Report No. UT-XXX

SEISMIC VULNERABILITY OF UDOT LIFELINES IN SALT LAKE COUNTY, UTAH

Prepared For:

Utah Department of Transportation Research Division

Submitted by:

Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering University of Utah

Authored by:

Dr. Steven F. Bartlett, P.E., Associate Professor

- **Dr. Xuesong, Zhou, Assistant Professor**
- **Dr. Aleksandar Stevanovic*, Assistant Professor**

April 2011

Disclaimer

The authors alone are responsible for the preparation and accuracy of the information, data, analysis, discussions, recommendations, and conclusions presented herein. The contents do not necessarily reflect the views, opinions, endorsements, or policies of the Utah Department of Transportation and the US Department of Transportation. The Utah Department of Transportation makes no representation or warranty of any kind, and assumes no liability therefore.

Acknowledgements

We thank the Research Division of the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) for the funding of this project. We would also like to thank Corin Piacenti for developing the NEHRP soil classification map for Salt Lake County.

Table of Contents

List of Figures

List of Tables

Executive Summary

Large earthquakes can cause extensive damage to transportation infrastructure. In addition to replacement and repair costs for the transportation infrastructure, such events can increase time delays and congestion that results from the loss of function of major components of the traffic network. This report describes the methodologies used to perform REDARS (Risks from Earthquake Damage to Roadway Systems) evaluations of urban transportation system in the Salt Lake Valley, Utah from damage resulting from two seismic events. The evaluations were performed using the Hazards System, Component and Economic Modules within the REDARS v.2 software (Chang et al., 2008). This report focuses on the hazards and the component module inputs, analyses and results. Additional system and economic analyses were subsequently calculated outside the REDARS model by Kim et al. (2008) using the expected damage states from this report. These analyses are also presented herein.

This seismic scenarios evaluated by this study were: (1) M7.0 event on the Salt Lake City segment of the Wasatch fault system, and (2) M6.0 event on the West Valley fault system, both of which are located in the Salt Lake Valley. The evaluations included damage to the transportation system resulting from strong motion (earthquake shaking), liquefaction ground displacement (i.e., lateral spread and settlement) and surface fault rupture. The damage estimates calculated by REDARS include bridge and link (i.e., roadway) damage states and total repair costs.

The repair costs for the Salt Lake City traffic network for the M7.0 and M6.0 events are estimated to be \$435 M and \$71 M (2004 value), respectively. These estimates include infrastructure repair costs, but do not include user losses (i.e., losses due to decreases in the efficiency of the transportation network) and economic losses. In addition, this study suggests that permanent ground displacement from liquefaction and fault rupture for the M7.0 event will be considerable and will be most pronounced on: I-15 (south of I-215), I-215 (west side), I-80 (from the downtown area westward) (Figure 4), and on the valley's east side near the Wasatch fault. For the M6.0 event, liquefaction and fault damage is much more limited and is mainly expected on I-80, near the downtown area, and on the west side of I-215 (Figure 6).

1

It is expected that damage to the network will severely disrupt traffic flows for several months or a few years. Impacts on road users can be estimated in terms of user costs resulting from travel time delay. This report also evaluates traffic disruption (i.e., user delay costs) resulting from the two scenario events. The VISUM traffic macro-simulation model was used to estimate the delay-based user costs. Road segments, which are vulnerable yet critical to detour traffic following an earthquake have been prioritized for potential rehabilitation. The VISUM evaluations suggest that the M6.0 scenario event would cause about \$65 million in user losses. More significantly, the M7.0 scenario event would cause about \$1.3 billion in user losses during a 6-month, post-event window. User losses beyond this value may be incurred, depending upon the time required to bring the network back to its original, pre-event capacity, which may require considerable time for the M7.0 scenario event. Adaptive traffic modeling (i.e., Dynamic Traveler Model (Section 6) suggests that the user losses may be about \$1.8 to 2 billion for a reconstruction period of 18 months following the M7.0 scenario event.

Links that are susceptible to damage in one scenario, but critical in carrying detour traffic for the other scenario are defined as lifelines. A shortlist of lifelines is provided for each earthquake scenario with detailed information including names, directions and addresses. This list of lifelines may aid UDOT in the planning, operation and emergency response functions of its traffic network prior to a seismic event.

1.0 Introduction

Previous studies have been conducted on the Salt Lake Valley transportation system using earthquake scenarios. King and Kiremidjian (1994) performed a comprehensive seismic hazard and loss estimation study for the Salt Lake Valley using a geographic information systems (GIS) platform. This study considered a M7.5 event on the Salt Lake City segment of the Wasatch fault and evaluated seismic hazards resulting from strong (i.e., earthquake shaking), liquefaction (i.e., severe loss of shear strength from elevated pore pressures), landsliding and surface fault rupture (i.e., fault displacement). Of the 279 bridges analyzed in this study, 264 bridges showed moderate or higher damage. One conclusion from this study was that the damage model overestimated bridge damage and that an improved damage model was needed (King and Kiremidjian, 1994).

A more recent study by the Wasatch Regional Council (WFRC, 2008) is summarized in their Natural Hazard Pre-Disaster Mitigation Plan. This study considered two earthquake scenarios: M7.1 and M5.9 events located in the Salt Lake Valley. The vulnerability and damage to the infrastructure from multiple earthquake hazards was obtained from HAZUS-MH (FEMA, 2005). Out of 698 highway bridges analyzed, 496 showed moderate or higher damage from the M7.1 event, or 71 percent with an estimated repair cost of \$469 M (2008 value). For the M5.9 scenario, 126 bridges showed moderate or higher damage, or 18 percent with an estimated repair cost of \$82 M (2008 value).

In contrast to these general loss estimation tools, REDARS was developed to more specifically evaluate the damage impacts to a region's traffic system resulting from an earthquake event. It estimates reconstruction, travel and economic losses associated with this damage. REDARS v. 1 (Werner et al. 2000; 2003) was developed jointly in 2000 by MCEER (Multidisciplinary Center for Earthquake Engineering Research) and the FHWA (Federal Highway Administration) as part of FHWA-MCEER Project 106. This earlier version of the software was tested for a pre-earthquake traffic network for Shelby County, Tennessee (Werner et al. 2000). After this, the software was used make a pre-event evaluation of the Los Angeles, California area highway system (Werner et al. 2006a). The software package that was implemented for this study is REDARS v.2, which is the most current version (Werner et al. 2006b).

3

REDARS v. 2 has four modules that are used in performing an assessment: (1) component, (2) hazards, (3) system and (4) economic. The component module consists of inputting component attributes (e.g., bridge and roadway attributes – Section 2.1) and the subsequent REDAR analyses that determine each component's post-event damage state (e.g., collapsed, severely damaged, no damage, etc.) and the post-event traffic state (i.e., full or partial closure for repairs) and the cost and duration of the repairs. The hazards module is used to determine the spatial distribution of strong motion, location of fault rupture and amount of liquefactioninduced ground failure and requires earthquake, fault geometry and soil inputs. The system module consists of input data (Section 2.1) and models for determining the seismic performance of the highway system at different elapsed times following the earthquake. Lastly, the economic model is used for estimating anticipated repair costs (Section 4) and economic losses induced by the increase in travel times and reduced trip demands (Section 5). This study focuses on implementing the first two modules to the Salt Lake Valley traffic network and earthquake hazards. A summary of how our results were used in subsequent system and economic analyses is also given.

2.0 Modeling Inputs

2.1 Component Module

The component module estimates the seismic performance of the system components for a given scenario earthquake. The required inputs are: NHPN, HPMS, NBI and OD files and a map of the NEHRP (National Earthquake Hazard Reduction Program) soil classifications for the study area (Figure 1, see also Appendix 1). The NHPN (National Highway Planning Network) file is maintained by the FHWA and contains the transportation network (i.e., interstates, principal arterials and minor arterials.) The HPMS (Highway Performance and Monitoring System) data file is a nationwide inventory distributed by the FHWA that includes the condition, performance, use and operating characteristics of a roadway. The FHWA National Bridge Inventory (NBI) includes the location, structural type, year built and number of bridge lanes for each bridge in the transportation system. The Origin Destination (OD) data includes travel origins and destinations based on periodic public surveys. The NEHRP soil map used in the Hazard Component (Section 2.2) was developed for this study from surficial geologic mapping and soils data available for the Salt Lake Valley.

These input files are normally imported into the REDARS software using its import wizard and are subsequently processed and placed into tabular form before the hazard analysis can be performed. However, we did not use the REDARS import wizard due to incompatibility issues that REDARS has with the current format of the NHPN and HPMS files. Following the release of REDARS v. 2 in 2006, the formats of these files have changed, thus making them incompatible with the REDARS import wizard. Instead the raw data from these files was placed directly in Microsoft AccessTM tables, which entailed a significant effort for the project team. Future improvements to REDARS should consider modifications to its current import wizard.

The transportation network we considered was not obtained from the FHWA NHPN; instead a more extensive transportation network was obtained from the Wasatch Front Regional Council and manually imported into REDARS. The WFRC network is more extensive than that of the NHPN and the WFRC network has been used in several traffic modeling studies performed by the University of Utah for UDOT and other agencies. This network consists of 1,407 bridges and 18,601 links in Salt Lake Valley. An overview map of the interstate corridors, primary highways and major roads for the study area is shown in Figure 1. In short, the traffic system consists of four major freeways. Interstate 15 runs north-south just west of downtown. Interstate 80 enters close to the airport and merges with I-15 west of downtown and then heads east through the residential areas. State Route 201 runs east-west and bisects I-15 and I-80 at a major interchange in the northeastern part of the valley near the downtown area. Interstate 215 is a beltway that transverses the northwest and west neighborhoods and encircles the southern part of Salt Lake City.

2.2 Hazards Module

The hazards module is used to estimate seismic hazards and their impacts to the transportation network. It contains models for calculating the seismic hazards (i.e., strong motion, liquefaction damage and surface fault rupture) imposed on the traffic network. The earthquake event can be defined in three different ways: a) point source (magnitude and epicenter location), b) walkthrough file (multiple events including earthquake magnitude and fault geometry) and c) United State Geological Survey (USGS) ShakeMap™ file, which is currently found at: [\(http://earthquake.usgs.gov/eqcenter/shakemap/\)](http://earthquake.usgs.gov/eqcenter/shakemap/).

We evaluated options b) and c) above. However, regarding option c), we found that when the ShakeMap™ option is used in REDARS 2, liquefaction and surface fault rupture effects are not calculated. This programming oversight is a serious shortfall for the Salt Lake Valley; because liquefaction ground failure is expected in many parts of the central part of the valley (Olsen et al., 2007). In addition, option c) does not include surface fault rupture effects, so it was not used.

Ultimately, we chose to use option b) because it estimates strong motion, fault rupture and liquefaction effects; thus it is the most comprehensive option from a seismic hazard standpoint. Option b) can include multiple earthquake scenarios and requires data that characterizes the known active fault system(s) or random earthquake sources. Strong motion estimates for the Salt Lake Valley were calculated by REDARS using the Abrahamson and Silva (1997) attenuation relation. (Unfortunately, the Next Generation of Ground-Motion Attenuation (NGA) models

(Powers et al. 2008) are not available in REDARS 2, which would be an improvement to its current methodology.)

We considered two faulting scenarios for the Salt Lake Valley: a characteristic M7.0 event on the Salt Lake City segment of the Wasatch fault (Wong et al., 2002) and a M6.0 event on the West Valley fault system. The Salt Lake City segment is the primary seismic threat to the Salt Lake Valley transportation system. It is a normal fault at the eastern most edge of the Basin and Range Province that is approximately 46 km long and is bounded to the east by the Wasatch Mountain Range (Figure 2). This fault has an average recurrence interval of 1,200–1,300 years (Lund 2005) and is capable of generating peak ground acceleration values between 0.3 to 1.0 g throughout the valley (Wong et al. 2002). The West Valley fault zone (Figure 2) is antithetic to the Salt Lake City segment and may or may not be linked to rupture on the Wasatch fault. Based on its mapped surface length, this fault was assigned a M6.0 event using empirical relations of Wells and Coppersmith (1994). The information needed by REDARS 2 for option b) is summarized in Table 1 for these faults.

The fault geometry for the Salt Lake City segment of the Wasatch fault was assumed to be a polygon consisting of four points (Table 1) (Figure 2). The depth of the fault was estimated to be 20 km and that the fault dips westward at an angle of 45 degrees. The actual depth and dip of faulting are unknown, but a 20 km depth and dip of 45 degrees is commonly used in evaluations of the Wasatch fault. In addition, because this is a normal fault, all fault movement was assigned in the dip direction. The hypocenter was approximated at the center of the fault plane (Table 1), and the center of energy release location was approximated as halfway between the fault's base and its hypocenter location.

Nonlinear behavior of soft and deep soil deposits at relatively high levels of strong ground motion is of particular interest to Utah's transportation network because much of its urban population and infrastructure is located within 10 km of the Wasatch fault, where future peak ground acceleration (pga) is expected to be 0.3 g to 1.0 g, depending on the site conditions and proximity to the Wasatch fault (Wong et al. 2002). In addition, the Salt Lake Valley, which contains approximately 50 percent of the State's population, is a relatively deep intermontane basin filled with interbedded alluvium and lacustrine deposits that extend to considerable

depths. For example, Arnow et al. (1970) (see also Wong et al. (2002)) estimate that the thickness of unconsolidated Quaternary sediments is about 100 to 360 m near downtown Salt Lake City and such sediments extend to a depth of over 600 m, just north of the downtown area. In addition, late-Pleistocene and Holocene surficial sediments deposited by the Pleistocene-age Lake Bonneville and the present Great Salt Lake are soft, compressible and typically classify as soft to medium consistency clays. Undoubtedly, soft soil effects will play a significant role in modifying the strong motion in the Salt Lake Valley.

REDARS v. 2 adjusts the strong motion estimates for soil effects using maps that use the NEHRP soil classification system (NEHRP, 1997). In implementing the Abrahamson and Silva (1997) attenuation relation, soil classes A, B and C are considered to be rock sites and are not adjusted; NEHRP soil classes D and E are considered to be soil sites and their ground motion estimates are adjusted. We developed a NEHRP site class map for the Salt Lake Valley, Utah (Figure 1) using geologic mapping and geophysical data (Figure 2) (Table 2). To produce this map, SH-wave velocities at 140 locations in the Salt Lake Valley were compiled from conventional downhole, crosshole and surface geophysical techniques. These Vs measurements were obtained from Ashland and Rollins (1999) and from Bischoff (2005) and entered into the GIS database by Bartlett et al. (2005). The average shear wave velocity of the upper 30 m of the soil profile, V_{530} , was calculated and superimposed on a surficial geological map (Figure 2). The geologic mapping for the Salt Lake Valley was acquired from two main sources: a surficial geologic map of the Salt Lake City segment of the Wasatch fault zone (Personius and Scott, 1992) for the eastern side of the valley and several quadrangle maps (Biek et al., 2004 and Biek, 2005) that cover the remainder of the valley. All the geospatial data was entered in the North American Datum (NAD) 1983 projected coordinate system data. The geologic data and the major roads were clipped at the Salt Lake County boundaries. These maps and Vs data were combined to produce a NEHRP site class map of the entire valley (Figure 1, see also Appendix 1). For units where shear wave velocity measurements were not available, the type and age of the deposit was used to infer the site class. Figure 1 shows that the central portion of the valley, near the Jordan River, is predominantly Site Class E (Vs₃₀ < 180 m/s); however some Site Class F soils may exist, due to the possibility of liquefaction. Sites located outside of recent river and stream deposits, but still in the central part of the valley floor, are underlain by lacustrine silts and clays and

8

typically classify as Site Class D (Vs₃₀ 180–360 m/s). At higher elevations, denser sand and gravel deposits of terrace, fan, delta and glacial origin generally have Vs₃₀ values greater than 360 m/s and classify as Site Class C (Vs₃₀ 360–760 m/s). There was insufficient data to map site class F soils; thus, all such soils were categorized as site class E in this map. However, we recommend that the potential for site class F soils should be determined by site-specific investigations using geotechnical data, as was done for potentially liquefiable soils in this study, as described in the next section. In addition, the Magna Tailings impoundment was labeled as "Special Study Area;" because of the special characteristics of these tailing slimes.

Table 1 Walkthrough file input for the Salt Lake Valley scenario earthquakes

Figure 1 NEHRP site classification map and major route locations for Salt Lake County, Utah

Figure 2 Surficial geology map of the Salt Lake Valley (modified from Personius and Scott, 1992; Biek et al., 2004; and Biek, 2005). Dots show Vs³⁰ measurement locations

Table 2 Geologic units and descriptions for Figure 2

2.0 Liquefaction Assessment Outputs

Liquefaction damage to the transportation network can be estimated by REDARS for lateral spread and ground settlement. However, REDARS does not contain routines to calculate if liquefaction will be triggered for the scenario earthquake. This must be done external to the REDARS program by the user and later provided as input to REDARS for assessing potential damage to each component of the network. Thus, we performed liquefaction-triggering analyses using computer routines that follow the liquefaction methodology outlined in NCEER (1997). The geotechnical borehole data used to calculate the liquefaction hazard were obtained from several different sources and screened using quality indicators developed by Bartlett and Olsen (2005). In total, 930 standard penetration test (SPT) boreholes were analyzed for the study area. The primary source of subsurface data was the Utah Department of Transportation, which provided a significant electronic subsurface database from the recently finished I-15 Reconstruction project and other previous projects (Bartlett and Olsen, 2005). These data were most heavily concentrated at bridge and retaining wall locations. Other subsurface data were obtained from Salt Lake County Planning, local area consultants and data used in the previous liquefaction potential map by Anderson et al. (1986). The subsurface database includes: SPT N values, groundwater levels, soil descriptions, and other classification properties such as fines content and Atterberg limits.

Some required soil information was missing in some of the boreholes (e.g., soil unit weight, fines content, etc.). For these boreholes, Microsoft Visual Basic for Applications (VBA) routines were used to fill in data gaps by averaging according to soil type and geologic unit (Bartlett and Olsen, 2005). However, in no case were SPT N values estimated; if this information was not available, the corresponding borehole information was not used because of the large uncertainty in estimating SPT N values. In addition, the depth to groundwater was estimated for some boreholes lacking this information. These estimates were made from nearby boreholes using an inverse distance squared method to interpolate groundwater elevations between boreholes. The inverse distance squared method was compared with results from kriging and spline interpolation methods and appeared to produce reasonable results (Bartlett and Olsen, 2005).

15

We performed liquefaction-triggering calculations at each borehole and interpolated the results to each network component location. To do this, the factor of safety against liquefaction was calculated at each borehole location for the scenario earthquakes and averaged at each component location using an inverse-distance weighting scheme. The developed routine used the factors of safety against triggering liquefaction for the three nearest boreholes in the weighted average. If the weighted average was less than 1.0, then liquefaction was assumed to occur at the component location and that component was further evaluated for horizontal and vertical ground displacement, as discussed in the following sections.

Once a component has been flagged by the user as being susceptible to liquefaction, REDARS v.2 determines the amount of liquefaction-induced lateral spread and vertical settlement for all components susceptible to liquefaction. The REDARS model also determines the amount of surface fault rupture displacement. The earthquake induced permanent ground displacement (PGD) resulting from liquefaction and surface fault rupture is used to determine the damage state and repair costs of highway links, as explained below.

2.1 Liquefaction – Induced Lateral Spread

REDARS uses a four-parameter model of Bardet et al. (2002) to estimate the amount of lateral spread (i.e., horizontal) displacement from liquefaction. For sloping ground conditions, Bardet et al. (2002) model is:

$$
\log_{10}(D_H + 0.01) = -6.815 + 1.017M_w - 0.278\log_{10}R - 0.026R + 0.454\log_{10}S + 0.558\log_{10}T_{15}
$$
 (1)

For free-face conditions, the model is:

$$
\log_{10}(D_H + 0.01) = -7.280 + 1.017M_w - 0.278\log_{10}R - 0.026R + 0.497\log_{10}W + 0.558\log_{10}T_{15}
$$
 (2)

Equation (1) is valid for sloping ground conditions; whereas, Equation (2) is used near river channels or other abrupt topographic features. D_H is the horizontal displacement (m), M_W is the moment magnitude, R is the distance to the fault rupture or nearest seismic source (km), S is the ground slope (%), W is the free face ratio (%), which is the height (H) of the free face divided by the distance (L) to the free face and T_{15} is the cumulative thickness of saturated, granular sediments with normalized standard penetration test (SPT) blow counts (i.e., N_{160}) less than 15 (Bardet et al. 2002). (The normalization consists of converting the N value to a hammer energy ratio of 60 percent and to an effective overburden stress of 1 tsf.) Also, prior to calculating T_{15} , the N₁₆₀ values are converted to clean sand values (i.e., N_{160CS}) when applying equations (1) and (2) (Bardet et al., 2002; NCEER 1997).

REDARS uses the inputted M_w provided in Table 1 to estimate D_H at each component and link location. In addition, REDARS calculates the appropriate R using the fault geometry parameters given in Table 1. However, the topographical factors (W and S) are not directly calculated by REDARS and must be estimated by the user. We calculated these factors at each location using a digital elevation model (DEM) for Salt Lake Valley (Olsen et al., 2005). Lastly, the soil factor (T_{15}) was obtained from our borehole database and interpolated to the network component and link locations using the same weighted averaging method employed in the liquefaction triggering analysis.

2.2 Liquefaction – Induced Vertical Settlement

REDARS uses the volumetric strain curves of Tokimatsu-Seed (1987) to estimate the amount of liquefaction settlement at the network component locations. The inputs for these curves are: pga, SPT N₁₆₀ values, thickness and depth and total and effective vertical stresses (σ_v and σ_v) for the liquefied zone(s). We used the borehole database of (Olsen et al. 2005) to populate the REDARS tables using an inverse distance weighted average of the three nearest boreholes. REDARS calculates the appropriate pga values for the network components using the information in Table 1 and the Abrahamson and Silva (1997) attenuation relation.

All liquefied layers are included in the vertical settlement calculations. The settlement for each layer was calculated using N_{160C} values (i.e., N_{160} corrected to a clean sands value) (NCEER, 1997) and settlement was summed for all sub-layers.

$$
Z = \sum_{i=1}^{L} (\Delta T)_i
$$
 (3)

The REDARS input table allows the user to specify only two layers for the vertical settlement calculation; however some sites in the Salt Lake Valley had more than two liquefiable layers in the borehole log. For these cases, we performed liquefaction settlement analysis external to

the program (NCEER, 1997) and then back-calculated the N_{160CS} value that produced the same settlement for a single layer system. The back-calculated N_{160CS} value and the corresponding cumulative thickness of the liquefied layers were given to REDARS for its subsequent liquefaction settlement analyses.

3.0 Component Module Outputs

The component module of REDARS 2 consists of models that determine the earthquake induced damage states from the hazard modules and the subsequent repair requirements for bridges, approach fills and roadway links in the traffic system. The component module outputs estimates of the post-event component states and the associated repair costs. The component damage state for bridges is dependent on the ground motion model in the form of fragility curves. Fragility curves are presented as lognormal curves that relate the probability of being in, or exceeding a building damage state for a given spectral acceleration. The different damage states (DS) are: slight or DS = 2, moderate or DS = 3, extensive or DS = 4 and collapse or DS = 5 (see also Table 6).

The default REDARS v. 2 bridge fragility curves were taken from HAZUS 99 (FEMA 2002) and are expressed in terms of spectral accelerations leading to the onset (i.e., threshold) of each of the five damage states which are shown in the threshold spectral acceleration table for seismically designed bridges (built after 1990) and conventionally designed bridges in the REDARS v.2 manual (Werner et al. 2006b). The threshold spectral accelerations are given at a period of 1.0 sec. The threshold spectral accelerations are shown for standard bridges, which are bridges with no 3D effects from deck arching membrane action, bridges with no skew, and the NEHRP soil Type B soft rock conditions are used.

REDARS v.2 has differing default threshold accelerations for conventionally designed and seismically designed bridges. However, all default spectral accelerations need to be corrected by factors that account for skew and 3D effects of the actual bridge. This is done in the following manner. The default threshold spectral acceleration is determined by REDARS for non-seismically and seismically designed bridges. Following this, the Abrahamson and Silva (1997) attenuation relation is used to obtain the demand spectral accelerations at 1.0 and 0.3 seconds, respectively (i.e., Sa (1.0) and Sa (0.3)) at the bridge for each scenario earthquake. Values of Sa (1.0) and (0.3) have been adjusted for soil effects as discussed in the Hazards Module section of this paper.

Once the demand spectral accelerations have been determined, they are compared to the capacity spectral acceleration to define the damage state. In this step, demand spectral acceleration is compared with the capacity spectral acceleration starting with the highest damage state (i.e., damage state 5). If the demand spectral acceleration is less than the capacity spectral acceleration, then the capacity spectral acceleration for the next lower state is considered (i.e., damage state 4). The process is repeated until the demand spectral acceleration first exceeds the capacity spectral acceleration. The damage state corresponding to this first exceedance is assigned as the damage realized by this component.

The bridge attributes required to calculate the damage state were obtained from the NBI. The REDARS software uses the ITYPE parameter to determine the bridge type and the STATE parameter to distinguish between bridges constructed in California and those constructed other states. In order to convert from a standard bridge to the actual bridge, the skew angle is required and calculated as:

$$
K_{\text{skew}} = \sqrt{\sin(90 - ANGLE)}\tag{4}
$$

where: ANGLE is the skew angle and is defined as the angle between a line normal to the centerline of the roadway to the centerline of the supporting piers.

In addition, a 3D factor, K_{3D} , is used in the calculations and its value is a function of whether or not the bridge has been seismically designed, the number of spans (NSPAN) and the bridge length (L).

For bridges with damage states of 3, 4 and 5, the long period response governs and the median spectral acceleration at the onset of the ith damage state at the mth bridge is termed as $C'(1.0)_{i,m}$. It is calculated from:

$$
C'(1.0)_{i,m} = K_{\text{skew}} * K_{3D} * S_a(1.0)_{i,m}
$$
\n(5)

where: $\text{Sa}(1.0)_{i,m}$ is the 1-second spectral acceleration for a standard bridge obtained from the threshold spectral acceleration table.

For bridges that are governed by short period response at damage state 2, the capacity spectral acceleration C'(0.3)_{2,m} is modified by a shape factor, K_{shape},

$$
K_{shape} = \frac{2.5 * S_a(1.0)}{S_a(0.3)}
$$
(6)

where: $S_a(1.0)$ and $S_a(0.3)$ are the 1 s and 0.3 s demand spectral accelerations, respectively.

The short period capacity spectral acceleration for standard bridges at damage state 2, $C'(1.0)_{25,m}$ (2S refers to damage state 2 where short period response governs) is calculated as shown in Equation (7).

$$
C'(1.0)_{2S,m} = Minimum(1, K_{shape})^* C(1.0)_{2,m}
$$
\n(7)

where: $C(1.0)_{2,m}$ is the 1.0 s spectral acceleration obtained from the threshold spectral acceleration table for damage state 2 in the standard form (no correction for skew and 3D effects)

For bridges governed by long period response at damage state 2, the capacity spectral acceleration leading to the onset of damage state 2 is equal to the threshold spectral acceleration for the standard bridge:

Equations 7 and 8 for damage state 2 bridges do not include factors for 3D and skew effects because these effects are insignificant at small structural displacements.

3.1 Bridge damage state from ground shaking

Our initial runs with the REDARS 2 component module and the default fragility curves displayed more than expected damage to many of the newly constructed bridges along the I-15 corridor. These bridges were seismically designed for a 2500-year return period event as part of the I-15 Reconstruction Project during 1998 to 2002. The performance goal established by UDOT for these bridges is that they should incur only minor damage resulting from a 2500-year event and such bridges should be in service soon after the earthquake. Because our preliminary runs with the REDARS default fragility curves calculated more than expected damage to newly constructed bridges, we chose to input user-specified fragility curves (Figure 3) for all UDOT bridges constructed after 1998. The user-specified curves are based on ATC-13 (1985).

To implement the ATC-13 curves, we classified the newly constructed bridges into two different classes. These are: conventional bridges (less than 500 ft spans) and major bridges (greater than 500 ft spans). Because no bridge in the network had spans greater than 500 ft, only conventional bridges were used. However, conventional bridges were further divided into two groups: multiple simple span bridges and continuous bridges. The multiple span bridges are bridges with more than one span and with a total length less than 500 ft. Continuous conventional bridges are bridges with span lengths less than 500 ft and their number of spans is equal to one.

From Figure 3, it is clear that multiple span bridges are more susceptible to damage than continuous bridges because of potential damage to the joints connecting the different spans and multiple bents. As expected, such bridges are more likely to experience more extensive damage due to these connections and unseating of the bridge components.

Figure 3 Fragility curves for multiple span and continuous bridges designed after 1998

The ATC-13 fragility curves shown in Figure 3 predicted somewhat less bridge damage in the collapsed and extensive categories (see Table 3) and were deemed more appropriate for the newly constructed UDOT bridges (i.e., bridges constructed after 1998). For example, Table 3 compares the results for the HAZAUS 99 fragility and ATC-13 fragility curves for strong motion damage only (i.e., liquefaction damage is not included). This table suggests that fewer bridges will be damaged in the collapsed and extensive categories when the ATC-13 curves are used. However, another significant difference is that the ATC-13 fragility curves suggest more damage in the moderate category when compared with the results from the HAZAUS 99 curves (Table 3). The increased number of bridges with moderate damage is a consequence due to the shape of the ATC-13 fragility curves for multiple span bridges. The ATC-13 fragility curves for these bridges have a relatively sharp curvature at pga values between 0.1 and 0.3 g (Figure 3). Because many of the pga values for this study fall within in this range, many multiple span bridges are categorized as having moderate damage using the ATC-13 fragility curves.

Lastly, we note that bridges with a damage state of moderate, extensive or collapse will not be in service following the event (Table 3). Such bridges should be considered unavailable for emergency response and recovery efforts. Bridges with slight damage should be available for such efforts but may require inspection before returning to full operation.

Table 3 Damage results for built in and constructed fragility curves

3.2 Bridge damage states from permanent ground displacement

In addition to strong motion damage to bridges, the bridge damage states are determined from the amount PGD calculated by REDARS 2 resulting from liquefaction and fault rupture. This model is not completed in full since it only considers the damage to bridges from PGD as incipient unseating and collapse, which correspond to damage states 4 and 5, respectively. Initial damage to bearings, which would fall into damage state 2 or 3, is not considered as well as the effects of PGD on foundations and abutments. The process of obtaining the median PGD capacity is similar to obtaining the spectral acceleration capacity. The capacity PGD is obtained for the specific bridge using the PGD capacity table in the REDARS 2 manual (Werner et al. 2006b). The capacity PGD from the PGD capacity table is further modified to account for PGD induced unseating using Equation (9).

$$
(PGD_{cap})'_{i,m} = (PGD_{cap})_{i,m} * f_i
$$
\n
$$
(9)
$$

The modification factor fⁱ depends on the length, width, skew angle and number of spans of the bridge.

After the bridge PGD capacity is obtained it is compared to the PGD demand from liquefaction or surface fault rupture. First it is determined if the bridge demand PGD is greater than the PGD capacity for damage state 5. If it is, the bridge is assigned a damage state 5. If it is not, the software checks if the demand PGD is greater than PGD capacity for damage state 4. If this is true damage state 4 is assigned and otherwise the bridge has no damage due to the permanent ground displacement hazard.

3.3 Surface Fault Rupture model

The surface fault rupture is a contributor to link damage. Surface fault rupture displacements are determined for all sites that are located in the zone of deformation of the fault rupture.

The input data to the surface rupture model is the fault attribute and rupture data specified in the walkthrough file. After the input data is inputted, each site in the traffic network is analyzed

to determine if the site might experience fault displacement during the earthquake scenario. The fault rupture model assumes that the site is prone to surface fault rupture if any of the following conditions are met: a) the probability of some displacement at the site is greater than 0.4 % and there is a normal from the site to the ruptured fault zone; b) the component is within the fault zone of deformation (the default deformation zone of 500m on the hanging wall side of the normal fault was used); c) The component has a normal to the fault and is located within 100 m of the fault; d) the component has a normal to the fault and is located within 500 m of the hanging wall of the fault.

If a given site is determined to experience fault rupture, the surface fault displacements are calculated. The maximum surface fault displacement is calculated by using the Wells and Coppersmith 1994 equation. The maximum surface fault displacement is used to determine the median surface fault rupture PGD that is based on a cumulative probability of 0.5 (Werner et al. 2006b).

3.4 Approach fill damage methodology

Improperly compacted embankment at bridge abutments may be sensitive to differential settlement resulting from vibratory strong motion during the earthquake. REDARS software contains models for estimating damage states and repair costs of approach fills subjected to this type of earthquake-induced settlement. REDARS v.2 uses the Youd (2002) model for estimating the earthquake-induced settlement of bridge approach fills. The required inputs to the Youd (2002) model are bridge specific data. The bridge dependent data needed to determine the approach fill settlement are: a) bridge number and location; b) relative compaction of approach fill soils (standard proctor density); and c) maximum thickness of the approach fill. No relative compaction and fill height information was available, so we used REDARS default values of 95 percent relative compaction (i.e., RC=95%) and maximum fill thickness of 12 feet (i.e., T_{AF} = 12 ft). The REDARS default RC value of 95 percent is very close to the 96 percent RC value required by UDOT for embankments constructed near bridges (UDOT, 2008). Fill thickness at bridge approaches can vary widely, depending on the location and type of bridge. Typical values can be from 0 to about 24 feet, with 24 feet being representative of overpass structures. A midrange value of 12 feet was selected for this study. (In addition, we note that damage to bridges and bridge approaches is not strongly affected by the selection of these parameters. The

settlement caused by additional compaction of the embankment during the earthquake event is expected to be only a few inches, even for relatively high embankments. Thus, the consequences of this effect are small for most evaluation purposes.)

The earthquake dependent data required for calculating the approach fill settlement resulting from further compaction of the embankment during the dynamic event are: M_w and pga for each bridge site; these are calculated by REDARS in manner similar to that used for the the liquefaction settlement hazard assessment. The approach fill settlement S_{AF} is calculated from:

$$
S_{AF} = \varepsilon_{AF}^* T_{AF} \tag{10}
$$

where ε_{AF} is the volumetric strain of the approach fill and TAF is the maximum fill thickness. Values of ε_{AF} are dependent on the earthquake magnitude M_w, pga and RC.

After the approach fill settlement is calculated, depending on the amount of the settlement, the damage state is determined and its associated repair costs. REDARS assigns three damage states based on the results of Equation (10). If the approach fill settlement is less than 1.0 in., no repairs are needed and bridge damage state 1 is assigned. If the approach fill settlement is between 1.0 and 6.0 in., damage state 2 (slight damage) is assigned and a temporary repair (i.e., a concrete asphalt ramp) is assigned. If the approach fill settles more than 6.0 in., the damage state 3 (moderate damage) is assigned. The REDARS manual suggest that for damage state 3, the approach fill should be stabilized by mud jacking (coring holes and pumping grout) and constructing an asphalt-concrete ramp. However, such remediation is not recommended for UDOT bridges because their approach fills have been seismically evaluated and constructed according to UDOT requirements. The expected settlement damage from additional compaction of the embankment is expected to be small.

3.5 Highway pavement (Link) model

A traffic system is comprised of four components: node, link, bridge and shape points. The node is a point in the transportation network, which represents the endpoints of links. A link is the connection between nodes. The collection of many links comprises a road network. The traffic network is also comprised of bridges, including the bridge identifier, the associated link identifier and other bridge attributes. Shape points are points in the traffic network in addition

to the nodes, which define the shape of a link. The link damage states were also developed by Caltrans staff engineers and are used in the default link model to determine link damage. The link model does not differentiate between asphalt and concrete, which is another factor that needs to be considered for future updates. In addition, the model should be developed for application to other regions besides California.

REDARS v.2 determines the link damage state by calculating the permanent ground displacement PGD in the traffic system for all the links located on liquefiable soils and in the zone of the fault deformation. After the PGD for a link is found, the damage states are determined based on the displacement of the ground. The appropriate damage states and repair costs for each link in the traffic system, based on the PGD calculated by REDARS, are obtained from the Link damage and repair cost table from the REDARS 2 manual (Werner et al. 2006b). If the PGD is less than 1.0 in., damage state 1 is assigned to the link (no damage). If the PGD calculated is between 1.0 and 3.0 in., the damage state 2 (slight damage) is assigned and the link pavement has slight cracking or movement, but it does not cause any interruption of the traffic. For links with PGD between 3.0 and 6.0 in., the damage state 3 (moderate damage) is assigned and moderate cracking and movement to the pavement is observed. The damage state 4 (extensive damage) is assigned to links with PGD between 6 and 12 in. and failure to the pavement structure is observed and movement of the subsurface soils. Links with PGD of 12 in. and greater are assigned damage state 5 (irreparable damage) and show failure of the pavement structure and the subsurface soils.

For links located on non-liquefiable soils and links that are not located within the rupture zone of the fault, the REDARS v.2 will not calculate PGD hazards or estimate an induced damage state to the pavement.

28
4.0 Estimated Damage to Highway Network

The damage states and repair costs resulting from seismic events on the Salt Lake City segment of the Wasatch fault and the West Valley fault are shown in Table 4. REDARS estimates the Salt Lake City segment of the Wasatch fault rupture will produce \$435 M (2004 value) and the West Valley fault will produce \$71 M (2004 value) of damage to the Salt Lake Valley transportation network. These estimates include repair costs, but do not include user losses (i.e., losses due to decrease in the efficiency of the transportation network) and subsequent economic losses. User losses are discussed in the companion to this paper (Kim et al. 2008).

Of the 1407 bridges analyzed in our inventory, 602 or 47 percent of the bridges are expected to receive moderate or higher levels of damage for the M7.0 event. In comparison, the WFRC (2008) study suggests that approximately 71 percent of the bridges will receive moderate or higher damage. The reason(s) for the differences are not entirely apparent, but may be due in part to the different fragility curves used by this study for the post-1998 bridges and differences in the bridge inventories.

The REDARS model was run with and without permanent ground displacement (PGD) effects present in the model to see what additional damage was done to the network from liquefaction and other sources of PGD, as requested by the UDOT geotechnical group. The REDARS results suggest that losses resulting from PGD (i.e., lateral spread, liquefaction settlement and fault rupture) will be significant for the M7.0 event. For example, the expected damage increases from \$55 M to \$435 M (2004 value), when PGD effects from these phenomena are considered (Table 4). Much of the increased cost is due to an increase in the number of bridges being assigned extensive and collapse damage states from the PGD effects. For example, Figure 4 shows the expected damage states resulting from strong motion and PGD; whereas Figure 5 shows the expected damage states for strong motion only. Comparison of these figures reveals that PGD damage is expected to be more pronounced on I-15 (south of I-215), on I-215 (west side), on I-80 (from the downtown area westward) and on the east side (near the Wasatch fault) for the M7.0 earthquake. This is due to the softer, more granular surficial soil sediments deposited by recent rivers and streams that result in a relatively high liquefaction hazard for the highway corridors that are founded on these deposits. In addition, we note that the expected

liquefaction damaged areas correspond to areas that have been mapped with a moderate to high liquefaction hazard by Anderson et al. (1986) and by Olsen et al. (2007).

The M6.0 event on the West Valley fault system is expected to produce much less damage and therefore have significantly lower repair costs. PGD effects from lateral spread, liquefaction settlement and surface fault rupture also contribute greatly to the damage of the traffic network in this scenario. The associated repair costs for ground motion only is about \$25 M (2004 value), whereas the expected damage including PGD effects is \$71 M (2004 value) in repair cost. Table 4 shows that there is a significant increase in the number of bridges and links predicted to be collapsed or extensively damaged from PGD effects and this approximately doubles the repair cost. For comparison, Figure 6 shows the M6.0 event damage states and the distribution of the damage in the Salt Lake City traffic network with PGD effects included; Figure 7 shows the same event with only strong ground motion damage. The location of the PGD damage is more pronounced on I-80 (in the downtown area) and on I-215 (west side) and is due to the moderate to high liquefaction hazards in these areas.

These damage states for the M7.0 event will be used in the subsequent traffic modeling presented in this report. The system state at different times, represented by the number and location of closed and damaged bridges and links, will be estimated from the predicted damage states and used to predict the traffic volume on different roads at different times after the earthquake. In addition, increases in trip or travel times and their associated user's costs will be estimated.

Table 4 Salt Lake City segment and West Valley faults damage states and repair cost

Figure 4 Map of damage states for the M7.0 event in the Salt Lake City Valley including PGD effects

Figure 5 Map of damage states for the M7.0 event in the Salt Lake City Valley without PGD effects

Figure 6 Map of damage states for the M6.0 event in the Salt Lake City Valley including PGD effects

Figure 7 Map of damage states for the M6.0 event in the Salt Lake City Valley without PGD effects

5.0 Transportation Network Modeling

Earthquakes damage transportation infrastructure which impedes traffic flow. The impacts of bridge damage and decreased traffic efficiency include not only short-term costs of structural repair, but also long-term economic consequences (Dusicka et al. 2007). This research assumes that one long-term consequence is the loss of time as commuters and freight travel slows down to navigate disrupted networks. In addition to initial replacement or repair costs of damage to the transportation structures, large earthquakes increase time delays because of network components' loss of function (Cho et al. 2003). After a severe earthquake, different parts of a roadway system will receive various levels of damage, and the capacity of those severely affected portions will be reduced, which will cause further traffic congestion (Feng and Wen, 2005). Damage to the transportation network can disrupt traffic flows from months to years. The disrupted traffic flows can impact the economic recovery of the region as well as postearthquake emergency response and reconstruction operations (Werner et al. 2006). The Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) recognized the risks posed by these hazards and initiated this analysis.

Earthquake related economic losses due to the increased travel times may be evaluated by examining the difference between network performance before and after an earthquake. A user equilibrium network flow model is one of the most useful traffic assignment models in transportation analysis.

Post-earthquake travel times are compared to pre-earthquake travel times in order to understand the effects of earthquake damage on travel times (Werner et al, 1997). Werner et al. (2008) developed methodologies to estimate the delay based user costs using Risks from Earthquake Damage to Roadway Systems (REDARS) software. Post-earthquake damage information was supplied as REDARS output. The traffic disruption assessment is delivered through VISUM simulation software. VISUM is a refined and site-specific macro-simulation model of Salt Lake County.

This part of the report presents the estimated delay-based user costs due to the traffic disruptions caused by two earthquake scenarios: (1) the M7.0 Wasatch fault rupture scenario (2) the M6.0 Taylorsville fault rupture scenario. Road segments that come under fault zone are most likely to get damaged after an earthquake. These road segments are defined as vulnerable links. Links that can carry considerable detour traffic after an earthquake are defined as critical links. A list of links susceptible to damage, yet critical for each scenario, was prioritized for rehabilitation.

The objectives of the traffic modeling part of this report are:

- To compile a list of links that would be:
	- o Vulnerable to both the M7.0 and M6.0 scenario events (The most vulnerable links)
	- o Critical to both the M7.0 scenario and the M6.0 scenario (The most critical links)
	- o Vulnerable in the M7.0 scenario and critical in the M6.0 scenario (Lifelines for the M6.0 scenario)
	- o Vulnerable in the M6.0 scenario and critical in the M7.0 scenario (Lifelines for the M7.0 scenario)
- Recommend UDOT potential protection, improvement, and maintenance procedures for lifelines.
- Determine how the earthquake damage influence traffic in terms of AM peak, mid day, PM peak and off peak traffic.
- Assess the impact of degree of damage on the traffic in terms of user delay costs.

The following sections explain the data collection, software tools, and the methodology used in the study.

5.1 Methodology

5.1.1 Study Area

The study area is located in Salt Lake County (Figure 1). This part of the network, in which most of the damage is expected resulting from both the M7.0 scenario and the M6.0 scenario, is underlain by soft to medium stiff soils, some of which are potentially liquefiable. The transportation network for the study region encompasses several major roadways and bridge

structures. Major highways in the area include Interstates 15, 80, 215 and several other state highways (Figure 1).

5.1.2 Flow Process of Methodology for Calculating Delay Costs

An economic analysis was developed to quantify the economic losses due to the decreased performance of the network from bridge damage. The methodology is shown as a schematic flowchart in Figure 8 below.

Figure 8 Flow chart for traffic modeling methodology

5.1.3 Delay Based User Costs

The economic losses due to earthquake are a combination of direct and indirect losses. Direct losses are due to rehabilitation of damaged network and indirect losses are due to impacts on traffic delays. The indirect costs associated with the functionality of the transportation network, can be much more significant than repairing the actual physical damage. Evaluating the economic loss of a highway transportation system in a metropolitan area is a significant and important task that can be used by decision makers to assign resources in accordance with the estimated economic risk (Luna et al. 2008). The first step in the transportation analysis was defining the Measure of Effectiveness (MOE). MOEs are used to compare and evaluate network performance. Since the major focus was the impact on road users, user cost was selected as the MOE. Impacts on road users can be estimated in terms of user costs due to travel time delay. User costs represent the monetary value of travel delays (Martin et al. 2007). US Department of Transportation (USDOT) suggests monetary value of time savings depending on the trip purpose and conditions under which the trip is made (USDOT, 1997).

5.2 Data Collection

5.2.1 OD Matrices

Local and state governments subdivide the roadway system into a set of sub-regions called Traffic Analysis Zones (TAZs) to monitor user trip demands on the roadway system. The O-D matrix defines the number of trips from each TAZ to all other TAZs in the region. Origin-Destination (O-D) data estimates the location of travel origins and destinations and the corresponding number of trips from and to all the different TAZs in the region (1). TAZ and O-D data enabled the current VISUM model to measure travel time between different sub-regions of the network as well as link volumes.

The Origin-Destination (OD) demand tables for the year 2008 were obtained from WFRC and used in the analysis. Diurnal periods in the analysis were defined in such a way that morning and afternoon peaks are distinguished from rest of the day. Additionally, hours after afternoon peak were split into evening and night periods as traffic demand significantly varies in those time periods (Martin et al., 2007). The diurnal periods for this study are presented in Table 5.

Table 5 Diurnal periods for the analysis

5.2.2 Truck Traffic

Truck percentages of Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) were obtained from UDOT's traffic statistics for the year 2008 (UDOT, 2008). Data was collected from the permanent traffic counters in the study area. Figure 9 shows the map of permanent traffic counters in Salt Lake County. The average value of truck percentage was derived as 9% of AADT.

5.2.3 Value of Travel (VOT)

Data for Values of Travel (VOTs) was gathered from Texas Department of Transportation. VOTs were estimated at \$15.47 per hour of person travel and \$102.12 per hour of truck time. These values are based on a calculation that weighs several value categories including average wages and fringe benefits, costs of employees, freight inventory values and average vehicle occupancies (TTI, 2009).

Figure 9 Permanent traffic counter location map in Salt Lake County, Utah

5.3 REDARS Analysis

REDARS was used to estimate the extent and location of earthquake damage to a roadway system, how this damage affects system-wide post-earthquake travel times and traffic flows, and the economic losses caused by travel time delays (REDARS, 2005). REDARS combines structural, geotechnical, transportation, and economic methodologies to perform deterministic and probabilistic analysis of the network model as part of a comprehensive seismic risk assessment.

Earthquakes result in damage to links. However, the severity of damage will not be the same for all the links. So, link damages should be classified in such a way that similar types of links will respond alike for a certain rehabilitation process. The different Permanent Ground Displacement Damage States (PGD DS) are: slight or PGD DS = 2, moderate or PGD DS = 3, extensive or PGD DS = 4 and collapse or PGD DS = 5. Table 6 shows the classification of damage states based on the type of damage in the structure.

Table 6 Classification of damage states for structures

Figure 4 displays the M7.0 scenario post-earthquake network model in REDARS. Links at different PGD DS values are shown in different colors.

5.4 Transferring Data from REDARS to VISUM

REDEARS was not used for the traffic modeling, because more refined and site specific transportation planning model in VISUM is available for Salt Lake County. With a more refined VISUM model, the results of the traffic assignments reflect the dynamics of a post-earthquake traffic demand in a better way. Analysis of post-earthquake traffic flows in REDARS is based on a User-Equilibrium (UE) model of transportation-system user behavior, which assumes that all users follow routes that minimize their travel times. At user equilibrium conditions, no traveler has an incentive to change paths, because all paths used between any given origin-destination pair have equal cost/time (Shiraki et al., 2007). The assignment procedures in VISUM are based on search algorithms which determine routes between ODs. The search procedure is followed by a choice procedure, which distributes the travel demand of an OD pair onto links (VISUM, 2007). The default model in REDARS assumes that post-earthquake trip demands on the highway system are equal to pre-earthquake trip demands (Werner et al., 2006). (This assumption is not strictly true because driver behavior changes following the event, as discussed in Section 6.0.) Nonetheless, the REDARS assumption of pre and post-earthquake trip demand equality was made and adopted for VISUM analyses presented in the section.

The development and implementation of the interface between REDARS and VISUM was one of the key components of this study. The hazard and vulnerability assessments performed within REDARS were incorporated into VISUM using spreadsheet (Microsoft Excel) tools. Hazard and vulnerability assessments provided outputs in terms of link damage states. Capacity loss for a link depends upon the degree of damage to the link. The link damage represents the worst state of damage to the bridges in that link. For example, if at least one of the bridges in a link suffers major damage, and if that is the greatest state of damage, the whole link is considered having major damage (Shinozuka et al., 2006).

The damage data from post-earthquake REDARS model was incorporated into VISUM model. Figure 10 displays the freeway and state highway network in VISUM for Salt Lake County, Utah. The colors display links at different damage states.

43

Figure 10 VISUM post-earthquake model with damaged links for M7.0 earthquake with PGD effects

5.5 Analysis in VISUM

The methods described in the following sections reflect all diurnal periods in both the M7.0 scenario and the M6.0 scenario.

5.5.1 Pre-Earthquake Analysis

The damage model in VISUM consists of links with PGD DS values ranging from 0 to 6. Each PGD DS value represents the level of damage on the link. However, these values do not affect the original capacities and free flow speeds that already existed in the VISUM model. These parameters were kept unchanged to conduct experiments for pre-earthquake conditions.

Traffic analysis was done for each diurnal period separately. The capacity available on a link was represented in terms of capacity per hour per lane (CPHPL). Both CPHPL and free flow speed on a link are constant and do not vary with time of day. In VISUM total capacity on a link is the product of CPHPL, number of lanes in that link, and the number of hours in the diurnal period. So, the total capacity for a link changes from one diurnal period to other. Total capacities were measured for all links and a model was prepared for initial traffic assignment.

The next step in the analysis was assigning traffic demand on the network. OD demand matrices were developed separately for each diurnal period. These demands were then assigned on the respective VISUM models, using equilibrium assignment (Shinozuka et al., 2006). This procedure resulted in average link travel times and link-volumes for all links in the network. The product of average link travel time and link-volume for a link resulted in total link travel time in vehiclehours. Summation of all link travel times provided total network travel time for that diurnal period. It is not required to conduct pre-earthquake analysis separately for the M7.0 scenario and the M6.0 scenario, since the capacity and diurnal demands are constant in both cases. However, post-earthquake analysis must be done for each scenario separately, since each of them results in different magnitude of damage and have different levels of total network capacity. Therefore, the pre-earthquake travel times were the same for both the M7.0 scenario and the M6.0 scenario.

5.5.2 Post-Earthquake Analysis

Following an earthquake, the roadway links will encounter different levels of damage. The PGD DS value of a link represents the level of damage from permanent ground displacement. Link damage states and their default capacity and free flow speed change rates from REDARS are shown in Table 7. Percentage values also account for the changes resulting from the repair work, and the detour of traffic. (These values are preliminary default values in REDARS and future research is needed to validate these relations (Shinozuka et al., 2006).)

State of Link	PGD DS	Capacity Change	Free Flow Speed
Damage		Rate	Change Rate
None		100%	100%
Minor	2	100%	75%
Moderate	3	75%	50%
Major		50%	50%
Collapse	5	50%	50%

Table 7 Change in road capacity and free flow speed due to damages

Table 8 shows the variation in timeframes for links at different damage states to reach fullyopen status. (All of these values are based on a limited research and need to be further validated. For example, depending on the number of collapsed bridges in the Salt Valley is may require more the 140 to 220 days to reconstruct such bridges.)

Any of the default values determining traffic states can be modified by the user, including the default assumption that a bridge is either fully opened or fully closed during repair. The user can override this assumption so that a "partially opened" bridge is considered where the number of lanes closed to traffic is a function of the damage state, total number of lanes and the number of bridge spans (Dusicka et al., 2007). This analysis assumed default values for capacity and free flow speed changes for all damage types except collapse. The collapse state should be redefined, for more accurate analysis. Although, the defaults values suggest that collapsed links will retain 50% capacity and speed (Table 7), it might not be the same in case of bridges. A bridge is very unlikely to carry any traffic when it has collapsed. The default traffic model in REDARS assumes that a bridge is either fully-closed or fully-open to traffic during repair. Therefore, all collapsed bridges are assumed to be closed, so that they have 0% capacity and 0% free flow speed during the entire rehabilitation period (Table 9). These values were used in our analyses.

State of Link Damage	PGD DS	Capacity Change	Free Flow Speed
		Rate	Change Rate
None		100%	100%
Minor	າ	100%	75%
Moderate	3	75%	50%
Major	4	50%	50%
Collapsed Bridges		0%	0%

Table 9 Modified road capacity and free flow speeds due to damages

From the REDARS user manual (REDARS, 2005), the relationship between travel-related costs and time suggests that for the first seven days the delay cost per day is constant. This may be due to the emergency activities that would take place during the initial days following an earthquake. During this time no rehabilitation would occur and the daily delay costs would be at peak level. The delay costs should be calculated immediately from the day the earthquake occurs, but not from the day when rehabilitation starts. Therefore, 7 more days were added to the total timeframes to measure delay costs. The changed timeframes are shown in Table 10.

Table 10 Damage states and modified timeframes to reach fully-open status

These capacity and free flow speed changes were incorporated into the VISUM model and the traffic assignment was run again. Since the capacity was decreased for the same demand, traffic is congested and the total travel times were increased. Similar to the pre-earthquake conditions, the total daily network travel times were calculated for all diurnal periods. Tables 11-12 show pre-earthquake and post-earthquake travel times for all diurnal periods in both the M7.0 scenario and the M6.0 scenario.

Table 11 Average network travel times, M7.0 scenario event

Table 12 Average network travel times, M6.0 event

The difference between total travel times for pre-earthquake and post-earthquake conditions resulted in delay times in vehicle-hours. These delay times were multiplied with VOTs to derive travel costs. As link-volumes consist of both passenger cars and trucks, separate VOTs were used for measuring delay costs.

5.6 Evaluation of Vulnerability and Importance of the Links in Network

One of the objectives of this research was to recommend to UDOT potential protection, improvement, and maintenance procedures for critical lifelines for post-earthquake conditions. However, it is impractical to improve all vulnerable bridges for seismic hazards due to limited resources. Therefore, only road segments (links), which are vulnerable in one scenario but still can carry a considerable amount of detour traffic in the other scenario, were selected for rehabilitation. UDOT can concentrate only on these prioritized links and avoid all others to minimize the improvement costs.

Links, which are damaged under both earthquake scenarios, are defined as most vulnerable links.

Hence, all these links will have at least one damage state between slight and collapse in both scenarios. VISUM damage models were processed and filtered for the links with damage state between 2 and 5.

The most critical links are defined as the links with the highest increase in traffic (ratio of traffic volumes after and before the earthquake) under both earthquake scenarios. VISUM assigns the redundant traffic, which would go on damaged links had no earthquake occurred, onto the neighboring links. So, the traffic volumes on neighboring links were increased following each earthquake scenario. Critical links play an important role in maintaining regular traffic when all the freeway and major roads, which carry much of the daily traffic, are damaged due to earthquake.

Finally, a list of both critical and vulnerable links was prepared for each scenario. Due to the constraint of limited resources, it is vital to manage disaster mitigation resources with a strategic budget planning. These lists can be more informative for UDOT to optimize the rehabilitation resources and to reduce the vulnerability of the critical links.

All three categories of links which are most vulnerable, most critical and a combination of critical and vulnerable were produced using filtering process in VISUM.

5.7 Results of Vulnerability and Importance Evaluations

5.7.1 Average Daily User Costs

The cumulative average daily user costs were measured on the $7th$, 11th, 19th and 187th day following each earthquake. This was to understand how the average costs varied due less damaged types opened during rehabilitation. Tables 13-14 show average user costs for the M7.0 scenario and the M6.0 scenario, respectively.

Table 13 Cumulative average user delay costs, M7.0 scenario event

Table 14 Cumulative average user delay costs, M6.0 scenario event

These results are also presented in Figures 11-12 to visualize the variation. Each data series represents cumulative average user costs for all diurnal periods. Regardless of time, the delay cost patterns found to be the similar with peak level at PM. As the rehabilitation progresses, the average delay cost tend to decrease relative to original costs.

Figure 11 Post-earthquake cumulative average user delay costs, M7.0 scenario event

Figure 12 Post-earthquake cumulative average user delay costs, M6.0 scenario event

5.7.2 Total User Costs

Tables 15-16 show the cumulative total user costs at different points of time for which slightly, moderately, extensively and completely damaged links are fully-open to the traffic. The total cumulative user costs are presented in Figures 13 and 14 to visualize the variation. The graphs

show a similar pattern from 7 to 19 days, but important differences are seen at 187 days. The user costs at 187 days for the M6.0 scenario have diminished when compared the 7, 11 and 19 day benchmarks. This is because significant portions of the traffic network have been repaired by this time. However for the M7.0 scenario the user costs at time 187 days is very similar to those at the 7, 11 and 19 day bench mark. This is because most of the links received DS=5 (i.e., complete damage), which requires 187 days for such links to regain full capacity. (Obviously, it is not reasonable to expect that full capacity will be restored to these links on day 188 and that the user delay costs will go to zero. Residual user delay costs may go on for considerable time after day 187, but this has not been estimated by the model.)

The calculated user delay costs show that the maximum impacts would be imposed on PM traffic. Also, the M6.0 scenario would incur \$65 million, which is significantly lower than the Wasatch Scenario of \$1,312 million at day 187. This is due to larger extent of damage in the Wasatch Scenario when compared with the M6.0 scenario.

Table 15 Cumulative total user delay costs (\$Million), M7.0 scenario event

Table 16 Cumulative total user delay costs (\$million), M6.0 scenario event

Diurnal Period	Cumulative Total User Costs (\$Million)				
	7 Days	11 Days	19 Days	187 Days	
AM.	0.57	0.85	1.14	3.41	
MD	1.54	2.32	3.25	13.72	
PM	3.24	4.99	7.71	41.90	
PEV	0.54	0.81	1.13	5.07	
NEV	0.14	0.21	0.27	1.02	
Total	6	9	13	65	

Figure 13 Post-earthquake cumulative total user delay costs, M7.0 scenario event

Figure 14 Post-earthquake cumulative total user delay costs, M6.0 scenario event

5.8 Vulnerable and Critical Road Segments

Figures 15-18 show maps of links classified into different types. Figure 15 shows the most vulnerable links and Figure 16 shows the most critical links. Figure 17 shows links that are critical in the Wasatch Scenario and vulnerable in the M6.0 scenario. Similarly, Figure 18 presents links that are critical the M6.0 scenario and vulnerable in the Wasatch Scenario.

Each map is also transformed into a table of links for detailed results, with the link numbers in ascending order. These tables are presented in Appendix 3. Tables A3-1 and A3-2 present the lists of most vulnerable and most critical links with link numbers in ascending order. The direction of each link is provided to distinguish links with only one direction (e.g. on/off ramps) from others. Generally, each road will have a single name throughout its length in the network. However, it might have both damaged and undamaged links in it as a result of earthquake. Therefore, to differentiate damaged links from all others, they are defined with names and from/to information.

In Table A3-1, among 237 most vulnerable links, around 25% have bridges in them. This provides a clear understanding of the severity of damage. However, some of these links might still be critical even after earthquake. For example, links which are slightly damaged would still have 100% capacity, although their speed is reduced for safety reasons. Most critical links in Table A3- 2 are the ones on which traffic is increased (i.e. the ratio of traffic volumes after and before earthquake is more than 1) in both scenarios.

Finally, a list of vulnerable yet critical road sections is prepared for each scenario. Tables A3-3 and A3-4 present a combination of critical and vulnerable links (lifelines) for the Wasatch Scenario and the M6.0 scenario, respectively. All these links should have volumes increased due to detour traffic and should have a damage state between 2 and 5. For example, Table A3-3 shows a combination of links with traffic ratios more than 1 in the Wasatch Scenario and having damage states between 2 and 5 in the M6.0 scenario. A final list of links can be created from these two by eliminating all the repeated link numbers. This short list of links can be used by UDOT to minimize the traffic disruptions caused by any of the two earthquakes.

Figure 15 Most vulnerable links (VISUM) in Salt Lake County, Utah

Figure 16 Most critical links (VISUM) in Salt Lake County, Utah

Figure 17 Combination of critical and vulnerable links (Lifelines for the M7.0 scenario event)

Figure 18 Combination of critical and vulnerable links (Lifelines for the M6.0 scenario event)

6.0 Dynamic Traveler Response Model

6.1 Introduction

Several studies have been devoted to examining seismic hazards and their impacts in metropolitan regions. Typically, physical damages to the transportation infrastructure first lead to significantly reduced traffic capacity and then further result in degradation of critical urban activities, such as post-earthquake emergency response. Unlike physical commodities, flow in utility lifeline systems and post-earthquake traffic flow patterns in roadway systems are extremely complex and difficult to estimate. This is because they not only are constrained by degraded capacity of links but also depend on various spatial and temporal factors, such as origin-destination demand, travel time, and trip length, as well as intricate traveler response behavior.

An urban seismic risk assessment method needs to address system performance for both infrastructure components and transportation network layers. Werner et al. (1997) proposed a scenario-based loss assessment method that focuses on seismic hazards to highway systems. Chang and Nojima (1997, 1998) and Nojima (1999) developed flow-dependent measures to estimate the post-earthquake performance of highway transportation network systems. Basoz and Kiremidjian (1996) estimated network-wide traffic delays for prioritizing retrofit strategies. In a study by Werner et al. (2000), the risk to the transportation system is computed based on the direct damage to major components (e.g., bridges) and the connectivity between a predefined set of origin-destination pairs.

Describing post-earthquake origin-destination (OD) demand patterns has been an essential but thorny issue for transportation-related systems and analyses. As indicated by Table 17 for the 1995 Northridge earthquake study, trip patterns and traveler responses during the reconstruction period demonstrates a diverse spectrum of behaviors (Schiff, 1995):

- 1. Continue to use freeway then divert to primary detour
- 2. Continue to use freeway, but divert to parallel freeway (located 8 mile south)
- 3. Continue to use freeway, but divert to other city or arterials
- 4. Shift to transit
- 5. Departure time change
- 6. Eliminate trip

Table 17 Changes in mode and route choice pattern (Schiff, 1995)

Cho et al. (2003) developed both fixed and variable demand assignment methods. The variable demand model assumes that trip rates are influenced by the cost of the trip in terms of time or distance. In their model, travelers will decide if they need to cancel or continue to travel, and they further select the mode and route after a seismic event. In a recent study by Kiremidjian et al. (2008), the demand fluctuation was assumed to be the same as what has been observed from two recent earthquake cases in California (i.e., Loma Prieta, 1989 and Northridge, 1995).

Dynamic Traffic Assignment (DTA) modeling methodologies can accurately capture the buildup and dissipation of transportation system congestion by describing route, mode, and departure time choices of individual travelers. Using the Salt Lake City metropolitan network as a case study, this study adopts a multimodal DTA modeling framework developed by Mahmassani (2001) and Zhou et al. (2008) to evaluate the direct and indirect impact of earthquake damage on the transportation network.

This section is organized into two major parts. The first part (i.e., Section 6.2) seeks to determine link capacity breakdowns due to earthquake damage via a Seismic Risk Analysis (SRA) software package, namely REDARS 2 (Risks from Earthquake Damage to Roadway System). A wide range of hazards, including ground motion, liquefaction, and surface rupture fault, are systematically evaluated and used to estimate seismic damage in the study area. Two earthquake scenarios (M 7.0 and M 6.0 events) are used to generate realistic damage state estimates on the transportation network.

The second part of this section (i.e., Section 6.3) aims to evaluate network-wide traffic flow patterns by seamlessly integrating a simulation-based DTA modeling system with the seismic risk analysis model. By starting with a pre-earthquake travel pattern, the DTA model takes postearthquake network capacity as an external input and iteratively simulates day-by-day changes in the post-earthquake traffic pattern until long-term traffic flow equilibrium is approached. Based on the Salt Lake City metropolitan area, a case study is used to illustrate the proposed methodology and modeling details.

6.2 Seismic Risk Analysis

6.2.1 System Input

The methodology for integrating Seismic Risk Analysis (REDARS 2) and Dynamic Traffic Assignment (DYNASMART-P) systems is shown in Figure 19. In the REDARS 2 seismic risk analysis, results are developed from a set of input parameters, such as soil, link, node, and bridge data. The evaluated seismic vulnerability of the transportation component results is mapped to the corresponding transportation network as capacity reduction parameters for the dynamic traffic assignment procedure, which provides modified travel demand and traffic time.

Figure 19 Flow chart for REDARS/ DYNASMART-P integration
The seismic risk analysis methodology in REDARS 2 can be carried out in both deterministic and probabilistic approaches. This software package has been developed and released by the Federal Highway Administration with a number of case studies in the states of California, Tennessee, and Oregon. In these studies, the seismic hazards and the resulting damage states are estimated for each component in the transportation network, and a *static* traffic assignment model (without departure time and traffic flow dynamic representation) is used to perform networkwide traffic delay estimation.

6.2.2 Seismic Hazard Scenarios

The local soil conditions and fault geometry are key inputs for estimating strong motion hazard. REDARS 2 includes two ground motion models, namely the Abrahamson-Silva (1997) ground motion model, applied to shallow crustal earthquakes in active tectonic regions, and the model by Silva et al. (2002 and 2003), applied to stable tectonic regions. These ground attenuation models typically characterize the effects of local soil conditions by a single term in the ground motion equation. In this study, the soil conditions along the roadway system consist of rock, soft rock, stiff soil, and soft soils, while the last two classes are the most common soil types; some soils are susceptible to liquefaction hazards.

The deterministic seismic hazard scenarios in this analysis used the Walkthrough file, which estimates strong ground motion, fault ruptures, and liquefaction effects. The primary source of seismic hazards is the Salt Lake City Segment of Wasatch fault, which is about 46 km long and parallels the base of the Wasatch Mountain range. According to a study by Wong et al. (2002), this range-bounding normal fault is capable of producing a magnitude 7.0 to 7.5 earthquake. Comparably, the West Valley fault zone is estimated to produce magnitude 6.0 events. Other potential sources of hazards include other mapped faults and smaller unmapped faults (expected magnitude less than 6.5) that are located close to population centers.

65

Figure 20 Salt Lake Valley, Utah seismic hazard scenarios map

In this study, we consider two potential seismic events that may impact or damage the transportation network (Figure 20 and Table 18). First, in the Wasatch fault zone, the Salt Lake City segment is located in the east bench of the valley. Second, the West Valley fault zone, the Taylorsville segment, is located on the west side of the valley, which is expected to give considerably less impact than the Wasatch fault in the Salt Lake City section. The scenarios that are used in this study represent realistic seismic events in the Salt Lake Valley.

Table 18 Seismic hazard scenarios

Figure 21 shows the study network in the Salt Lake City metropolitan area, which is one of the most rapidly growing urban areas in the United States. Its population was estimated by the Census Bureau to be 1,468,207 residents as of July 2006. There was an increase of 10.1% since the 2000 Census and 2.5% above the prior year (USCB, 2008). Utah has been widely recognized as having a relatively high seismic hazard. The 240-mile-long Wasatch fault is made up of several segments that are capable of producing up to magnitude 7.5 earthquakes. During the past 6000 years, the Salt Lake City segment has lain under the Salt Lake valley and has ruptured at least four times. The average recurrence interval for surface faulting earthquakes in this segment is 1350 +/-200 years, with the most recent earthquake occurring about 1300 (+/-250) years ago (Black et al., 1996).

The study network includes three major highways, namely I-15, I-80, and a bypass route, I-215, as well as major arterials. The traffic network contains 8524 nodes and 18,601 links, and its link capacity and origin-destination demand data are obtained from the Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC), which is the local planning organization for this area.

Figure 21 Study network for seismic risk analysis of the Salt Lake Valley, Utah

In 2007, 3813 bridges were recorded in the National Bridge Inventory (NBI) database in the state of Utah. The most up-to-date data from the NBI database and Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) are used for the 1407 bridges covered in this study area, and a breakdown of bridge locations on different highways can be found in Table 19.

Table 19 Bridge locations in Salt Lake City metro area (NBI, 2008)

6.2.3 Post-earthquake Network Capacity Analysis

As a result of the seismic hazard evaluations, the network damage states are shown in Figure 22. Due to the higher level of strong motion, permanent ground displacement (PGD) from liquefaction effects, and surface fault rupture, the Salt Lake City segment component damages are comparably higher than the Taylorsville segment event. By considering major networkwide traffic impacts, congestion that is induced by the seismic event of the Taylorsville segment may not be significant. On the other hand, the rupture of the Salt Lake City segment could impose dramatic damages on the transportation network due to critically damaged locations. The network damage contours from these two scenarios are shown on Table 20 and Figure 22. Based on the above considerations, further transportation network analysis will focus on network interruptions due to the activities and damage to the Salt Lake City segment.

Table 20 Damage status from seismic risk analysis from REDARS 2 simulation

Figure 22 Bridge damage status contour from seismic risk analysis

The above earthquake damage evaluation gives the component damage status of the transportation network. Table 5 further describes the general repair consequences that are assumed in HAZUS99 (1999). In this study, damage states used as a default repair model from the REDARS2 simulation results. Further in the DYNASMART-P simulation, damaged link capacity is reduced based on Table 21.

6.3 Transportation Network Analysis

6.3.1 Model Overview and Notations

This section focuses on estimating the network flow transitions from the aftermath, approximately 2 weeks after the incidents, to the stabilized conditions. The multimodal DTA (Dynamic Traffic Assignment) methodology by Mahmassani (2001) and Zhou et al. (2008) is extended to realistically describe post-earthquake traffic flow dynamics. The proposed procedure includes the following three steps:

(1) Convert a large number of transportation network damage states from SRA to DTA simulation,

(2) Load multiclass dynamic OD demand flows to an impacted network, modified to be suitable for modeling post-disaster situations,

(3) Evaluate the overall network performance in terms of traffic volumes, trip length, and travel time in a day-to-day meso-scopic simulation framework.

The following notation is used to represent variables in the problem formulation and solution algorithm:

Notation

- i origin zone index, $i \in I$
- j destination zone index, $j \in J$
- p superscript for trip purposes (e.g., home-based work, home-based shop),
- m travel mode index, $m \in M$
- T total number of time intervals in the analysis period for modeling departure time choice.
- PAT preferred arrival time interval index, PAT=1, 2,..., T
- τ departure time interval index, τ =1, 2,..., T

Consider a regional transportation network G(N, A) consisting of $|N|$ nodes, $|A|$ directed arcs, multiple origins $i \in I$, and destinations $j \in J$. The analysis period of interest, taken as the planning horizon, is discretized into small intervals 1,…,T. It is assumed that zone-to-zone static OD demand tables $d_{i,j,p}$ are available (e.g., from regional transportation planning agencies) over the study horizon, representing the number of individual travelers traveling from zone i to zone j

with a trip purpose p. One simple way for obtaining dynamic OD demand tables is to convert static OD demand table $d_{i,j,p}$ to

$$
d_{i,j,p,\tau} = d_{i,j,p} \times \beta_{p,\tau} \tag{1}
$$

where $\beta_{p,\tau}$ is the temporal distribution for trip purpose p that translates static OD demand to dynamic OD demand.

Another commonly used method is to perform dynamic OD estimation using link counts. However, as the demand pattern is expected to have significant changes after a major earthquake, the post-earthquake link counts are unavailable before the event; thus, the temporal profile-based method in Equation (1) should be sufficient.

Table 21 Repair consequences and link capacity reduction for each bridge damage state (modified from HAZUS99 (1999))

Applying damage states to quantitative measures of link capacity can be very subjective (Cho et al., 1999). The most reasonable approach for estimating damaged bridge functionality is to assume that the bridge is to be either fully open or closed after an earthquake. A safetyoriented local policy would close any damaged structures to traffic, regardless of its delay and cost impact on a traffic network. However, in this study, it is assumed that except for extensive damaged or collapsed bridges, all other damaged bridges need to be repaired within 6 months and would be restored to be functional at the first stage in the overall reconstruction period.

6.3.2 Modeling Changes in Spatial and Temporal Demand Patterns

As shown in Figure 23, the traffic assignment model with elastic demand can be solved by the standard fixed demand traffic assignment program through network representation. In other words, our current study considers two modes: drive alone and stay-at-home.

Moreover, an excess demand formulation is adopted to capture the split of OD flows between the physical network and the artificial link that represents the "stay-at-home" mode. A simple flow split function can be illustrated conceptually as the following, while a more elaborate formulation that integrates mode and departure time choice is given in the next session.

$$
d_{i,j,\tau} = \sum_{m} d_{i,j,\tau}^{m} = d_{i,j,\tau}^{0} + d_{i,j,\tau}^{1}
$$
 (2)

$$
d_{i,j,\tau}^m = d_{i,j,\tau} \frac{e^{\theta_{i,j} T_{i,j,\tau}^m}}{e^{\theta_{i,j} T_{i,j,\tau}^0} + e^{\theta_{i,j} T_{i,j,\tau}^1}}
$$
(3)

where m = 0-1 indicator for bypassing or traversing flows

 $d_{i,j,\tau}^1$ = demand flows that are accommodated in the physical network

 $d_{i,j,\tau}^{\,0}$ = demand flows that are carried by the virtual link

 $T^1_{i,j,\tau}$ and $T^o_{i,j,\tau}$ are average travel times for paths (*i,j, t*) traversing and bypassing in the physical network respectively, and $\theta_{i,j}$ is a dispersion parameter to be estimated. If $T^1_{i,j,\tau}$ is dramatically increased for all of the available paths due to reduced capacity and is higher than a threshold value corresponding to $T^o_{i,j,\tau}$, then part of the travelers will switch to artificial links; i.e., cancel the trip and stay at home.

Figure 23 Virtual link for OD pair (i, j).

A damaged transportation network will change both spatial and temporal demand patterns during the reconstruction period. In the Hanshin-Awaji Earthquake case study, the research of Iida et al. (2000) found that an increase in the OD flow of short-distance trips is generated in large part by the need to rely on automobiles due to a lack of availability of other modes of transportation that normally are used for everyday activities. This indicates the desirability of trip activity to be regulated by physical network accessibility, which affects short-distance trips such as home-based shop trip (HBS) rather than home-based work (HBW) trips. Home-based work trips are usually have fixed destinations and more restricted arrival times, rather homebased shop trips, which have less restricted destination choices. The following discussion considers departure/arrival time adjustment, route change, and destination choice behavior for different trip purposes.

Home-based work trip (departure time and route changes)

This study assumes that the Preferred Arrival Time (PAT) is 8-9AM for the morning peak, and the alternative tree for each OD pair includes:

Spatial dimension:

Path (k=1, m=1) Path (k=2, m=1)

Stay at home (m=0)

….

Temporal dimension:

Different departure time.

Given a fixed PAT, home-based work trips can change routes or departure times to avoid traffic. Let us further define $AAT_{i,j,PAT}^{\tau,m,k}$ $\sup_{i,j, PAT}^{\tau,m,k}$, $S\!D_{i,j, PAT}^{\tau,m,k}$, $S\!D E_{i,j, PAT}^{\tau,m,k}$ $\sum_{i,j,PAT}^{\tau,m,k}$, $SDL_{i,j,PAT}^{\tau,m,k}$, actual arrival time, schedule delay, early schedule delay, and late schedule delay, respectively, of an alternative (i, j, PAT, τ, m, k) , where

$$
SD_{i,j,PATH}^{\tau,m,k} = AAT_{i,j,PATH}^{\tau,m,k} - PAT
$$
 (4)

$$
SDE_{i,j,PATH}^{\tau,m,k} = \max\{0, -SD_{i,j,PATH}^{\tau,m,k}\}\tag{5}
$$

and $S\!D\!L_{i,j,PAT}^{\tau,m,k}$ = max {0, $S\!D_{i,j,PAT}^{\tau,m,k}$ $\}$ (6) as illustrated in Figure 24.

Figure 24 Illustration of disutility functions for schedule delay (Noland, Small, Koskenoja, and Chu 1998)

For each traveler with (*i*, *j*, *p*, *PAT*) where p= HBW, the systematic utility equation for an

alternative (departure time
$$
\tau
$$
, mode m , and path k) is:
\n
$$
V_{i,j,p,Par}^{\tau,m,k} = \alpha_1 \times T_{i,j,p}^{\tau,m,k} + \alpha_2 \times SDE_{i,j,p,Par}^{\tau,m,k} + \alpha_3 \times SDL_{i,j,p,Par}^{\tau,m,k}.
$$
\n(7)

The coefficients $\alpha_{_1}$, $\alpha_{_2}$, $\alpha_{_3}$ are utility coefficients for travel time, early schedule delay, and late schedule delay, respectively. Typically, $\alpha_{_3}$ is greater than $\alpha_{_2}$, as a late schedule delay has higher penalties than early schedule delays.

By assuming that random error terms are independently identically distributed Gumbel variables, the choice probabilities for each alternative (τ, m, k) correspond to the usual unordered Multinomial Logit (MNL) choice function:

$$
Pr_{i,j,p,PATH}^{\tau,m,k} = \frac{Exp(V_{i,j,p,PATH}^{\tau,m,k})}{\sum_{\tau,m,k} Exp(V_{i,j,p,PATH}^{\tau,m,k})}
$$
(8)

Other complicated and sophisticated forms, such as path-size logit ordered generalized extreme value models, can be used, because the approach considers details at the individual traveler level. The choice probabilities further link the OD demand to flows that are associated with each alternative:

$$
r_{i,j,p,PATH}^{\tau,m,k} = d_{i,j,p,PATH} \times \Pr_{i,j,p,PATH}^{\tau,m,k} = d_{i,j,p,PATH} = d_{i,j,p,PATH} \times \frac{Exp(V_{i,j,p,PATH}^{\tau,m,k})}{\sum_{\tau,m,k} Exp(V_{i,j,p,PATH}^{\tau,m,k})},
$$
\n(9)

where $r_{i,j,PAT,p}^{x,m,k}$ number of travelers for alternative (*i*, *j*, *PAT*, *t*, *m*, *k*) at iteration *n*

Home-based shop trip (destination and route changes)

For trip purpose p= HBS, the total production from each zone *i* is

$$
d_{i,p,\tau} = \sum_{j} d_{i,j,p,\tau} \tag{10}
$$

The alternative tree for each origin *i* includes

Destination *j* =1,

Path (j=1, k=1), m=1

Path (1,2), m=1

….

Destination *j* =2

Path (j=2,,k=1), m=1

Path (2,2), m=1

….

Stay at home, m =0

For each traveler with (i, τ) , the systematic utility equation is

$$
V_{i,p,\tau}^{j,m,k} = \alpha_1 \times TT_{i,p,\tau}^{j,m,k}, \qquad (11)
$$

where $V_{(i,j,PAT)}^{(\tau,m,k),n}$ is the systematic utility for alternative (*i*, *j*, *PAT*, *t*, *m*, *k*) at iteration *n*.

The choice probabilities further link the OD demand to flows that are associated with each alternative using Eq. (12) for $p =$ HBS.

$$
r_{i,p,\tau}^{j,m,k} = d_{i,p,\tau} \times \Pr_{i,p,\tau}^{j,m,k} = d_{i,p,\tau} \times \frac{Exp(V_{i,p,\tau}^{j,m,k})}{\sum_{j,m,k} Exp(V_{i,p,\tau}^{j,m,k})}.
$$
 (12)

6.3.3 Simulation-based Solution Framework

To solve the dynamic traveler assignment problem in transportation networks, we essentially want to determine the number of travelers for each alternative and the resulting temporalspatial loading of vehicles. To this end, we extend the DTA solution methodology to support post-earthquake planning and operations decisions. The system features the following three components:

- (1) Traffic simulation (or supply) component (with reduced link capacity),
- (2) Traveler behavior component, departure time, destination, and route choice
- (3) Path processing and traveler assignment component.

A traffic simulator, namely DYNASMART-P (Mahmassani, 2001), is used to capture the traffic flow propagation in the traffic network and evaluate network performance under reduced link capacity and a given mode, departure time, and route decisions that are made by the individual travelers. Given the user behavior parameters, the traveler behavior component aims to describe travelers' mode, departure time, and route selection decisions after an earthquake. The third component is intended to generate realistic alterative route choice sets and perform stochastic network loading for solving the traveler assignment problem under impacted network conditions.

This study presents an iterative procedure for solving the stochastic intermodal dynamic traveler assignment problem with joint mode and departure time choice. In this solution framework, a dynamic step size is used to simultaneously update flow and reference cost vectors (r, π) using the auxiliary solution. The iterative procedure that is adopted here can only be viewed as an approximate (heuristic) algorithm intended for modeling day-to-day traffic changes and learning processes, in which 10% or 25% of travelers (as modeled as different step sizes) every day consider making changes.

Without loss of generality, the following discussion only considers home-based work (HBW) trips, so trip purpose index *p* is ignored below. The main steps of the solution procedure are described as follows:

Step 1: Initialization

Let day *n*=0. Based on a set of initial link and node travel attributes, find an initial feasible shortest path set for each mode and each departure time in the damaged transportation network. Perform stochastic network loading using the path set. Generate the set of modedeparture time-path flow solution $\left\lceil r\right\rceil^{n=0}$.

Step 2: Compute time-dependent intermodal least-cost paths and update choice set

Day index *n* = *n*+1.

Given a time-dependent link travel time, find intermodal time-dependent K-least-cost paths in the multidimensional network for each mode at each departure time for each choice (*i*, *j*, *PAT*).

At iteration *n*, construct the feasible alternative set $\Omega_{(i,j,PAT)}^{n+1}$ for each (*i*, *j*, *PAT*), which contains all of the alternatives in $\Omega_{(i,j,PAT)}^n$ and the new alternatives that are found through the intermodal K-shortest path search process**.** Given path travel time and travel cost, calculate the schedule delay and travel time reliability that are associated with each path to provide a $\mathsf{generalized\ cost\ vector}\left[V_{i,j,PATH}^{\tau,m,k}\right]^{n}.$

Step 3: Update path assignment solution

Use a predetermined size of move to find a new departure time-mode-path flow pattern. In the following example, a Method of Successive Average (MSA) is used.

$$
r_{(i,j,PAT)}^{(\tau,m,k),n+1} = r_{(i,j,PAT)}^{(\tau,m,k),n} + \frac{1}{n} \Big\{ r_{(i,j,PAT)}^{(\tau,m,k),n+1} - r_{(i,j,PAT)}^{(\tau,m,k),n} \Big\} \qquad \forall i, j, PAT, \tau, m, k \tag{13}
$$

where the auxiliary departure time-mode-path flow vector is

$$
r_{(i,j,PATH)}^{(\tau,m,k),n+1} = d_{i,j,PATH} \times \frac{Exp(V_{(i,j,PATH)}^{(\tau,m,k),n})}{\sum_{\tau,m,k} Exp(V_{(i,j,PATH)}^{(\tau,m,k),n})} \qquad \forall i, j, PATH, \tau,m,k
$$
\n(14)

and an auxiliary reference cost vector

$$
\underline{\pi}_{(i,j,PATH)}^{n+1} = \frac{d_{i,j,PATH}}{\sum_{\tau,m,k} Exp(V_{(i,j,PATH)}^{(\tau,m,k),n})} \qquad \forall i, j, PATH
$$
\n(15)

For home-based shop trips,

and a new reference generalized cost,

$$
\pi_{(i,j,PATH)}^{n+1} = \pi_{(i,j,PATH)}^n + \frac{1}{n} \left\{ \underline{\pi}_{(i,j,PATH)}^{n+1} - \pi_{(i,j,PATH)}^n \right\} \quad \forall i, j, PATH \tag{16}
$$

Step 4: Stochastic network loading

Under the set of mode, departure time, and path assignment $,m, k \quad \big]^{n+1}$, *j*, $\left[r_i^{\tau,m,k} \right]^{n+1}$ $\left[\begin{array}{cc} r^{i}, m, \kappa \\ i, j, PAT \end{array}\right]$, generate the vehicle/traveler attributes and simulate the assigned vehicles between each O-D pair for each departure interval τ and each mode m. Generate $V_{(i,j,PAT)}^{(\tau,m,k),n+1}$ with the latest simulation results.

Step 5: Convergence checking (if reaching steady state)

Calculate

Calculate
\n
$$
Gap = \sum_{i,j,PATH} \left\{ \sum_{(i,j,PATH, \tau, m, k) \in \Omega_{i,j,PATH}^{n+1}} \frac{1}{2} (\ln r_{(i,j,PATH)}^{(\tau, m, k), n+1} - V_{(i,j,PATH)}^{(\tau, m, k), n+1} - \pi_{(i,j, PATH)}^{n+1})^2 \right\}
$$
\n(17)

If $Gap < \delta$, convergence is achieved, where δ is a prespecified parameter.

If convergence is attained, stop. Otherwise, go to Step 2.

In Step 3, as K routes are generated at each iteration and stored in the alternative set of $\Omega^n_{(i,j,PAT)}$. Thus, there are at most a total of n^* K alternatives for each choice (*i, j, PAT*) at iteration *n*. K=5 is used in the experiments of this study.

6.4 Application of Model to Salt Lake Valley

The Salt Lake City metro test network is modeled using 1500 traffic analysis zones (TAZs) for a 180-minute simulation horizon. Three different scenarios are tested, including a do-nothing scenario and two damaged network scenarios with network-wide capacity deductions, shown as Table 22.

Table 22 Pre-earthquake/ Post-earthquake network capacity

Typically, overpass bridges may impact directly related underlying links. In this study, all of the links that are located under overpass bridges (that have extensive or complete damage) are assumed to be reopened shortly after structural debris is cleaned. The loaded Salt Lake City network includes highway corridors and major and minor arterial streets, as well as connectors, so the total capacity reduction values that are shown in Table 6 are statistically diluted. The mapping link damages from REDARS 2 to DYNASMART-P are shown in Figure 25.

I-80/ I-15 Interchange

Figure 25 Mapping link damage to DYNARSMART-P (Scenario 1)

In the following discussion, we sequentially examine the network-wide, origin-destinationspecific and path-specific travel times, extracted from vehicular simulation results from DYNASMART-P.

Table 23 first gives the network-wide average travel time in the do-nothing case as 21 minutes. Based on the simulation results, scenario 1 (Salt Lake City Segment) and scenario 2 (Taylorsville Segment) produce 123.3% and 31.9% increases, respectively, in terms of average travel time. In the first scenario, many parts of the interstate freeway system are accessible, so most vehicles use limited arterial streets or residual highway segments.

Network wide travel time	Pre-	Scenario 1	Scenario 2
	EQ	Salt Lake City	Taylorsville
Link capacity decreased by Pre-EQ		2.433%	0.6909%
Simulated Travel time (minutes)	21.0	46.9	27.7
Travel time increased by Pre-EQ		123.3%	31.9%

Table 23 Network-wide travel time changes

In addition, Table 24 provides useful OD-specific MOEs (measures of effectiveness), while OD pair 1480 to 195 is chosen for measuring the major traffic impact in the North-South bound using the I-15 corridor. By examining 26 vehicles that have traveled along this OD pair, in scenario 1, when the I-15 corridor is severely damaged, the impacted vehicles find alternative routes close to the I-15 corridor, further leading to a 29.89% increase in their average travel times. Comparably, the I-15 corridor has minor damage in scenario 2, and the average travel time is increased by 3.51% because additional trip length due to detours does not significantly impact the travel time along the whole trip.

Table 24 Travel time impact for OD pair 1480 to 195

Figure 26 Tested sample OD pair

Based on the dynamic OD demand matrix in this network, 6 critical OD pairs are selected to be compared under both pre-earthquake and post-earthquake conditions (Figure 26). The OD pair 991 to 996 represents incoming traffic flow from the west side of Salt Lake City to the CBD area through the I-80 corridor. Those OD pairs that originally need to cross the I-15 or I-80 corridor in the pre-earthquake case either need to find detour routes or experience severe traffic congestion on available underpasses in the post-earthquake case. Overall, the average travel time is increased by 25% to 35%, and the additional delay for each OD pair depends on the related severity on its passing routes. Specifically, the heavy delays from OD pair 357 to 991 are mainly due to the lack of detour routes available in this impacted area. As only AM peak demand in considered, traffic flow OD pair 357 to 991 (in the counterflow direction) shows slightly reduced travel times. Figure 27 shows the difference in terms of average travel time between pre-earthquake and post-earthquake cases for each critical OD pair.

Figure 27 Average path travel time for major O/D pair

Table 25 further details vehicle-specific statistics as a result of route, mode, and departure time changes, while OD pair 995 to 357 is selected with 6 vehicles in the pre-earthquake case and 10 vehicles in the post-earthquake case. As illustrated in Figure 28, in the post-earthquake conditions, the departure times for 10 vehicles are almost evenly spread due to the congestion level on the projected paths.

Table 25 Adjusted departure time pattern for OD pair 995 to 357

Figure 28 Departure time adjustment for path 995-357

6.4 Indirect Loss Estimation on Post-Earthquake Transportation Network

The risk assessment problem on capacity-reduced transportation networks could be more complex under this approach, since the indirect loss has two strongly correlated components: (1) the cost of the traffic delays and (2) the cost of the lost trips. Recently, Nilsson (2008) tested incremental seismic scenarios in the Charleston, SC urban area. The intensity of an Mw 7.0 earthquake used in this study leads to an estimated loss of \$83 million and \$1.1 billion for the direct and indirect damages, respectively. In Nilsson's study, the cost of indirect loss, such as expenditures associated with traffic diversion, was calculated approximately by using a multiplication factor of 13 based on the study by ATC (1991), in which indirect cost was estimated as 7 to 20 times the calculated direct costs.

As indicated by Moore et al. (2006), REDARS validation studies showed that the loss estimation model substantially overestimated travel volumes and delays in the Los Angeles network relative to the observations following the 1994 Northridge earthquake. In some cases, the overestimated travel volumes was about 2.5 times greater than what were observed on the day following the earthquake, and the modeled delays was around 12 times greater than what were observed (Cho et al. 2003a; Werner et al. 2004).

Moore et al. (2006) further conducted a study with an Mw 7.1 earthquake event along the Hayward fault in the San Francisco Bay Area. For this intense earthquake, the REDARS 2.0 model estimates 92 collapsed bridge, 466 damaged bridges as well as 36 links failures due to liquefaction. The total cost of transportation delays and the value of trips forgone (due to reductions in service) were estimated to be \$656.81 Million. The REDARS recovery model suggests that all the collapsed and damaged bridges would be repaired or reconstructed within 231 days. It should be remarked that, this total loss does not include the cost of repairing transportation structures or the cost of freight flows forgone.

Estimated the indirect loss in the Salt Lake Valley study in this paper was based on the following assumptions: a value of time at \$15 per person-hour, and average vehicle occupancy of 1.2 persons per passenger car unit, and a factor 4.0 for converting traffic demands from the fourhour peak to a daily pattern. The travel impacts of daily delay loss are estimated \$1 to 3, million varied by reconstruction time frames. The total indirect loss subject to delayed travel time is estimated to be \$1.8 to 2 billion for a reconstruction period of 18 months.

Figure 29 Trip demand/ network capacity restoration

Figure 29 shows the difference between upper bound network capacity recovery (UB) and lower bound network capacity recovery (LB). The daily total delay cost due to the reduction of transportation capacity was strongly related with network recovery capabilities provided by the transportation authority and returning volume of foregone travel demand in the network. The calculated cost was based on the number of trips on year of 2030 forecasted by Mountainland Association of Governments (MAG, 2002). Table 26 further summarized the delay cost following the earthquake and during the course of recovery.

Table 26 Estimated travel delay cost by level of traffic severity

7.0 Conclusions

The expected damage to UDOT's traffic network is considerable for an earthquake occurring within the Salt Lake Valley. The estimated damage to the transportation system from a M7.0 rupture of the Salt Lake City segment of the Wasatch fault is approximately \$435 M (2004 value). The expected damage resulting from a M6.0 rupture of the West Valley fault is approximately \$71 M (2004 value). These estimates include damage resulting from strong motion, liquefaction and fault rupture.

The REDARS methodology suggests that the primary contributor to the expected damage is permanent ground displacement (PGD) resulting from liquefaction and fault rupture effects. All REDARS models suggest that the expected damage greatly increases when PGD effects are included. For example, we performed additional REDARS analysis without such effects and the estimated damage to the traffic system significantly decreased to \$55 M (2004 value) for rupture on the M7.0 event and to about \$25 M (2004 value) for the M6.0 event.

The PGD damage from liquefaction effects and fault rupture for the M7.0 earthquake is largely present on I-15 (south of I-215), on I-215 (west side), on I-80 (from the downtown area westward) and on the east side (near the Wasatch fault). The liquefaction PGD damage corresponds to areas having a mapped moderate to high liquefaction hazard (Anderson et al. 1986).

The PGD damage for the M6.0 earthquake scenario is prevalent on I-80 (downtown area) and I-215 (west side), which corresponds to the high liquefaction hazard mapped in this area.

Traffic modeling was also performed for each earthquake scenario to estimate the delay-based user costs following an earthquake and also help UDOT to make informed decisions on disaster mitigation plans. Costs were estimated for both the Wasatch Scenario and the M6.0 scenario. REDARS, VISUM and MS Excel were the tools used for this analysis.

1. A list of road segments (lifelines) with names, directions, and addresses was prepared for each scenario. These segments are vulnerable but still can carry considerable detour traffic if strengthened for seismic hazards. This information could help UDOT in prioritizing vulnerable links for improvements and using its limited resources effectively.

- 2. The calculated user costs indicated that the maximum impacts would be imposed on PM traffic.
- 3. The completely damaged links contributed more to the total delay costs. This is not only due to their severity of damage, but also due to larger rehabilitation periods required.
- 4. The M6.0 scenario would incur a delay cost of \$65 million in the first six months were there to be an M6.0 earthquake on the Taylorsville fault system in West Valley City
- 5. The Wasatch Scenario would incur a user delay cost of \$1.3 billion in the first six months were there to be an M7.0 earthquake on the Salt Lake City segment of the Wasatch fault.
- 6. The dynamic traveler model suggests that the user delay cost may range from \$1.8 to 2.0 billion in an 18-month reconstruction period.

This report also presents a practical dynamic traveler microassignment model to simultaneously capture variable traffic demand and departure time choice dynamics. One particular focus is on how to represent different trip-making options and characteristics for different trip purposes. A case study using a large-scale transportation network is presented to illustrate the capability of the proposed system integration. The OD-, path-, and vehicle-specific information is systematically examined to provide a better understanding of traffic flow evolution after a major earthquake event in an urban region. The proposed methodology can uniquely meets the needs of metropolitan planning organization (MPO) and state department of transportation (DOT) agencies for sophisticated decision-making tools that involve large-scale dynamic traffic simulation.

The dynamic traveler microassignment model provide a platform for integrating a rich set of traveler choice models, applied at the individual traveler level within a realistic representation of the dynamics of traffic flow in networks with dramatic capacity changes due to earthquakes.

Furthermore, integrating REDARS 2 and DYNASMART-P to perform earthquake hazard evaluation and traffic impact studies through dynamic network simulation at a meso-scopic level can provide transportation planners with a realistic estimation of seismic risk-related road capacity damage and provide earthquake engineers with detailed evaluation of large-scale network-wide traffic impact.

8.0 Future Research and Improvements

The above damage estimates have considerable uncertainties that are attributable to limitations or simplifications of the REDARS methods and/or uncertainty or incomplete information in the modeling input data. One major source of uncertainty associated with the liquefaction susceptibility calculations was the necessity of interpolating subsurface borehole properties to the bridge locations. Although 930 SPT boreholes were used in this evaluation of the Salt Lake Valley, interpolation of the borehole information to the bridge locations was necessary, which introduces spatial uncertainty in the PGD estimates and the estimated damage. Another REDARS limitation related to fault rupture is that REDARS v.2 software does not allow for faults to be input as curvilinear features. Thus, the fault damage locations in this study are approximate.

We also believe that the strong motion bridge damage estimates could be improved by using site-specific bridge fragility curves, which is allowed by the software. For this project, fragility curves based on ATC-13 (1985) were used for bridges built during or after 1998 because of their improved seismic design. For pre-1998 bridges, REDARS default curves were used. (A bridgeby-bridge assessment of the fragility curves was not performed because of the number of bridges, project funding and time constraints.) However, we found that bridge damage, when considered on regional basis, was not very sensitive to the two different sets of fragility curves that we employed for assessment of the bridges constructed after 1998.

Most of the traffic modeling part of this study used default values derived from limited research in this field. The hypothetical values to measure retained capacity and speed on damaged links, should be refined more accurately. A further classification of damage types and their capacities can affect final results. For estimation of more accurate delay based user costs and rehabilitation time periods, location based parameters should be taken into consideration. For example, emergency response system, immediate and log-term post-earthquake traffic volumes, weather conditions and type of work zone operations may significantly affect the delay costs and reconstruction activities. Considering hourly, daily, monthly and seasonal demand variations may considerably change final outputs.

Lastly, there are several process and software improvements to REDARS v.2 that would make it easier to implement and use. Currently, REDARS cannot read the current NHPN and the HPMS files and this format incompatibility caused us to bypass the REDARS v.2 import wizard and input the required data directly in the program input tables. This was a major programming effort and required considerable time. In addition, REDARS does not include any utilities for viewing, importing or modifying the location or the attributes of bridges or links; instead all attributes needed to be changed manually in the program input tables. Further, we believe that REDARS needs to incorporate liquefaction-induced PGD effects when the SHAKEMAP option is used. This feature would increase REDARS potential use for estimating losses that incorporate SHAKEMAP scenarios. Lastly, we believe it would be useful if the software could directly incorporate published results from liquefaction and ground deformation maps (Olsen et al., 2007) directly instead of calculating these values within the REDARS program. Also, all liquefaction-triggering calculations need to be done external to the program and these calculations could easily be incorporated within REDARS to simplify the liquefaction screening analyses.

References

Abrahamson, N. A. and Silva, W. J., (1997). "Empirical Response Spectral Attenuation Relations for Shallow Crustal Earthquakes," Seismological Research Letters, Vol. 68, No. 1, pp. 94-127.

Anderson, L. R., Keaton, J. R., Spitzley, J. E., and Allen, A. C., (1986). Liquefaction potential map for Salt Lake County, Utah: Utah State University Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering and Dames and Moore, unpublished final technical report prepared for the U.S. Geological Survey, National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program Award No. 14-08-0001- 19910, 48 p.; published as Utah Geological Survey Contract Report 94-9, 1994.

Arnow, T., Van Horn, R., and LaPray, R. (1970). "The pre-Quaternary surface in the Jordan Valley, Utah," *U.S. Geological Survey Professional Paper* 700, p. D257-D261 ASCE 7-05, "Minimum Design Loads for Buildings and Other Structures," American Society of Civil Engineers, 2006, 424 p.

Applied Technology Council (ATC), 1991. Seismic Vulnerability and Impact of Disruption of Lifelines in the Conterminous United States, Report No. ATC-25.

ATC-13 (1985). Buscovich, P., Coronado, J., Kiremidjian, A.S., Pelham, S. H., Reaveley, L.D., Roth, R.J.. "Earthquake Damage Evaluation Data for California," Applied Technology Council Paper, Federal Emergency Management Agency.

Ashland, F., and Rollins, K. (1999). "Unpublished geotechnical and shear wave velocity database for the Salt Lake Valley," Utah Geological Survey.

Bardet, J-P. Tobita, T. Mace, N., and Hu, J. (2002). "Regional Modeling of Liquefaction-Induced Ground Deformation," *Earthquake Spectra*, Vol. 18, No.1, February, pp 19-46.

Bartlett S. F., Olsen, M. J., and Solomon, B. J. (2005). "Lateral Spread Hazard Mapping of Northern Salt Lake County for a Magnitude 7.0 Scenario Earthquake," United States Geological Survey, USGS Award No. 04HQGR0026, 218 p.

Biek, R. F., Solomon, B. J., Keith, J. D., and Smith T. W. (2004). Interim geologic maps of the Copperton, Magna, and Tickville Spring Quadrangles, Salt Lake and Utah Counties, Utah: Utah Geological Survey Open-File Report 434, scale 1:24,000.

Basoz, N. and Kiremidjian, A. 1996. Risk Assessment of Highway Transportation Systems. The John A. Blume Earthquake Engineering Center Report No. 118, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Stanford University, Stanford, CA.

Biek, R. F. (2005). Geologic map of the Jordan Narrows Quadrangle, Salt Lake and Utah Counties, Utah: Utah Geological Survey Map 208, scale 1:24,000.

Bischoff, T.A., 2005, "Collection of shear wave velocity data for use in Utah Geological Survey Site-Conditions maps and database," Master's Project, Utah State University.

Black, B.D., Lund, W.R., Schwartz, D.P., Gill, H.E., and Mayes, B.H., 1996. Paleoseismic Investigation on the Salt Lake City Segment of the Wasatch Fault Zone at the South Fork Dry Creek and Dry Gulch Sites, Salt Lake County, Utah, Utah Geological Survey Special Study, Vol. 92, pp 22.

FEMA (2002). HAZUS 99 Service Release 2 (SR2). "*Technical Manual* ", developed by the FEMA through agreements with National Institute for Building Sciences, Washington D.C.

Feng, C., and Wen, C. A. (2005). "Fuzzy Bi-Level and Multi-Objective Model to Control Traffic Flow into the Disaster Area Post Earthquake", Journal of the Eastern Asia Society for Transportation Studies, Vol. 6, pp. 4253 – 4268.

Chang, S. E., Nojima, N. 1997. Highway System Performance Measures and Economic Impact. *Proc. of the 7th U.S.-Japan Workshop on Earthquake Disaster Prevention for Lifeline Systems*, Seattle, WA.

Chang, S. E., Nojima, N. 1998. Measuring Lifeline System Performance: Highway Transportation Systems in Recent Earthquakes. *Proc. of the 6th National Conference on Earthquake Engineering*, Seattle, USA, Paper No.70, p 12.

Chang, S. E., Nojima, N. 1998. Measuring Lifeline System Performance: Highway Transportation Systems in Recent Earthquakes. *Proc. of the 6th National Conference on Earthquake Engineering*, Seattle, USA, Paper No.70, p 12.

Cho, S., Fan, Y., and Moore, J. 2003. Modeling Transportation Network Flows as a Simultaneous Function of Travel Demand, Network Damage, and Network Level of Service, the Proceedings of the ASCE Technical Council on Lifeline Earthquake Engineering (TCLEE) Sixth U.S. Conference and Workshop BIBLIOGRAPHY 81on Lifeline Earthquake Engineering, August 10-13, 2003, Long Beach, CA, pp 868-877.

Dusicka, P., Glickman, M., and Oppenheimer, H. (2007). "Seismic Vulnerability Assessment of Oregon Highway Bridges," Oregon Department of Transportation.

FEMA (2005). HAZUS-MH MR3 (HAZUS-MH Version 1.3).

King, S. A. and Kiremidjian, A. S. (1994). "Regional Seismic Hazard and Risk Analysis through Geographic Information Systems," The John A. Blume Earthquake Engineering Center, Stanford, CA.

HAZUS. 1999. Earthquake Loss Estimation Technical Manual, National Institute of Building Sciences, Washington D.C.

Iida, Y., Kurauchi, F. and Shimada, H. 2000. Traffic Management System Against Major Earthquakes. *IATSS Research*, Vol. 24 (2) pp 6-17.

Kiremidjian, A, Moore, J., Fan, Y., Yazlali, O., Basoz, N., Williams, M. 2008. Seismic Risk Assessment of Transportation Network Systems, Journal of Earthquake Engineering. *Journal of Earthquake Engineering,* Vol. 11 (3), pp 371 – 382

Luna, R., Hoffman, D., and Lawrence, W. (2008). "Estimation of Earthquake Loss due to Bridge Damage in the St. Louis Metropolitan Area. I: Direct Losses". Journal of American Society of Civil Engineers.

Lund, W. R., (2005). "Consensus Preferred Recurrence-Interval and Vertical Slip-Rate Estimates, Utah Geological Survey Bulletin 134, CD-ROM.

Mahmassani, H., 2001. Dynamic Network Traffic Assignment and Simulation Methodology for Advanced System Management Applications. *Networks and Spatial Economics*, Vol. 1, pp 267- 292.

Martin, P.T., Jovanovic, D., and Stevanovic, A. (2007). " 4500 South (300 West To State Street) Closure: The Evaluation of Users' Impacts." University of Utah Traffic Lab, UTL-12-07-94.

Moore, J., Cho, S., Fan, Y., 2006. Quantifying Economic Losses from Travel Foregone Following a Large Metropolitan Earthquake, Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center Report No 2006/09, PEER, University of California, Berkeley, CA.

Mountainland Association of Governments (MAG), 2002. Inter-Regional Corridor Alternatives Analysis (IRCAA), Orem, Utah, Ch 2, pp15-18.

National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program (NEHRP) (1997). "Recommended Provisions for the Development of Seismic Regulations for New Buildings," Building Seismic Safety Council, Washington D.C.

National Bridge Inventory, 2008. Federal Highway Administration http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/Bridge/nbi/ascii.cfm?year=2008

NCEER (1997). "Proceedings of the NCEER Workshop on Evaluation of Liquefaction Resistance of Soils," edited by Youd, T. L., and Idriss, I. M., Technical Report NCEER-97-0022, National Center for Earthquake Engineering Research.

Nilsson, E., 2008. Seismic Risk Assessment of the Transportation Network of Charleston, SC, Master of Science Thesis, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology.

Nojima, N. 1999. Performance-Based Prioritization for Upgrading Seismic Reliability of a Transportation Network, *Journal of Natural Disaster Science*, Vol.20, No.2, pp 57-66.

Noland, R., Small, K., Koskenoja, P., Chu., X. 1998. Simulating Travel Reliability. *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, Vol. 28(5), pp 535-564.
Olsen, M. J., Bartlett, S. F. and Solomon, B. J., (2007). "Lateral Spread Hazard Mapping of the Northern Salt Lake Valley, Utah, for M7.0 Scenario Earthquake," Earthquake Spectra, Vol. 23, Number 1, pp. 95-113.

Personius, S. F., and Scott, W. E. (1992). Surficial geologic map of the Salt Lake City segment and parts of adjacent segments of the Wasatch fault zone, Davis, Salt Lake, and Utah Counties, Utah: U.S. Geological Survey Miscellaneous Investigations Map I-2106, scale 1:50,000.

Powers, M., Chiou, B., Abrahamson, N., Bozorgnia, Y., Shantz, T. and Roblee, C., (2008). "An Overview of the NGA Project," Earthquake Spectra, Vol. 24, No. 1, pp. 3-21.

REDARS 2 User Guide (2005). Multidisciplinary Center for Earthquake Engineering Research (MCEER).

Schiff, Anshel J. 1995. Northridge Earthquake: Lifeline Performance and Post Earthquake Response, *TCLEE Monograph*, No.8.

Shinozuka, M., Murachi, Y., Dong, X., Zhou, Y., and Orlikowski, M., Ghosh (2006). Effect of Seismic Retrofit of Bridges on Transportation Networks, California Department of Transportation (Caltrans).

Shiraki, N., Shinozuka, M., Hon, M., Moore, J., Chang, S., Kameda, H., and Tanaka, S. (2007). System Risk Curves: Probabilistic Performance Scenarios for Highway Networks Subject to Earthquake Damage.

Silva, W., Gregor, N., and Darragh, R. 2002. Development of Regional Hard-Rock Attenuation Relations for Central and Eastern North America, Pacific Engineering and Analysis, El Cerritto CA.

Silva, W., Gregor, N., and Darragh, R. 2003. Development of Regional Hard-Rock Attenuation Relations for Central and Eastern North America, Mid-Continent, and Gulf Coast Areas, Pacific Engineering and Analysis, El Cerritto CA.

Texas Transportation Institute (2009). Office of the Secretary of Transportation. Urban Mobility Report. [http://tti.tamu.edu/documents/mobility_report_2009_wappx.pdf . Accessed on](http://tti.tamu.edu/documents/mobility_report_2009_wappx.pdf%20.%20Accessed%20on%2007/30/2009) [07/30/2009.](http://tti.tamu.edu/documents/mobility_report_2009_wappx.pdf%20.%20Accessed%20on%2007/30/2009)

Tokimatsu, K. and Seed, H B, (1987). "Evaluation of Settlements in Sands due to Earthquake Shaking," *Journal of the Geotechnical Engineering Division*, *ASCE*, Vol. 113, No. 8, August, pp 861-878.

UDOT (2008). Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction."

UDOT (1977). "Utah Official Highway Map, 77/78" Utah Department of Transportation.

United States Census Bureau (USCB), Population Division. 2008. Annual Estimates of the Population of Metropolitan and Micropolitan Statistical Areas: April 1, 2000 to July 1, 2007 (CBSA-EST2007-01)" (CSV). 2007 *Population Estimates*.

U.S. Department of Transportation (1997). Office of the Secretary of Transportation. Department Guidance for the Valuation of Travel Time in Economic Analysis. Memorandum. Available Online: [http://ostpxweb.dot.gov/policy/data/vot97guid.pdf. Accessed on 06/15/2009.](http://ostpxweb.dot.gov/policy/data/vot97guid.pdf.%20%20Accessed%20on%2006/15/2009)

Utah Department of Transportation (2008). "Traffic Statistics. Annual Truck Traffic Data. [http://www.udot.utah.gov/main/uconowner.gf?N=5829105802218755.](http://www.udot.utah.gov/main/uconowner.gf?N=5829105802218755) Accessed on 05/15/2009.

Utah Department of Transportation (2009). Traffic Statistics. Hourly Traffic Volume Reports and ATR Maps. [http://www.udot.utah.gov/main/f?P=100:pg:0::::v,t:,2315.](http://www.udot.utah.gov/main/f?P=100:pg:0::::v,t:,2315) Accessed on 05/15/2009.

USBLM (1985). "Utah Land Status, 13132817" United States Bureau of Land Management.

VISUM 10.0 User Manual (2007). PTV Planung Transport Verkehr AG, pp. 2−136.

WFRC (2008). "Natural Hazard Pre-Disaster Mitigation Plan," Wasatch Regional Council, [http://wfrc.org.](http://wfrc.org/)

Wells, D. L. and Coppersmith, K. J., (1994). "New Empirical Relations among Magnitude, Rupture Length, Rupture Width, Rupture Area, and Surface Displacement," Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America, Vol. 84, No. 4, pp. 974-1002.

Werner, S., Craig, E. and Moore, J. 1997. Loss Estimation Due to Seismic Risks to Highway Systems, *Earthquake Spectra*, Vol.13, No.4, pp585-604.

Werner, S. D., Taylor, C. E., Moore, J. E. II, Walton, J. S. and Cho, S. (2000). " A Risk-Based Methodology for Assessing the Seismic Performance of Highway Systems, Technical Report MCEER-00-0014, Multidisciplinary Center for Earthquake Engineering Research, University at Buffalo, NY.

Werner, S. D., Lavoie, JP, Eitzel, C, Cho, S. Huyck, C. Ghosh, S. Eguchi, R. T. Taylor, C. E. and Moore, J. E. (2003). "REDARS 1: Demonstration Software for Seismic Risk Analysis of Highway Systems, Multidisciplinary Center for Earthquake Engineering Research, Report MCEER-03-SP01.

Werner, S., Taylor, C., Cho, S., Lavoie, J., Huyck, C., Eitzel, C., Eguchi, R. and Moore, J., 2004. New Developments in Seismic Risk Analysis of Highway Systems, the Proceedings of the 13th Annual World Conference on Earthquake Engineering, Vancouver, August 1-6, 2004, Paper 2189.

Werner, S.D., Lavoie, J.P., Eitzel, C., Cho, S., Huyck, C., Ghosh, S., Eguchi, R.T., Taylor, C.E., and Moore, J. (2006), Technical Manual - REDARS 1: Demonstration Software for Seismic Risk Analysis of Highway Systems. Multidisciplinary Center for Earthquake Engineering Research (MCEER).

Werner, S. D. Cho, S. Taylor, C. E., Lavoie, JP and Huyck, C. K. (2006a). Seismic Analysis of a Roadway System in the Los Angeles, California Area, Proceedings of the Fifth National Conference (5NSC) on Bridges & Highways: Innovations in Earthquake Engineering for Highway Structures; San Mateo, California, September 18-20, 2006. MCEER Publications, Buffalo, NY, 2006.

Werner, S. D., Taylor, C. E. Cho, S., Lavoie, JP, Huyck, C., Eitzel, C., Chung, H., Eguchi, R. T. (2006b). "REDARS 2 Methodology and Software for Seismic Risk Analysis of Highway Systems, Multidisciplinary Center for Earthquake Engineering Research, Report MCEER-06-SP08.

Werner, S., Taylor, C., Cho, S., Lavoie, J., Huyck, C., and Eguchi, R. (2008). " REDARS 2 Methodology and Software for Seismic Risk Analysis of Highway Systems."Multidisciplinary Center for Earthquake Engineering Research (MCEER).

Wong, I., Silva, W., Wright, D., Olig, S., Ashland, F., Gregor, N., Christenson, G., Pechmann, J., Thomas, P., Dober, M., Gerth, R., (2002). "Ground-Shaking Map for a Magnitude 7.0 Earthquake on the Wasatch Fault, Salt Lake City, Utah, Metropolitan Area," Utah Geological Survey Public Information Series 76, Utah Geological Survey Miscellaneous Publication MP 02-05

Youd, T.L. (2002). "Pavements," Chapter 6 of *Seismic Retrofitting Manual for Highway Structures: Retaining Structures, Slopes, Tunnels, Culverts, and Pavements*, Buffalo NY: Multidisciplinary Center for Earthquake Engineering Research, January.

Youd, T. L, and Perkins, D. M. (1978). "Mapping liquefaction-induced ground failure potential," Journal of the Geotechnical Engineering Division, ASCE, pp. 443-446.

Zhou, X. and Mahmassani. H. S. 2007. A Structural State Space Model for Real-Time Origin-Destination Demand Estimation and Prediction in a Day-to-Day Updating Framework. *Transportation Research Part B*, Vol. 41, No.8, pp 823-840.

Zhou, X, Mahmassani, H.S. and Zhang, K. 2008. Dynamic Micro-assignment Modeling Approach for Integrated Multimodal Urban Corridor Management. *Transportation Research Part C*. Vol. 16, No. 2, pp 167-186.

Appendix 1 – Soil Classification Map for Salt Lake Valley

A1. Introduction

Local site conditions have an important influence on the characteristics of strong ground motion during major earthquakes. In short, wave propagation from a major earthquake on the Salt Lake City Segment of the Wasatch fault is expected to be strongly affected by the sharp impedance contrasts at the bedrock/sediment interface and the attenuation of seismic wave energy in the central part of the basin as a result of the relatively deep soil column and overlying soft lacustrine and alluvial deposits.

This appendix presents a site class map for the various soil/rock conditions in Salt Lake Valley, Utah using geological, geophysical data and the classification system developed by the National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program (NEHRP, 1997). This map is required for REDAR analyses and is also useful for strong motion studies and developing design spectra according to the seismic provision in ASCE 7-05 and MCEER-ATC-49. To produce the site class map, SH-wave velocities at several sites in the Salt Lake Valley were compiled from conventional downhole, crosshole and surface geophysical techniques. NEHRP site class boundaries were created using the average shear wave velocity of the upper 30 m of the soil profile and surficial geological mapping. The mapping showed that the central portion of the valley, near the Jordan River, is predominantly Site Class E (<180 m/s); however some Site Class F soils may exist, due to the possibility of liquefaction. Sites away from active river and stream deposits, but still found in the central part of the valley floor are underlain by lacustrine silts and clays and typically classify as Site Class D (180–360 m/s.). At higher elevations, denser sand and gravel deposits of terrace, fan, delta and glacial origin generally have Vs30 velocities greater than 360 m/s and classify as Site Class C (360–760 m/s.).

Currently, Utah uses the International Building Code (IBC 2006) for its seismic provisions for buildings and MCEER-ATC-49 for interstate bridges. These codes are essentially the same in outlining the methods for determining the strong motion and design spectra at a given site. IBC (2006), in turn, references ASCE 7-05 for its seismic provisions. Thus, ASCE 7-05 is an integral part of the building codes of the United States and is a complete revision of ASCE 7-02. This new standard has revised and significantly reorganized provisions for seismic design of structures, as well as revisions in the provisions for determining live, flood, wind, snow, and atmospheric ice loads.

The seismic provisions for critical (i.e., interstate) highway bridge design adopted by the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) are found in MCEER-ATC49 as implemented in UDOT (2007). These criteria apply to the design of bridges using a performance-based approach. The three performance levels are Operational, Repairable and Life Safety. These performance levels are defined by the expected damage, service and functionality after design earthquakes and depend on the bridge category (Table A1-1).

Generally, unless specified otherwise by UDOT, the seismic design loading for bridges is based on a 75-year life of the structure and the design considers to design basis ground motions: (1) Maximum Considered Earthquake (MCE) event with strong motion that has a 2 percent probability of exceedance in 50 years and (2) Design level Expected Earthquake (EE) event with strong motion that has a 10 percent probability of exceedance in 50 years (Table A1-1). Further, UDOT classifies its bridges as: (1) Critical bridges that must remain open to all traffic immediately after the MCE, (2) Essential bridges that can only be closed to traffic for a limited period of time for repairs after a design level event (MCE). These bridges should be open for

emergency vehicles and for security/defense purposes immediately after the design earthquake and (3) Normal bridges are all other bridges not classified as Critical or Essential.

Both building and bridge code use the National Seismic Hazard Maps to determine the design basis events (USGS 2008a, b). The national maps show the distribution of earthquake strong motion for various levels of exceedance probability in the United States. These maps were created to provide the most accurate and detailed information possible to assist planners, engineers and risk assessors in planning, designing and evaluating infrastructure (e.g., buildings, bridges, highways, utilities, etc.) to withstand shaking from major earthquakes in the United States. For example, the central part of the Salt Lake Valley has pga values that range from about 0.48 to 0.65 g (USGS, 2008b).

A1.2 Soil Effects

For strong motion evaluations of existing facilities and for construction of new facilities located on soils profiles, it is important to consider soil effects. Soft and/or deep soil profiles will either amplify or de-amplify the strong motion depending on the nature and frequency content of the strong motion and the characteristics of the soil profile. Nonlinear behavior of soft and deep soil profiles at higher levels of strong ground motion is of particular interest to Utah, because much of its urban population and infrastructure is located within 10 km of the Wasatch Fault, where future peak ground acceleration (pga) is expected to be 0.3 g to 1.0 g, depending on the site conditions and proximity to the Wasatch fault (Wong et al. 2002). In addition, the Salt Lake Valley, which contains approximately 50 percent of the State's population, is a relatively deep intermountain basin filled with interbedded alluvium and lacustrine deposits that extend to considerable depths. For example, Arnow et al. (1970; see also Wong et al. 2002) estimate that the thickness of unconsolidated Quaternary sediments is about 100 to 360 m near downtown Salt Lake City (Figure A1-1); and such sediments extend to a depth of over 600 m, just north of the downtown area. In addition, late-Pleistocene and Holocene surficial sediments deposited by the Pleistocene-age Lake Bonneville and the present Great Salt Lake are soft, compressible and typically classify as soft to medium consistency clays. Undoubtedly, soft soil effects will play a significant role in modifying the strong motion in the Salt Lake Valley.

The National Seismic Hazard Maps are valid for soft rock conditions (i.e., NEHRP site Class B) where the shear wave velocity in the upper 30 meters (i.e., V_s 30) of the profile is between 2500 to 5000 ft/s (Table A1-2). For other site conditions, the national maps must be adjusted for soil effects using either site-specific ground response analyses or generic techniques outlined in MCEER/ATC-49 and ASCE 7-05. Because soil conditions predominate throughout most of Salt Lake Valley, it is necessary to adjust spectral values obtained from the national maps for soil conditions using either ground response analyses or generic techniques in current building or bridge code.

Site Class	$\overline{\nu}_s$	\bar{N} or \overline{N}_{ch}	\overline{S}_u
Α	> 1500 m/sec (> 5000 ft/sec)		
в	760 to 1500 m/sec (2500 to 5000 ft/sec)		
c	360 to 760 m/sec $(1200 \text{ to } 2500 \text{ ft/sec})$	> 50	> 100 kPa (> 2000 psf)
D	180 to 360 m/sec (600 to 1200 ft/sec)	15 to 50	50 to 100 kPa $(1000 \text{ to } 2000 \text{ psf})$
E	< 180 m/sec (<600 ft/sec)	<15 blows/0.30 m $(15$ blows/ft)	< 50 kPa (<1000 psf)

Table A1-2. NEHRP Site Classes used in current building and bridge codes (after MCEER/ATC/49).

MCEER/ATC-49 and ASCE 7-05 use generic site factors to adjust Site Class B spectral values for soil effects. These methods are very similar and a two-factor approach based on recommendations developed by the NCEER/SEAOC/BSSC Site Response Workshop (Rinne and Dobry, 1992; Borcherdt, 1994.). In this simplified approach, the short period acceleration (0.2 s) rock spectral value, S_s, is multiplied by a short-period site coefficient F_a. The longer period spectral values are represented by a curve that begins with the one-second period rock acceleration value, S_1 , divided by the period (i.e., S_1/T) and multiplied by the long-period site coefficient, F_v. Recently, ASCE 7-05 has introduced a long period transition period, T_L, in the design spectra that marks the change from constant velocity to constant displacement. Crouse

et al. (2006) describe the development of the constant displacement period for ASCE 7-05. For the Salt Lake City Valley, the constant displacement period is 8 seconds (Crouse et al. 2006).

Values of the site coefficients F_a and F_v vary according to soil conditions and level of strong motion. Hence a determination of the site class (Table A1-2) is required to implement MCEER/ATC-49 and ASCE 7-05 and to perform REDARS analyses. The basis for this determination can be obtained from site-specific geophysical or geotechnical testing or it may be estimated from published mapping and shear wave velocity data, such as presented in this appendix.

A1.3 Development of NEHRP Site Class Map

Currently, there is no NEHRP site class map available for the Salt Lake Valley for earthquake resistant design or other seismic evaluations such as REDARS. Thus, the map developed in this appendix will be useful to civil engineers and others, who must implement seismic design procedures or make other evaluations that required site classification. Geographical Information Systems (GIS) is the primary tool used for graphic representation of geospatial data, including: geotechnical, geographical and geologic information. It is the tool used to develop the maps described herein.

In order to create a suitable map for NEHERP site classification, a combination of existing GIS maps and additional geophysical data were used. The process and sources for these data are discussed in the following sections.

A1.3.1 Geologic Mapping

The geologic data for Salt Lake Valley was acquired from two main sources: a surficial geologic map of the Salt Lake City segment of the Wasatch fault zone (Personius and Scott, 1992) for the eastern side of the valley and several quadrangle maps (Biek et al., 2004 and Biek, 2005) that cover the remainder of the valley. These maps were combined to produce the geologic map of the entire valley (Figure A1-2) that was later used in conjunction with the hazard calculations to define the extent of each hazard zone. Table A1-3 summarizes the geologic map units shown on Figure A1-2.

A1.3.2 Geophysical Measurements

The best method to determine Site Class is shear wave velocity measurements. NEHRP Site Class determination requires that the shear wave velocity measurements be averaged in the upper 30 meters of the profile, which produces a V_s 30 value. The V_s 30 values for the Salt Lake Valley were superimposed on the geologic map (Figure A1-2). These values were obtained from Ashland and Rollins (1999) and from Bischoff (2005) and entered into the GIS database by Bartlett et al. (2005). In addition to the geological units shown in Figure A1-2, maps of the Salt Lake Valley major roads was obtained from UDOT and the Salt Lake County boundaries were obtained from USDA and NRCS.

A1.3.3 Compilation of the GIS Database and Map Production

All the geospatial data was in the NAD 1983 projected coordinate system data from the three maps into one new map. The geologic data and the major roads had to be clipped to the county boundary polygon.

The shear wave velocity along with the coordinates were imported into the ArcGIS map and then saved as a shape file. The velocities were then displayed as different colors representing their appropriate site class determined using Table A1-2 above. The velocity point data was then clipped to the county boundary (Figure A1-3).

The USGS geologic units with shear wave velocity were given a NEHERP site classification. All the geologic polygons with the same site classification were saved as layer files (Figure A1-3). By extrapolating the known data and using the properties of the soil classified in the USGS map the remaining polygons were converted to NEHRP site classifications.

To complete the final NEHRP soil map, a new color scheme was chosen, legend, metadata, north arrow, and title were added (Figure A1-4).

Figure A1-1: Surficial deposits and depth of Quaternary unconsolidated sediments in Salt Lake Valley (after Wong et al. 2002).

Figure A1-2: Surficial geology map of the Salt Lake Valley, Utah (modified from Personius and Scott, 1992; Biek et al., 2004; and Biek, 2005).

Figure A1-3: Location of Vs30 measurements in Salt Lake Valley, Utah from geophysical testing.

Figure A1-4: NEHRP site class map for Salt Lake Valley, Utah.

Appendix 1 - References

Arnow, T., Van Horn, R., and LaPray, R. (1970). "The pre-Quaternary surface in the Jordan Valley, Utah," *U.S. Geological Survey Professional Paper* 700, p. D257-D261 ASCE 7-05, "Minimum Design Loads for Buildings and Other Structures," American Society of Civil Engineers, 2006, 424 p.

Ashland, F., and Rollins, K. (1999). "Unpublished geotechnical and shear wave velocity database for the Salt Lake Valley," Utah Geological Survey.

Bartlett S. F., Olsen, M. J., and Solomon, B. J. (2005). "Lateral Spread Hazard Mapping of Northern Salt Lake County for a Magnitude 7.0 Scenario Earthquake," United States Geological Survey, USGS Award No. 04HQGR0026, 218 p.

Biek, R. F., Solomon, B. J., Keith, J. D., and Smith T. W. (2004). Interim geologic maps of the Copperton, Magna, and Tickville Spring Quadrangles, Salt Lake and Utah Counties, Utah: Utah Geological Survey Open-File Report 434, scale 1:24,000.

Biek, R. F. (2005). Geologic map of the Jordan Narrows Quadrangle, Salt Lake and Utah Counties, Utah: Utah Geological Survey Map 208, scale 1:24,000.

Bischoff, T.A., 2005, "Collection of shear wave velocity data for use in Utah Geological Survey Site-Conditions maps and database," Master's Project, Utah State University.

Borcherdt, R. D. (1994). Simplified site classes and empirical amplification factors for sitedependent code provisions, *Proceedings of the NCEER/SEAOC/BSSC Workshop on Site Response During Earthquakes and Seismic Code Provision*s, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, November 18-20.

Crouse, C.B., Leyendecker, E.V., Somerville, P.G., Power, M. and Silva, W. J. (2006). Development of seismic ground-motion criteria for the ASCE 7 standard, *Proceedings of the 8th National* Earthquake Engineering Conference, San Francisco California, April 18th – 22nd, 2006. International Building Code (2006). International Code Council.

MCEER/ATC-49 (2003). "Recommended LRFD Guidelines for the Seismic Design of Highway Bridges," Part I: Specifications, University at Buffalo, State University of New York, 107 Red Jacket Quadrangle, Buffalo, New York.

National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program (NEHRP) (1997). "Recommended Provisions for the Development of Seismic Regulations for New Buildings," Building Seismic Safety Council, Washington D.C.

Personius, S. F., and Scott, W. E. (1992). Surficial geologic map of the Salt Lake City segment and parts of adjacent segments of the Wasatch fault zone, Davis, Salt Lake, and Utah Counties, Utah: U.S. Geological Survey Miscellaneous Investigations Map I-2106, scale 1:50,000.

Rinne, E., and R. Dobry (1992). Preliminary site recommendations, Memorandum to Roland Sharpe, Chairman TS 2, Building Seismic Safety Council, December 11.

UDOT (2007). "UDOT Structures Design Manual, Section 6: Seismic Design Criteria." Utah Department of Transportation.

USGS (2008a). "2008 United States National Seismic Hazard Maps Fact Sheet 2008-3018, April 2008.

USGS (2008b). "Documentation for the 2008 Update of the United States National Seismic Hazard Maps," USGS Open File Report 2008-1128.

Wong, I. G., Silva, W., Olig, S., Thomas, P., Wright, D., Ashland, F., Gregor, N., Pechmann, J., Dober, M., Christenson, G., and Gerth, R. (2002). Earthquake scenario and probabilistic ground shaking maps for the Salt Lake City, Utah, metropolitan area, *Utah Geological Survey Miscellaneous Publication 02-5*.

Appendix 2 – Liquefaction Evaluations for Transportation Network

REDARS performs an initial screening of the soils based on an assessment of local geology and soil conditions. In this step, the geologic units and depositional processes are evaluated in order to identify those sites along the highway system that can be classed as low-hazard sites. These sites are eliminated from further liquefaction analysis. This evaluation is based on comparisons of the geologic input data to geologic screening criteria that are shown in Table A2-1 and are based on analysis of geologic conditions at sites of past liquefaction (Youd and Perkins, 1978). Table A2-2 shows the hazard assigned to each geological unit based on Table A2-1. The hazard column of Table A2-2 shows the following: $3.00 =$ high hazard, $2.00 =$ moderate hazard, $1.00 =$ low hazard and 0.00 = very low hazard.

Unfortunately, REDARS does not perform liquefaction triggering evaluations and this must be done a priori using other means such as computer algorithms. We performed liquefactiontriggering calculations at each borehole and interpolated the results to each network component location. To do this, the factor of safety against liquefaction was calculated at each borehole location using NCEER (1997) for the scenario earthquake and averaged at each component location using an inverse-distance weighting scheme. The developed routine used the factors of safety against triggering liquefaction for the three nearest boreholes in the weighted average. If the weighted average was less than 1.0, then liquefaction was assumed to occur at the component location and that component was further evaluated for horizontal and vertical liquefaction ground displacement. The liquefaction ground displacement methods are contained within REDARS and were done within this environment.

An extensive ArcGIS® geotechnical database was used for the liquefaction analysis in the Salt Lake Valley (Bartlett et al., 2005; Olsen et al. 2007, Erickson, 2007). The borehole locations are shown in Figure A2-1. Efforts have been made to gather subsurface information for nearly all major geologic units and to document the quality of data of the borehole information. At the time of this study, the database contained subsurface information from 963 boreholes drilled in the valley since 1959 (Figure A2-1). Many of the boreholes are from recent Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) projects where explorations generally extend to depths of 15 m or greater, especially near bridge structures. In other areas of the valley, the major contributors of subsurface data were Salt Lake County, city municipalities and geotechnical consultants. The electronic geotechnical database used for the liquefaction evaluations can be found at: <http://www.civil.utah.edu/~bartlett/ULAG/>

The information compiled in the ArcGIS® geotechnical database includes borehole logs, soil descriptions, groundwater levels, SPT blow counts, fines content, mean grain size and soil unit weights. Because the subsurface information originated from a variety of sources and data quality varied, a system was developed to assign data quality indicators to each individual datum (Bartlett et al., 2005). In this system, a "1" was assigned to data where the supporting information was well documented in the original geotechnical report. (In total there were 2,261 fines content and 315 mean grain size measurements in the database that had data quality rankings of "1.") A data quality indicator of "2" was given to data that could be reasonably estimated from nearby borehole logs for the same site, and a "3" denoted data that were averaged from other nearby boreholes based on their soil type and geologic unit. Missing soil unit weight, fines content and mean grain size data that could not be estimated from nearby boreholes were averaged from high quality data within the entire database. For these averages, a "4" was assigned to data that represent averaged properties for the same soil type and geologic unit; and a "5" was assigned to data that represent averaged properties for the same soil type irrespective of the geologic unit. (No SPT penetration resistance data were averaged for this study; if such data were missing, the borehole information was not used.)

A groundwater depth map is required for liquefaction, lateral spread and ground settlement calculations. A comprehensive groundwater map did not exist for the mapped area, nor was there sufficient historical data to accurately model groundwater depths and fluctuations throughout the valley. Thus, the recorded groundwater depths from the borehole logs were used to generate a groundwater map using an inverse distance square interpolation method (Bartlett et al., 2005).

Tables A2-2 and A2-3 show whether or not liquefaction is triggered at the bridge locations for the M6.0 and M7.0 events, respectively. The NBI_REF column is the National Bridge Inventory Reference Number of each structure. The LINK_ID is the link number used by REDARS, X is the latitude of the bridge location, Y is the longitude of the bridge location, UNIT is the respective geologic unit where the bridge is located (see Table 2, main report) and Liquefaction shows if liquefaction is triggered for the input event. The information in these tables was passed to REDARS so that it could calculate the lateral spread and settlement damage at each bridge. Similar analysis was done for each roadway link in the traffic network, but this has not been included in this report due to its length. In addition, the roadway link liquefaction evaluation is deemed less valuable for potential seismic upgrading of the network because it is UDOT's general policy not to remediate potential liquefaction damage to typical roadway. This is based on the fact that most roadways are easily repaired following the liquefaction event.

Figure A2-1: Locations of geotechnical boreholes contained in ArcGIS® geotechnical database, Salt Lake Valley, Utah.

Table A2-1 Estimated Susceptibility of Sedimentary Deposits to Liquefaction during Strong Seismic Shaking (Youd and Perkins, 1978)

Table A2-2 Liquefaction Evaluations for Bridges for M6.0 Event

Table A2-3 Liquefaction Evaluations for Bridges for M7.0 Event

Appendix 2 - References

Bartlett S. F., Olsen, M. J., and Solomon, B. J., 2005, *Lateral spread hazard mapping of northern Salt Lake County for a magnitude 7.0 scenario earthquake*, Technical Report submitted to the United States Geological Survey, USGS Award No. 04HQGR0026, 218 p.

Erickson, G., 2007, *Probabilistic liquefaction potential mapping of the Salt Lake Valley, Utah*, M.S. Thesis, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of Utah.

NCEER (1997). "Proceedings of the NCEER Workshop on Evaluation of Liquefaction Resistance of Soils," edited by Youd, T. L., and Idriss, I. M., Technical Report NCEER-97-0022, National Center for Earthquake Engineering Research.

Olsen, M. J., Bartlett, S. F. and Solomon, B. J., 2007, *Lateral spread hazard mapping of the northern Salt Lake Valley, Utah, for M7.0 scenario earthquake*, Earthquake Spectra, Vol. 23, Number 1, pp. 95-113*.*

Appendix 3 – Vulnerable and Critical Links

Table A3-1: Most vulnerable links (VISUM) in Salt Lake County

Table A3-2: Most critical links (VISUM) in Salt Lake County

Table A3-4: Links critical in the M6.0 scenario and vulnerable in the Wasatch Scenario

Link Number	From Node	To Node	Is Bridge Present	The M6.0 scenario Volume Ratio (after/before)	The Wasatch Scenario PGD DS	Road Name	Direction	From	To
-----------------------	----------------------------	-------------------	-----------------------------	--	---	------------------	------------------	-------------	----

