




EXPLANATION

Areas inferred to be underlain by landslide deposits resulting from landsliding, avalanching, block gliding, debris sliding or flowing, earthflows, mudflows, rocksliding, rockfalls, rotational slides, slab or flake sliding, slumping, talus accumulation, and translational sliding. Rock glacier deposits, colluvium, and solifluction deposits are included in some areas. Some till is mapped with landslide deposits because distinguishing these two deposits from one another is difficult. Furthermore, in some areas till has failed by landsliding and other types of mass movements. Movement within the deposits varies from none to rapid; rates of movement may also be variable in any given landslide within the same year. Ages of deposits range from early Pleistocene to Holocene.


FACTORS AFFECTING MAP ACCURACY\*

Landslide deposits that formed since the aerial photographs were taken are not shown. Landslides are more difficult to recognize in heavily forested areas and consequently such areas are less accurately mapped than nonforested areas. Map accuracy varies according to the quality of aerial photographs used. Haze, cloud cover, poor sun angle, and shadows make photointerpretation difficult. Mapping of landslides by photointerpretation presents many problems such as: distinction between terrace-shaped slump-type landslide deposits and alluvial terrace deposits where both are adjacent to stream courses; recognition of landslide deposit boundaries (the upslope boundary is commonly defined by an easily recognized scarp but the toe or downslope boundary is seldom well defined and thus is difficult to locate exactly); recognition of stable masses of bedrock surrounded by landslide deposits, especially where only a small knob projects through; and separation of landslide deposits from glacial deposits.

SUGGESTIONS FOR MAP USERS\*

This map should not be used to determine the probability of future landsliding, as geologic and climatic changes during the past few hundred thousand years have altered slope stability and because this map does not provide information regarding composition and type of movement of individual landslide deposits. Therefore, the map is not a substitute for careful detailed large-scale site investigations by engineering geologists and soils engineers. Areas susceptible to landslide and related activity should be carefully studied before any development begins. This map has been prepared to provide a regional context for interpreting detailed site investigations and should be used in conjunction with topographic, slope, surficial, bedrock, and soils maps, aerial photographs, and other available information. The limitations of this map should be obvious inasmuch as one inch (2.54 cm) on the map equals approximately 3.9 miles (6.4 km) on the ground.

\*Modified from Nilsen, T. H., 1972, Preliminary photointerpretation map of landslide and other surficial deposits of the Mount Hamilton quadrangle and parts of the Mount Boardman and San Jose quadrangles, Alameda and Santa Clara Counties, California: U.S. Geol. Survey Misc. Field Studies Map MF-339.





SOURCES OF INFORMATION


Vertical and oblique aerial photographs covering the entire quadrangle at various scales (1:60,000 and larger) and in various years were interpreted by R. B. Colton in 1975. Most aerial photographs used are small-scale (1:60,000) Army Map Service Project 126AF, 1953 (available from U.S. Geological Survey).

Area of no known landslides and related deposits, or area of minor landslides and related deposits too small to be shown at the present scale.

1. Braddock, W. A., unpub. data.
2. Braddock, W. A., Calvert, R. H., O'Connor, J. T., and Swann, G. A., 1973, Geologic map and sections of the Horseshoe Reservoir quadrangle, Larimer County, Colorado: U.S. Geol. Survey Open-file Report.
3. Braddock, W. A., Connor, J. J., Swann, G. A., and Wohlford, D. D., 1973, Geologic map and sections of the Laporte quadrangle, Larimer County, Colorado: U.S. Geol. Survey Open-file Report.
4. Colton, R. B., and Braddock, W. A., unpub. data.
5. Colton, R. B., Houston, R. S., and Braddock, W. A., unpub. data.
6. Corbett, M. K., 1968, Tertiary volcanism of the Specimen-Lulu-Iron Mountain area, north-central Colorado, in Epis, R. C., ed., Cenozoic volcanism in the southern Rocky Mountains: Colorado School Mines Quart., v. 63, no. 3, pl. 1.
7. Gardner, M. E., 1968, Preliminary report on the engineering geology of the Boulder quadrangle, Boulder County, Colorado: U.S. Geol. Survey Open-file Report.
8. Izett, G. A., 1974, Geologic map of the Trail Mountain quadrangle, Grand County, Colorado: U.S. Geol. Survey Geol. Quad. Map GQ-1156.
9. Wruke, C. T., and Wilson, R. F., 1967, Geologic map of the Boulder quadrangle, Boulder County, Colorado: U.S. Geol. Survey Open-file Map.



1°x2° QUADRANGLES  
INCLUDED IN LANDSLIDE STUDY




INDEX TO TOPOGRAPHIC MAPPING  
IN GREELEY 1°x2° QUADRANGLE

PRELIMINARY MAP OF LANDSLIDE DEPOSITS, GREELEY 1°x2° QUADRANGLE, COLORADO

By

Roger B. Colton, Jeffrey A. Holligan, and Larry W. Anderson

1975



CONTOUR INTERVAL 200 FEET  
WITH SUPPLEMENTARY CONTOURS AT 100 FOOT INTERVALS  
TRANSVERSE MERCATOR PROJECTION

1955 MAGNETIC DECLINATION FOR THIS SHEET VARIES FROM 14°30' EASTERLY FOR THE CENTER OF THE WEST EDGE TO 17°30' EASTERLY FOR THE CENTER OF THE EAST EDGE. MEAN ANNUAL CHANGE IS 0°07' WESTERLY.

Data as of June 1975

Base from U.S. Geological Survey, 1954-61



For sale by U.S. Geological Survey, price 50 c

M(200)  
MF 704  
C1