**TRANSPORTATION POOLED FUND PROGRAM**

**QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT**

**Lead Agency: Utah Department of Transportation**

**INSTRUCTIONS:**

*Project Managers and/or research project investigators should complete a quarterly progress report for each calendar quarter during which the projects are active. Please provide a project schedule status of the research activities tied to each task that is defined in the proposal; a percentage completion of each task; a concise discussion (2 or 3 sentences) of the current status, including accomplishments and problems encountered, if any. List all tasks, even if no work was done during this period.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Transportation Pooled Fund Program Project #****TPF-5(296)** | **Transportation Pooled Fund Program - Report Period:**\_ Quarter 1 (January 1 – March 31, 2016) **x Quarter 2 (April 1 – June 30, 2016)**\_ Quarter 3 (July 1 – September 30, 2016)\_ Quarter 4 (October 1 – December 31, 2016) |
| **Project Title:**Simplified SPT Performance-Based Assessment of Liquefaction and Effects |
| **Name of Project Manager(s):**David Stevens | **Phone Number:** 801-589-8340 | **E-Mail** davidstevens@utah.gov |
| **Lead Agency Project ID:**FINET 42065, ePM PIN 12436UDOT PIC No. UT13.407 | **Other Project ID (i.e., contract #):** UDOT Contract No. 148753  | **Project Start Date:** March 6, 2014 |
| **Original Project End Date:**November 30, 2016 | **Current Project End Date:** May 31, 2017 | **Number of Extensions:**2 |

Project schedule status:

 \_ On schedule **X** On revised schedule \_ Ahead of schedule \_ Behind schedule

Overall Project Statistics:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  **Total Project Budget** |  **Total Cost to Date for Project** |  **Percentage of Work**  **Completed to Date** |
| $167,500.00 (current contract)$167,500.00 (total commitments) | $95,750 | 70% |

***Quarterly*** Project Statistics:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  **Total Project Expenses**  **and Percentage This Quarter** |  **Total Amount of Funds**  **Expended This Quarter** |  **Total Percentage of**  **Time Used to Date** |
| 0% | $0 | 70% |

|  |
| --- |
| **Project Description**:Liquefaction of loose saturated sands results in significant damage to buildings, transportation systems and lifelines in most large earthquake events. Liquefaction and the resulting loss of shear strength can lead to lateral spreading and seismic slope displacements, which often impact bridge abutments and wharfs, damaging these critical transportation links at a time when they are most needed for rescue efforts and post-earthquake recovery.While most updated seismic provisions now adopt a risk-targeted approach to design ground motions for superstructures, other critical aspects of geotechnical engineering, such as liquefaction and ground deformation evaluation, are still based on the older concept of deterministic hazard evaluation. Recent advances in performance-based earthquake engineering (PBEE) in geotechnical engineering (e.g., Kramer and Mayfield 2007; Rathje and Saygili 2008; Bradley et al. 2011; Franke and Kramer 2013) have introduced probabilistic uniform hazard-based procedures for evaluating seismic ground deformations within a performance-based framework from which the likelihood of exceeding various magnitudes of deformation within a given time frame can be computed. However, the ability to apply these performance-based procedures on everyday projects is generally beyond the capabilities of most practicing engineers.This study proposes to create and evaluate *simplified* performance-based design procedures for the *a priori* prediction of liquefaction triggering, lateral spread displacement, seismic slope displacement, and post-liquefaction free-field settlement using the standard penetration test (SPT).Objectives for this study include: 1. Derive new simplified performance-based procedure for liquefaction triggering, lateral spread displacement, free-field post-liquefaction settlements, and Newmark seismic slope displacements. 2. Develop liquefaction parameter maps in GIS format associated with each of the hazards included in objective 1 at return periods of 475 years, 1033 years, and 2475 years for each of the states participating in the study. 3. Evaluate the new simplified performance-based liquefaction procedures against conventional (i.e., AASHTO) liquefaction analysis procedures. 4. Develop a simplified design procedure that will allow the designer to envelope the performance-based and conventional results to select which result will govern the design.Tasks for this study include, regarding the participating states: 1. Derivation and validation of a new simplified liquefaction triggering model (Year 1). 2. Derivation and validation of simplified lateral spread displacement models (Year 1). 3. Derivation and validation of simplified post-liquefaction settlement models (Year 2).4. Derivation and validation of simplified Newmark seismic slope displacement models (Year 2).5. Assessment of grid spacing considerations in various seismic environments for map development (Years 1 & 2).6. Development of liquefaction parameter maps at targeted return periods in GIS file format (Years 1 & 2).7. Comparison of simplified, conventional, and deterministic analysis approaches (Years 1 & 2).8. Development of a simplified design procedure and an analysis spreadsheet that incorporates both performance-based and conventional methods (Years 1 & 2).9. Preparation of the annual and final reports (Years 1 & 2).10. Dissemination of results in appropriate engineering journals and conferences (Years 1 & 2). 11. Technical Advisory Committee meetings (Years 1 & 2), including training meetings in each of the partner states on the new performance-based liquefaction hazard methods.Dr. Kevin Franke of BYU is the Principal Investigator for this research project. The technical advisory committee (TAC) for the study includes representatives from UT, AK, CT, ID, MT, OR, and SC state DOTs. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Progress this Quarter (includes meetings, work plan status, contract status, significant progress, etc.):****Task 1** – 100% complete.**Task 2** – 100% complete.**Task 3** – 100% complete.**Task 4** – 100% complete.**Task 5** – 100% complete.**Task 6** – 90% complete. Some work remains for Alaska and Oregon once the new USGS hazard tool becomes available.**Task 7** – 100% complete.**Task 8** – 90% complete. The TAC quarterly update report for Tasks 7 and 8 (Year 2) was updated based on TAC feedback and posted online. BYU continued updating the analysis spreadsheet based on TAC feedback. Some work remains for Alaska and Oregon.**Task 9** – 90% complete. BYU completed the draft final update report and the draft SPLiq user’s manual, and the TAC provided review comments. Some work remains for Alaska and Oregon.**Task 10** – 70% complete. A paper was submitted to the journal *Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering* to clearly explain the differences between traditional liquefaction hazard maps and new performance-based reference parameter maps. Two more journal papers are currently under preparation, with another two pending. **Task 11** – 80% complete. Two TAC web-conferences were held, one in April and another in May. The April meeting focused on the Tasks 7 & 8 (Year 2, Quarter 3) update report and updated spreadsheet tool, planning for remaining maps and reports, and planning for a May training workshop. Also at the April meeting, based on TAC input, a decision was made to have Dr. Franke travel to each participating state in the study, to provide a one-day training workshop for each state DOT’s staff, instead of having partner state contacts travel to Utah for a single workshop. The May meeting focused on the draft final report, updated spreadsheet tool, draft SPLiq user’s manual, and planning for state training workshops. The state training workshops began in June with South Carolina, Idaho, and Connecticut.**Contract** – UDOT worked with Dr. Franke and executed a contract amendment to include developing liquefaction parameter maps for Oregon based on 2014 USGS deaggregation data and for Alaska based on 2008 USGS deaggregation data (once the new USGS hazard tool becomes available), associated updating of the SPLiq tool and research reports, conducting the state-specific training workshops, and a 6-month time extension. Based on news of an upcoming AASHTO SCOBS T-3 and NCHRP study to update AASHTO seismic hazard maps and site coefficients to be consistent with the USGS 2014 NSHM, UDOT initiated a discussion with TAC members regarding their possible interest in having SPLiq reference parameter maps based on 2014 deaggregations in addition to maps based on 2008 deaggregations. |
| **Anticipated work next quarter**:**Task 1** – Completed.**Task 2** – Completed. **Task 3** – Completed.**Task 4** – Completed.**Task 5** – Completed.**Task 6** – BYU will pursue use of the new Uniform Hazard Tool from USGS to prepare reference parameter maps for Alaska based on 2008 USGS deaggregation data, and for Oregon based on 2014 USGS deaggregation data.**Task 7** – Completed.**Task 8** – Work could continue for Alaska and Oregon. BYU will continue updating the SPLiq spreadsheet tool. BYU will continue creating tutorial videos to help TAC members with the use of GIS maps and the analysis spreadsheet.**Task 9** – TAC final report will be revised by BYU based on TAC feedback and then published by UDOT.**Task 10** – Papers under review will be either accepted or rejected for publication; work on two pending journal papers will continue.**Task 11** – Additional training workshops will be held in Utah and Montana. Plan a TAC web-conference in fall 2016.**Contract** – UDOT requests that each partner state (except for Oregon) let us know by early September 2016 if they can provide an extra $2,000/state in 2016 or 2017 to fund development of reference parameter maps based on 2014 USGS deaggregations in addition to the planned/completed maps based on 2008 deaggregations. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Significant Results:**Dr. Franke has traveled to the DOT headquarters in South Carolina, Connecticut, and Idaho to provide a full-day training workshop on the performance-based research completed through this project, and to train engineers on using the software developed through the project. Overall, these meetings have been a tremendous success, and feedback from trainees is overwhelmingly positive such that many individual engineering consultants are privately requesting Dr. Franke to travel to their firms to provide the training. Additional DOT training sessions are scheduled for Montana and Utah for the months of July and August 2016. Training sessions will be held in Oregon and Alaska once the performance-based reference parameter maps for those states are completed (pending the development of the new seismic hazard analysis tools by the US Geological Survey). Feedback regarding the final report for the study and *SPLiq* spreadsheet tool has been provided sporadically. Dr. Franke and his students continue to implement comments as they receive them.  |
| **Circumstance affecting project or budget. (Please describe any challenges encountered or anticipated that** **might affect the completion of the project within the time, scope and fiscal constraints set forth in the** **agreement, along with recommended solutions to those problems).**We continue to be impacted by the delay of the USGS in introducing its new Uniform Hazard Tool. The permanent retirement of the seismic hazard deaggregation servers for the state of Alaska by the USGS in November 2015 introduced a significant setback to the project. At the time the servers were shut down, approximately 80% of the reference parameter maps for volumetric strain and seismic slope stability were completed for the state of Alaska. After deliberation with the TAC, it was decided to wait upon the USGS to release its new uniform hazard tool in early 2016 to complete the reference parameter maps for Alaska using the USGS 2008 seismic hazard update, as well as the reference parameter maps for Oregon using the USGS 2014 seismic hazard update. We anticipate this work can still be completed in 2016. We are in contact with the USGS and are aware of their delays. Unfortunately, no reliable time estimate has been provided for when the new Uniform Hazard Tool will be released. According to our most current, best estimates, the tool hopefully will be available by late summer. As a result, we (BYU) requested a six month no-cost extension of the project to accommodate the possibility that the USGS delays extend beyond the summer. We also received notice from contacts within FHWA that AASHTO is considering bypassing the use of the USGS 2008 seismic hazard values, and instead implementing the most recent USGS 2014 seismic hazard values. Such implementation would negate the value of the reference parameter maps that we’re developing in this study because they are based on the USGS 2008 seismic hazard values. The TAC is aware of this issue, and is currently deliberating the possible extension of this project to develop reference parameter maps using the 2014 seismic hazard values for all of the states involved in the study. To date, no definitive decision has been made by the TAC regarding this challenge.  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Potential Implementation:** Completion of the simplified analysis spreadsheet will allow engineers to implement performance-based liquefaction hazard analysis (i.e., triggering, lateral spread displacement, settlement, and seismic slope stability) at return periods of 475, 1033, and/or 2475 years for all of the states in the study. With the completion and validation of SPLiq, engineers will be able to quickly and easily perform probabilistic liquefaction hazard analysis on their projects at locations within the states for which reference parameter maps were developed.  |