Table of Contents

Chan at al ID#	Dogo
Chen et al ID#	Page 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
101 102	3
102	4
103 104	3
104	0
105	/
106	8
107 108 109	9
108	10
109	11 12 13 14 15
110	12
111	13
112 113	14
113	15
114	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26
115	17
116	18
117	19
118 119	20
119	21
120	22
121	23
120 121 122 123 124	24
123	25
124	26
125 126 127	27 28 29
126	28
127	29
128	30
129	31
130	32
131	33
132	34
129 130 131 132 133 134 135 142 143 144 145 146 147 148	30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45
134	36
135	37
142	38
143	39
144	40
145	41
146	42
147	43
148	$\frac{13}{44}$
149	45
177	TJ

Chan at al ID#	Dogo
Chen et al ID #	Page
150	46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56
151 153	4/
153	48
153	49
153 154 155 156 157 158 159	50
155	31
156	52
15/	53
158	54
	55
160	56
161 162	57
162	58
163	59
164	60
165	57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65
166	62
167	63
168	64
168 169 170	65
170	66
171	67
171 172 173	67 68
173	69
174	70 71 72
175	71
176	72
177	73
177 178 179	74
179	75
180	76
181	77
182	78
183	79
184	80
180 181 182 183 184 185 186	81
186	82
187 188 189 190	73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81 82 83 84 85
188	84
189	85
190	86
191	87
171	<u> </u>

*				
LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84	TEAM:	3.00.00	DATE (4/2014) / TIME:
101	N 38 27 460	Harrey So		4-16-14 16:16
/0/	E 05 65 185	Scharer	Stock	Strike/Dip of fault: N 135 °E
Note on local lit			Note	on local geomorphology:
ro cani	c bedrock big	ration of		challow channel mantled in
Cov	reced with big	COMPLES		Cobble!
Confident this is	s a real offset feature?		Confi	dent that the <i>geometry</i> chosen in screenshot is
/	channel is 7	600	ACCU	RATE? YES / NO ALL TO CLOSE
	6.046, 27	· Cerle	Confid	RATE? YES NO Negations chosen in screenshot are
			ACCU	RATE? YES NO not to sheam red one to oblique
				urement reported within the screenshot. Include a
sketch with pier	cing points, if feature is i	dentified:		
Max offset				
Min offset				
	, and explain what it is band (explain why)			tic declination Good (12)
	d, and what it is based on		magne	tic declination, GeoXH?)
Feature extents	(4	r ·	(Fundamental)
Quality rating of	r previous LIDAR measure	ment : none, po	or, tair,	good, or very good (Explain why)
Quality rating of				or very good (include description to support your rating)
	178	· 290 Cm		an well defined
				disact frating
e.	,			

,				
LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84	TEAM:		DATE (4/2014) / TIME:
/	N 38 27 435	Harvey So	haver	1 4-16-14 16:02
102	E 05 65 204	Stock So	"U.Sa	\(\frac{4-16-14}{\text{ 16:02}} \) Strike/Dip of fault:
Note on local lit	hology:		Note o	on local geomorphology: Thun fan In
56/2 W	ule volcanic asl	1/	broad	on local geomorphology: Then fan In a bedrock channel allersof!
ande	ule volcanic asl inte (platy weather	(ng)		allutalfill
,	a real offset feature?			dent that the <i>geometry</i> chosen in screenshot is
YES / NO				RATE? YES INO fault + profile lines OK dent that the projections chosen in screenshot are
				RATE? YES / NO
DESCRIBE the ex	tant to which you can/car	not validate th	0 moasu	surement reported within the screenshot. Include a
	cing points, if feature is id		e measu	arement reported within the screenshot. Include a
Max offset				
Min offset				
Preferred offset,	and explain what it is bas	ed on		
Fault zone width	(explain why) $/ \cancel{5} \%$, and what it is based on (compass? 12°F	magneti	tic declination GeoXH?)
Feature extents	, and what it is based on t	compass. 12 L	тавнесь	tic decimation, decorn,
Quality rating of	previous LiDAR measuren	nent : none, po	or, fair, g	good, or very good (Explain why)
Quality rating of	current field measuremen			or very good (include description to support your rating)
			y m	y (adesett)
		tape med	isure	110 cm - 150 cm.

LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84	TEAM:		DATE (4/2014) / TIME:
	N 38 27 393	sousa scho	aver	4/6/14 3:17
103	E 05 65 233	Harvey Stoc	K	4 /6 / 14 3 - 17 Strike/Dip of fault:
Note on local lit		1 ar le	Note o	n local geomorphology:
Volcanic	hology: rock-prob hb-bid-	Mark	peo	liment contact-up steep channel walf evolung bedrock flounds)
lag crystals			(6	evoling bedrock flounts)
Confident this is	a real offset feature?		Confid	and that the manusature shoops in correspond to
YES / NO	a real offset reature?			ent that the <i>geometry</i> chosen in screenshot is ATE? YES / NO / Margar 15 Cut Vet
			Confide	ent that the <i>projections</i> chosen in screenshot are
			ACCUR	ATE? YES / NO
DESCRIBE the ex	tent to which you can/car	nnot validate the		rement reported within the screenshot. Include a
sketch with pier	cing points, if feature is id	entified:	Λ	all to be closer to the full to
Max offset			K()	cant for curvature & features
Min offset				
	, and explain what it is bas ı (explain why) / //		Sha	Le low away
Fault zone trend	, and what it is based on (compass? 12°E n	nagneti	c declination, GeoXH?)
Feature extents	LIDAD	. An	(becar	good, or very good (Explain why)
Quality rating of	previous LIDAR measurer	nent : none, poo	r, tair, g Mo	old long of feature.
Quality rating of	current field measuremen		ood, or	very good (include description to support your rating)
rander.				frante hoagues on top & hall
				horit. (10(a) stope)
	11	4	207	50 B) set measure & with tape
	/////		ſ	a 20 cm. E gide 1
			D	a 10 Cm. 8 6100
*	mal / A	iward along		
	Mittel	A. A.H	MON	
		\$ 1	1	e e
		*		
	I,			

LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84	TEAM:	DATE (4/2014) / TIME:
	N 38 27 364	Scharer Stor	E 4/16/15 2:30 pm
104	E 05 65 258	Sousa Hav	
Note on local lit	hology:		Note on local geomorphology:
tuff melli	a on Ex N-		Heepslopes
fines &	inined on the W.		
, 0			Edwar channel Cut into steep slops
Confident this is	a real offset feature?		Confident that the <i>geometry</i> chosen in screenshot is
YES / NO			ACCURATE? YES / NO
			Confident that the <i>projections</i> chosen in screenshot are
			ACCURATE? YES (NO) 3 maway on Jan streams
			e measurement reported within the screenshot. Include a
sketch with pier	cing points, if feature is id	entified:	Davisheam bedrock channel. 15 full & boulders.
			15 full & boulders.
Max offset Min offset			
Duefermed offers	, and explain what it is bas	sed on	
Fault zone width	(explain why)	h Mus s	trand) that 2 more mapped strands fatherw
Fault zone trend	, and what it is based on (compass? 12°E	magnetic declination, GeoXH?)
Feature extents			
Quality rating of	previous LiDAR measurer	ment : none, po	or, fair, good, or very good (Explain why)
	current field measureme		good, or very good (include description to support your rating)
Kates		disorg	Le feature, can see ed 85 87
1 stal range		erry	king
Total range	100 CM	SI	hing Rate's Field book
			*

		T			
LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84	TEAM:		DATE (4/2014) / TIME:	
	N 38 27 090	Source		4-16-15 13:00	
105	E 05 65 502	Schared Harvey	Strike	Strike/Dip of fault:	
Note on local lit	hology:)	Note o	n local geomorphology:	
talus slope of volcanic blocks		moderate/ takes slope			
×					
	a real offset feature?		Confident that the <i>geometry</i> chosen in screenshot is		
YES / NO	Offset of feat	nie 15	ACCURATE? YES / NO 49 she cam ch - Confident that the projections chosen in screenshot are		
YES / NO offset of feature is fine for total offset of Thatway but AI not known		ACCURATE? YES / NO too many fault of			
DESCRIBE the ex	tent to which you can/ca	nnot validate tl	ne measu	rement reported within the screenshot. Include a	
sketch with pier	cing points, if feature is id	entified:	T	re 10 m - distance on either	
Max offset			Ş	ide many may encoupass	
Min offset				mo-existing bends or other	
Preferred offset, and explain what it is based on Fault zone width (explain why)				ne-existing bends or other early with events.	
	, and what it is based on (compass? 12°E			
Feature extents	,		0	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
	previous LiDAR measurer	ment : none, po	or, fair, g	good, or very good (Explain why)	
Quality rating of	current field measureme	nt: poor, fair.	good, or	very good (include description to support your rating)	

LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84	TEAM:	DATE (4/2014) / TIME:
101	N 38 27 033	Stock	4-16-14 12:38
(06	E 05 65 554	Schgreve	Strike/Dip of fault: en edge on steps or ented
Note on local lit			Note on local geomorphology:
Colluvia	im (O bediock)		Speam Channel Zone full & huge bouldors, misch in debristan deponts + talus
Confident this is	a real offset feature?		Confident that the <i>geometry</i> chosen in screenshot is
YES / NO	gar.	, 1	ACCURATE? YES (NO)
channel 1	s a feature. No	reles do	Confident that the <i>projections</i> chosen in screenshot are
	s a feature. Mos a single channel the fault.		ACCURATE? YES (NO) projection angle on Eside is no good,
		nnot validate the	e measurement reported within the screenshot. Include a
sketch with pier	cing points, if feature is ide	entified: Pro	files are not parallel to the fault.
Max offset		bo	files are not parallel to The fault. In I Them cross he fault obliquely.
Min offset		ha	utiple channels are present upstream.
Preferred offset	, and explain what it is bas	icu on	
Fault zone width			break.
Fault zone trend	l, and what it is based on (compass? 12°E	magnetic declination, GeoXH?)
reature externes			or, fair, good, or very good (Explain why)
Quality rating of	previous LibAit measuren	nent . none, pot	or, rail, good, or very good (Explain Wily)
Quality rating of	current field measuremen	nt: poor, fair, g	good, or very good (include description to support your rating)
fa	ult hocato com	prise a	series of enechalon steps.
d	psheam: by g constraining	dramage area.	area, finne 15 into small

	LITAA in MCCOA	TEADA.		DATE /A/204A) / TIBAE.	
LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84	TEAM:		DATE (4/2014) / TIME:	
107	N 38 27 012	Scharer Sousa		4-16-15 12 noon	
107	E 05 65 575	Stock Ho	ervey	Strike/Dip of fault:	
Note on local lit	nology:		Note on local geomorphology:		
allevial			channel w/ inser ferrace down stream.		
a bedrood	5 B unknown Date	ckness			
· Covere	s & waknown the	Q talus			
Confident this is	a real offset feature?			ent that the <i>geometry</i> chosen in screenshot is	
YES \ / NO	chaine	1138 Rock	ACCUR	ATE? YES / NO	
		00	Conflae	ent that the <i>projections</i> chosen in screenshot are	
			ACCUR	ATE? YES / NO	
				too simplistic	
	tent to which you can/car cing points, if feature is id		e measu	rement reported within the screenshot. Include a	
96	•				
Max offset		cho	me/	4.97 M	
Min offset				4.97 m	
	and explain what it is bas	A .			
	(explain why) 5 M				
Fault zone trend	, and what it is based on (compass? 12°E	magneti	c declination, GeoXH?)	
Feature extents because un certainties should be fore					
Quality rating of	previous LiDAR measurer	nent : none, pod	or, fair, g	ood, or very good (Explain why)	
Quality rating of				very good (include description to support your rating)	
· field meas: can't see feature very well					

LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84	TEAM:	DATE (4/2014) / TIME:
1	N 38 26 983	Stock Sau	59 4-16-14 11:00
108	E 05 65 586	Scharer	Strike/Dip of fault: 140°
Note on local lit	hology:		Note on local geomorphology:
talus e	covering soft voluses (stones).	anic	channels in takes covered slopes.
Confident this is YES / NO	a real offset feature? (hagnel of the pro-	Tieles	Confident that the <i>geometry</i> chosen in screenshot is ACCURATE? YES NO confident that the <i>projections</i> chosen in screenshot are ACCURATE? YES / NO
	ctent to which you can/ca cing points, if feature is ic		e measurement reported within the screenshot. Include a wide up stream ferrace due to whology contrasts
Fault zone width Fault zone trend Feature extents	, and what it is based on	(compass? 12°E n	magnetic declination, GeoXH?) r) fair, good, or very good (Explain why)
Quality rating of	current field measureme	nt: poor, fair, g	ood, or very good (include description to support your rating)
	The char	and de	fam Channel wall Inset few as Channel

Note on local lithology False Covered Councided Confident this is a real YES / NO DESCRIBE the extent	M in WGS84	TEAM:	DATE (4/2014) / TIME:
Note on local lithology takes covered Confident this is a rea YES / NO DESCRIBE the extent	38 26 941	Sauce Stock	416/14 10:45
Confident this is a rea YES / NO	565 637	Harvey Scharer	#/16/14 /0:45 Strike/Dip of fault:
Confident this is a rea		Note on local ged	omorphology:
YES / NO DESCRIBE the extent	d sloper 2 OF Medrock	Channel Cui	t into Caliche + Colluvium
	al offset feature? hannel		ne geometry and projections chosen in CURATE? YES / NO × directions when we will not be the company of the comp
screenshot, include a		nnot validate the measu points, if feature is ider	rement reported within the
Max offset Min offset Preferred offset, and Fault zone width (exp Fault zone trend, and Feature extents Quality rating of prev	explain what it is bas plain why) 25 m d what it is based on (o vious LiDAR measuren	sed on compass? 12°E magnetiment: none, poor, good	and curature ports faulting

LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84	TEA	1 7 (77)	DATE (4/2014) / TIME:
1 .	N 38 26 905		usa Stock	4/16/14 10:00
110	E 3565 661	>0	have Harriey	Strike/Dip of fault:
Note on local lit	nology:		Note on local ged	omorphology:
alluvial	cover over fr	ne	bedoock	race in channel fault
lapilli +	and meecin	,,	Insel ter	race in channel Tuni
old Fault	between flow bu	ude.		
16 VA ON &	between flow be	u)f		
Confident this is	a real offset feature?			ne geometry and projections chosen in
YES / NO	It is a hill	lac	screenshot is ACC	CURATE? YES // NO
DESCRIBE the ex	tent to which you can/c	annot v	alidate the measu	rement reported within the
screenshot. Inclu	ude a sketch with piercir			
N.A		Man	1 Fult 15	at apex of Bowl
Max offset Min offset				
	and explain what it is b	ased or	1	
ault zone width				
	, and what it is based or	n (comp	ass? 12°E magneti	c declination, GeoXH?)
Feature extents	provious LiDAP moasur	omonta	none near good	, or very good (Explain why)
	7	_		good (include description to support
the rating given)			, 8,	B(
1. Trees	Full moasu	ne ho	at 15 m	deflerent footnice
July 100	NT MG I	SCE	Kate's not	defferent frature
/ / V 1	1 (1107-1		1 0010 0	1
1 GC XH	1			
1 GC XH				
1 Gc, XH				
1 Gc XH				
(GG XH				
(Ga XH				
(GG XH				
(Ga XH				
1 Gc, XH				
(GC XH!				
1 GC XH!				
1 Gc XH				

LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84	TEAM:		DATE (4/2014) / TIME:	
	N 38 78 26 839	Sivar Jane	1 Kale	21-15-14	18:00 hours
[1]	E 05 65 723	Myan Fra	oahn	Strike/Dip of fault:	E subvential PW
Note on local lit	hology:		Note o	n local geomorphology:	Compass
talus si boulders	ope w/volcance	plocks and	She	Strike/Dip of fault: 40 n local geomorphology: sam gully, 2/2 2 / wels of in sed	m doep channel, terra ce
Confident this is a real offset feature? YES / NO			Confident that the <i>geometry</i> chosen in screenshot is ACCURATE? YES / NO Confident that the <i>projections</i> chosen in screenshot are ACCURATE? YES / NO		
	tent to which you can/car cing points, if feature is id		measu	rement reported within th	e screenshot. Include a
Max offset					
Min offset					
	and explain what it is bas		d f		
	(explain why) 4 Sep , and what it is based on (adadination GooVU2	
Feature extents	, and what it is based on (compass: 12 E	павпец	c decimation, deoxn?)	
Quality rating of previous LiDAR measurement : none, poor, fair, good, or very good (Explain why)					
Quality rating of current field measurement: poor, fair, good, or very good (include description to support your rating) 6 250 cm from Kak					

LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84 N 38 6 798	TEAM:		DATE (4/2014) / TIME:
1/2	E 0565769	w/ Ryon.		Strike/Dip of fault:
Note on local lit	hology:		Note o	n local geomorphology:
Talus coverds	s vilcense rocks Gorp	hyric lava)	upstrea	no has talus lobes with rudes in between
			downstr	can has a prominent chancel, but might be follow
, ,			sho	ft- ridse, not go up the sweles
	a real offset feature?		l	ent that the <i>geometry</i> chosen in screenshot is
YES / (NO)			1	ATE? YES / NO
			1	ent that the <i>projections</i> chosen in screenshot are ATE? YES / NO 1/2
			Accon	ATE? YES / NO &
	-		e measu	rement reported within the screenshot. Include a
sketch with pier	cing points, if feature is id	entified:		
Max offset				
Min offset				
	and explain what it is bas	sed on		
Fault zone width		50mn2552 12°E	magnati	a declination GooVU2
Feature extents	, and what it is based on (compass: 12 E	magneti	c decimation, Geoxney
and the second s	previous LiDAR measurer	ment / none, po	or, fair, g	good, or very good (Explain why)
			,	very good (include description to support your rating)
\$ hard to see	. Too 200 ml out No	mappoble off	set pea	ture. Fault some is also not well located.
-	easure in the greld.			
Location of 61	ve smale is question	able. No down	hear	section to match despite what
profile shows	four pield leating	of fault or	ed 6/0	e profile is conact it's in this
The Her ridge	orallel depression.			
Lit may be possi	ble to food matching	features if pr	rofiles co	e draw deve to conthettis to cobble
Lit may be possible to find martching peatures if profiles are brown dose to garlf. It's too to identify in the field, though.				and the formation of the same

LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84	TEAM:	DATE (4/2014) / TIME:		
	N 38 26 770	Sinan, Late, Ryan	4-15-14 16:47		
113CT	E 05 65 814	Frank, Joann, anst	Strike/Dip, of fault: Subvention (RW's B)	renta)	
Note on local lit	hology:		n local geomorphology:		
talus	slope Systeanic		e piles Abset in enechelon left		
	blicks	fau	lt steps.		
			ully at a large distance from The fault,		
Confident this is	a real offset feature?		ent that the <i>geometry</i> chosen in screenshot is		
YES / NO	and les a Di	Confide	ATE? YES / NO ent that the <i>projections</i> chosen in screenshot are		
	profiles are in the istern from profiler	So he ACCUR	RATE? YES / NO		
(G	istern popular i	a shaot	,		
			rement reported within the screenshot. Include a		
sketch with piero	cing points, if feature is id	entified:	Carrott Nistano from		
Max offset		, , , , ,	The fault.		
Min offset					
	and explain what it is bas	sed on			
Fault zone width		sompace 12°F magneti	is declination GooVH2)		
Feature extents	, and what it is based on (compass: 12 E magneti	ic decimation, Geoxney		
	previous LiDAR measurer	nent : none, poor, fair, g	good, or very good (Explain why)		
Quality rating of current field measurement: poor, fair, good, or very good (include description to support your rating) Nite: The real fault geometry & v not properly captured by the screen shot and as a result higher are not equidistant from the fault. Red profile is on the fault. The features captured in the two profiles do not correlate to each other across the fault.					
To make correct measurements, move both profiles 3 m east and Then you will see 2 gallies in each profile and These could be					
you will	see & galley	In Gurar Trooper	e and they		
correlate	d.		7113-0 and 113-1		
	110	XII west	1		
	A	BANK	channel s marginals Builder field. B= 2 m. /ks: 220 ± 20 CD= 2 z m loc-8 C 15 not precise / within 0.5 m,		
	tuck	Drawl	AB = 2 m. /Ks; 220 ± 20		
	1 -depart		local cas not precise / within		
		. (D - 2.2±0.5m		
			- L (-1 ()) M		

LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84	TEAM:		DATE (4/2014) / TIME:
117.	N 38 26756	Ryon joined	=	4/14/14
114	E 0565824			Strike/Dip of fault: sace as begine
Note on local lit	thology:		Note o	n local geomorphology:
unknown (not to	on thick) ~ 5-10?? we thin	ch talus	N/m	deep chancel willow talus deposite
Confident this is	s a real offset feature?		Confide	ent that the <i>geometry</i> chosen in screenshot is
YES / NO			ACCUR	ATE? YES / NO
great channel , b	lut the posite only uses water measurement	Sedge	1	ent that the <i>projections</i> chosen in screenshot are
to make the.	delibl measurement		ACCUR	ATE? YES / NO
DESCRIBE the ex	xtent to which you can/ca	nnot validate th	e measu	rement reported within the screenshot. Include a
	cing points, if feature is id			
Max offset				
Min offset	and avalate velocities is in			
	, and explain what it is bas n (explain why) \sim 2 \sim	sed on		
		compass? 12°F	magneti	c declination, GeoXH?) see map.
Feature extents				
Quality rating of	f previous LiDAR measurer	ment: none, po	or, fair, g	ood, or very good (Explain why) on S edge vistream yellow line on to better but hord to see
Quality rating of	f current field measureme	nt: poor, fair,	good, or	very good (include description to support your rating)
			5 6)
			It zone now	
	1 : 1	fe	atore linea	mall corrective
	20 m >	08	channel	right at foult.
1			nc.	
	flt. zone]1	s mile . Sir	igle trace	e of fault.
2.6m	The day of	Offe	set 26 s	0,5
111	¥	A		
£10% ->				·
I				

LIDAR # UTM in WGS84 SKJR N 38 26 743 KJSF E 05 65 847 TFKS	
Note on local lithology: Talus (< 10cm) thick, over volconic beleevia. Scorp exposes in volconic bedrack.	Note on local geomorphology: Officet bedrock incised clannel. Government substrate. But not very thick (con't be)
Confident this is a real offset feature? YES / NO DESCRIBE the extent to which you can/cannot valid	Confident that the <i>geometry</i> chosen in screenshot is ACCURATE? YES / NO profiles OK. Confident that the <i>projections</i> chosen in screenshot are ACCURATE? YES / NO see note below on yellow like. Late the measurement reported within the screenshot. Include a

sketch with piercing points, if feature is identified:

Max offset

Min offset

Preferred offset, and explain what it is based on

Fault zone width (explain why)

Fault zone trend, and what it is based on (compass? 12°E magnetic declination, GeoXH?) 130°

Feature extents

Quality rating of previous LiDAR measurement: none, poor, fair, good, or very good (Explain why) correct secture is pided Trend is not.

Quality rating of current field measurement: poor, fair, good, or very good (include description to support your rating)

Smile to previous location, Oblique profile not capturing good channel merphology Chancel is effect. Erron Yellow-line can be drawn better, on the upstream, taking the entire linear trend of chancel. Chancel might take a bend in towards the part that seems to implience upstream trend of the yellow he Field measurement of thatway affect is 1.50 = 3.5 m depending on how much deflection you assome prior to repturing.

LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84	TEAM:		DATE (4/2014) / TIME:
N 38 26 132			*	
116	E 05 65 854			Strike/Dip of fault:
Note on local lit	hology:		Note o	n local geomorphology:
				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
the second secon	a real offset feature?			ent that the <i>geometry</i> chosen in screenshot is
YES / NO			ACCUR	ATE? YES / NO
			Confid	ent that the <i>projections</i> chosen in screenshot are
			ACCUR	ATE? YES / NO
DECODIDE			and the second second	and the second section of the second second section and the second secon

DESCRIBE the extent to which you can/cannot validate the measurement reported within the screenshot. Include a sketch with piercing points, if feature is identified:

Max offset

Min offset

Preferred offset, and explain what it is based on

Fault zone width (explain why)

Fault zone trend, and what it is based on (compass? 12°E magnetic declination, GeoXH?)

Feature extents

Quality rating of previous LiDAR measurement: none, poor, fair, good, or very good (Explain why)

Quality rating of current field measurement: poor, fair, good, or very good (include description to support your rating)

LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84	TEAM:	DATE (4/2014) / TIME:
1	N 38 65 89 26	123	4-15-14 15,06
11/	E 05 65 0 16		Strike/Dip of fault:
Note on local lit	thology:	•	Note on local geomorphology:
talus s	stope of volcan	ue rock	channels in talus stop
		n 6 all	
YES / NO	s a real offset feature?	els ande	Confident that the <i>geometry</i> chosen in screenshot is ACCURATE? YES / NO good make see left
	an observe in Mo Fin		
	xtent to which you can/car cing points, if feature is id		e measurement reported within the screenshot. Include a
-	ama pamia, maaaana ia ia		
Max offset Min offset			
WATER STATE OF THE PARTY OF THE	, and explain what it is bas	sed on	
Fault zone width		12°F	recording declination CocVIII)
Feature extents		compass? 12 E	magnetic declination, GeoXH?)
The second section of the second section of the second		nent : none, po	or, fair, good, or very good (Explain why)
Quality rating of	f current field measureme	nt: poor, fair, {	good, or very good (include description to support your rating)
		nome b/c	the posser
lf fault to	rend is very oblique	to chanel	sweles, parell parallel propiles (topographic)
will not ee	syture the channel c	sconety, m	try it Systement to make offset measurements
,			

LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84	TEAM:		DATE (4/2014) / TIME:	
	N 38 26 676	ALCIZ SI	rever	4/15/14	14:41
118	E 05 65 931	Atole Sour Harver	5 n	Strike/Dip of fault:	
Note on local lit			Note o	n local geomorphology:	
talus a	bedrock		Х	Channel in talus	
*					
Confident this is	a real offset feature?			ent that the <i>geometry</i> chosen ir	
YES / NO				ATE? YES // NO There a	
				ent that the <i>projections</i> chosen	
10			ACCUR	ATE? YES / NO wide for	oult rome
DESCRIBE the ex	tent to which you can/car			rement reported within the scre	
sketch with pier	cing points, if feature is id	entified:	C	he probless on an	They Stay
Max offset			Main	much mae subtle the	2 MINON Scarp.
Min offset	and avalain what it is had				
Fault zone width	(explain why)	> 3	Hand	etran line directions a	
Fault zone trend	, and what it is based on (compass? 12°E	magneti	c declination, GeoXH?)	
Feature extents					
Quality rating of	previous LiDAR measurer	ment : none, po	or, fair, g	good, or very good (Explain why)
Quality rating of	current field measureme	nt: poor, fair,	good, or	very good (include description	to support your rating)
	12 m -	- 2.5 m	depl	Ending on continuity	of downstream
	Channe	1 Dalwa	of Inth	FZ (
		, ,	Good	Eding on continuity !	

LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84	TEAM:		DATE (4/2014) / TIME:	
	N 38 26 653	AKUZ Sa	159	4/15/14 14:27	
119	E 05 65 960	Stock A	arvey	Strike/Dip of fault: N75W here	
Note on local lit	hology:		Note o	on local geomorphology:	
allavium			1	math alluvial Stopes	
				Cut by channels	
				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Confident this is	a real offset feature?			ent that the <i>geometry</i> chosen in screenshot is	
YES / NO				RATE? YES / NO	
				ent that the <i>projections</i> chosen in screenshot are	
		4	ACCUR	RATE? YES // NO	
DESCRIBE the ex	tent to which you can/car	nnot validate the	e measu	urement reported within the screenshot. Include a	
	cing points, if feature is id				
W1770					
Max offset					
Min offset	and explain what it is bas	ed on		*	
Fault zone width	(explain why)	neters.	mani	g factures	
Fault zone trend	, and what it is based on (compass? 12°E	magneti	ic declination, GeoXH?)	
Feature extents	,		_		
Quality rating of	previous LiDAR measuren	nent : none, pod	or, fair, g	good, or very good (Explain why)	
Quality rating of current field measurement: poor, fair, good, or very good (include description to support your rating the large of the fact of the large of the fact of the large of the fact of the large of the l					
$1.2m \pm 0.5m$					

LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84	TEAM:	DATE (4/2014) / TIME:	
	N 38 26 590	Scharce, Stock	4/15/14 12:53 pm	
120	E 05 66027	Sonsa Akar	Strike/Dip of fault:	
Note on local lit	hology:	No	ote on local geomorphology:	
pywodast	har leposit	t deposit	Some of allavial slope with channels in it	
Cd 6	he levosit			
	Y1000 ** 1			
			·	
Confident this is	a real offset feature?	whomas in co	onfident that the <i>geometry</i> chosen in screenshot is	
	Long by May hav Th	1 1	CCURATE? (YES) / NO n/a Myde lical	
	Myects aens		onfident that the <i>projections</i> chosen in screenshot are	
in the fault Tone			ACCURATE? YES) / NO n/a	
	V		Yelland Times look good-	
			easurement reported within the screenshot. Include a	
sketch with pier	cing points, if feature is id		red profile is piding that	
Max offset	dist	inhated faulting	the Pfile is not-	
Min offset			me prote 15 mail-	
Annual a vectorion deser	and explain what it is bas	ed on		
Fault zone width	(explain why)	tens 8) Melers.	lots of straineds	
Fault zone trend	, and what it is based on (compass? 12°E mag	gnetic declination, GeoXH?)	
Feature extents			as quality	
Quality rating of previous LiDAR measurement : none, poor, fair, good, or very good (Explain why)				
Quality rating of	(d, or very good (include description to support your rating)	
not possible to making for confidence.				

	LITAA in MCCOA	TEADA.	DATE (A (OOA A) / TINAT
LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84	TEAM:	DATE (4/2014) / TIME:
CT 121	N 38 26 530	Sousa	4-15-2014 11:41 Am
CT 121	E 05 66 074		Strike/Dip of fault:
Note on local lit	hology:		Note on local geomorphology:
who helf ove	Many by allavial +	enace	Set of knaces adjacent to channel -
mblend			
1000			
Confident this is	a real offset feature?		Confident that the <i>geometry</i> chosen in screenshot is
YES / NO			ACCURATE? (YES) NO 15 & Chagne 1
channel o	cut by fault		Confident that the <i>projections</i> chosen in screenshot are
,)		Could witude no Misel Achashel
DESCRIBE the ex	tent to which you can/ca	nnot validate th	ne measurement reported within the screenshot. Include a
	cing points, if feature is id		to measurement reported than the solicensists made a
Max offset			
	eno		atland
Fault zone width	, and explain what it is bas	on Ca 3	magnetic declination, GeoXH?)
Fault zone trend	l, and what it is based on (compass? 12°E	magnetic declination, GeoXH?)
Feature extents		1	
Quality rating of	previous LiDAR measurer	ment : none, po	por, fair, good, or very good (Explain why)
0 111 111			seconse of prosecus of projects on
			good, or very good (include description to support your rating)
14 10	do of channel	and ha	we I'm offset - (Sinau).
clia	nnel 15 Very 5/hi	10015	
7.1	luce of the tiral	Obert	
there was in westical offset			
hill nearly had pre-early garke scary probably			
. typ of mosed on scarp (W-facing) to N et lac. 120-1			
*			
			ž.

*			
LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84	TEAM:	DATE (4/2014) / TIME:
	N 38 26 437	Sousa 1	XXCIE 4/15/14 10:30 AM.
122	E 05 66 117	Stock S Harvey	Strike/Dip of fault: N 145 E Frunten
Note on local lit	hology:		Note on local geomorphology:
pyroclass	ne censity Current ash flow - over ain yearshy whangulan to	deposits hu	Note on local geomorphology: be and channel, takes covered terracos on
alluvial d	mosty wangulan to	Weblect	either side of The stream in File, any talus stopes visible on
	1		anly talus shopes VISIBLE on
Confident this is	a real offset feature?		Confident that the <i>geometry</i> chosen in screenshot is
YES)/ NO			ACCURATE YES / NO
			Confident that the <i>projections</i> chosen in screenshot are
			ACCURATÉ? YES / NO
DECCRIPE He			but follow terrace edge has some uncertain
	cing points, if feature is id		ne measurement reported within the screenshot. Include a
Sketen with pier	cing points, it reature is it	entinea.	and The Carrier as the poton, A The
Max offset			quite The Same as the bottom of the channel - thank Is wide, blocks -
Min offset			obscure bottom
Preferred offset	, and explain what it is ba	sed on	magnetic declination, GeoXH?) WE side at least the W.
Fault zone widtl	(explain why) Scar	15 M. F.	compagnet facing) we I m higher
Fault zone trend	l, and what it is based on	compass? 12°E	magnetic declination, GeoXH?) Than The W.
Feature extents			or, fair, good, or very good (Explain why)
Quality rating of	previous LIDAN measure	nent . none, po	or, rain good, or very good (Explain Wily)
Quality rating of	current field measureme	nt: poor, fair,	good, or very good (include description to support your rating)
			file.
(3 M)	side		1 to me This Dellat
hand	to say of his represe	nts localiz	ed slip just from This event
Then 15	auther main splay	totle W	of this measurement
			•

Ser.				
LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84	TEAM:	DATE (4/2014) / TIME:	
	N 38 26 216	Sonsa, Witter	Shy 4/14/2014	17.40
123	E 05 66 244	Stock	Strike/Dip of fault: Man	16 E Vertical unto
Note on local lit	channel downent	uto calche No	e on local geomorphology: channel adjacent to formed by lava blo	
layers + foliated	blocky falus of flair bunded for	red bearing	formed by lava blo	ve \$5.
	a real offset feature?		fident that the <i>geometry</i> chose	en in screenshot is
YES / NO	à		CURATÉ? YES / NO fident that the projections cho	son in screenshot are
			CURATE? YES / NO	sen in screenshot are
Preferred offset Fault zone width Fault zone trend Feature extents	, and explain what it is bas n (explain why) l, and what it is based on (compass? 12°E mag	me a guid fau Cau oshy Caufass netic declination, GeoXH?) ir, good, or very good (Explain v	
			or very good (include descripti	ion to support your rating)
1.5 m	of uncertainty of	ne to width	of channel	
*				

LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84	TEAM: A	Colon DATE	(4/2014) / TIME:		
LIDAN #	N 38	Harven Sa	i)a	A 14/2214	17:15	
124	E 05	Shik, Wit	Ko sky Strike,	(4/2014) / TIME: + / 14 / 20 14 'Dip of fault:		
Note on local li	thology:		Note on local	geomorphology:		
				×		
Confident this i	s a real offset feature?		Confident that ACCURATE? Y	-/	sen in screenshot i	S
113 // 110					nosen in screensho	t are
			ACCURATE? Y	ES / NO	ė.	
DESCRIBE the o	xtent to which you ca	/cannot validate the	massurament	reported within th	ne screenshot Incli	ıde a
	rcing points, if feature		measurement	reported within th	ie screensnot. men	ide a
	not red	manable. 131	g rodefall	Over W	side	
Max offset Min offset)	exposmes		
MILL OLISET						
Preferred offset	, and explain what it i	s based on				
Fault zone widt	h (explain why)			-		
Fault zone widt Fault zone trend	h (explain why) d, and what it is based		nagnetic declin	ation, GeoXH?)		
Fault zone widt Fault zone trend Feature extents	h (explain why) d, and what it is based	on (compass? 12°E m			n why)	
Fault zone widt Fault zone trend Feature extents Quality rating o	h (explain why) d, and what it is based f previous LiDAR meas	on (compass? 12°E m	, fair, good, or	very good (Explair		
Fault zone widt Fault zone trend Feature extents Quality rating o	h (explain why) d, and what it is based	on (compass? 12°E m	, fair, good, or	very good (Explair		ur rating)
Fault zone widt Fault zone trend Feature extents Quality rating o	h (explain why) d, and what it is based f previous LiDAR meas	on (compass? 12°E m	, fair, good, or	very good (Explair		ur rating)
Fault zone widt Fault zone trend Feature extents Quality rating o	h (explain why) d, and what it is based f previous LiDAR meas	on (compass? 12°E m	, fair, good, or	very good (Explair		ur rating)
Fault zone widt Fault zone trend Feature extents Quality rating o	h (explain why) d, and what it is based f previous LiDAR meas	on (compass? 12°E m	, fair, good, or	very good (Explair		ur rating)
Fault zone widt Fault zone trend Feature extents Quality rating o	h (explain why) d, and what it is based f previous LiDAR meas	on (compass? 12°E m	, fair, good, or	very good (Explair		ur rating)
Fault zone widt Fault zone trend Feature extents Quality rating o	h (explain why) d, and what it is based f previous LiDAR meas	on (compass? 12°E m	, fair, good, or	very good (Explair		ur rating)
Fault zone widt Fault zone trend Feature extents Quality rating o	h (explain why) d, and what it is based f previous LiDAR meas f current field measur	on (compass? 12°E m	, fair, good, or	very good (Explair		ur rating)
Fault zone widt Fault zone trend Feature extents Quality rating o	h (explain why) d, and what it is based f previous LiDAR meas	on (compass? 12°E m	, fair, good, or	very good (Explair		ur rating)
Fault zone widt Fault zone trend Feature extents Quality rating o	h (explain why) d, and what it is based f previous LiDAR meas f current field measur	on (compass? 12°E m	, fair, good, or	very good (Explair		ur rating)
Fault zone widt Fault zone trend Feature extents Quality rating o	h (explain why) d, and what it is based f previous LiDAR meas f current field measur	on (compass? 12°E m	, fair, good, or	very good (Explair		ur rating)
Fault zone widt Fault zone trend Feature extents Quality rating o	h (explain why) d, and what it is based f previous LiDAR meas f current field measur	on (compass? 12°E m	, fair, good, or	very good (Explair		ur rating)
Fault zone widt Fault zone trend Feature extents Quality rating o	h (explain why) d, and what it is based f previous LiDAR meas f current field measur	on (compass? 12°E m	, fair, good, or	very good (Explair		ur rating)
Fault zone widt Fault zone trend Feature extents Quality rating o	h (explain why) d, and what it is based f previous LiDAR meas f current field measur	on (compass? 12°E m	, fair, good, or	very good (Explair		ur rating)

LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84	TEAM:	DATE (4/2014) / TIME:
	N 3825979 E 566393		4/14
120			Strike/Dip of fault: 147/90 120
Note on local li	thology:	Note on lo	ocal geomorphology:
~3 collavio	n knob	E-side of Broad col	fault local Peak. Movimon to-focus suspeces
YES / NO	s a real offset feature?	screensho	that the geometry and projections chosen in ot is ACCURATE? YES / NO
	xtent to which you can, lude a sketch with piero		measurement reported within the shape would be is identified:
Preferred offset Fault zone widt Fault zone trene Feature extents Quality rating o Quality rating o the rating given This rakes in Kh Sprificad	f previous LiDAR measure f current field measure) Swither fault 2me	based on on (compass? 12°E n urement: none, poor ment: poor, good, or us-profile is diff use to poold. So profile over upfset and als exercises.	r, good, or very good (Explain why) or very good (include description to support fiest to identify in the field. getten to past is impossible to do.

LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84	TEAM:	DATE (4/2014) / TIME:
	N 38 25 915	Kate Sinan	Strike/Dip of fault:
126	E 56 6 449	Frank Ryan	Strike/Dip of fault:
Note on local lit	hology: ferrace on top canic bedrock ()	Note on local ge	w/ 2 obvious
0.001	1 66 . 6	0 61 111 11	ys ho
YES / NO	s a real offset feature?		he geometry and projections chosen in CCURATE? YES / NO yellar
	ktent to which you can/car ude a sketch with piercing		urement reported within the ntified:
Fault zone widtl Fault zone trend Feature extents Quality rating o	f current field measuremen	compass? 12°E magnet	d, or very good (Explain why) y good (include description to support

LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84	TEAM:	DATE (4/2014) / TIME:
100	N 38 25 861	F, K.R.	14/2 1500
127	E 56 6 485	SiJiJi	Strike/Dip of fault:
Note on local li	thology:	Note on local ge	omorphology:
all	uvium	eds of 2 m	cap of allaving
Confident this is YES / NO	s a real offset feature?		ne geometry and projections chosen in CURATE? YES / NO
screenshot. Inc	lude a sketch with piercing	points, if feature is idea	1
Fault zone trend Feature extents Quality rating o Quality rating o the rating given	d, and what it is based on (f f previous LiDAR measurer f current field measureme)	compass? 12°E magnet nent : none, poor, good nt: poor, good, or very	, or very good (Explain why) good (include description to support
Fault	2 one 15 too	wide to m	ake measurement
		*	

LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84	TEAN		DATE (4/2014) / TIME:
100	N 38 25816	No	HE I THIN	14 204PM
128	E 56 6512	+ 6	7+5	Strike/Dip of fault: 1450
Note on local lit	:hology:		Note on local ged	
volga lava	up stream		Down stream	broad ridge.
	congo clown shin		uy stream Sea	both shelf.
Moderst				
	s a real offset feature?			ne geometry and projections chosen in
YES / NO			screenshot is AC	CURATE? YES / (NÒ)
DESCRIBE the ex	xtent to which you can/ca	nnot va	lidate the measu	rement reported within the
and the second s	ude a sketch with piercing	g points	, if feature is ider	ntified:
Sina way	o'H 34			
Max offset Min offset				
	, and explain what it is ba	sed on		
	h (explain why)			
Fault zone trend	d, and what it is based on	(compa	ss? 12°E magneti	c declination, GeoXH?)
Feature extents				
				, or very good (Explain why)
Quality rating of	i current field measureme \	ent: po	or, good, or very	good (include description to support
the rating given	1			upstram
profile	dawn too	close	to fault	to Capter on
offset	to pography. (Joan	Car		*
Featra	is not linear.	pn fi	e donstrea.	· i good. Upsta
public w	rold change a	12	if mov	ed forthe fait.
360	± 300 cm			
bulls on n	pstream side ch	nonge)	draw at all)	it you man to four fact
			×	

LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84	TEAM:	DATE (4/2014) / TIME:
	N 38	J+J+F+R+W+S	4/14
129	E 56		Strike/Dip of fault: 1500
Note on local lit		Note on local ge	omorphology:
White vol	cons who well	F fam	d
weathers	ste don	ais / 1 /	g Jule
	Ste don bela falt Str. Volce red out & produkt flo	W/	annels in volcair unit.
Confident this is	a real offset feature?	Confident that the	ne geometry and projections chosen in
YES / NO		screensnot is AC	CURATE? YES / NO
			rement reported within the
screenshot. Incl	ude a sketch with piercing	points, if feature is ide	ntified:
Max offset			
Min offset			
	, and explain what it is bas n (explain why) — (5 p		
	d, and what it is based on (ic declination, GeoXH?)
Feature extents		mont inone moor good	, or very good (Explain why)
	-	The same of the sa	good (include description to support
the rating given		i i	
Mar)	channel in	duding by	ch 4-8m
offset	64 ve)	hard to 5	e fine of
	match bec	ayst :t	is had to
difm	- 1	Comment.	
l			7
	projects	ch. dr	ar differ
Down store	im featre is real,	, up then feate in	of 180) -
Fault in	to the class	1 heads!	

Photo IDs (If file names are similar, include photographer's initials:

LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84 N 38 25 749	TEAM: Scharer		DATE (4/2014) / TIME:	3:20 Pm
TC130	E 05 66 561	Stock		Strike/Dip of fault:	
Note on local lit	0,		Note o	on local geomorphology:	
Volcan	ic talus		5	mall channels cut u	nto rounded
Collu	vislover on slop	C	hill	5.	
/	a real offset feature?			ent that the <i>geometry</i> chosen in RATE? YES / NO	n screenshot is
YES / NO			Confid	ent that the <i>projections</i> chosen	in screenshot are
			ACCUF	RATE? YES / NO 7 Pr	nection lines
				rement reported within the scr	
sketch with pier	cing points, if feature is id	entified:			
Max offset					
Min offset Preferred offset	, and explain what it is bas	sed on			
Fault zone width Fault zone trend	n (explain why) 0.5 , and what it is based on (compass? 12°E	magnet	ic declination, GeoXH?)	iase Bscarp
Feature extents Quality rating of	previous LiDAR measurer	ment : none, po	or, fair,	good, or very good (Explain why	<i>(</i>)
Quality rating of	current field measureme	nt: poor, fair,	good, or	very good (include description	to support your rating)
2					
				8.	
*					

LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84	TEAM:		DATE (4/2014) / TIME:
	N 38 25 676	Abriz C	charer	4-17-14 66.31
131	E 05 66 595	Stock		Strike/Dip of fault:
Note on local lit	hology: Typ I aw sic side Thin allavial cover			n local geomorphology:
Valeniela	de side		N	refer scale baildons
Volcamela	Duly alluvial COLEV		1	alus blocks on sunface.
beard wi	I will willow their		,	
х				
Confident this is	a real offset feature?			ent that the <i>geometry</i> chosen in screenshot is
YES / NO				RATE? YES)/ NO
				ent that the <i>projections</i> chosen in screenshot are
			ACCUR	ATE? YES / NO
			e measu	rement reported within the screenshot. Include a
sketch with pier	cing points, if feature is id	entinea.	L	Metream allavium Thicker -
Max offset				yetream allavium Thicker - more conborner rinds
Min offset				[[[]]
Preferred offset	, and explain what it is bas	sed on		
Fault zone width	(explain why) 3 m			
Fault zone trend	, and what it is based on (compass? 12°E	magneti	ic declination, GeoXH?)
Feature extents			/	
Quality rating of	previous LiDAR measurer	nent : none, po	or, fair, g	good, or very good (Explain why)
Quality rating of	current field measureme	nt: poor, fair,	good, or	very good (include description to support your rating)
				C. Kolik un belook

DATE (4/2014) / TIME: LiDAR# UTM in WGS84 TEAM: AKC12 N 38 25 681 Scharer Stock Note on local geomorphology:

Axis of ridge (hill-top)

apex of ridge has carry built in

perious visit Note on local lithology: Volcanic rock talus lovered slopes Confident this is a real offset feature? Confident that the *geometry* chosen in screenshot is YES / NO ACCURATE? YES / NO Confident that the *projections* chosen in screenshot are project ohs are The ACCURATE? YES // NO DESCRIBE the extent to which you can/cannot validate the measurement reported within the screenshot. Include a sketch with piercing points, if feature is identified: Max offset Min offset Preferred offset, and explain what it is based on Fault zone width (explain why) Fault zone trend, and what it is based on (compass? 12°E magnetic declination, GeoXH?) Feature extents Quality rating of previous LiDAR measurement: none, poor, fair, good, or very good (Explain why) Centre is good, it was originally continued by ridge when the country apex of sets on uncertainty as so many long to sets on humans of so many long. It ocks on her own face the surface Quality rating of current field measurement: poor, fair, good, or very good (include description to support your rating) 370 km + 100 cm

UTM in WGS84 TEAM: DATE (4/2014) / TIME: LIDAR# 7 APRIL 18.33 Alln N 38 133 E 05 Strike/Dip of fault: Note on local geomorphology: Note on local lithology: volcame bedrock w/ talus bedrock channel on E subtle chaund on W Confident this is a real offset feature? Confident that the geometry chosen in screenshot is matching is not ACCURATE? YES / NO YES / NO Confident that the *projections* chosen in screenshot are ACCURATE? YES / NO DESCRIBE the extent to which you can/cannot validate the measurement reported within the screenshot. Include a sketch with piercing points, if feature is identified: Max offset Min offset Preferred offset, and explain what it is based on Fault zone width (explain why) Fault zone trend, and what it is based on (compass? 12°E magnetic declination, GeoXH?) Feature extents Quality rating of previous LiDAR measurement: none, poor, fair, good, or very good (Explain why) Quality rating of current field measurement: poor, fair, good, or very good (include description to support your rating) 6 + 410 - 70 There is an offset channed but That is not what is being picked.

Downstram channel came from somewhere else

LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84	TEAM:		DATE (4/2014) / TIME:
134	N 38 25 654			4-17-14 .18:42
	N 38 25 654 E 05 66 613			Strike/Dip of fault:
Note on local lit				n local geomorphology:
	une rock			smooth ridge with
W	I talus cover			smooth ridge with irregulady spaced blocks in
	a real offset feature?			ent that the <i>geometry</i> chosen in screenshot is
YES / NO				ATE? YES / NO
				ent that the <i>projections</i> chosen in screenshot are
			ACCUR	ATE? YES / NO
DESCRIBE the ex	tent to which you can/car	not validate th	e measu	rement reported within the screenshot. Include a
	cing points, if feature is ide		e measa	rement reported within the sercension medded a
	6 F 6 F			
Max offset				
Min offset				
Preferred offset	, and explain what it is bas	sed on		
Fault zone width				
	, and what it is based on (compass? 12°E	magneti	c declination, GeoXH?)
Feature extents				
Quality rating of	previous LiDAR measuren	nent : none, po	or, fair, g	ood, or very good (Explain why)
Quality rating of	current field measuremen	nt: poor, fair, {	good, or	very good (include description to support your rating)
	\$50+	100 cm		

LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84	TEAM:	DATE (4/2014) / TIME:
135	N 38 25 611	SA	4/17/14 17:09
175	E 05 66 642	JM8-	Strike/Dip of fault:
Note on local lit	hology:		Note on local geomorphology:
1/3	I carric bedrock		Chaunal in Fan
	Lame bedrock		danskeam naviar turistechamel
1	E side whilet		Chaunof in fan auxisheam: navrav tur wide channel with boulder levers lops heam: lobate deplosits a allivial Confident that the geometry chosen in screenshot is
Confident this is	a real offset feature?		Confident that the <i>geometry</i> chosen in screenshot is
YES / NO			ACCURATE? YES / NO Confident that the <i>projections</i> chosen in screenshot are
			ACCURATE? YES / NO W Side My incorrect
			ne measurement reported within the screenshot. Include a
sketch with pier	cing points, if feature is id	entified:	Correct mojection 14 fines scale
Max offset			feature from will show in
Min offset			C, DAR
Preferred offset,	and explain what it is bas	sed on	
Fault zone width			
	, and what it is based on (compass? 12°E	magnetic declination, GeoXH?)
Feature extents	provious LiDAP monsuron	nont i nono ho	fair good ar your good (Explain why) Marc than
Quality fatilig of	previous LIDAN measurer	nent . none, por	or, fair, good, or very good (Explain why)
Quality rating of	current field measuremen	nt: poor, fair, g	good, or very good (include description to support your rating)
k	Mp And	arta 2	ISO Thatwe of fresh)
	1001.	1 com	280 Malweg fresh)
	hank		3/0
ha	Twey comes ver	1)	did not use product from
	tweg comes ver	7 50 cm	did not use broader for
			, t

LiDAR # 42 C 7	UTM in WGS84 N 38 24 789 E 56 7 047	TEAM: Scharer Harvey Stock	DATE (4/2014) / TIME: 4/4//4 /8 02 Strike/Dip of fault:
Note on local lite Vol carrie he? tuff + e	chology: bedrock epiclastie	alluvial	l geomorphology: Veneev on bedvock pe - Thin Collavial accuss The purple apstrain
YES / NO	s a real offset feature?	screenshot is	at the geometry and projections chosen in SACCURATE? YES / NO while for feat
	xtent to which you can/ca ude a sketch with piercin		
Fault zone widtl Fault zone trend Feature extents Quality rating of	f previous LiDAR measure f current field measureme)	t hand to se (compass? 12°E mag ment : none, poor, g ent: poor, good) or v	projection direction is ok; hate provide narrower to only fit gnetic declination, GeoXH?) charvels That contains projection by good, or very good (Explain why) very good (include description to support
	fa V	fault oriental ult. Downstr 1 stand of	can puble crosses The The fault.
Bigl	est step in fa		
		*	

LiDAR # 143 CT	UTM in WGS84 N 38 7 4 7 29 E 56 7 06 9	TEAM: Scharer Shek Harvey	DATE (4/2014) / TIME: 4 /04/14				
block	hology: Valcaniclastic root frishle to by + ash flow-	Note on local ge	omorphology: ssurs here - one upslope facing + 2 downslope facing seen on Nsidel				
Confident this is a real offset feature? YES / NO black slope (b and less) an S. NICE channel Confident that the geometry and projections chosen in screenshot is ACCURATE? YES / NO							
screenshot. Incl	ktent to which you can/canude a sketch with piercing		ntified:				
Max offset Min offset Preferred offset, and explain what it is based on Fault zone width (explain why) Fault zone trend, and what it is based on (compass? 12°E magnetic declination, GeoXH?) Feature extents Quality rating of previous LiDAR measurement: none, poor, good, or very good (Explain why) Quality rating of current field measurement: poor, good, or very good (include description to support							
the rating given		chapted to	nge black do sent variuskel wider on slope				
lipslope fiss may be slo	prefailure E	hanvol De black	boulder				

LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84	TEAM:	DATE ((4/2014) / TIME: +/2014 17'26
Live	N 38 24 655	Scharer	4/9	1/2014 1/26
144 CT	E 56 7 096	Stock Have	(cy Strike/	Dip of fault:
Note on local lit	hology;		local geomorpho	
bedroo	12 rages	bedou	CK ridger	In 11stapes
Voltan	ic (epiclastic is) DW side geen volcanic (Intra		ν	
be a	15) el vi sigo	(10012		
/ //	s a real offset feature?		_	etry and projections chosen in
YES / (NO)		screens	hot is ACCURATE?	? YES / NO
DESCRIBE the ex	xtent to which you can/ca	nnot validate t	ne measurement	reported within the
l .	ude a sketch with piercing			,
Max offset Min offset				1 (.)
	, and explain what it is ba	sed on		& fault
Fault zone widtl				
	d, and what it is based on	(compass? 12°l	magnetic declina	ation, GeoXH?)
Feature extents	f previous LiDAR measure	mont: none n	or good or yery	good (Evolain why)
	•	-		nclude description to support
the rating given		, , ,	, , .	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
	£ .	1	1.00 1	/ 11.
match	ed a planar v nshean side	ystream	In 1151 one v	1/2 gullos ou
do W	nstean side	,		V
				*
		4		
		7		

LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84	TEAM:	DATE (4/2014) / TIME:
	N 38 24503	SHEARER	4/4/14 16:30
145	E 56 7155	STOCK	Strike/Dip of fault:
Note on local lit W side: bed SSICGI W Clasts	hology: Jed piclastic volcau The daate (fs pap bered who desert va	Note on local go	eomorphology: tween two bedrock hillstopus
E: Store Co	bered of acseri va	- K 1925	
Confident this is YES / NO	s a real offset feature?	Confident that t	the geometry and projections chosen in CCURATE? YES / NO
	ktent to which you can/cal ude a sketch with piercing		entified:
Fault zone width Fault zone trend Feature extents Quality rating of	I, and what it is based on (previous LiDAR measurer current field measureme	compass? 12°E magne ment : none, poor, goo	tic declination, GeoXH?) Late School d, or very good (Explain why) y good (include description to support South general applants
		4	

LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84 💥	TEA		DATE (4/2014) / TIME:			
1111	N 38 24465		ARER	4/4/14			
146	E 56 7166		,	Strike/Dip of fault:			
Note on local lit		-	Note on local ge	omorphology:			
E, uphill: ma	fic volcanic under bou	ilder	gully adj	aunt hill slope itel to fault trace			
	Ash tuff under boulder		300 por a				
	talus under bedde	7					
Confident this is a real offset feature? YES / NO				ne geometry and projections chosen in CURATE? YES / NO			
	DESCRIBE the extent to which you can/cannot validate the measurement reported within the screenshot. Include a sketch with piercing points, if feature is identified:						
Max offset Min offset							
The second second second	, and explain what it is bas	sed or	1				
				uted deformation on E sid			
Fault zone trend	l, and what it is based on (
Feature extents	Formania va LiDAD va a a suva v			The second of th			
				, or very good (Explain why) good (include description to support			
the rating given		iit. P	oor, good, or very	good (metade description to support			
profile los	ration of and	À.L	ne closer on	w. side waterial			
		\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \	4 1				
min stopes	were forosas o	7 ~	marcentie	Nariasa material			
				affected hill slopes			
Stream pro	section may not b	oc chin	a would be	best ulprogram tools optimum here)			
*(con	sidering field mea	SWE	ments found	no of-se-1			
field meas	wement of dis	Sove	te chonne	l is complicated			
by hummo	cky terrain a	+001	1 Zone ator	mation dyields no			

* ~ start of profiles

LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84	TEAM:		DATE (4/2014) / TIME:
	N 38 24 405	Stock		4-18-14 3:30 pm
CT 147	E 05 67 194			Strike/Dip of fault:
Note on local lit	hology:		Note o	n local geomorphology:
Valcani	- bedrock-In stea	ur	bar	+ Swale from
Volcanic bedrack-In steam Channel (major arroyo)			distributed dramages in low area	
Confident this is YES / NO	a real offset feature?		ACCUR Confide	ent that the <i>geometry</i> chosen in screenshot is ATE? YES / NO ent that the <i>projections</i> chosen in screenshot are ATE? YES / NO
DESCRIBE the ex	tent to which you can/car	not validate th	e measu	rement reported within the screenshot. Include a
sketch with pier	cing points, if feature is id	entified:	4	sheam channel very broad
Max offset			d	whiteam channel very broad winstream channel man confinet upsteam in very soft believe (truff)
Min offset				upsheam in very soft believe (truff)
Preferred offset,	and explain what it is bas	ed on	ī	
Fault zone width	(explain why) 2m —	- E SI	de up	scarp
	, and what it is based on (
Feature extents				
Quality rating of	previous LiDAR measuren	nent : none, po	or, fair, g	good, or very good (Explain why)
Quality rating of	current field measuremen	at: noor fair (good or	very good (include description to support your rating)

LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84	TEAM:	DATE (4/2014) / TIME:			
	N 38 24 252	K. Scharer	4-18-14 12:35 pm			
148	N 38 24 252 E 05 67 243	J. Stock	Strike/Dip of fault:			
Note on local lit	0,		Note on local geomorphology:			
Vo Carrico	bedied (decite?)		boulder filed channel upstream			
			boulter filed channed wist com			
	a real offset feature?		Confident that the <i>geometry</i> chosen in screenshot is			
YES / NO			ACCURATE? YES / NO Confident that the <i>projections</i> chosen in screenshot are			
			ACCURATE? YES / NO those the lines are			
	4.5		too favaray + too long			
			e measurement reported within the screenshot. Include a			
sketch with pier	cing points, if feature is id	entified:				
Max offset						
Min offset		7	cloice is 148=4 & dur new field number 148-4			
Preferred offset	, and explain what it is bas	sed on his	101ce is 148-4 /			
Fault zone width		compass? 12°F	magnetic declination, GeoXH?)			
Feature extents	i, and what it is based on t	compass: 12 L	magnetic decimation, dealth.			
Quality rating of	previous LiDAR measurer	ment : none, po	or, fair, good, or very good (Explain why)			
			At not on same features			
Quality rating of	current field measureme	nt: poor, fair, §	good, or very good (include description to support your rating)			
Quality rating of current field measurement: poor, fair, good, or very good (include description to support your rating see Kates note book downshoom uncolon top) projection lines upon on few wes that are not on the same scale as the DEM features						
Р	rojection likes 1/2	to on few	tures That are not on The			
So	ima scale as the	DEM featu	RS.			
	(4	AR.)				

LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84	TEAM:	DATE (4/2014) / TIME:	1.1.2		
	N 38 24 21 9	Scharev	18 APR 2014	1:48		
149	E 05 67 252	Stock	Strike/Dip of fault:			
Note on local lit	hology:	75	Note on local geomorphology:	,		
Volca	vic bedrek		upstream befock chann	Le (
Variab	de handross		Note on local geomorphology: Wish cam be nock chann filled with large clasts.			
/	a real offset feature?		Confident that the <i>geometry</i> chosen in screenshot is			
YES / NO			ACCURATE? YES / NO Confident that the <i>projections</i> chosen in scre	enchot are		
			ACCURATE? YES / NO ? tob smal	1 to see screenshot		
DESCRIBE the ex	tent to which you can/car	not validate th	e measurement reported within the screensho	ot. Include a		
sketch with pier	cing points, if feature is id	entified:				
Max offset						
Min offset						
	, and explain what it is bas	ed on				
Fault zone width						
Fault zone trend	, and what it is based on (compass? 12°E	magnetic declination, GeoXH?)			
Feature extents						
Quality rating of	previous LiDAR measurer	nent : none, po	or, fair, good, or very good (Explain why)			
Quality rating of current field measurement: poor, fair, good, or very good (include description to support your rating)						
	dramag is a dauble gully we have both, uf steam locations are proposed by be trock notches.					
upstream locations are princed by be frock notches						

	*			
LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84	TEAM:		DATE (4/2014) / TIME:
1.	N 38 24 204	KScharer	,	4.18.14 11:40
150	N 38 24 204 E 05 67 255	1. Stock		Strike/Dip of fault:
Note on local lit	hology:		Note o	on local geomorphology:
Vo / Ca	mc beanch		Th	whole-filled bedrock channel. on stream bedrock channel.
001-	an W side		. ((uf strain).
2010	v vu vo stat	le le	don	instream bediock charmal.
Confident this is	a real offset feature?			ent that the <i>geometry</i> chosen in screenshot is
YES / NO	hich auch	- 4		RATE? YES Y NO
	high quality of	t on the		ent that the <i>projections</i> chosen in screenshot are RATE? YES / NO
-			ACCUR	MALE! TES / NO
DESCRIBE the ex	tent to which you can/ca	nnot validate the	e measu	rement reported within the screenshot. Include a
sketch with pier	cing points, if feature is id	entified:		
Max offset Min offset				
STOCKERS OF THE PLANE OF THE PLANE	and explain what it is bas	sed on	. 1	0
Fault zone width	and explain what it is bas (explain why) 2 //	- doubt	0 57	and
	, and what it is based on (
Feature extents				
Quality rating of	previous LiDAR measurer	nent : none, pod	or, fair, g	good, or very good (Explain why)
Quality rating of current field measurement: poor, fair, good, or very good (include description to support your rating)				
Secher field asjes				

LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84	TEAM:	DATE (4/2014) / TIME:
1	N 38 24 23	Schare	4-18-14 11:05
15/	E 05 67 266	Stock	Strike/Dip of fault:
Note on local lit	hology:	1	Note on local geomorphology:
Volcame	belovek (dashe?	()	channels in soft Note occasion
			channels in soft vole bedrock (downstream) upstream channels in hander tock
	a real offset feature?		Confident that the <i>geometry</i> chosen in screenshot is
YES / NO			ACCURATE? YES / NO
			Confident that the <i>projections</i> chosen in screenshot are
			ACCURATE? YES / (NO) / hy line some sheam ridge books degree st
DESCRIBE the ex	tent to which you can/car cing points, if feature is ide	nnot validate the entified:	e measurement reported within the screenshot. Include a
Max offset			
Min offset		3.	
Preferred offset,	, and explain what it is bas	ed on	
Fault zone width			
	, and what it is based on (compass? 12°E	magnetic declination, GeoXH?)
Feature extents Ouality rating of	previous LiDAR measuren	nent : none. por	or/fair, good, or very good (Explain why)
quanty ruting or	previous Elb/III medadren	iene i mone, po	3.7,14.17, 3.004, 0.1.14, 3.004 (2.1.1.14.11.11.17.1
Quality rating of	current field measuremer	nt: poor, fair, ¿	good, or very good (include description to support your rating)
	no fre	ld meas.	but lidar should be of b
	U TO		i Decla 9
	profiles	raphy That	mck up The scale of
	polo (1)	re Davil	all yellow line comes from one of the does not reflect the grounder paper in the profile.
	1.0311	dges an	Loes not reflect the protocol
	1 . 0	The topos	naphy in the proble.
	shape of	1,0	

LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84	TEAM:	DATE (4/2014) / TIME:					
	N 38 24 15+	STOCK	415/14 17:14					
153	E 56 7256	LYNCH	Strike/Dip of fault:					
Note on local lit	hology:	Note on local	geomorphology:					
E: felsic	Ash Tuff	Stream	channel w/ alluvial fill					
w; Gl. be	Ash Tufl fuer mafic I clastic volconic	aug draining	y to yoult // channel					
Canfidant this is	a waal affaat faatuwa?	Confident that	the geometry and projections should in					
YES / NO	a real offset feature?	1	the geometry and projections chosen in ACCURATE? YES NO					
DESCRIBE the ex	tent to which you can/ca	nnot validate the mea	surement reported within the					
	ude a sketch with piercing							
Max offset								
Min offset			-					
Foult zone width	, and explain what it is bas (explain why)		2 geoxh					
Fault zone trend	, and what it is based on ((compass? 12°E magn	etic declination, GeoXH?)					
Feature extents								
Quality rating of	current field measureme		od, or very good (Explain why) ry good (include description to support					
the rating given)	shape varies	Lidalia a	way from fault					
by pro	file lines co	atch a con	way from fault throws collevial planar across					
slope	that was	pparently	planar across					
to yo	au It							
¥								
		4						

L'DAD II	UTM in WGS84	TEAM:		DATE (4/2014) / TIME:			
LiDAR #	The second secon	- 10		4/17/14	10:00		
153	N 38 74 160	Sugar Sto	C.	4/17/14			
let o	E 05 67 269	Gracy St.	y .	Strike/Dip of fault:	OE 80°NE		
Note on local lit			Noto	n local geomorphology:	1		
Voltanic	rocts and.		De.	Drock channel ug	05De am		
Coll U	Vian		cha	drock channel y nd on W side and both side	s of fault		
Confident this is	a real offset feature?		Confide	ent that the <i>geometry</i> chos	sen in screenshot is		
YES / NO			ACCUR	ATE? YES / NO ent that the <i>projections</i> cho	sing the break in		
					osen in screenshot are		
			ACCURATE? YES // NO				
DECCRIPE the or	stant to which you can loo	nnat validata th		romant rangeted within the	a saraanshat Ingluda a		
	cing points, if feature is id			rement reported within the	100		
sketch with pier	cing points, it reature is it	icitinea.		TC not using 12	re channels That		
Max offset				are eary ford	out fy to prokap		
Min offset				Rofiles are +	DO locky to picky		
Preferred offset	, and explain what it is ba			The Chames at 7	is without		
Fault zone width		PW C					
	l, and what it is based on	(compass? 12°E	magneti	declination, GeoXH?)			
Feature extents	nrevious LiDAR measure	ment: none no	or fair g	ood, or very good (Explain	why)		
Quality fating of	previous LIDAN measurer	ment . none, po	or, ran, s	ood, of very good (Explain	w.,,,		
Quality rating of	current field measureme	nt: poor, fair, a	good, or	very good (include descrip	tion to support your rating)		
h. 1/9/03/05	on either set ?.	starp ar	e sa	me LiThology	N/A		
	, ,			0			
Note also	done on 4/4/14						
Treim	an Max sile						
	*						

LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84	TEA		DATE (4/2014) / TIME:			
101	N 38 24122		TO CIL	4/5/14 16:48			
159	E 56 7278	1	ARVEY	Strike/Dip of fault:			
Note on local lithology:			Note on local geomorphology:				
	21sic ASH TUFF		variable	sincised, collusium			
to E(Up)			& allovio	m chalce & hill slope			
matic lave	to wast (dow	m)	chenn				
Confident this is	s a real offset feature?		Confident that th	ne geometry and projections chosen in			
YES / NO			screenshot is AC	CURATE? YES NO			
DECODINE II			l'il de disconsission				
				rement reported within the			
screenshot. Include a sketch with piercing points, if feature is identified:							
Max offset							
Min offset			_				
Fault zone widtl	, and explain what it is bas	sea oi	n	geoxH			
	d, and what it is based on (comp	ass? 12°E magnet	,			
Feature extents			FAIR				
				or very good (Explain why)			
Quality rating of the rating given		nt: p	oor, good, or very	good (include description to support			
buster	tions good						
Eastern	valley profil	e 1	varies e	2 meter scale			
due to	o internal va	no	tions 1	ulin erosability.			
proti	: may be t	00	for to	E of fault-			
100/c @	post rystur	C	air phote	25			
	•						
			*	×.			

LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84	TEAM:	DATE (4/2014) / TIME:		
LIDAK #	N 38 24092	HARVEY	4/5/14 11:28		
155	E 56 7278	LYNCH	Strike/Dip of fault: Geo XH		
		STOCK	GeoXH		
Note on local lit	^	Note on local ge			
erosive r	natic lave to u	, well incl.	sed V bedrock channel		
resistan-	altered Ash tuff	to E			
	a real offset feature?		he geometry and projections chosen in		
YES)/ NO		screenshot is AC	CCURATE? YES / NO		
DESCRIBE the ex	tent to which you can/car	nnot validate the meas	urement reported within the		
screenshot. Incl	ude a sketch with piercing	points, if feature is ide	ntified:		
when you	oneed to us	e a handlen	s to see the		
Min offset	rojection lin	es on the c	DEM it's too small		
	, and explain what it is bas	sed on	7 - 24		
Fault zone width			3 GeoXH		
Feature extents	, and what it is based on (compass r 12 E magne	iic declination, Geoxh?)		
	previous LiDAR measurer	nent : none, poor, good	d, or very good (Explain why)		
		nt: poor, good, or very	good (include description to support		
the rating given)					
Channel	is deedy (rela	tively) incis	ed into volcenia,		
be drock	e & thalung	is well de	tined e apex of		
S. chem	nel margins	are differe	ent slopes & shopes		
due to	variations	in bedroc	k & it		
appears	mad the	program	preterentially		
Linnel	the d		111		
aligned the channel margin over thelweg					
			*		
		*			
		ŧ			

1:0404	UTM in WGS84	TEA	M:	DATE (4/2014) / TIME:	
LiDAR#	N 38 24 054		0 C/C	4/5/14 15:48	
156	E 56 7297		ARVEY	Strike/Dip of fault:	
			YMCH		
Note on local lithology:			Note on local ged		
E:UP a	Here & felse Ash	TUFF	Talus	alluvium choked	
W. Down	mafic lava		Channel	in "bedrock"	
			ridges		
C (1 111111	1 11 11 12		Carefi dana da a da		
YES / NO	a real offset feature?		screenshot is ACC	ne geometry and projections chosen in CURATE? YES / NO	
TES / NO			Sercensilot is Acc	CONATE: (LS) / NO	
				rement reported within the	
	ude a sketch with piercing			^	
Max offset	10 CAPTURE		pper stran	d	
Min offset					
	, and explain what it is bas	sed or	n	3 GeoXH	
Fault zone width			2 12°F		
Feature extents	l, and what it is based on (comp	ass? 12 E magneti	c declination, GeoxH?)	
	previous LiDAR measurer	nent :	none, poor, good	or very good (Explain why)	
Quality rating of	current field measureme			good (include description to support	
the rating given					
HS DEY	1 IS WAY TOO	SM	1 ALL SCAL	E	
Measwerr	rent would b	e "11	mproved	pl nous ware	
Bidge	due a di de		ratile m	as be aftected	
	Je e shore	10	OF E SI	de Southern channel	
Ridge edge e single parotile may be aftected by internal indulations of E side southern channe					
margin	due to vari	at	ni 2 moi	rock erosability	
margin due to variations in voice erosability					
			*		

	LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84	TEA	M: Tock	DATE (4/2014) / TIME:
	150	N 38 24040	-	ARVEY	4/5/14 15:12
	15 +	E 56 730	Ĺ	YNCH	Strike/Dip of fault: GROXH
	Note on local lit	hology:	1	Note on local ged	
E(LP)	· Silicified	volcanic Ashun	der	up: alluvii	m/colluvium choked nel in L/gully
		: mafic laug		down bedr	ock channel recently
(Confident this is YES NO	a real offset feature?		Confident that th	ne geometry and projections chosen in CURATE? YES / NO
	DESCRIBE the ex	ctent to which you can/car	not	alidate the measu	rement reported within the
	screenshot. Incl	ude a sketch with piercing	poin	ts, if feature is ider	ntified:
	Max offset	ment fails to	C	apture .	pper sman s
	Min offset				
	STATE OF THE PARTY	, and explain what it is bas	sed o	า	
	Fault zone width				c declination GeoXH2) Coxh
	Fault zone trend Feature extents	l, and what it is based on (comp	ass? 12°E magneti	c declination, GeoXH?)
	ON THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPERT	previous LiDAR measurer	nent	: none, poor, good	or very good (Explain why)
					good (include description to support
	the rating given)	ĺ			
	* lower	projection	fo	Mows V	alley axis near
	Yault	I abber brosec	ho	in fails?	alley axis near to capture apparent convergence apparent.
	valley o	axis rotation	to	od gue	convergence & tact.
	due to	rotation be	tu	seen stra	nds? or due to
	prerupt	are deflection	0	+ valley?	
					12 de allund All
	lower ?	malweg is now	0	incised in	to deallowid All
	upper,	that wing is b	00 X	h ero ded	in to older a room
	J118	aggrated as	OUR	Shutter	into older allowel
	·			4	
				×	

LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84	TEA		DATE (4/2014) / TIME:	
170	N 38 74007	SH	EARER	4/4/14 13:45	
100	E 56 73	HI	4RVEY	Strike/Dip of fault:	
Note on local lithology: E. Talus veneer on whitex/rich Ash Tutt W. Talus & alluvial veneer on matic vacconic roules			Note on local geomorphology: Colluvial slope which sed gullies between diff of Volcaniclestic rods & randed hills of matic volcanic rocks		
Confident this is a real offset feature? YES / NO			Confident that the geometry and projections chosen in screenshot is ACCURATE? YES / NO		
DESCRIBE the extent to which you can/cannot validate the measurement reported within the screenshot. Include a sketch with piercing points, if feature is identified: Max offset Min offset Preferred offset, and explain what it is based on Fault zone width (explain why) Fault zone trend, and what it is based on (compass? 12°E magnetic declination, GeoXH?) Feature extents Quality rating of previous LiDAR measurement: none, poor, good, or very good (Explain why) Quality rating of current field measurement: poor, good, or very good (include description to support the rating given)					
11) - TOTAL TOTAL			raviolita =	Visit in the	

Lidaris overly porecise parotile positions fail to capture Marge differences in channel shape, downstrand location may be win fault zone

E of fault, "Channel" shape is determined by convergence of talus slopes e gully bottern, but porcyclion line dursn't follow gully,

w of fault, "channel" shape is flanked by broad rounded ridge strong willy determines profile.

LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84	TEA		DATE (4/2014) / TIME:
	N 38 23939		ARER EY	4/4/14 13:10
159 CT	E 567326			Strike/Dip of fault:
Note on local lit			Note on local ged	omorphology:
E', White XI,	nch Ash tuff		SEE BET	Low
W: Weather	ed mafic volc rock		,	
Confident-this is YES / NO	a real offset feature?			ne geometry and projections chosen in CURATE? YES / NO
	tent to which you can/can ude a sketch with piercing			rement reported within the ntified:
Max offset Min offset Preferred offset, and explain what it is based on Fault zone width (explain why) Fault zone trend, and what it is based on (compass? 12°E magnetic declination, GeoXH?) Feature extents Quality rating of previous LiDAR measurement: none, poor, good, or very good (Explain why) Quality rating of current field measurement: poor, good, or very good (include description to support the rating given)				
Slopes are findamentally different due to different gumorphic oringins				
E side	is fan 21 west is a dault further west	to //	Channel & mafe bout	channel location
			,	

LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84	TEAM:	DATE (4/2014) / TIME:
11 0	N 38	SHEARER	414114
160	E 56	HARVEY	Strike/Dip of fault: geax H
Note on local li		Note on lo	cal geomorphology:
alluvial cha	annel at into		stream channel from
	ash (NE) epicle) collusion/allu		le valley
* -	c volconic rocks		
0081 111211	c norcovic Locie?	(ω)	
Confident this i YES / NO	s a real offset feature?		that the geometry and projections chosen in t is ACCURATE? YES / NO
DESCRIBE the e	xtent to which you can	/cannot validate the	measurement reported within the
screenshot. Inc	lude a sketch with pier	cing points, if feature	is identified:
Max offset			
Min offset			
	t, and explain what it is	based on geoXH	on Southern margin
Fault zone widt	h (explain why) – 🧠	eoxH	
Fault zone trend	d, and what it is based	on (compass? 12°E m	agnetic declination, GeoXH?)
Enatura autonto			DOT a GOOD TEATURE
Our lite extents	f		profile of Southern mary
Quality rating o	f previous LiDAR meas	urement : none, poor	good, or very good (Explain why)
Quality rating o Quality rating o	f previous LIDAR meas f current field measure	urement : none, poor ement: poor, good, c	r very good (include description to support
Quality rating o Quality rating o the rating given	f previous LIDAR meas f current field measure)	ement: poor, good, c	or very good (Explain why) or very good (include description to support
Quality rating o Quality rating o the rating given	f previous LIDAR meas f current field measure)	ement: none, poor, good, c	or very good (Explain why) or very good (include description to support
Quality rating o Quality rating o the rating given	f previous LIDAR meas f current field measure)	ement: none, poor, good, c	or very good (Explain why) or very good (include description to support
Quality rating o Quality rating o the rating given	f previous LIDAR meas f current field measure)	ement: none, poor, good, c	or very good (Explain why) or very good (include description to support
Quality rating o Quality rating o the rating given Eprofile Wording Wall of	f previous LIDAR meas f current field measure) appears to a ers required, f sets two	ement: none, poor, good, c	or very good (Explain why) or very good (include description to support
Quality rating o Quality rating o the rating given Eprofile Wording Wall of	f previous LIDAR meas f current field measure)	ement: none, poor, good, c	grood, or very good (Explain why) or very good (include description to support confidence to avoid the damage zone shows scarp forent terrains &
Quality rating o Quality rating o the rating given Eprofile Worofile Vaul of	f previous LIDAR meas f current field measure) appears to a ers required, f sets two	ement: none, poor, ement: poor, good, conditions of a standard distance of the standard distance	grood, or very good (Explain why) or very good (include description to support and le damage zone to avoid the damage zone of avoid the damage zone forent terrains &
Quality rating o Quality rating o the rating given Eprofile Wordfile	f previous LIDAR meas f current field measure) appears to a ers required, f sets two	ement: none, poor, good, c	grood, or very good (Explain why) or very good (include description to support anothe damage zone to avoid the damage zone of avoid terrains &
Quality rating o Quality rating o the rating given Eprofile Wordfile	appears to an ers required, from the sets two allowings.	ement: none, poor, ement: poor, good, conditions of a standard distance of the standard distance	grood, or very good (Explain why) or very good (include description to support anothe damage zone to avoid the damage zone of avoid terrains &
Quality rating o Quality rating o the rating given Eprofile Worofile	appears to an appear to a appears to an appear to an appear to a appear to a appear to a appear to a appear to an appear to a appear	ement: none, poor ement: poor, good, coments of autility districtly districtl	grood, or very good (Explain why) or very good (include description to support anothe damage zone to avoid the damage zone of avoid terrains &
Quality rating o Quality rating o the rating given Eprofile Wordfile Wordfi	appears to an appear to a appears to an appear to an appear to a appear to a appear to a appear to a appear to an appear to a appear	ement: none, poor ement: poor, good, coments of autility districtly districtl	or very good (Explain why) or very good (include description to support change zone to avoid the damage zone of each terrains &
Quality rating o Quality rating o the rating given Eprofile Wordfile Wordfi	appears to an appear to a appears to an appear to an appear to a appear to a appear to a appear to a appear to an appear to a appear	ement: none, poor ement: poor, good, coments of autility districtly districtl	or very good (Explain why) or very good (include description to support change zone to avoid the damage zone of each terrains &
Quality rating of Quality rating of the rating given the rating given to go and the rating given the rating of the rating given the rating given the rating of the rating given the rating	appears to an appear to a appears to an appear to an appear to a appear to a appear to a appear to a appear to an appear to a appear	ement: none, poor ement: poor, good, coments of autility districtly districtl	or very good (Explain why) or very good (include description to support change zone to avoid the damage zone of each terrains of
Quality rating of Quality rating of the rating given Eprofile worth of which the control of the	appears to an appear to a appears to an appear to an appear to a appear to a appear to a appear to a appear to an appear to a appear	ement: none, poor ement: poor, good, coments of autility districtly districtl	or very good (Explain why) or very good (include description to support camage zone to avoid the damage zone on as scarp (forent terrains &

11000	UTM in WGS84	TEA	N/I+	DATE (4/2014) / TIME:		
LiDAR #		100 March 100 Ma	EARER	7 - 1		
161	N 38 23877	1		4 4 14 1 3		
,	E 567343	MA	RVEY	Strike/Dip of fault:		
	Note on local lithology:			omorphology:		
Combined	talus & alluvi	S	Talus slo	pe/alluvion fan		
Veneer ove	r bedded epicl	astc	Apron be-	ween cliff &		
10/canic	rocks		incised	stream channel		
Confident this is YES / NO	a real offset feature?		Confident that the screenshot is ACC	ne geometry and projections chosen in CURATE? (YES)/ NO		
1	ktent to which you can/ca ude a sketch with piercing			rement reported within the ntified:		
Fault zone width Fault zone trend Feature extents Quality rating of Quality rating of the rating given) Upstream to be as damage	Max offset Min offset Preferred offset, and explain what it is based on Fault zone width (explain why) ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~					
lower projection may be too oblique & inderestimate						
channels à deposits are distinctive above à below fault.						
overall, comme	grature is more slupe I than	off	mogenal to	fault then 162 Is on Slope		

UTM in WGS84 TEAM: DATE (4/2014) / TIME: LiDAR# N 38 23 863 SHEARER 4/4/14 10:46 AM 162 HARVEY E 567346 Strike/Dip of fault: Note on local lithology: Note on local geomorphology: variable thickness of talus/allovin Mixed talus slope & alluvial channels oriented obliquely to faut over well indirated bedded epiclastic volcanic rocks Confident this is a real offset feature? Confident that the geometry and projections chosen in screenshot is ACCURATE? YES / (NO YES) / NO DESCRIBE the extent to which you can/cannot validate the measurement reported within the screenshot. Include a sketch with piercing points, if feature is identified: Max offset GeoXH Min offset Preferred offset, and explain what it is based on Fault zone width (explain why) 4 M - large damage 200 + Assures & Fault zone trend, and what it is based on (compass? 12°E magnetic declination, GeoXH2) Feature extents - large - but oblique to fault Quality rating of previous LiDAR measurement: none, poor, good, or very good (Explain why) Quality rating of current field measurement: poor, good, or very good (include description to support the rating given) poor quality of feature due to ambiguity in original A) original channel may have been originally sigmoid shaped-diverted along old fault trace B) in 2014, unable to project Astron channel past wide damage zone except as linear projection from distant point (see geo XH data) Potential scenario pre-ruptre ruptue lengthers intermediate chimal

Photo IDs (If file names are similar, include photographer's initials:

LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84	TEAM:	DATE (4/2014) / TIME:
1620	N 38 23 783	Schare	4-3-14 18:05
	N 38 23 783 E 56 7 372	God	Strike/Dip of fault:
Note on local line bedded	thology: Volcanic	Note on local g	geomorphology: Channol W/1-2m dicu
: lava flor		boulde.	b, law terroce on
1 9		noterra	theour side of fauttice on side of fast
Confident this i	s a real offset feature?		the geometry and projections chosen in ACCURATE? YES / NO 1/4
			surement reported within the
creenshot. Inc	lude a sketch with piercing	points, if feature is in	entified: suggest you should not
Max offset	,	use hulls lope	rofile to get Deset
Min offset Preferred offset	t, and explain what it is ba		
ault zone widt	h (explain why)		
Fault zone trend Feature extents	d, and what it is based on (compass? 12°E magn	etic declination, GeoXH?)
		ment : none, poor, god	od, or very good (Explain why)
		nt: poor, good, or ve	ry good (include description to support
the rating given)		
		*	¥

LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84	TEA		DATE (4/2014) / TIME:
164	N 3823654		schared	3-4-14 18:45
	E 567410		Harvey Stock	Strike/Dip of fault:
Note on local lithology:			Note on local geo	omorphology:
E: Talus slope under bedded lahar			Talus apr	on between local highs
wi. Talus s	slope down to mafic v	dc.	is a	
in between . wide w	In between fault shank we lom wide white ash zone			
Confident this is	a real offset feature?			ne geometry and projections chosen in
(YES) / NO			screenshot is AC	CURATE? YES / NO
DESCRIBE the or	tant to which you can loar	noti		15 mpossible to see -
A .	ude a sketch with piercing			rement reported within the
	ade a sketen with piereing	роши	,	air phator
Max offset				all phonol
Min offset				2 24 2
Fault zone width	, and explain what it is bas	sea or	1	see GeoXH dota
	l, and what it is based on (comp	ass? 12°E magnet	ic declination, GeoXH?)
Feature extents				
	0.7		. (- /	or very good (Explain why)
,		nt: p	oor, good, or very	good (include description to support
the rating given)				
	+			
				*
ж				
			4	

1:0404	UTM in WGS84	TEAM:	DATE (4/2014) / TIME:			
LiDAR#	N 38 D (140	Schaver				
165 TC	E 56 7 110	Shoul	Strike/Dip of fault:			
105 10	1 425	Harver				
Note on local lithology:			on local geomorphology:			
lahan to E	t.		rock channel to K			
66+ V-	c. could we allowing	m Fran	faul opex) to W			
(demils fam)	c. colored wy allowing					
	s a real offset feature?		lent that the geometry and projections chosen in			
YES / NO		screer	shot is ACCURATE? (YES) / NO			
DESCRIPE the ex	ytant to which you can/cau	anot validato	the measurement reported within the			
	ude a sketch with piercing					
		,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,				
Max offset						
Min offset		Ĭ.	,			
Preferred offset	Preferred offset, and explain what it is based on Fault zone width (explain why) 2 m					
Fault zone trend	1 (explain why) $\sim m > 1$	compass? 12	°F magnetic declination, GeoXH?)			
Feature extents	, and what it is based on (00111pu001 112	°E magnetic declination, GeoXH?)			
Quality rating of	f previous LiDAR measurer	nent : none,	poor, good, or very good (Explain why)			
		nt: poor, go	od, or very good (include description to support			
the rating given)					
		4				

I:DAD#	UTM in WGS84	TEA	M:	DATE (4/2014) / TIME:
LiDAR#	N 3823563	2 3 3 3 3	EARER	4/4/14 9:15
166	E 56 7418	+	1ARVEY	Strike/Dip of fault:
Note on lead lit			Note as least rea	
Note on local lit	am! thin alluvial te	Neec	Note on local geo	
	Le volcanic be drock		reaching by	lebris flow fan ack to high mesa
E (UP STREA	+m) : Variable alluma	1	0	186 18 1119
veneer (up	to 2 meters) over me itioning to bedded epi	afic clash		
	a real offset feature?			e geometry and projections chosen in
YES / NO			screenshot is ACC	CURATE? YES / (NO)
DESCRIBE the ex	tent to which you can/car	not v	alidate the measu	rement reported within the
screenshot. Incl	ude a sketch with piercing	point	s, if feature is iden	itified:
Max offset			7	
Min offset			& GOXH	
	, and explain what it is bas			
	n (explain why) METI			a declination (SecVIII)
	l, and what it is based on (i - short + plus lar			
				or very good (Explain why)
Quality rating of	current field measuremer			good (include description to support
	-SEE GOOXH		_	. 1
profiles projection	drawn too far	- (ron fault	given stream variation
(stream vo	ariation possibl	400	not Visible	· e Lider resolution
	, , ,	0		()
Previous	Lidar- poor-	Li	dar measu	remonts profile exclude significant
	posit	ion	tails to e	exclude significant
	Chenn	(Varia Tion	
low street lack of 10 by this does in	certainty shat I feature, but of dicate recent	s owe hear	to ambiguer channel ance of low	region was controlled ser wedge to a bedrock
				*

LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84	TEAM:	DATE (4/2014) / TIME:
0	N 38 23 5/2	Scharer	4/3/10 16-15
167 CT	E 56 7 446	- Harrey Stock	Strike/Dip of fault:
Note on local lit	thology:	Note on loca	al geomorphology:
volcanic !	redrock willouse b	addes slope nu	al geomorphology: ests ahardoned ferro co on of fault moots active wash on w. s. de
felsic vole	of vesicular	meter to gide	0 Fault
	lava rolled do	5/00	moste active wash on wiside
	Stop	8 fo	., 4
Confident this is	s a real offset feature?		at the geometry and projections chosen in
YES / NO			S ACCURATE? YES / NO
			I concern w/terrace/
			easurement reported within the
screenshot. Incl	ude a sketch with piercing	g points, if feature is	not using same
Max offset			contact on bill sides of fault
Min offset			Sides of fault
	t, and explain what it is ba	sed on	
Fault zone widt	h (explain why)		
		(compass? 12°E mag	gnetic declination, GeoXH?)
Feature extents			
			good, or very good (Explain why)
the rating given		nt: poor, good, or	very good (include description to support
	looking N:	á	E side looking N
	SIEPE		1510 pe
			perched
	active wast	active	(now incised)
		wash.	(New Miles
80 Sci 12	naybe unideresty.	mated Iconsu	of Mis-
00	10-		
		4	
			,

(+ 160	UTM in WGS84 N 38 23 366	TEAM:	DATE (4/2014) / TIME:		
	1 30 60 700	Scharce	4-3-14 15:15		
	E 56 7 469	Harvey Stock	Strike/Dip of fault:		
Note on local lith	oloan.		l geomorphology:		
	ed with olive grey g				
class. gedion	ck In w n & side	10	de is covered with 1698 ocks		
Channel Unterview vole rock on Wside Eside of fault is hedded vole					
Confident this is a YES / NO	a real offset feature?	Confident th	at the geometry and projections chosen in s ACCURATE? YES / NO		
	ent to which you can/can de a sketch with piercing		easurement reported within the identified:		
Max offset Min offset Preferred offset, and explain what it is based on Fault zone width (explain why) Fault zone trend, and what it is based on (compass? 12°E magnetic declination, GeoXH?) Feature extents Quality rating of previous LiDAR measurement: none, poor, good, or very good (Explain why) Quality rating of current field measurement: poor, good, or very good (include description to support the rating given)					
	sketch for detail narym was a sl where to fault is in prientation		refore The eoutrophile on Wisite of		
		4			

I 'D A D II	UTM in WGS84	TEAM:	DATE (4/2014) / TIME:
LiDAR#	N 38 77 77	Harvey	4.3.14
CT 169	1-6	Scharer	Strike/Dip of fault:
1 101	E 56 7 520	Stock	Strike/Dip of fault.
Note on local lit		Note on local ge	eomorphology:
allaviu	m (active)	active h	uash
	s a real offset feature?		he geometry and projections chosen in
YES / NO	Can't Walunte	screenshot is AC	CCURATE? YES / NO
DESCRIBE the e	xtent to which you can/car		urement reported within the
	ude a sketch with piercing		-
Max offset			
Min offset	, and explain what it is bas	sed on	
Fault zone widt		sed on	
	d, and what it is based on (compass? 12°E magnet	tic declination, GeoXH?)
Feature extents			
	•		d, or very good (Explain why)
the rating given		nt: poor, good, or very	good (include description to support
the rating given	ı		
CT 11,065	No long possible . F	2 avolument	
of wheas. No long possible F.Z. ended at			
	I		
*			
i e			
		4	
•			

LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84 N 38 23 033 E 56 7 543	TEAM: Harvey Scharer	DATE (4/2014) / TIME: 4/3/14 / 14:35 Strike/Dip of fault:
CT 170	7 543	Stock	
Note on local lit	hology:	Note on local ge	eomorphology:
active all	VIOM	active v	Nash (madery bar + swale
Confident this is	a real offset feature?	Confident that t	he geometry and projections chosen in
YES / NO	a real enset reatarer		CCURATE? YES / NO
DESCRIBE the ex	tent to which you can/car	nnot validate the meas	urement reported within the
	ude a sketch with piercing		
Max offset			

Min offset

Preferred offset, and explain what it is based on

Fault zone width (explain why)

Fault zone trend, and what it is based on (compass? 12°E magnetic declination, GeoXH?)

Feature extents

Quality rating of previous LiDAR measurement: none, poor, good, or very good (Explain why)

Quality rating of current field measurement: poor, good, or very good (include description to support the rating given)

cannot see fault location

to day I W side of likely fault trace is totally
eroded

LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84	TEAM:	DATE (4/2014) / TIME:
1-4/	N 38 22 958	Harvey Scharer	4-3-14 14:05
[7]	E 56 7 558	Stock	Strike/Dip of fault:
Note on local lit	hology:		ocal geomorphology:
W: Small	The weather my felsic	W8	fautt smooth hill wraps toward Foult The
V 6 C6	of weathering felsic		
ti folso	c lava, blacks, coffic	N E3	fault:
Confident this is	a real offset feature?	Confident	that the geometry and projections chosen in
YES / NO		screensno	t is ACCURATE? YES / NO
DESCRIBE the ex	ktent to which you can/ca	nnot validate the	measurement reported within the
screenshot. Incl	ude a sketch with piercing	points, if feature	is identified:
Max offset Min offset			
A PARTICULAR SERVICES DE CONTRACTOR DE	, and explain what it is ba	sed on	
Fault zone width		364 011	
		(compass? 12°E m	nagnetic declination, GeoXH?)
Feature extents			4
	121		good, or very good (Explain why)
		nt: poor, good, c	or very good (include description to support
the rating given	E side 15 not Th	esame as a	W so tope are expected
to b. 1.10.	set Nedly side St	ones might 1	nave been culving in map view e and millions were not p would have been a local
To be any ger	Carlon II	- 41 5/2011	e and hillsons were not
This w.	s or ginnally a	ur ved stap	a large breeze a local
hall had	same stope, Ih	e to militis	p would have seen
possible	sterestinate due	to unknow	n hillstope geometry
J			
		4.	
			*

LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84	TEAM:	DATE (4/2014) / TIME:
	N 38 22 845	Harvey Shaver	4-3-14 13:42
172	E 56 7517	Soct	Strike/Dip of fault:
Note on local lit	hology:	Note on local ge	eomorphology:
In white	Volc 10CK (Mod	ash tranch pit	3 day by military are
or hill stop	Q	nearly	0 /
hw 11 20- 1-		J	
Confident this is YES / NO	s a real offset feature?	Confident that t screenshot is AC	the geometry and projections chosen in CCURATE? YES / NO
	xtent to which you can/car ude a sketch with piercing		urement reported within the
Screenshot, mer	ade a sketch with piereing	points, ii reature is ide	ntineu.
Max offset			
Min offset	, and explain what it is bas	and on	
Fault zone width		sea on	
	d, and what it is based on (compass? 12°E magne	tic declination, GeoXH?)
Feature extents			1 (5-1 (-1)
			d, or very good (Explain why) y good (include description to support
the rating given		nt. poor, good, or ver	y good (melade description to support
Cannot see	e faut place. nate theasure the		
12/11.2.1	1 1 1 1 0 45 W. C. H.	+ ? par A	L (
C MAIN	The meanic me	ins from da	ia lat
E NECLZ	1999 photo	5	*
		4	

LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84	TEAM:	DATE (4/2014) / TIME:	
CT 170	N 38 22 781	Harvey	4/3/14 13:15	
CT 173	E 56 7 577	Scharl	Strike/Dip of fault:	
Note on local lit		Note on local ge	Note on local geomorphology:	
E. colluvi	MA	counted hill	slopes	
Maleisal— Confident this is YES / NO	y solver volcanite mulcous sa real offset feature?	screenshot is A0	the geometry and projections chosen in	
			male may be for close	
	ktent to which you can/car ude a sketch with piercing		urement reported within the entified:	
Max offset Min offset Preferred offset, and explain what it is based on Fault zone width (explain why) Fault zone trend, and what it is based on (compass? 12°E magnetic declination, GeoXH?) Feature extents Quality rating of previous LiDAR measurement: none, poor, good, or very good (Explain why) Quality rating of current field measurement: poor, good, or very good (include description to support the rating given)				
May be or	o side profile .	la beoxiti-	ship est. from Liber	
Slope Cole	n on volc VX	on W side of that is sear on E	sde & fault.	
block of red-weathering nonvesicular magic larn on W side surfice.				
		4		
		*		

LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84	TEAM	1:	DATE (4/2014) / TIME:
17/16	N 38 22 697	(,	Harvey	11:49
1/4 (T	N 38 22 697 ED56 7 589	<	Stock	Strike/Dip of fault:
Note on local lit	hology: vesicla wpstream fav. Ldown stream	/	Note on local ge	omorphology:
Jeorope 1	La collava	M	rounded s	iones wohill (t)
Dearoll	en weathering volc	· vale	909	14 8 6 4
9121	en weathering voic	TOUR	smoolh slo	nos W & Tami
Confident this is	a real offset feature?	(Confident that th	ne geometry and projections chosen in
YES // NO			screenshot is AC	CURATE? (YES) / NO
DESCRIBE the ex	tent to which you can/ca	nnot va	lidate the measu	rement reported within the
screenshot. Inclu	ude a sketch with piercing	g points,	, if feature is ide	ntified:
Max offset				
Min offset				C u h
	and explain what it is ba	sed on		because slope is
Fault zone width	(explain wny) and what it is based on (compa	ss? 12°F magnet	ic declination, GeoXH?) to o unstable
Feature extents	, and what it is based on	Compa	oo. 12 1 magnet	while E
				or very good (Explain why)
Quality rating of the rating given)	current field measureme	nt: poo	or, good, or very	good (include description to support
	1 1 6 61 .	01/ 1	2 1	the late of the same
note: 400	1 of hillow & side is	U4 1	not have the	whed by olluvium+
Some	White Courted Die	44"	Tier	ea,
	Lide wich	erain 4 ct	due to	a coxy the fault
	lanc in A	u - 89	2	but not the Speet
	he Blow to	nhiou	us to an	can gooxy the fault but not the offset feature above + belowit
	,	0.7	- Ch	

	LITAA in MICCOA	TEARA.	DATE (4/2044) / TIDAE
LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84	TEAM: Harvey	DATE (4/2014) / TIME:
A 170	N 38 22 654	Schard	11-11-
CT 175	E 56 7 592	Stock	Strike/Dip of fault:
Note on local lit	hology:	Note on local	geomorphology:
bedrock (hannel upstream	14 rounded h	ulls vi/small clybsof
matic lave	- COA WITCHAIL	1. bedrock on	terop
downstream:	giorn aftered)	11/6	,
rock locally	hology: hannel upstream grown aftered o corred by talus		
Confident this is	a real offset feature?	Confident tha	t the geometry and projections chosen in
YES / NO			ACCURATE? YES) / NO
DECORIDE II		1 0	may have projection uncontainty
	rtent to which you can/car ude a sketch with piercing		asurement reported within the
Screenshot, mer	ade a sketch with piercing	, points, il leature is i	dentined.
Max offset			
Min offset			
Preferred offset	, and explain what it is bas	sed on	Kate.
Fault zone widtr	n (explain why) Me	compass? 12°F magr	netic declination, GeoXH?)
Feature extents	, and what it is based on t	compass: 12 Linagi	ietic decimation, deoxii: /
THE REPORTS STREET, AND SHOULD	previous LiDAR measurer	ment : none, poor, go	ood, or very good (Explain why)
Quality rating of	current field measurement	nt: poor, good, or ve	ery good (include description to support
the rating given)			
			×
~			w.
		*	3

LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84	TEAM:	DATE (4/2014) / TIME:
176	N 38 22 514	Harvey	4/3/2014 10:00
1 10	E 56 7 609		Strike/Dip of fault:
Note on local lit	hology:	Note on local ge	omorphology: Whear
(gully) in ve	(6) bedrock cham esicular majec lava	surfaces	Il with planar facture rregular surface of lava
dourstram;	talus slope (mai	The fault strand	to W not measured here
Confident this is	a real offset feature?	Confident that t	he geometry and projections chosen in
YES / NO		screenshot is AC	CURATE? YES / NO (strong libras)
			rement reported within the
screenshot. Incl	ude a sketch with piercing	points, if feature is ide	ntified:
Max offset			
Min offset			
	, and explain what it is bas		
Fault zone width	n (explain why) >/h	gully present	
Feature extents	l, and what it is based on (ometry uncotants
	nrevious LiDAR measurer		I, or very good (Explain why)
Quality rating of	current field measureme	nt noor good or very	good linclude description to support
the rating given)		he	of M
		acular in the Colo	es. Map
		Va va Jacque	个巨
	Vol Crack	ye sicular was color lava Vole bedrock	Į.
	Jax 4	chound	*
	17×1		- FAULT
tales	VISIBLE YAS and rockford & ween having c green ween	11 2/2025	Now o
(one MO	11.6	m dutance any	No la company
fault plans	VISUBTY	De h	Neen Known
too much rec	an locatal s	De0	week channels.
green	e menting .	100	
	green- wear on the	dhea wa	
	(constitute	4	
	C	100 101 0	2 6100 11-
DS(N 0681 01	682 068	5 0689 0692

	Turnet turnet		
LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84	TEAM: Schover	DATE (4/2014) / TIME:
1-7-7	N 38 22 251	Stock	4/2/14/8:00
/ /	E 56 7 637	Harven	Strike/Dip of fault:
Note on local lit	hology:		cal geomorphology:
volc	bedrock	1 '	ed hill-top
	myawhthe dike intermed compos		
YES / NO	s a real offset feature?		that the geometry and projections chosen in is ACCURATE? YES) / NO
			measurement reported within the
screenshot. Incl	ude a sketch with piercing	points, if feature	is identified:
Max offset Min offset		2017	ild full mens = 190 cm
	, and explain what it is bas	sed on	kgle Schaner
Fault zone widtl		compass? 12°F m	agnetic declination/GeoXH?)
Feature extents	- 12 P	pass	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,
,			, good, or very good (Explain why)
the rating given		nt: poor, good, d	r very good (include description to support
	,		
			*
	* '		
		4	
		7	
		. ///	0/2-
DSCN	0652 0657 0	0661 0666	0670

LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84	TEAM:	DATE (4/2014) / TIME:
	N 38	J Stock	4/2/14 1715
178 CT	E 56	J Harvey	Strike/Dip of fault:
Note on local lit	hology: ES Fau	Note on	local geomorphology:
beddel volc	thology: Estranger	time re	ound hulls or S side of drawnel
givind pha	nerity dike	1*	, , ,
white out in	at cut at a los	2.5	
1 The grains	nerity dike ed soil at scary he classes of dike	material	
Confident this is	a real offset feature?	Confiden	t that the geometry and projections chosen in
YES / NO		screensh	ot is ACCURATE? YES / NO
DECORIDE		uncesta	intype possible original carrative of change
		n/cannot validate th	e measurement reported within the
screenshot, inci	ude a sketch with pier	nulla points, il reatur	d Marinera.
Max offset		110 (10	ld them now - see data from 2012 field measurements
Min offset			Im I Honorismoll)
	, and explain what it i	s based on	VCI
Fault zone widtl	h (explain why)		4. Schare
Fault zone trend	d, and what it is based	on (compass? 12°E	magnetic declination, GeoX州?)
Feature extents			
Quality rating o	f previous LiDAR meas		or, good, or very good (Explain why)
Quality rating of Quality rating of	f previous LiDAR meas f current field measur		or, good, or very good (Explain why) or very good (include description to support
Quality rating of Quality rating of	f previous LiDAR meas f current field measur		
Quality rating of Quality rating of	f previous LiDAR meas f current field measur		
Quality rating of Quality rating of	f previous LiDAR meas f current field measur		
Quality rating of Quality rating of	f previous LiDAR meas f current field measur		
Quality rating of Quality rating of	f previous LiDAR meas f current field measur		
Quality rating of Quality rating of	f previous LiDAR meas f current field measur		
Quality rating of Quality rating of	f previous LiDAR meas f current field measur		
Quality rating of Quality rating of	f previous LiDAR meas f current field measur		
Quality rating of Quality rating of	f previous LiDAR meas f current field measur		
Quality rating of Quality rating of	f previous LiDAR meas f current field measur		
Quality rating of Quality rating of	f previous LiDAR meas f current field measur		
Quality rating of Quality rating of	f previous LiDAR meas f current field measur		
Quality rating of Quality rating of	f previous LiDAR meas f current field measur		
Quality rating o	f previous LiDAR meas f current field measur	ement: poor, good,	or very good (include description to support
Quality rating of Quality rating of	f previous LiDAR meas f current field measur	ement: poor, good,	or very good (include description to support
Quality rating of Quality rating of	f previous LiDAR meas f current field measur	ement: poor, good,	
Quality rating of Quality rating of	f previous LiDAR meas f current field measur	ement: poor, good,	or very good (include description to support
Quality rating of Quality rating of the rating given	f previous LiDAR meas f current field measur	ement: poor, good,	or very good (include description to support

LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84	TEAM:	DATE _/ (4/2014) / TIME:
1	N 38 22 155	Harvey School	4/2/14 16.32
1794	N 38 22 155 E 56 7 648		# 14 16.52 Strike/Dip of fault:
Note on local lit	hology:	Note on local ged	omorphology:
talus cover	within 5 m of fa	ut counded ut deser van	omorphology: In 1/5 - foes of fams. Mish absent on class.
sloves	of fault have ex	(no sel	ab for
	V		
YES / NO	s a real offset feature?	screenshot is ACC	ne geometry and projections chosen in CURATE? YES / NO
	xtent to which you can/car ude a sketch with piercing	nnot validate the measu	rement reported within the
Max offset			
Min offset	, and explain what it is bas	end on	Kate will measure
Fault zone width	· ·	sed on	Kate will measure
	d, and what it is based on (compass? 12°E magneti	ic declination, GeoXH?)
Feature extents			
	-		, or very good (Explain why)
the rating given		nt: poor, good, or very	good (include description to support
the rating given,	1		
		4	
		*	

DSCN

0600,603, 605,608,614,615,617,619,620,621,623/16/15

LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84	TEAM:	DATE (4/2014) / TIME:
10	N 38 22 036	Schuler	4/2/14 /674
180	E 56 7 641	Stock	Strike/Dip of fault:
Note on local lit	hology: thin manife of on Voc. VX. deflated paleosu	Note on local geo Alluvial of	omorphology: au
Confident this is YES NO	remoye from	Confident that the screenshot is ACC	ne geometry and projections chosen in CURATE? YES / NO
	tent to which you can/car ude a sketch with piercing		rement reported within the ntified:
Fault zone width Fault zone trend Feature extents Quality rating of Quality rating of the rating given)	, and what it is based on (compass? 12°E magneti ment: none, poor, good nt: poor, good, or very c wystram feeth	or very good (Explain why) good (include description to support be to very bload- Stream,

LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84	TEA		DATE (4/2014) / TIME:
	N 38 21 899	(i	Stock, schared	Strike/Dip of fault:
CT 181	E 56 7 669	7-7	arvey	Strike/Dip of fault:
Note on local lit	hology:		Note on local ged	
alluvia +	unded Talusdy		rounded hills	
3467C	unded folisof:		he headed it	rannel noupstream eguiv.
Intermed voll	the ly		7	1
compos.				
	a real offset feature?			e geometry and projections chosen in
YES / NO	NEMOVE From la	99 0	screenshot is ACC	CURATE? YES / NO
DESCRIBE the ex				rement reported within the
screenshot. Incl	ude a sketch with piercing	point	ts, if feature is iden	ntified:
NA			CT/S -	and by the the fault
Max offset Min offset			Mis & Side	there is in the fault there is no channel on the
	, and explain what it is bas	ed or	1 60	de here
Fault zone width				
	l, and what it is based on (comp	ass? 12°E magneti	c declination, GeoXH?)
Feature extents	' L'DAD			1/5 1 : - 1)
				, or very good (Explain why) good (include description to support
the rating given)		it. p	oor, good, or very	good (include description to support
00 /				Mag.
	beheard (harrel			, - of
	(hanner			
NMC	D wide alluvial		fault (Curi	ves) SE
1 (D pride alluvial	6	1	
blacks	pour fant			
<i>y</i> ,,	-blu!			
	modified by			+ 1 11000
	post - 6:0,0		A 90	himsh clister
	e. 6516M		a	nd 1.0K to beheaded
			cl	nd 1.0% for beheaded hannels
			*	
			*	

DSCN 0556 0589 0561 0564 0565

0568

LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84	TEAM: Scharer	DATE (4/2014) / TIME:
1.7/0	N 38 2 774	Stock Harvey	Strike/Dip of fault:
182	E 56 7 706	lynch !	Strike/Dip of fault:
Note on local li ral we true f talus wy lo bocks of will sheet wash on	thology: Volcome, thin verse wave block varmshe top-alloviel fan	er & founded broad mi	slopes
YES / NO	s a real offset feature? xtent to which you can/ca	screenshot is A	the geometry and projections chosen in CCURATE? YES / NO /hays with match on shear steel surement reported within the
screenshot. Inc	lude a sketch with piercing	g points, if feature is id	entified:
Fault zone widt Fault zone trend Feature extents Quality rating o	d, and what it is based on the following of the following	(compass? 12°E magne ment : none, poor, goo ent: poor, good) or ver	the existing left jug the existing visit jug the exist jug
	1 270'CM	channel wid	thannel to south,
o then	April danage zone Nel Width 177 cm mers 10 cm frampage s	V 1 111	no pref measurement since downstream channel though fairty mary on has scarp collavium on it (an't see tralweg)

Photo IDs (If file names are similar, include photographer's initials: PSCN 0542, 0544, 0548

LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84	TEA		DATE (4/2014) / TIME:
	N 38 21 658		ly nich	4/2/14 1:40 AM
103 CT	E 56 7 727		Stock	Strike/Dip of fault: N345° E from M. H. Brunter
Note on local lithology:			Note on local ge	
talus fans,	In high scarp w			
talus and	Soil carbonate be low			
Eside scar	In high scarp wy soil carbonate be low p has orange expos g volcanic volk th	Wb)		
Confident this is a real offset feature?				he geometry and projections chosen in
YES // NO			screenshot is AC	CCURATE? YES ') NO
DESCRIBE the ex	ktent to which you can/ca	nnot v	147 -110 14.01	urement reported within the
screenshot. Incl	ude a sketch with piercing	g point	ts, if feature is ide	ntified:
Max offset				
Min offset				
Preferred offset	, and explain what it is bas	sed or	1	7/1.5 A 1 D
Fault zone widtr	I (explain why) $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{M}}$ I. and what it is based on ((comp	ass? 12°E magnet	cic declination, GeoXH?
Feature extents	,		Ö	D - Pantstr
Quality rating of	f previous LiDAR measurer	ment :	none, poor, good	d, or very good (Explain why)
the rating given		ent: p	oor, good, or very	good (include description to support
		. 1	1.1 0 1/n GV	100
o of the Mocks	· vase of riage on	N	side of the	
	1 CeoXH a	long	here. Filos	A (Cast hound) + B (W bound)
	side / (hahno!			A (East bound)+ B (W bound)
/	8)			
NZASE	S/ 6/10-		- t. 1	
+ _	18	fault	- 45W	
Sid.	channel			
, lake	(hannel			
5,11				
			*	

JMS: DSCN ONSG-

0451

0454

LiDAR # UTM in WGS84	TEAM: Harrey	DATE (4/2014) / TIME:
N 38 21 614	TEAM: Harrey	4/2/14 10-28
JT 184 E 567 740	4000	Strike/Dip of fault:
Note on local lithology: fals of the matic volclova angular to subangular bloc block dram & 20 cm	Note on local ged	omorphology:
talas of lat-matic volcieva	debris fan	
angular to subangular bloc	tes , no bedrock	exposure
block dram & 20 cm		
Confident this is a real offset feature?	Confident that th	e geometry and projections chosen in
YES / NO	screenshot is ACC	CURATE? YES / NO
,	later evollar	CURATE? YES / NO
DESCRIBE the extent to which you can/can	not validate the measu	rement reported within the
screenshot. Include a sketch with piercing p	points, if feature is ider	tified:
Maxoffset	data a munia	ann Mest
Min offset see JMS Note Dook for		
Preferred offset, and explain what it is based and sale and what it is based on to	ed on	de noted in field
Fault zone trend, and what it is based on (c	romnass 2 12°E magneti	c declination GenYH2)
Feature extents	ompass: 12 Linagneti	c decimation, deoxir: j
Quality rating of previous LiDAR measurem	ent : none. poor. good.	or very good (Explain why)
Quality rating of current field measuremen		
the rating given		40.00
max Sketch	+ nebblo	d 242° or N62°E
Coh	blerd	
Welling 1	on the land vile tress	1 242° or N62°E
Opport of 1	na weg	
chamel		*
11	oush - outside Achan	nel, intraviminate of
6 354+2 (m →)	> < forth te	nd, indicerninalises
W 2-14 6 Z		1
ainte d'appel & cregote hust	sind ace	
chappel * Cresote hus	1.	
(Marine)	, ,	
()		
1 - 2 - 4 - 4		
N 270° El Guer That (regulige	*	
V	8	

Photo IDs (If file names are similar, include photographer's initials: DSCN 0409,0414,0419, 0420429, 0428

LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84	TEAM: /r #	DATE (4/2014) / TIME:
185 CT	N 38 2 473	DL.	4-1-2014 18:00
165 (1	E 567 772	JMS	Strike/Dip of fault: N43° £ 9009
Note on local lit	hology:	Note on local g	geomorphology: Efacing
and sitic	thin talks on volc the of amphibit I volcyous factor milar of Minsol	obsetrida	e crest scarp.
	s a real offset feature?		the geometry and projections chosen in
Z \ \ \	idge crest		CCURATE? YES / NO.
			surement reported within the
screenshot. Incl	ude a sketch with piercin	g points, if feature is id	entified:
Fault zone widt Fault zone trend Feature extents Quality rating o	I, and what it is based on f previous LiDAR measure f current field measureme	(compass? 12°E magne ment: none, poor, good or ve	etic declination, GeoXH?) N143 Scand Bod, or very good (Explain why) ry good (include description to support Re N488 ± 0.5 m posthancus.
			1 18 to -01. 3M be swearfull.

PSCN 0391, 0396, 0401, 0404

	LITAL in MCCOA	TEADA.	DATE (4/2044) / TIME.	
LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84 N 38 21 360	He fruit, Scharer,	DATE (4/2014) / TIME:	
186 CT	E 56 - 786			
Chen Tao)	E 30 7 789	Ly de Stark	Strike/Dip of fault:	
Note on local lit		Note on local geo	omorphology:	
mapic b	edrock on both sides	10 undea	cover, significant jasper	
	Sides-	alluvia	cover, significantly	
6 61 111:	1 (() () 2			
VEC / NO	s a real offset feature?		ne geometry and projections chosen in CURATE? YES / NO W SPCAMY WAS	10
123 / 110		profiles to a	curate? yes / NO up streamy hotel	
DESCRIBE the ex	xtent to which you can/car	nnot validate the measu	rement reported within the	
screenshot. Incl	ude a sketch with piercing	points, if feature is ider	ntified:	2)
Max offset 7	M		rement reported within the both mobile was fault	
Min offset			,	
	, and explain what it is bas	sed on		
Fault zone width	h (explain why) d, and what it is based on (compass? 12°F magneti	c declination GeoVH2\	
Feature extents		compass: 12 Emagneti	c declination, GeoxH?)	no
			or very good (Explain why)	
Quality rating of the rating given			good (include description to support	
the rating given	1	In devuis 8	hast morphology	
Tis mean	- 4/a/20 14			
100 11900	1/0/2019	G. Ir NIPA	tooka 15 wrong an Lidar ist	
quality exc	iellent-	is a d	t	
1 1 1 1 1 1	1		1	
		- artifical	(Humination.	
	14 cho	aunel		
		1000	downs peau proble	
	9 7		ames up scarp,	
Shu	oller ridge		too short needs	
			to be inger.	
Kena	nne.	4		
*CVC	1		none fautt ruptures W	
, ,		8L	tench location?	
		\mathcal{D}		

Photo IDs (If file names are similar, include photographer's initials: D5CN 0405, 0933, 0935, 0936, 0937, F5CN 0934

LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84	TEAM:	DATE (4/2014) / TIME:
	N 38 21 050	Hanry	4-1-2014 16:53
187	E 56 7 842	STAK	Strike/Dip of fault:
Note on local lit	hology:	Note on local ge	eomorphology:
talus coverei	1 dopes & Soil-		
Confident this is	s a real offset feature?	Confident that t	he geometry and projections chosen in
YES / NO	Y- Shaped; orig geon	screenshot is AC	CCURATE? YES / NO) She for the large from fould
		4 1.0	urement reported within the
	ude a sketch with piercing		
Max offset			
Min offset			
Preferred offset	, and explain what it is bas n (explain why) 9 m —	sed on two solays based	tic declination, GeoXH?)
Fault zone trend	l, and what it is based on (compass? 12°E magne	tic declination, GeoXH?)
Feature extents Ouality rating of	f previous LiDAR measurer	ment : none poor good	d, or very good (Explain why)
Quality rating of	f current field measureme	nt: poor, good, or ver	y good (include description to support
the rating given	1	N/a	
		4	

J. Stock: DSCN 0384, 0390

LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84	TEAM:	DATE (4/2014) / TIME:
188 CT	N 38 20 7/1	O(H	4/1/2014 6.09
10101	E 56 7 93	Jins	Strike/Dip of fault:
Note on local lite	(E). If m of soil recorded magical	wh-	ocal geomorphology:
	(W) talus, alluy, sa		
YES / NO	s a real offset feature?		t that the geometry and projections chosen in ot is ACCURATE? YES / NO
			e measurement reported within the
screenshot. Incl	ude a sketch with piercing	points, if featur	e is identified:
Fault zone width Fault zone trend Feature extents Quality rating of Quality rating of the rating given	d, and what it is based on (f previous LiDAR measurer f current field measureme)	compass? 12°E in the second compass? 12°E in the second content of	magnetic declination, GeoXH?) or, good, or very good (Explain why) or very good (include description to support
channel on	Note side of fault d	or) but Car	rel to any channel visible on
due pobil	e also may have	Chosself a	and fault splay.
Þ		4	

Photo IDs (If file names are similar, include photographer's initials: J. Stock's DSCN 0355/0362

UTM in WGS84 TEAM: DATE (4/2014) / TIME: LiDAR# N 38 20 483 14:54 Lunch Strike/Dip of fault: Stock Note on local lithology: Note on local geomorphology: 2 strands of fault inge mostly tolus & volc 1x, soil + colluvium on top & terrace Confident this is a real offset feature? Confident that the geometry and projections chosen in screenshot is ACCURATE? YES / NO be boushall vide YES / NO DESCRIBE the extent to which you can/cannot validate the measurement reported within the screenshot. Include a sketch with piercing points, if feature is identified: Max offset Min offset Preferred offset, and explain what it is based on Fault zone width (explain why) (M - two strands. Fault zone trend, and what it is based on (compass? 12°E magnetic declination, GeoXH?) Feature extents Quality rating of previous LiDAR measurement: none, (poor) good, or very good (Explain why) Quality rating of current field measurement: poor, good, or very good (include description to support the rating given) lethology change @ foult

down slope of fault breaks: all a Vid torrace Oya 2 wheedowsh class coatings merefore ridge line slopes may not match up previous scarp here

Photo IDs (If file names are similar, include photographer's initials: DSCKI 0331, 0333, 0337, 0340, 0341, 0342

1:0004	UTM in WGS84	TEA	N/I•	DATE (4/2014) / TIME:		
LiDAR#				4/1/2014 1417		
190	N 38 20 267 E 56 8 06 8	1	Har vey	Strike/Dip of fault:		
/ -						
Note on local lithology: Note on local geomorphology:						
fault goinge of andosthe			hill slope 1!	soblighe to pople,		
	V		Change &	uflull + downhill,		
			hat easi	soblique to pofile, uphill + downhill, 1 to correl features at		
Confident this is a real offset feature? YES NO				ne geometry and projections chosen in		
TLS / NO			profiles h	curate? yes / no) try at are more do sely spread		
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			rement reported within the		
screenshot. Include a sketch with piercing points, if feature is identified:						
Max offset						
Min offset						
Preferred offset, and explain what it is based on						
Fault zone width (explain why) 3 m - 2 strand 5 here						
	d, and what it is based on (comp	bass? 12°E magneti	ic declination, GeoXH?)		
Quality rating of previous LiDAR measurement: none poor, good, or very good (Explain why)						
Quality rating of current field measurement: poor, good, or very good (include description to support						
the rating given) hot possible - prev. Visit view This site as ambig rous, calld not project gully hat Ft because of sag pond.						
	a	In!	ig hou) ca	ald not project		
	9'	ning	MA H	because of sag pond.		
				*		
			*			

not what and shows shot

14							
LiDAR#	UTM in WGS84	TEAM:	DATE (4/2014) / TIME:				
7	N 38 20 232	Stock	4/1/14 11:43 am				
(19/ (TC)	E 568 08 6	Harvey	Strike/Dip of fault: (336-120) John				
Note on local lithology: Volcanitastic Scd VX E of fault Volc IX (andesite?) w & fault-							
The state of the s	s a real offset feature?		Confident that the geometry and projections chosen in				
YES / NO		screenshot is AC	screenshot is ACCURATE? YES / NO				
DECCRIPE the av	utant ta vuhiah vav. aan /aas		uramant was arted within the				
DESCRIBE the extent to which you can/cannot validate the measurement reported within the screenshot. Include a sketch with piercing points, if feature is identified:							
Max offset Min offset Preferred offset, and explain what it is based on Fault zone width (explain why) Im gap between walls of scaps. Fault zone trend, and what it is based on (compass? 12°E magnetic declination, GeoXH?) Feature extents Quality rating of previous LiDAR measurement: none, poor, good, or very good (Explain why) Quality rating of current field measurement: poor, good, or very good (include description to support the rating given) BDS words an sweenshot do not correspond to his measured Feature and seem to be consistently to The sails.							
bedding measurement Lip 78° toward N65°E fundet (Included 120 E decl)							
faul	4 1						