GEOYSTEMS ENGINEERING

CPT CASE HISTORIES OF POST-LIQUEFACTION FREE-FIELD GROUND SETTLEMENT

by

Franklin R. Olaya and Jonathan D. Bray

Report No. UCB/GT 2022-02

July 11, 2022

Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering
University of California
Berkeley, California

ABSTRACT

Liquefaction-induced ground settlement is a complex process resulting from the combined effect of particle sedimentation and soil reconsolidation due to post-shaking dissipation of excess-pore-water pressure. Current empirical models are based on a limited number of field case histories. Consequently, it is difficult to quantify uncertainty in the estimate of post-liquefaction settlement. A database of 205 well documented ground settlement case histories is developed with the goal to support the development of an improved liquefaction-induced ground settlement procedure. This study takes advantage of the numerous site investigations, ground motion recordings, and LiDAR surveys performed following the 2010-2011 Canterbury earthquake sequence and the 2013-2016 northern South Island, New Zealand earthquakes. The characteristics of a well-defined post-liquefaction ground settlement field case history are presented, and the general geotechnical characteristics of the sites are described. The procedures used to process the CPT data and the models used to estimate ground motion intensity measures are discussed. The survey techniques employed to estimate liquefaction-induced ground settlement are summarized. The approach taken to represent key aspects of the in-situ soil conditions such as state measures in the form of relative density or state parameter are detailed, and the simplified liquefaction triggering procedures utilized in this study are described. The database is available as a *flatfile* in an electronic data repository so it can be readily accessed by researchers and engineers. Supporting information developed in this study, such as electronic CPT data, when available, and detailed descriptions of the case histories, are also shared. This database supports the development of performance-based probabilistic models to estimate liquefaction-induced free-field ground settlement.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research was supported financially by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) through Agreement 65A0774 Amendment Number TO 005 and by the U.S. National Science Foundation through Grant CMMI-1956248. Additional support was provided by the Faculty Chair in Earthquake Engineering Excellence at UC Berkeley. The findings, opinions, and conclusions presented in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the sponsors. The views and conclusions contained in this document are those of the authors and should not be interpreted as necessarily representing the official policies, either expressed or implied, of the U.S. Government or the State of California.

The authors would also like to extend gratitude to the New Zealand government for openly sharing its CPT data and ground settlement data through the New Zealand Geotechnical Database (NZGD), as well as the engineers of Tonkin + Taylor, Ltd, and other engineers who provided data and managed the data collected following the New Zealand earthquakes. CentrePort, Wellington is thanked for providing access to its site to document ground performance and characterize the ground, including assistance of Tiffany Palmer of the CentrePort Ltd., Misko Cubrinovski, Ribu Dhakal, and Christopher de la Torre of the University of Canterbury, Emilia Stocks, Stuart Palmer, Mike Jacka, and Sjoerd van Ballegooy of Tonkin + Taylor, Iain Haycock of the McMillan Drilling Group, Hugh Cowan of the NZ EQC, and the aerial survey data from Cardno. We thank Zorana Mijic of UC Berkeley for her assistance in compiling the case histories in Christchurch, New Zealand. We also thank Uri Eliahu and Pedro Espinosa of ENGEO, Inc. for providing CPT data for Treasure Island, R. Luna for provided CPT data for the Treasure Island, J.P. Bardet for providing CPT data for the Marina District, the U.S. Geologic Survey (USGS) and the New Generation Liquefaction (NGL) project for providing access to liquefaction reports and CPT data for Marina District and Treasure Island. We also thank all previous researchers who collected and shared data used in this research project. Additionally, discussions with Ribu Dhakal of the University of Canterbury about liquefaction effects in CentrePort are greatly appreciated.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Research Motivation

Free-field, level ground, liquefaction-induced settlement is a key mechanism of ground failure (e.g., Lee and Albaisa 1974, Ishihara and Yoshimine 1992, and Bray and Macedo 2017). It can be treated as an index of ground damage due to liquefaction in the Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research (PEER) Center performance-based earthquake engineering framework (Deierlein et al. 2003). Liquefaction-induced ground settlement can damage infrastructure, such as buried utilities or light-weight structures with shallow foundations, as reported in the Marina District after the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake (O'Rourke and Roth, 1990). The amount of ground settlement and the time it takes for the settlement to occur depend primarily on the subsurface soil conditions and the earthquake ground shaking.

The mechanisms of liquefaction-induced ground settlement are related to complex particle sedimentation and soil reconsolidation processes that occur during and after earthquake shaking. Sedimentation and reconsolidation occurring within a soil unit are difficult to be captured by continuum-based numerical simulations. Hence, current engineering practice relies on semiempirical models that are based on and validated against field case histories. Early models (e.g., Ishihara and Yoshimine 1992) were developed considering a relatively small number of case histories, usually characterized with the standard penetration test (SPT). More recent models based on the cone penetration test (CPT) have been widely adopted because of the CPT's superior repeatability and nearly continuous profiling relative to the SPT. However, these methods (e.g., Zhang et al. 2002, Yoshimine et al. 2006, and Idriss and Boulanger 2008) still suffer from being validated against a limited number of field case histories. Consequently, these procedures were developed deterministically with no quantification of the uncertainty of the liquefaction-induced ground settlement estimate.

Obtaining field case histories with reliable pre- and post-earthquake ground elevation measurements is one of the primary limitations in the development of predictive models of liquefaction-induced settlement. CPT-based investigations and topographic surveys conducted by the US Geological Survey (USGS) following the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake produced some of the first CPT-based well-documented case histories of post-liquefaction settlement in the United States (US). Additional case histories have been gradually becoming available as records of land damage were made available after major earthquake events (e.g., 1999 Chi-Chi Taiwan; 2011 Tohoku Japan). Reconnaissance efforts conducted in Christchurch, New Zealand after the 2010-2011 Canterbury earthquake sequence has contributed much data related to ground motion recordings, patterns of seismic ground performance, and ground characterization, largely through CPTs. Areal imagery, LiDAR measurements, and subsurface characterization campaigns have been carried out extensively. The combination of all these information provides a great opportunity to advance our current empirical models. Research by the University of Canterbury, University of California - Berkeley, University of Texas at Austin, and Tonkin + Taylor produced an initial set of 55 well documented sites with predominantly low levels of land damage (Russell and van Ballegoy, 2015). Most of these sites correspond to locations where none to minor land damage was observed even though simplified liquefaction methods anticipated severe surface manifestations. An additional 34 sites have been developed by Mijic et al. (2021) with the objective to include sites with and without liquefaction manifestations that show no major discrepancies between the estimates from simplified liquefaction methods and the actual field observations. Of these two sets of sites in Christchurch, those with free-field, level ground conditions were investigated further as part of this study.

Assessment of liquefaction-induced ground damage under performance-based frameworks provides valuable information for seismic design. In geotechnical engineering, robust probabilistic procedures for estimating post-liquefaction free-field settlements are required. The initial step in the development of these procedures is a comprehensive database of field case histories that represent sites of different formation processes, with uniform or interlayered stratigraphy, which were subjected to ground motions of different intensities and durations.

The primary objective of this research report is to document field case histories of post-liquefaction free-field, level ground settlement. Because the CPT has become the preferred in-situ test in research and practice due to its higher reliability compared to the SPT (NRC, 2016), only case histories with CPT data available were collected. In addition to ground settlement data and soil profile information, CPT-derived parameters such as the soil behavior type index (I_c, Robertson 2009a) are also documented. The characteristics of the ground motions associated with the case histories are documented through intensity measures (IMs) like the ground surface peak ground acceleration (PGA), cumulative absolute velocity (CAV), and Arias intensity (I_A). A *flatfile* containing the synthesis of parameters for each case history is provided as an electronic supplement in addition to the raw CPT soundings and appendices detailing each case history (when available). These case histories can subsequently be used in the development of new empirically based probabilistic methods that accounts for the uncertainty in the settlement estimates to support performance-based earthquake engineering approaches.

1.2 Previous Studies

1.2.1 SPT-Based Case Histories

The landmark works of Tokimatsu and Seed (1987) and Ishihara and Yoshimine (1992) provided useful engineering procedures to estimate free-field post-liquefaction ground settlement based on SPT data. Their procedures are rooted in laboratory-based relationships between the relative density, the factor of safety against liquefaction triggering, and reconsolidation volumetric strains. Ishihara and Yoshimine (1992) used 6 SPT case histories from the 1964 Niigata, Japan M_w 7.5 earthquake to evaluate the reliability of their procedure. The Niigata sites are predominantly sand deposits with a few localized thin silt lenses. A PGA of 0.16 *g* recorded at a nearby strong motion station was assumed to be representative of the seismic demand at the sites.

Wu and Seed (2004) developed a ground settlement procedure based on cyclic tests performed on Monterey 0/30 sand. In contrast to Ishihara and Yoshimine (1992), their model uses a $M_w = 7.5$ cyclic stress ratio ($CSR_{7.5}$) as a demand term and the overburden-corrected, energy-corrected, clean sand equivalent blow count $(N_1)_{60,cs}$ as the resistance term. A total of 14 SPT case histories from 7 earthquakes were collected to validate their model. In their database, the Moss Landing site during the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake was identified to have suffered lateral spreading (Kayen and Mitchell 1997).

Cetin et al. (2009) expanded the Wu and Seed (2004) laboratory clean sand data to develop a probabilistic post-liquefaction ground settlement model. In this model, the demand term is defined as CSR_{field} which is the CSR corrected for magnitude, unidirectionality of shaking and atmospheric pressure while $(N_1)_{60,cs}$ is kept as the resistance term. For model validation and additional regression analyses, 49 well-documented SPT case histories were collected. They also used these case histories to quantify the variability in the settlement estimate. Some of the case histories in Cetin et al. (2009) are reported to have been affected by lateral displacements in the range of 200-600 mm.

Recently, Mesri et al. (2018) developed a predictive model that depends on the coefficient of vertical compression (m_{vs}) and the excess pore-water pressure generated by the earthquake (u_g). These parameters are formulated as a function of the energy-corrected blow count N_{60} and the factor of safety against liquefaction. For validation, they used ground settlement observations from 78 case histories from earthquakes with M_w between 7.1 and 8.0, and PGA ranging from 0.16 *g* to 0.35 *g*.

The number of SPT case histories of post-liquefaction free-field ground settlement have grown from less than 10 to almost 80 over the last three decades as a result of different research efforts following important earthquake events. Despite these advancements, borehole logs with SPT data are not readily available and differences between the interpretation of the case histories among the different studies exist. Also, the SPT case histories discussed previously are largely influenced by data from the 1989 Loma

Prieta and 1995 Hyogoken Nambu earthquakes. These two events contribute with 80% and 70% of the total number of case histories in the Cetin et al. (2009) and Mesri et al. (2018) databases, respectively.

1.2.2 CPT-Based Case Histories

Zhang et al. (2002) adapted the Ishihara and Yoshimine (1992) relationship between the factor of safety against liquefaction and reconsolidation volumetric strains to develop a widely used CPT method for estimating liquefaction-induced ground settlement. As part of the study, they developed case histories in the Marina District and Treasure Island after the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake to validate their method. A total of 11 sites were documented and interpreted. These sites generally consist of hydraulic sandy fill on top of natural sand deposits that overly clay deposits and experienced PGAs between 0.12 *g* to 0.24 *g*.

Juang et al. (2013) expanded the work of Zhang et al. (2002) by including the probability of liquefaction into the model formulation and by extending the number of free-field settlement case histories to 32. Particularly, sites investigated following the 1999 Chi-Chi earthquake were added to the cases previously reported by Zhang et al. (2002). The Chi-Chi case histories supplies data with recorded PGAs up to 0.79 *g* which adds valuable information to the range of PGAs covered by previous case histories. Juang et al. (2013) also reported 32 additional "building" case histories (i.e., cases where the settlement is influenced by building movement).

Sadeghi et al. (2021) performed a series of numerical analyses assuming different soil conditions and ground motion parameters to develop a synthetic dataset of post-shaking settlement. This synthetic dataset was then used as the basis for a functional predictive model. Their model was subsequently compared with 32 free-field ground settlement case histories. Like the SPT case histories discussed previously, the CPT case histories presented by Sadeghi et al. (2021) show an important overlap with previous studies (e.g., Juang et al. 2013) with the main addition by Sadeghi et al. (2021) being the inclusion of 6 case histories from the 2010-2011 CES in Christchurch.

Figure 1.1 shows the growth of the number of SPT and CPT case histories over the last three decades (including the number of case histories added in this study). Before this study, the number of CPT case histories of post-liquefaction free-field ground settlement was less than half of the number of the SPT cases, despite the superiority of the CPT in characterizing the ground relative to the SPT. Additionally, previous liquefaction-induced ground settlement databases do not provide a clear definition of what constitutes a field case history. From the cases reported, it appears that most case histories have been defined using a single CPT. This is potentially problematic because closely spaced CPTs are correlated and should not be treated as independent case histories. Moreover, the spatial variability of a site cannot be evaluated if there is only one CPT defining the ground conditions at a site.

1.3 Report Organization

This report presents the development of a comprehensive database of CPT field case histories of liquefaction-induced free-field, level ground settlement. Site, earthquake, and settlement characteristics are documented and discussed. The remainder of this report is organized into two chapters and nine appendices as follows:

- Chapter 2 presents the definition of a field case history adopted in this study. Site and soil conditions are provided, and the procedure used to process the CPT data are described, which includes documenting measurements of groundwater levels at the time of the earthquake, the correlations considered for estimating relative density and state parameter, and the methods used for liquefaction triggering evaluation. The approach used for ground motion characterization and the ground motion models considered are presented. Methods employed for estimating ground settlement are reported. Lastly, an electronic *flatfile* documenting the database is provided.

- Chapter 3 summarizes the methodologies used in each stage of the case histories development.

- Appendix A contains the electronic *flatfile* with post-liquefaction free-field ground settlement data summarized.

- Appendix B contains the available CPT electronic data.

- Appendices C to I describe each field case history in the database.



Figure 1.1 Growth of the number of liquefication-induced ground settlement field case histories.

Chapter 2 CASE HISTORIES AND DATA DOCUMENTATION

2.1 Post-Liquefaction Ground Settlement Case History Definition

The field case histories developed for this study are a collection of subsurface geotechnical data derived mainly from surficial geological information and CPT penetration data; groundwater depth; observations of field performance in the form of pre- and post-event topographic surveys, LiDAR data, or satellite imagery; and characterization of the ground motion associated to the occurrence of liquefaction at the site. In addition to moment magnitude (M_w), earthquake ground shaking in liquefaction evaluations is commonly represented by intensity measures (IMs) such as peak ground acceleration (PGA), pseudo spectral accelerations (Sa), cumulative absolute velocity (CAV), or Arias intensity (I_A). Accordingly, in this report a case history is defined as the combination of (1) a site with laterally uniform soil stratigraphy with at least one CPT, (2) an earthquake event represented by its M_w, ground surface PGA or other IMs, and (3) consistent post-liquefaction volumetric-induced free-field, level ground settlement measurements. Thus, each case history is a site characterized by a representative set of CPT-derived parameters, which undergoes an estimated level of earthquake shaking, wherein the liquefaction-induced ground settlement was measured. For sites with multiple CPT soundings or multiple point settlement measurements, geometric means of these values are used to represent central values in the case history.

2.2 Case History Descriptions

Well-documented field case histories provide valuable information about the interaction effects of variable soil properties, stratigraphy, and multi-directional shaking. This information is key for developing robust empirical models (e.g., Bray et al. 2017). In the context of developing an empirical model, ground motion IMs have been used successfully (e.g., Bray and Macedo 2017, Bullock et al. 2019) with representative soil parameters and site conditions presented in the form of soil types captured by indices such as the soil behavior type index (I_c, Robertson 2009a), relative density (D_r) or the state parameter (ψ_o, Been and Jefferies 1985). Before presenting the methodology used to generate the selected IMs and soil parameters, a brief description of the site characteristics of the case histories is presented as it provides the necessary background for interpretation of these case histories. In addition, sources of CPT and other field data are given.

Post-earthquake reconnaissance efforts by Bennett (1990), Power et al. (1998), and Hryciw (1991) are the source of the subsurface geotechnical characteristics and post-liquefaction settlement data for the Marina District and Treasure Island sites following the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake. The Marina District is an 8-m to 10-m thick hydraulic fill site composed of clean to silty sands (SP, SP-SM) with fines content (FC) up to 21%. Underlaying the sandy fill is the San Francisco Young Bay Mud clay deposit. Treasure Island is a hydraulic fill located 6.5 km from Marina District. It consists of an 8-m thick, clean to silty sand fill followed by a shoal sand unit of similar thickness overlying the San Francisco Young Bay Mud deposit. The fill and shoal are of similar gradation (FC up to 40%) but the shoal deposit shows some clay bridging of particles, particle interlocking, and other fabric effects. CPT raw data were obtained from the USGS (https://earthquake.usgs.gov/research/cpt/data/), the Next Generation Liquefaction Project (https://www.nextgenerationliquefaction.org/), and from ENGEO (2015, 2019a, 2019b and 2019c). With the geotechnical and topographic data and the available CPTs, 4 and 5 case histories were defined in the Marina District and Treasure Island, respectively, for the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake.

Juang et al. (2002) summarize findings from the reconnaissance mission of the Taiwanese National Center for Research in Earthquake Engineering (NCREE) in the cities of Yuanlin and Wufeng. Lee et. al (2011) and Chu et al. (2003) performed additional ground investigations and topographic surveys. Their results provide information about the geotechnical characteristics and post-liquefaction settlement for the Yuanlin and Wufeng sites after the 1999 Chi-Chi, Taiwan earthquake. The Yuanlin site is composed of a series of fine silty sand layers of variable FC and silt layers with occasional clay lenses. The soil in Wufeng is mainly composed of silty sands to sandy silts (FC up to 15%) up to a depth of about 12 m overlying fine silty clays and gravels. CPT data was obtained from the investigation campaigns documented by Chu et al. (2004) at PEER (https://rb.gy/s5mx7y) and Juang (2002) at Clemson University (http://hsein.people.clemson.edu/). Based on this information, 3 case histories were defined in Yuanlin and 3 other cases in Wufeng for the 1999 Chi-Chi earthquake.

The stratigraphy, soil types, and the effects of liquefaction experienced at CentrePort in Wellington after the 2013 Cook Strait, 2013 Lake Grassmere, and 2016 Kaikoura earthquakes have been documented extensively in the studies by Cubrinovski et al. (2018), Bray et al. (2019), Dhakal et al. (2020), and Dhakal et al. (2022). CentrePort is a 10-m to 20-m thick hydraulic fill where first 2 to 3 m correspond to a compacted layer (crust) generally above the groundwater level. An older reclamation constructed in 1910s was constructed by placing a 1 to 7 m thick layer of a gravel-sand-silt mixture which overlies a 1 to 6 m of gravelly sand. The most recent reclamation (i.e., the Thorndon reclamation) consists of a 10 m of sandy gravel fill below the crust. For both type of fills, the sandy gravel and gravel-sand-silt mixtures, the sand and silt fractions make up between 20% and 50% of the fill. Following the fill materials, uncompacted marine sediments of 1 to 4 m of thickness and composed of clays, silty clays and sands are found. CPT data have been shared through a research effort led by the Univ. of Canterbury in collaboration with the Univ. of California – Berkeley, Tonkin + Taylor, Ltd., and CentrePort. At the time of this report, the electronic data are not approved by CentrePort to be released publicly. However, much of the information is available through the publications mentioned previously. A total of 27 case histories have been developed for CentrePort for primarily the 2016 Kaikoura and 2013 Lake Grassmere earthquakes with one case for the 2013 Cook Strait earthquake.

The Christchurch liquefaction vulnerability study by Tonkin + Taylor (Russell and van Ballegoy, 2015) identified and documented land damage throughout Christchurch after the 2010-2011 Canterbury earthquake sequence. As a result, a set of well-documented 55 sites with varying levels of ground damage was defined. Later, Mijic et al. (2021) complemented the existing 55 sites with 34 additional sites to arrive at an unbiased set of sites with levels of manifestations from none to severe. The set of 89 sites in Christchurch can be broadly classified into sites of relatively continuous (thick) sandy materials and sites with different degrees of stratification with presence of interbedded sandy, silty, and clayey materials (Beyzaei et al. 2018). These surficial sand, silt, and gravel deposits vary in thickness from less than 10 m to over 40 m in the western part of Christchurch whereas swamp deposits of the same thickness and composed of sand, silt, clay, and peat are in the western part of the city. Underlying these soils, a sequence of thick layers of gravels and sands with silts are found (Markham et al. 2016). High-quality pre- and post-earthquake LiDAR surveys data, CPT recordings and soil boring logs were obtained from the New Zealand Geotechnical Database (https://www.nzgd.org.nz/). Information for the 2010 Darfield, 2011Christchurch, and June 2011 earthquakes were processed to develop a total of 157 case histories in Christchurch.

Tokimatsu et al. (2012) and Kokusho et al. (2014) document field data of the hydraulic fills in Urayasu, Japan. The reclaimed land of Urayasu is an 8-m thick hydraulic fill composed of loose silty sands and sandy silts that sit atop a soft to firm clay stratum about 10 to 40 m thick. Information regarding the overall seismic performance and the range of observed settlements in Urayasu are provided in Katsumata and Tokimatsu (2012) and Cox et al. (2013). In addition to providing ranges of free-field ground settlement, Cox et al. (2013) shows CPT data at 6 different locations in Urayasu. With this information, 6 case histories are developed for the Urayasu sites shaken by the 2011 Tohoko earthquake.

Initially 213 case histories were collected, processed, and examined. Through closer examination of the cases, 6 cases were removed from the database because they were potentially affected by liquefaction-induced lateral ground movements due to buried stream channels or buried structures such as pools. Preliminary regression analysis of the settlement data of the remaining cases identified 2 outliers that were more than 3 standard deviations from the median of the regression. These 2 cases were marginal liquefaction case histories according to simplified liquefaction triggering procedures and were removed. The final database contains 205 case histories.

Table 2.1 presents the distribution of the assembled 205 CPT case histories of post-liquefaction free-field, level ground settlement. Reclaimed land is typically the product of sequential hydraulic filling of borrowed granular material. This construction method results in relatively uniform and loose fills typically overlying marine sediments. The hydraulic fills in the database are usually less than 10 m thick and are typically comprised of silty sands to sandy silts (with exception of CentrePort which has a significant fraction of gravel). Case histories of the performance of hydraulic fills, such as those during the 1995 Kobe earthquake (e.g., Yasuda et al. 1996), indicate that uniformly constructed hydraulic fills tend to exhibit relatively uniform settlement. Conversely, natural soil deposits are inherently heterogenous as a consequence of complex depositional processes that can show significant spatial variability in addition to other age-related effects. The assessment of liquefaction performance in the Christchurch Business District (Beyzaei et al. 2018) illustrates the effects of depositional processes on ground performance. Due to the differing formation processes and their seismic response, the case histories are classified into the two primary categories of natural soil deposits and hydraulic fills. Of the 205 case histories, 163 cases are classified as natural soil deposits and 42 cases are classified as hydraulic fills.

Table 2.1 Summary of Free-Field Settlement Case Histories

Location	Earthquake	Case histories	CPTs	Type of deposit
Marina District, California	1989 Loma Prieta	4	8	Hydraulic fill
Treasure Island, California		5	84	
Wufeng, Taiwan	1999 Chi-Chi	3	3	Natural soil
Yuanlin, Taiwan		3	4	
CentrePort, Wellington	2013 Cook Strait	1	8	Hydraulic fill
	2013 Lake Grassmere	13	69	
	2016 Kaikoura	13	69	
Christchurch, New Zealand	2010 Darfield	45	210	Natural soil
	2011 Christchurch	47	220	
	2011 June	65	285	
Urayasu, Japan	2011 Tohoku	6	6	Hydraulic fill

2.3 CPT Processing

The raw electronic CPT profiles were evaluated before being processed. CPTs with the following characteristics were not used in this study:

a) CPTs with incomplete data (e.g., no data recorded in the upper 10 m of the profile)
b) Very short CPT profiles (i.e., ≤ 5m depth of penetration)
c) Trace of a CPT differed markedly from the traces of the other CPTs at the site

Figure 2.1 shows an example of an excluded CPT (i.e., CPT 56472 shown in red) with normalized tip resistance (q_{c1N}) and soil behavior type index (I_c) profiles markedly different from the q_{c1N} and I_c profiles of the other CPTs defining the Shirley Intermediate School site. CPT 56472 defines the northern edge of the Shirley Intermediate School site, as it contains noticeably more gravel and is significantly denser than the soil profiles described by the other CPTs located closer to the center of the site.



Figure 2.1 Example of an excluded CPT at a site (CPT 56472 in red at the Shirley Intermediate School site).

2.3.1 Groundwater Depth

Groundwater table (GWT) depths at CPT locations in the Marina District were estimated by Bennett (1990) from boring logs. A mean GWT depth of 2.90 m is representative of the site with exception of the southeast area where a GWT depth of 5.40 m is more representative. The GWT in Treasure Island is related to the sea mean lower low water (MLLW). At the time of the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake, the GWT depth was estimated between 0.90 and 2.0 m. Juang et al. (2002) reports GWT depth estimated by the NCREE reconnaissance effort. Depths of 0.5 - 4.0 m and 0.5 - 5.0 m are estimated in Yuanlin and Wufeng, respectively, at the time of the 1999 Chi-Chi earthquake. An analysis of piezometer data in CentrePort by Dhakal et al. (2020) indicates that the GWT depth varied between 2.0 and 4.0 m during the 2013-2016 earthquake sequence. In Christchurch, event specific GWT depths have been obtained from wells installed prior to and after the Darfield 2010 earthquake combined with LiDAR data. The GWT levels in the wells measured prior to the Christchurch 2011 and June 2011 events were used to generate surfaces of GWT depth for these earthquakes. Lastly, similar to other hydraulic fills, the GWT depth in the Urayasu site is relatively uniform and varies within 0.5 m to 3.0 m (Tokimatsu et al. 2012).

2.3.2 Derivation of CPT-based Parameters

Each CPT sounding provides cone resistance (q_c), sleeve friction (f_s), and dynamic pore pressure (u_2) measurements. The combination of these measurements permits the interpretation of the stratigraphy and characterization of soil behavior type index with depth. In addition, several mechanistically based correlations that relate cone measurements to different soil properties and parameters exist (e.g., relative density and peak friction angle). The ability to obtain reliable estimates of engineering soil properties is one of the major advantages of the CPT in engineering practice.

The soil behavior type index (I_c) is a useful CPT-derived parameter. It classifies the soil based on the in-situ type of response during shearing (e.g., sand-like or clay-like, and loose or dense). In addition, an $I_c = 2.6$ threshold is typically adopted in simplified liquefaction triggering methods to identify soils with $I_c \geq 2.6$ as non-liquefiable. The I_c relationship proposed by Robertson (2009a) as shown in Eq. 1 is used in this study.

$$I_c = \left[(3.47 - \log Q_t)^2 + (\log F_r + 1.22)^2\right]^{0.5} \tag{1}$$

where $Q_t = (q_t - \sigma_v) / \sigma'_v$ and $F_r = f_s/(q_t - \sigma_v)$, and q_t is the corrected cone resistance whereas σ_v and σ'_v are the total and effective vertical stresses, respectively.

An estimate of FC is also required in routine triggering methods as well as in other informative correlations. Idriss and Boulanger (2008) recommend measuring the FC directly from representative samples, however, this may not be practical in many engineering applications. Even though discrepancies between I_c and FC classifications are expected (e.g., Robertson 2009a and Beyzaei et al. 2018b), correlations between I_c and FC have been proposed and implemented in practice and research. The FC (in %) relationship of Boulanger and Idriss (2014) as shown in Eq. 2 is used in this study.

$$FC = 80(I_c + C_{FC}) - 137 \tag{2}$$

where C_{FC} is a calibration parameter that is set to zero to obtain a global average relationship. If site-specific data are available, a calibrated C_{FC} can be used. For example, Maurer et al. (2019a) evaluated many field samples and CPT data and suggested using $C_{FC} = 0.13$ in Christchurch.

The CPT data can also be used to obtain estimates of soil state. Particularly, relative density (D_r) and the state parameter (ψ_o) are of interest for this study. D_r (in %) is estimated using the correlations of Robertson and Cabal (2015) and Bray and Olaya (2022) as shown in Eqs. 3 and 4, respectively. ψ_o (in decimal) is estimated using the correlations of Robertson (2010) and Olaya and Bray (2022) as shown in Eqs. 5 and 6, respectively.

$$D_r = \sqrt{\frac{Q_{tn,cs}}{350}} \cdot 100 \tag{3}$$

$$D_r = \sqrt{\frac{q_{c1n} \cdot I_c^{3.5}}{1500}} \cdot 100 \tag{4}$$

$$\psi_o = 0.485 - 0.314 \cdot \log Q_{tn,cs} \tag{5}$$

$$\psi_o = \xi \cdot (e_{max} - e_{min}) \left[1/\mathrm{Ln}(\sigma'_{cr}/\sigma'_v) - D_{r_o}\right] \tag{6}$$

where $Q_{tn,cs}$ is the normalized clean-sand-equivalent cone resistance as defined in Robertson and Cabal (2015) and q_{c1n} is the normalized cone resistance as defined in Boulanger and Idriss (2014). ξ is a calibration parameter, (e_{max} - e_{min}) is the void ratio range, σ'_{cr} is the crushing pressure, σ'_v is the vertical effective stress and D_{ro} is an estimate of the initial D_r. Additional details and recommendations for estimating the parameters of Eq. 6 are given in Olaya and Bray (2022).

The Robertson and Cabal (2015) correlation was developed based on clean sand data from calibration chamber tests. The $Q_{tn,cs}$ term permits extending the application of the correlation to silty sands by means of the clean-sand-equivalent resistance correction. In contrast, the Bray and Olaya (2022) correlation has been developed using high quality CPT and laboratory test data on clean and silty sands, hence, a clean-sand-equivalent correction is not needed. The average of both relationships is used in this study to consider the epistemic uncertainty in estimation of D_r. Similarly, the Robertson (2010) correlation for ψ_o has been derived based on clean sand data and it is extended to silty sands through the use of $Q_{tn,cs}$. The Olaya and Bray (2022) relationship is based on critical state theory concepts and was calibrated using laboratory test data on clean and silty sands. The average of both correlations is used as a representative average in this study. Figure 2.2 shows the FC and D_r correlations employed in this study.

2.3.3 Liquefaction Triggering Evaluation

Two simplified liquefaction triggering methods were used to compute the factor of safety against liquefaction (FS_L). Within each triggering method, a probability of liquefaction, PL = 50% was used so that median estimates of FS_L are obtained. The methods of Boulanger and Idriss (2014) and Robertson and Wride (1998) with the modifications in Robertson (2009b) were used. While the Boulanger and Idriss (2014) method is probabilistic in nature, the Robertson and Wride (1998) is not. The work of Ku et al. (2012) was used to adjust the Robertson and Wride (1998) method to achieve PL = 50%. The average of the median (PL = 50%) FS_L estimates of Boulanger and Idriss (2014) and Robertson and Wride (1998)/Robertson (2009b) is used.

2.4 Ground Motion Intensity Measures and Liquefaction Severity Indexes

The seismic demand at case histories sites is represented with surface ground motion intensity measures. In sites with ground motion recordings available from nearby stations (e.g., CentrePort), IMs derived from the recordings are used. When no ground motion recordings were available in the vicinity of the site, average median estimates obtained from ground motion models (GMMs) are used. The time-averaged 30 m soil shear wave velocity (V_{S30}) is commonly used as a site parameter describing the near-surface soil conditions in GMMs, so V_{s30} values are provided for all case histories. Direct measurements of V_{s30} at the sites are limited. Thus, most of the V_{s30} values have been obtained from V_{s30} maps available in the literature (i.e., USGS 2021, California Department of Conservation 2021, Liu et al. 2015, Vantassel et al. 2015, McGann et al. 2017, and Cox et al. 2013).

In simplified liquefaction triggering assessments, moment magnitude (M_w) is used as a proxy for shaking duration effects while the horizontal peak ground acceleration (PGA) provides a direct measure of the ground motion intensity at the site. Research on the effects of liquefaction (e.g., Bray and Macedo 2017 and Bullock et al. 2019) have shown that the spectral acceleration at a degraded period (Sa), the Cumulative Absolute velocity (CAV), and Arias Intensity (I_A) have good potential as ground displacement predictor variables, hence they are also included. This study employs the GMMs of Campbell and Bozorgnia (2012), Abrahamson et al. (2016), and Macedo et al. (2021) for shallow crustal regions and the GMMs of Foulser-Piggott and Goda (2015) and Macedo et al. (2019) for Subduction regions.

Liquefaction-induced ground damage severity indexes have been developed to relate the FS_L to the degree of observed ground damage. Previous research (e.g., Maurer et al. 2014 and Hutabarat and Bray 2021) have shown that the accuracy of different liquefaction indices depends greatly on the site's stratigraphy and the site's system response to earthquake excitations. Therefore, it is informative to include relevant liquefaction indices as part of the case histories development so that the correspondence between liquefaction-induced ground settlement and different liquefaction indices can be explored. The Liquefaction Index Potential (LPI), the Ishihara-inspired LPI (LPI_{ish}), and the Liquefaction Severity Number (LSN) were computed in this study (each index is defined in Maurer et al. 2019b). Figure 2.3 contains the distribution of V_{s30} and the ground motion IMs developed for the database.



Figure 2.2 CPT-based (a) Fines content correlation of Boulanger and Idriss (2014) and (b) Relative density correlations of Bray and Olaya (2022) and Robertson and Cabal (2015)



Figure 2.3 Distribution of V_{s30} and key IMs in the database

2.5 Free-Field Ground Settlement Measurement

Vertical ground settlement in the Marina District after the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake was estimated by Bennett (1990) as the difference in elevation from surveys conducted in 1961, 1974, and 1989 (post-earthquake). The settlement component due to compression of the bay mud and consolidation of the fill was assessed using the difference between the 1961 and 1974 surveys. At first, the 1974 – 1961 settlement was planned to be subtracted from the 1974 – 1989 settlement to isolate the earthquake induced settlement. However, Bennett (1990) pointed out that many uncertainties were not captured by the topographic surveys; hence, it was recommended to use the settlement between 1974 and 1989 as the post-earthquake settlement because it may provide an estimate that accounts for these uncertainties. For Treasure Island, the settlement after the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake was estimated by Bennett (1998) using topographic survey data at a few free-field locations that were next to pile supported buildings assumed not to have settled due to the earthquake.

For the Yuanlin and Wufeng sites, land subsidence measurements after the 1999 Chi-Chi earthquake were conducted by the Taiwanese National Center for Research in Earthquake Engineering (NCREE) and are documented in Juang (2002) and Juang et al. (2013). Lee et al. (2011) discuss additional ground settlement measurements that were carried out in 2005 employing GPS surveys, reconnaissance reports, and site photographs for the Wufeng area. These two survey campaigns were used to estimate the post-liquefaction ground settlement at sites in Yuanlin and Wufeng.

Ground settlement at CentrePort following the 2013 Cook Strait and 2013 Lake Grassmere earthquakes was estimated primarily by manual field surveys as part of damage inspection campaigns. Settlement measurements are limited for the 2013 Cook Strait event while for the 2013 Lake Grassmere settlement estimates are available for several locations. Shortly after the 2016 Kaiokura earthquake, settlements were documented from manual surveys. Later, terrestrial and areal LiDAR surveys were conducted in CentrePort and subsequent point estimates of settlement were calculated (Cuvrinovski et al.

2018). Using these point measurements, settlement contours covering the CentrePort area were developed and shared in Dhakal et al. (2022).

In Christchurch, LiDAR point cloud data were processed with Global Mapper to generate elevation models for total settlement, tectonic movement, and net ground subsidence (Mijic et al. 2021). These elevation models were further complemented with flight error estimates and localized ejecta-induced settlements. These LiDAR-based elevation models form the basis of the post-liquefaction ground settlement estimates after the 2010 Darfield, 2011 Christchurch, and June 2011 earthquakes.

Katsumata and Tokimatsu (2012) report the amount of ground settlement following the 2011 Tohoku earthquake. For this case history, ground settlement was carefully measured at multiple locations using - pile-supported structures that showed no evidence of displacement as a reference. These point-based measurements were later used to develop a map of post-liquefaction ground settlement.

The more densely surveyed areas such as Marina District and Christchurch provide insights into the range in which the ground settlement varies. Accordingly, for this report, a mean settlement was estimated based on field measurements, soil characteristics and the degree of liquefaction observed at the site. To complement these mean estimates, a range representing the 16^{th} and 84^{th} lognormal settlement percentiles has been estimated from the average dispersion of the data from their mean values.

Chapter 3 SUMMARY

A comprehensive database of 205 CPT field case histories of post-liquefaction free-field ground settlement is developed. The case histories are classified into 163 natural soil deposit sites and 42 hydraulic fill sites, because these sites differ in their formation processes and spatial variability.

As part of the case histories characterization, a total of 966 CPTs were processed using several state-of-the-practice correlations and liquefaction triggering procedures. The in-situ state of the soil was characterized using the correlations of Robertson and Cabal (2015) and Bray and Olaya (2022) for the relative density and Robertson (2010) and Olaya and Bray (2022) for the state parameter. The simplified liquefaction triggering methods of Boulanger and Idriss (2014) and Robertson and Wride (1998)/Robertson (2009b) were employed. The use of at least two relationships accounts in part for the epistemic uncertainty involved in the estimation of soil properties and liquefaction triggering.

The seismic demand associated with each case history is reported by means of the earthquake magnitude, M_w, and a series of intensity measures that have been shown to correlate well with earthquake-induced ground and building displacements. Ground motion recordings were used directly to derive intensity measures at sites with nearby recordings available whereas for sites with no ground motion recordings, mean estimates from ground motion models were used. V_{s30} values are also provided for each case history because it provides an index for site response amplification and is used in modern ground motion models.

Best estimates of liquefaction-induced free-field settlement measurements are provided for each case history. The estimation of post-liquefaction settlement is difficult because in addition to the site's intrinsic spatial variability, there always exists uncertainty in the pre- and post-earthquake ground elevation surveys. Hence, for each site, a mean settlement was estimated based on the topographic measurements, soil characteristics and the degree of liquefaction observed at the site. To complement these mean estimates, a range representing the 16^{th} and 84^{th} settlement percentiles are also provided.

A *flatfile* summarizing the characteristics of the 205 case histories is the primary product of this study and it is shared as an electronic document in Appendix A of this report. In addition, the publicly available CPT data that support the case histories development are available in Appendix B of this report. The details of each field case history are provided in Appendices C through I.

REFERENCES

Abrahamson C., Shi M.H., Yang B. (2016). Ground-Motion Prediction Equations for Arias Intensity Consistent with the NGA-West2 Ground-Motion Models. *PEER Report 2016/05*, University of California, Berkeley, California.

Been, K. and Jefferies, M.G. (1985). A State Parameter for Sands. *Geotechnique,* 35(2), 99-112.

Bennett M.J. (1990). Ground Deformation and Liquefaction of Soil in the Marina District. Effects of the Loma Prieta Earthquake on the Marina District San Francisco, California. *USGS Open-file Report 90-253.*

Bennett M.J. (1998). Sand Boils and Settlement on Treasure Island After the Earthquake. The Loma Prieta, California, Earthquake of October 17, 1989 – Liquefaction. *USGS Profesional Paper 1551-B.*

Beyzaei C.Z., Bray J.D., van Ballegooy S., Cubrinovski M., Bastin S. (2018a). Depositional Environment Effects on Observed Liquefaction Performance in Silt Swamps During the Canterbury Earthquake Sequence, *Soil Dyn. Earthq. Eng.,* 107,303–321.

Beyzaei, C.Z., Bray, J.D., Cubrinovski, S., Riemer, M., and Stringer, M. (2018b). Laboratory-based Characterization of Shallow Silty Soils in Southwest Christchurch. *Soil Dyn. Earthq. Eng.,* 110, 93-109.

Boulanger R.W., Idriss I.M. (2014). CPT and SPT Based Liquefaction Triggering Procedures, *Report No. UCD/CGM-14/01*, University of California, Davis, CA.

Bray, J.D. and Macedo, J. (2017). 6th Ishihara Lecture: Simplified Procedure for Estimating Liquefaction-induced Building Settlement. *Soil Dyn. Earthq. Eng*.102, 215-231.

Bray J.D. and Olaya F.R. (2022). 2022 H. Bolton Seed Medal Lecture - Evaluating the Effects of Liquefaction. Presented at ASCE GeoCongress 2022; will be submitted to the *J. of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering*, ASCE.

Bray J.D., Cubrinovski M., Dhakal R., and de la Torre C. (2019). Seismic Performance of CentrePort Wellington. *ASCE GeoCongress 2019 GSP 308*. 76 – 89.

Bray J.D., Boulanger R.W., Cubrinovski M, Tokimatsu K., Kramer S.L., O'Rourke T., Rathje E., Green R.A., Robertson P., and Beyzaei C.S. (2017). U.S.–New Zealand–Japan International Workshop, Liquefaction-induced Ground Movements Effects, 2–4 November 2016 *PEER Report 2017/02,* University of California, Berkeley, California.

Bullock Z., Karimi Z., Dashti S., Porter K., Liel A.B., and Franke K. W. (2019). A physics-informed Semi-empirical Probabilistic Model for the Settlement of Shallow-founded Structures on Liquefiable Ground. *Geotechnique* 69(5), 406 – 419.

California Department of Conservation. (2021). CGS Map Sheet 48: Shear-wave Velocity in Upper 30m of Surficial Geology (Vs30). https://gis.data.ca.gov/datasets/cadoc::cgs-map-sheet-48-shear-wave-velocity-in-upper-30m-of-surficial-geology-vs30/about

Campbell K.W., Bozorgnia Y. (2012). A Comparison of Ground Motion Prediction Equations for Arias Intensity and Cumulative Absolute Velocity Developed Using a Consistent Database and Functional Form, *Earthq. Spectra*, 28, 931–941.

Cetin K.O., Bilge H.T., Wu J., Kammerer A.M., Seed R.B. (2009). Probabilistic Models for Cyclic Straining of Saturated Clean Sands. *J Geotech Geoenviron Eng,* 135(3), 71–86.

Chu B.L., Hsu S.C., Chang Y.M. (2003). Ground Behavior and Liquefaction Analyses in Central Taiwan-Wufeng. *Engineering Geology*, 71, 119 -139.

Chu D. B., Stewart J.P., Lee S., Tsai J.S., Lin P.S., Chu B.L., Seed R.B., Hsu S.C., Yu M.S., Wang M. CH. (2004). Documentation of Soil Conditions at Liquefaction and Non-liquefaction Sites from 1999 Chi-Chi (Taiwan) Earthquake. *Soil Dyn. Earthq. Eng*. 24, 647 - 657.

Cox B.R., Boulanger R.W., Tokimatsu K., Wood C.M., Abe A., Ashford S., Donahue J., et al. (2013). Liquefaction at Strong Motion Stations and in Urayasu City During the 2011 Tohoku-Oki Earthquake. *Earthq. Spectra*, 29, S55 – S80.
Cubrinovski M., Bray J.D., de la Torre C., Olsen M., Bradley B., Chiaro G., Stocks E., Wotherspoon L., Krall T. (2018). Liquefaction-Induced Damage and CPT Characterization of the Reclamations at CentrePort, Wellington. *Bull. Seismol. Soc. Am.* 108: 1695 – 1708.
Deierlein, G., Krawinkler, H., and Cornell, C., (2003). A Framework for Performance-based Earthquake Engineering, *Pacific Conference on Earthquake Engineering*, 13–15 February 2003, Christchurch, New Zealand.
Dhakal R., Cubrinovski M., Bray J. D. (2020). Geotechnical Characterization and Liquefaction Evaluation of Gravelly Reclamations and Hydraulic Fills (port of Wellington, New Zealand). *Soils Found.*60(6),1507–31.
Dhakal R., Cubrinovski M., Bray J.D. (2022). Evaluating the Applicability of Conventional CPT-based Liquefaction Assessment Procedures to Reclaimed Gravelly Soils. *Soil Dyn. Earthq. Eng*. 155 107176.
ENGEO (2015). Geotechnical Data Report (GDR), Sub-Phase 1A, Treasure Island, San Francisco, California, *Project No 7091.000.000*.
ENGEO (2019a). Geotechnical Exploration, Wastewater Treatment Plant, Treasure Island, San Francisco, *Project No. 7091.000.005*.
ENGEO (2019b). Geotechnical Characterization Report, Treasure Island Stages 2 and 3 Major Phase 1, Subphases 1A, 1D, 1F, 1G, 1H, 1I Infrastructure Improvements, San Francisco, California, *Project No. 7091.000.003*.
ENGEO (2019c). Geotechnical Design Report, Treasure Island Stages 2 and 3 Major Phase 1, Subphases 1A, 1D, 1F, 1G, 1H, 1I Infrastructure Improvements, San Francisco, California, *Project No. 091.000.003*, DRAFT.
Foulser-Piggott, R., and K. Goda (2015). Ground-motion Prediction Models for Arias Intensity and Cumulative Absolute Velocity for Japanese Earthquakes Considering Single-station Sigma and Within Event Spatial Correlation, *Bull. Seismol. Soc. Am*. 105, no. 4, 1903–1908.
Geyin M., Maurer B. (2020). Fragility Functions for Liquefaction-Induced Ground Failure. *J Geotech Geoenviron Eng,* 146(12) 04020142.
Hryciw R. D. (1991). Post Loma Prieta Earthquake CPT, DMT and Shear Wave Velocity Investigations of Liquefaction Sites in Santa Cruz and on Treasure Island. *Final Report to the USGS Award No. 14-08-0001-G1865*.
Hutabarat D., Bray J.D. (2021). Effective Stress Analysis of Liquefiable Sites to Estimate the Severity of Sediment Ejecta. *PEER Report 2021/03,* University of California, Berkeley, California.
Idriss I, Boulanger R. (2008). Soil Liquefaction During Earthquakes. *Earthquake Engineering Research Institute (EERI)*, MNO-12.
Ishihara K, Yoshimine M. (1992). Evaluation of Settlements in Sand Deposits Following Liquefaction During Earthquakes. *Soils Found*., 32(1),173–188.
Juang C.H. (2002). Investigation of Soil Liquefaction in the 1999 Chi-Chi, Taiwan, Earthquake, National Science Foundation, CMMI-0085143. http://hsein.people.clemson.edu/.
Juang C.H., Yuan H., Lee DH, Ku CS. (2002). Assessing CPT-based Methods for Liquefaction Evaluation with Emphasis on the Cases from the Chi-Chi, Taiwan, Earthquake. *Soil Dyn. Earthq. Eng.* 22, 241–258.
Juang C, Ching J, Wang L, Khoshnevisan S, Ku C-S. Simplified Procedure for Estimation of Liquefaction-induced Settlement and Site-specific Probabilistic Settlement Exceedance Curve Using Cone Penetration Test (CPT). *Can Geotech J* 2013;50(10).
Katsumata K., Tokimatsu K. (2012). Relationship Between Seismic Characteristics and Liquefaction Damages of Urayasu City Induced by the 2011 Great East Japan Earthquake. *9th International Conference on Urban Earthquake Engineering/ 4th Asia Conference on Earthquake Engineering.*

Kayen R.E., Mitchell J.K. (1997). Arias Intensity Assessment of Liquefaction Test Sites on the East Side of San Francisco Bay Affected by the Loma Prieta, California, Earthquake of 17 October 1989. *Natural Hazards* 16: 243–265, 1997.

Kokusho T., Nagao Y., Ito F., Fukuyama T. (2014). Sand Liquefaction Observed During Recent Earthquake and Basic Laboratory Studies on Aging Effect. *Earthquake Geotechnical Engineering Design 28*.

Lee, K. L., and Albaisa, A. (1974). Earthquake Induced Settlements in Saturated Sands. *J. Geotech. Eng. Division*. GT4, 387-406.

Lee W.F., Ishihara K., Chen S.H., Chu B.L. (2011). Liquefaction Induced Ground Failures Caused by Strong Ground Motion. *5th international Conference on Earthquake Geotechnical Engineering*. Paper No. ASOLE.

Liu, K.S., Tsai, Y.B. (2015). A Refined Vs30 Map for Taiwan Based on Ground Motion Attenuation Relationships. *Terrestrial, Atmospheric and Oceanic Sciences Journal.* 26 (6)

Macedo J., Abrahamson N., Bray J.D. (2019). Arias Intensity Conditional Scaling Ground-Motion Models for Subduction Zones. *Bull. Seismol. Soc. Am*. 109, no. 4, 1343 – 1357.

Macedo J., Abrahamson N., Liu C. (2021). New Scenario-Based Cumulative Absolute Velocity Models for Shallow Crustal Tectonic Settings. *Bull. Seismol. Soc. Am*. 111, no. 4, 157 – 172.

Markham C.S., Bray J.D., Macedo J., Luque R. (2016). Evaluating Nonlinear Effective Stress Site Response Analyses Using Records from the Canterbury Earthquake Sequence. *Soil Dyn. Earthq. Eng.* 82, 84–98.

Maurer B.W., Green R.A., van Ballegoy S., Wotherspoon. L. (2019a). Development of Region-specific Soil Behavior Type Index Correlations for Evaluating Liquefaction Hazard in Christchurch, New Zealand. *Soil Dyn. Earthq. Eng.* 117, 96–105.

Maurer B.W., Green R.A., Cubrinovski M., Bradley B.A. (2019b). Evaluation of the Liquefaction Potential Index for Assessing Liquefaction Hazard in Christchurch, New Zealand. *J Geotech Geoenviron Eng,* 140 04014032-1.

Mesri G., Shahien M., Kane T. (2018). Seismically Induced Settlement of Ground Experiencing Undrained Shaking and Laterally Constrained Compression. *Can Geotech J*, 1-18.

Mijic Z., Bray J.D., van Ballegoy S. (2021). Detailed Evaluation of Insightful Liquefaction Ejecta Case Histories for the Canterbury Earthquake Sequence, New Zealand. *USGS G20AP00079 Technical Report.*

McGann, C.R., Bradley B.A., Cubrinovski M. (2017). Development of a Regional Vs30 Model and Typical Vs Profiles for Christchurch, New Zealand from CPT Data and Region-specific CPT-Vs correlation. *Soil Dyn. Earthq. Eng*. 95.

National Research Council (NRC) (2016). State of the Art and Practice in the Assessment of Earthquake Induced Soil Liquefaction and Its Consequences. *Committee on Earthquake Induced Soil Liquefaction Assessment*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

New Zealand Geotechnical Database (NZGD) (2021). New Zealand Geotechnical Database. New Zealand Earthquake Commission. Available at: https://www.nzgd.org.nz/ (accessed 2020).

O'Rourke T.D., Roth B.L. (1990). Performance of Pipeline Systems in the Marina. Effects of the Loma Prieta Earthquake on the Marina District San Francisco, California. *USGS Open-file Report 90-253.*

Olaya F.R., Bray J.D. (2022). Strain Potential of Liquefied Soil. *J Geotech Geoenviron Eng*., ASCE, in press.

Power M.S., Egan J.A., Shewbridge S.E., deBecker J., Faris R. (1998). Analysis of Liquefaction-induced Damage on Treasure Island. The Loma Prieta, California, Earthquake of October 17, 1989 – Liquefaction. *USGS Profesional Paper 1551-B.*

Robertson, P.K. (2009a). Interpretation of Cone Penetration Tests – A Unified Approach. *Can Geotech J*, 46(11): 1337–1355.

Robertson P.K. (2009b). Performance-based Earthquake Design Using the CPT. *International Conference on Performance-Based Design in Earthquake Geotechnical Engineering* (Is-Tokyo 2009).

Robertson, P.K. (2010). Estimating In-situ State Parameter and Friction Angle in Sandy Soils from CPT. *2nd International Symposium on cone Penetration Testing*.
Robertson P.K., Cabal K.L. (2015). Guide to CPT for Geotechnical Engineering, 6th ed., *Gregg Drilling Testing, Inc*. Signal Hill, CA.
Robertson P.K., Wride C.E. (1998). Evaluating Cyclic Liquefaction Potential Using the Cone Penetration Test, *Can. Geotech. J.*, 35(3):442–459.
Russell, J., and van Ballegooy, S. (2015). Canterbury Earthquake Sequence: Increased Liquefaction Vulnerability Assessment Methodology. *T+T Report 0028-1-R-JICR-2015 prepared for the Earthquake Commission.*
Sadeghi H., Pak A., Pakzad A., Ayoubi P. (2021). Numerical-probabilistic Modeling of the Liquefaction-induced Free Fields Settlement. *Soil Dyn. Earthq. Eng.* 149, 106868.
Tokimatsu K., and Seed, H.B. (1977). Evaluation of Settlement in Sands due to Earthquake Shaking. *J.Geotech. Eng. Division*. 113(8), 861-878.
Tokimatsu K., Katsumata K. (2012). Liquefaction-induced Damage to Buildings in Urayasu City During the 2011 Tohoku Pacific Earthquake. *International Symposium on Engineering Lessons Learned from the 2011 Great East Japan Earthquake.*
USGS (2021). Marina District and Treasure Island: USGS Vs30 Models. https://earthquake.usgs.gov/data/vs30/.
Vantassel, J., Cox, B., Wotherspoon, L., and Stolte, A., 2018. Mapping Depth to Bedrock, Shear Stiffness, and Fundamental Site Period at CentrePort, Wellington, Using Surface-Wave Methods: Implications for Local Seismic Site Amplification. *Bull. Seismol. Soc. Am.* 108(38).
Wu, J., and Seed, R. B. (2004). Estimating of Liquefaction-induced Ground Settlement Case Studies. *Proc., 5th Int. Conf. on Case Histories in Geotechnical Engineering*, Paper 3.09.
Yasuda S., Ishihara K., Harada K., Shinkawa, N. (1996). Effect of Soil Improvement on Ground Subsidence due to Liquefaction. *Soils Found*, Special Issue, 99-107.
Yoshimine, M., Nishizaki, H., Amano, K., and Hosono, Y. (2006). Flow Deformation of Liquefied Sand Under Constant Shear Load and its Applications to Analysis of Flow Slide in Infinite Slope. *Soil Dyn. Earthq. Eng.* 26, 253–264.
Zhang G, Robertson PK, Brachman RWI. (2002). Estimating Liquefaction-induced Ground Settlements from CPT for Level Ground. *Can Geotech J*, 39, 1168–1180.

APPENDIX A: *FLATFILE* WITH POST-LIQUEFACTION FREE-FIELD GROUND SETTLEMENT DATA SUMMARY

The Excel file with the post-liquefaction free-field ground settlement estimates and other key information for each case history is available at this site:

https://ce.berkeley.edu/people/faculty/bray/research

https://berkeley.box.com/s/gjajrdasg7jwuwmyze1su1n59w9vunqw

APPENDIX B: ELECTRONICALLY AVAILABLE CPT DATA

The publicly available electronic CPT files compiled in this post-liquefaction free-field ground settlement database, which are not restricted from being shared due to Non-Disclosure Agreements (i.e., CentrePort data), are available at this site:

https://berkeley.box.com/s/gjajrdasg7jwuwmyze1su1n59w9vunqw

Appendix C - I: Case Histories

Appendices C through I document each field case history. It is a large file that is provided separately at this site:

https://berkeley.box.com/s/gjajrdasg7jwuwmyze1su1n59w9vunqw