SEISMIC HAZARD ZONE REPORT 094

PRELIMINARY REPORT
FOR REVIEW PURPOSES ONLY
TO BE SUPERSEDED ON OR ABOUT
February 11, 2005

SEISMIC HAZARD ZONE REPORT FOR THE LANCASTER EAST 7.5-MINUTE QUADRANGLE, LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

2004
(Revision of 2003 Preliminary Release)

DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION
California Geological Survey

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER
GOVERNOR

THE RESOURCES AGENCY
MICHAEL CHRISMAN
SECRETARY FOR RESOURCES

DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION
DARRYL YOUNG
DIRECTOR

CALIFORNIA GEOLOGICAL SURVEY
MICHAEL S. REICHLE, *ACTING STATE GEOLOGIST*

Copyright © 2004 by the California Department of Conservation. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced without written consent of the Department of Conservation.

"The Department of Conservation makes no warrantees as to the suitability of this product for any particular purpose."

SEISMIC HAZARD ZONE REPORT 094

SEISMIC HAZARD ZONE REPORT FOR THE LANCASTER EAST 7.5-MINUTE QUADRANGLE, LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

CALIFORNIA GEOLOGICAL SURVEY'S PUBLICATION SALES OFFICES:

Southern California Regional Office
655 S. Hope Street, Suite 700
Los Angeles, CA 90017
(213) 239-0878

Publications and Information Office
801 K Street, MS 14-34
Sacramento, CA 95814-3531
(916) 445-5716

Bay Area Regional Office
185 Berry Street, Suite 210
San Francisco, CA 94107-1728
(415) 904-7707

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY v

INTRODUCTION 1

SECTION 1 LIQUEFACTION EVALUATION REPORT Liquefaction Zones in the Lancaster East 7.5-Minute Quadrangle, Los Angeles County, California 3

PURPOSE 3

BACKGROUND 4

METHODS SUMMARY 5

SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS 5

PART I 6

PHYSIOGRAPHY 6

GEOLOGY 6

ENGINEERING GEOLOGY 8

GROUND WATER 10

PART II 11

LIQUEFACTION POTENTIAL 11

LIQUEFACTION SUSCEPTIBILITY 11

LIQUEFACTION OPPORTUNITY 12

LIQUEFACTION ZONES 13

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS 15

REFERENCES 15

SECTION 2 EARTHQUAKE-INDUCED LANDSLIDE EVALUATION REPORT NO LANDSLIDE HAZARDS ZONED 21

SECTION 3 GROUND SHAKING EVALUATION REPORT Potential Ground Shaking in the Lancaster East 7.5-Minute Quadrangle, Los Angeles County, California 23

PURPOSE 23

EARTHQUAKE HAZARD MODEL 24

APPLICATIONS FOR LIQUEFACTION AND LANDSLIDE HAZARD ASSESSMENTS28

USE AND LIMITATIONS.....31

REFERENCES 32

ILLUSTRATIONS

Figure 3.1. Lancaster East 7.5-Minute Quadrangle and portions of adjacent quadrangles, 10 percent exceedance in 50 years peak ground acceleration (g)—Firm rock conditions. 25

Figure 3.2. Lancaster East 7.5-Minute Quadrangle and portions of adjacent quadrangles, 10 percent exceedance in 50 years peak ground acceleration (g)—Soft rock conditions. 26

Figure 3.3. Lancaster East 7.5-Minute Quadrangle and portions of adjacent quadrangles, 10 percent exceedance in 50 years peak ground acceleration (g)—Alluvium conditions. 27

Figure 3.4. Lancaster East 7.5-Minute Quadrangle and portions of adjacent quadrangles, 10 percent exceedance in 50 years peak ground acceleration—Predominant earthquake.....29

Figure 3.5. Lancaster East 7.5-Minute Quadrangle and portions of adjacent quadrangles, 10 percent exceedence in 50 years magnitude-weighted pseudo-peak acceleration (g) for alluvium-Liquefaction opportunity.....30

Table 1.1. Map Units Used in the Lancaster East 7.5-Minute Quadrangle (after Ponti and Burke, 1980, and Ponti and others, 1981) 7

Table 1.2. Quaternary Map Units Used in the Lancaster East 7.5-Minute Quadrangle and Their Geotechnical Characteristics and Liquefaction Susceptibility 9

Plate 1.1. Quaternary geologic map of the Lancaster East 7.5-Minute Quadrangle, California ...34

Plate 1.2. Depth to ground water and location of boreholes used in this study, Lancaster East 7.5-Minute Quadrangle, California. Regional ground-water levels based on Carlson and Phillips (1998) ……..……35

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report and the accompanying Preliminary Seismic Hazard Zones Map for the Lancaster East 7.5-Minute Quadrangle, Los Angeles County, California, are revisions of the original preliminary report and map that were released April 17, 2003. This report and map reflect required changes following the adoption of revised seismic hazard zone mapping criteria by the State Mining and Geology Board in April 2004. Accordingly, the 90-day period provided for public review is repeated, beginning on the release date noted on the revised Preliminary Seismic Hazard Zones map. The report summarizes the methods and sources of information used to prepare the accompanying seismic hazard zones map. The map displays the boundaries of zones of required investigation for liquefaction and earthquake-induced landslides over an area of approximately 62 square miles at a scale of 1 inch = 2,000 feet. No zones of required investigation for earthquake-induced landslides exist in the Lancaster East Quadrangle.

The quadrangle lies in the Antelope Valley in northern Los Angeles County. The center of the area is about 5 miles east of Lancaster City Hall and 46 miles northeast of the Los Angeles Civic Center. The terrain is nearly level. The northern part was the site of a regional pluvial lake or playa in late Pleistocene time. Little Rock Wash, which enters the quadrangle in the southeastern corner, becomes indistinct near the center. Most of the land across the center of the quadrangle between Avenue J and Avenue L is within the City of Lancaster. Land south of Avenue L is within the City of Palmdale or associated with the Palmdale Airport (Air Force Plant 42). The remainder of the quadrangle is unincorporated Los Angeles County land. Land use consists of residential developments, airport facilities, and agriculture.

The map was prepared by employing geographic information system (GIS) technology, which allows the manipulation of three-dimensional data. Information considered includes topography, surface and subsurface geology, borehole data, historical ground-water levels, existing landslide features, slope gradient, rock-strength measurements, geologic structure, and probabilistic earthquake shaking estimates. The shaking inputs are based upon probabilistic seismic hazard maps that depict peak ground acceleration, mode magnitude, and mode distance with a 10 percent probability of exceedance in 50 years.

In the Lancaster East Quadrangle the liquefaction zone is limited to a narrow strip that coincides with Little Rock Wash. Liquefaction analysis indicates that loose, coarse-grained deposits within 40 feet of the surface are present in this area that could liquefy where saturated.

How to view or obtain the map

Seismic Hazard Zone Maps, Seismic Hazard Zone Reports and additional information on seismic hazard zone mapping in California are available on the California Geological Survey's Internet page: http://www.consrv.ca.gov/CGS/index.htm

Paper copies of Official Seismic Hazard Zone Maps, released by CGS, which depict zones of required investigation for liquefaction and/or earthquake-induced landslides, are available for purchase from:

BPS Reprographic Services
149 Second Street
San Francisco, California 94105
(415) 512-6550

Seismic Hazard Zone Reports (SHZR) summarize the development of the hazard zone map for each area and contain background documentation for use by site investigators and local government reviewers. These reports are available for reference at CGS offices in Sacramento, San Francisco, and Los Angeles. **NOTE: The reports are not available through BPS Reprographic Services.**

INTRODUCTION

The Seismic Hazards Mapping Act (the Act) of 1990 (Public Resources Code, Chapter 7.8, Division 2) directs the California Department of Conservation (DOC), Division of Mines and Geology (DMG) [now called California Geological Survey (CGS)] to delineate seismic hazard zones. The purpose of the Act is to reduce the threat to public health and safety and to minimize the loss of life and property by identifying and mitigating seismic hazards. City, county, and state agencies are directed to use the seismic hazard zone maps in their land-use planning and permitting processes. They must withhold development permits for a site within a zone until the geologic and soil conditions of the project site are investigated and appropriate mitigation measures, if any, are incorporated into development plans. The Act also requires sellers (and their agents) of real property within a mapped hazard zone to disclose at the time of sale that the property lies within such a zone. Evaluation and mitigation of seismic hazards are to be conducted under guidelines adopted by the California State Mining and Geology Board (SMGB) (DOC, 1997). The text of this report is on the Internet at http://gmw.consrv.ca.gov/shmp/SHMPsp117.asp

The Act directs SMGB to appoint and consult with the Seismic Hazards Mapping Act Advisory Committee (SHMAAC) in developing criteria for the preparation of the seismic hazard zone maps. SHMAAC consists of geologists, seismologists, civil and structural engineers, representatives of city and county governments, the state insurance commissioner and the insurance industry. In 1991 SMGB adopted initial criteria for delineating seismic hazard zones to promote uniform and effective statewide implementation of the Act. These initial criteria, which were published in 1992 as CGS Special Publication 118, were revised in 1996 and 2004. They provide detailed standards for mapping regional liquefaction and landslide hazards. The Act also directed CGS to develop a set of probabilistic seismic maps for California and to research methods that might be appropriate for mapping earthquake-induced landslide hazards.

In 1996, working groups established by SHMAAC reviewed the prototype maps and the techniques used to create them. The reviews resulted in recommendations that 1) the process for zoning liquefaction hazards remain unchanged and 2) earthquake-induced landslide zones be delineated using a modified Newmark analysis.

In April 2004, significant revisions of liquefaction zone mapping criteria relating to application of historically high ground-water level data in desert regions of the state were adopted by the SMGB. These modifications are reflected in the revised CGS Special Publication 118, which is available on the Internet at: http://gmw.consrv.ca.gov/shmp/SHMPsp118.asp

This Seismic Hazard Zone Report summarizes the development of the hazard zone map. The process of zoning for liquefaction uses a combination of Quaternary geologic mapping, ground-water information, and subsurface geotechnical data. The process for

zoning earthquake-induced landslides incorporates earthquake loading, existing landslide features, slope gradient, rock strength, and geologic structure. Probabilistic seismic hazard maps, which are the underpinning for delineating seismic hazard zones, have been prepared for peak ground acceleration, mode magnitude, and mode distance with a 10 percent probability of exceedance in 50 years (Petersen and others, 1996) in accordance with the mapping criteria.

This report summarizes seismic hazard zone mapping for potentially liquefiable soils and earthquake-induced landslides in the Lancaster East 7.5-Minute Quadrangle.

SECTION 1
LIQUEFACTION EVALUATION REPORT

Liquefaction Zones in the Lancaster East 7.5-Minute Quadrangle, Los Angeles County, California

By
Ralph C. Loyd

California Department of Conservation
California Geological Survey

Note: In April 2004, significant revisions of liquefaction zone mapping criteria relating to application of historically high ground-water levels in desert regions of the state were adopted by the State Mining and Geology Board (SMGB). These changes are reflected in the revised CGS Special Publication 118 (DOC, 2004), which is available on the Internet at http://gmw.consrv.ca.gov/shmp/SHMPsp118.asp

This report and the accompanying Preliminary Seismic Hazard Zones Map for the Lancaster East Quadrangle, which are revisions of the original preliminary report and map released in April 17, 2003, incorporate the newly adopted zone mapping criteria.

PURPOSE

The Seismic Hazards Mapping Act (the Act) of 1990 (Public Resources Code, Chapter 7.8, Division 2) directs the California Department of Conservation (DOC), Division of Mines and Geology (DMG) [now called California Geological Survey (CGS)] to delineate Seismic Hazard Zones. The purpose of the Act is to reduce the threat to public health and safety and to minimize the loss of life and property by identifying and mitigating seismic hazards. Cities, counties, and state agencies are directed to use seismic hazard zone maps developed by CGS in their land-use planning and permitting processes. The Act requires that site-specific geotechnical investigations be performed prior to permitting most urban development projects within seismic hazard zones.

Evaluation and mitigation of seismic hazards are to be conducted under guidelines adopted by the California State Mining and Geology Board (SMGB) (DOC, 1997). The text of this report is on the Internet at http://gmw.consrv.ca.gov/shmp/SHMPsp117.asp

Following the release of DMG Special Publication 117 (DOC, 1997), agencies in the Los Angeles metropolitan region sought more definitive guidance in the review of geotechnical investigations addressing liquefaction hazards. The agencies made their request through the Geotechnical Engineering Group of the Los Angeles Section of the American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE). This group convened an implementation committee under the auspices of the Southern California Earthquake Center (SCEC). The committee, which consisted of practicing geotechnical engineers and engineering geologists, released an overview of the practice of liquefaction analysis, evaluation, and mitigation techniques (SCEC, 1999). This text is also on the Internet at: http://www.scec.org/

This section of the evaluation report summarizes seismic hazard zone mapping for potentially liquefiable soils in the Lancaster East 7.5-Minute Quadrangle. The section and the accompanying Preliminary Seismic Hazard Zones map are revisions of an earlier preliminary report and map released April 17, 2003. The changes, which affect liquefaction zonation in some high desert regions, were prompted by SMGB adoption of revised criteria in April 2004 (DOC, 2004).

Section 3 (addressing potential ground shaking) completes the report, which is one of a series that summarizes production of similar seismic hazard zone maps within the state (Smith, 1996). Additional information on seismic hazards zone mapping in California is on CGS's Internet web page: http://www.consrv.ca.gov/CGS/index.htm

BACKGROUND

Liquefaction-induced ground failure historically has been a major cause of earthquake damage in southern California. During the 1971 San Fernando and 1994 Northridge significant damage to roads, utility pipelines, buildings, and other structures in the Los Angeles area was caused by liquefaction-induced ground displacement.

Localities most susceptible to liquefaction-induced damage are underlain by loose, water-saturated, granular sediment within 40 feet of the ground surface. These geological and ground-water conditions exist in parts of southern, most notably in some densely populated valley regions and alluviated floodplains. In addition, the potential for strong earthquake ground shaking is high because of the many nearby active faults. The combination of these factors constitutes a significant seismic hazard in the southern California region in general, including areas in the Lancaster East Quadrangle.

METHODS SUMMARY

Characterization of liquefaction hazard presented in this report requires preparation of maps that delineate areas underlain by potentially liquefiable sediment. The following were collected or generated for this evaluation:

- Existing geologic maps were used to provide an accurate representation of the spatial distribution of Quaternary deposits in the study area. Geologic units that generally are susceptible to liquefaction include late Quaternary alluvial and fluvial sedimentary deposits and artificial fill
- Shallow ground-water maps were constructed
- Geotechnical data were quantitatively analyzed to evaluate liquefaction potential of deposits
- Information on potential ground shaking intensity based on CGS probabilistic shaking maps

The data collected for this evaluation were processed into a series of geographic information system (GIS) layers using commercially available software. The liquefaction zone map was derived from a synthesis of these data and according to criteria adopted by the SMGB (DOC, 2004).

SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS

Evaluation for potentially liquefiable soils generally is confined to areas covered by Quaternary (less than about 1.6 million years) sedimentary deposits. The entire Lancaster East Quadrangle lies within the alluviated floor of the Antelope Valley. CGS's liquefaction hazard evaluations are based on information on earthquake ground shaking, surface and subsurface lithology, geotechnical soil properties, and ground-water depth, which is gathered from various sources. Although selection of data used in this evaluation was rigorous, the quality of the data used varies. The State of California and the Department of Conservation make no representations or warranties regarding the accuracy of the data obtained from outside sources.

Liquefaction zone maps are intended to prompt more detailed, site-specific geotechnical investigations, as required by the Act. As such, liquefaction zone maps identify areas where the potential for liquefaction is relatively high. They do not predict the amount or direction of liquefaction-related ground displacements, or the amount of damage to facilities that may result from liquefaction. Factors that control liquefaction-induced ground failure are the extent, depth, density, and thickness of liquefiable materials, depth to ground water, rate of drainage, slope gradient, proximity to free faces, and intensity and duration of ground shaking. These factors must be evaluated on a site-specific basis to assess the potential for ground failure at any given project site.

Information developed in the study is presented in two parts: physiographic, geologic, and hydrologic conditions in PART I, and liquefaction and zoning evaluations in PART II.

PART I

PHYSIOGRAPHY

Study Area Location and Physiography

The Lancaster East 7.5-Minute Quadrangle covers approximately 62 square miles in the Antelope Valley in northern Los Angeles County. The center of the area is about 5 miles east of Lancaster City Hall and 46 miles northeast of the Los Angeles Civic Center. The terrain in this quadrangle is nearly level where the northern part received fine-grained sediments at the margin of a regional pluvial lake or playa in late Pleistocene time. Total relief is only about 250 feet. Little Rock Wash, which enters the quadrangle in the southeastern corner, becomes indistinct near the center of the area where the lake deposits occur. Most of the land across the center of the quadrangle between Avenue J and Avenue L is within the City of Lancaster. Land south of Avenue L is within the City of Palmdale or associated with the Palmdale Airport (Air Force Plant 42) and the site of the proposed Palmdale International Airport. The remainder of the quadrangle is unincorporated Los Angeles County land. Land use consists of residential developments, airport facilities, and agriculture. Access to the area is via State Highway 14 (Antelope Valley Freeway) immediately west of the quadrangle and a grid of county roads consisting of numbered north-south streets and lettered east-west avenues.

GEOLOGY

Bedrock and Surficial Geology

Geologic units that are generally susceptible to liquefaction include late Quaternary alluvial and fluvial sedimentary deposits and artificial fill. For this evaluation, the Quaternary geologic maps of parts of Antelope Valley (Ponti, 1980; Ponti and Burke, 1980, and Ponti and others, 1981) were digitized by the Southern California Areal Mapping Project. The geology for the Lancaster East Quadrangle was extracted from this regional map, with minor modifications added by CGS to form a 1:24,000-scale map. Plate 1.1 shows the generalized Quaternary geology of the Lancaster East Quadrangle that was used in combination with other data to evaluate liquefaction potential and develop the Seismic Hazard Zone Map.

The entire Lancaster East Quadrangle is covered by alluvial deposits of Quaternary age. These Pleistocene through Holocene surficial deposits are summarized in Table 1.1 and discussed below. Ponti and Burke (1980) and Ponti and others (1981) mapped the Quaternary units based on relative age (Q1-7; 1 being oldest) and grain size (f=fine,

m=medium, and c=coarse). Deposits exposed in the Lancaster East Quadrangle are described in the following paragraphs.

The oldest Quaternary sediments, which are exposed along the southern boundary of the quadrangle, are late Pleistocene alluvial fan materials (Q4). Ponti and Burke (1980) and Ponti and others (1981) describe this unit as coarse-grained, unconsolidated, uplifted, and slightly dissected. The exposures have moderately developed soils, distinct horizons and clay accumulations.

Holocene alluvial fan and wash sediments (Q6) cover most of the quadrangle. These sediments are unconsolidated clastic material representing deposition during Holocene and/or, locally, late Pleistocene time. This unit consists mainly of medium-grained deposits except in the northeastern third of the quadrangle where they are fine-grained, reflecting deposition in a distal alluvial fan environment. Soils on alluvial fan and colluvial materials are weakly developed.

Latest Holocene coarse- to medium-grained clastic sediments (Q7) that have been deposited on the sides of unnamed washes during overbank sheet flooding. These deposits are unconsolidated with little if any soil development. The deposits within the modern washes, such as Little Rock Wash (Qsc) and sand dunes (Qsd) are also unconsolidated with no soil development.

Several square miles in the northwestern corner of the quadrangle are covered by sediments mapped by Ponti and others (1981) as Quaternary playa deposits (Qpl). Regionally, these sediments are described as compact lacustrine silt and clay with minor loose well-sorted sand and fine gravel deposited in the shallow-water margins of the last pluvial lake that filled the lowland parts of Antelope valley up until about 12,000 years ago.

Map Unit	Environment of Deposition	Age
Qsc	modern wash	latest Holocene
Qsd	sand dunes	latest Holocene
Q7	Alluvial fan	latest Holocene
Q6	alluvial fan, wash, colluvial aprons	latest Pleistocene and Holocene
Qpl	playa deposits	late to latest Pleistocene
Q4	alluvial fan	late Pleistocene

Table 1.1. Map Units Used in the Lancaster East 7.5-Minute Quadrangle (after Ponti and Burke, 1980 and Ponti and others, 1981)

Structural Geology

The Lancaster East Quadrangle lies within the Antelope Valley, a wedge-shaped part of the Mojave Desert bounded on the northwest by the Garlock Fault and the Tehachapi Mountains, and on the south by the San Andreas Fault and the Transverse Ranges. The trace of the closest active fault within the San Andreas Rift Zone is about 3.5 miles south of the quadrangle. This and other active faults within the zone, including strands that ruptured during the great 1857 Fort Tejon earthquake, have been included in the Official Earthquake Fault Zone map prepared by CDMG [now CGS] (1979) and considered to be a major potential seismic source (Petersen and others, 1996).

ENGINEERING GEOLOGY

As stated above, materials that are generally susceptible to liquefaction are mainly late Quaternary alluvial and fluvial sedimentary deposits and artificial fill. Deposits that contain saturated, loose sandy and silty soils are most susceptible to liquefaction. Lithologic descriptions and soil test results reported in geotechnical borehole logs provide valuable information regarding subsurface geology, ground-water levels, and the engineering characteristics of sedimentary deposits.

Of particular value in liquefaction evaluations are logs that report the results of downhole standard penetration tests. Standard Penetration Tests (SPTs) provide a uniform measure of the penetration resistance of geologic deposits and are commonly used as an index of soil density. This in-field test consists of counting the number of blows required to drive a split-spoon sampler (1.375-inch inside diameter) one foot into the soil at the bottom of a borehole at chosen intervals while drilling. The driving force is provided by dropping a 140-pound hammer weight 30 inches. The SPT method is formally defined and specified by the American Society for Testing and Materials (2004) in test method D1586. Recorded blow counts for non-SPT geotechnical sampling where the sampler diameter, hammer weight or drop distance differ from those specified for an SPT (ASTM D1586), are converted to SPT-equivalent blow counts. The actual and converted SPT blow counts are normalized to a common-reference, effective-overburden pressure of one atmosphere (approximately one ton per square foot) and a hammer efficiency of 60 percent using a method described by Seed and Idriss (1982) and Seed and others (1985). This normalized blow count is referred to as $(N_1)_{60}$.

The Seed-Idriss Simplified Procedure for liquefaction evaluation was developed primarily for clean sand and silty sand. As described above, results depend greatly on accurate evaluation of in-situ soil density as measured by the number of soil penetration blow counts using an SPT sampler. However, many of the Holocene alluvial deposits in the study area contain a significant amount of gravel. In the past, gravelly soils were considered not to be susceptible to liquefaction because the high permeability of these soils presumably would allow the dissipation of pore pressures before liquefaction could occur. However, liquefaction in gravelly soils has been observed during earthquakes, and recent laboratory studies have shown that gravelly soils are susceptible to liquefaction (Ishihara, 1985; Harder and Seed, 1986; Budiman and Mohammadi, 1995; Evans and

Zhou, 1995; and Sy and others, 1995). SPT-derived density measurements in gravelly soils are unreliable and generally too high. They are likely to lead to overestimation of the density of the soil and, therefore, result in an underestimation of the liquefaction susceptibility. To identify potentially liquefiable units where the N values appear to have been affected by gravel content, correlations were made with boreholes in the same unit where the N values do not appear to have been affected by gravel content.

During the initial stages of this investigation, CGS obtained logs of geotechnical boreholes that had been drilled in various localities within Antelope Valley. Staff collected the logs from the files of the cities of Lancaster and Palmdale, California Department of Transportation, Los Angeles County Public Works Department, and Earth Systems, Inc. Five of the logs are from boreholes drilled within the Lancaster East Quadrangle, whereas some 20 more were drilled just outside the western boundary of the quadrangle. The borehole sites were digitally located and associated log data entered into the CGS geotechnical GIS database to enable computer-assisted analysis and evaluation.

Examination of borehole logs indicates that throughout the Lancaster East Quadrangle sedimentary deposits at depths of less than 40 feet contain significant amounts of loose to moderately dense sandy and silty sediments. The lithologic descriptions provided in geotechnical borehole logs were augmented by examination of lithologic descriptions included in the logs of scores of water wells drilled in the study area.

Geologic Map Unit	Material Type	Consistency	Age	Liquefaction Susceptibility*
stream channel, wash (Qsc)	medium to coarse sand and gravel	very loose	latest Holocene	high
sand dune (Qsd)	sand	Very loose	Holocene & late Pleistocene	high
overbank, sheet flood (Q7)	sand, gravel, & silt	Loose	Holocene & late Pleistocene	high
alluvial fan, overbank, sheet flood (Q6)	sand, gravel, & silt	loose to dense	Holocene & late Pleistocene	high to moderate
alluvial fan w/ secondary carbonate (Quca)	sand and silt with up to 10-foot zone of calcium carbonate cement	loose to very dense	Holocene & late Pleistocene	high to low
playa deposits (Qpl)	sand, silt, clay	loose to dense	Holocene & late Pleistocene	high to low
alluvial fan (Q4)	gravel, sand, silt, clay	Dense	Pleistocene	low
alluvial fan (Q3)	gravel, sand, silt, clay	Dense	Pleistocene	low

*when saturated

Table 1.2. Quaternary Map Units Used in the Lancaster East 7.5-Minute Quadrangle and Their Geotechnical Characteristics and Liquefaction Susceptibility

GROUND WATER

Saturation reduces the effective normal stress of near-surface sediment, thereby increasing the likelihood of earthquake-induced liquefaction (Youd, 1973). CGS compiles and interprets ground-water data to identify areas characterized by, or anticipated to have in the future, near-surface saturated soils. For purposes of seismic hazard zonation, "near-surface" means at a depth less than 40 feet.

Natural hydrologic processes and human activities can cause ground-water levels to fluctuate over time. Therefore, it is impossible to predict depths to saturated soils during future earthquakes. One method of addressing time-variable depths to saturated soils is to establish an anticipated high ground-water level based on historical ground-water data. In areas where ground water is either currently near-surface or could return to near-surface levels within a land-use planning interval of 50 years, CGS constructs regional contour maps that depict these levels. In some areas with low precipitation, such as Antelope Valley, records may indicate that near-surface ground water existed during historical time, but large withdrawal and low recharge rates preclude a return to those conditions within 50 years. For these areas, the historically highest ground-water level is not used to establish the anticipated depth to saturated soil for hazard evaluation. For these and all other areas, CGS delineates present or anticipated near-surface saturated soils caused by locally perched water and seepage from surface-water bodies.

Future initiation of large-scale, artificial recharge programs could result in a significant rise in ground-water levels over 50 years. When alerted of such programs, CGS will evaluate their impact relative to liquefaction potential and revise official seismic hazard zone maps, if necessary. Plate 1.2 depicts areas characterized by present or anticipated shallow ground water within the Lancaster East Quadrangle.

Little Rock Creek is the only area within the quadrangle identified to be periodically characterized by shallow ground-water conditions. Staff used the following publications and internet sources to evaluate ground-water conditions and historical ground-water use in the Lancaster West and surrounding quadrangles: Johnson (1911); Thompson (1929); California Department of Water Resources (1965); Bloyd (1967); Durbin (1978); Duell (1987); Leighton and Associates (1990); Templin and others (1995); Galloway and others (1998); Carlson and others (1998); Carlson and Phillips (1998); Sneed and Galloway (2000); Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (2003); and California Department of Water Resources (2003). A detailed report of the ground-water hydrology of Antelope Valley is available on the U.S. Geological Survey web site (U.S. Geological Survey, 2003). In addition, satellite imagery provided by ASTER (2001) was used to identify and delineate major drainages and surface water bodies.

PART II

LIQUEFACTION POTENTIAL

Liquefaction may occur in water-saturated sediment during moderate to great earthquakes. Liquefied sediment loses strength and may fail, causing damage to buildings, bridges, and other structures. Many methods for mapping liquefaction hazard have been proposed. Youd (1991) highlights the principal developments and notes some of the widely used criteria. Youd and Perkins (1978) demonstrate the use of geologic criteria as a qualitative characterization of liquefaction susceptibility and introduce the mapping technique of combining a liquefaction susceptibility map and a liquefaction opportunity map to produce a liquefaction potential map. Liquefaction susceptibility is a function of the capacity of sediment to resist liquefaction. Liquefaction opportunity is a function of the potential seismic ground shaking intensity.

The method applied in this study for evaluating liquefaction potential is similar to that of Tinsley and others (1985). Tinsley and others (1985) applied a combination of the techniques used by Seed and others (1983) and Youd and Perkins (1978) for their mapping of liquefaction hazards in the Los Angeles region. CGS's method combines geotechnical analyses, geologic and hydrologic mapping, and probabilistic earthquake shaking estimates, but follows criteria adopted by the SMGB (DOC, 2004).

LIQUEFACTION SUSCEPTIBILITY

Liquefaction susceptibility reflects the relative resistance of a soil to loss of strength when subjected to ground shaking. Physical properties of soil such as sediment grain-size distribution, compaction, cementation, saturation, and depth govern the degree of resistance to liquefaction. Some of these properties can be correlated to a sediment's geologic age and environment of deposition. With increasing age, relative density may increase through cementation of the particles or compaction caused by the weight of the overlying sediment. Grain-size characteristics of a soil also influence susceptibility to liquefaction. Sand is more susceptible than silt or gravel, although silt of low plasticity is treated as liquefiable in this investigation. Cohesive soils generally are not considered susceptible to liquefaction. Such soils may be vulnerable to strength loss with remolding and represent a hazard that is not addressed in this investigation. Soil characteristics and processes that result in higher measured penetration resistances generally indicate lower liquefaction susceptibility. Thus, blow count and cone penetrometer values are useful indicators of liquefaction susceptibility.

Saturation is required for liquefaction, and the liquefaction susceptibility of a soil varies with the depth to ground water. Very shallow ground water increases the susceptibility to liquefaction (soil is more likely to liquefy). Soils that lack resistance (susceptible soils) typically are saturated, loose and sandy. Soils resistant to liquefaction include all soil types that are dry, cohesive, or sufficiently dense.

CGS's map inventory of areas containing soils susceptible to liquefaction begins with evaluation of geologic maps and historical occurrences, cross-sections, geotechnical test data, geomorphology, and ground-water hydrology. Soil properties and soil conditions such as type, age, texture, color, and consistency, along with historical depths to ground water are used to identify, characterize, and correlate susceptible soils. Because Quaternary geologic mapping is based on similar soil observations, liquefaction susceptibility maps typically are similar to Quaternary geologic maps

LIQUEFACTION OPPORTUNITY

Liquefaction opportunity is a measure, expressed in probabilistic terms, of the potential for strong ground shaking. Analyses of in-situ liquefaction resistance require assessment of liquefaction opportunity. The minimum level of seismic excitation to be used for such purposes is the level of peak ground acceleration (PGA) with a 10 percent probability of exceedance over a 50-year period (DOC, 2004). The earthquake magnitude used in CGS's analysis is the magnitude that contributes most to the calculated PGA for an area.

For the Lancaster East Quadrangle, PGAs ranging from 0.36 to 0.60 g, resulting from a predominant earthquake of magnitude 7.8, were used for liquefaction analyses. The PGA and magnitude values were based on de-aggregation of the probabilistic hazard at the 10 percent in 50-year hazard level (Petersen and others, 1996; Cramer and Petersen, 1996). See the ground motion portion (Section 3) of this report for further details.

Quantitative Liquefaction Analysis

CGS performs quantitative analysis of geotechnical data to evaluate liquefaction potential using the Seed-Idriss Simplified Procedure (Seed and Idriss, 1971; Seed and others, 1983; National Research Council, 1985; Seed and others, 1985; Seed and Harder, 1990; Youd and Idriss, 1997; Youd and others, 2001). Using the Seed-Idriss Simplified Procedure one can calculate soil resistance to liquefaction, expressed in terms of cyclic resistance ratio (CRR), based on SPT results, ground-water level, soil density, moisture content, soil type, and sample depth. CRR values are then compared to calculated earthquake-generated shear stresses expressed in terms of cyclic stress ratio (CSR). The Seed-Idriss Simplified Procedure requires normalizing earthquake loading relative to a M7.5 event for the liquefaction analysis. To accomplish this, CGS's analysis uses the Idriss magnitude-scaling factor (MSF) (Youd and Idriss, 1997). It is convenient to think in terms of a factor of safety (FS) relative to liquefaction, where: FS = (CRR / CSR) * MSF. FS, therefore, is a quantitative measure of liquefaction potential. CGS uses a factor of safety of 1.0 or less, where CSR equals or exceeds CRR, to indicate the presence of potentially liquefiable soil. While an FS of 1.0 is considered the "trigger" for liquefaction, for a site-specific analysis an FS of as much as 1.5 may be appropriate depending on the vulnerability of the site and related structures.

The CGS liquefaction analysis program calculates an FS for each geotechnical sample where blow counts were collected. Typically, multiple samples are collected for each

borehole. The program then independently calculates an FS for each non-clay layer that includes at least one penetration test using the minimum $(N_1)_{60}$ value for that layer. The minimum FS value of the layers penetrated by the borehole is used to determine the liquefaction potential for each borehole location. The reliability of FS values varies according to the quality of the geotechnical data. FS, as well as other considerations such as slope, presence of free faces, and thickness and depth of potentially liquefiable soil, are evaluated in order to construct liquefaction potential maps, which are then used to make a map showing zones of required investigation.

Most of the geotechnical borehole logs reviewed in this study (Plate 1.2) include blow-count data from SPTs or from penetration tests that allow reasonable blow count translations to SPT-equivalent values. Non-SPT values, such as those resulting from the use of 2-inch or 2½-inch inside-diameter ring samplers, are generally translated to SPT-equivalent values if reasonable factors can be used in conversion calculations. The reliability of the SPT-equivalent values varies. Therefore, they are weighted and used in a more qualitative manner. Few borehole logs, however, include all of the information (e.g. soil density, moisture content, sieve analysis, etc.) required for an ideal Seed-Idriss Simplified Procedure. For boreholes having acceptable penetration tests, liquefaction analysis is performed using recorded density, moisture, and sieve test values or using averaged test values of similar materials.

LIQUEFACTION ZONES

Criteria for Zoning

Areas underlain by materials susceptible to liquefaction during an earthquake were included in liquefaction zones using criteria developed by the Seismic Hazards Mapping Act Advisory Committee and adopted by the SMGB (DOC, 2004). Under those guideline criteria, liquefaction zones are areas meeting one or more of the following:

1. Areas known to have experienced liquefaction during historical earthquakes

2. Areas of uncompacted fill that are saturated, nearly saturated, or may be expected to become saturated

3. Areas where sufficient existing geotechnical data and analyses indicate that the soils are potentially liquefiable.

4. Areas where existing subsurface data are not sufficient for quantitative evaluation of liquefaction hazard. Within such areas, zones may be delineated by geologic criteria as follows:

    a) Areas containing soil deposits of late Holocene age (current river channels and their historical floodplains, marshes and estuaries) where the M7.5-weighted peak acceleration that has a 10 percent probability of being exceeded in 50 years is greater than or equal to 0.10 g and the anticipated depth to saturated soil is less than 40 feet; or

b) Areas containing soil deposits of Holocene age (less than 11,000 years), where the M7.5-weighted peak acceleration that has a 10 percent probability of being exceeded in 50 years is greater than or equal to 0.20 g and the anticipated depth to saturated soil is less than 30 feet; or

(c) Areas containing soil deposits of latest Pleistocene age (between 11,000 years and 15,000 years), where the M7.5-weighted peak acceleration that has a 10 percent probability of being exceeded in 50 years is greater than or equal to 0.30 g and the anticipated depth to saturated soil is less than 20 feet.

Application of these criteria allows compilation of liquefaction zones of required investigation, which are useful for preliminary evaluations, general land-use planning and delineation of special studies zones (Youd, 1991).

Areas of Past Liquefaction

Documentation of historical liquefaction or paleoseismic liquefaction in the Lancaster East Quadrangle was not found during this study.

Artificial Fill

Artificial fill was not mapped in the Lancaster East Quadrangle.

Areas with Sufficient Existing Geotechnical Data

Combining limited geotechnical information available with detailed geologic mapping and published water-well data generally provided an adequate basis for evaluating regional liquefaction potential in the Lancaster East Quadrangle. The information indicates that sediments within 40 feet of the surface throughout most of the quadrangle consist of young Quaternary alluvial fan deposits. Geologic maps and water-well log lithologic descriptions show that the sedimentary layers in the southern two-thirds of the quadrangle consist mainly of coarse-grained material (silt, sand, and gravel), reflecting deposition in a proximal alluvial fan environment, whereas geologic maps and geotechnical logs indicate that deposits in the northern third of the quadrangle consist largely of dense, fine-grained material (clay, clayey silt, and clayey sand), reflecting deposition in an older, distal alluvial fan environment. Liquefaction analysis indicates that loose, coarse-grained deposits could liquefy where saturated within 40 feet of the surface as shown on Plate 1.2. Such deposits in the Lancaster East Quadrangle are identified only within the channel of Little Rock Creek. The channel is thus designated a zone of required investigation on the Seismic Hazard Zone Map of the Lancaster East Quadrangle.

Areas with Insufficient Existing Geotechnical Data

SMGB Criterion Item 4 (see above) was used to extrapolate soil conditions into the undeveloped desert areas of the Lancaster East Quadrangle where geotechnical data were insufficient for evaluating liquefaction potential.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Thanks go to staff at the California Department, of Transportation, Sacramento District Laboratory; Dan Schneidereit, Bruce Hick, and staff at Earth Systems; Gary Gilbreath, Robert Pierotti, and Timothy Ross at California Department of Water Resources; Charles T. Nestle and Robert Thomas at Los Angeles County Department of Public Works; and Steve Phillips, Devin Galloway, and Peter Martin of the U.S. Geological Survey. Additionally, the author acknowledges CGS staff Terilee McGuire, Lee Wallinder and Bob Moskovitz for providing extraordinary GIS support; Barbara Wanish for preparing the final liquefaction hazard zone maps and graphic displays; Al Barrows for text contributions and editorial support; and student assistants Osama Altashi, Ben Wright, Andrea Ignacio, and Ian Penny for data entry and digitizing support.

REFERENCES

American Society for Testing and Materials, 2004, Standard test method for penetration test and split-barrel sampling of soils, Test Method D1586-99, *in* Annual Book of ASTM Standards, v. 4.08.

ASTER, (2001), http://asterweb.jpl.nasa.gov/

Bloyd, R.M., Jr., 1967, Water resources of the Antelope Valley-East Kern Water Agency area, California: U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report, 73 p.

Budiman, J.S. and Mohammadi, Jamshid, 1995, Effect of large inclusions on liquefaction of sands, *in* Evans, M.D. and Fragaszy, R.J., *editors*, Static and Dynamic properties of Gravelly Soils: American Society of Civil Engineers Geotechnical Special Publication no. 56, p. 48-63.

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, 1979, Revised Official Map of Special Studies Zones, Palmdale Quadrangle, scale 1:24,000.

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, 1997, Guidelines for evaluating and mitigating seismic hazards in California: California Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 117, 74 p.

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, 2004, Recommended criteria for delineating seismic hazard zones in California: California Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 118, 12 p.

California Department of Water Resources, 1965, Water wells in the western part of the Antelope Valley Area, Los Angeles County, California: California Department of Water Resources Bulletin 91-11. *Prepared in cooperation with the U.S. Geological Survey.*

California Department of Water Resources, 1966, Water wells in the western part of the Antelope Valley Area, Los Angeles County, California: California Department of Water Resources Bulletin 91-12.

California Department of Water Resources, 2003, Historical Data Map California Department of Water Resources, 2003, Historical Data Map, Water Data Library: http://wdl.water.ca.gov/

Carlson, C.S. and Phillips, S.P., 1998, Water level changes (1975-98) in the Antelope Valley, California: U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 98-561, 2 sheets.

Carlson, C.S., Leighton, D.A., Phillips, S.P. and Metzger, L.F., 1998, Regional water table (1996) and water-table changes in the Antelope Valley ground-water basin, California: U.S. Geological Survey Water-Resources Investigations Report 98-4022, 2 sheets.

Cramer, C.H. and Petersen, M.D., 1996, Predominant seismic source distance and magnitude maps for Los Angeles, Orange, and Ventura counties, California: Bulletin of Seismological Society of America, v. 86, no. 5, p. 1,645-1,649.

Duell, L.F.W., Jr., 1987, Geohydrology of the Antelope Valley area, California, and design for a ground-water-quality monitoring network: U.S. Geological Survey Water-Resources Investigations Report 84-4081, 72 p.

Durbin, T.J., 1978, Calibration of a mathematical model of the Antelope Valley ground-water basin, California: U.S. Geological Survey Water-Supply Paper 2046, 51 p. *(prepared in cooperation with the California Department of Water Resources).*

Evans, M.D. and Zhou, Shengping, 1995, Liquefaction behaviour of sand-gravel composites: American Society of Civil Engineers, Journal of Geotechnical Engineering, v. 121, no. 3, p. 287-298.

Galloway, D.L., Phillips, S.P. and Ikehara, M.E., 1995, Land subsidence and its relation to past and future water supplies in Antelope Valley, California, *in* Borchers, J., *editor*, Land Subsidence--Case Studies and Current Research: Proceedings of the Dr. Joseph F. Poland Symposium on Land Subsidence, Association of Engineering Geologist Special Publication 8, p. 529-539.

Harder, L.F. and Seed, H.B., 1986, Determination of penetration resistance for coarse-grained soils using the Becker hammer drill: University of California at Berkeley, College of Engineering, Earthquake Engineering Research Center, report no. UCB/EERC-86/06, 126 p.

Ishihara, Kenji, 1985, Stability of natural deposits during earthquakes, *in* Proceedings of the Eleventh International Conference on Soil Mechanics and Foundation Engineering, San Francisco, v. 1, p. 321-376.

Johnson, H.R., 1911, Water resources of Antelope Valley, California: U.S. Geological Survey Water-Supply Paper 278, 92 p.

Leighton and Associates, 1990, Safety Element of the Los Angeles County General Plan, Hazard Reduction in Los Angeles County: volumes 1 and 2, Plate 4, scale 1:125,000.

Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, 2003, Hydrologic reports 1996-2002 http://ladpw.org/wrd/report/

National Research Council, 1985, Liquefaction of soils during earthquakes: National Research Council Special Publication, Committee on Earthquake Engineering, National Academy Press, Washington, D.C., 240 p.

Petersen, M.D., Bryant, W.A., Cramer, C.H., Cao, Tianqing, Reichle, M.S., Frankel, A.D., Lienkaemper, J.J., McCrory, P.A. and Schwartz, D.P., 1996, Probabilistic seismic hazard assessment for the State of California: California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, Open-File Report 96-08; also U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 96-706, 33 p.

Ponti, D.J., 1980, Stratigraphy and engineering characteristics of upper Quaternary sediments in the eastern Antelope Valley and vicinity, California: M.S. Thesis, Stanford, Stanford University, 157 p.

Ponti, D.J., and Burke, D.B., 1980, Map showing Quaternary geology of the eastern Antelope Valley and vicinity, California: U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 80-1064, scale 1:62,500.

Ponti, D.J., Burke, D.B. and Hedel, C.W., 1981, Map showing Quaternary geology of the central Antelope Valley and vicinity, California: U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 81-737, scale 1:62,500.

Seed, H.B. and Idriss, I.M., 1971, Simplified procedure for evaluating soil liquefaction potential: Journal of the Soil Mechanics and Foundations Division of ASCE, v. 97: SM9, p. 1,249-1,273.

Seed, H.B. and Idriss, I.M., 1982, Ground motions and soil liquefaction during earthquakes: Monograph Series, Earthquake Engineering Research Institute, Berkeley, California, 134 p.

Seed, H.B., Idriss, I.M. and Arango, Ignacio, 1983, Evaluation of liquefaction potential using field performance data: Journal of Geotechnical Engineering, v. 109, no. 3, p. 458-482.

Seed, H.B., Tokimatsu, Kohji, Harder, L.F., and Chung, R.M., 1985, Influence of SPT procedures in soil liquefaction resistance evaluations: Journal of Geotechnical Engineering, ASCE, v. 111, no. 12, p. 1,425-1,445.

Seed, R.B. and Harder, L.F., 1990, SPT-based analysis of cyclic pore pressure generation and undrained residual strength: Proceedings of the H. Bolton Seed Memorial Symposium, v. 2, p. 351-376.

Smith, T.C., 1996, Preliminary maps of seismic hazard zones and draft guidelines for evaluating and mitigating seismic hazards: California Geology, v. 49, no. 6, p. 147-150.

Sneed, M., and Galloway, D.L., 2000, Aquifer-system compaction and land subsidence: measurements, analyses, and simulations--the Holly Site, Edwards Air Force Base, Antelope Valley, California: U.S. Geological Survey Water-Resources Investigations Report 00-4015, 65 p.

Southern California Earthquake Center, 1999, Recommended procedures for implementation of DMG Special Publication 117 guidelines for analyzing and mitigating liquefaction in California: Southern California Earthquake Center, University of Southern California, 63 p.

Sy, Alex, Campanella, R.G. and Stewart, R.A., 1995, BPT-SPT correlations for evaluations of liquefaction resistance in gravelly soils, *in* Evans, M.D. and Fragaszy, R.J., *editors*, Static and Dynamic Properties of Gravelly Soils: American Society of Civil Engineers Geotechnical Special Publication no. 56, p. 1-19.

Thompson, D.G., 1929, The Mohave Desert region, California, a geographic, geologic and hydrologic reconnaissance: U.S. Geological Survey Water-Supply Paper 578, 759 p.

Templin, W.E., Phillips, S.P., Cherry, D.E., DeBortoli, M.L. and others, 1995, Land use and water use in the Antelope Valley, California: U.S. Geological Survey Water-Investigations Report 94-4208, 98 p.

Tinsley, J.C., Youd, T.L., Perkins, D.M. and Chen, A.T.F., 1985, Evaluating liquefaction potential, *in* Ziony, J.I., *editor*, Evaluating earthquake hazards in the Los Angeles region — An earth science perspective: U.S. Geological Survey Professional Paper 1360, p. 263-316.

U.S. Geological Survey, 2003, Ground Water Atlas of the United States – Segment 1 California Nevada, http://ca.water.usgs.gov/groundwater/gwatlas/basin/single.html

Youd, T.L., 1973, Liquefaction, flow and associated ground failure: U.S. Geological Survey Circular 688, 12 p.

Youd, T.L., 1991, Mapping of earthquake-induced liquefaction for seismic zonation: Earthquake Engineering Research Institute, Proceedings, Fourth International Conference on Seismic Zonation, v. 1, p. 111-138.

Youd, T.L. and Idriss, I.M., 1997, *editors*, Proceedings of the NCEER workshop on evaluation of liquefaction resistance of soils: National Center for Earthquake Engineering Research Technical Report NCEER-97-0022, 276 p.

Youd, T.L., Idriss, I.M., Andrus, R.D., Arango, I., Castro, G., Christian, J.T., Dobry, R., Finn, W.D.L., Harder, L.F. Jr., Hynes, M.E., Ishihara, K., Koester, J.P., Liao, S.S.C., Marcusson, W.F., Martin, G.R., Mitchell, J.K., Moriwaki, Y., Power, M.S., Robertson, P.K., Seed, R.B. and Stokoe K.H., 2001, Liquefaction resistance of soils: Summary report from the 1996 NCEER and 1998 NCEER/NSF workshops on evaluation of liquefaction resistance of soils, Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering, October 2001, pp 817-833.

Youd, T.L. and Perkins, D.M., 1978, Mapping liquefaction-induced ground failure potential: Journal of Geotechnical Engineering, v. 104, p. 433-446.

SECTION 2
EARTHQUAKE-INDUCED LANDSLIDE EVALUATION REPORT

NO LANDSLIDE HAZARDS ZONED

Within the Lancaster East Quadrangle, no areas have been designated as "zones of required investigation for earthquake-induced landslides." However, the potential for landslides may exist locally, particularly along stream banks, margins of drainage channels, and similar settings where steep banks or slopes occur. Such occurrences are of limited lateral extent or are too small and discontinuous to be depicted at 1:24,000 scale (the scale of Seismic Hazard Zone Maps). Within the liquefaction zones, some geologic settings may be susceptible to lateral-spreading (a condition wherein low-angle landsliding is associated with liquefaction). Also, landslide hazards can be created during excavation and grading unless appropriate techniques are used.

SECTION 3
GROUND SHAKING EVALUATION REPORT

Potential Ground Shaking in the Lancaster East 7.5-Minute Quadrangle, Los Angeles County, California

By

Mark D. Petersen*, Chris H. Cramer*, Geoffrey A. Faneros, Charles R. Real, and Michael S. Reichle

California Department of Conservation
California Geological Survey
***Formerly with CGS, now with U.S. Geological Survey**

PURPOSE

The Seismic Hazards Mapping Act (the Act) of 1990 (Public Resources Code, Chapter 7.8, Division 2) directs the California Department of Conservation (DOC), Division of Mines and Geology (DMG) [now called California Geological Survey (CGS)] to delineate Seismic Hazard Zones. The purpose of the Act is to reduce the threat to public health and safety and to minimize the loss of life and property by identifying and mitigating seismic hazards. Cities, counties, and state agencies are directed to use the Seismic Hazard Zone Maps in their land-use planning and permitting processes. The Act requires that site-specific geotechnical investigations be performed prior to permitting most urban development projects within the hazard zones. Evaluation and mitigation of seismic hazards are to be conducted under guidelines established by the California State Mining and Geology Board (DOC, 1997. The text of this report is on the Internet at http://gmw.consrv.ca.gov/shmp/SHMPsp117.asp

This section of the evaluation report summarizes the ground motions used to evaluate liquefaction and earthquake-induced landslide potential for zoning purposes. Included are ground motion and related maps, a brief overview on how these maps were prepared, precautionary notes concerning their use, and related references. The maps provided

herein are presented at a scale of approximately 1:150,000 (scale bar provided on maps), and show the full 7.5-minute quadrangle and portions of the adjacent eight quadrangles. They can be used to assist in the specification of earthquake loading conditions ***for the analysis of ground failure*** according to the "Simple Prescribed Parameter Value" method (SPPV) described in the site investigation guidelines (California Department of Conservation, 1997). Alternatively, they can be used as a basis for comparing levels of ground motion determined by other methods with the statewide standard.

This section and Sections 1 and 2 (addressing liquefaction and earthquake-induced landslide hazards) constitute a report series that summarizes development of seismic hazard zone maps in the state. Additional information on seismic hazard zone mapping in California can be accessed on the California Geological Survey's Internet page: http://www.consrv.ca.gov/CGS/index.htm

EARTHQUAKE HAZARD MODEL

The estimated ground shaking is derived from the statewide probabilistic seismic hazard evaluation released cooperatively by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology [California Geological Survey], and the U.S. Geological Survey (Petersen and others, 1996). That report documents an extensive 3-year effort to obtain consensus within the scientific community regarding fault parameters that characterize the seismic hazard in California. Fault sources included in the model were evaluated for long-term slip rate, maximum earthquake magnitude, and rupture geometry. These fault parameters, along with historical seismicity, were used to estimate return times of moderate to large earthquakes that contribute to the hazard.

The ground shaking levels are estimated for each of the sources included in the seismic source model using attenuation relations that relate earthquake shaking with magnitude, distance from the earthquake, and type of fault rupture (strike-slip, reverse, normal, or subduction). The published hazard evaluation of Petersen and others (1996) only considers uniform firm-rock site conditions. In this report, however, we extend the hazard analysis to include the hazard of exceeding peak horizontal ground acceleration (PGA) at 10 percent probability of exceedance in 50 years on spatially uniform conditions of rock, soft rock, and alluvium. These soil and rock conditions approximately correspond to site categories defined in Chapter 16 of the Uniform Building Code (ICBO, 1997), which are commonly found in California. We use the attenuation relations of Boore and others (1997), Campbell (1997), Sadigh and others (1997), and Youngs and others (1997) to calculate the ground motions.

The seismic hazard maps for ground shaking are produced by calculating the hazard at sites separated by about 5 km. Figures 3.1 through 3.3 show the hazard for PGA at 10 percent probability of exceedance in 50 years assuming the entire map area is firm rock, soft rock, or alluvial site conditions respectively. The sites where the hazard is calculated are represented as dots and ground motion contours as shaded regions. The quadrangle of interest is outlined by bold lines and centered on the map. Portions of the eight

LANCASTER EAST 7.5 MINUTE QUADRANGLE AND PORTIONS OF ADJACENT QUADRANGLES

10% EXCEEDANCE IN 50 YEARS PEAK GROUND ACCELERATION (g)

1998

FIRM ROCK CONDITIONS



Base map from GDT

0 1.5 3
Miles

Department of Conservation
California Geological Survey

Figure 3.1

LANCASTER EAST 7.5 MINUTE QUADRANGLE AND PORTIONS OF ADJACENT QUADRANGLES

10% EXCEEDANCE IN 50 YEARS PEAK GROUND ACCELERATION (g)

1998

SOFT ROCK CONDITIONS



Base map from GDT

0 1.5 3
Miles

Department of Conservation
California Geological Survey

Figure 3.2

LANCASTER EAST 7.5 MINUTE QUADRANGLE AND PORTIONS OF ADJACENT QUADRANGLES

10% EXCEEDANCE IN 50 YEARS PEAK GROUND ACCELERATION (g)

1998

ALLUVIUM CONDITIONS



Base map from GDT

0 1.5 3
Miles

Department of Conservation
California Geological Survey

Figure 3.3

adjacent quadrangles are also shown so that the trends in the ground motion may be more apparent. We recommend estimating ground motion values by selecting the map that matches the actual site conditions, and interpolating from the calculated values of PGA rather than the contours, since the points are more accurate.

APPLICATIONS FOR LIQUEFACTION AND LANDSLIDE HAZARD ASSESSMENTS

Deaggregation of the seismic hazard identifies the contribution of each of the earthquakes (various magnitudes and distances) in the model to the ground motion hazard for a particular exposure period (see Cramer and Petersen, 1996). The map in Figure 3.4 identifies the magnitude and the distance (value in parentheses) of the earthquake that contributes most to the hazard at 10 percent probability of exceedance in 50 years on alluvial site conditions (*predominant earthquake*). This information gives a rationale for selecting a seismic record or ground motion level in evaluating ground failure. However, it is important to keep in mind that more than one earthquake may contribute significantly to the hazard at a site, and those events can have markedly different magnitudes and distances. For liquefaction hazard the predominant earthquake magnitude from Figure 3.4 and PGA from Figure 3.3 (alluvium conditions) can be used with the Youd and Idriss (1997) approach to estimate cyclic stress ratio demand. For landslide hazard the predominant earthquake magnitude and distance can be used to select a seismic record that is consistent with the hazard for calculating the Newmark displacement (Wilson and Keefer, 1983). When selecting the predominant earthquake magnitude and distance, it is advisable to consider the range of values in the vicinity of the site and perform the ground failure analysis accordingly. This would yield a range in ground failure hazard from which recommendations appropriate to the specific project can be made. Grid values for predominant earthquake magnitude and distance should **not** be interpolated at the site location, because these parameters are not continuous functions.

A preferred method of using the probabilistic seismic hazard model and the "simplified Seed-Idriss method" of assessing liquefaction hazard is to apply magnitude scaling probabilistically while calculating peak ground acceleration for alluvium. The result is a "magnitude-weighted" ground motion (liquefaction opportunity) map that can be used directly in the calculation of the cyclic stress ratio threshold for liquefaction and for estimating the factor of safety against liquefaction (Youd and Idriss, 1997). This can provide a better estimate of liquefaction hazard than use of predominate magnitude described above, because all magnitudes contributing to the estimate are used to weight the probabilistic calculation of peak ground acceleration (Real and others, 2000). Thus, large distant earthquakes that occur less frequently but contribute *more* to the liquefaction hazard are appropriately accounted for.

Figure 3.5 shows the magnitude-weighted alluvial PGA based on Idriss' weighting function (Youd and Idriss, 1997). It is important to note that the values obtained from this map are pseudo-accelerations and should be used in the formula for factor of safety without any magnitude-scaling (a factor of 1) applied.

LANCASTER EAST 7.5 MINUTE QUADRANGLE AND PORTIONS OF ADJACENT QUADRANGLES

10% EXCEEDANCE IN 50 YEARS PEAK GROUND ACCELERATION

1998

PREDOMINANT EARTHQUAKE
Magnitude (Mw)
(Distance (km))



Base map from GDT

0 1.5 3
Miles

Department of Conservation
California Geological Survey

Figure 3.4

LANCASTER EAST 7.5 MINUTE QUADRANGLE AND PORTIONS OF ADJACENT QUADRANGLES

10% EXCEEDANCE IN 50 YEARS MAGNITUDE-WEIGHTED PSEUDO-PEAK ACCELERATION (g) FOR ALLUVIUM

1998

LIQUEFACTION OPPORTUNITY



Base map from GDT

0 1.5 3
Miles

Department of Conservation
California Geological Survey

Figure 3.5

USE AND LIMITATIONS

The statewide map of seismic hazard has been developed using regional information and is ***not appropriate for site specific structural design applications***. Use of the ground motion maps prepared at larger scale is limited to estimating earthquake loading conditions for preliminary assessment of ground failure at a specific location. We recommend consideration of site-specific analyses before deciding on the sole use of these maps for several reasons.

1. The seismogenic sources used to generate the peak ground accelerations were digitized from the 1:750,000-scale fault activity map of Jennings (1994). Uncertainties in fault location are estimated to be about 1 to 2 kilometers (Petersen and others, 1996). Therefore, differences in the location of calculated hazard values may also differ by a similar amount. At a specific location, however, the log-linear attenuation of ground motion with distance renders hazard estimates less sensitive to uncertainties in source location.

2. The hazard was calculated on a grid at sites separated by about 5 km (0.05 degrees). Therefore, the calculated hazard may be located a couple kilometers away from the site. We have provided shaded contours on the maps to indicate regional trends of the hazard model. However, the contours only show regional trends that may not be apparent from points on a single map. Differences of up to 2 km have been observed between contours and individual ground acceleration values. *We recommend that the user interpolate PGA between the grid point values rather than simply using the shaded contours*.

3. Uncertainties in the hazard values have been estimated to be about +/- 50 percent of the ground motion value at two standard deviations (Cramer and others, 1996).

4. Not all active faults in California are included in this model. For example, faults that do not have documented slip rates are not included in the source model. Scientific research may identify active faults that have not been previously recognized. Therefore, future versions of the hazard model may include other faults and omit faults that are currently considered.

5. A map of the predominant earthquake magnitude and distance is provided from the deaggregation of the probabilistic seismic hazard model. However, it is important to recognize that a site may have more than one earthquake that contributes significantly to the hazard. Therefore, in some cases earthquakes other than the predominant earthquake should also be considered.

Because of its simplicity, it is likely that the SPPV method (DOC, 1997) will be widely used to estimate earthquake shaking loading conditions for the evaluation of ground failure hazards. It should be kept in mind that ground motions at a given distance from an earthquake will vary depending on site-specific characteristics such as geology, soil properties, and topography, which may not have been adequately accounted for in the regional hazard analysis. Although this variance is represented to some degree by the

recorded ground motions that form the basis of the hazard model used to produce Figures 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3, extreme deviations can occur. More sophisticated methods that take into account other factors that may be present at the site (site amplification, basin effects, near source effects, etc.) should be employed as warranted. The decision to use the SPPV method with ground motions derived from Figures 3.1, 3.2, or 3.3 should be based on careful consideration of the above limitations, the geotechnical and seismological aspects of the project setting, and the "importance" or sensitivity of the proposed building with regard to occupant safety.

REFERENCES

Boore, D.M., Joyner, W.B. and Fumal, T.E., 1997, Empirical near-source attenuation relationships for horizontal and vertical components of peak ground acceleration, peak ground velocity, and pseudo-absolute acceleration response spectra: Seismological Research Letters, v. 68, p. 154-179.

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, 1997, Guidelines for evaluating and mitigating seismic hazards in California: Special Publication 117, 74 p.

Campbell, K.W., 1997, Attenuation relationships for shallow crustal earthquakes based on California strong motion data: Seismological Research Letters, v. 68, p. 180-189.

Cramer, C.H. and Petersen, M.D., 1996, Predominant seismic source distance and magnitude maps for Los Angeles, Orange and Ventura counties, California: Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America, v. 85, no. 5, p. 1645-1649.

Cramer, C.H., Petersen, M.D. and Reichle, M.S., 1996, A Monte Carlo approach in estimating uncertainty for a seismic hazard assessment of Los Angeles, Ventura, and Orange counties, California: Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America, v. 86, p. 1681-1691.

International Conference of Building Officials (ICBO), 1997, Uniform Building Code: v. 2, Structural engineering and installation standards, 492 p.

Jennings, C.W., *compiler*, 1994, Fault activity map of California and adjacent areas: California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, California Geologic Data Map Series, map no. 8.

Petersen, M.D., Bryant, W.A., Cramer, C.H., Cao, T., Reichle, M.S., Frankel, A.D., Lienkaemper, J.J., McCrory, P.A. and Schwartz, D.P., 1996, Probabilistic seismic hazard assessment for the State of California: California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology Open-File Report 96-08; also U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 96-706, 33 p.

Real, C.R., Petersen, M.D., McCrink, T.P. and Cramer, C.H., 2000, Seismic Hazard Deaggregation in zoning earthquake-induced ground failures in southern California: Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference on Seismic Zonation, November 12-15, Palm Springs, California, EERI, Oakland, CA.

Sadigh, K., Chang, C.-Y., Egan, J.A., Makdisi, F. and Youngs, R.R., 1997, SEA96- A new predictive relation for earthquake ground motions in extensional tectonic regimes: Seismological Research Letters, v. 68, p. 190-198.

Wilson, R.C. and Keefer, D.K., 1983, Dynamic analysis of a slope failure from the 1979 Coyote Lake, California, Earthquake: Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America, v. 73, p. 863-877.

Youd, T.L. and Idriss I.M., 1997, Proceedings of the NCEER workshop on evaluation of liquefaction resistance of soils: Technical Report NCEER-97-0022, 40 p.

Youngs, R.R., Chiou, S.-J., Silva, W.J. and Humphrey, J.R., 1997, Stochastic point-source modeling of ground motions in the Cascadia Region: Seismological Research Letters, v. 68, p. 74-85.



Base map enlarged from U.S.G.S. 30 x 60-minute series

34°37'30"
118°00' 00"

LANCASTER EAST QUADRANGLE

SCALE

1 .5 0 1 MILE

1000 0 1000 2000 3000 4000 5000 6000 7000 FEET

1 .5 0 1 KILOMETER

N

See "Bedrock and Surficial Geology" in Section 1 of report for descriptions of units.

Plate 1.1 Quaternary Geologic Map of the Lancaster East 7.5-Minute quadrangle. From Ponti and Burke (1980) and Ponti and others (1981)



Base map enlarged from U.S.G.S. 30 x 60-minute series

LANCASTER EAST QUADRANGLE

SCALE

N

150 Depth to ground water, in feet

● Geotechnical borings used in liquefaction evaluation

Plate 1.2 Depth to ground water, and locations of boreholes used in this study, Lancaster East 7.5-Minute Quadrangle, California. Regional ground-water levels based on Carlson and Phillips (1998).