

# **VOLUME II - APPENDIXES A - E**

## Fault Evaluation Study and Seismic Hazard **Assessment**

Private Fuel Storage Facility Skull Valley, Utah.

#### **Prepared for:**

Stone & Webster Engineering Corporation P.O. Box 5406 Denver, Colorado 80217-5406

*Prepared by:* 

Geomatrix Consultants, Inc. 100 Pine Street, 10th Floor San Francisco, California 94111 (415) 434-9400

February 1999

Project No. 4790

### Geomatrik **C nsultants**

### TABLE OF CONTENTS GEOMATRIX



### APPENDIXES



 $\bar{z}$ 

 $\bar{\mathcal{A}}$ 

 $\sim$   $\sim$ 



## APPENDIX A

### SUPPLEMENTAL GEOPHYSICAL FEASIBILITY SURVEYS

#### **APPENDIX A**

#### **SUPPLEMENTAL GEOPHYSICAL** FEASIBILITY **SURVEYS**

Two geophysical feasibility surveys were performed to evaluate the potential use of ground penetrating radar and magnetometer techniques to identify anomalies that may be related to capable faults at the proposed Private Fuel Storage Site (PFSF) in Skull Valley, Utah. The results of these feasibility surveys are presented below.

### **GROUND PENETRATING** RADAR FEASIBILITY SURVEY

The purpose of this survey was to determine if ground-penetrating radar (GPR) is an appropriate tool to identify potential faults in the shallow subsurface at the PFSF site. If GPR reliably worked at the site then shallow faults might be identifiable with a superior resolution compared to S wave seismic reflection techniques. GPR surveys are commonly used to delineate subsurface targets such as shallow stratigraphy and faults.

GPR works on the principle of inducing high frequency radio waves into the earth and recording the energy that is reflected back from depth. Depth of penetration is dependent on the transmitting frequency, the dielectric constant of the subsurface material, the electrical conductivity of the subsurface material and its pore fluid. The presence of near-surface silts and clays may result in severe signal attenuation. Conversely, the presence of dry sands commonly results in excellent GPR signal propagation.

A successful GPR survey was previously performed approximately 5 miles east of the site to map the burial location of sheep. That GPR survey was performed on a gravel and sand alluvial fan on the west flank of the Stansbury Mountains.

A primary issue concerning the utility of GPR at the PFSF site is the depth of penetration of the radar energy that might be achieved. The shallow lithology of the site consists primarily of silt and clay material that attenuates the radar energy. It is possible to predict the attenuation properties of the soils if one has information concerning their electrical conductivity. An electrical conductivity greater-than approximately 10 to 20 milliSeimens/meter (mS/m) would indicate that GPR energy would not propagate to the depths necessary to image potential shallow faults at the PFSF site. If the electrical conductivity is 5 mS/m or less, then the chances of a successful GPR survey is excellent.

To assess the likelihood of success of a GPR survey, a series of electrical conductivity measurements of the sediments were made at various locations around the site. A Geonics EM31 and solid state data logger were used for this purpose. The instrument simultaneously records the quadrature and in-phase components of the electromagnetic fields generated by the device's transmitter. The quadrature-component data are measurements of the electrical conductivity of the material within the instruments depth of investigation. All readings were taken with the instrument oriented parallel to the direction of travel, in the vertical dipole mode and with the instrument at waist height. The depth of penetration with the instrument in this configuration is approximately 12 to 15 feet. Readings were automatically stored in a solid state memory data logger during the survey. The data logger was interfaced to a portable computer and the data were transferred to a floppy disk for subsequent processing and interpretation. A base station was established and was revisited at the beginning and end of the investigation to check for instrument drift and malfunction. No instrument drift or malfunction was observed.

The electrical conductivities of the soils ranged from about 50 mS/m (Stansbury Sand Ridges) to over 400 mS/m (proposed storage site area). These conductivities are not favorable for obtaining high-resolution GPR data at depths where stratigraphy is old enough to be useful for evaluating fault capability. Therefore, additional GPR survey investigations were not pursued.

### MAGNETOMETER FEASIBILITY SURVEY

**A** magnetometer feasibility survey was performed to investigate the possibility that magnetometer data may provide useful information concerning shallow capable faults. The magnetic signature of rocks and sediments is related to the relative content of magnetic minerals they contain. If a fault creates a significant offset in a unit exhibiting a high magnetic susceptibility than a series of magnetic measurements across the fault will show a change in the magnetic field. The anomaly magnitude will decrease and the wavelength increase with increasing distance from the source of the magnetic susceptibility contrast. The USGS aeromagnetic map of Utah was reviewed and there was no magnetic expression associated with the known range bounding faults in the area of the site. The PFSF Site occupies a broad subtle regional magnetic high of approximately 80 gammas with an anomaly wavelength on the order of 20 miles.

The stratigraphy in the vicinity of the proposed PFSF consists of an approximately 150- to 250 m (500- to 800-ft) thick section of Quaternary and Tertiary basin fill overlying Paleozoic bedrock. Magnetic measurements are commonly used to identify basement faulting owing to

the relatively high magnetic susceptibility of basement rocks. By comparison, unconsolidated sediments and sedimentary rocks typically exhibit a much smaller magnetic susceptibility. A fault generally can not be identified with magnetic techniques unless it creates a lateral change in the magnetic susceptibility of subsurface units. An exception to this would be the case when secondary processes cause a mineral precipitate in the fault/fracture zone.

A ground based magnetometer survey was conducted to investigate the feasibility of the magnetic technique to assist in identifying capable faults at the site. A total of 9.6 km (6 mi) of magnetic profile data were measured along three parallel profile lines. These three lines, each 3.2 km (2 mi) in length were surveyed coincident with, and parallel to, seismic line PFSF 98-A. The three profiles were approximately 200 feet apart.

A Geometrics G858 cesium vapor magnetometer was used for the survey magnetometer and a Geometrics G856 magnetometer was used for the magnetic base station. Prior to the survey, the Space Environment Services office of the NOAA was contacted to obtain a magnetic forecast for the following 12 hours. This was done to minimize the chance of a solar storm causing large natural variations in the magnetic field that would render the field survey data, even with the corrections from the base magnetometer, largely useless. There were no solar storms forecast and an examination of the base station magnetometer revealed no evidence of significant magnetic variations during the survey. The base station magnetometer data was used to drift correct the survey magnetometer data by removing small scale natural, temporal, variations in the earth's magnetic field.

The three magnetic profiles are shown in Figure A-1, A-2, and A-3. Faults that were interpreted from the s-wave seismic survey of seismic line PFSF-98-A are plotted relative to the magnetometer data on Figure A-1. A common feature exhibited on all profiles is a change in magnetic character approximately  $\frac{1}{2}$  way through the lines. The eastern half of the profiles exhibit a relatively uniform magnetic response interrupted by very short wavelength anomalous spikes. The magnetic field increases approximately 40 gammas along the western half of the profiles. This change in magnetic response occurs at approximately line position 5000 feet. It is interesting to note that this change in magnetic response coincides with the point of the maximum gravity gradient. The increase in magnetic response from the center of the lines towards the west may be related to a decrease in the depth to magnetic basement rocks. Both P and S wave seismic data suggest a possible bedrock block dipping towards the east in this area. This tilted bedrock block may reflect a northwestern extension of Hickman Knolls.

**A-3**

In general, faults are recognized on both magnetic and gravity data by the identification of gradients. A gravity profile coincident with these magnetic profiles was extracted from the gridded Edcon gravity data set. This gravity profile and the calculated gradient is shown in Figure A-4. Due to the long wavelength of both the magnetic and gravity anomalies, the source of the anomalies is interpreted to be at significant depth, certainly much deeper than the upper 100 feet where work is focused to identify capable faults. Although the source of these anomalies may be related to a fault, the determination of the spatial positioning of that hypothesized fault is only approximate. The short wavelength magnetic anomalies are thought to be associated with lateral changes in the magnetic mineral content (i.e., near surface detrital magnetite) of the soils rather than evidence of shallow faulting. A comparison of the magnetic data and the faults interpreted from the S-wave seismic survey do not reveal a consistent magnetic response signature corresponding with the interpreted fault locations.



FIGURE **A-I** Magnetic profile for line 1.

I:\DOC\_SAFE\4790\REPORT\APX-A.DOC 29-Jan-99



Line 2 Parallel to Seismic Line PFSF 98A, 200 feet south









West

Magnetic profile for line 3.

Line 3





Comparison of gravity and magnetic anomalies.

A-7



# APPENDIX B BORING LOGS



s:\4790\UtahPFSF\_9811\logs\\_LogExplan.ai

 $\mathcal{L}^{\pm}$ 



s:\4790\UtahPFSF\_9811\logs\\_C\_01\_01.ai

 $\zeta_{\rm{c}}$   $\omega$ 



s:\4790\UtahPFSF\_9811\logs\\_C\_01\_02.ai



 $\sim$   $\sim$ 





:s-\4790\UtahPFSF-981 1\togs\\_C\_03\_02.ai

 $\overline{\phantom{a}}$ 



(oject No. 4790 Geomatrix Consultants  $\bar{z}$ 

s:\4790\UtahPFSF\_9811\logs\\_C\_03\_03.ai



\PFSF\_9811\logs\\_C\_04\_01.ai



s:\4790\UtahPFSF\_9811\logs\\_C\_04\_02.ai

 $\overline{\phantom{a}}$ 



s:\4790\UtahPFSF\_9B11\logs\\_C\_04\_03.ai

 $\overline{\phantom{a}}$ 





 $\ddot{\phantom{a}}$ 

 $\frac{1}{2}$ 



s:\4790\UtahPFSF\_9811\logs\\_C\_05\_03.ai

























 $\sim$   $-$


s:\4790\UtahPFSF\_981 1\logs\\_C\_08\_03.ai









í,

 $\ddot{\phantom{a}}$ 



 $\overline{a}$ 





 $\frac{1}{2}$  ,  $\frac{1}{2}$ 

s:\4790\UtahPFSF\_9811\logs\\_C\_10\_03.ai







s:\4790\UtahPFSF\_981 1\logs\.C 11\_03.ai

્



Ň





 $\mathcal{A}$ 





tara



s:\4790\UtahPFSF\_9811\logs\\_C\_13\_03.ai











s:\4790\UtahPFSF\_981 1\fogs\\_C\_15.01.ai





l,



 $\sim$ 

















 $\zeta_{\rm{obs}}$ 



981 1 \log:



 $\ddot{\phantom{0}}$ 

 $\sim$ 



s:\4790\UtahPFSF\_9811\logs\\_C\_18\_03.ai




s:\4790\UtahPFSF\_9811\logs\\_C\_19\_02.ai



s:\4790\UtahPFSF\_981 1logs\\_C\_19\_03.ai





s:A4790\UtahPFSF\_981 1\togs\\_C\_20\_02.ai



 $\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}$ 

 $\sim$ 

 $\frac{1}{2}$ 

 $\sim$ 





 $\tilde{\zeta}$ 





s:\4790\UtahPFSF\_9811\logs\\_C\_23\_01.ai

 $\mathbf{L}$ 

÷.



s:\4790\UtahPFSF\_981 1\logs\\_C\_23\_02.ai

 $\sim$ 



 $\leftarrow$ 

 $\sim 10^6$ 









s:\4790\UtahPFSF\_9811\logs\\_C\_25\_01.ai



s:\4790\UtahPFSF 981 1\logs\\_C\_25\_02.ai







s:\4790\UtahPFSF\_9811\logs\\_C\_27\_01.ai





s:\4790\UtahPFSF\_981 1\logs\\_C\_28\_01.ai

 $\sim$ 









s:\4790\UtahPFSF\_9811\logs\\_C\_30\_01.ai

 $\sim$ 







# APPENDIX C

# TEST PIT AND HAND-EXCAVATED AUGER HOLE LOGS

**Private Fuel Storage Facility**  Contact **GEOMATRIX** *Skull Valley, Utah* 



Project 4790





**\_\_ 1ý**

*Skull Valley, Utah* 

 $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ 



Project 4790



Note: north-trending fractures and infilled fractures present, some extend to lower sand; east-trending fractures subparallel to test pit also observed.

**Private Fuel Storage Facility**  Contact **Contact Contact Cont** *Skull Valley, Utah* 



Project 4790

for more complete description of units.





*Skull Valley, Utah* 



Project 4790

#### Page 1 of 1





Samples taken from all units.

*Skull Valley, Utah* 

**Private Fuel Storage Facility**  Contact Conta

Project 4790

#### Page 1 of 1

ä,





Sample **-3.65** m

#### **LOG** OF **TEST** PIT TP-4 **Private Fuel Storage Facility**  Contract **Contract Contract Contract**

*Skull Valley, Utah* 



Project 4790

#### Page 1 of 1





#### **LOG** OF **TEST** PIT TP-5 **Private Fuel Storage Facility**  CEOMATRIX

*Skull Valley, Utah* 



### Page **1** of 1





 $\bar{\mathcal{A}}$ 

Not described in detail due to cave-in.

*Skull Valley, Utah* 



Project 4790

#### Page 1 of 3



(frames 1-4)


#### **LOG** OF **TEST** PIT **TP-7 Private Fuel Storage Facility**  Contact **GEOMATRIX** *Skull Valley, Utah*

Project 4790



 $\bar{z}$ 

### **LOG OF TEST PIT TP-7** *Private Fuel Storage Facility Skull Valley, Utah*



Project 4790

Page **3** of **3** 

Note: Fractures and fissures observed in deep-water sediments cannot be traced downwards. The fractures may be the result of strong ground motion or dessication or freeze-thaw that occurred on the mud flats subsequent to the drop of the lake below this elevation and prior to deposition of overlying units.

Samples: **0. <sup>8</sup>**to **0.9** m 1.2 to 1.3 m 2.1 to 2.2 m 3.1 to 3.2 m 3.9 to 4.2 m 4.51 to 4.78 m 5.3 to 5.35 m 6.3 to 6.45 m (collected 5 gallon bucket sample from which samples 4790/FS-la/TP-7 and 4790/FS-lb/TP-7 were derived.) These samples were dated at  $24,600 \pm$ 190 and 23,990 **±** 380 RCYBP (radiocarbon years before present), respectively (see Appendix D).

# **LOG OF TEST PIT TP-8**<br>*Private Fuel Storage Facility*

*Skull Valley, Utah* 



Project 4790

#### Page **1** of 2



frames 5-8

**Elevation** Depth Depth Geologic Units (Feet) (Feet) (Meters) Description Description Comments  $-4466$  0 0 Ground Surface: Gentle north slope (middle of post Provo recessional shoreline erosional scarp). Similar to unit below, except mottled with slightly  $A/E$  soil horizon<br>more organic material. developed on eol developed on eolian deposits. -4465.34 0.66 0.20 Brown (10YR 5/3, m); plastic, nonsticky; fine sandy Eolian deposit. SILT; massive; many pores and root tubules. -4463.64 2.36 0.72 Pale brown to brown (10YR 5.5/3, m), slightly redder Cambic B soil on ped faces; sandy clayey SILT; fine blocky structure; horizon developed on clear irregular lower soil boundary. The underlying unit. -4463.24 2.76 0.84 Light gray (10YR 7/2, m); sandy clayey SILT; Provo deep-water massive; abundant ostracodes; clear smooth to wavy facies lower contact; fractures and infilled fissures present as described below. -4462.42 3.58 1.09 Similar to underlying unit, except finer blocky Bonneville flood and structure, more strongly mottled white and reddish post-flood Provo brown; fractures and infilled fissures present as deep-water facies described below; clear irregular lower contact.

#### **LOG** OF **TEST** PIT **TP-8**  *Private Fuel Storage Facility*

*Skull Valley, Utah*



Project 4790

#### Page 2 of 2



 $\frac{1}{2}$ 



9-1 (frames 23-24)



*Skull Valley, Utah* 



Project 4790

Page 1 of **I** 





#### LOG OF TEST PIT TP-1 **I Private Fuel Storage Facility**  Contact **GEOMATRIX** *Skull Valley, Utah*



Page 1 of 1

## See Figure **C-1**

#### LOG OF TEST PIT TP-12 **Private Fuel Storage Facility**  COMATRIX **GEOMATRIX** *Skull Valley, Utah*



Page 1 of 1

## See Figure **C-2**

 $\bar{z}$ 

*Skull Valley, Utah* 

**- I---**







*Skull Valley, Utah* 







Private Fuel Storage Facility **Contract Contract Co** *Skull Valley, Utah* 



Project 4790





 $\mathcal{L}$ 

**Private Fuel Storage Facility**  GEOMATRIX *Skull Valley, Utah* 







**Private Fuel Storage Facility**  Contact **GEOMATRIX** *Skull Valley, Utah* 



Project 4790





 $\sim$ 

following:

**Private Fuel Storage Facility**  Contract **GEOMATRIX** *Skull Valley, Utah* 



Project 4790

#### Page 2 of 2



Base of test pit



#### **LOG OF TEST PIT TP-19** 4 SECOND 1 SECOND **Private Fuel Storage Facility Company of the Company of**

*Skull Valley, Utah* 







#### **LOG** OF **TEST** PIT TP-19 **Private Fuel Storage Facility**  Contact The GEOMATRIX

*Skull Valley Utah* 



Project 4790



test pit

#### **LOG** OF **TEST** PIT TP-20 *Private Fuel Storage Facility*

*Skull Valley, Utah*

**GEOMATRIX** 

Project 4790

#### Page 1 of 2





 $\sim$ 

#### **LOG OF TEST PIT TP-20 4 and 20 and 20 and 20 and 20 and 4 and 20 and 4 and Private Fuel Storage Facility** *GEOMATRIX*

*Skull Valley, Utah* 





Private Fuel Storage Facility **Contract Contract Co** 





**Private Fuel Storage Facility**  COVID-19 CONDITION *Skull Valley, Utah* 





#### **LOG** OF **TEST** PIT TP-23 **Private Fuel Storage Facility**  CONSIDERITY **GEOMATRIX**

*Skull Valley, Utah* 



Project 4790

#### Page 1 of 1





*Private Fuel Storage Facility* **GEOMATRIX** *Skull Valley, Utah* 



Project 4790





L,

*Skull Valley, Utah* 



Project 4790

Page **I** of 1





#### **LOG** OF **HAND EXCAVATED AUGER** HOLE **AH-2**

**Private Fuel Storage Facility**  Contact **GEOMATRIX** *Skull Valley, Utah* 







#### **LOG** OF **HAND EXCAVATED AUGER** HOLE **AH-3**

**Private Fuel Storage Facility**  Contact **Contact Contact Cont** *Skull Valley, Utah* 











-1376

**4505** 

(feet)

ه<br>آ

**7M** oTEST PIT 12 Private Fuel Storage Facility Skull Valley, Utah Project No. Figure<br>4790 C-2  $Z^{\prime}$  $GEDMATRIX$  4790





Prominent silica-carbonate filled fracture

Notes:

- n1 Detached dolomite boulder.
- -

# **-4---- N85\*E A E**  Distance (meters) EXPLANATION **Ab b"11**  POST-PROVE SAND RAMP DEPOSITS 4515 Brownish yellow (10yr **6/6** dry) silty fine sand; occasional subrounded to rounded pebbles up to 2 to 3 cm; a few discontinuous pebbly sand lenses; gravelly near base with cobbles and boulders up to 10 to 20 cm common STANSBURY NEAR-SHORE BAR/BEACH DEPOSIT ~ Sandy gravel; poorly sorted; subangular to well-rounded pebbles in a sandy matrix; carbonate rinds up to 1 mm on the bottoms of clasts; elevation 4508 ft. (1374.4 m) FOR A I PRE-STANSBURY BURIED PALEOSOL (PROMONTORY SOIL?)<br>4510 + 1375 E **1377 PHATA (COVER OF IRENEVAL)** OPERATION COVER ON SHEAR ZONE **Very pale brown (10yr 8/3 dry)** stage II to III carbonate; weak platey Very pale brown (10yr 8/3 dry) stage II to III carbonate; weak platey structure locally;<br>
nearly continuous rinds on clasts and matrix plugged with carbonate Sheared and brecciated dolomite (paleozoic) includes blocks of tuffaceous siltstone 1374 '•. (indicated by T); derived from Tertiary Salt Lake Formation; more numerous and larger blocks (up to 0.5m in width) observed in north wall of test pit. Numerous **12 COVID AND SUBLET AND RESPOCK (PALEOZOIC)**<br>The very dark gray to black brecciated dolomite; similar to rocks that crop out in

Location: Hickman Knolls 7.5-minute quadrangle Logged By: K.L. Hanson and Date: 9/21/98 **9 9 02 22 0O4•---D** 

n2 Mullion structure and groove lineations plunging steeply south.





N5°W to N10°E; 85°W.

 $n2-$ 

**0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7**<br> **1 1 1 1 1 1** 

N11°E; 85°W

Projected ground surface







### APPENDIX D

## GEOCHRONOLOGY REPORTS (TEPHRACHRONOLOGY AND RADIOCARBON ANALYSIS)

Michael E. Perkins Dept. of Geology and Geophysics 135 S. 1460 E. Room 719 University of Utah Salt Lake City, UT 84112-0111

7 December 1998

Katheryn Hanson Principal Geologist Geomatrix Consultants 100 Pine Street, 10th Floor San Francisco, CA 94111

Dear Katheryn:

As Valley, **requested** ested, I analyzed glass shards from four samples of vitric tuffs collected from Skull<br>UT. Sample ID's are tr1-1, 2, 3 and 4. The samples w Valley, UT. Sample ID's are trl-1, 2, 3 and 4. The samples of viric turns collected from Skull<br>SX-50 microprobe at the Dept. of Geology and Generalized U.  $SX-50$  microprobe at the Dept. of Geology and Geophysics, University of Utah. General procedures for sample preparation  $\sigma$  declogy and Geophysics, University of Utah. General procedures for sample preparation and analyses are described in Perkins et al. (1995). The analyses for these samples were compared with the solid in Perkins et al. (1995). The analyses for these samples were compared with those in an extensive database of<br>analyses/stratigraphic data/age datas for late G analyses/stratigraphic data/age dates for late Cenozoic vitric tephra layers  $(\leq 16$  Ma) in the Western U. S. This database has been assembled by manufacturing  $(\leq 16$  Ma) in the Department S. This database has been assembled by myself and several colleagues at the  $\frac{1}{2}$  of Geology and several colleagues at the of Geology Department of Geology and Geophysics. Some of the key tephra layers in this database are<br>described in published papers (Porlijne et al. Some of the key tephra layers in this database are described in published papers (Perkins et al., 1995 and 1998; Williams, 1994). The analyses of your samples and those of the meat similar database analyses of your samples and those of the most similar samples in the Univ. of Utah tephra database are given in enclosed tables. The correlations of the four samples are discussed below.

Samples tr1-1, 2, and 3 gray vitric tuffs. These three samples are compositionally identical (within measurement error) as is clear from both the analyses of individual shards (Table 1) bed, the ---<br>here and the mean composition of the shards from each sample (Table 2). The tr1-1/2/3 ash bed, here termed the Skull Valley ash bed, does not match to any sample in our database. It most closely resembles a tuff in the Salt La It most closely resembles a tuff in the Salt Lake Fm in the Cache Valley, UT area (Table 3a). An analysis of this ash bed (cv12-20-6pg) is included in Table 2 for reference. The 3a). An analysis of this ash bed (cv12-20-6pg) is included in Table 2 for reference. The<br>Salt Lake Fm. in the Cache Valley area was deposited in the Cache 2 for reference. The Salt Lake Fm. in the Cache Valley area was deposited in the interval  $11-5$  Ma (Perkins, unpublished data). The Skull Volley area was deposited in the interval  $11-5$  Ma (Perkins, in our database data). The Skull Valley ash does not closely resemble any Quaternary ash bed in our database (Table 3a) so, I conclude that the Skull Valley ash bed is most likely an ash bed in the Salt Lake Fm. Regionally the Salt Lake Formation ranges in age from ~16 to 4<br>Ma.

Sample tr1-4 is white biotite bearing ash bed. It is a good compositional match to two  $\sim$ 15.4 Ma ash beds in the Rio Grande Rift north of Santa Fe, New Mexico (samples rg-18<br>and rg-143), as well as several other similar with  $\frac{1}{2}$ . and rg-143), as well as several other similar, middle Miocene ash beds in the Rio Grande<br>Rift. The match between tr1-4 and both rs 19 and no 142;<br> of Rift. The match between trl-4 and both rg-18 and rg-143 is clear by the visual comparison of the analyses (Table 2), the plot of Fe vs. Ca (Fig. 1), and the value of the distance function,  $\bf{D}$  between these two sensul 1998) we function, **D**, between these two samples (Tables 3b). As discussed in Perkins et al. (1995; 1998) we expect D $\leq$ 3.8 (for a seven element comparison) between two compositionally identical samples.

The possible match of a sample with two or more different ash beds is not uncommon<br>when using probe analyses for correlations  $\Delta$  a natural patch of a shipped is not uncommon when using probe analyses for correlations. As noted by Perkins et al. (1998) such correlations are not definitive. However, the results discussed above are consistent with the conclusion that samples  $tr_{\alpha}1 \cdot 2 \cdot 3$  and  $4 \cdot \text{me}$  with  $\alpha$ of the Salt Lake Fm. of the Salt Lake Fm. Furthermore, there is no reason to believe that they are Quaternary

If If it is important to more precisely delimit the age of these tuffs, I can analyze tr1-4 together with its likely correlatives by the YPF mathed TV. with its likely correlatives by the XRF method. This would provide a more definitive test<br>the possible correlation between these two semples (De Li the possible correlation between these two samples (Perkins et al., 1998). Note however,<br>that three or more samples need to be applyied (that is not al., 1998). Note however, that three or more samples need to be analyzed (at least  $tr1-4$ ,  $rg-18$ , and  $rg-143$ ). Since sample preparation for XRF analyses are laborious, and my time for such work is limited will be unable to do them until after th sample preparation for XRF analyses are laborious, and my time for such work is limited, I will be unable to do them until after the first of next year.

If you have questions concerning any of the above or the enclosed invoice for the electron analyses, please contact me at your convenience. probe analyses, please contact me at your convenience.

Regards,

Michael E. Perkins<br>801-581-6552 (office) mperk@mines.utah.ed



 $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ 

Table 1. Electron probe microanalyses of individual glass shards

1. All analytical concentrations in wt%.<br>2. Total Fe as  $Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>$ .

Table 2. Averages of electron probe microanalyses of glass shards from Skull Valley, UT ash bed samples and some similar ash bed samples from other areas

Samples'	$n^2$	SiO. [.51°	[.01]	$TiO2$ Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> [.2]	Fe2O <sub>1</sub> <sup>4</sup> MnO [.03]	[.005]	$[.01]$ $[.02]$		[.02]	MgO CaO BaO Na, O' K, O [.2]		- CI $[.3]$ $[.004]$ $[.03]$	F.	<b>H2O</b> [1.0]	$\overline{\bullet}$ 1.031	Sum [1.0]
$tr1-1$	22.		70.8 0.10	12.4	1.68	$0.083 \cdot 0.04 \cdot 0.46$			0.01	3.4	5.1	0.17	0.27	5.8	0.15	100.2
$tr1-2$	22.		70.9 0.10	12.3	1.66	0.079 0.04 0.47			0.01	3.4	5.0	0.17	0.30	6.0	0.17	100.3
$tr1-3$	22.	71.0	0.10	12.3	1.67	0.075 0.05 0.47			0.00	3.4	5.1	0.17	0.28	5.5	0.16	100.0
cv 12-20-6pg	20.		70.9 0.11	12.5	1.56	0.076 0.05 0.53			0.00	2.9	5.7	0.18	0.31	5.0	0.18	99.64
tr1 $-4$	22.	72.9	0.12	11.B	0.78	0.058 0.05 0.50			0.00	2.9		$5.2 \quad 0.14$	0.37	5.2	0.19	99.8
rg-18	20.		72.5 0.12	-11.7	0.77	0.054 0.06 0.48			0.04	2.4	6.3	0.14	0.11	5.4	0.08	100.0
rg-143	20.		73.3 0.12	11.8	0.83	0.050 0.06		0.51	0.03	2.3	6.0	0.14	0.13	4.6	0.09	99.8
Walcott ash bed	-20		74.1 0.18	11.5	1.21	0.040 0.08 0.48			0.10	3.3	5.1	0.10	0.09	-3.3	0.06	99.3

1. The "trl" samples are from Skull Valley, UT. The "cv" sample is from the Cache Valley, UT area. The "rg" samples are from the Rich Grande Rift, New Mexico. The Walcott ash bed sample is from the type section near Americ

 $\mathcal{L}$ 

 $\overline{a}$ 

4. Total Fe as Fe<sub>2</sub>O3. Second to cation exchange with groundwater so measured concentrations do not reflect original concentrations.<br>5. Alkalies are subject to cation exchange with groundwater so measured concentrations d









 $\sim$ 



Figure la. Fe vs. Ca for Skull Valley ash bed and similar ash bed in Cache Valley, UT

Fe

Figure lb. Fe vs. Ca for ash bed trl-4 and compositionally similar ash beds.

ca<br>O



Fe

Mr. DARDEN G. HOOD RONALD E. HATFIELD<br>Tector Ronald E. HATFIELD RONALD E. HATFIELD

Laboratory Manager

CHRISTOPHER PATRICK TERESA A. ZILKO-MILLER<br>Associate Managers

January 4, 1999

Mr. Donald L. Wells/F. Swan Geomatrix Consultants 100 Pine Street, 10th Floor San Francisco, CA 94111

Dear Mr. Wells and Mr. Swan:

Please find enclosed the radiocarbon dating results for two samples of carbonate sediment (4790/FS-1a/TP-7 and 4790/FS-1b/TP-7) which were submitted on December 17 for analysis on the ADVANCE delivery basis. They were both very small, requiring us to convert the sample carbon to graphite and then to count the radiocarbon atomically using an accelerator mass spectrometer (AMS). They each provided plenty of carbon for reliable measurements and all analytical steps went normally. The quoted errors represent 1 sigma statistics. Since these errors cannot include uncertainties outside of those which can be quantified during measurement, it is best to consider them as minimum quotes.

BETA ANALYTIC **INC.**  RADIOCARBON **DATING SERVICES** 

Literature discussing the generalities of analysis and calendar calibration are enclosed. The "Analytical Procedures and Final Report" discussion should answer most questions about the report and results. If you have any specific questions, please do not hesitate to contact us.

When reporting the results, you should designate the radiocarbon "BP" ages as the "Conventional Radiocarbon Age", quote the measured C13/C12 ratios and note that the dates were done at Beta Analytic. Calendar calibrated results are not enclosed as the results were beyond the calendar calibration range.

Our invoice is enclosed. Please, immediately give it to the appropriate office for prompt payment or send VISA charge authorization. Thank you.

Sincerely,<br>Surely Hood

4985 S.W. 74 COURT, MIAMI, FL 33155 U.S.A. "TELEPHONE: 305-667-5167 **/** FAX: 305-663-0964 **/** INTERNET: beta@radiocarbon.com WEB SITE: http://www.radiocarbon.com


Mr. DARDEN G. HOOD **Ronald Executive Control of the Control of Control Control of Control Cont** 

Laboratory Manager

CHRISTOPHER PATRICK TERESA A. ZILKO-MILLER<br>Associate Managers

### ANALYTICAL PROCEDURES AND FINAL REPORT

**BETA** ANALYTIC **INC.**  RADIOCARBON **DATING SERVICES** 

#### FINAL REPORT

This package includes the final date report, this statement outlining our analytical procedures, a glossary of pretreatment terms, calendar calibration information, billing documents (containing balance/credit information and the number of samples submitted within the yearly discount period), and peripheral items to use with future submittals. The final report includes the individual analysis method, the delivery basis, the material type and the individual pretreatments applied. Please recall any correspondences or communications we may have had regarding sample integrity, size, special considerations or conversions from one analytical technique to another (e.g. radiometric to AMS). The final report has also been sent by fax or e-mail, where available.

#### PRETREATMENT

Results were obtained on the portion of suitable carbon remaining after any necessary chemical and mechanical pretreatments of the submitted material. Pretreatments were applied, where necessary, to isolate <sup>14</sup>C which may best represent the time event of interest. Individual pretreatments are listed on the report next to each result and are defined in the enclosed glossary. When interpreting the results, it is important to consider the pretreatments. Some samples cannot be fully pretreated making their <sup>14</sup>C ages more subjective than samples which can be fully pretreated. Some materials receive no pretreatments. Please read the pretreatment glossary.

#### ANALYSIS

Materials measured by the radiometric technique were analyzed by synthesizing sample carbon to benzene (92% C), measuring for **" 4C** content in a scintillation spectrometer, and then calculating for radiocarbon age. If the Extended Counting Service was used, the  $^{14}$ C content was measured for a greatly extended period of time. AMS results were derived from reduction of sample carbon to graphite (100 %C), along with standards and backgrounds. The graphite was then sent for  $^{14}C$ measurement in an accelerator-mass-spectrometer located at one of six collaborating research facilities, who return the results to us for verification, isotopic fractionation correction, calendar calibration, and reporting.

#### THE RADIOCARBON AGE AND CALENDAR CALIBRATION

The "Conventional C14 Age (\*)" is the-result after applying C13/C12 corrections to the measured age and is the most appropriate radiocarbon age (the "\*" is discussed at the bottom of the final report). Applicable calendar calibrations are included for organic materials and fresh water carbonates between 0 and 10,000 BP and for marine carbonates between 0 and 8,300 BP. If certain calibrations are not included with this report, the results were either too young, too old, or inappropriate for calibration.

> 4985 S.W. 74 **COURT,** MIAMI, FL **33155 U.S.A.**  TELEPHONE: 305-667-5167 **/** FAX: **305-663-0964 / INTERNET:** beta@radiocarbon.com WEB SITE: http://www.radiocarbon.com



# APPENDIX E

# PROPRIETARY INDUSTRY GRAVITY DATA

#### APPENDIX **E**

#### PROPRIETARY **INDUSTRY** GRAVITY **DATA**

Approximately 1030 gravity measurements have been collected over a 400 square mile area in Skull Valley for the purpose of supporting oil exploration. These land based gravity data were acquired by Edcon, Inc. in 1978 along roads at a measurement spacing of approximately  $\frac{1}{4}$ mile.

Gravity surveys measure the earth's acceleration of gravity, which is directly related to the subsurface density distribution. Geologic faults are sometimes expressed by an increased lateral change (horizontal gradient) of the gravity field.

During the initial phase of this investigation, Geomatrix licensed 80 gravity stations from Edcon, Inc. comprising two east-west profiles from this data set. These profiles are located immediately north and south of the PFSF site. After reviewing these data, Geomatrix licensed the remaining gravity measurements from Edcon, Inc. The color contoured Bouguer Gravity data are shown on Plate E-1. The terrain correction was computed to Hayford-Bowie Zone J using a density of 2.67 g/cm<sup>3</sup>. The Bouguer gravity was computed using a density of 2.67 g/cm3. The 1930 International gravity formula was used to compute the latitude correction.

These gravity data are owned by Edcon, Inc. and may not be publicly distributed. Geomatrix received permission from Edcon, Inc. to publicly present contoured gravity data in the immediate vicinity of the site. As such, Plate 1 shows contoured gravity data within a radius of approximately 2.5 miles of the site.

The Skull Valley gravity data are used to assist with the regional fault interpretations and with the development of the regional structural cross-sections (Figures 2-1 and 2-3). The prominent gravity lows, gravity highs, and areas having steep gravity gradients are presented on Plate 6. In addition, the gravity data are used to assist in the placement of two of the shear wave seismic lines. Line PFSF-98A was extended eastward such that it crossed the maximum horizontal gravity gradient. The orientation of seismic line PFSF-98B was chosen so as to trend perpendicular to the local basin structure as inferred from the gravity data.

# TERRAIN CORRECTED **BOUGER** GRAVITY MAP

# (Proprietary Data Licensed from **EDCON,** Inc.)

Private Fuel Storage Facility Skull Valley, Utah



**NOTE:** This 1:100,000-scale gravity map is based on proprietary data that are owned **by** Edcon, Inc. The license agreement prohibits general distribution of the regional gravity data. Plate **E-1**  may be made available to reviewers of this report who agree to abide **by** the terms of the license agreement.



# **VOLUME III- APPENDIX** F

# Fault Evaluation Study and Seismic Hazard Assessment

Private Fuel Storage Facility Skull Valley, Utah

#### *Prepared for:*

Stone & Webster Engineering Corporation P.O. Box 5406 Denver, Colorado 80217-5406

*Prepared by:* 

Geomatrix Consultants, Inc. 100 Pine Street, 10th Floor San Francisco, California 94111 (415) 434-9400

February 1999

Project No. 4790

# Geomatrix Consultants



# APPENDIX F

# ASSESSMENT OF APPROPRIATE GROUND MOTION ATTENUATION RELATIONSHIPS



## **APPENDIX** F ASSESSMENT OF APPROPRIATE **GROUND** MOTION **ATTENUATION RELATIONSHIPS**

#### **INTRODUCTION**

At present, strong motion data recorded in Utah are very limited. In the past, evaluations of seismic hazard, (e.g. Youngs and others, 1987) have typically concluded from examination of the limited strong and weak motion (i.e. seismographic network recordings) that strong ground motion attenuation relationships developed from analysis of California earthquake recordings can be used for Basin and Range sites. However, more recent studies have used examinations of world-wide normal faulting earthquake data together with a variety of modeling techniques to infer that there may be significant differences between strong ground motions in California and those from normal faulting earthquakes in extensional tectonic regimes, such as the Basin and Range region of north-central Utah. Much of this work was reviewed as part of the seismic hazard assessment for the proposed nuclear waste repository at Yucca Mountain, Nevada (CRWMS M&O, 1998). As part of that study, a panel of seven ground motion experts was assembled to provide assessments of the appropriate ground motion models for the Basin and Range region of southern Nevada. In that study, two basic approaches were used to develop ground motion attenuation relationships, one based on modifications to empirical California strong motion attenuation relationships and one based on numerical modeling. For this study, we utilize the results of the Yucca mountain study to modify California empirical ground motions to the conditions at Skull Valley, Utah. These modifications account for the effects of the characteristics of the earthquake source, the crustal wave propagation path, and the local site geology.

### **MODIFICATIONS** FOR **EARTHQUAKE SOURCE EFFECTS**

The ground motion expert panel for the Yucca Mountain study selected seven alternative empirical attenuation relationships for use in estimating strong ground motions from normal faulting earthquakes. These relationships are listed in Table F-1. Five alternative scaling relationships were developed for the project to scale the relationships for the difference between the earthquake sources of California strike-slip earthquakes and normal faulting earthquakes (see column 2 of Table F-I). The first is the assumption that there is no significant difference (no scaling). The second scaling method is a set of empirical adjustment factors derived by Dr. N. Abrahamson to adjust the Abrahamson and Silva (1997) attenuation relationships from strike-slip to normal faulting (designated A-E in Table F-i). The third



scaling method used by the expert panel is one-half of the empirical adjustment factors developed by Dr. N. Abrahamson (designated 1/2A-E in Table F-I). The fourth and fifth scaling factors were developed by Drs. K. Campbell and W. Silva using the point source stochastic ground motion model and the difference in stress drop between California strike-slip and extensional normal faulting earthquakes (designated KCSC and WSSC, respectively in Table F-i).

The amount of scaling as a function of earthquake magnitude and ground motion period is shown on Figure F-1. The empirical scaling relationship developed by Dr. Abrahamson was only defined for the period range of PGA to 2.0 seconds. For this study we assume that the scaling factor he obtained for 2.0 second spectral acceleration also applies to longer periods.

The third column of Table F-1 lists the relative weights applied to each of the scaled empirical attenuation relationships. These weights are an average of the weights assigned by the seven ground motion panel experts. We propose to use this assessment to select appropriate scaled empirical attenuation relationships to apply to normal faulting earthquakes in Utah. The assessments for the Yucca Mountain project were for rock site conditions, while the Skull Valley site is located on alluvial soils. Five of the rock site attenuation relationships listed in Table F-I have companion alluvial soil site attenuation relationships. The fourth column of Table F-I lists the re-normalized weights for these five relationships scaled with the indicated earthquake source scaling factors. The relationship developed by Sabetta and Pugliese (1996) was not included because it was given a low weight by only one expert, resulting in a combined average relative weight of less that one percent.

As indicated on Figure F-1, the scaling factors developed by Drs. Campbell (KCSC) and Silva (WSSC) are very similar. Therefore, for this study, we used Dr. Silva's scaling factors for both KCSC and WSSC scaling because they have a convenient numerical expression that can be used to adjust the coefficients of the selected empirical attenuation relationships. As a result, 17 alternative scaled empirical attenuation relationships were used to model horizontal ground motions at the site.

A similar process was used to specify empirical attenuation relationships for vertical motions. Table F-2 lists the empirical attenuation relationships for vertical motions considered by the Yucca Mountain Ground Motion Expert Panel. There are fewer relationships available for vertical motions. One panel member chose to apply a vertical/horizontal ground motion ratio



for rock sites to the Boore and others (1997) attenuation relationship as one option for specifying vertical motions.

The second column of Table F-2 lists the scaling relationships to adjust the empirical models to normal faulting conditions. Dr. Abrahamson developed a separate set of empirical adjustment factors for vertical motions. The stress drop scaling factors for horizontal motions developed by Drs. Campbell and Silva were assumed by the panel members to also apply to vertical motions. Figure F-2 compares the resulting scaling relationships for vertical motions.

The third column of Table F-2 lists the relative weights applied to each of the scaled empirical attenuation relationships averaged over the seven ground motion panel experts. The fourth column of Table F-1 lists the re-normalized weights for those relationships that have companion soil site attenuation relationships. No vertical/horizontal ratio for soil sites was developed by the expert panel and the Sadigh and others (1997) relationships do not contain coefficients for vertical motions on soil sites. As a result, nine alternative attenuation relationships were used to evaluate ground motions for vertical sites.

#### **MODIFICATIONS** FOR **CRUSTAL** PATH **EFFECTS**

The rate of attenuation of ground motion level with distance from the source is controlled by geometric spreading of the wave front and anelastic energy absorption by the crustal rocks along the travel path. Given that the earthquakes of interest to the Skull Valley site are expected to occur in the upper portion of the earth's crust in similar geometries to California earthquakes, we assume that similar geometric spreading effects occur in both regions. The energy absorption along the travel path is usually represented by the quality factor, Q. Crustal rocks in California generally have a relatively low value of  $Q$ , that is often modeled by the relationship  $Q = 150f^{0.6}$ , where f is the frequency of the seismic wave. Singh and Herrmann (1983) assessed Q for the Utah region to be  $Q = 500f^{0.2}$ . This higher value of Q may result in less attenuation of seismic waves with distance compared to California. The difference in  $Q$  is expected to have no significant effect for nearby sources because the travel path is only a few kilometers. However, the most active source of large earthquakes in the region is the Wasatch fault, located approximately 80 km to the east of the site. For this source, the effects of differences in crustal attenuation may be important.

The effect of differences in  $Q$  between California and Utah was assessed using the technique applied for the Yucca Mountain study. The point source stochastic ground motion model (Hanks, 1979; Hanks and McGuire, 1981; Boore, 1983, 1986). was used to simulate spectral



accelerations for a magnitude 7 earthquake at a range of distances using the Q expressions for California and Utah (a magnitude 7 earthquake was chosen as the likely size of earthquakes on the Wasatch fault that may have a significant contribution to hazard at the site. All other parameters were set at appropriate values for California earthquakes. Figure F-3 shows the results of these simulations.

The difference between the ground motion levels as a function of distance, r, can be modeled by the expression (Youngs and others, 1987):

$$
SA(Utah Q)/SA(California Q) = 1.0 + \gamma r
$$
 (F-1)

The values of parameter  $\gamma$  obtained from the simulations are:



These values, together with Equation  $(F-1)$  were used to adjust the selected empirical attenuation relationships to account for the expected difference in crustal attenuation between California and north-central Utah.

#### **MODIFICATIONS** FOR **LOCAL** SITE **CONDITIONS**

Soil profile at the Skull Valley site consist of approximately 45 feet of latest Pleistocene alluvium (silts, clays and dense sands) underlain by Pleistocene silts and clays. These are, in turn, underlain by partially consolidated Tertiary sediments of the Salt Lake group to a depth of 400 to 800 ft. The shallow refraction surveys (Geosphere Midwest, 1997) indicate a shear wave velocity of approximately 750 ft/sec for the latest Pleistocene sediments and 2000 ft/sec for the Pleistocene sediments. These velocities are consistent with the average velocities estimated by Bay Geophysics (1999) of 800 ft/sec for the soil above the Pleistocene boundary and 1,100 ft/sec for soil above the Tertiary boundary. Shear wave velocity data from the Salt



Lake Valley suggests velocities in the range of 1,000 to 1,750 m/sec (3,280 to 5,741 ft/sec) for the Tertiary Salt Lake group (Tinsley and others, 1991; Williams and others, 1993; Wong and Silva, 1993).

On the basis of the depth to rock and the general soil conditions, one would classify the Skull Valley site as a deep alluvial soil site. However, the available shear wave velocity data suggests that the materials are somewhat stiffer than typically associated with alluvial soil sites representative of the empirical ground motion data base used to develop the California soil site attenuation relationships. Figure F-4 compares the estimated velocity profile for the Skull Valley site with the velocity profile developed by Silva and others (1998) to represent alluvial soils typical of California soil site strong motion recording stations. The velocities for the deeper sediments in Skull Valley are much higher that the corresponding velocities in typical California deep soil deposits.

In order to evaluate the effect of the different velocity profiles on ground motions, a analysis of the relative response of the Skull Valley soil profile compared to the generic California deep soil profile was performed. These analyses were performed using the following approach:

- 1. Select a set of rock site recordings from earthquakes within the appropriate magnitude range and scale the recordings to ground motion levels relevant to evaluating the site hazard.
- 2. Deconvolve the recordings to a depth where the crustal velocities in California and Utah are similar, removing the rock site amplification.
- 3. Compute the response of the California generic deep soil and Skull Valley profiles using the deconvolved rock motions from step 2.
- 4. Compute the ratio of the response spectra for the surface motions obtained from the site response analyses of step 3. Use the statistics of these response spectral ratios to assess the expected difference between the response of California deep soil sites and the Skull Valley site.

#### **SELECTION** OF ROCK **SITE** RECORDINGS

It is expected that the major contributions to the hazard will be from large magnitude earthquakes occurring on the nearby Skull Valley and Stansbury faults. Therefore, twelve rock recordings from magnitude -6.5 to 7 earthquakes were selected for the site response analyses. Table F-3 lists the selected recordings. Six of the recordings are from California earthquakes and six are from large normal faulting earthquakes recorded in Italy.



The recordings were scaled to ground motion levels corresponding to maximum magnitude events on the two nearby faults. The mean maximum magnitude for the Stansbury fault is M 7. Using the rock-site attenuation relationship developed by Abrahamson and Silva (1997) scaled to normal faulting conditions, the resulting median peak ground acceleration is 0.32g. Figure F-5 shows the corresponding response spectrum. Each of the rock recordings were scaled so that their response spectrum matches the target spectrum on average by minimizing the area between the two spectrum. The mean maximum magnitude for the East fault is M 6.5. Using the rock-site attenuation relationship developed by Abrahamson and Silva (1997) scaled to normal faulting conditions, the resulting median peak ground acceleration is 0.57g. Figure F-6 shows the corresponding response spectrum and the rock recordings scaled to match.

#### DECONVOLUTION OF ROCK MOTIONS

The recorded rock surface motions were deconvolved to a depth where the crustal velocities are comparable in California and Utah. Figure F-7 shows crustal shear wave velocity profiles developed for northern and southern California by Wald and others (1991) and Magistrale and others (1992), respectively. Also shown on Figure F-7 are shear wave velocity profiles for the site region. The crustal velocity profile used for earthquake location in north-central Utah consists of the following (J. Pechmann, Univ. of Utah, pers. comm., 1999):

Depth Range (km)	P-Velocity (km/sec)	S-Velocity (km/sec)
$0 - 1.4$	3.4	1.95
$1.4 - 15.5$	5.9	3.39

Utah Crustal Velocity Profile

The three-layer Skull Valley model shown on Figure F-7 represents 500 ft of Tertiary basin fill with a velocity of 1.375 km/sec over the above crustal velocity profile. Also shown on Figure F-7 is a two-layer profile consisting of 500 **ft** of Tertiary basin fill with a velocity of 1.375 km/sec over a uniform crustal velocity of 3 km/sec. This velocity was used by Wong and Silva (1993) to represent the upper crustal velocity in north-central Utah and was used for sensitivity analyses in this study. It was judged that the three profiles reached sufficiently similar velocities at a depth of 3 km to use this depth as the appropriate base point for site response analyses.

The near-surface shear wave velocities at rock site recording stations typically exhibit a strong velocity gradient. Figure F-8 shows an average shear wave velocity profile developed by Silva and others (1998) to represent the near-surface velocities at California strong motion stations.



This 100-m profile was placed at the top of the two California crustal velocity profiles to represent near-surface conditions.

The deconvolution calculation were performed using the one-dimensional wave propagation computer program SHAKE (Schnable and others, 1972). Figure F-9 shows the normalized shear modulus and damping curves recommended by Silva and others (1998) for use at shallow depths in weathered and fractured rock typical of the velocity profile shown on Figure F-8. Once the rock velocity reaches  $3,000$  ft/sec (at a depth of about 50 ft), the rock is assumed to behave linearly (no modulus reduction).

The material damping in the rock below a depth of 50 ft was estimated using the observed high frequency attenuation at rock site recording stations. This is modeled by the attenuation parameter developed by Anderson and Hough (1984) have show that the high frequency attenuation of ground motions in the near surface can be modeled by the attenuation parameter Silva and Darragh (1996) indicate that is related to the near surface shear wave quality factor, *Q,* by the expression:

$$
\kappa = \frac{H}{Q_s V_s} \tag{F-2}
$$

where  $H$  is the portion of the crust over which the energy loss occurs and  $V_s$  is the average shear wave velocity over H. The appropriate value of H is 1 to 2 km (Silva and Darragh, 1992).

 $Q_s$  is, in turn, related to the material damping,  $\lambda$ , used in liner viscoelastic wave propagation modeling (such as the site response analyses performed for this study using the program SHAKE) by the expression:

$$
\lambda = \frac{1}{2Q_s} \tag{F-3}
$$

Silva and Darragh (1992) found that  $Q_s$  for WUS rocks is proportional to shear wave velocity and that a average value of  $\kappa = 0.04$  sec is appropriate for California rock site strong motion recording stations. Using the assumption that  $Q_s \propto V_s$ , material damping values were computed for each of the layers in the upper 2 km of the California crustal models using Equations (F-2) and (F-3) to produce a composite  $\kappa$  of 0.04 sec. The resulting  $Q_s$  values and



equivalent damping values for the upper 2 km of the northern and southern California velocity models are given in Table F-4. Damping in the rock below a depth of 2 km was set to zero.

The deconvolution analysis assumes that all of the surface rock motions are a result of vertically propagating shear waves. However, Silva (1986) found that some of the surface motions consist of higher mode surface waves. He recommended that motions for frequencies higher than about 15 Hz be filtered out of the surface motions before deconvolution to reduce the potential for overestimation of the motions at depth. He also indicated that the motions should be removed using an anti-aliasing filter rather than the abrupt frequency cut-off employed in program SHAKE. Accordingly, the rock recordings were low-pass filtered with a Butterworth filter prior to being input into the deconvolution analysis. The filtering was preformed prior to scaling the records to the target rock motion response spectra shown on Figures F-4 and F-5. The records were also high-pass filtered above a frequency of 0.14 Hz (a period of 7.0 sec.) and base-line corrected to remove spurious low frequency motions. Twenty four base motions were then computed at a depth of 3 km, twelve for the northern California crust and 12 for the southern California crust.

#### Site Response Analyses

The twenty-four base motions were used to compute the response of the soil profiles shown on Figure F-4. Silva and others (1998) used two alternative sets of soil modulus and damping relationships for California alluvial soils. One set, designated herein as Set A, was developed by EPRI (1993) and is shown on Figure **F-I** Oa. A second, somewhat stiffer set was found to work well for some sites. These curves , designated herein as Set B, are shown on Figure F **10b.** Both sets were used to compute the soil profile responses.

Because only limited shear wave velocity data are available for the Skull Valley sediments, sensitivity analyses were performed using a range of shear wave velocities.

As indicated above, the average velocity for the Holocene and Pleistocene sediments are estimated to be 750 and 2,000 ft/sec, respectively. The range in velocities reported by Geosphere Midwest (1997) was from about 700 to 790 ft/sec for the latest Pleistocene soils and 1,700 to 2,400 for the Pleistocene soils. Analyses were conducted using the upper and lower limits of these velocity ranges as well as the midpoint. Analyses were conducted using both Set A and Set B modulus and damping relationships (Figures F-10a and F-10b).



Analyses were also conducted using the lower limit, the midpoint and the upper limit of the shear wave velocity for the Tertiary sediments. An additional set of analyses was also conducted assuming that the velocity of the sediments varies linearly from the lower limit at the top of the Tertiary layer to the upper limit at the bottom. The Tertiary sediments and underlying rock were assumed to behave linearly. The damping in the Tertiary sediments and rock to a depth of 2 km was computed using the same technique outlined above for the California crustal models. Wong and Silva (1993) used a  $\kappa$  of 0.04 sec for Utah sites, similar to California rock sites. However, the higher near-surface rock velocities in Utah suggest that the  $\kappa$  values may be somewhat lower. Accordingly,  $\kappa$  values of 0.02, 0.03, and 0.04 sec were used in the analyses. Table F-5 lists the resulting  $Q_s$  values and equivalent damping values for the upper 2 km of the Utah crustal models. Damping in the rock below a depth of 2 km was set to zero.

#### Relative Site Response

The relative response of the Skull Valley sediments compared to typical California deep soil sites was evaluated by computing the ratio of the response spectra for the computed surface motions for each individual input base rock motion. Figure **F-11** shows an example of one such set of spectral ratios. Each plot shows the ratio of surface response spectra computed using the rock motion indicated. The rock motions in this example were scaled to the M 6.5 rock spectra (0.57g PGA) and deconvolved through the southern California crustal model. The California soil motions were computed using the deep soil velocity profile shown on Figure F-4 placed on top of the southern California crust and using Set A soil modulus and damping relationships. The Skull Valley sediment motions were computed using the median sediment velocities on the three-layer crustal model with a  $\kappa$  of 0.03 sec and Set A soil modulus and damping relationships. The individual rock input motions produce variations in the relative response reflecting differences in the frequency content of the records. Because we are interested in the average differences in the relative response of the two profiles and because ground motions are typically assumed to be lognormally distributed, we use the geometric mean (average of the logs) of the spectral ratios to evaluate the relative response and assume that this represents the median relative response.

Figure F-12 shows examples of the statistics of the individual spectral ratios. Each curve on part (a) is the geometric mean of twelve spectral ratios. The curve labeled "So. CA crust, Set A is the geometric mean of the twelve spectral ratios shown on Figure F-11. The curves four curves shown on part (a) indicate the effect of the two California crustal models and the



alternative soil modulus and damping relationships. As indicated, the two crustal models produce very similar spectral ratios. The alternative sets of soil properties produce a greater difference in the spectral ratios. Set B properties produce lower spectral ratios because the stiffer modulus reduction and lower damping values produce higher response for the California deep soil profiles. Because the empirical attenuation relationships use data from both northern and southern California and because Silva and others (1998) found both sets of soil properties to be appropriate for California sites, we compute the average relative response over all four California conditions (48 spectral ratios).

Part (b) of Figure F-12 shows the effect of the level of motion on the median spectral ratio. [The curve labeled 0.57g PGA rock motions is the geometric mean of the four curves shown on Part (a).] Slightly lower spectral ratios are computed using the higher level rock input motions, indicating that the shaking level has a somewhat greater effect on the Skull Valley sediment response than on the California deep soil response.

Figure F-13 shows the effect of variations in the properties of the Pleistocene soils on the median spectral ratios. Part (a) shows the effect of the alternative sets of shear modulus and damping relationships (Figures  $F-10a$  and  $F-10b$ ) and part be shows the effect of varying the soil velocity over the range in reported velocities. The alternative sets of modulus and damping curves have a greater effect than the range of low-strain shear wave velocities on the relative response.

Figure F-14 shows addition effects of variations in the velocities of the Skull Valley sediments. Part (a) shows the effect of varying the Tertiary sediment velocity, including a gradational velocity model. The effect of the velocity variations is relatively small. Comparison of part (a) of Figure F- 14 with part (b) of Figure F- 13 indicates the frequency range controlled by the various sediments. The relative response for ground motion periods less than about 0.5 sec (frequencies greater than 2 Hz) are affected by the velocities assigned to the Holocene and Pleistocene soils while the relative response for periods greater than about 0.5 sec are affected by the velocities assigned to the Tertiary sediments. Part (b) of Figure F-14 combines the velocity variations of the previous two cases, shown the effect of varying the velocities of all of the sediments over the ranges indicated above.

Figure F-15 shows the effect of the alternative crustal properties on the median relative response. Part (a) shows the effect of varying  $\kappa$  from 0.02 to 0.04 sec and part (b) shows the effect of using the two-layer versus the three-layer velocity profiles shown on Figure F-7.



Varying  $\kappa$  has only a minor effect on the relative response at high frequencies and the alternative crustal velocity profile only has a significant effect at periods longer than 2 seconds.

The results of the relative response calculations are summarized on Figure F-16. Part (a) shows the median relative response curves for the cases discussed above using rock motions scaled to both M 7.0 and M 6.5 input levels. The variations in the relative response reflect uncertainties in the velocity of the sediments, the appropriate modulus and damping relationships, and the properties of the upper crust in Skull Valley. Part (b) shows the median relative response computed over the uncertainty in the site properties for the two input motion levels. These results indicate that the response of the Skull Valley site is slightly higher for high frequency motions and is lower for low frequency motions.

The exact peaks and valleys in the curves shown on part (b) arise in part because only a single average profile was used to represent the response of California deep soil sites. It is expected that if the variation in California soil profile velocities and depths was incorporated into the relative response analysis through the use of Monte Carlo simulation, then the relative spectral ratios will be smoothed out [see EPRI (1993) for an example of this approach]. Accordingly, a smooth relative response curve was constructed through the computed median spectral ratios as shown on part (b) of Figure F-16. Greater smoothing was applied to the long period spectral ratios because it is likely that considering a range of depths for the California profiles would tend to fill in the large "valley" in the median spectral ratios. The resulting site response adjustment factors are:





These factors were used to scale the empirical deep soil attenuation relationships to the Skull Valley site conditions.



## EMPIRICAL **ATTENUATION RELATIONSHIPS** FOR HORIZONTAL **MOTIONS AND SEISMIC SOURCE SCALING** FACTORS FROM THE **YUCCA MOUNTAIN GROUND** MOTION EXPERT **PANEL**

Private Fuel Storage Facility Skull Valley, Utah

Page 1 of 1





### EMPIRICAL **ATTENUATION RELATIONSHIPS** FOR VERTICAL **MOTIONS AND SEISMIC SOURCE SCALING** FACTORS FROM THE **YUCCA MOUNTAIN GROUND MOTION** EXPERT **PANEL**

Private Fuel Storage Facility Skull Valley, Utah

Page 1 of 1





# ROCK RECORDINGS **USED** IN **SITE RESPONSE ANALYSES**

Private Fuel Storage Facility

Skull Valley, Utah







# MATERIAL **DAMPING** FOR **CALIFORNIA CRUSTAL MODELS**

Private Fuel Storage Facility Skull Valley, Utah

Page **I** of 1

# Material Damping for California Crustal Models



#### Southern California Crust



 $\Sigma$ *K* = 0.04



## MATERIAL **DAMPING** FOR **SKULL** VALLEY **CRUSTAL** PROFILES

Private Fuel Storage Facility Skull Valley, Utah

Page 1 of **3** 



Three Crustal Layers, *x=* 0.02 sec, Low Tertiary V,

#### Three Crustal Layers,  $K = 0.03$  sec, Low Tertiary V<sub>s</sub>

 $\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{in}}$ 



Three Crustal Layers,  $K = 0.04$  sec, Low Tertiary V<sub>s</sub>







 $\Sigma \kappa$ = 0.02



## MATERIAL **DAMPING** FOR **SKULL** VALLEY **CRUSTAL** PROFILES

Private Fuel Storage Facility Skull Valley, Utah

Page 2 of 3



#### Three Crustal Layers,  $K= 0.03$  sec, Midrange Tertiary V<sub>s</sub>

#### Three Crustal Layers, *K=* 0.04 sec, Midrange Tertiary V.



Three Crustal Layers,  $K= 0.02$  sec, High Tertiary V<sub>s</sub>









## MATERIAL **DAMPING** FOR **SKULL** VALLEY **CRUSTAL** PROFILES Private Fuel Storage Facility

Skull Valley, Utah

Page 3 of 3



 $\overline{\Sigma_{K}}=0.04$ 

# Three Crustal Layers,  $K= 0.03$  sec, Gradational Tertiary V<sub>s</sub>



 $\Sigma \kappa = 0.03$ 









**C', 0** 'p **z**

 $\ddotsc$ 

SCALING RELATIONSHIPS DEVELOPED FOR THE YUCCA MOUNTAIN PROJECT (CRWMS M&O, 1998) FOR TRANSLATING HORIZONTAL GROUND 4790<br>MOTIONS FROM CALIFORNIA STRIKE-SLIP EARTHQUAKES TO MOTIONS FROM CALIFORNIA STRIKE-SLIP EARTHQUAKES TO Figure EXTENSIONAL TECTONICS NORMAL FAULTING EARTHQUAKE MOTIONS.



**(.**

**0**

SCALING RELATIONSHIPS DEVELOPED FOR THE YUCCA MOUNTAIN<br>
PROJECT (CRWMS M&O, 1998) FOR TRANSLATING VERTICAL GROUND<br>
MOTIONS FROM CALIFORNIA STRIKE-SLIP EARTHQUAKES TO<br>
EXTENSIONAL TECTONICS NORMAL FAULTING EARTHQUAKE MOTION









 $\int_{0}^{\infty}$ 

ROCK SITE MOTIONS SCALED TO MEDIAN RESPONSE SPECTRUM FOR A M 7 EARTHQUAKE ON THE 4790 GEOMATRIX **STANSBURY FAULT.** 



 $\left\{ \right.$ 

 $F-6$ 






















Von-GDS