



Reflection of Contrasting Crustal Structures of the Western Usa in Gravity Field

T.V. Romanyuk (1), W.D. Mooney (2)

(1) Institute of Physics of the Earth named after O.Yu.Shmidt, RAS, B. Gruzinskaya 10, Moscow 123995, Russia, (romanyuk@ifz.ru / 0952556040), (2) US Geological Survey, 345 Middlefield Rd. MS 977, Menlo Park, CA 94025, United States (mooney@usgs.gov)

The modeled profile (length is about 3000 km) crosses the contrasting morphological structures of western USA. It starts in the Pacific ocean (~35N; -125W), then cross the Central California, Great Valey, Sierra-Nevada Mountaints, Basin and Range Province, Plateau Colorado, Rocky Mountaints, and finishes in the Great Plains (~42N; -100W). Beneath the surface, the profile crosses interesting uppermost-mantle features, including a high- velocity body beneath the Sierra-Nevada reaching a depth of 200 km, undulations of lithosphere/asthenosphere boundary, edge of Precambrian cratonic lithosphere, etc...

The gravity field of the ocean-continent transition is characterized by a steady decrease from about -22 mGal free air anomalies over the Pacific plate, to negative Bouguer anomalies down to -350 mGal over the Rocky Mountaints, and then inctease to near zero values over the Great Plains. The gravity anomaly crossing by the profile is a global minimum. Western USA is also characterized by negative geoid anomaly down to -30m.

Most of the profile follows the seismic experiments lines. Seismic-geological structure of the crust is compiled in accordance to [1-11]. Sesmic-geological crustal structure changes dramatically along the profile. Oceanic part of the profile is presented by thin (5-6) km high velocity (basalt/gabbro) oceanic crust. Shelf and coastal ranges are characterized by (10-15) km thickness crust composed mostly of metasediments. Great Valey is a deep sedimentary basin. In axial part beneath sediments the complexes with mantle geophysical signatures are located. Batholith of Sierra-Nevada is characterized by low seismic velocities (~6.0 km/c) and thick (45-50) km crust. Basin

and Range Province is characterized by strongly deformed upper crust and flat Moho at the depth ~30 km. Plateau Colorado, Rocky Mountains and Great Plains are less studied by seismic investigations. Nevertheless, variations of crustal thickness and structure were also revealed there.

There was executed a preliminary density modeling.

Model 1. Densities in water were fixed as 1.03 g/ccm, in sediments as 2.0-2.4, and in the blocks of the crust as 2.85 g/ccm, in the blocks of the mantle as 3.30 g/ccm. This model shows roughly the gravity effects of the water layer, the sedimentary basins, and the undulations of the Moho boundary at fixed density contrast of 0.45 g/ccm. Residual anomaly were up to 200 mGal. Because density variations in the crust can not compensate so great anomalies, it proves existence of mantle density anomalies.

Model 2. Densities in the mantle are allowed to vary within (3.15-3.50) g/ccm. This model allow to define conventional mantle densities anomaly. A trend of density increase toward inner parts of North American continent was revealed. The trend correlates with increasing of seismic Pn velocities.

Work was partly supported under RFBI N 04-05-65092.

REFERENCES 1. Camilleri P.A. Chamberlain K.R. 1997. Mesozoic tectonics and metamorphism in the Pequop Mountains and Wood Hills region, northeast Nevada: Implications for the architecture and evolution of the Sevier Orogen, GSA Bull. V.100. N.1. P.74-94.

2. Constenius K.N., Johnson R.A., Dickinson W.R., Williams T.A. 2000. Tectonic evolution of the Jurassic-Cretaceous Great Valley forearc, California: Implications for the Franciscan thrust-wedge hypothesis, Geol. Soc. Amer. Bull. V.112. N.11. P.1703-1723.

3. Dumitru T.A., Duddy I.R., Green P.F. 1994. Mesozoic-Cenozoic burial, uplift, and erosion history of the west-central Colorado Plateau, Geology. V.22. P.499-502.

4. Godfrey N.J., Beaudoin B.C., Klemperer S.L., Mendocino Working Group. 1997. Ophiolitic basement to the Great Valley forearc basin, California, from seismic and gravity data: Implications for crustal growth at the North American margin, Geol. Soc. Amer. Bull. V.108. N.12. P.1536-1562.

5. Godfrey N.J., Klemperer S.L. 1998. Ophiolitic basement to a forearc basin and implications for continental growth: The Coast Range/Great Valley ophiolite, California, Tectonics. V.17. N.4. P.558-570.

6. Keller G.R., Cather S.M., eds. 1994. Basins of the Rio Grande Rift: Structure,

Stratigraphy, and Tectonic Setting, Boulder. Colorado. Geological Society of America Special Paper 291. P.235.

7. Lastowka L.A., Sheehan A.F., Schneider J.M.. 2001. Seismic Evidence for Partial Lithospheric Delamination Model of Colorado Plateau Uplift, Geophys. Res. Lett. V.28. N.7. P.1319-1322.

8. McQuarrie N., Chase C.G. 2000. Raising the Colorado Plateau, Geology. V.28. N.1. P.91-94.

9. Park S.K., Wernicke B. 2003. Electrical conductivity images of Quaternary faults and Tertiary detachment in the California Basin and Range. Tectonics. V.22. N4. 1030, doi:10.1029/2001TC001324, 2003

10. Unsworth M., Egbert G., Booker J. 1999. High-resolution electromagnetic imaging of the San Andreas fault in Central California, J. Geophys. Res. V.104. P.1131-1150.

11. Zand G., Myers S.C., Wallace T.C., 1995. Crust and mantle structure across the Basin and Range - Colorado Plateau boundary at 37°N latitude and implications for Cenozoic extensional mechanism, J. Geophys. Res. V.100. P.10529-10548.