (often based on the short interval after a larger event and similar waveforms on the closest station). The event is assigned to the location of the larger, well-located event, and then the available seismograph readings are used to determine the origin

time and magnitude of the aftershock. All earthquakes in Table 1 were determined from 3 or more stations.

The three crucial variables associated with the calculations of earthquake parameters are: clarity of phase arrival (particularly important when working with minimal data), azimuthal coverage, and the accuracy of the crustal models used (e.g. seismic velocity models and composition of the earth's layers). It is assumed that station timing is precise because they use clocks linked to GPS. The number of stations and phases used in determining the location of each earthquake is included in Table 1.

## 4.2 LIMITATIONS

Location accuracy in northern Ontario is to a degree hampered by the fact that:

- i. Because of socio-geographical constraints several of the original stations were more or less in a straight line, so azimuthal coverage was not ideal; this has been improved by the addition of the newer, temporary stations;
- ii. Stations are widely spaced so that phase arrivals may be ambiguous (as a rule the closer the station the sharper the arrival);
- iii. Distances larger than 100 km between stations contributes to a lack of phase data for small events ( $m_N < 2$ );
- iv. Some places have more background noise, which can also mask the phase arrivals on nearby stations; and
- v. Depths are approximated, as discussed in Section 4.2.1.

The uncertainties associated with earthquake locations (and in particular, for events of magnitude 2.0 or less) must be taken into consideration when attempting to relate these events to specific geological features or trends. As a result, caution must be exercised when assessing other derived values, including epicentre and origin time. Accurate locations are an important and necessary component of any probabilistic model using geological structures to assess seismic hazard, even though the probability of a future earthquake is not simply a function of previous seismic activity at a particular place.

For the current network, assuming all stations are recording optimally, a magnitude 2 event located within the network (that is to say, the epicentre was surrounded by stations on all sides), will have an approximate location accuracy of  $\pm 10$  km. As the event gets larger, and the recordings on the stations get clearer, the associated error decreases. Being able to determine the depth of an earthquake will further decrease this error. In the Atikokan region, where there is currently a slightly higher density of stations, this error is likely closer to  $\pm 5$  km, and less if the approximate depth is known.

On the other hand, for events located to one side of the network (in particular to the west and north), the location accuracy will decrease as the epicentre will not be well surrounded. This means that any inaccuracy in the velocity model will not be corrected by recordings from the opposite site. This location inaccuracy will get bigger as the epicentre is located further from the network.

Also, as the size of the event decreases, the number of stations that clearly record that event will decrease, and the onset of the phases will become less clear. This will increase the amount of error associated with an epicentre. Similarly a station which stops recording or which is noisy will have the same effect on the location uncertainty as a decrease in magnitude.

#### 4.2.1 Focal Depth

Stevens (1994) in her paper dealing with earthquakes located in the Lake Ontario region warns of taking into account the reliability of earthquake parameters before proposing a seismotectonic model. She noted that determining an accurate epicentre using direct calculation for a particular event requires that the recording stations be fairly evenly distributed in azimuth about the epicentre (to allow triangulation). In addition, an accurate estimate of depth within the crust requires that several of these stations be located close to the epicentre, at distances smaller than the local crustal thickness (approximately 30-50 km). In general, unless a special network of closely-spaced stations has been installed to study a small area (the Charlevoix, Quebec network being one example), station spacings are seldom less than 50 km. Thus few earthquakes will be recorded within 50 km of more than one station, and depth cannot be directly calculated, but is instead assumed, as is the case in the study area. Where depth of earthquake activity in continental terranes is well known (Charlevoix area for example) earthquake depths seldom exceed 30 km and mostly fall between 10 and 20 km. For eastern Canada, the default depth is generally assumed to be mid-crust, i.e. 18 km, and this is used as the default depth for northern Ontario earthquakes when no other data is available.

There are ways of determining earthquake depth other than direct calculation. The key method has relied on phases recorded on the far side of the earth that have been reflected off the earth's surface, the difference in travel time between the direct, downward arrival and the surface reflection thus establishes the earthquake's depth. However, none of the earthquakes in northern Ontario, in 2013 or in any previous year since the study began in 1982, have been large enough to be recorded clearly at such great distances. A modification of this method, the Regional Depth Phase Modelling (RDPM) method, that uses regional depth phases and does not require close station spacing has been developed by Ma (2004) in conjunction with CHIS seismologists and is now being applied to the larger eastern Canadian earthquakes (generally  $m_N 3+$ , although depending on the stations and their distribution around the epicentre, this number can be lower). Ma states, "The regional depth phase sPg and sPmP are very sensitive to focal depth. sPg depth phase develops well generally at distance between about 60 to 120 km for earthquakes, some as small as  $m_N 1.5$ . sPmP depth phase develops well at distances of about 130 to 300 km (actually existing as far as about 600 km). Beyond 300 km, the identification of the phase becomes a problem. With regional depth phase sPmP, we can reliably estimate focal depth by modelling waveforms recorded at stations more than 200 km away for an earthquake with  $m_N$  about 2.5. With regional depth phase sPg, we can reliably estimate focal depth by modelling waveforms recorded at stations about 60 km away for an earthquake with  $m_N$  about 2.0. In short, we can reliably estimate focal depth with regional depth phase modelling method for moderate and small earthquakes without records from nearby stations in northern Ontario." (Ma, 2004, p.3).

Further work using RDPM modelling was done by Ma and Atkinson (2006) for earthquakes from the neighbouring regions of the West Quebec seismic zone, and in southern Ontario for 1980 – 2004. It was noted that events deeper than 15 km were limited to specific regions, while the shallower events were found over the entire region. A paper based on the Ma (2004) contract report for CHIS and extended with subsequent work appeared as Ma et al., (2008). Figure 9 shows an application of RDPM to a 2013 event and shows the match of the observed to the synthetic waveforms generated for shallower and deeper depths.

A second method of depth determination involves the modelling of the relatively long-period phase Rg. Rg waves are strongly excited by shallow (<5 km depth) events (e.g. Figure 8) and

are nearly always present in surface explosions. The presence of a strong Rg-phase for some of the earthquakes indicated that the depths of these events were likely 5 km or shallower, and generally a 5 km depth has been assigned for these events. A paper based on work using the period of the maximum power Rg/Sg spectral ratio to determine depths of small shallow events in eastern Canada by Ma and Motazedian (2011) suggests that resolution better than 5 km or less can be achieved.

Table 3 lists all the events from 2013 in northern Ontario that had an Rg phase present, and are therefore known to be shallow (most are fixed at 5 km depth, but some with unusually strong Rg are fixed at 1 km depth), as well as the one event, which was well enough recorded at suitable distance for a reliable depth to be determined using the RDPM method.

#### 4.2.2 Velocity Models

The present velocity model for determining earthquake epicentres in northern Ontario is the standard model of 36 km thick crust for the Canadian Shield. This model uses the following seismic velocities:

Pg 6.2 km/s	(crustal)
Pn 8.2 km/s	(direct longitudinal wave that has passed below the continental layers)
Sn 4.7 km/s	(direct transverse wave that has passed below the continental layers)
Sg 3.57 km/s	(crustal)
Crustal thickness	36 km

A Lithoprobe seismic experiment carried out throughout northern Ontario in the summer of 1996 yielded a suite of small magnitude explosions whose epicentres, depths and origin time were precisely known. Using results from this experiment, G. Musacchio et al. (2004) found:

- Large variations in lower crustal velocities (6.7 -7.5 km/s)
- Higher upper mantle velocities (8.0 – 8.8 km/s);
- Crustal thickness variations (31 - 45 km); and
- An 8% azimuthal crustal velocity anisotropy.

Work by Bent and Kao (2006) using teleseismic receiver functions have also found that the crustal thickness varied from 35 – 45 km under many of the stations in eastern and central Canada, with the majority being in the thicker range, from 40 – 42 km. A strong anisotropy is also noted by Darbyshire and Lebedev (2006) in their work using surface wave analysis. Motazedian et al. (2013) used Rayleigh wave dispersion to calculate shear wave velocities for the eastern North America region.

The different models proposed would need to be assessed to determine which one (or combination thereof) would be most appropriate, for the region under consideration for this study, as would the consequences of applying such a model for the earthquake locations in this report. If the velocities in the lower crust and upper mantle are higher than the current model, this might mean that the earthquakes are farther away from the recording stations than currently computed. However, the effects of using a poor velocity model are greatest when the station

distribution is poor, and at the current time the excellent station distribution reduces the effects significantly. That was not the case for the 1982-2003 epicentres, recorded by few stations mainly on an east-west line. Therefore some of those epicentres may be biased (probably towards being too close to the line of stations) relative to the current ones.

## 5. MAGNITUDE CALCULATION

Earthquake size is expressed by magnitude, a mathematical quantity derived from the amplitude of seismic signals recorded at a given distance. For regional-scale monitoring of eastern Canada and for this report, most magnitudes are based on the Nuttli magnitude scale ( $m_N$ ), a variation on the Richter scale ( $M_L$ ). The magnitude scale is a logarithmic scale, so that a 10-fold decrease of earthquake size decreases the magnitude by 1. For example, the amplitude read off a seismograph record for a magnitude 1 earthquake is ten times bigger than the amplitude for a magnitude 0 earthquake and 100 times bigger than the amplitude for a magnitude -1 earthquake. Negative magnitudes are found for very weak events not felt by humans but recorded by extremely sensitive seismographs. Magnitude 3 earthquakes are generally big enough to be felt (if they occur close to populated areas) and magnitude 5 events are generally large enough to cause minor property damage.

The magnitude of an earthquake is determined by averaging the estimates made at each recording station, and so the precision of the final magnitude can be computed. As typical precisions are about 0.1 magnitude units (for the standard error of the mean), the errors in the magnitude are not considered further in the discussion.

For purposes of international comparison, it is useful to express earthquake magnitude in terms of moment magnitude ( $M_w$ ). Bent (2011) suggests that for Nuttli magnitudes above  $\sim 3$  the post-1997 relationship is  $M_w = m_N - 0.53$ , so as an approximation this relation could be applied to the smaller  $m_N$  magnitudes in this report.

## 6. EARTHQUAKE OCCURRENCE RATES

As stated in the Introduction, the annual frequency of earthquakes of a given magnitude is a logarithmic function of magnitude. The function, termed a magnitude-recurrence curve, can be established by fitting the northern Ontario earthquakes on a log of cumulative frequency versus magnitude plot. To establish the most reliable recurrence curve it is necessary to include earthquakes for the longest period of time possible. The dataset for  $m_N > 3$  is considered complete since 1987, providing 27 years of data for the less-common larger earthquakes.

Figure 10 shows the magnitude-recurrence plot for the year 2013 earthquakes in black and the plot for the 27-year period of 1987 to 2013 inclusive in red. The standard statistics for the curve fits are given in the boxes. For each dataset the middle line represents the best fit curve, while the outer lines indicate the error bounds.

The 2013 curve is lower than the longer-term curve, but with a much greater uncertainty. For the year-2013 a best fit slope of  $b = 1.271 \pm 0.22$  was found, versus  $1.168 \pm 0.05$  for the 27-year period curve. Note that the data points of the one-year curve (black) are very similar to the ones of the 27-year curve (red) at the lower magnitudes near 2.0, but the occurrence of the single  $m_N$  3.8 plots above the curve (expected rate is 1-in-5-years) and the rate of magnitude 2.4 to 2.8

events is about 50% lower than the long-term average. Fluctuations like these are expected, as a single year's worth of data is not considered enough time to generate a statistically-significant curve for this region of relatively low seismicity in which the repeat time for events larger than 4 is close to a decade. A more detailed discussion of magnitude-recurrence curves and comparisons amongst different years and for different time periods for the northern Ontario region was given in Section 6 and Appendix A of report NWMO TR-2007-02 (Hayek et al, 2007).

## **7. MINING-INDUCED ACTIVITY**

CHIS does not document mining-induced events or mining activity in a comprehensive manner, as this does not fall within our mandate. The only routinely located mining events are blasts and suspicious events larger than  $m_N 2.5$ , or events where there is a request from the mine for information. Literally hundreds of blasts are recorded and identified by the project on a yearly basis. Locations were determined for 69 mining-induced seismic events of magnitude 0.5 or greater in the study area in 2013. Thirty of these events occurred in the Sudbury Basin, 11 in the Red Lake region, 27 in the Cadillac, QC region, and 1 in the Timmins area. Ten of these mining-induced events recorded in the study area in 2013 were larger than  $m_N 2.5$  and are listed in Table 4.

## **8. SUMMARY**

Data capture was in excess of 96% from six of the seven core seismograph stations, and in excess of 92% for six of the nine POLARIS-type installations. Many of the solar powered sites, experienced power failure and had poor telecommunications during the winter months, especially January, February, November and December. SILO dropped out in 2010 due to faulty components and unfortunately no maintenance trip could be made to this site in 2013.

The seismic activity in the study area during the calendar year 2013 consisted of 70 earthquakes ranging in magnitude from 0.9 to 3.8. Thirty-four earthquakes were larger than  $m_N 2.0$ , and only one was  $m_N 3.0$  or larger. The largest event,  $m_N 3.8$ , occurred 66 km north of Chapleau, ON, on February 19<sup>th</sup>. Based on the logarithmic frequency-magnitude relationship, mentioned in Section 1, the distribution of magnitudes indicates that a few earthquakes near  $m_N 2.0$  and many smaller remain undetected.

The distribution of the majority of the detected earthquakes in this region for 2013 conformed to the pattern of previous seismicity. However, no events occurred in three regions of previous low-level seismicity.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

The authors would like to thank CHIS staff for helping to develop and maintain the programs used to gather data for this report and POLARIS and UWO for all the additional data from their network. A special thanks to Richard Crowe and other staff from NWMO for reviewing this report.

## REFERENCES

- Bent, A. L. 2011. Moment magnitude ( $M_w$ ) conversion relations for use in hazard assessments in eastern Canada, *Seismological Research Letters*, v. 82, p. 984-990.  
doi:10.1785/gssrl.82.6.984.
- Bent, A., and H. Kao. 2006. Crustal structure for eastern and central Canada from an improved neighbourhood algorithm inversion. *Seismological Research Letters*, v.77, p 297.
- Darbyshire, F.A, and S. Lebedev. 2006. Variations in lithospheric structure and anisotropy beneath the Superior and Grenville Provinces, Ontario. *POLARIS Ontario Research Workshop*, pp. 19-22.
- Hayek, S., J.A. Drysdale, V. Peci, S. Halchuk, J. Adams, and P. Street. 2007. Seismic Activity in Northern Ontario Portion of the Canadian Shield: Annual Progress Report for the Period January 01 – December 31, 2006. NWMO TR-2007-02.
- Ma, S. 2004. Focal depth investigation for earthquakes from 1980 to 2003 in northern Ontario using Regional Depth Phase (sPg, SPmP) Modelling (RDPM) Method and surface waves. Research Contract Report to CHIS, Contract NRCan-04-0601, pp. 1-111.
- Ma, S., and G.M. Atkinson. 2006. Focal Depths for Small to Moderate Earthquakes ( $m_N \geq 2.8$ ) in Western Quebec, Southern Ontario, and Northern New York. *Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America*, Vol. 9, No. 2, pp. 609-623
- Ma, S., D.W. Eaton and J. Adams. 2008. Intraplate Seismicity of a Recently Deglaciated Shield Terrane: A Case Study from Northern Ontario, Canada. *Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America*, Dec. 2008; 98: 2828 – 2848.
- Ma, S., and D. Motazedian. 2011. Depth Determination of Small Shallow Earthquakes in Eastern Canada from Maximum Power Rg/Sg Spectral Ratio, *Journal of Seismology*, Vol. 16, No. 2, pp. 107-129.
- Motazedian, D., S. Ma, and S. Crane. 2013. Crustal shear-wave velocity models retrieved from Rayleigh wave dispersion data in northeastern North America, *Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America*. Vol. 103, No. 4.
- Musacchio, G., D.J. White, I. Asudeh, and C.J. Thomson. 2004. Lithospheric structure and composition of the Archean western Superior Province from seismic refraction/wide-angle reflection and gravity modeling. *Journal of Geophysical Research* 109: No. B3. B03304 10.1029/2003JB002427.
- Stevens, A. E. 1994. Earthquakes in the Lake Ontario region: Intermittent scattered activity, not persistent trends. *Geoscience Canada*, Vol. 21, 105-111.
- US Array, Incorporated Research Institutions for Seismology. 2013. <http://www.usarray.org/> (accessed May 2013).



**Table 1: Located Local Earthquakes, January - December 2013**

Date	Time (UT)	Latitude	Longitude	#stns/ phases	Magnitude (m <sub>N</sub> )	Region and Comment
2013-01-08	00:31:53	49.17N	89.63W	4/ 8	1.8	86 km NW from Mackenzie, ON. Felt
2013-01-19	06:47:53	51.69N	92.04W	4/ 7	2.0	130 km W from Pickle Lake, ON
2013-01-27	10:29:08	47.43N	78.39W	7/13	1.9	81 km S from Malartic, QC
2013-01-29	10:37:25	50.33N	88.68W	5/ 8	1.6	55 km E from Collins, ON
2013-02-01	23:56:18	52.55N	79.66W	6/12	2.8	James Bay
2013-02-07	01:02:11	48.13N	80.06W	8/14	2.2	3 km SW from Kirkland Lake, ON.
2013-02-19	04:59:44	48.42N	83.30W	8/10	3.8	66 km N from Chapleau, ON
2013-02-25	12:27:35	50.25N	92.60W	3/ 5	1.5	47 km NW from Sioux Lookout, ON
2013-02-25	22:36:54	50.19N	92.60W	4/ 7	1.5	46 km W from Sioux Lookout, ON
2013-03-07	03:57:02	50.90N	94.59W	4/ 8	2.4	62 km W from Red Lake, ON
2013-03-08	08:41:34	48.73N	91.21W	4/ 7	1.7	30 km E from Atikokan, ON
2013-03-11	20:42:32	48.16N	80.05W	9/15	2.2	1 km NW from Kirkland Lake, ON.
2013-03-21	14:14:08	51.14N	83.63W	5/ 9	2.4	163 km N from Hearst, ON
2013-03-23	00:24:12	48.34N	83.32W	5/10	2.4	54 km N from Chapleau, ON
2013-03-29	21:50:20	53.96N	80.95W	3/ 5	2.2	James Bay
2013-04-29	23:04:21	49.03N	91.85W	4/ 8	1.3	36 km NW from Atikokan, ON
2013-04-30	06:42:51	53.17N	78.98W	6/10	2.4	James Bay
2013-05-20	20:45:40	46.87N	78.94W	5/10	1.9	21 km NE from Temiscaming, QC
2013-06-01	15:25:38	49.02N	90.86W	5/ 9	1.7	63 km NE from Atikokan, ON
2013-06-04	00:36:20	49.04N	90.87W	3/ 6	0.9	63 km NE from Atikokan, ON
2013-06-07	06:13:16	53.60N	81.87W	3/ 6	2.1	James Bay
2013-06-25	17:46:51	52.00N	79.94W	3/ 5	2.1	James Bay
2013-06-27	01:28:21	53.87N	81.68W	3/ 6	1.9	James Bay
2013-08-06	13:40:51	46.57N	79.29W	5/10	2.0	22 km SW from Temiscaming, QC
2013-08-11	08:16:21	47.79N	78.53W	6/11	2.1	48 km SW from Malartic, QC
2013-08-14	08:28:12	52.53N	79.26W	3/ 5	1.9	James Bay
2013-08-15	13:20:36	46.37N	78.15W	3/22	2.4	43 km E from Mattawa, ON
2013-08-19	08:44:44	51.00N	93.73W	4/ 8	1.8	Red Lake, ON
2013-08-22	00:25:50	49.81N	86.65W	6/11	2.0	9 km W from Longlac, ON
2013-08-25	05:07:56	52.88N	80.20W	4/ 7	1.9	James Bay
2013-08-25	20:45:26	52.62N	80.45W	5/ 8	2.2	James Bay
2013-08-31	12:07:21	48.95N	92.25W	6/10	1.6	51 km NW from Atikokan, ON
2013-08-31	23:52:26	50.14N	94.01W	6/ 9	2.4	47 km NE from Kenora, ON
2013-09-04	15:58:33	49.83N	92.17W	4/ 6	1.5	30 km SW from Sioux Lookout, ON
2013-09-04	19:41:07	49.84N	92.19W	7/12	2.3	29 km SW from Sioux Lookout, ON
2013-09-06	22:57:57	49.97N	90.76W	5/ 9	1.5	52 km SW from Allanwater Bridge,
2013-09-08	00:04:05	49.03N	90.90W	7/13	1.9	61 km NE from Atikokan, ON
2013-09-10	06:56:32	52.55N	80.13W	5/ 8	2.0	James Bay
2013-09-11	10:20:27	49.82N	92.14W	8/14	2.1	30 km S from Sioux Lookout, ON
2013-09-19	12:40:53	49.82N	92.11W	5/ 9	1.4	29 km S from Sioux Lookout, ON
2013-09-21	17:00:34	52.04N	81.36W	3/ 6	2.2	92 km NW from Moosonee, ON
2013-09-24	07:17:19	48.23N	78.45W	6/11	2.5	26 km NW from Malartic, QC
2013-10-08	03:57:41	47.55N	78.40W	6/11	2.0	67 km S from Malartic, QC
2013-10-10	02:50:16	51.50N	92.69W	3/ 6	2.0	87 km NE from Red Lake, ON
2013-10-10	08:58:11	46.82N	78.90W	8/16	2.1	20 km NE from Temiscaming, QC
2013-10-14	00:37:15	49.63N	91.97W	6/12	2.2	49 km S from Sioux Lookout, ON
2013-10-17	20:00:42	49.09N	92.05W	6/10	2.5	49 km NW from Atikokan, ON

2013-10-17	20:13:24	49.09N	92.04W	4/ 7	1.5	49 km NW from Atikokan, ON
2013-10-17	20:22:25	49.09N	92.05W	3/ 6	1.5	49 km NW from Atikokan, ON
2013-10-17	20:24:57	49.08N	92.08W	3/ 6	1.2	50 km NW from Atikokan, ON
2013-10-17	21:26:26	49.09N	92.05W	5/ 9	1.8	49 km NW from Atikokan, ON
2013-10-17	21:27:44	49.09N	92.04W	4/ 7	1.6	49 km NW from Atikokan, ON
2013-10-17	21:33:17	49.09N	92.05W	6/11	2.1	49 km NW from Atikokan, ON
2013-10-17	23:10:15	49.09N	92.05W	5/ 9	1.8	50 km NW from Atikokan, ON
2013-10-17	23:13:32	49.07N	92.06W	5/ 9	1.4	49 km NW from Atikokan, ON
2013-10-19	01:58:38	49.09N	92.05W	4/ 8	1.5	50 km NW from Atikokan, ON
2013-10-23	00:41:14	49.44N	91.32W	4/ 8	1.6	80 km N from Atikokan, ON
2013-10-26	01:51:07	49.80N	90.51W	5/ 8	1.7	55 km SW from Allanwater Bridge,
2013-10-26	01:52:55	49.80N	90.54W	3/ 6	1.6	56 km SW from Allanwater Bridge,
2013-10-29	02:01:43	49.09N	92.05W	4/ 7	1.6	49 km NW from Atikokan, ON
2013-11-04	02:49:22	49.09N	92.04W	3/ 6	1.3	49 km NW from Atikokan, ON
2013-11-10	20:40:25	48.62N	92.14W	6/11	2.4	41 km W from Atikokan, ON
2013-11-20	10:44:11	51.61N	84.45W	9/13	2.6	204 km SW from Attawapiskat, ON
2013-11-25	04:35:31	46.45N	78.72W	1/21	2.4	15 km N from Mattawa, ON
2013-12-02	15:34:23	49.82N	92.11W	4/ 8	1.4	29 km S from Sioux Lookout, ON
2013-12-22	20:02:13	49.53N	91.56W	5/10	1.5	67 km SE from Sioux Lookout, ON
2013-12-25	00:27:04	49.06N	91.68W	4/ 8	1.1	34 km N from Atikokan, ON
2013-12-27	22:11:19	49.06N	91.24W	5/ 9	2.4	44 km NE from Atikokan, ON
2013-12-28	09:06:53	49.38N	91.96W	3/ 6	1.0	74 km N from Atikokan, ON
2013-12-28	10:43:16	51.07N	93.73W	5/ 8	2.1	Red Lake, ON

**Table 2: NWMO Supported Stations Operating During 2013  
(2012 figures given in brackets)**

Station		Lat (°N)	Long (°W)	Elev (m)	Uptime (%) 2013 (2012)	Dates of operation as digital stations
ULM	Pinawa	50.2503	95.8750	251	100.0 (100.0)	19941207 <sup>1</sup> -
SOLO	Sioux Lookout	50.0213	92.0812	373	93.5 ( 99.0)	19981104-
TBO	Thunder Bay	48.6473	89.4083	468	99.6 ( 96.8)	19931005-
GTO	Geraldton	49.7455	86.9610	350	97.5 ( 99.3)	20010104-
KAPO	Kapuskasing	49.4504	82.5079	210	99.6 ( 97.8)	19980114-
EEO	Eldee	46.6411	79.0733	398	96.1 ( 85.7)	19931005-
CRLO	Chalk River	46.0375	77.3801	168	98.9 ( 98.1)	19941117-
SILO	Sutton Inlier	54.4791	84.9126	195	0.0 ( 0.0)	20030609-
VIMO	Victor Mine	52.8173	83.7449	78	99.9 ( 99.9)	20030611-
MALO	McAlpine Lake	50.0244	79.7635	271	98.0 ( 91.2)	20030620-
KILO	Kirkland Lake	48.4972	79.7232	314	99.8 ( 93.7)	20030622-
SUNO	Sudbury	46.6438	81.3442	343	80.6 ( 86.3)	20030623-
EPLO	Experimental Lake	49.6737	93.7258	437	86.2 ( 81.5)	20040611-
ATKO	Atikokan	48.8231	91.6004	383	92.1 ( 88.1)	20040609-
PKLO	Pickle Lake	51.4987	90.3522	376	93.6 ( 92.2)	20040615-
PNPO	Pukaskwa Nat. Park	48.5957	86.2846	219	94.2 ( 90.7)	20040618-

<sup>1</sup>The date of operation of the core CNSN stations (ULM, SOLO, TBO, GTO, KAPO, EEO and CRLO) is the date since the station was upgraded to be a continuous digital station, not the date when the station was first installed.

Notes: The following summary lists major outages that affected station operation times in 2013.

- SOLO and EPLO communications were affected by accumulated snow in the VSAT dish antenna. SOLO was out during the intervals January 1<sup>st</sup> to 2<sup>nd</sup>, February 18<sup>th</sup> to 22<sup>nd</sup>, November 17<sup>th</sup> to 18<sup>th</sup>, and December 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup>. EPLO was out from November 28<sup>th</sup> into December.
- SOLO dropped out from April 30<sup>th</sup> to May 17<sup>th</sup>. The telecommunications became misconfigured for unknown reasons, and had to be reprogrammed by the provider.
- GTO, EEO and CRLO experienced outages probably due to loss of main power. GTO was out on June 26<sup>th</sup> and 27<sup>th</sup>, and from December 22<sup>nd</sup> to 23<sup>rd</sup>. EEO was out from January 1<sup>st</sup> to 11<sup>th</sup>, and on November 1<sup>st</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup>. CRLO dropped out during intervals in July, and was out from October 27<sup>th</sup> to 28<sup>th</sup>.
- GTO station equipment had to be power cycled to restore data flow after outages from January 18<sup>th</sup> to 23<sup>rd</sup>, and from October 2<sup>nd</sup> to 4<sup>th</sup>.
- EEO dropped out during intervals in July. The satellite telecommunications service provider replaced their transmitter, and repointed the dish antenna.
- The EEO digitizer was replaced on September 16<sup>th</sup> to improve data quality. The replacement digitizer had a GPS timing problem, and resulted in lost data. The timing was corrected on September 17<sup>th</sup>.
- SILO remains out since 2010 due to faulty station components. A repair trip to the site is required.
- Solar powered sites dropped out due to low battery voltage during parts of winter. MALO, SUNO, EPLO, ATKO, PKLO, and PNPO dropped out during intervals from November 2012 to March 2013. SUNO and EPLO dropped out during intervals starting from December 2013.
- A data acquisition computer partially hung on October 16<sup>th</sup> affecting data availability from several stations (VIMO, MALO, KILO, SUNO, EPLO, ATKO, PKLO, PNPO).


**Table 3: Depths Derived using Rg-phases and Regional Depth Phase Method (RDPM) for Moderate-sized Events for 2013**

Date	Time (UT)	Magnitude	Depth	Depth type	Region and Comment
mm/dd	hh:mm:ss	( $m_N$ )	(km)	Rg/RDPM	
01/08	00:31:53	1.8	5	Rg	86 km NW from Mackenzie, ON. Felt
01/27	10:29:08	1.9	1	Rg	81 km S from Malartic, QC
01/29	10:37:25	1.6	5	Rg	55 km E from Collins, ON
02/07	01:02:11	2.2	5	Rg	3 km SW from Kirkland Lake, ON.
02/19	04:59:44	3.8	8	RDPM	66 km N from Chapleau, ON
02/25	12:27:35	1.5	5	Rg	47 km NW from Sioux Lookout, ON
02/25	22:36:54	1.5	5	Rg	46 km W from Sioux Lookout, ON
03/08	08:41:34	1.7	5	Rg	30 km E from Atikokan, ON
03/11	20:42:32	2.2	5	Rg	1 km NW from Kirkland Lake, ON.
03/23	00:24:12	2.4	5	Rg	54 km N from Chapleau, ON
04/29	23:04:21	1.3	5	Rg	36 km NW from Atikokan, ON
06/01	15:25:38	1.7	5	Rg	63 km NE from Atikokan, ON
06/04	00:36:20	0.9	5	Rg	63 km NE from Atikokan, ON
08/19	08:44:44	1.8	1	Rg	Red Lake, ON
08/22	00:25:50	2.0	5	Rg	9 km W from Longlac, ON
08/31	12:07:21	1.6	5	Rg	51 km NW from Atikokan, ON
08/31	23:52:26	2.4	5	Rg	47 km NE from Kenora, ON
09/04	15:58:33	1.5	1	Rg	30 km SW from Sioux Lookout, ON
09/04	19:41:07	2.3	1	Rg	29 km SW from Sioux Lookout, ON
09/06	22:57:57	1.5	5	Rg	52 km SW from Allanwater Bridge,
09/08	00:04:05	1.9	5	Rg	61 km NE from Atikokan, ON
09/11	10:20:27	2.1	5	Rg	30 km S from Sioux Lookout, ON
09/19	12:40:53	1.4	5	Rg	29 km S from Sioux Lookout, ON
09/24	07:17:19	2.5	1	Rg	26 km NW from Malartic, QC
10/14	00:37:15	2.2	5	Rg	49 km S from Sioux Lookout, ON
10/17	20:00:42	2.5	5	Rg	49 km NW from Atikokan, ON
10/17	20:13:24	1.5	5	Rg	49 km NW from Atikokan, ON
10/17	20:22:25	1.5	5	Rg	49 km NW from Atikokan, ON
10/17	20:24:57	1.2	5	Rg	50 km NW from Atikokan, ON
10/17	21:26:26	1.8	5	Rg	49 km NW from Atikokan, ON
10/17	21:27:44	1.6	5	Rg	49 km NW from Atikokan, ON
10/17	21:33:17	2.1	5	Rg	49 km NW from Atikokan, ON
10/17	23:10:15	1.8	5	Rg	50 km NW from Atikokan, ON
10/17	23:13:32	1.4	5	Rg	49 km NW from Atikokan, ON
10/19	01:58:38	1.5	5	Rg	50 km NW from Atikokan, ON
10/23	00:41:14	1.6	5	Rg	80 km N from Atikokan, ON
10/26	01:51:07	1.7	5	Rg	55 km SW from Allanwater Bridge,
10/26	01:52:55	1.6	5	Rg	56 km SW from Allanwater Bridge,
10/29	02:01:43	1.6	5	Rg	49 km NW from Atikokan, ON
11/04	02:49:22	1.3	5	Rg	49 km NW from Atikokan, ON
11/10	20:40:25	2.4	5	Rg	41 km W from Atikokan, ON
12/02	15:34:23	1.4	5	Rg	29 km S from Sioux Lookout, ON
12/22	20:02:13	1.5	5	Rg	67 km SE from Sioux Lookout, ON


12/25	00:27:04	1.1	5	Rg	34 km N from Atikokan, ON
12/27	22:11:19	2.4	1	Rg	44 km NE from Atikokan, ON
12/28	09:06:53	1.0	5	Rg	74 km N from Atikokan, ON
12/28	10:43:16	2.1	1	Rg	Red Lake, ON

**Table 4: Mining-Induced Seismic Events  $m_N$  2.5 and Greater,  
January - December 2013**

<b>Date (yyyy/mm/dd)</b>	<b>Mine</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Magnitude (<math>m_N</math>)</b>
2013-01-18	Laronde Mine	Cadillac,	2.8
2013-01-22	Laronde Mine	Cadillac,	2.6
2013-05-11	Creighton	Sudbury	2.6
2013-05-11	Creighton	Sudbury	2.7
2013-05-13	Creighton	Sudbury	2.8
2013-07-02	Coleman Mine	Sudbury	2.8
2013-08-31	Cadillac,	Cadillac,	3.0
2013-09-04	Laronde Mine	Cadillac	3.4
2013-11-02	Garson Mine	Sudbury	2.8
2013-11-15	Creighton	Sudbury	2.5




**Figure 1: Earthquakes in Northern Ontario and Adjacent Areas, 2013**




**Figure 2: Earthquakes in Northern Ontario and Adjacent Areas, 1982 - 2013**






**Figure 3: Earthquakes  $m_N \geq 3$  in Northern Ontario and Adjacent Areas, 1982 – 2013**



**Figure 4: Earthquakes in Eastern Canada, 2013**



Earthquakes plotted for the region within dashed lines

**Figure 5: Earthquakes in Eastern Canada, 1982 - 2013**






Figure 6: Earthquakes and Blasts in Northern Ontario and Adjacent Areas, 2013







**Figure 7: Earthquakes in Northern Ontario and Adjacent Areas for 2013 and prior years**



**Figure 8: Rg Surface Waves from the  $m_N$  2.4 on 2013/12/27, 44 km NE of Atikokan, ON**



**Figure 9: Observed and Synthetic Waveforms from the  $m_N$  3.8 on 2013/02/19, 66 km north of Chapleau, ON**



**Figure 10: Recurrence Curves for Northern Ontario**