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## 1 Introduction

Yuma Exploration and Production Company Inc. (www.yumaexploration.com) is planning a seismic survey covering 160 square miles ( 414 square kilometers) in Livingston Parish. The survey area begins east of the Livingston site and continues to the west. This is a 3-D survey employing explosive charges at depths of 40 to 100 feet ( 12 to 31 m ). Their plan is for a source density of 58 sources per square mile detected with 68 instrument stations per square mile. Nominally this implies a distance of approximately 300 feet ( 100 m ) between explosion sites. To deal with areas that are hard to instrument or drill and to avoid structures or water wells they can "offset" their pattern or sources and receivers. They normally stay at least 400 feet ( 122 m ) from buildings and wells, and in preliminary discussions have indicated that staying 800 feet ( 244 m ) from the LIGO central and end stations should be possible. Figure 1 shows the survey map for the area around the Observatory.

YUMA employs several subcontractors to acquire necessary permits (Exploration Land Services), to evaluate the survey effects on structures and wells (Urban Seismic Specialists), to perform the drilling and shoot the explosives (CGGVeritas). Urban Seismic Specialists try to ensure that the maximum ground velocity at 400 feet from the shot is $0.35 \mathrm{in} / \mathrm{s}(8.9 \mathrm{e}-3 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s})$ although in practice they say that they are usually an order of magnitude below this).

Initially the survey will deploy drilling buggies to place the charges. These are rugged all-terrain vehicles which can easily travel through light forest (where the tree boles are 3 in in thickness or less). The actual shots are expected to be fired in March or April of 2009. Typically they can survey 70 square miles per month, so they expect to blast for 2.5 months. Blasting within 2 miles of any corner station should last from 2 to 4 weeks. This is a daytime activity only.

Commissioning activities during the daytime will be impaired by the extra seismic noise, especially when the survey team is in the immediate vicinity of the lab. What follows is a preliminary look at some test explosions with an eye to judging their impact on the detector from both an operational and safety viewpoint.

## 2 Test Blasts

On October 282008 CGGVeritas conducted 23 test explosions at a location 4.5 km from the LLO corner station. We attempted to monitor the explosions in the field using a Streckeisen STS-2 seismometer and two L4-C geophones, one oriented vertically and one horizontally. These instruments were set up 15 m from the closest sources and about 125 m from the furthest. In practice this proved to be far too close and the instruments saturated for many of the blasts. The STS-2 data was not useable and that instrument was locked down to prevent it from being damaged. Some of the blasts saturated our on-site STS-2 channels at the corner and end stations. We were however able to get good data from several of the blasts locally, and from all of the blasts using the Guralp seismometers at the corner and end stations. We have asked the monitors from Urban Seismic Specialists if we can have access to their data and are hopeful that this will be forthcoming. This would give us information up to 1000 feet ( 305 m ) from the site of the blasts.

Figure 2 shows the blast area location relative to the LIGO site, Figure 3 shows a close up of the blast area. All the blasts occurred in a 400 ' $x 75$ ' rectangle and used either Geoprime or Geoprime dBX as the explosive charge (Figures 4,5). The layout of the explosions is shown in Figure 6. The explosive charges varied in size from 2.2 lbs to 11 lbs .


Figure 1: YUMA Survey Map. Detail of area near Livingston Observatory.


Figure 2: Map of Blast Site with distances to LIGO corner and end stations.


Figure 3: Detail of Blast Site. LIGO's field instruments were set up at the yellow placemark. The blasts were in the shaded in rectangle which was approximately $400^{\prime} \times 75^{\prime}$ in size.


Figure 4: GEOPRIME explosive was used in 10 explosions


Figure 5: GEOPRIME_dbX explosive was used in 13 explosions


Figure 6: Layout of the test blasts. Shot 502103 was 50 ' due north of our measuring equipment and was the closest explosion to us.

## 3 Blast 21, 505101

Plots for the other 23 test shots can be found at the end of this document. Here we present a detailed look at the blast which showed up strongly at the site. This blast was from 11 lbs of Geoprime at a depth of 60 feet.


Figure 7: a) Velocity in the Z direction as seen by the on-site Guralp Seismometers. b)Velocity in the Z direction seen at the blast site from the vertical L4-C geophone.

Figure 7(a) shows the signal seen by the Guralp seismometers at the Livingston site. The peak velocity seen at the corner station is $7 \mathrm{e}-5 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$. For a surface wave we expect the amplitude to fall off as $1 / \sqrt{\mathrm{R}}$ whereas for a bulk wave we expect the behavior to be $1 / \mathrm{R}$. Here the amplitude seems to fall off to $3.5 \mathrm{e}-5 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$ at the X end station, consistent with the latter. Figure 7(b) shows the signal seen locally with an L4-C geophone. The instrument was located approximately 261 feet ( 79 m ) from the blast site and measures a peak velocity of $1.6 \mathrm{e}-2 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$. If the amplitude is falling as $1 / \mathrm{R}$ then we would expect a peak velocity at the corner station of $2.8 \mathrm{e}-4 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{s}$, where we have taken a simple ratio of the distances. The fact that we see a value lower than this implies that a simple model will not work. The blast location measurement is from the near-field and likely contains a mixture of unresolved waveforms.

Finally we note that the speed of the seismic wave seen by the Guralp seismometers is slightly less than $2 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{s}$. This is characteristic of a surface wave, although as we note above the decay of the peak amplitude is not.

The survey crew did note that they had hit sand for several of their hole depths. We don't yet know which holes had charges in sand and which had charges in regular clay. This may allow us to extract some simple scaling laws in the future.

It is probably good news for us that the signals detected by the Guralps seem to have characteristic frequencies above 10 Hz where we have significant passive isolation. However as you can see from Figure 3 there is significant energy at frequencies below 10 Hz detected locally. This will certainly excite the stack resonances at 1.2 Hz and 2.1 Hz .


Figure 8: Time-Frequency plot for Blast 21 as seen by the vertical L4C.

## 4 Conclusions

Figure 9(a) shows the amplitude spectral density of the locally measured motion for all of the blasts which did not saturate our instruments. Figure 9(b) compares the RMS ground motion for the period covering all of the blasts to that of a quiet period between blasts.

Currently the STS-2 seismometers at the end stations have a factor of 3 higher gain than the one at the corner station. We should reduce these gains to guard against saturation. This should allow us to continue to use feedforward sensor correction for more distant blasts. This will also help instrument stability during small earthquakes.

We were quite surprised at the intensity of the blasts, they were far more powerful than initial discussions with the survey crew had led us to believe. It is likely that we will experience on the order of $1 \mathrm{~cm} / \mathrm{s}$ peak velocities at a distance of 400 feet. We hope to gain access to other data taken during the tests in order to make a more definitive statement. If necessary we can also go into the field again when the survey starts and make more ground motion measurements.

Our plan going forward is:

- Develop a model to predict the waveforms we expect from future blasts. We are hopeful that we can make good predictions at least in the far-field. This effort will include calculating the total pulse energy.
- Acquire extra data from other monitors at the site of the test blasts to fill in gaps in our present understanding.
- Compare the blasts to other large amplitude seismic events which we have experienced on-site in an effort to put their effect into context. Such events include large earthquakes and heavy construction.


Figure 9: a) ASD for the period covering all blasts and of a quiet period between two blasts. b) ASD of all blasts detected locally without saturation of the vertical L4C.

- Using existing information try to model the motion of the test masses due to the blasts.
- Engage the eLIGO commissioning team in the process, to better understand the impact on the eLIGO schedule.

































