

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	i
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	v
LIST OF FIGURES	vi
ABSTRACT	ix
INTISARI.....	x
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Problem Formulation.....	4
1.3 Research Objectives	8
1.4 Research Originality	8
1.5 Research Benefits	12
2. THEORY AND LITERATURE REVIEW	15
2.1 Earthquakes and Site Condition	15
2.2 Earthquake Hazard	16
2.3 Shear Wave Velocity and Vs30.....	18
2.3.1 MASW	18
2.3.2 Microtremor and HVSR Inversion.....	21
2.4 ShakeMap	25
2.5 Peak Ground Acceleration (PGA).....	25
2.6 Seismic Intensity	27
2.7 Geomorphology and Landform Unit.....	30
2.8 Landform unit Approach in the Study of Vs30 Model	32
2.9 Theoretical Background	33
3. RESEARCH METHOD	38
3.1 Research Location	38
3.2 Sample and Population	44
3.3 Material	48
3.4 Data Collecting Tools.....	48

3.5	Data Collection Techniques	50
3.5.1	Primary Data	50
3.5.2	Field Data Processing.....	53
3.6	Data Collection Techniques	53
3.6.1	MASW	53
3.6.2	Microtremors.....	54
3.7	Data and Research Results Analyzing.....	55
3.7.1	Field Data Analysis	55
3.7.2	Analysis of Research Results	56
4.	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.....	61
4.1	Characteristic and Spatial Distribution of Vs30 in Yogyakarta	61
4.1.1	Characteristic of Vs30 in Yogyakarta	61
4.1.2	Spatial Distribution of Vs30 in Yogyakarta.....	74
4.2	Landform Based Model of Vs30 for Earthquake Hazard Assessment in Yogyakarta	80
4.2.1	Vs30 Estimation Model based on Landform Unit	80
4.2.2	Comparison between Vs30 Estimation Model based on Landform Unit and USGS	89
4.2.3	Earthquake Hazard Assessment in Yogyakarta	95
5.	CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION.....	105
5.1	Conclusion.....	105
5.1.1	The Conclusion Related to the Characteristic and Spatial Distribution of Vs30 in Yogyakarta.....	105
5.1.2	The Conclusion Related to the Landform Based Model of Vs30 for Earthquake Hazard Assessment in Yogyakarta	106
5.2	Novelties of the Dissertation	107
5.3	Recommendation.....	107
	REFERENCES.....	109
	Appendix	117

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1.1 Comparison between previous research and this study	13
Table 2.1 Site classification SNI 1726-2012	18
Table 2.2 Modified Mercalli Intensity (MMI)	28
Table 2.3 The empirical correlation between MMI, PGA, PGV, perceived shaking and the potential damage that might be happened during an earthquake	29
Table 3.1 Number of sampling based on landform units	45
Table 4.1 The Vs30 values based on the MASW and microtremor analysis result	62
Table 4.2 The Vs30 values based on NSPT and microtremor	63
Table 4.3 The value of Vs30 analysis results at 545 sites by main-landform units	65
Table 4.4 The value of Vs30 analysis results at 545 sites by sub-landform units	65
Table 4.5 Regression coefficients and standard deviations of each simulation based on main-landform units	81
Table 4.6 Regression coefficients and standard deviations of each simulation based on sub-landform units	81

LIST OF FIGURES

	Page	
Figure 1.1	Tectonic setting of Indonesia	1
Figure 1.2	Seismicity map of Indonesia period 2009-2018	2
Figure 2.1	Attenuation of seismic waves	17
Figure 2.2	Schematic of MASW survey instrument	20
Figure 2.3	Step of acquisition and analysis of the MASW method	20
Figure 2.4	Basin models that contain fine sedimentary material	23
Figure 2.5	Examples of microtremor spectrum from HVSR analysis	24
Figure 2.6	Conceptual framework	37
Figure 3.1	Seismicity map of Yogyakarta and surrounding areas, period 2009 – 2020	49
Figure 3.2	Research area and main landform unit map in Yogyakarta region	42
Figure 3.3	Research area and sub landform unit map in Yogyakarta region	43
Figure 3.4	Distribution Map of Vs30 field measurement	46
Figure 3.5	A Set of MASW instrument	48
Figure 3.6	A Set of microtremor instrument	48
Figure 3.7	Microtremor record from site survey	50
Figure 3.8	Site survey implementation of microtremor	50
Figure 3.9	MASW record from site survey	51
Figure 3.10	Site survey implementation of MASW	51
Figure 3.11	Flowchart of the research steps	59
Figure 4.1	The example of the dispersion curve and 1D model of MASW	61
Figure 4.2	The example of the HVSR curve and the 1D model of microtremor	61
Figure 4.3	The relationship of Vs30 values between the MASW with and microtremor methods	63
Figure 4.4	The location of the drilling and microtremor	64
Figure 4.5	Spatial distribution map of Vs30 values by main landform unit	69
Figure 4.6	Mean value and standard deviation of Vs30 by main landform unit	69
Figure 4.7	Spatial distribution map of Vs30 values by sub landform unit	70

Figure 4.8	Mean value and standard deviation of Vs30 by main landform unit	70
Figure 4.9	Spatial distribution map of Vs30 values by elevation	71
Figure 4.10	Correlation of Vs30 value and elevation	71
Figure 4.11	Spatial distribution map of Vs30 values by slope	72
Figure 4.12	The correlation of Vs30 value and slope	72
Figure 4.13	Spatial distribution map of the Vs30 from site measurement	75
Figure 4.14	Spatial distribution map of site classification from site measurement	76
Figure 4.15	Spatial distribution map of the Vs30 from USGS	77
Figure 4.16	Spatial distribution map of site classification from USGS	78
Figure 4.17	Spatial distribution map of Vs30 by Model1 based on main-landform unit	83
Figure 4.18	Spatial distribution map of Vs30 by Model2 based on sub-landform unit.	84
Figure 4.19	Site classification map of Vs30 by Model1 based on main-landform unit	85
Figure 4.20	Site classification map of Vs30 by Model2 based on sub-landform unit	86
Figure 4.21	Comparison between Vs30 value from site measurement and Model	87
Figure 4.22	Difference between Vs30 value from site measurement and Model	87
Figure 4.23	Histogram of comparison of the Vs30 from site measurement and Model	87
Figure 4.24	Spatial distribution map of Vs30 by USGS and Vs30 values from site measurement	89
Figure 4.25	Comparison of the Spatial distribution map of Vs30	90
Figure 4.26	Comparison between Vs30 from site measurement and the estimated model by Model1, Model2, and USGS	91
Figure 4.27	Comparison of the difference between Vs30 from site measurement and the estimated model by Model1, Model2, and USGS	91
Figure 4.28	Histogram of comparison of the Vs30 from site measurement and Model1, Model2, and USGS	93
Figure 4.29	Comparison between Vs30 from site measurement and USGS	93

Figure 4.30	The ShakeMap scenario of the Yogyakarta earthquake on May 27, 2006 obtained with the Vs30 value of Model2	96
Figure 4.31	The ShakeMap scenario of the Yogyakarta earthquake on May 27, 2006 obtained with the Vs30 value of USGS	96
Figure 4.32	Geographic distribution of 2006 earthquake casualties	98
Figure 4.33	The ratio of house damage due to 2006 earthquake in Yogyakarta	98
Figure 4.34	Spatial correlation between earthquake damage pattern and general landform	100
Figure 4.35	The percentage of earthquake damage pattern and general landform	100
Figure 4.36	The percentage of landform in each earthquake damage	100
Figure 4.37	The ShakeMap scenario of the worst scenario for an earthquake in the Opak fault obtained with the Vs30 value of Model2	103
Figure 4.38	The ShakeMap scenario of the worst scenario for an earthquake in the Opak fault obtained with the Vs30 value of USGS	103