



## MAPPING PROCEDURE

National High Altitude Program (NHAP), 1:58,000-nominal-scale, color-infrared photographs were used for photogeologic interpretation. This mapping was transferred directly to 1/2" by 1" topographic quadrangle maps enlarged to the scale of the photographs. These maps were then reduced and compiled at 1:250,000 scale. This compilation was then compared with previous mapping of young faults within the quadrangle (Erect Western, Inc., 1981, fig. 1) and significant differences between maps were resolved. Because this previous mapping was based on photogeologic analysis of 1:24,000-scale color aerial photography and extensive field verification, approximately 15-20 percent more young faults were identified by this mapping than by the present reconnaissance study. Most of these additional faults have been added to this map.

Following comparison and resolution with previous mapping, the final 1:250,000-scale compilation was digitized using a GTCO digitizing board connected to a Macintosh II minicomputer. The resulting vector file was converted to raster format (cell size = 200 m by 200 m) and analyzed to determine the approximate length and average orientation of each fault segment. These data are summarized in table 1 and figure 2.

average orientation of each fault segment. These data are summarized in table 1 and figure 2. The results of using a variety of criteria to estimate the age of faulting are compared in figure 3. The geologic, paleogeographic and geomorphic criteria (table 2). These age estimates provide a general indication of the approximate timing of young faulting throughout the quadrangle. However, it should be emphasized that these data do not necessarily reflect the age of most recent surface rupture along any particular fault segment. Rather, they provide only very general estimates of the age of faulting. The age of faulting on any one surface can be determined by detailed analysis of surficial deposits and erosion surfaces and by both geotipic and imprecise geochronologic methods. The distribution of these deposits and surfaces is inherently biased by geomorphic process and environment. For example, in those areas of the Great Basin where fault uplift rates are low to moderate, remnants of older geomorphic surfaces tend to be concentrated in proximal piedmont areas, whereas younger surficial deposits are more common in distal piedmont areas. In contrast, in areas of high uplift rates, older surfaces are more likely to be offshore younger surface deposits than are faults located along front ranges or in proximal piedmont areas. Therefore, inferences based on data regarding the temporal distribution of young fault activity should be made with caution.

In addition to the limitations imposed by map and photo scales, one other factor also significantly constrains the resolution of the present map. The photography used in this analysis, which was acquired under high sun-angle conditions, is not well suited for the discrimination and mapping of subtle topographic features. Consequently, reexamination of any of the fault systems shown on this map, using larger scale and (or) lower sun angle aerial photography, would very likely reveal a substantial number of additional vague fault segments used with caution.

Several factors significantly influence the preservation of fault-related landforms and, therefore, the preservation of young faults as indicated by the distribution of these landforms can be significantly biased. These factors include (1) composition, induration and thickness of the host rock; (2) degree of cementation and diagenesis; (3) type and age of the cap or other fault related landforms; (4) regional climatic conditions and paleoclimatic variations; and (5) magnitude and recurrence of fault movement (Wallace, 1977; Bucknam and Anderson, 1980; Nashed, 1984; Hanks and others, 1984; Meyer, 1984; Pierce and Colwell, 1986; Wallace, 1987). By contrast, the recognition of older faults is more difficult because they are often covered by an approximate somewhat biased picture of late Tertiary and Quaternary faulting within the quadrangle. Specifically, faults having no long history of recurrent movement, juxtaposing bedrock and alluvium, or cutting upper Cenozoic lava flows (and/or cinder cones) may be easily recognized. However, faults which have been inactive for long periods of time, or which have had low surface displacements and having either short histories of recurrent movement or long recurrence intervals tend to be underrepresented. Scarps developed on volcanic rocks may be preserved for periods of as much as 10 my. By contrast, faults which have been active during the last few thousand years, but which have produced little displacement over thousands years at most, and even on inactive piedmont surfaces, fault scarps on unconsolidated alluvial fans are significantly rounded within several thousand years (Wallace, 1977) and low scarp heights would be sufficiently degraded to be unrecognizable on aerial photography within a few hundred thousand years (Wallace, 1977; Hanks and others, 1984; Wallace, 1987).

Bell, J.W., 1984, Quaternary fault map of Nevada-Reno Sheet: Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology Map 79 scale 1:250,000.

Bucknam, R.C., Carlson, E.M., 1979, Estimation of fault-scar ages from a scar-height-slope-angle relationship: *Geology*, v. 7, p. 11-14.

Bull, W.B., 1977, Tectonic geomorphology of the Mojave Desert, California: U.S. Geological Survey, Office of Research, Studies, Volcanoes, and Engineering, Contract Report 14-06 001 G-394, Menlo Park, California, 188 p.

Bull, W.B., and McFadden, L.D., 1977, Tectonic geomorphology north and south of the Garlock fault, California: *Geological Society of America Bulletin*, v. 88, 1137-1144.

\_\_\_\_\_, 1980, Tectonic geomorphology: 8th Annual Geomorphology Symposium, State University of New York, Binghamton, p. 115-137.

Christiansen, R.L., and McKee, E.H., 1978, Late Cenozoic volcanic and tectonic evolution of the Great Basin and Snake Range, Nevada: *Geological Society of America Bulletin*, v. 89, 1413-1424.

Eaton, G.P., 1982, The Basin and Range Province: Origin and tectonic significance: *Annual Reviews Earth and Planetary Science*, v. 10, p. 409-440.

Ernst, W.P., 1981, The Basin and Range Province in the MXS listing region, Nevada and Utah: unpublished report prepared for the Department of the U.S. Air Force, Norton AFB, CA, 77 p., 11 maps, 1:250,000 scale.

Hanks, T., Bucknam, R.C., Lajoie, K.R., and Wallace, R.E., 1984, Modification of wave-cut and faulting controlled landforms: *History of Geophysical Research*, v. 89 (B7), p. 5771-5790.

Macchettie, M.N., 1986, History of Quaternary offset and paleoseismicity along the La Jencia fault, central Rio Grande, New Mexico: *Geological Society of America Bulletin*, v. 97, 1413-1424.

\_\_\_\_\_, 1988, Quaternary movement along the La Jencia fault, central New Mexico: U.S. Geological Survey Professional Paper 1440, 81 p.

\_\_\_\_\_, 1989, A morphometric approach, in Forman, S.L., ed., *Dating methods applicable to Quaternary geologic studies in the western United States*: Utah Geological and Mineral Survey Miscellaneous Publication 89-7, p. 30-42.

Mayer, L., 1980, Quaternary fault scarps formed in alluvium using morphological parameters: *Quaternary Research*, v. 22, p. 300-313.

Nash, D.B., 1980, Historical dating of degraded normal fault scarps: *Journal of Geology*, v. 88, p. 253-360.

\_\_\_\_\_, 1982, Quaternary fluvial terrace scarps and fault scarps near West Yellowstone, Montana: *Geological Society of America Bulletin*, v. 95, p. 1413-1424.

Pierce, K.L., and Colman, S.M., 1986, Effect of height and orientation (microclimate) on geomorphic degradation rates: *Journal of Geology*, v. 94, 141-150.

\_\_\_\_\_, 1987, Late-glacial tectonic scarps in central Idaho: *Geological Society of America Bulletin*, v. 97, p. 869-885.

Stewart, J.H., 1983, Cenozoic structure and tectonics of the northern Basin and Range Province, California: *Geological Society of America Bulletin*, v. 94, 1413-1424.

\_\_\_\_\_, 1985, The Basin and Range Province: Geothermal Resources Council, Special Report 193, p. 29-40.

Thornburg, W.D., 1949, *Principles of Geomorphology*: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 594 p.

Wallace, R.E., 1980, Quaternary fault scarps in north-central Nevada: *Geological Society of America Bulletin*, v. 88, p. 1267-1281.

\_\_\_\_\_, 1978, Geometry and rates of change of fault-generated near-fronts, north-central Nevada: U.S. Geological Survey Professional Paper 1094, 100 p.

\_\_\_\_\_, 1979, Map of young fault scarps related to earthquakes in north central Nevada: U.S. Geological Survey Open File Report 79-1554, scale 1:125,000.

Zoback, M.L., and Zoback, K.E., 1980, Late Cenozoic tectonic and seismicity in the state of stress and style of tectonism of the Basin and Range Province of the western United States, in Vine, F.T., and Smith, A.D., eds., *Extensional tectonics associated with convergent plate boundaries*: The Royal Society, London, 1980, 189 p.

Table 2. General photogeologic and geomorphic criteria used to estimate general ages of piedmont surfaces

Figure 2. Rose diagrams summarizing orientation of young faulting. Number indicates mean fault trend. See table 1 for data.

 Fault scarps on Quaternary surficial deposits or Quaternary erosional surfaces—  
Scarp on Quaternary deposits or Quaternary erosion surfaces other than those displacement  
associated with known historic earthquakes. Hatchures indicate downslope direction of scarp.  
Symbol indicates approximate age of offset surficial deposit or erosion surface:

Q3	Holocene (0-10 ka)
Q2-3	Latest Pleistocene and (or) Holocene (0-30 ka)
Q2	Late Pleistocene (10-130 ka)
Q1-2	Early to middle and (or) late Pleistocene (0.01-1.5 Ma)
Q1	Early Pleistocene (0.12-1.5 Ma)

Photogeologic and geomorphic criteria used to estimate ages are summarized in table 2

**Fault-related lineaments on Quaternary surficial deposits or on Quaternary erosion surfaces**-Alignments, in Quaternary surficial deposits or across Quaternary erosional surfaces, of one or more of the following features: linear reaches of stream channels, linear stream valleys, shallow linear swales, springs, vegetation discontinuities. Commonly associated with fault scarps on Quaternary deposits and (or) erosional surfaces.

**Major range-front faults.**—Faults bounding tectonically active fronts of major mountain ranges. These range fronts are characterized by: fault juxtaposition of Quaternary alluvium against bedrock, fault scarps and lineaments on surficial deposits along or immediately adjacent to range front, a general absence of pediments, abrupt piedmont-hillslope transitions, steep bedrock slopes, faceted spurs, wingless valleys, and subsurface systems of high-gradient, narrow, steep-sided canyons orthogonal to range front. Only mapped in areas along range front where fault scarps and (or) lineaments on Quaternary surficial deposits or on Quaternary erosion surfaces are absent

— Faults juxtaposing Quaternary alluvium against bedrock (other than major range-front faults).—Morphologically similar to major range-front faults except that associated fault systems are significantly less extensive and fault scarps are substantially lower, shorter, and less continuous. Solid lines indicate locations where fault scarps are abrupt and well-defined; long dashes indicate locations where scarps are less well defined.

**Faults forming scarps and (or) prominent topographic lineaments on Tertiary volcanic or sedimentary rocks.**—These scarps have morphologies ranging from partially rounded and moderately dissected to undissected. Topographic lineaments are composed of alignments of one or more of the following landforms: abrupt scarps, linear hillside ridges, benches and trenches, linear reaches of stream channels and small stream valleys, ridge-crests, saddles and cols, linear depressions and small closed basins. Many of these faults form closely spaced groups in areas underlain by Tertiary ash-flow tuffs and lava flows

Any use of trade, product, or firm names in this publication is for descriptive purposes only and does not imply endorsement by the U.S. Government.

For sale by U.S. Geological Survey, Map Distribution  
Box 25298, Federal Center, Denver, CO 80225

By  
John C. Dohrenwend, Bruce A. Schell, and Barry C. Moring  
1992