

PACIFIC EARTHQUAKE ENGINEERING RESEARCH CENTER

Performance-Based Robust Nonlinear Seismic Analysis with Application to Reinforced Concrete Highway Bridge Systems

> Xiao Liang Khalid M. Mosalam

Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering University of California, Berkeley

PEER Report No. 2016/10 Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center Headquarters at the University of California, Berkeley

December 2016

PEER 2016/10 December 2016

Disclaimer

The opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this publication are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the study sponsor(s) or the Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center.

Performance-Based Robust Nonlinear Seismic Analysis with Application to Reinforced Concrete Highway Bridge Systems

Xiao Liang Khalid M. Mosalam

Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering University of California, Berkeley

PEER Report 2016/10 Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center Headquarters at the University of California, Berkeley

December 2016

ABSTRACT

The performance-based earthquake engineering (PBEE) approach, developed at the Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center (PEER), aims to robustly decompose the performance assessment and design process into four logical stages that can be studied and resolved in a systematic and consistent manner. However, the PBEE approach faces two key challenges: (1) an accurate seismic structural analysis and (2) the selection and modification of ground motions (GMs). This report addresses these two challenges with application to reinforced concrete (RC) bridge systems.

In nonlinear structural dynamics, the most accurate analytical simulation method is the nonlinear time history analysis (NTHA). It involves the use of different types of direct integration algorithms and nonlinear equation solvers where their stability performance and convergence behaviors are of great significance. Lyapunov stability theory, the most complete framework for stability analysis of dynamical systems, is introduced in this study. Based on this theory, a new nonlinear equation solver is developed and its convergence performance theoretically formulated and verified by several examples. Stability is one of the most important properties of direct integration algorithms to consider for efficient and reliable NTHA simulations. Two Lyapunov-based approaches are proposed to perform stability analysis for nonlinear structural systems. The first approach transforms the stability analysis to a problem of existence, which can be solved via convex optimization. The second approach is specifically applicable to explicit algorithms for nonlinear single-degree-of-freedom and multi-degree-of-freedom systems considering strictly positive real lemma. In this approach, the stability analysis of the formulated nonlinear system is transformed to investigating the strictly positive realness of its corresponding transfer function matrix.

Ground motion selection and modification (GMSM) procedures determine the necessary input excitations to the NTHA simulations of structures. Therefore, proper selection of the GMSM procedures is an important prerequisite for accurate and robust NTHA simulation, and thus for the entire PBEE approach. Although many GMSM procedures are available, there is no consensus regarding a single accurate method, and many studies have focused on evaluating these procedures. This report develops a framework for probabilistic evaluation of the GMSM procedures in the context of a selected large earthquake scenario with bidirectional GM excitations.

In urban societies, RC highway bridges are key components of transportation infrastructure systems and play a significant role in transporting goods and people around natural terrains. Therefore, they are expected to sustain minor damage and maintain their functionality in the aftermath of major earthquakes, a common occurrence in California due to its many active faults. Accurate seismic structural analysis of existing and newly designed RC highway bridges is fundamental to estimate their seismic demands. As important lifeline structures, RC highway bridge systems are investigated as an application of the previously discussed theoretical developments proposed in this report to address the two key challenges in the PEER PBEE approach.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The work was supported primarily by California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) under contract number 65A0454. This Caltrans award and the administrative support of Mr. Peter Lee are greatly appreciated. Special thanks are due to Dr. Selim Günay for his technical input throughout the project. The authors would also like to thank Professor Farzin Zareian at the University of California, Irvine, for providing the OpenSees models of the analyzed bridges. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of Caltrans or the Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center.

ABS	STRAC'	Тi	ii
ACH	KNOWI	LEDGMENTS	v
CON	NTENT	S v	'ii
LIS	Г OF Т.	ABLES	ĸi
LIS	F OF F	IGURES x	V
1	INT	RODUCTION	.1
	1.1	Motivation and Objective	.1
	1.2	Organization of the Report	3
2	DIR	ECT INTEGRATION ALGORITHMS AND NONLINEAR SOLVERS	. 5
	2.1	Introduction	5
	2.2	Direct Integration Algorithms	6
		2.2.1 Explicit Newmark Algorithm	7
		2.2.2 Operator-Splitting Algorithm	7
		2.2.3 Implicit Newmark Algorithm	9
		2.2.4 TRBDF2 Algorithm	11
	2.3	Nonlinear Equation Solvers	12
		2.3.1 Regular Newton-Raphson Algorithm	13
		2.3.2 Broyden Algorithm	13
		2.3.3 Newton-Raphson with Line Search Algorithm	14
		2.3.4 Broyden–Fletcher–Goldfarb–Shanno Algorithm	14
		2.3.5 Krylov-Newton Algorithm	15
3	DEV	ELOPMENT OF LYAPUNOV-BASED NONLINEAR EQUATION	
	SOL	VER	17
	3.1	Introduction	17
	3.2	Stability of Nonlinear Systems	18
		3.2.1 Continuous-Time Systems	18
		3.2.2 Discrete-Time Systems	18
		3.2.3 Stability Definitions	18
	3.3	Lyapunov Stability Theory	19
		3.3.1 Continuous-Time Systems	19
		3.3.2 Discrete-Time Systems	19
	3.4	Lyapunov-Based Nonlinear Equation Solver	20
		3.4.1 Static Problems	21

CONTENTS

		3.4.2 Dynamic Problems	21
	3.5	Numerical Examples	23
		3.5.1 SDOF Nonlinear Static System	23
		3.5.2 Two-DOF Nonlinear Static System	26
		3.5.3 MDOF Nonlinear Dynamical System	29
4	NUN	IERICAL LYAPUNOV STABILITY ANALYSIS	43
	4.1	Introduction	43
	4.2	Direct Integration Algorithms	44
	4.3	Lyapunov Stability Analysis	45
	4.4	Numerical Lyapunov Analysis	50
		4.4.1 Softening Example	52
		4.4.2 Stiffening Example	52
	4.5	Accuracy Analysis	53
5	LYA	PUNOV STABILITY CONSIDERING STRICTLY POSITIVE REAL	
	LEM	IMA	59
	5.1	Introduction	59
	5.2	Mathematical Preliminaries	60
	5.3	Explicit Integration Algorithms	61
		5.3.1 Standard Single-Step Explicit Algorithms	61
		5.3.2 Predictor-Corrector Explicit Algorithms	62
	5.4	MDOF Nonlinear Systems	62
		5.4.1 MDOF Stiffening Systems	64
		5.4.2 MDOF Softening Systems	65
	5.5	Lyapunov Stability Analysis as a Problem of Convex Optimization	66
	5.6	Numerical Examples for SDOF Systems	69
		5.6.1 Stiffening Systems	70
		5.6.2 Softening Systems	71
	5.7	Numerical Examples for MDOF systems	72
		5.7.1 MDOF Bridge Structures	72
		5.7.2 Multi-Story Shear Building Structures	75
	5.8	Discussion of Broader Scope	78
6	DEV	ELOPMENT OF THE BENCHMARK PROBABILITY	
	DIST	FRIBUTION OF SEISMIC DEMANDS	81
	6.1	Introduction	81
	6.2	Benchmark Probability Distribution of Seismic Demands	82
	6.3	Evaluation of the GMSM Procedures	84

7	COM	IPUTATIONAL BRIDGE STRUCTURE MODELS	
	7.1	Introduction	85
	7.2	Bridge Structures	
	7.3	Computational Models	
		7.3.1 Material Properties	87
		7.3.2 Superstructure Modeling	
		7.3.3 Column-Bent Modeling	
		7.3.4 Abutment Modeling	90
8	APP	LICATION OF ROBUST INTEGRATION AND SOLUTION	
	ALG	ORITHMS SELECTION	
	8.1	Introduction	93
	8.2	Applicability of Integration Algorithms	94
		8.2.1 Explicit Newmark (EN) Algorithm	94
		8.2.2 Operator-Splitting (OS) Algorithm	94
		8.2.3 TRBDF2 Algorithm	96
	8.3	Parametric Study to Assess Convergence Properties of IN Algorithm	
		8.3.1 Type and Sequence of Nonlinear Equation Solvers	
		8.3.2 Convergence Test Type	101
		8.3.3 Convergence Tolerance	102
		8.3.4 Integration Time Step	104
		8.3.5 Adaptive Swiching of Integration Algorithms	104
	8.4	Seismic Response of Bridges	
9	PRO	BABILISTIC EVALUATION OF GROUND-MOTION SELECTION	N
	AND	MODIFICATION PROCEDURES	113
	9.1	Introduction	
	9.2	Earthquake Scenario	
	9.3	Benchmark Probability Distribution of Seismic Demands	114
	9.4	GMSM Procedures	
		9.4.1 $S_{a}(T_{1})$ Selection and Scaling Method	
		9.4.2 Conditional Mean Spectrum (CMS) Method	
		9.4.3 Unconditional Selection (US) Method	
	9.5	Evaluation of the GMSM Procedures	
10	SUM	MARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND FUTURE EXTENSIONS	
	10.1	Summary	
	10.2	Conclusions	
	10.3	Future Extensions	

REFERENCES.		5
APPENDIX A ANALYS	BASE FUNCTIONS USED FOR NUMERICAL STABILITY SIS	51
APPENDIX B	DERIVATION OF α and β for the bridge structure 16	3
APPENDIX C SHEAR I	DERIVATION OF α AND β FOR THE MULTI-STORY BUILDING	57
APPENDIX D BUILDIN	NUMERICAL RESULTS FOR THE TWO-STORY SHEAR NG16	<i>i</i> 9
APPENDIX E IN CHAI	DOCUMENTATION OF THE UTILIZED GROUND MOTIONS PTER 8	'1
APPENDIX F: IN CHAI	DOCUMENTATION OF THE UTILIZED GROUND MOTIONS PTER 9	95

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1	Documentation of the GM used for the two-DOF nonlinear dynamical system
Table 3.2	The execution time for the two-DOF example #1
Table 3.3	The average numbers of iterations per time step for the two-DOF example35
Table 3.4	The average numbers of iterations per time step for the five-DOF and ten- DOF examples
Table 4.1	Coefficients for the Newmark and the OS Integration Algorithms45
Table 4.2	Coefficients of approximation operators for the Newmark and the OS Integration Algorithms
Table 4.3	Conditions for $\rho(\mathbf{A}_i) \le 1$
Table 4.4	Nonlinear pendulum
Table 5.1	Elements of A matrix for PCE algorithms65
Table 5.2	Coefficients of MDOF stiffening and softening systems
Table 5.3	The <i>k</i> values of different SSE algorithms for stiffening and softening systems
Table 5.4	The <i>k</i> values of different generalized- α PCE algorithms for stiffening and softening systems
Table 5.5	The \bar{k} of each basic resisting force for the bridge structure
Table 5.6	The \bar{k} of each basic resisting force for the bridge structure for different λ and cost function
Table 5.7	The \bar{k} of each basic resisting force for the 20-story shear building
Table 7.1	Characteristics of the selected bridges
Table 8.1	MDOF eoefficients for the Newmark and the OS integration algorithms94
Table 8.2	The convergence failure time [sec] of simulations for different initial nonlinear solvers under GM31 for Bridge A with Type II abutment modeling
Table 8.3	Total number of iterations for simulations with different convergence tests under GM31 for Bridge A with Type II abutment modeling102
Table 8.4	<i>Max_{error}</i> in longitudinal deformation of node 100 for GM31 (different convergence tests) for Bridge A with Type II abutment modeling102
Table 8.5	The convergence failure time [sec] of simulations for different integration time steps under GM31 for Bridge A with abutment modeling105

Table 8.6	The convergence failure time [sec] of simulations for different implicit integration methods	106
Table B.1	List of elements contributing to the restoring force associated with each DOF	164
Table E.1	Documentation of 40 pulse-like GMs	173
Table E.2	Documentation of 40 GMs of <i>CMS</i> group of Bridge A with Type I abutment modeling for 50% POE in 50 years.	174
Table E.3	Documentation of 40 GMs of <i>CMS</i> group of Bridge A with Type II abutment modeling for 50% POE in 50 years.	175
Table E.4	Documentation of 40 GMs of <i>CMS</i> group of Bridge A with Type I abutment modeling for 10% POE in 50 years.	176
Table E.5	Documentation of 40 GMs of <i>CMS</i> group of Bridge A with Type II abutment modeling for 10% POE in 50 years.	177
Table E.6	Documentation of 40 GMs of <i>CMS</i> group of Bridge A with Type I abutment modeling for 2% POE in 50 years.	178
Table E.7	Documentation of 40 GMs of <i>CMS</i> group of Bridge A with Type II abutment modeling for 2% POE in 50 years.	179
Table E.8	Documentation of 40 GMs of reference group of Bridge A for 50% POE in 50 years.	180
Table E.9	Documentation of 40 GMs of reference group of Bridge A for 10% POE in 50 years.	181
Table E.10	Documentation of 40 GMs of reference group of Bridge A for 2% POE in 50 years.	182
Table E.11	Documentation of 40 GMs of <i>CMS</i> group of Bridge B for 50% POE in 50 years.	183
Table E.12	Documentation of 40 GMs of <i>CMS</i> group of Bridge B for 10% POE in 50 years.	184
Table E.13	Documentation of 40 GMs of <i>CMS</i> group of Bridge B for 2% POE in 50 years.	185
Table E.14	Documentation of 40 GMs of reference group of Bridge B for 50% POE in 50 years.	186
Table E.15	Documentation of 40 GMs of reference group of Bridge B for 10% POE in 50 years.	187
Table E.16	Documentation of 40 GMs of reference group of Bridge B for 2% POE in 50 years.	188

Table E.17	Documentation of 40 GMs of <i>CMS</i> group of Bridge C for 50% POE in 50 years.	189
Table E.18	Documentation of 40 GMs of <i>CMS</i> group of Bridge C for 10% POE in 50 years.	190
Table E.19	Documentation of 40 GMs of <i>CMS</i> group of Bridge C for 2% POE in 50 years.	191
Table E.20	Documentation of 40 GMs of reference group of Bridge C for 50% POE in 50 years.	192
Table E.21	Documentation of 40 GMs of reference group of Bridge C for 10% POE in 50 years.	193
Table E.22	Documentation of 40 GMs of reference group of Bridge C for 2% POE in 50 years.	194
Table F.1	Documentation of 60 GMs used for the development of benchmark PDSD	197
Table F.2	Documentation of 40 GMs of $S_a(T_1)$ procedure for Bridge A with Type I	
	abutment modeling	199
Table F.3	Documentation of 40 GMs of $S_a(T_1)_p$ procedure for Bridge A with Type I abutment modeling	200
Table F.4	Documentation of 40 GMs of $S_a(T_1)$ procedure for Bridge A with Type II abutment modeling	201
Table F.5	Documentation of 40 GMs of $S_a(T_1)_p$ procedure for Bridge A with Type II abutment modeling	202
Table F.6	Documentation of 40 GMs of <i>CMS</i> procedure for Bridge A with Type I abutment modeling	203
Table F.7	Documentation of 40 GMs of <i>CMS</i> procedure for Bridge A with Type II abutment modeling	204
Table F.8	Documentation of 40 GMs of US procedure for Bridge A.	205
Table F.9	Documentation of 40 GMs of $S_a(T_1)$ procedure for Bridge B.	206
Table F.10	Documentation of 40 GMs of $S_a(T_1)_p$ procedure for Bridge B	207
Table F.11	Documentation of 40 GMs of CMS procedure for Bridge B	208
Table F.12	Documentation of 40 GMs of US procedure for Bridge B.	209
Table F.13	Documentation of 40 GMs of $S_a(T_1)$ procedure for Bridge C	210
Table F.14	Documentation of 40 GMs of $S_a(T_1)_p$ procedure for Bridge C	211
Table F.15	Documentation of 40 GMs of CMS procedure for Bridge C	212

Table F.16Documentation of 40 GMs of US procedure for Bridge C.213

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1	Classification of report chapters.	4
Figure 3.1	The sketch of the restoring force for the SDOF nonlinear static system	24
Figure 3.2	Traces of equilibrium search for the SDOF example using the regular NR algorithm.	24
Figure 3.3	Traces of equilibrium search for the SDOF example using the proposed Lyapunov-based algorithm	26
Figure 3.4	Two-DOF nonlinear system	27
Figure 3.5	Force-deformation relationships of the two springs.	27
Figure 3.6	Traces of equilibrium search for the two-DOF static example using the regular NR algorithm.	28
Figure 3.7	Traces of equilibrium search for the two-DOF static example using the proposed Lyapunov-based algorithm	29
Figure 3.8	General multi-story shear building structures	30
Figure 3.9	Hysteresis relationship of the story ressiting force versus the story drift	31
Figure 3.10	Plots of the ground accelerations for the GM used in this example.	31
Figure 3.11	Time history displacements for the two-DOF dynamic example obtained from the two nonlinear solution algorithms for GM1 with $SF = 2.0$	32
Figure 3.12	Time history displacements for the two-DOF dynamic example obtained from the two nonlinear solution algorithms for GM2 with $SF = 3.0$	33
Figure 3.13	Traces of equilibrium search for the two-DOF dynamic example using the two nonlinear solution algorithms for GM1 with $SF = 2.0$	34
Figure 3.14	Traces of equilibrium search for the two-DOF dynamic example using the two nonlinear solution algorithms for GM2 with $SF = 3.0$	34
Figure 3.15	Time history displacements for the two-DOF dynamic example obtained from the two nonlinear solution algorithms for GM1 with $SF = 3.0$	35
Figure 3.16	Time history displacements for the two-DOF dynamic example obtained from the two nonlinear solution algorithms for GM2 with $SF = 7.5$	35
Figure 3.17	Time history displacements for the two-DOF dynamic example obtained from the two nonlinear solution algorithms for GM1 with $SF = 3.0$	36
Figure 3.18	Traces of equilibrium search for the two-DOF dynamic example using the two nonlinear solution algorithms for GM2 with $SF = 7.5$	36

Figure 3.19	Time history displacements for the five-DOF dynamic example obtained from the two nonlinear solution algorithms for GM1 with $SF = 4.5$	37
Figure 3.20	Time history displacements for the five-DOF dynamic example obtained from the two nonlinear solution algorithms for GM2 with $SF = 4.5$	37
Figure 3.21	Time history displacements for the five-DOF dynamic example obtained from the two nonlinear solution algorithms for GM1 with $SF = 4.5$	38
Figure 3.22	Traces of equilibrium search for the five-DOF dynamic example using the two nonlinear solution algorithms for GM2 with $SF = 4.5$	38
Figure 3.23	Time history displacements for the ten-DOF dynamic example obtained from the two nonlinear solution algorithms for GM1 with $SF = 2.0$	39
Figure 3.24	Time history displacements for the ten-DOF dynamic example obtained from the two nonlinear solution algorithms for GM2 with $SF = 4.5$	40
Figure 3.25	Time history displacements for the ten-DOF dynamic example obtained from the two nonlinear solution algorithms for GM1 with $SF = 2.0$	41
Figure 3.26	Traces of equilibrium search for the ten-DOF dynamic example using the two nonlinear solution algorithms for GM2 with $SF = 4.5$	41
Figure 4.1	Definition of stiffening and softening systems.	44
Figure 4.2	Time history plot of the displacement of an unstable example with $\rho(\mathbf{A}_i) = 1$	49
Figure 4.3	Schematic illustration of discretization process	52
Figure 4.4	Schematic illustration of the nonlinear pendulum in a general deformed state.	55
Figure 4.5	Period elongation and amplitude decay for the pendulum problem with $\theta_0 = 0.10\pi$	56
Figure 4.6	Period elongation and amplitude decay for the pendulum problem with $\theta_0 = 0.50\pi$	57
Figure 5.1	Schematic illustrations of two nonlinear systems with sector-bounded basic resisting forces	64
Figure 5.2	Nyquist plot of $H(z)$ for a stiffening system of the explicit Newmark algorithm.	70
Figure 5.3	Nyquist plot of $H(z)$ for a softening system of the explicit Newmark algorithm.	71
Figure 5.4	A MDOF bridge structure	72
Figure 5.5	General multi-story shear building structure.	75

Figure 5.6	δ^1 of different number of stories and damping values	79
Figure 5.7	Schematic illustrations of sector-bounded basic resisting forces not strictly stiffening or softening.	80
Figure 7.1	Configurations of the selected bridges	84
Figure 7.2	Modeling of Bridge B [Kaviani et al. 2014].	85
Figure 7.3	Column modeling scheme for Bridge B [Kaviani et al. 2014].	87
Figure 7.4	Configuration of a typical seat-type abutment [Kaviani et al. 2014]	88
Figure 7.5	Abutment modeling with springs and gap elements	89
Figure 7.6	Shear key force-deformation backbone curves [Kaviani et al. 2014]	90
Figure 8.1	Superstructure and the column bent of Bridge B	93
Figure 8.2	Maxerror of the OS algorithm for the three selected EDPs of Bridge B.	95
Figure 8.3	Comparison of the IN and OS algorithm results for NTHA of Bridge B with Type I abutment modeling (Ground motion #21 as an example)	97
Figure 8.4	Maxerror of the OS algorithm for the three selected EDPs of Bridge B.	97
Figure 8.5	The maximum scaling factors for 40 GMs.	103
Figure 8.6	<i>Max_{error}</i> of each tolerance for node 100 and node 12 (longitudinal displacement).	104
Figure 8.7	Campbell and Bozorgnia (CB) 2008 spectrum and <i>CMS</i> for 10% POE in 50 years for Bridge B site.	108
Figure 8.8	Ratios of median EDPs for the two abutment modeling cases of Bridge A	110
Figure 8.9	Ratios of median EDPs for the two abutment modeling cases of Bridge B	111
Figure 8.10	Ratios of median EDPs for the two abutment modeling cases of Bridge C	112
Figure 9.1	Ground-motion intercept angle scheme for the strike-normal component	113
Figure 9.2	Response spectra for the selected earthquake scenario of Bridge B site	114
Figure 9.3	<i>PDSD</i> estimates of column shear force of different intercept angles from $S_a(T_1)$ procedure for Bridge A	121
Figure 9.4	<i>PDSD</i> estimates of column drift ratio of different intercept angles from $S_a(T_1)$ procedure for Bridge A	122
Figure 9.5	<i>PDSD</i> estimates of abutment unseating displacement of different intercept angles from $S_a(T_1)$ procedure of for Bridge A.	123
Figure 9.6	<i>PDSD</i> estimates of column shear force of different intercept angles from $S_a(T_1)_p$ procedure for Bridge A	124

Figure 9.7	<i>PDSD</i> estimates of column drift ratio of different intercept angles from $S_a(T_1)_p$ procedure for Bridge A	125
Figure 9.8	<i>PDSD</i> estimates of abutment unseating displacement of different intercept angles from $S_a(T_1)_p$ procedure for Bridge A	126
Figure 9.8	<i>PDSD</i> estimates of column shear force of different intercept angles from <i>CMS</i> procedure for Bridge A.	127
Figure 9.10	<i>PDSD</i> estimates of column drift ratio of different intercept angles from <i>CMS</i> procedure for Bridge A.	128
Figure 9.11	<i>PDSD</i> estimates of abutment unseating displacement of different intercept angles from <i>CMS</i> procedure for Bridge A.	129
Figure 9.12	<i>PDSD</i> estimates of column shear force of different intercept angles from <i>US</i> procedure for Bridge A.	130
Figure 9.13	<i>PDSD</i> estimates of column drift ratio of different intercept angles from <i>US</i> procedure for Bridge A.	131
Figure 9.14	<i>PDSD</i> estimates of abutment unseating displacement of different intercept angles from <i>US</i> procedure for Bridge A.	132
Figure 9.15	<i>PDSD</i> estimates of column shear force of different intercept angles from $S_a(T_1)$ procedure for Bridge B	133
Figure 9.16	<i>PDSD</i> estimates of column drift ratio of different intercept angles from $S_a(T_1)$ procedure for Bridge B	134
Figure 9.17	<i>PDSD</i> estimates of abutment unseating displacement of different intercept angles from $S_a(T_1)$ procedure for Bridge B	135
Figure 9.18	<i>PDSD</i> estimates of column shear force of different intercept angles from $S_a(T_1)_P$ procedure for Bridge B	136
Figure 9.19	<i>PDSD</i> estimates of column drift ratio of different intercept angles from $S_a(T_1)_p$ procedure for Bridge B	137
Figure 9.20	<i>PDSD</i> estimates of abutment unseating displacement of different intercept angles from $S_a(T_1)_p$ procedure for Bridge B	138
Figure 9.21	<i>PDSD</i> estimates of column shear force of different intercept angles from <i>CMS</i> procedure for Bridge B.	139
Figure 9.22	<i>PDSD</i> estimates of column drift ratio of different intercept angles from <i>CMS</i> procedure for Bridge B.	140
Figure 9.23	<i>PDSD</i> estimates of abutment unseating displacement of different intercept angles from <i>CMS</i> procedure for Bridge B.	141

Figure 9.24	PDSD estimates of column shear force of different intercept angles fromUS procedure for Bridge B.142
Figure 9.25	PDSD estimates of column drift ratio of different intercept angles from US procedure for Bridge B. 143
Figure 9.26	<i>PDSD</i> estimates of abutment unseating displacement of different intercept angles from <i>US</i> procedure for Bridge B
Figure 9.27	<i>PDSD</i> estimates of column drift ratio of different intercept angles from $S_a(T_1)$ and $S_a(T_1)_p$ procedures for Bridge C with Type I abutment modeling
Figure 9.28	<i>PDSD</i> estimates of column drift ratio of different intercept angles from $S_a(T_1)$ and $S_a(T_1)_p$ procedures for Bridge C with Type II abutment modeling
Figure 9.29	<i>PDSD</i> estimates of column drift ratio of different intercept angles from <i>CMS</i> and <i>US</i> procedures for Bridge C with Type I abutment modeling
Figure 9.30	<i>PDSD</i> estimates of column drift ratio of different intercept angles from <i>CMS</i> and <i>US</i> procedures for Bridge C with Type II abutment modeling148
Figure B.1	A MDOF bridge with identified DOFs and element numbers164

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 MOTIVATION AND OBJECTIVE

The response of a structure to earthquake excitation and the consequences of this response involve various uncertainties at different stages, including the definition of hazard, structural response, damage, and the corresponding loss determination. The performance-based earthquake engineering (PBEE) approach, developed at the Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center (PEER), aims to robustly divide the performance assessment and design process into logical stages that can be studied and resolved in a systematic and consistent manner [Moehle and Deierlein 2004]. Thus, uncertainties in these stages can be explicitly taken into account to enable comprehensive understanding of the structural performance in a probabilistic manner to determine the most efficient decision regarding the seismic risk mitigation actions [Günay and Mosalam 2013], requiring considerable numbers of structural simulations. Due to physical, economical, and time constraints, experimental testing is not feasible as the sole structural simulator in PBEE. Alternatively, analytical simulations, where the analytical models are calibrated using the results of the experimental tests, fit reasonably well within the PBEE framework.

One of the key challenges involved in the PBEE approach is accurate and robust seismic structural analysis. In nonlinear structural dynamics, nonlinear time history analysis (NTHA) is considered the most accurate analytical simulation method. Using this approach, direct integration algorithms in conjunction with nonlinear equation solvers are used to solve the temporally discretized equations of motion that govern the structural responses under dynamic loading. Therefore, the selection of direct integration and nonlinear solution algorithms is essential to ensure accurate and robust NTHA. The used integration algorithms are fundamentally categorized into either implicit or explicit. Explicit algorithms do not require iterations by adopting certain approximations related to the kinematics of the structural system. In contrast, implicit algorithms involve iterations and must be complemented by nonlinear equation solvers when applied to nonlinear structural systems. The most standard nonlinear equation solver is the regular Newton-Raphson (NR) algorithm. Although major drawbacks exist, a new nonlinear equation solver is developed in this report based on Lyapunov stability theory.

Stability is one of the most important properties of direct integration algorithms that must be considered for efficient and reliable simulations using NTHA. For linear structures, the stability analysis of direct integration algorithms is conducted using the *amplification operator* and its associated *spectral radius*. Such analysis provides useful insight for the selection of the suitable integration algorithm with the proper time step size to solve a dynamic problem. Integration algorithms, however, are usually applied to multi-degree-of-freedom (MDOF) nonlinear dynamic problems. Therefore, the stability analysis of direct integration algorithms involving nonlinear dynamics is necessary and should be extended to MDOF structural systems. Two Lyapunov-based approaches are proposed to conduct the stability analysis of direct integration algorithms for nonlinear structural systems.

Another key challenge in PBEE analyses is the selection and modification of ground motions (GMs) to serve as input excitations to simulate the NTHA of structures. The intricate nonlinear response of structures is highly sensitive to the ground motion selection and modification (GMSM) of the input records. Therefore, the GMSM of the input records are vital prerequisites for accurate seismic analysis. Numerous research efforts have focused on developing different GMSM procedures and fall into two categories: (1) amplitude scaling and (2) spectrum shape matching procedures.

The first approach selects and modifies the GM records based on scalar intensity measures (IMs). The second approach takes the spectrum shape into account to select and scale a suite of GM records that closely match a target spectrum. Although many GMSM procedures are available, there is a lack of consensus regarding a single accurate method. The existing evaluation studies in the literature are primarily for building structures and consider unidirectional input ground motion. In general, bidirectional GM studies should be conducted, especially for the structures with very different behaviors in two directions, e.g., bridge structures. To fill in this knowledge gap, a framework based on the PBEE approach is proposed to evaluate different GMSM procedures to conduct NTHA simulations under bidirectional GM excitations.

In urban societies, reinforced concrete (RC) highway bridges are key components of infrastructure systems and play a significant role in transportation of goods and people. Therefore, they are expected to sustain minor damage and maintain their functionality in the aftermath of earthquakes, a common occurrence in California due to its many active faults. In the last two decades, bridges designed according to modern design codes performed poorly performance or even collapsed during earthquakes [Benzoti et al. 1996]. Thus, accurate seismic structural analysis of existing and newly designed RC highway bridges is fundamental to estimate their seismic response. As such important lifeline structures, RC highway bridge systems are investigated as an application of the previously discussed theoretical developments proposed in this report to address the two key challenges in the PBEE approach.

The objective of this study is to enhance the PBEE approach in terms of accurate and robust NTHA simulations and probabilistic evaluation of GMSM procedures. In light of this objective, the major contributions of this study can be summarized as follows:

- 1. Development of a nonlinear equation solver that attempts to overcome the drawbacks of NR algorithms.
- 2. Development of a Lyapunov-based approach that enables performing the stability analysis numerically.
- 3. Development of a Lyapunov-based approach to investigate the stability of explicit direct integration algorithms for nonlinear MDOF systems by means of the *strictly positive real lemma*.
- 4. Recommendations of accurate and robust NTHA simulations for RC highway bridge systems.

5. Development of a framework to probabilistically evaluate GMSM procedures with application to RC highway bridge systems.

1.2 ORGANIZATION OF THE REPORT

This report is organized into ten chapters as schematically illustrated in Figure 1.1. After this introductory chapter, Chapter 2 reviews the direct integration algorithms and nonlinear equation solvers investigated herein. The theoretical developments are presented in Chapters 3 through 6. Chapter 3 introduces the concept of continuous-time and discrete-time systems and the definitions of stability, and then introduces the Lyapunov stability theory for these two systems. Next, a new nonlinear equation solver is developed to overcome the drawbacks of the NR algorithms, and its convergence performance is demonstrated by several numerical examples. Chapters 4 and 5 utilize the Lyapunov stability theory for discrete-time systems to investigate the stability of direct integration algorithms for nonlinear structural systems. Chapter 4 proposes a numerical approach to transform the problem of seeking a Lyapunov function to a convex optimization problem, i.e., an approach that enables performing the stability analysis numerically. In addition, the accuracy of the integration algorithms is examined using a geometrically nonlinear problem, which has a closed-form exact solution. Chapter 5 proposes another Lyapunov-based approach to investigate the stability of explicit direct integration algorithms for nonlinear MDOF systems by means of the strictly positive real lemma. This approach transforms the stability analysis to pursuing the strictly positive realness of the transfer function matrix for the formulated MDOF system. Several examples, including a bridge structure and a generic multi-story shear building, are presented in this chapter to demonstrate the validity of this approach. Chapter 6 introduces the well-known PEER PBEE approach and presents a framework for probabilistic evaluation of GMSM procedures.

The application of the theoretical developments in Chapters 3 through 6 is presented in Chapters 7, 8, and 9. Chapter 7 provides a brief introduction of RC highway–bridge structures selected in this study and reviews the computational models of these bridges. Chapter 8 investigates solutions to the numerical problems of convergence experienced in the NTHA simulations of these RC highway bridge systems. Recommendations are given in Chapters 8 for the accurate and robust NTHA simulations. Chapter 9 probabilistically evaluates several GMSM procedures considering the distinct structural behaviors in the longitudinal and transverse directions of RC highway bridges under bidirectional GM excitations. A brief summary, the main conclusions and future extension based on this study are presented in Chapter 10. This report also includes six appendices. Appendices A to E provide the derivations and details used for the proposed two Lyapunov-based approaches of stability analysis. Appendices E and F document all GMs utilized in this report.



Figure 1.1 Classification of report chapters.

2 DIRECT INTEGRATION ALGORITHMS AND NONLINEAR SOLVERS

2.1 INTRODUCTION

The response of a structure to earthquake excitation and the consequences of this response involve various uncertainties at different stages, including the definition of hazard, structural response, damage, and the corresponding loss determination. The performance-based earthquake engineering (PBEE) approach considers all these uncertainties to determine the most efficient methodology to mitigate the seismic risk [Günay and Mosalam 2013], requiring a considerable number of structural analytical simulations. Because of the continued advances in computing power [Mosalam et al. 2013], nonlinear time history analysis (NTHA) method has emerged as the most suitable approach for analyzing large and complex structures.

The structural response under dynamic loading is governed by the differential equations of motion. In structural dynamics, direct integration algorithms are commonly used to solve these equations of motion after they are temporally time-discretized. Various implicit and explicit direct integration methods have been developed. Some examples of well-known methods are the Newmark family of algorithms [Newmark 1959], Hilber-Hughes-Taylor (HHT) algorithm [Hilber et al. 1977], the Operator-Splitting (OS) algorithms [Hughes et al. 1979], the generalized- α algorithm [Chung and Hulbert 1993], and the TRBDF2 algorithm [Bathe 2007], among many others.

Direct integration algorithms for solving a structural dynamics problem are fundamentally categorized into either implicit or explicit. An integration algorithm is explicit when the responses of the next time step depend on the responses of previous and current time steps only. In contrast, implicit algorithms require iterations because the responses of the next time step depend on the responses of previous, current, and next time steps. Explicit algorithms do not require iterations by adopting certain approximations related to the kinematics of the structural system. In contrast, implicit algorithms involve iterations and need to be complemented by nonlinear equation solvers when applied to nonlinear structural systems.

The most standard nonlinear equation solver is the Newton-Raphson (NR) algorithm where its local rate of convergence is quadratic [Bathe 2006]. It requires computing and inverting the Jacobian matrix explicitly at every iteration, potentially leading to excessive computations. The modified NR algorithm holds the Jacobian matrix constant as the one from the first iteration over the time step. It has a lower computational cost per iteration than the regular NR algorithm but possesses only linear local rate of convergence. For both modified and regular NR algorithms, the search directions can be improved by line search techniques [Crisfield 1991] when a positive definite Jacobian matrix is obtained. This improvement may not always be appropriate in the cases with degrading materials and analyses involving large displacements. Quasi-Newton methods seek a compromise between the modified and regular NR algorithms by modifying the Jacobian matrix with low-rank updates during the search for equilibrium, resulting in a superlinear rate of convergence. Some examples of Quasi-Newton algorithms are the Broyden algorithm [Broyden 1965] and the Broyden–Fletcher–Goldfarb–Shanno (BFGS) algorithm [Broyden 1970; Fletcher 1970; Goldfarb 1970; and Shanno 1970]. The Krylov-Newton algorithm also seeks a balance between the regular and modified NR algorithms by matrix-vector operations [Scott and Fenves 2010]. The subsequent sections introduce the direct integration algorithms and nonlinear equation solvers presented herein.

2.2 DIRECT INTEGRATION ALGORITHMS

The equations of motion of a multi-degree-of-freedom (MDOF) system under an external dynamic force excitation can be defined as follows:

$$\mathbf{m}\ddot{\mathbf{u}} + \mathbf{c}\dot{\mathbf{u}} + \mathbf{f} = \mathbf{p} \tag{2.1}$$

where **m** is the mass matrix, **c** is the damping matrix, and $\ddot{\mathbf{u}}$, $\dot{\mathbf{t}}$, and **p** are the acceleration, velocity, restoring force, and external force vectors, respectively. The restoring force can generally be defined as a function of displacement. Due to several factors, such as the random variation of the external force with time—e.g., due to earthquake shaking—and the nonlinear variation of the restoring force vector with displacement, closed-form solution of Equation (2.1) is not possible [Chopra 2006]. Therefore, numerical integration methods are used for the sought solution.

Differences between direct integration methods are mainly introduced by the way they approach Equations (2.2)–(2.4), arranged as the Newmark difference equations for displacement and velocity, and the discretized dynamic equilibrium equation, respectively.

$$\mathbf{u}_{i+1} = \mathbf{u}_i + (\Delta t)\dot{\mathbf{u}}_i + \frac{(\Delta t)^2}{2} \left[(1 - 2\beta)\ddot{\mathbf{u}}_i + 2\beta \ddot{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1} \right]$$
(2.2)

$$\dot{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1} = \dot{\mathbf{u}}_i + (\Delta t) [(1-\gamma) \ddot{\mathbf{u}}_i + \gamma \ddot{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1}]$$
(2.3)

$$\mathbf{m}\ddot{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1} + \mathbf{c}\dot{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1} + \mathbf{f}_{i+1} = \mathbf{p}_{i+1}$$
(2.4)

where the γ and β parameters define the variation of accelerations over a time step, Δt . For example, $\gamma = 1/2$ and $\beta = 1/4$ represent constant average acceleration over the time step, while $\gamma = 1/2$ and $\beta = 1/6$ define linear variation of acceleration during the time step.

The following sub-sections describe the alternative integration methods and their corresponding algorithms, namely the Explicit Newmark, Operator-Splitting, and TRBDF2 integrators and the commonly utilized Implicit Newmark integration method, and the corresponding algorithms. This description begins with the basic three Equations (2.2)–(2.4) and emphasizes departure points and differences between these methods.

2.2.1 Explicit Newmark Algorithm

Explicit Newmark (EN) integration [Newmark 1959] is defined by setting $\beta = 0.0$. Thus, the implicit nature of Equation (2.2) is eliminated, making the method an explicit one, by removal of the $\ddot{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1}$ term. Accordingly, Equation (2.2) becomes

$$\mathbf{u}_{i+1} = \mathbf{u}_i + \left(\Delta t\right) \dot{\mathbf{u}}_i + \frac{\left(\Delta t\right)^2}{2} \ddot{\mathbf{u}}_i$$
(2.5)

Substituting Equations (2.3) and (2.5) in Equation (2.4), the linear system of equations defined by Equations (2.6) is obtained, which can be solved to determine the acceleration. Subsequently, Equation (2.3) is used to determine the velocity.

$$\mathbf{m}_{\text{eff}} \mathbf{u}_{i+1} = \mathbf{p}_{\text{eff}}$$

$$\mathbf{m}_{\text{eff}} = \mathbf{m} + (\Delta t) \gamma \mathbf{c}$$

$$\mathbf{p}_{\text{eff}} = \mathbf{p}_{i+1} - \mathbf{f}_{i+1} - \mathbf{c} \Big[\dot{\mathbf{u}}_i + (\Delta t) (1 - \gamma) \ddot{\mathbf{u}}_i \Big]$$
(2.6)

The algorithm for an integration time step of the EN method is summarized as follows:

- 1. Compute the displacement using Equation (2.2);
- Obtain the restoring force, f, corresponding to the computed displacement from the constitutive relationships of the defined materials and elements using a state determination method [Spacone et al. 1996];
- 3. Calculate the acceleration by solving the linear system of equations defined by Equations (2.6);
- 4. Determine the velocity using Equation (2.3); and
- 5. Increment *i* and proceed with the next integration time step.

2.2.2 Operator-Splitting Algorithm

Similar to the EN method, the Operator-Splitting (OS) method [Hughes et al. 1979] eliminates the implicit nature of the solution algorithm. Instead of the direct elimination adopted by the EN, OS uses a prediction-correction technique. The predicted displacement, $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1}$, is obtained by neglecting the $\ddot{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1}$ term in the bracketed part of Equation (2.2), i.e.,

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1} = \mathbf{u}_i + (\Delta t)\dot{\mathbf{u}}_i + \frac{(\Delta t)^2}{2} [(1 - 2\beta)\ddot{\mathbf{u}}_i]$$
(2.7)

After prediction of the displacement, the method is defined by setting the restoring force of the integration time step as the sum of the restoring force corresponding to the predicted displacement, $\tilde{\mathbf{f}}_{i+1}$, and the difference between the corrected and predicted displacements multiplied by the tangential stiffness matrix, \mathbf{k}_T , i.e.,

$$\mathbf{f}_{i+1} = \widetilde{\mathbf{f}}_{i+1} + \mathbf{k}_T \left(\mathbf{u}_{i+1} - \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1} \right)$$
(2.8)

The difference between the corrected and predicted displacements is defined as follows:

$$\Delta \mathbf{u}_{i+1} = \mathbf{u}_{i+1} - \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1} \tag{2.9}$$

Substituting Equation (2.9) in Equation (2.8) gives,

$$\mathbf{f}_{i+1} = \widetilde{\mathbf{f}}_{i+1} + \mathbf{k}_T \left(\Delta \mathbf{u}_{i+1} \right) \tag{2.10}$$

Subtracting Equation (2.7) from Equation (2.2) leads to the relationship between $\Delta \mathbf{u}_{i+1}$ and $\ddot{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1}$, i.e.,

$$\ddot{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1} = \frac{\Delta \mathbf{u}_{i+1}}{\left(\Delta t\right)^2 \beta} \tag{2.11}$$

Substituting Equation (2.11) in the Newmark difference equation for velocity, i.e., Equation (2.3), gives,

$$\dot{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1} = \dot{\mathbf{u}}_i + (\Delta t)(1-\gamma)\ddot{\mathbf{u}}_i + \frac{\gamma}{(\Delta t)\beta}(\Delta \mathbf{u}_{i+1})$$
(2.12)

The linear system of Equation (2.13) is obtained by substitution of Equations (2.10), (2.11), and (2.12) in Equation (2.4), which can be solved to determine the displacement along with Equation (2.14).

$$\mathbf{k}_{\text{eff}} \Delta \mathbf{u}_{i+1} = \mathbf{p}_{\text{eff}}$$

$$\mathbf{k}_{\text{eff}} = \frac{1}{\left(\Delta t\right)^2 \beta} \mathbf{m} + \frac{\gamma}{\Delta t \beta} \mathbf{c} + \mathbf{k}_T$$

$$\mathbf{p}_{\text{eff}} = \mathbf{p}_{i+1} - \tilde{\mathbf{f}}_{i+1} - \mathbf{c} \Big[\dot{\mathbf{u}}_i + (\Delta t) (1 - \gamma) \ddot{\mathbf{u}}_i \Big]$$

$$\mathbf{u}_{i+1} = \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1} + \Delta \mathbf{u}_{i+1}$$
(2.13)

The algorithm for an integration time step of the OS method is summarized as follows:

- 1. Compute the predicted displacement using Equation (2.7);
- 2. Obtain the restoring force, \tilde{f} , corresponding to the predicted displacement from the constitutive relationships of the defined materials and elements using a state determination method [Spacone et al. 1996];
- 3. Determine the acceleration using Equation (2.11);
- 4. Obtain the restoring force corresponding to the corrected displacement following the procedure outlined in step 2 above;
- 5. Determine the velocity using Equation (2.12); and
- 6. Increment *i* and proceed with the next integration time step.

Note that some of the studies in literature use \mathbf{k}_{I} as the initial stiffness matrix instead of \mathbf{k}_{T} . For example, Combescure and Pegon [1997] used \mathbf{k}_{I} in hybrid simulations involving physical and computational substructures due to the difficulties in obtaining the tangent stiffness matrices of the test specimens.

2.2.3 Implicit Newmark Algorithm

The implicit nature of the solution algorithm is eliminated in the EN and OS methods. In contrast, the Implicit Newmark (IN) integrator [Newmark 1959] treats the governing equations (difference and dynamic equilibrium equations) directly without altering their implicit nature. Rearranging the time-discrete equilibrium equations, i.e., Equation (2.4), one obtains

$$\mathbf{p}_{i+1} - \mathbf{m}\ddot{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1} - \mathbf{c}\dot{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1} - \mathbf{f}_{i+1} = \mathbf{0}$$
(2.15)

where \mathbf{u}_{i+1} and $\dot{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1}$ are functions of $\ddot{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1}$ through Equations (2.2) and (2.3), and \mathbf{f}_{i+1} is a function of \mathbf{u}_{i+1} . Therefore, Equation (2.15) represents a nonlinear system of equations in terms of $\ddot{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1}$. The implicit nature of this equation is eliminated in the EN and OS methods as previously discussed, which is not the case for the IN integration algorithm [Newmark 1959] considering Equation (2.15).

Using a nonlinear equation solver, Equation (2.15) can be solved for either the acceleration $\ddot{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1}$ or the displacement increment, $\delta \mathbf{u}_{i+1}$ as defined below, referred to as the acceleration and displacement formulations, respectively. The displacement formulation is presented herein because it leads to fewer convergence problems than the acceleration formulation [Schellenberg et al. 2009]. OpenSees [McKenna et al. 2010], the computational platform used to conduct the analyses presented in the following sections, uses the displacement formulation.

In order to solve for the displacement increments, the difference Equations (2.2) and (2.3) are redefined such that the velocities and accelerations are expressed in terms of displacements as follows:

$$\ddot{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1} = \frac{\delta \mathbf{u}_{i+1}}{(\Delta t)^2 \beta} - \frac{1}{(\Delta t)\beta} \dot{\mathbf{u}}_i - \left(\frac{1}{2\beta} - 1\right) \ddot{\mathbf{u}}_i$$
(2.16)

$$\delta \mathbf{u}_{i+1} = \mathbf{u}_{i+1} - \mathbf{u}_i \tag{2.17}$$

$$\dot{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1} = \frac{\gamma}{(\Delta t)\beta} \delta \mathbf{u}_{i+1} - \left(\frac{\gamma}{\beta} - 1\right) \dot{\mathbf{u}}_i - (\Delta t) \left(\frac{\gamma}{2\beta} - 1\right) \ddot{\mathbf{u}}_i$$
(2.18)

As a result of the redefined difference equations, $\dot{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1}$, $\ddot{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1}$ and also \mathbf{f}_{i+1} are represented as functions of \mathbf{u}_{i+1} . The most common nonlinear equation solver that can be used to solve the nonlinear system of equations, defined in terms of \mathbf{u}_{i+1} , as shown in Equation (2.15), is the regular NR method, which seeks the roots of a function as follows:

$$g'(x^k)\delta x^k = -g(x^k) \tag{2.19}$$

where g and g' represent the function and its derivative with respect to x, respectively, x is the root of the function, k is the iteration number, and δx^k is the difference between the value of x in the current and previous iterations. If the left-hand side of Equation (2.15) is considered as function g in Equation (2.19), one can write the following in terms of displacement,

$$g'\left(\mathbf{u}_{i+1}^{k}\right)\delta\mathbf{u}_{i+1}^{k} = -g\left(\mathbf{u}_{i+1}^{k}\right)$$
(2.20)

$$g\left(\ddot{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1}^{k}\right) = \mathbf{m}\ddot{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1}^{k} + \mathbf{c}\dot{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1}^{k}\mathbf{f}_{i+1}^{k} - \mathbf{p}_{i+1}$$
(2.21)

$$g'\left(\mathbf{u}_{i+1}^{k}\right) = \frac{1}{\left(\Delta t\right)\beta}\mathbf{m} + \frac{\gamma}{\left(\Delta t\right)\beta} + \mathbf{c} + \mathbf{k}_{T}$$
(2.22)

where \mathbf{k}_T is the tangential stiffness matrix corresponding to the displacement vector \mathbf{u}_{i+1}^k , which can be obtained as a result of a state determination method [Spacone et al. 1996]. Substitution of Equations (2.21) and (2.22) in Equation (2.20) leads to the linear system of Equation (2.23) in the same format as the other methods explained earlier.

$$\mathbf{k}_{\text{eff}} \delta \mathbf{u}_{i+1}^{k} = \mathbf{p}_{\text{eff}}$$

$$\mathbf{k}_{\text{eff}} = \frac{1}{\left(\Delta t\right)^{2} \beta} \mathbf{m} + \frac{\gamma}{\left(\Delta t\right) \beta} + \mathbf{c} + \mathbf{k}_{T}$$

$$\mathbf{p}_{\text{eff}} = \mathbf{p}_{i+1} - \mathbf{m} \ddot{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1}^{k} - \mathbf{c} \dot{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1}^{k} - \mathbf{f}_{i+1}^{k}$$
(2.23)

At this point, it is beneficial to state that all three methods discussed above reduce the nonlinear differential equations of motion to a system of linear algebraic equations. However, depending on the way each method treats the three basic Equations (2.2)–(2.4), the resulting coefficient matrix (or the Jacobian matrix), \mathbf{m}_{eff} for EN, and \mathbf{k}_{eff} for OS and IN, and the effective load vector, \mathbf{p}_{eff} , differ from one method to the other. Accordingly, these differences determine the adequacy and ease of application of each method as will be demonstrated.

After the determination of the displacement increment for iteration k from Equation (2.23), the method continues by the calculation of the displacement, velocity, and acceleration for iteration k+1 using Equations (2.24)–(2.26), respectively.

$$\mathbf{u}_{i+1}^{k+1} = \mathbf{u}_{i+1}^k + \delta \mathbf{u}_{i+1}^k \tag{2.24}$$

$$\dot{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1}^{k+1} = \frac{\gamma}{\Delta t\beta} \left(\mathbf{u}_{i+1}^{k+1} - \mathbf{u}_i \right) - \left(\frac{\gamma}{\beta} - 1 \right) \dot{\mathbf{u}}_i - \Delta t \left(\frac{\gamma}{2\beta} - 1 \right) \ddot{\mathbf{u}}_i$$
(2.25)

$$\ddot{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1}^{k+1} = \frac{1}{\left(\Delta t\right)^2 \beta} \left(\mathbf{u}_{i+1}^{k+1} - \mathbf{u}_i \right) - \frac{1}{\Delta t \beta} \dot{\mathbf{u}}_i - \left(\frac{1}{2\beta} - 1 \right) \ddot{\mathbf{u}}_i$$
(2.26)

An iterative method requires an initial guess for the sought value, i.e., for $\ddot{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1}^{k=1}$. For the regular NR method, displacement of the previous iteration can be used as the initial guess as defined in Equation (2.27). Subsequent substitution of this equation into Equations (2.2) and (2.3) leads to the corresponding velocity and acceleration, i.e., $\dot{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1}^{k=1}$ and $\ddot{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1}^{k=1}$ vectors, as follows:

$$\mathbf{u}_{i+1}^{k=1} = \mathbf{u}_i \tag{2.27}$$

$$\dot{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1}^{k=1} = -\left(\frac{\gamma}{\beta} - 1\right)\dot{\mathbf{u}}_i - \left(\Delta t\right)\left(\frac{\gamma}{2\beta} - 1\right)\ddot{\mathbf{u}}_i$$
(2.28)

$$\ddot{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1}^{k=1} = -\frac{1}{(\Delta t)\beta} \dot{\mathbf{u}}_i - \left(\frac{1}{2\beta} - 1\right) \ddot{\mathbf{u}}_i$$
(2.29)

The algorithm for an integration time step of the IN method is summarized as follows:

1. Determine the initial guess, k = 1, for displacement from Equation (2.27) and the corresponding velocity and acceleration from Equations (2.28) and (2.29), respectively;

For each iteration k = 1: N, where N is the total number of iterations:

- 2. Obtain the restoring force, **f**, corresponding to the computed displacement from the constitutive relationships of the defined materials and elements using a state determination method [Spacone et al. 1996];
- 3. Determine the displacement increment by solving the linear system of equations defined by Equation (2.23).
- 4. Compute the displacement, velocity, and acceleration using Equations (2.24)–(2.26); and
- 5. Check convergence by comparing a calculated norm with a defined tolerance value. If the norm is smaller than the tolerance, set N = k, increment *i*, and proceed to the next time integration step; otherwise, increment *k* and go to step 2.

Regarding the above algorithm:

- The presence of the convergence check requires at least two iterations. Therefore, unless a solution is separately coded for a linear case, general nonlinear analysis software requires at least two iterations for the IN integration, even in the case of a linear problem.
- Different norms can be used for the convergence check in step 5. Examples of these norms are the displacement increment, unbalanced force, and energy norms.

2.2.4 TRBDF2 Algorithm

The TRBDF2 method [Bank et al. 1985; Bathe and Baig 2005; and Bathe 2007] is a composite integration method that uses IN and three-point-backward Euler scheme alternately in consecutive integration time steps. The first step uses the IN method with constant average acceleration, i.e. with $\gamma = 1/2$ and $\beta = 1/4$ in the difference Equations (2.2) and (2.3). The consequent step uses the equations of the three-point Euler backward method, i.e., Equations (2.30) and (2.31) for the relationship between the displacement, velocity, and acceleration instead of the Newmark difference Equations (2.2) and (2.3).

$$\dot{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1} = \frac{\mathbf{u}_{i-1} - 4\mathbf{u}_i + 3\mathbf{u}_{i+1}}{2(\Delta t)}$$
(2.30)

$$\ddot{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1} = \frac{\dot{\mathbf{u}}_{i-1} - 4\dot{\mathbf{u}}_i + 3\dot{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1}}{2(\Delta t)} \tag{2.31}$$

Following the regular NR method as demonstrated for IN, the following linear system of Equation (2.32) is obtained:

$$\mathbf{k}_{eff} \delta \mathbf{u}_{i+1}^{k} = \mathbf{p}_{eff}$$

$$\mathbf{k}_{eff} = \frac{9}{4(\Delta t)^{2}} \mathbf{m} + \frac{3}{2(\Delta t)} \mathbf{c} + \mathbf{k}_{T}$$

$$\mathbf{p}_{eff} = \mathbf{p}_{i+1} - \mathbf{m} \left(\frac{9\mathbf{u}_{i+1}^{k} - 12\mathbf{u}_{i} + 3\mathbf{u}_{i-1}}{4(\Delta t)^{2}} - \frac{4\dot{\mathbf{u}}_{i} - \dot{\mathbf{u}}_{i-1}}{2\Delta t} \right) - \mathbf{c} \left(\frac{3\mathbf{u}_{i+1}^{k} - 4\mathbf{u}_{i} + \mathbf{u}_{i-1}}{2\Delta t} \right) - \mathbf{f}_{i+1}^{k}$$
(2.32)

After the determination of the displacement increment for iteration *k* from Equation (2.32), the method continues by calculating the displacement, velocity, and acceleration for iteration k+1 using Equations (2.33)–(2.35), respectively.

$$\mathbf{u}_{i+1}^{k+1} = \mathbf{u}_{i+1}^{k} + \delta \mathbf{u}_{i+1}^{k}$$
(2.33)

$$\dot{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1}^{k+1} = \frac{\mathbf{u}_{i-1} - 4\mathbf{u}_i + 3\mathbf{u}_{i+1}^{k+1}}{2(\Delta t)}$$
(2.34)

$$\ddot{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1}^{k+1} = \frac{\dot{\mathbf{u}}_{i-1} - 4\dot{\mathbf{u}}_i + 3\dot{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1}^{k+1}}{2(\Delta t)} \tag{2.35}$$

Note that the consecutive steps are considered as the sub-steps of a one-step process in Bathe and Baig [2005] and Bathe [2007] rather than considering them as consecutive steps, which is exactly the same as the formulation presented above but with a time step $\Delta t/2$. Bathe and Baig [2005] and Bathe [2007] used this method in structural dynamics to conserve energy and momentum at large deformations (not necessarily involving material nonlinearity) where the IN method may fail to do so and become unstable. Herein, it is considered not because of its superior stability performance compared to IN, but because of its better convergence behavior due to the numerical damping provided by the Euler backward method, as discussed in the next chapter.

2.3 NONLINEAR EQUATION SOLVERS

Equation (2.4) can be written in a residual form as follows:

$$\mathbf{r}(\mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{p} - \mathbf{m}\ddot{\mathbf{u}} - \mathbf{c}\dot{\mathbf{u}} - \mathbf{f}$$
(2.36)

The statement of equilibrium requires that the residual forces to be zeros, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{r}(\mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{0} \tag{2.37}$$

The following sub-sections describe how each of the discussed nonlinear solvers attempt to satisfy Equation (2.37). Note that the subscript *i* representing the number of the integration time step is dropped to simplify the expressions in the following sub-sections.

2.3.1 Regular Newton-Raphson Algorithm

The regular NR algorithm is based on linear approximation of the residual vector as follows:

$$\mathbf{r} \left(\mathbf{u}^{k} + \Delta \mathbf{u}^{k+1} \right) \approx \mathbf{r} \left(\mathbf{u}^{k} \right) + \frac{\partial \mathbf{r} \left(\mathbf{u}^{k} \right)}{\partial \mathbf{u}} \left(\Delta \mathbf{u}^{k+1} \right)$$
(2.38)

The superscript k denotes the iteration number within one time step, and the matrix $\frac{\partial \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{u}^k)}{\partial \mathbf{u}}$ is called the system Jacobian matrix, which is denoted as follows:

$$\mathbf{J}_{k} = \frac{\partial \mathbf{r} \left(\mathbf{u}^{k} \right)}{\partial \mathbf{u}} = -\mathbf{k}_{T}$$
(2.39)

where \mathbf{k}_T is the tangential stiffness matrix. The algorithm starts with an initial guess and iterates with the following equations until a certain convergence criterion is met.

$$\Delta \mathbf{u}^{k+1} = -\mathbf{J}_{k}^{-1} \mathbf{r} \left(\mathbf{u}^{k} \right) = \mathbf{k}_{T}^{-1} \mathbf{r} \left(\mathbf{u}^{k} \right)$$

$$\mathbf{u}^{k+1} = \mathbf{u}^{k} + \Delta \mathbf{u}^{k+1}$$
(2.40)

2.3.2 Broyden Algorithm

In regular NR algorithm, the Jacobian matrix is computed at every iteration, which is a complicated and expensive operation. The idea behind Broyden method is to compute the whole Jacobian only at the first iteration and then do a *rank-one update* at the other iterations [Broyden 1965], i.e.,

$$\mathbf{J}_{k} = \mathbf{J}_{k-1} + \frac{\Delta \mathbf{r}^{k} - \mathbf{J}_{k-1} \Delta \mathbf{u}^{k}}{\left\| \Delta \mathbf{u}^{k} \right\|^{2}} \left(\Delta \mathbf{u}^{k} \right)^{T}$$
(2.41)

where $\|\bullet\|$ indicates the discrete L_2 -norm¹ and superscript *T* indicates transpose.

$$\Delta \mathbf{u}^{k} = \mathbf{u}^{k} - \mathbf{u}^{k-1}$$

$$\Delta \mathbf{r}^{k} = \mathbf{r}^{k} - \mathbf{r}^{k-1}$$
(2.42)

Subsequently, the algorithm proceeds with Equation (2.40) as in the regular NR algorithm. Note that the modified NR is a special case where the rank-one update is ignored.

¹ $\|\mathbf{u}\| = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n} u_i^2}$ where *n* in the number of components of the vector \mathbf{u}

2.3.3 Newton-Raphson with Line Search Algorithm

The direction of $\Delta \mathbf{u}$ determined by the regular NR method is often correct. However, the same is not always true for the step size $\|\Delta \mathbf{u}\|$. Furthermore, it is computationally less expensive to compute the residual for several points along $\Delta \mathbf{u}$ rather than forming and factorizing a new Jacobian matrix [Crisfield 1991].

In the Newton-Raphson with Line Search (NRLS) algorithm [Crisfield 1991], the regular NR method is used to compute $\Delta \mathbf{u}$. However, only a certain portion of the calculated $\Delta \mathbf{u}$ is used to determine the displacement in the next iteration as follows:

$$\Delta \mathbf{u}^{k+1} = -\mathbf{J}_k^{-1} \mathbf{r} \left(\mathbf{u}^k \right) = \mathbf{k}_T^{-1} \mathbf{r} \left(\mathbf{u}^k \right)$$

$$\mathbf{u}^{k+1} = \mathbf{u}^k + \eta \,\Delta \mathbf{u}^{k+1}$$
(2.43)

Four types of line search algorithm are available in OpenSees [McKenna et al. 2010]: *Bisection, Secant, RegulaFalsi*, and *Interpolated*. The different line search algorithms embrace different root finding methods to determine the factor η . A root of the function $s(\eta)$ is defined as follows:

$$s(\eta) = \Delta \mathbf{u}^{k+1} \mathbf{r} \left(\mathbf{u}^{k} + \eta \,\Delta \mathbf{u}^{k+1} \right)$$
(2.44)

with the following initial guess

$$s_0 = \Delta \mathbf{u}^{k+1} \mathbf{r} \left(\mathbf{u}^k \right) \tag{2.45}$$

2.3.4 Broyden–Fletcher–Goldfarb–Shanno Algorithm

From an initial guess \mathbf{u}_0 and an approximate Hessian matrix² \mathbf{B}_0 , the following steps in the Broyden–Fletcher–Goldfarb–Shanno (BFGS) algorithm are repeated until convergence is reached [Bathe and Cimento 1980]:

1. A direction $\Delta \mathbf{u}^k$ is obtained by solving the following equation:

$$\mathbf{B}_{k}(\Delta \mathbf{u}^{k}) = -\nabla \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{u}^{k}) \tag{2.46}$$

where \mathbf{B}_k is an approximation of the Hessian matrix, which is updated at each iteration, and $\nabla \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{u}^k)$ is the gradient³ of the function evaluated at \mathbf{u}^k .

2. A line search is performed to find the step size η^k for the *k*th iteration and update the displacement as follows:

$$\mathbf{u}^{k+1} = \mathbf{u}^k + \eta^k \Delta \mathbf{u}^k \tag{2.47}$$

3. Set the Hessian matrix, which is updated for the next iteration as follows:

 ${}^{3}\nabla f = \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}\mathbf{i} + \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}\mathbf{j} + \frac{\partial f}{\partial z}\mathbf{k}$, where $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}, \text{ and } \mathbf{k}$ are unit vectors in the directions x, y, and z, respectively.

²Hessian matrix is a square matrix of second-order partial derivatives of a function.
$$\mathbf{B}_{k+1} = \mathbf{B}_{k} + \frac{\mathbf{y}^{k} (\mathbf{y}^{k})^{T}}{(\mathbf{y}^{k})^{T} \mathbf{s}^{k}} - \frac{\mathbf{B}_{k} \mathbf{s}^{k} (\mathbf{s}^{k})^{T} \mathbf{B}_{k}}{(\mathbf{s}^{k})^{T} \mathbf{B}_{k} \mathbf{s}^{k}}$$
(2.48)

where

$$\mathbf{s}^{k} = \boldsymbol{\eta}^{k} \Delta \mathbf{u}^{k} \tag{2.49}$$

$$\mathbf{y}^{k} = \nabla \mathbf{r} \left(\mathbf{u}^{k+1} \right) - \nabla \mathbf{r} \left(\mathbf{u}^{k} \right)$$
(2.50)

2.3.5 Krylov-Newton Algorithm

At each time step, instead of Equation (2.37), the Krylov-Newton algorithm seeks the solution to the system of the following preconditioned residual equations [Scott and Fenves 2010]:

$$\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{k}_0^{-1} \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{0}$$
(2.51)

where \mathbf{k}_0 is the tangential stiffness at the first iteration of the time step. The solution to Equation (2.51) is equivalent to that of Equation (2.37) as long as \mathbf{k}_0 is nonsingular. Thus, Equation (2.38) becomes

$$\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{u}^{k+1}) = \mathbf{R}(\mathbf{u}^{k}) - \mathbf{A}\Delta\mathbf{u}^{k+1} = \mathbf{0}$$
(2.52)

where **A** is the identity matrix when modified NR algorithm is used, while $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{k}_0^{-1} \mathbf{k}_T$ when using the regular NR algorithm. Instead of the current tangent, the tangent at the initial guess is used for the modified NR algorithm in the iterations.

The Krylov-Newton algorithm decomposes $\Delta \mathbf{u}^{k+1}$ into two components as follows:

$$\Delta \mathbf{u}^{k+1} = \mathbf{w}^{k+1} + \mathbf{q}^{k+1} \tag{2.52}$$

where \mathbf{w}^{k+1} is the acceleration component, and \mathbf{q}^{k+1} is the standard modified Newton component. \mathbf{w}^{k+1} is further represented as a linear combination of the vectors from the subspace of displacement increments with size *m*, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{w}^{k+1} = c_1 \Delta \mathbf{u}^1 + \dots + c_m \Delta \mathbf{u}^m \tag{2.54}$$

To satisfy Equation (2.52), the first step is to minimize the norm of vector $\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{u}^k) - \mathbf{A}\mathbf{w}^{k+1}$ which represents an over-determined system of equations for the unknown coefficients $c_1, \ldots c_m$ in Equation (2.54), by least-squares analysis [Golub and Van Loan 1996]. The second step for satisfying Equation (2.52) is to solve the following equations:

$$\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{u}^{k+1}) = \mathbf{g}_k - \mathbf{A}\mathbf{q}^{k+1} = \mathbf{0}$$
(2.55)

where $\mathbf{g}_k = \mathbf{R}(\mathbf{u}^k) - \mathbf{A}\mathbf{w}^{k+1}$, and \mathbf{A} is the identity matrix using the modified NR algorithm. Thus,

$$\mathbf{q}^{k+1} = \mathbf{g}_k \tag{2.56}$$

The displacement increment is then calculated by summing the two components determined from Equations (2.54) and (2.56).

3 DEVELOPMENT OF LYAPUNOV-BASED NONLINEAR EQUATION SOLVER

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The regular Newton-Raphson (NR) algorithm reviewed in Chapter 2 is the most standard and commonly used nonlinear equation solver in nonlinear structural analysis subjected to static and/or dynamic loading. The major drawbacks to using this algorithm are as follows:

- 1. The Jacobian matrix is required to be computed explicitly, which may be computationally expensive and difficult;
- 2. The Jacobian matrix is required to be invertible; and
- 3. The convergence of this algorithm is not guaranteed, i.e., the initial guess is important and needs to be within the region of attraction of the solution point.

Lyapunov stability theory [Khalil 2002; Haddad and Chellaboina 2008], developed by the Russian mathematician Aleksandr Lyapunov [1892], is the most complete framework of stability analysis for dynamical systems. It is based on constructing a function of system-state coordinates (usually considered as the energy function of the system) that serves as a generalized norm of the solution of the dynamical system. The appeal of Lyapunov stability theory resides in the fact that conclusions about the stability behavior of the dynamical system can be obtained without actually computing the system solution trajectories. As a consequence, Lyapunov stability theory has become one of the most fundamental and standard tools of dynamical systems and control theory.

This chapter proposes a nonlinear equation solver for nonlinear structural analysis for problems involving static and/or dynamic loads based on Lyapunov stability theory. Several recent works that are similar in spirit as applied to power flow problems by Milando [2009] and Xie et al. [2013]. The main idea is to reformulate the equations of motions into a hypothetical dynamical system characterized by a set of ordinary differential equations, whose equilibrium points represent the solutions of the nonlinear structural problems. Starting from the Lyapunov stability theory, it is demonstrated that this hypothetical dynamical system is characterized by a globally asymptotic stability, i.e., convergence, to the equilibrium points for structural dynamics [Liang and Mosalam 2017b]. This feature overcomes the inherent limitations of the traditional iterative minimization algorithms and has no restriction on the selection of the initial guess for various structural nonlinear behaviors. Comparisons between the proposed algorithm and regular NR algorithm are presented using several numerical examples from structural statics and dynamics.

3.2 STABILITY OF NONLINEAR SYSTEMS

The stability of two categories, continuous-time and discrete-time nonlinear systems, is presented in this section.

3.2.1 Continuous-Time Systems

Consider a continuous-time nonlinear system [Khalil 2002]:

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{x}} = \boldsymbol{r}(\boldsymbol{x}) \tag{3.1}$$

and assume its equilibrium point is at x = 0, i.e., r(0) = 0. If the equilibrium of interest is x^* that is other than zero, i.e., $x^* \neq 0$, let

$$\widetilde{\boldsymbol{x}} = \boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{x}^* \tag{3.2}$$

and therefore

$$\dot{\widetilde{x}} = \mathbf{r}(x) = \mathbf{r}(\widetilde{x} + x^*) = \widetilde{\mathbf{r}}(\widetilde{x})$$
(3.3)

which leads to

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{r}}(\mathbf{0}) = \mathbf{0} \tag{3.4}$$

3.2.2 Discrete-Time Systems

Similarly, consider a nonlinear discrete-time system [Khalil 2002]:

$$\boldsymbol{x}_{k+1} = \boldsymbol{r}(\boldsymbol{x}_k) \tag{3.5}$$

and assume that the system has an equilibrium point at the origin, i.e., $\mathbf{r}(\mathbf{0}) = \mathbf{0}$. If the equilibrium of interest is \mathbf{x}^* that is other than zero, i.e., $\mathbf{x}^* \neq \mathbf{0}$, let

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{x}}_k = \boldsymbol{x}_k - \boldsymbol{x}^* \tag{3.6}$$

and therefore

$$\widetilde{\boldsymbol{x}}_{k+1} + \boldsymbol{x}^* = \boldsymbol{r}(\boldsymbol{x}_k) = \boldsymbol{r}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{x}}_k + \boldsymbol{x}^*)$$
(3.7)

$$\widetilde{\boldsymbol{x}}_{k+1} = \boldsymbol{r} \left(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{x}}_k + \boldsymbol{x}^* \right) - \boldsymbol{x}^* = \widetilde{\boldsymbol{r}} \left(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{x}}_k \right)$$
(3.8)

which also leads to Equation (3.4).

3.2.3 Stability Definitions

<u>Stability</u>: The equilibrium x = 0 is stable if for each $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that:

$$|\mathbf{x}(0)| \le \delta \Rightarrow |\mathbf{x}(t)| \le \varepsilon \quad \forall t \ge 0$$
(3.9)

Obviously, the equilibrium point is unstable if it is not stable.

<u>Asymptotic stability</u>: The equilibrium $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$ is asymptotically stable if it is stable and $\mathbf{x}(t) \rightarrow 0$ for all $\mathbf{x}(0)$ in the neighborhood of $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$.

<u>Global asymptotic stability</u>: The equilibrium $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$ is globally asymptotically stable if it is stable and $\mathbf{x}(t) \rightarrow 0$ for all $\mathbf{x}(0)$. Note that $\mathbf{x}(t) \rightarrow 0$ does not necessarily guarantee stability. For example, trajectories may converge to the origin only after a large detour that violates the stability definition in Equation (3.9).

3.3 LYAPUNOV STABILITY THEORY

3.3.1 Continuous-Time Systems

Let \mathcal{V} be a continuously differentiable scalar function defined in the domain $D \in \mathbb{R}^n$ that contains the origin. The equilibrium point $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$ is stable if the following conditions are satisfied [Khalil 2002]:

$$v(\mathbf{0}) = 0 \text{ and } v(\mathbf{x}) > 0 \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in D - \{\mathbf{0}\}$$

$$(3.10)$$

and

$$\dot{v}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \frac{d}{dt} v(\boldsymbol{x}) = \nabla v(\boldsymbol{x})^T \cdot \mathbf{r}(\boldsymbol{x}) \le 0 \quad \forall \boldsymbol{x} \in D$$
(3.11)

Moreover, x = 0 is asymptotically stable if

$$\dot{v}(\boldsymbol{x}) < 0 \quad \forall \boldsymbol{x} \in D - \{\boldsymbol{0}\}$$
(3.12)

If, in addition, $D \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and the Lyapunov function v is radially unbounded, i.e.,

$$|\mathbf{x}| \to \infty \Rightarrow v(\mathbf{x}) \to \infty$$
 (3.13)

then x = 0 is globally asymptotically stable.

3.3.2 Discrete-Time Systems

Analogously to the continuous-time systems case, the discrete-time Lyapunov stability theory is discussed herein. let v be a continuously scalar function defined on the domain D that contains the origin. The equilibrium point $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$ is stable if [Khalil 2002] Equations (3.10) and (3.14) are satisfied.

$$\Delta v_{k+1} = v(\boldsymbol{x}_{k+1}) - v(\boldsymbol{x}_{k}) \le 0 \quad \forall \boldsymbol{x} \in D$$
(3.14)

Moreover, x = 0 is asymptotically stable if

$$\Delta v(\boldsymbol{x}_{k+1}) < 0 \quad \forall \boldsymbol{x} \in D - \{\boldsymbol{0}\}$$

$$(3.15)$$

If, in addition, $D \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and the Lyapunov function v is radially unbounded as defined in Equation (3.13), then x = 0 is globally asymptotically stable.

Continuous time systems require that the derivative of the Lyapunov function is negative along the trajectories. Discrete-time systems require that the difference in the Lyapunov function is negative along the trajectories. Note: we do not require that v is continuously differentiable but only continuous.

3.4 LYAPUNOV-BASED NONLINEAR EQUATION SOLVER

As stated in Equation (2.37), the general formulation of nonlinear set of equations is as follows:

$$\mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \mathbf{0} \tag{3.16}$$

Consider a hypothetical dynamical system characterized by the following first order differential equation

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{x}} = -\mathbf{K} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{x}} \mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{x}) \right]^T \mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{x}) = -\mathbf{K} \mathbf{J}(\boldsymbol{x})^T \mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{x})$$
(3.17)

where **K** is positive definite, i.e., $\mathbf{K} = \mathbf{K}^T \succ \mathbf{0}$, and the Jacobian matrix is

$$\mathbf{J}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}) \tag{3.18}$$

For this system, the Lyapunov function is chosen as follows:

$$v(\boldsymbol{x}) = \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{x})^T \mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{x})$$
(3.19)

A sufficient condition for the system to be stable is as follows:

$$\dot{v}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{x}} \mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{x}) \, \dot{\boldsymbol{x}} \right]^{T} \mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{x}) + \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{x})^{T} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{x}} \mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{x}) \, \dot{\boldsymbol{x}} \right]$$
$$= -\frac{1}{2} \left[\mathbf{J}(\boldsymbol{x}) \mathbf{K} \mathbf{J}(\boldsymbol{x})^{T} \mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{x}) \right]^{T} \mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{x}) - \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{x})^{T} \left[\mathbf{J}(\boldsymbol{x}) \mathbf{K} \mathbf{J}(\boldsymbol{x})^{T} \mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{x}) \right]$$
(3.20)
$$= -\mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{x})^{T} \mathbf{J}(\boldsymbol{x}) \mathbf{K} \mathbf{J}(\boldsymbol{x})^{T} \mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{x})$$

Considering the Jacobian matrix $\mathbf{J}(\mathbf{x})$ is well-defined, i.e., $\mathbf{J}(\mathbf{x}) \neq \mathbf{0}$, $\mathbf{J}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{K}\mathbf{J}(\mathbf{x})^{T}$ is positive definite and therefore $\dot{v}(\mathbf{x}) < 0$, where the asymptotical stability condition of the hypothetical dynamical system in Equation (3.17) is guaranteed. Then any differential equation solver can be used to solve Equation (3.17), starting from the initial condition (or guess). $\mathbf{x}(t=0) = \mathbf{x}^{0}$. To reduce the computational expense of calculating $\mathbf{J}(\mathbf{x})$, a special case of Equation (3.17) is to replace $\mathbf{J}(\mathbf{x})$ with the constant $\mathbf{J}(\mathbf{x}^{0})$.

3.4.1 Static Problems

For static structural problems, Equations (3.16) and (3.17) become

$$\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}) - \mathbf{p} = \mathbf{0} \tag{3.21}$$

$$\dot{\mathbf{u}} = \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{u}) = -\mathbf{K} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{u}} \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{u}) \right]^T \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{u}) = -\mathbf{K} \mathbf{J}(\mathbf{u})^T \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{u}) = -\mathbf{K} \mathbf{k}_T^T \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{u})$$
(3.22)

and the corresponding Jacobian matrix is

$$\mathbf{J}(\mathbf{u}) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{u}} \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{u}) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{u}} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{k}_{T}$$
(3.23)

where \mathbf{k}_{T} is the tangent stiffness of the structural system. The Lyapunov function corresponding to Equation (3.19) becomes

$$v(\mathbf{u}) = \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{u})^T \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{u})$$
(3.24)

Therefore, as proved previously, the hypothetical dynamical system in Equation (3.22) is asymptotically stable. Moreover, if the restoring force is radially unbounded, i.e.,

$$|\mathbf{u}| \to \infty \Rightarrow \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{u}) \to \infty \Rightarrow \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{u}) \to \infty$$
 (3.25)

then, the hypothetical system in Equation (3.22) is globally asymptotically stable and converges to the equilibrium corresponding to $v(\mathbf{u}) = 0$; thus $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{0}$. Note that the tangent stiffness matrix \mathbf{k}_T can be replaced by the constant stiffness matrix at the initial guess at \mathbf{u}^0 .

3.4.2 Dynamic Problems

For a structural system subjected to dynamic loadings, e.g., earthquake excitations, the discretized equations of nodal equilibrium for the nonlinear dynamic response of the structural system can be written in the following residual form

$$\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{u}_{i+1}) = \mathbf{m}\ddot{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1} + \mathbf{c}\dot{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1} + \mathbf{f}_{i+1} - \mathbf{p}_{i+1} = \mathbf{0}$$
(3.26)

Using the implicit Newmark integration algorithm and reordering the Newmark difference equations [Equations (2.2) and (2.3)] as follows:

$$\dot{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1} = \frac{\gamma}{(\Delta t)\beta} (\mathbf{u}_{i+1} - \mathbf{u}_i) - \left(\frac{\gamma}{\beta} - 1\right) \dot{\mathbf{u}}_i - (\Delta t) \left(\frac{\gamma}{2\beta} - 1\right) \ddot{\mathbf{u}}_i$$
(3.27)

$$\ddot{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1} = \frac{1}{\left(\Delta t\right)^2 \beta} \left(\mathbf{u}_{i+1} - \mathbf{u}_i \right) - \frac{1}{\left(\Delta t\right) \beta} \dot{\mathbf{u}}_i - \left(\frac{1}{2\beta} - 1 \right) \ddot{\mathbf{u}}_i$$
(3.28)

Substituting Equations (3.27) and (3.28) into Equation (3.26) leads to the following

$$\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{u}_{i+1}) = \mathbf{m}\ddot{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1} + \mathbf{c}\dot{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1} + \mathbf{f}_{i+1} - \mathbf{p}_{i+1}$$

$$= \mathbf{m} \left[\frac{1}{(\Delta t)^{2} \beta} (\mathbf{u}_{i+1} - \mathbf{u}_{i}) - \frac{1}{(\Delta t) \beta} \dot{\mathbf{u}}_{i} - \left(\frac{1}{2\beta} - 1\right) \ddot{\mathbf{u}}_{i} \right]$$

$$+ \mathbf{c} \left[\frac{\gamma}{(\Delta t) \beta} (\mathbf{u}_{i+1} - \mathbf{u}_{i}) - \left(\frac{\gamma}{\beta} - 1\right) \dot{\mathbf{u}}_{i} - (\Delta t) \left(\frac{\gamma}{2\beta} - 1\right) \ddot{\mathbf{u}}_{i} \right] + \mathbf{f}_{i+1} - \mathbf{p}_{i+1}$$
(3.29)

For the i+1 step, the responses of the previous step, i.e., *i*-th step, are constants. Therefore, Equation (3.29) can be simplified further as follows:

$$\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{u}_{i+1}) = \left[\frac{\mathbf{m}}{(\Delta t)^2 \beta} + \frac{\mathbf{c}\gamma}{(\Delta t)\beta}\right] \mathbf{u}_{i+1} + \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}_{i+1}) + \text{constants}$$
(3.30)

and the corresponding Jacobian matrix is as follows:

$$\mathbf{J}(\mathbf{u}_{i+1}) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{u}_{i+1}} \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{u}_{i+1}) = \frac{1}{(\Delta t)^2 \beta} \mathbf{m} + \frac{\gamma}{(\Delta t) \beta} \mathbf{c} + \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{u}_{i+1}} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}_{i+1})$$

$$= \frac{1}{(\Delta t)^2 \beta} \mathbf{m} + \frac{\gamma}{(\Delta t) \beta} \mathbf{c} + \mathbf{k}_{T_{i+1}}$$
(3.31)

where $\mathbf{k}_{T_{i+1}}$ is the tangent stiffness matrix at the *i*+1 step. Therefore, according to Equation (3.17), the hypothetical dynamical system and corresponding Lyapunov function are as follows:

$$\dot{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1} = \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{u}_{i+1}) = -\mathbf{K} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{u}_{i+1}} \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{u}_{i+1}) \right]^T \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{u}_{i+1}) = -\mathbf{K} \mathbf{J}(\mathbf{u}_{i+1})^T \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{u}_{i+1})$$
$$= -\mathbf{K} \left[\frac{1}{(\Delta t)^2 \beta} \mathbf{m} + \frac{\gamma}{(\Delta t) \beta} \mathbf{c} + \mathbf{k}_{T_{i+1}} \right]^T \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{u}_{i+1})$$
(3.32)

$$v(\mathbf{u}_{i+1}) = \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{u}_{i+1})^T \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{u}_{i+1})$$
(3.33)

It is clear from Equation (3.30) that $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{u}_{i+1})$ is radially unbounded, which is independent of the radially unboundedness of $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{u}_{i+1})$. Therefore, the equilibrium point of the dynamical system in Equation (3.32) is globally asymptotically stable. In other words, it converges to the solution of Equation (3.32) for all initial values or guesses of \mathbf{u}_{i+1} . Moreover, similar to the formulation for the static problems, the tangent stiffness matrix $\mathbf{k}_{T_{i+1}}$ can be replaced by the constant stiffness at \mathbf{u}_{i+1}^0 .

The general procedures for the proposed Lyapunov-based nonlinear solver are summarized as follows:

1. Compute the Jacobian matrix using Equations (3.23) and (3.31) for static and dynamical systems, respectively;

- 2. Form the hypothetical dynamical system represented by Equations (3.22) and (3.32) for static and dynamical systems, respectively; and
- 3. Solve the set of equations for the hypothetical dynamical system using numerical integration scheme starting from the initial condition (or guess). The hypothetical dynamical systems of all the numerical examples in this chapter are solved by the explicit Dormand–Prince method [Dormand and Prince 1980]. The procedures of implementation and storage need are given in [Liang and Mosalam 2017b].

3.5 NUMERICAL EXAMPLES

Several numerical examples are presented in this section to compare the convergence behaviors of the regular NR algorithm and that of the proposed algorithm. The first example is a single-degree of freedom (SDOF) nonlinear static system characterized by a single parameter. The second example is a two-DOF static system with bilinear force-deformation relationships that is analyzed using the inconsistent Jacobian matrix as discussed below. The third set of examples is a two-DOF dynamical system used to compare the convergence behavior of the above-mentioned two nonlinear solution algorithms under the excitation of ground motion (GM) input. For convenience, all units are omitted in this section, where use of consistent units is taken into account.

3.5.1 SDOF Nonlinear Static System

Consider the restoring force of the nonlinear SDOF system shown in Figure. 3.1, which has the following form:

$$f(u) = sign(u)|u|^{r}$$
(3.35)

where sign(u) = 1 if $u \ge 0$, otherwise sign(u) = -1. Based on the regular NR algorithm,

$$u^{i+1} = u^{i} - J(u^{i})^{-1} f(u^{i}) = u^{i} - sign(u^{i})\frac{1}{r}|u^{i}|$$

= $\left(1 - \frac{1}{r}\right)u^{i}$ (3.36)

From Equation (3.36), it can be seen that the regular NR algorithm is reduced to a linear system where the eigenvalue is (r-1)/r. Its convergence is guaranteed if $(r-1)/r \in (-1,1)$, i.e., r > 1/2. For example, if r = 2, the regular NR algorithm converges to the solution, i.e., u = 0, as shown in Figure 3.2a. However, if r < 1/2, e.g., r = 1/3 and r = 1/4, the algorithm diverges as shown in Figures 3.2b and 3.2c, respectively. It is noted that the algorithm oscillates or flip-flops indefinitely between u^0 and $-u^0$ if r = 1/2 as shown in Figure 3.2d.



Figure 3.1 The sketch of the restoring force for the SDOF nonlinear static system.



Figure 3.2 Traces of equilibrium search for the SDOF example using the regular NR algorithm.

Considering the formulation in the previous section and Equation (3.35), the first order ordinary differential equation for the hypothetical dynamical system and the corresponding Lyapunov function are as follows:

$$\dot{u} = -K \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial u} f(u) \right]^{T} f(u) = -K r \operatorname{sign}(u) |u|^{2r-1}$$
(3.37)

$$v(u) = \frac{1}{2} |u|^{2r}$$
(3.38)

Figure 3.3 presents the traces of equilibrium search for the same SDOF examples with different values of r using the proposed nonlinear solution algorithm where the required number of iterations for each case is given as the last number of the x-axis. It is clear that the proposed algorithm is globally asymptotically stable for this example.



Figure 3.3 Traces of equilibrium search for the SDOF example using the proposed Lyapunov-based algorithm.

3.5.2 Two-DOF Nonlinear Static System

A two-story shear building is modeled as the system shown in Figure 3.4. It consists of two uniaxial springs with bilinear force-deformation relationships shown in Figure 3.5. A load vector of $\mathbf{P} = \begin{bmatrix} 10 & 20 \end{bmatrix}^T$ is applied to the system. Taking advantage of the compatibility matrix **A**, shown in Figure 3.4, the consistent Jacobian stiffness matrix is obtained as follows:

$$\mathbf{k}_{b} = \begin{bmatrix} k_{1} & 0\\ 0 & k_{2} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \mathbf{J} = \mathbf{A}^{T} \mathbf{k}_{b} \mathbf{A} = \begin{bmatrix} k_{1} + k_{2} & -k_{2}\\ -k_{2} & k_{2} \end{bmatrix}$$
(3.39)

Restoring vector \mathbf{f} , which is radially unbounded, is as follows (q's are defined in Figure 3.5):

$$\mathbf{f} = \begin{bmatrix} f_1 \\ f_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} q_1 - q_2 \\ q_2 \end{bmatrix}$$
(3.40)

The efficiency of the regular NR algorithm relies heavily on the computation of a numerically consistent Jacobian matrix. For complex constitutive models, a consistent Jacobian matrix can be difficult to develop and implement. Utilization of an inconsistent Jacobian matrix or the one with approximation errors is likely to lead to the non-convergence of the regular NR algorithm [Scott and Fenves 2010], as demonstrated here. To mimic an error in the Jacobian calculations of the element state determination, an artificial coupling of the two springs is introduced as assumed in [Scott and Fenves 2010], leading to the following Jacobian matrix:

$$\mathbf{k}_{b} = \begin{bmatrix} k_{1} & 0.5\\ 0.5 & k_{2} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \mathbf{J} = \mathbf{A}^{T} \mathbf{k}_{b} \mathbf{A} = \begin{bmatrix} k_{1} + k_{2} - 1 & -k_{2} + 0.5\\ -k_{2} + 0.5 & k_{2} \end{bmatrix}$$
(3.41)





Two-DOF nonlinear system.



Figure 3.5 Force-deformation relationships of the two springs.



Figure 3.6 Traces of equilibrium search for the two-DOF static example using the regular NR algorithm.

The equilibrium point of this system is predetermined as $\mathbf{u} = \begin{bmatrix} 39 & 21 \end{bmatrix}^T$. Figures 3.6 and 3.7 show, respectively, the convergence behavior of the regular NR and that of the proposed Lyapunov-based algorithms with different initial guesses. Note that in Figure 3.6, the regular NR algorithm either diverges or oscillates around the true solution. It is noted from Figure 3.6d that even though the initial guess is just around the equilibrium point, the regular NR algorithm fails to converge to the true solution. In contrast, the proposed Lyapunov-based algorithm converges for all the initial guesses. This is expected as this proposed algorithm is globally asymptotically stable for this system with the property of radially unboundedness shown in Equation (3.40). Similar to the first example, the required number of iterations for each case is given as the last number of the x-axis in Figure 3.8. It is noted that the regular NR method converges with consistent Jacobian matrix.



Figure 3.7 Traces of equilibrium search for the two-DOF static example using the proposed Lyapunov-based algorithm.

3.5.3 MDOF Nonlinear Dynamical System

A multi-story shear building structure (Figure 3.8) with story hysteresis force-deformation relationship in Figure 11 is simulated under the excitation of the GM input. The two GM records, selected from the NGA Ground Motion Database (PEER 2011), are documented and plotted in Table 3.1 and Figure 3.8.

3.5.3.1 Two-DOF Nonlinear Dynamical System

In this section, the same 2-DOF system (n = 2 in Figure 10) as in the previous section is simulated, i.e.,

$$m_1 = 1/250$$
, $k_{11} = 10$, $k_{21} = 1$, $Q_1 = 9$, $m_1 = 1/200$, $k_{12} = 2$, $k_{22} = 1$, $Q_2 = 2$ (3.42)

The convergence behaviors of the regular NR and the proposed Lyapunov-based algorithms are demonstrated and compared after time discretizing the governing equations by the implicit Newmark integration with constant average acceleration. Figures 3.11 and 3.12 show the displacements of the two DOFs from the two algorithms for GM1 and GM2 with the scaling factor (*SF*) of 2.0 and 3.0, respectively. Such selection of the *SF*s enables the two-DOF system to go into the nonlinear range. It can be seen that the time history responses obtained from the two algorithms are almost on top of each other. The differences between peak displacements of DOF 1 and DOF 2 for GM1 are 0%. These differences for GM2 are 4×10^{-6} % and 0%, respectively. The perfect match of the time history responses along with the small values of the error measure for the peak response again indicate that the accuracy of the proposed Lyapunov-based and that of the regular NR algorithms are comparable. The execution time for this example is given is Table 3.2. Figures 3.13 and 3.14 present the traces of equilibrium search for the two algorithms at 5.84 sec and 20.00 sec for GM1 and GM2, respectively. The y-axis of these two figures (and also the following figures of traces of equilibrium search), δ is defined as follows:

$$\delta = q_k^j / q_k^{eq} \tag{3.43}$$

where q_k^j is the displacement, velocity or acceleration of the *j*th iteration at the *k*th DOF and q_k^{eq} is the corresponding value of the equilibrium point. Therefore, $\delta = 1$ indicates convergence.



Figure 3.8 General multi-story shear building structure.



- Figure 3.9 Hysteresis relationship of the story resisting force versus the story drift.
- Table 3.1Documentation of the GM used for the two-DOF nonlinear
dynamical system.

Property	GM1	GM2
NGA sequence #	1044	900
Earthquake name	Northridge-01	Landers
Station	Newhall – Fire Station	Yermo Fire Station
Magnitude	6.69	7.28
Δt for simulation	0.08 sec	0.1 sec
Duration	40 sec	44 sec



Figure 3.10 Plots of the ground accelerations for the GM used in this example.



Table 3.2The execution time for the two-DOF example #1.

Figure 3.11 Time history displacements for the two-DOF dynamic example obtained from the two nonlinear solution algorithms for GM1 with SF = 2.0.



Figure 3.12 Time history displacements for the two-DOF dynamic example obtained from the two nonlinear solution algorithms for GM2 with SF = 3.0.



Figure 3.13 Traces of equilibrium search for the two-DOF dynamic example using the two nonlinear solution algorithms for GM1 with SF = 2.0.



Figure 3.14 Traces of equilibrium search for the 2-DOF dynamic example using the two nonlinear solution algorithms for GM2 with SF = 3.0.

In order to test the algorithms in situations experiencing possible problems of convergence, the *SF*s for GM1 and GM2 are set as 3.0 and 7.5, respectively. Figures 3.15 and 3.16 compare the obtained time history displacements from the two algorithms. It is observed that the regular NR algorithm fails to converge at 5.20 sec and 19.00 sec, respectively, while the proposed Lyapunov-based algorithm is able to simulate through the whole course. Figures 3.17 and 3.18 present the traces of equilibrium search for the two algorithms where the regular NR ends up with oscillating indefinitely that fails to reach a solution while the proposed new algorithm converges to the solution smoothly. It is noted that the obtained time history responses from the two algorithms are the same up to the problematic time step. Therefore, as shown in Figures 3.17 and 3.18, the two algorithms start at the same initial guess, i.e., the response of the last time step, for the problematic

time step. The average numbers of iterations per time step of the two nonlinear solution algorithms for this example are documented in Table 3.3.

Table 3.3	The average numbers of iterations per time step for the two-DOF
	example.

GM	Algorithm	Example #1	Example #2
1	regular NR	3.2	3.4
1	Lyapunov-based	20.3	21.9
2	regular NR	3.1	3.1
	Lyapunov-based	19.3	22.4



Figure 3.15 Time history displacements for the 2-DOF dynamic example obtained from the two nonlinear solution algorithms for GM1 with SF = 3.0.



Figure 3.16 Time history displacements for the 2-DOF dynamic example obtained from the two nonlinear solution algorithms for GM2 with SF = 7.5.



Figure 3.17 Traces of equilibrium search for the 2-DOF dynamic example using the two nonlinear solution algorithms for GM1 with SF = 3.0.



Figure 3.18 Traces of equilibrium search for the 2-DOF dynamic example using the two nonlinear solution algorithms for GM2 with SF = 7.5.

3.5.3.2 Five-DOF Nonlinear Dynamical System

In this and next sections, simulations are conducted using Bathe's method (Bathe 2007) with NR including line search or using the proposed Lyapunov-based algorithms. The Bathe method interchanges the use of the implicit Newmark algorithm with constant average acceleration and the use of the three point Euler backward scheme. It is expected to present better stability behavior due to the numerical damping introduced by the Euler backward scheme. Also, the NR algorithm with line search technique was observed to possess better convergence behavior (Liang 2016). For this five-DOF example (n = 5 in Figure 3.8), the parameters in Figure 3.9 are selected as follows:

$$m_i = 1/20, k_{1i} = 200, k_{2i} = 10, Q_i = 10, i = 1, \dots, 5$$
 (3.44)

Figures 3.19 and 3.20 compare the obtained time history displacements of DOF 1 and DOF 4 from the two algorithms for GM1 and GM2, respectively. It is observed that the NR algorithm with line search fails to converge at 10.72 sec and 19.80 sec for GM1 and GM2, respectively, while the proposed Lyapunov-based algorithm is able to simulate throughout the whole time history. Figures 3.21 and 3.22 present the traces of equilibrium search of the two DOFs for the two algorithms for GM1 and GM2, respectively, where the proposed new algorithm converges to the solution smoothly while the NR with line search fails to do so.



Figure 3.19 Time history displacements for the 5-DOF dynamic example obtained from the two nonlinear solution algorithms for GM1 with SF = 4.5.



Figure 3.20 Time history displacements for the 5-DOF dynamic example obtained from the two nonlinear solution algorithms for GM2 with SF = 4.5.



Figure 3.21 Traces of equilibrium search for the 5-DOF dynamic example using the two nonlinear solution algorithms for GM1 with SF = 4.5.



Figure 3.22 Traces of equilibrium search for the 5-DOF dynamic example using the two nonlinear solution algorithms for GM2 with SF = 4.5.

3.5.3.3 Ten-DOF Nonlinear Dynamical System

In this ten-DOF example (n = 10 in Figure 3.8), the parameters in Figure 3.9 are selected as follows:

$$m_i = 1/100, k_{1i} = 200, k_{2i} = 10, Q_i = 10, i = 1, ..., 10$$
 (3.45)

Figures 3.23 and 3.24 show the obtained time history displacements of four selected DOFs from the two nonlinear solution algorithms for GM1 and GM2 where the NR algorithm with line search fails to converge at 5.52 sec and 16.70 sec, respectively. Figures 3.25 and 3.26 present the traces of equilibrium search of the four selected DOFs for the two algorithms for GM1 and GM2, respectively. The average numbers of iterations per time step of the two nonlinear solution algorithms for the five-DOF and ten-DOF examples are documented in Table 3.4. It is noted that

the reported numbers of iteration for NR algorithm with line search include both pure NR iterations (reported separately in parenthesis) and line search iterations. From Tables 3.2 to 3.4 and also the comparisons in Figures 3.13 and 3.14, it is noted that the proposed Lyapunov-based algorithm generally takes more iterations and execution time to converge but still within the acceptable range, especially considering that the average numbers of iterations for the regular NR and NR with line search algorithms are calculated only until the problematic steps.



Figure 3.23 Time history displacements for the ten-DOF dynamic example obtained from the two nonlinear solution algorithms for GM1 with SF = 2.0.



Figure 3.24 Time history displacements for the ten-DOF dynamic example obtained from the two nonlinear solution algorithms for GM2 with SF = 4.5.

Table 3.4	The average numbers of iterations per time step for the five-DOF
	and ten-DOF examples.

GM	Algorithm	5-DOF example	10-DOF example
1	NR with line search	13.1 (2.8)	11.7 (2.6)
1	Lyapunov-based	30.3	37.9
2	NR with line search	13.6 (2.5)	9.3 (2.4)
2	Lyapunov-based	30.7	44.9



Figure 3.25 Traces of equilibrium search for the ten-DOF dynamic example using the two nonlinear solution algorithms for GM1 with SF = 2.0.



Figure 3.26 Traces of equilibrium search for the ten-DOF dynamic example using the two nonlinear solution algorithms for GM2 with SF = 4.5.

4 NUMERICAL LYAPUNOV STABILITY ANALYSIS

4.1 INTRODUCTION

Stability is one of the most important properties of direct integration algorithms that must be considered for efficient and reliable simulations. Most of the past studies conducted the stability analysis of direct integration algorithms for linear elastic structures (e.g., Bathe and Wilson [1972]; Hilber et al. [1977]; Hughes [1987]; and Tamma et al. [2000]) using the amplification operator and its associated spectral radius. These research efforts provide useful insight for the selection of a suitable integration algorithm with the proper time step size to solve a dynamic problem. Integration algorithms, however, are usually applied to nonlinear dynamic problems. Studies involving nonlinear dynamics are therefore necessary but relatively limited in the literature. Hughes [1976] investigated the stability of the Newmark algorithm with constant acceleration applied to problems involving nonlinear dynamics. Zhong and Crisfield [1998] developed an energy-conserving co-rotational procedure for the dynamics of shell structures. Kuhl and Crisfield [1999] developed a generalized formulation of the energy-momentum method within the framework of the generalized- α algorithm. Chen and Ricles [2008] explored the stability of several direct integration algorithms for nonlinear SDOF systems by utilizing discrete control theory.

This chapter considers two general classes of nonlinear SDOF structural systems: stiffening and non-degrading softening systems. The idealized backbone curves (force-displacement relationship) of these two systems are illustrated in Figure 4.1. Systematic Lyapunov stability and accuracy analyses of several implicit and explicit direct integration algorithms for these two nonlinear structural systems are presented in Liang and Mosalam [2015; 2016a]. Unlike linear systems, the stability analysis of nonlinear systems is complicated and challenging because of the specific properties possessed by nonlinear systems. For example, the stability of nonlinear systems is dependent on initial conditions and the principle of superposition does not hold in general.

The Lyapunov stability theory introduced in Chapter 3 is used herein to study the stability of nonlinear systems. Generally speaking, constructing the previously mentioned energy function for the nonlinear system—the basis of Lyapunov stability theory—is not readily available. Therefore, to solve the problem in a simpler and clearer way, this chapter proposes a numerical approach to transform the problem of seeking a Lyapunov function to a convex optimization problem. Because this proposed approach may involve extensive computations, this chapter proposes an approach that performs the stability analysis numerically. Convex optimization considers the problem of minimizing convex functions over convex sets where a wide range of problems can be formulated in this way. In this optimization, any local minimum must be a global minimum, which is an important property leading to reliable and efficient solutions using, e.g. interior-point methods, which are suitable for computer-aided design or analysis tools [Boyd and Vandenberge 2004].

It is shown that the proposed approach is generally applicable to direct integration algorithms for various nonlinear behaviors. Moreover, based on Lyapunov stability theory, some arguments of stability regarding these direct integration algorithms from past studies are found to be groundless and these findings are discussed herein. The chapter also investigates the OS algorithm that uses tangent stiffness in the formulation, which has not been previously studied. It is shown that this algorithm possesses similar stability properties to those of the implicit Newmark integration. Finally, the accuracy of the integration methods is examined using a geometrically nonlinear problem, which has a closed-form exact solution.



Figure 4.1 Definition of stiffening and softening systems.

4.2 DIRECT INTEGRATION ALGORITHMS

The discretized equation of motion of a SDOF system under an external dynamic force excitation is expressed as:

$$m\ddot{u}_{i+1} + c\dot{u}_{i+1} + f_{i+1} = p_{i+1} \tag{4.1}$$

where *m* and *c* are the mass and viscous damping, and \ddot{u}_{i+1} , \dot{u}_{i+1} , f_{i+1} , and p_{i+1} are the acceleration, velocity, restoring force, and external force at the time step i + 1, respectively. The restoring force, f(u), is generally defined as a function of displacement, *u*.

Usually, single-step direct integration algorithms are defined by the following difference equations:

$$u_{i+1} = u_i + \eta_0 \left(\Delta t\right) \dot{u}_i + \eta_1 \left(\Delta t\right)^2 \ddot{u}_i + \eta_2 \left(\Delta t\right)^2 \ddot{u}_{i+1} + \eta_3$$
(4.2)

$$u_{i+1} = \eta_4 \dot{u}_i + \eta_5 (\Delta t) \ddot{u}_i + \eta_6 (\Delta t) \ddot{u}_{i+1} + \eta_7$$
(4.3)

In general, Equations (4.1)–(4.3) require an iterative solution, which forms the basis of implicit algorithms. On the other hand, these algorithms become explicit when $\eta_2 = 0$. Coefficients of the Newmark integration family [Newmark 1959] and the explicit OS algorithms [Hughes et al. 1979] are summarized in Table 4.1, where $\kappa = m/[\beta(\Delta t)^2] + c\gamma[\beta(\Delta t)] + k_{i+1}; k_{i+1}$ is defined below.

Coefficient	Newmark	OS
κ ₀	1	$1 - c/(\kappa(\Delta t))$
ĸ	$(1-2\beta)/2$	$(1-2\beta)/2-c(1-\gamma)/(\kappa(\Delta t))$
κ ₂	β	0
K ₃	0	$\left(p_{i+1}-\widetilde{f}_{i+1} ight)\!/\kappa$
K ₄	1	$1 - c\gamma/(\beta\kappa(\Delta t))$
K ₅	$1 - \gamma$	$1 - \gamma - c\gamma(1 - \gamma)/(\beta\kappa(\Delta t))$
K ₆	γ	0
<i>K</i> ₇	0	$\gamma \left(p_{i+1} - \widetilde{f}_{i+1} \right) / \left(\beta \kappa (\Delta t) \right)$

 Table 4.1
 Coefficients for the Newmark and the OS Integration Algorithms.

4.3 LYAPUNOV STABILITY ANALYSIS

For each direct integration algorithm, the relationship between the kinematic quantities at time steps i+1 and i can be established as follows:

$$\boldsymbol{x}_{i+1} = \boldsymbol{A}_i \boldsymbol{x}_i + \boldsymbol{L}_i \tag{4.4}$$

where $\mathbf{x}_i = \left[\left(\Delta t \right)^2 \ddot{u}_i \left(\Delta t \right) \dot{u}_i u_i \right]^T$, and \mathbf{A}_i and \mathbf{L}_i are the approximation operator and the loading vector at the time step i, respectively. The loading vector, \mathbf{L} , is generally independent of the vector of kinematic quantities, \mathbf{x} . Equation (4.4) can be further extended as:

$$\boldsymbol{x}_{i+1} = \left(\prod_{j=1}^{1} \mathbf{A}_{j}\right) \boldsymbol{x}_{1} + \sum_{l=1}^{i-1} \left[\left(\prod_{k=i}^{l+1} \mathbf{A}_{k}\right) \mathbf{L}_{l} \right] + \mathbf{L}_{i}$$
(4.5)

where $\prod_{j=i}^{1} \mathbf{A}_{j} = \mathbf{A}_{i} \mathbf{A}_{i-1} \cdots \mathbf{A}_{2} \mathbf{A}_{1}$. In order to investigate the stability of the system in Equation (4.4), a Lyapunov artificial energy function v_{i+1} [Franklin et al. 2015] at the time step i+1, can be chosen as:

$$v_{i+1} = \boldsymbol{x}_{i+1}^T \mathbf{M} \boldsymbol{x}_{i+1} \tag{4.6}$$

where **M** is positive definite, i.e., $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{M}^T \succ \mathbf{0}$, and **0** is the null matrix of the same dimension as **M**. The system in Equation (4.4) is stable if the Lyapunov function in Equation (4.6) is bounded for $i \rightarrow \infty$. Substituting Equation (4.5) into Equation (4.6) with some manipulations leads to the following:

$$v_{i+1} = \mathbf{x}_{1}^{T} \left(\prod_{k=1}^{1} \mathbf{A}_{K}^{T} \right) \mathbf{M} \left(\prod_{j=1}^{1} \mathbf{A}_{j} \right) \mathbf{x}_{1} + \sum_{l=1}^{i-1} \sum_{m=1}^{i-1} \left[\mathbf{L}_{l}^{T} \left(\prod_{k=i}^{l+1} \mathbf{A}_{K}^{T} \right) \mathbf{M} \left(\prod_{n=1}^{m+1} \mathbf{A}_{n} \right) \mathbf{L}_{m} \right] + \mathbf{L}_{i}^{T} \mathbf{M} \mathbf{L}_{i}$$
$$+ 2 \mathbf{x}_{1}^{T} \left(\prod_{k=1}^{1} \mathbf{A}_{K}^{T} \right) \mathbf{M} \mathbf{L}_{i} + 2 \left[\sum_{l=1}^{i-1} \mathbf{L}_{l}^{T} \left(\prod_{k=i}^{l+1} \mathbf{A}_{K}^{T} \right) \right] \mathbf{M} \mathbf{L}$$
$$+ 2 \mathbf{x}_{1}^{T} \left(\prod_{k=1}^{1} \mathbf{A}_{K}^{T} \right) \mathbf{M} \left[\sum_{m=1}^{i-1} \left(\prod_{n=i}^{m+1} \mathbf{A}_{n} \right) \mathbf{L}_{m} \right]$$
$$(4.7)$$

Because the loading vector, **L**, is generally a function of external force *p*, it is bounded; therefore, based on Equation (4.7), the boundedness of the Lyapunov function v_{i+1} for $i \to \infty$ leads to the boundedness of $\prod_{j=i}^{1} \mathbf{A}_{j}$ for $i \to \infty$. For linear behavior of structures, the approximation operator, **A**, remains constant; thus $\prod_{j=i}^{1} \mathbf{A}_{j}$ becomes \mathbf{A}^{i} , which can be decomposed as follows:

$$\mathbf{A}^{i} = \mathbf{V}\mathbf{D}^{i}\mathbf{V}^{\cdot 1} \tag{4.8}$$

where **D** and **V** are matrices of eigenvalues and eigenvectors of **A**, respectively. The boundedness of \mathbf{A}^i for $i \to \infty$ leads to the well-known stability criterion for linear systems, namely, the spectral radius of the approximation operator $\rho(\mathbf{A})$ must be less than or equal to 1.0.

For nonlinear structures, $\prod_{j=i}^{1} \mathbf{A}_{j}$ is more involved due to the continuous variation of approximation operator \mathbf{A}_{i} . Therefore, the stability of a nonlinear system cannot be solely determined using the spectral radius of its approximation operator \mathbf{A}_{i} . However, the investigation of the eigen properties of \mathbf{A}_{i} is still necessary in nonlinear problems. For small values of Δt , e.g., Δt required for accuracy as discussed later in the section "Accuracy Analysis," the increment of restoring force can be approximated [Chopra 2006] as:

$$f_{i+1}^* - f_i = k_{T_{i+1}}^* \left(u_{i+1}^* - u_i \right)$$
(4.9)

where $(f_{i+1}^*, k_{T_{i+1}}^*, u_{i+1}^*) = (f_{i+1}, k_{T_{i+1}}, u_{i+1})$ for the Newmark family of algorithms and $(f_{i+1}^*, k_{T_{i+1}}^*, u_{i+1}^*) = (\tilde{f}_{i+1}, \tilde{k}_{T_{i+1}}, \tilde{u}_{i+1})$ for the OS algorithms. Note that $k_{T_{i+1}}$ is the tangent stiffness at the time step i+1, and other parameters are as defined before. The tangent stiffness is generally a function of the displacement; thus Equation (4.4) represents a nonlinear system of equations. With the approximation in Equation (4.9), the approximation operator \mathbf{A}_i for the Newmark and the OS algorithms is derived as follows:

$$\mathbf{A}_{i} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1 - \frac{1 - 2\beta}{2} \omega_{0}^{2} (\Delta t)^{2} - 2\zeta \omega_{n} (1 - \gamma) (\Delta t)}{1 + 2\zeta \omega_{n} \gamma (\Delta t) + \beta \omega_{1}^{2} (\Delta t)^{2}} & -\frac{\omega_{0}^{2} (\Delta t)^{2}}{1 + 2\zeta \omega_{n} \gamma (\Delta t) + \beta \omega_{1}^{2} (\Delta t)^{2}} & 0\\ \frac{\gamma \left(1 - \frac{1 - 2\beta}{2} \omega_{0}^{2} (\Delta t)^{2} - 2\zeta \omega_{n} (1 - \gamma) (\Delta t)\right)}{1 + 2\zeta \omega_{n} \gamma (\Delta t) + \beta \omega_{1}^{2} (\Delta t)^{2}} + (1 - \gamma) & 1 - \frac{\gamma \omega_{0}^{2} (\Delta t)^{2}}{1 + 2\zeta \omega_{n} \gamma (\Delta t) + \beta \omega_{1}^{2} (\Delta t)^{2}} & 0\\ \frac{\beta \left(1 - \frac{1 - 2\beta}{2} \omega_{0}^{2} (\Delta t)^{2} - 2\zeta \omega_{n} (1 - \gamma) (\Delta t)\right)}{1 + 2\zeta \omega_{n} \gamma (\Delta t) + \beta \omega_{1}^{2} (\Delta t)^{2}} + \frac{1 - 2\beta}{2} & 1 - \frac{\beta \omega_{0}^{2} (\Delta t)^{2}}{1 + 2\zeta \omega_{n} \gamma (\Delta t) + \beta \omega_{1}^{2} (\Delta t)^{2}} & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$
(4.10)

where $\zeta = c/(2m\omega_n)$, $\omega_n^2 = k_I/m$. Coefficients ω_0 and ω_1 for the Newmark integration family and the OS algorithms are listed in Table 4.2. Here, $\omega_{T_{i+1}}^2 = k_{T_{i+1}}/m$, $\tilde{\omega}_{T_{i+1}}^2 = \tilde{k}_{T_{i+1}}/m$. It is obvious that one of the eigenvalues of \mathbf{A}_i in Equation (4.10) is 1. For the Newmark and OS algorithms with $(\beta, \gamma) = (1/4, 1/2)$, the other two eigenvalues are obtained as:

$$\lambda_{1,2} = \frac{1 - \frac{3}{8}\omega_0^2 (\Delta t)^2 + \frac{1}{8}\omega_1^2 (\Delta t)^2 \pm \Delta t \sqrt{\omega_n^2 \zeta^2 + \frac{1}{4}\omega_n \zeta \Delta t (\omega_1^2 - \omega_0^2) + (\Delta t)^2 (9\omega_0^4 - 10\omega_0^2 \omega_1^2 + \omega_1^4) - \omega_0^2}}{1 + \omega_n \zeta \Delta t + \frac{1}{4}\omega_1^2 (\Delta t)^2}$$
(4.11)

On the other hand, for the explicit Newmark algorithm, i.e., $(\beta, \gamma) = (0, 1/2)$,

$$\lambda_{1,2} = \frac{1 - \frac{1}{2}\omega_{T_{i+1}}^2 (\Delta t)^2 \pm \Delta t \sqrt{\omega_n^2 \zeta^2 + \frac{1}{4}\omega_{T_{i+1}}^4 (\Delta t)^2 - \omega_{T_{i+1}}^2}}{1 + \omega_n \zeta \Delta t}$$
(4.12)

Different from the integration algorithms above, the TRBDF2 is a multi-step algorithm with numerical damping introduced by the Euler backward scheme. Its approximation operator in Equation (4.14) is obtained for the case of zero viscous damping ($\zeta = 0$) by similar linearization approximation for the tangent stiffness as before and given as follows:

$$k_{T_{i+1}} = (f_{i+1} - f_{i+0.5}) / (u_{i+1} - u_{i+0.5}) = (f_{i+0.5} - f_i) / (u_{i+0.5} - u_i)$$
(4.13)

$$\mathbf{A}_{i} = \frac{1}{B} \begin{vmatrix} 9 - \frac{47}{16} \,\omega_{T_{i+1}}^{2} \left(\Delta t\right)^{2} & \frac{5}{16} \,\omega_{T_{i+1}}^{4} \left(\Delta t\right)^{4} - 9 \,\omega_{T_{i+1}}^{2} \left(\Delta t\right)^{2} & 0 \\ 9 - \frac{5}{16} \,\omega_{T_{i+1}}^{2} \left(\Delta t\right)^{2} & 9 - \frac{47}{16} \,\omega_{T_{i+1}}^{2} \left(\Delta t\right)^{2} & 0 \\ 9 - \frac{5}{16} \,\omega_{T_{i+1}}^{2} \left(\Delta t\right)^{2} & 0 \\ 0 - \frac{5}{16} \,\omega_{T_{i+1}}^{2} \left(\Delta t\right)^{2} & 0 \\ 0 - \frac{5}{16} \,\omega_{T_{i+1}}^{2} \left(\Delta t\right)^{2} & 0 \\ 0 - \frac{5}{16} \,\omega_{T_{i+1}}^{2} \left(\Delta t\right)^{2} & 0 \\ 0 - \frac{5}{16} \,\omega_{T_{i+1}}^{2} \left(\Delta t\right)^{2} & 0 \\ 0 - \frac{5}{16} \,\omega_{T_{i+1}}^{2} \left(\Delta t\right)^{2} & 0 \\ 0 - \frac{5}{16} \,\omega_{T_{i+1}}^{2} \left(\Delta t\right)^{2} & 0 \\ 0 - \frac{5}{16} \,\omega_{T_{i+1}}^{2} \left(\Delta t\right)^{2} & 0 \\ 0 - \frac{5}{16} \,\omega_{T_{i+1}}^{2} \left(\Delta t\right)^{2} & 0 \\ 0 - \frac{5}{16} \,\omega_{T_{i+1}}^{2} \left(\Delta t\right)^{2} & 0 \\ 0 - \frac{5}{16} \,\omega_{T_{i+1}}^{2} \left(\Delta t\right)^{2} & 0 \\ 0 - \frac{5}{16} \,\omega_{T_{i+1}}^{2} \left(\Delta t\right)^{2} & 0 \\ 0 - \frac{5}{16} \,\omega_{T_{i+1}}^{2} \left(\Delta t\right)^{2} & 0 \\ 0 - \frac{5}{16} \,\omega_{T_{i+1}}^{2} \left(\Delta t\right)^{2} & 0 \\ 0 - \frac{5}{16} \,\omega_{T_{i+1}}^{2} \left(\Delta t\right)^{2} & 0 \\ 0 - \frac{5}{16} \,\omega_{T_{i+1}}^{2} \left(\Delta t\right)^{2} & 0 \\ 0 - \frac{5}{16} \,\omega_{T_{i+1}}^{2} \left(\Delta t\right)^{2} & 0 \\ 0 - \frac{5}{16} \,\omega_{T_{i+1}}^{2} \left(\Delta t\right)^{2} & 0 \\ 0 - \frac{5}{16} \,\omega_{T_{i+1}}^{2} \left(\Delta t\right)^{2} & 0 \\ 0 - \frac{5}{16} \,\omega_{T_{i+1}}^{2} \left(\Delta t\right)^{2} & 0 \\ 0 - \frac{5}{16} \,\omega_{T_{i+1}}^{2} \left(\Delta t\right)^{2} & 0 \\ 0 - \frac{5}{16} \,\omega_{T_{i+1}}^{2} \left(\Delta t\right)^{2} & 0 \\ 0 - \frac{5}{16} \,\omega_{T_{i+1}}^{2} \left(\Delta t\right)^{2} & 0 \\ 0 - \frac{5}{16} \,\omega_{T_{i+1}}^{2} \left(\Delta t\right)^{2} & 0 \\ 0 - \frac{5}{16} \,\omega_{T_{i+1}}^{2} \left(\Delta t\right)^{2} & 0 \\ 0 - \frac{5}{16} \,\omega_{T_{i+1}}^{2} \left(\Delta t\right)^{2} & 0 \\ 0 - \frac{5}{16} \,\omega_{T_{i+1}}^{2} \left(\Delta t\right)^{2} & 0 \\ 0 - \frac{5}{16} \,\omega_{T_{i+1}}^{2} \left(\Delta t\right)^{2} & 0 \\ 0 - \frac{5}{16} \,\omega_{T_{i+1}}^{2} \left(\Delta t\right)^{2} & 0 \\ 0 - \frac{5}{16} \,\omega_{T_{i+1}}^{2} \left(\Delta t\right)^{2} & 0 \\ 0 - \frac{5}{16} \,\omega_{T_{i+1}}^{2} \left(\Delta t\right)^{2} & 0 \\ 0 - \frac{5}{16} \,\omega_{T_{i+1}}^{2} \left(\Delta t\right)^{2} & 0 \\ 0 - \frac{5}{16} \,\omega_{T_{i+1}}^{2} \left(\Delta t\right)^{2} & 0 \\ 0 - \frac{5}{16} \,\omega_{T_{i+1}}^{2} \left(\Delta t\right)^{2} & 0 \\ 0 - \frac{5}{16} \,\omega_{T_{i+1}}^{2} \left(\Delta t\right)^{2} & 0 \\ 0 - \frac{5}{16} \,\omega_{T_{i+1}}^{2} \left(\Delta t\right)^{2} & 0 \\ 0 - \frac{5}{16} \,\omega_{T_{i+1}}^{2} \left(\Delta t\right)^{2} & 0 \\ 0 - \frac{5}{16} \,\omega_{T_{i+1}}^{2} \left($$

$$\mathbf{D}\left[\frac{9}{2} + \frac{1}{16}\omega_{T_{i+1}}^{2}\left(\Delta t\right)^{2} \qquad 9 - \frac{5}{16}\omega_{T_{i+1}}^{2}\left(\Delta t\right)^{2} \qquad \left(\omega_{T_{i+1}}^{2}\left(\Delta t\right)^{2} + 9\right)\left(\frac{1}{16}\omega_{T_{i+1}}^{2}\left(\Delta t\right)^{2} + 1\right)\right]$$

where $B = [\omega_{T_{i+1}}^2 (\Delta t)^2 + 9][\frac{1}{16}\omega_{T_{i+1}}^2 (\Delta t)^2 + 1]$. Thus, besides the one obvious eigenvalue of 1, the other two are as follows:

$$\lambda_{1.2} = \frac{9 - \frac{47}{16} \omega_{T_{i+1}}^2 (\Delta t)^2 \pm \left(9 - \frac{5}{16} \omega_{T_{i+1}}^2 (\Delta t)^2\right) \sqrt{-\omega_{T_{i+1}}^2 (\Delta t)^2}}{\frac{1}{16} \omega_{T_{i+1}}^4 (\Delta t)^4 + \frac{25}{16} \omega_{T_{i+1}}^2 (\Delta t)^2 + 9}$$
(4.15)

It can be shown that for $k_{T_{i+1}} \ge 0$, magnitudes of the eigenvalues in Equation (4.15) are always less than 1 because of introduced numerical damping.

The conditions for $\rho = (\mathbf{A}_i) \leq 1$ are summarized in Table 4.3 for the case of zero viscous damping $(\zeta = 0)$, which is the most critical case for the stability analysis of direct integration algorithms. In Table 4.3, $T_{T_{i+1}} = 2\pi/\omega_{T_{i+1}} = 2\pi\sqrt{m/k_{T_{i+1}}}$ and $(\beta, \gamma) = (1/4, 1/2)$ are used for implicit Newmark, OS_{initial} and OS_{tangent} and thereafter in this chapter. Note: the approximation operator of the explicit OS_{tangent} algorithm is the same as that of the implicit Newmark algorithm with $\omega_{T_{i+1}}$ replaced by $\tilde{\omega}_{T_{i+1}}$; see Table 4.2. This indicates that they possess similar stability properties, as indicated in Table 4.3.

Coefficient	Newmark	OS initial	OS _{tangent}
ω_0	$\mathscr{O}_{T_{i+1}}$	$\widetilde{\omega}_{T_{i+1}}$	$\widetilde{\omega}_{T_{i+1}}$
ω_1	$\mathscr{O}_{T_{i+1}}$	ω_n	$\widetilde{\omega}_{T_{i+1}}$

Table 4.2Coefficients of approximation operators for the Newmark and the
OS Integration Algorithms.

Table 4.5	Conditions for $p(\mathbf{m}_i) = 1$.
Integration Algorithms	Limits
Implicit Newmark	$k_{T_{i+1}} \ge 0$
Explicit Newmark	$\Delta t/T_{T_{i+1}} \leq 1/\pi$
$OS_{initial}$	$0 \leq \tilde{k}_{T_{i+1}} \leq k_I$
OS _{tangent}	$\widetilde{k}_{T_{i+1}} \ge 0$
TRBDF2	$k_{T_{i+1}} \ge 0$

Table 4.3 Conditions for $\rho(\mathbf{A}_i) \leq 1$.

The conditions in Table 4.3 are *not* stability criteria of the listed direct integration algorithms used in nonlinear systems. They are *only* the conditions for $\rho(\mathbf{A}_i) \leq 1$. Some past studies have determined the stability of direct integration algorithms based solely on the spectral radius. Combescure and Pegon (1997) claimed that the OS_{initial} algorithm is unconditionally stable as long as the tangent stiffness is smaller than or equal to the initial stiffness; otherwise, the algorithm is unstable. They directly applied the stability criterion that only works for linear structures, i.e., $\rho(\mathbf{A}_i) \leq 1$, to nonlinear ones. As previously discussed, the boundedness $\prod_{j=i}^{1} \mathbf{A}_j$ for $i \to \infty$ cannot be guaranteed by $\rho(\mathbf{A}_i) \leq 1$. Moreover, the unboundedness of $\prod_{j=i}^{1} \mathbf{A}_j$ for $i \to \infty$ cannot be simply equivalent to $\rho(\mathbf{A}_i) \leq 1$.

The example below is presented to illustrate that the system can still become unstable with $\rho(\mathbf{A}_i) \leq 1$ for every time step, i.e., the stability cannot be strictly guaranteed by $\rho(\mathbf{A}_i) \leq 1$ only. The implicit Newmark method with constant average acceleration is used in this example considering the following numerical conditions where all units are assumed consistent and omitted for convenience:

$$\zeta = 0.01 \quad \Delta t = 0.01T_n = 0.01(2\pi/\omega_n) \quad k_I = 100 \quad m = 1 \tag{4.16}$$

The response of the *i*th time step, x_i , with the loading vector $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{0}$, is as follows:

$$\boldsymbol{x}_{i} = \left[(\Delta t)^{2} \ddot{\boldsymbol{u}}_{i} \ (\Delta t) \dot{\boldsymbol{u}}_{i} \ \boldsymbol{u}_{i} \right]^{T} = \left(\prod_{j=i}^{1} \boldsymbol{A}_{j} \right) \boldsymbol{x}_{0}$$
(4.17)

The total number of simulated time steps is 10,000 with initial conditions $\mathbf{x}_0 = \left[(\Delta t)^2 \ddot{u}_0 (\Delta t) \dot{u}_0 u_0 \right]^T = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}^T$. In this example, 10,000 values of tangent stiffness are selected randomly under the condition that all of them are larger than the value of initial stiffness $k_1 = 100$, i.e., $k_{T_i} > k_1$, $i: 1 \rightarrow 10,000$, i.e. assuming a stiffening behavior. Therefore, according to Table 4.3, $\rho(\mathbf{A}_i) = 1$, $i: 1 \rightarrow 10,000$.

Figure 4.2 shows the time history plot of displacement u_i , $i:1 \rightarrow 10,000$; clearly the algorithm is unstable even with $\rho(\mathbf{A}_i) \leq 1$, $i:1 \rightarrow 10,000$. Moreover, the numerical example used in the section "Accuracy Analysis" also shows that the stability criterion based on investigating the conditions of the spectral radius fails to identify the stability of the OS_{initial} algorithm. Using discrete control theory, Chen and Ricles [2008] demonstrated that the Newmark method with constant average acceleration and explicit Newmark method are unconditionally stable if the stability limits listed in Table 4.3 are satisfied; otherwise, these methods are unstable. However, the root locus method presented in Chen and Ricles [2008] is a frequency domain equivalence of investigating the conditions of the spectral radius for the approximation operator. This root locus method is only applicable to linear time-invariant systems [Franklin et al. 2015], i.e., linear structures; that is the reason why the obtained results and stability limits are the same as those expressed by Equations (4.11) and (4.12) and listed in Table 4.3. Accordingly, these published arguments of stability, i.e., those by Combescure and Pegon [1997] and Chen and Ricles [2008], are incorrect and theoretically groundless and are not generally applicable to nonlinear problems.



Figure 4.2 Time history plot of the displacement of an unstable example with $\rho(\mathbf{A}_i) = 1$.

4.4 NUMERICAL LYAPUNOV ANALYSIS

This section presents a numerical approach that investigates the stability analysis discussed in the previous sections. This approach is based on transforming the stability analysis to a problem of convex optimization, which is applicable to direct integration algorithms applied to nonlinear problems.

As previously discussed, a system is stable if its $\prod_{j=i}^{1} \mathbf{A}_{j}$ is bounded for $i \to \infty$. This is equivalent to investigating the system in Equation (4.5) with the loading vector $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{0}$, i.e.,

$$\boldsymbol{x}_{i+1} = \boldsymbol{A}_i \boldsymbol{x}_i \tag{4.18}$$

 \mathbf{A}_i can be rewritten non-dimensionally, e.g., in the implicit Newmark algorithm:

$$\mathbf{A}_{i} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1 - 2\pi \zeta \mu - \pi^{2} \delta_{i+1}^{2} \mu^{2}}{1 + 2\pi \zeta \mu + \pi^{2} \delta_{i+1}^{2} \mu^{2}} & -\frac{\omega_{0}^{2} (\Delta t)^{2}}{1 + 2\pi \zeta \mu + \pi^{2} \delta_{i+1}^{2} \mu^{2}} & 0\\ \frac{1}{1 + 2\pi \zeta \mu + \pi^{2} \delta_{i+1}^{2} \mu^{2}} & \frac{1 + 2\pi \zeta \mu - \pi^{2} \delta_{i+1}^{2} \mu^{2}}{1 + 2\pi \zeta \mu + \pi^{2} \delta_{i+1}^{2} \mu^{2}} & 0\\ \frac{\frac{1}{2}}{1 + 2\pi \zeta \mu + \pi^{2} \delta_{i+1}^{2} \mu^{2}} & \frac{1 + 2\pi \zeta \mu}{1 + 2\pi \zeta \mu + \pi^{2} \delta_{i+1}^{2} \mu^{2}} & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$
(4.19)

where $\delta_{i+1} = \omega_{T_{i+1}} / \omega_n$, $\mu = \Delta t / T_n$, $T_n = 2\pi / \omega_n = 2\pi \sqrt{m/k_1}$. Therefore, \mathbf{A}_i is a function of δ_{i+1} . Similar to Equation (4.6), the Lyapunov function v_{i+1} at the time step i+1 can be selected as:

$$v_{i+1} = \boldsymbol{x}_{i+1}^T \boldsymbol{M}_{i+1} \boldsymbol{x}_{i+1}$$
(4.20)

where the positive definite matrix $\mathbf{M}_{i+1} = \mathbf{M}_{i+1}^T$ is a function of δ_{i+1} . A sufficient condition for the system and thus the direct integration algorithm to be stable is as follows:

$$\Delta v_{i+1} = v_{i+1} - r_i v_i$$

= $\mathbf{x}_{i+1}^T \mathbf{M}_{i+1} \mathbf{x}_{i+1} - r_i \mathbf{x}_i^T \mathbf{M}_i \mathbf{x}_i$
= $\mathbf{x}_i^T (\mathbf{A}_i^T \mathbf{M}_{i+1} \mathbf{A}_i - r_i \mathbf{M}_i) \mathbf{x}_i$
= $\mathbf{x}_i^T \mathbf{P}_{i+1} \mathbf{x}_i \le 0$ (4.21)

where $0 < r_t \le 1$ controls the rate of convergence, i.e., the smaller the r_t , the faster the convergence. Equation (4.21) leads to the negative semi-definiteness of \mathbf{P}_{i+1} , i.e. $\mathbf{P}_{i+1} \prec = \mathbf{0}$. For a direct integration algorithm, \mathbf{M}_{i+1} can be expressed as:

$$\mathbf{M}_{i+1} = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \alpha_j \boldsymbol{\Phi}(\delta_{i+1})_j \tag{4.22}$$

where α_j and $\Phi(\delta_{i+1})_j$ are the *j*-th constant coefficient and base function, respectively, and N is the total number of base functions. One example set of base functions is given in the Appendix A. The set of base functions of only Φ_1 to Φ_6 represent constant \mathbf{M}_{i+1} . Φ_7 to Φ_{12} constitute the
set of base functions that treats \mathbf{M}_{i+1} as a linear function of δ_{i+1} . Nonlinear relationship between \mathbf{M}_{i+1} and δ_{i+1} can be considered by additional base functions $\mathbf{\Phi}_{13}$ to $\mathbf{\Phi}_{18}$.

With the range of δ_i and δ_{i+1} given, e.g., $\delta_i, \delta_{i+1} \in [a,b]$, points can be sampled within this range (Figure 4.3), e.g., sampling n+1 points in [a,b] with interval $\Delta \delta = (b-a)/n$. This yields $(n+1)^2$ possible pairs of (δ_i, δ_{i+1}) . Accordingly, the stability analysis becomes a problem of convex optimization that seeks the determination of the coefficients α_j by minimizing their norm for the selected base functions $\Phi(\delta_{i+1})_j$ where $j:1 \rightarrow N$, subjected to the following conditions on the $(n+1)^2$ possible pairs of (δ_i, δ_{i+1}) :

$$\delta_{i}, \delta_{i+1} \in [a,b], \quad \Delta \delta = (b-a)/n$$

$$\mathbf{A}_{i}^{T} \mathbf{M}_{i+1} \mathbf{A}_{i} - r_{i} \mathbf{M}_{i} = \mathbf{A}_{i} (\delta_{i+1})^{T} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{N} \alpha_{j} \mathbf{\Phi}(\delta_{i+1})_{j} \right) \mathbf{A}_{i} (\delta_{i+1}) - r_{i} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \alpha_{j} \mathbf{\Phi}(\delta_{i})_{j} \prec = \mathbf{0} \quad (4.23)$$

$$\mathbf{M}_{i} = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \alpha_{j} \mathbf{\Phi}(\delta_{i})_{j} \succ \mathbf{0}, \quad \mathbf{M}_{i+1} = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \alpha_{j} \mathbf{\Phi}(\delta_{i+1})_{j} \succ \mathbf{0}$$

Moreover, with prior knowledge about the variation of δ_{i+1} , the range of $|\delta_{i+1} - \delta_i|$ can be specified, e.g., $|\delta_{i+1} - \delta_i| < \varepsilon$, where ε is an optional parameter that is not necessarily small. For example, suppose we are interested in investigating the stability of a certain algorithm in the range of $\delta_i, \delta_{i+1} \in [1, 2]$, and $\delta_i = 1.5$ at *i*th time step. If prior knowledge is known such that $\varepsilon = 0.3$, i.e., $\delta_{i+1} \in (1.2, 1.8)$, fewer possible pairs of (δ_i, δ_{i+1}) that require less computational effort can be considered.

The problem of convex optimization can be solved numerically using CVX, a software package for specifying and solving convex programs [CVX Research Inc. 2011]. Two examples, the softening and the stiffening cases, for the implicit Newmark algorithm are considered based on the following conditions:

$$\zeta = 0.05 \quad \mu = 0.05/(2\pi) \quad n = 20 \quad \varepsilon = 0.05 \quad r_t = 1.0$$
(4.24)

The set of base functions $\mathbf{\Phi}_1$ to $\mathbf{\Phi}_{12}$ in the Appendix A is used.



Figure 4.3 Schematic illustration of discretization process.

4.4.1 Softening Example

Suppose we are interested in investigating the stability of the implicit Newmark algorithm in the range of $\delta_i, \delta_{i+1} \in [0.9, 1.0]$, therefore $\Delta \delta = (b-a)/n = 0.005$. The coefficients $\alpha_j, j: 1 \rightarrow 12$, obtained by minimizing the two-norm of α , i.e. $\min \sqrt{(\sum_{j=1}^{12} |\alpha_j|^2)}$, are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_{1} &= 1.90 \times 10^{-8}, \quad \alpha_{2} &= 2.46 \times 10^{-9}, \quad \alpha_{3} &= 1.70 \times 10^{-10}, \quad \alpha_{4} &= -2.25 \times 10^{-9}, \\ \alpha_{5} &= -2.70 \times 10^{-10}, \quad \alpha_{6} &= -4.60 \times 10^{-10}, \quad \alpha_{7} &= 1.76 \times 10^{-8}, \quad \alpha_{8} &= 1.05 \times 10^{-9}, \\ \alpha_{9} &= 6.00 \times 10^{-11}, \quad \alpha_{10} &= -3.35 \times 10^{-9}, \quad \alpha_{11} &= 4.30 \times 10^{-10}, \quad \alpha_{12} &= -2.00 \times 10^{-10} \end{aligned}$$
(4.25)

The existence of such set of α_j implies the existence of \mathbf{M}_{i+1} in Equation (4.22) that satisfies the inequality in Equation (4.21), which indicates that the implicit Newmark algorithm is stable for the conditions in Equation (4.24) in the range of $\delta_i, \delta_{i+1} \in [0.9, 1.0]$.

4.4.2 Stiffening Example

Following a similar procedure used in the previous softening example, in the stiffening case with range of interest, $\delta_i, \delta_{i+1} \in [1.0, 1.1]$, the obtained coefficients $\alpha_i, j: 1 \rightarrow 12$, are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_{1} &= 9.81 \times 10^{-7}, \quad \alpha_{2} &= 2.28 \times 10^{-10}, \quad \alpha_{3} &= 1.93 \times 10^{-8}, \quad \alpha_{4} &= -2.25 \times 10^{-8}, \\ \alpha_{5} &= -2.30 \times 10^{-9}, \quad \alpha_{6} &= -1.53 \times 10^{-9}, \quad \alpha_{7} &= 1.01 \times 10^{-6}, \quad \alpha_{8} &= 3.39 \times 10^{-11}, \\ \alpha_{9} &= 7.03 \times 10^{-9}, \quad \alpha_{10} &= -8.94 \times 10^{-8}, \quad \alpha_{11} &= 7.20 \times 10^{-9}, \quad \alpha_{12} &= -5.01 \times 10^{-10} \end{aligned}$$
(4.26)

The set of α_j in Equations (4.25) and (26) from many determined sets has the minimum two-norm explaining the listed small values of α_j . The existence of such set of α_j implies that the implicit Newmark algorithm is stable for the conditions in Equation (4.24) in the range of $\delta_i, \delta_{i+1} \in [1.0, 1.1]$. The accuracy of the proposed numerical stability analysis approach depends on the selection of the interval $\Delta \delta$. Similar to the time step Δt used in nonlinear time history analysis, smaller $\Delta \delta$, that requires higher computational effort, leads to more accurate and

reliable stability analysis. For example, if n + 1 = 41 points (denoted as set A) are sampled ($\Delta \delta = 0.0025$) for the softening example, $41^2 - 21^2 = 1240$ additional pairs of (δ_i, δ_{i+1}) , which require more computational effort, need to be considered than that for the case with n + 1 = 21sampled points (denoted as set B). The stability analysis based on set A is closer to that of the continuous interval of [0.9, 1.0] than that based on set B. Furthermore, the set of coefficients α that satisfies the inequality of Equation (4.21) for set A, also fulfils the same inequality for set B because the set of the possible pairs of (δ_i, δ_{i+1}) for set B is a subset of that for set A. Therefore, the stability of the set of larger number of sampled points implies the stability of smaller number of sampled points. Note: Equation (4.21) is a sufficient condition for the direct integration algorithm to be stable. Therefore, the existence of the coefficients corresponding to the selected base functions obtained by the numerical approach proposed here that satisfies Equation (4.21) implies that the range of interest for δ_{i+1} is a sufficient range for the direct integration algorithm to be stable. However, inexistence of such coefficients does not indicate the instability of the direct integration algorithm within the range of interest for δ_{i+1} .

The approach presented above can be applied to investigating the stability of other direct integration algorithms, including the other four methods considered in this chapter. Also, various nonlinear problems, including stiffening ($\delta_{i+1} > 1$) and softening ($\delta_{i+1} < 1$) behaviors in Figure 4.1, can be taken into account. Accordingly, the proposed approach is generally applicable to direct integration algorithms as long as they can be expressed as given by Equation (4.18). Moreover, this approach can potentially be extended to MDOF systems. For m-DOF systems, the $3m \times 3m$ approximation operator is a function of δ_{i+1}^j , where $j: 1 \rightarrow m$ denotes the *j*-th DOF; thus $(m+1)(9m^2+3m)/2$ selected base functions and corresponding coefficients are needed if \mathbf{M}_{i+1} is expressed as an affine function of δ_{i+1}^j , $j:1 \rightarrow m$. For example, for each possible pair of computational $\left(\delta_{i}^{1},\delta_{i+1}^{1},...,\delta_{i}^{m},\delta_{i+1}^{m}
ight)$, the for effort 10-DOF systems is $\left\lceil (10+1) \left(9 \times 10^2 + 3 \times 10\right) / 2 \right\rceil / \left\lceil (1+1) \left(9 \times 1^2 + 3 \times 1\right) / 2 \right\rceil = 426.25 \text{ times that for SDOF systems.}$ Therefore, the proposed approach may involve extensive computations for MDOF systems.

4.5 ACCURACY ANALYSIS

The accuracy of the numerical integration algorithms depends on several factors, e.g., the loading, the time-step size, and the physical parameters of the system. In order to develop an understanding of this accuracy, a nonlinear test problem with an available closed-form exact solution is analyzed next.

Consider a simple pendulum (Figure 4.4) of length l, forming a time-dependent angle $\theta(t)$ with the vertical axis and undergoing time-dependent angular acceleration $\ddot{\theta}(t)$. The governing equation, initial conditions, exact solution, and period of vibration are summarized in Table 4.4, where g is the gravitational acceleration, $\tilde{n} = K(r) - \kappa_0 t$, $\kappa_0 = \sqrt{g/l}$, K(r) is the complete elliptical integral of the first kind, and sn(n;r) is the Jacobi elliptic function [Abramowitz and Stegun 1972].

Property	Expression
Governing equation	$\ddot{\theta} + (g/l)\sin\theta = 0$
Initial conditions	$\theta(0) = \theta_0, \dot{\theta}(0) = 0$
Exact solution (Beléndez et al. 2007)	$\theta(t) = 2 \arcsin\{\sin(\theta_0/2) \sin(\tilde{n}; r)\}, r = \sin^2(\theta_0/2)$
Period	$T = 4K(r)/\kappa_0$

Table 4.4Nonlinear pendulum.

Figures 4.5 and 4.6 present the period elongation and the amplitude decay of the investigated integration algorithms for $\theta_0 = 0.10\pi$ and $\theta_0 = 0.50\pi$, respectively. The period is shortened using explicit Newmark algorithm [Chopra 2006], and elongated by the other algorithms; the OS_{tangent} and implicit Newmark present similar period elongations. Although the TRBDF2 has the smallest period change, it is about twice computationally expensive compared to the other algorithms. Considering roughly the same computational efforts, e.g., $\Delta t/T = 0.08$ for TRBDF2 and $\Delta t/T = 0.04$ for the others, the accuracy becomes comparable. Moreover, the accuracy of all algorithms is indifferent for the integration time steps required for accuracy, i.e., $\Delta t/T < 0.01$ [Bathe 2006]. All algorithms do not result in any significant amplitude decay except in the case of TRBDF2, which presents some amplitude decay due to introduced numerical damping. Up to $\Delta t/T = 0.1$, period elongation (< ±3%) and amplitude decay (< 1%) are acceptable.

The nonlinear pendulum problem is also used to demonstrate the incorrectness of the stability criterion of the $OS_{initial}$ algorithm from past studies and the suitability of the proposed numerical stability analysis approach presented herein. The tangent stiffness of this nonlinear pendulum is obtained as:

$$k_T = (g/l)\cos\theta \tag{4.27}$$

This tangent stiffness k_T is always positive if $\theta \in (-\pi/2, \pi/2)$. The OS_{initial} algorithm with initial condition $\theta_0 = 0.10\pi$ results in all values of tangent stiffness that are larger than that of the initial stiffness, which is $(g/l)\cos(0.10\pi)$. Recall that the stability criterion by Combescure and Pegon [1997], refer to Table 4.3, implies that the OS_{initial} algorithm should be unstable for $\theta_0 = 0.10\pi$. The numerical problem is analyzed using the proposed numerical stability analysis approach for the following conditions:

$$\zeta = 0 \quad \mu = 0.05/(2\pi) \quad n = 20 \quad r_t = 1.0 \tag{4.28}$$

The set of base functions Φ_1 to Φ_6 as in Appendix A is used, which represents constant \mathbf{M}_{i+1} . The same procedure as in Section 4.4 is performed for $\theta_0 = 0.10\pi$ in this example. Therefore, for the range of interest $\delta_i, \delta_{i+1} \in [1.0, 1/\cos\theta_0]$, the coefficients $\alpha_j, j: 1 \to 6$ obtained by minimizing the two-norm of α , i.e. $\min \sqrt{(\sum_{j=1}^6 |\alpha_j|^2)}$:

$$\alpha_1 = 7.91 \times 10^{-7}, \quad \alpha_2 = 2.59 \times 10^{-10}, \quad \alpha_3 = 1.60 \times 10^{-8}, \\ \alpha_4 = -5.96 \times 10^{-8}, \quad \alpha_5 = 3.35 \times 10^{-9}, \quad \alpha_6 = -1.58 \times 10^{-9}$$
(4.29)

The existence of such set of α_j , $j:1 \rightarrow 6$ implies that the OS_{initial} algorithm is stable for $\theta_0 = 0.10\pi$. The results by the proposed approach is consistent with the fact that the OS_{initial} algorithm is stable as reflected in Figure 4.5, which confirms that stability criterion presented by Combescure and Pegon [1997] is not correct.



Figure 4.4 Schematic illustration of the nonlinear pendulum in a general deformed state.



Figure 4.5 Period elongation and amplitude decay for the pendulum problem with $\theta_0 = 0.10 \pi$.



Figure 4.6 Period elongation and amplitude decay for the pendulum problem with $\theta_{_0} = 0.50\pi$.

5 LYAPUNOV STABILITY CONSIDERING STRICTLY POSITIVE REAL LEMMA

5.1 INTRODUCTION

Chapter 4 proposed a numerical approach using the Lyapunov stability analysis of various implicit and explicit direct integration algorithms for SDOF nonlinear systems. Implicit algorithms may encounter numerical convergence problems when applied to nonlinear structural systems, especially those with large number of degrees of freedom (DOFs) or complex sources of nonlinearity. Explicit algorithms do not require iterations by adopting certain approximations related to the kinematics of the structural system, making them appealing for use in solving nonlinear dynamic problems. Various explicit direct integration algorithms have been developed, including the explicit Newmark algorithm [Newmark 1959], the Operator-Splitting algorithm [Hughes et al. 1979] and the generalized- α predictor-corrector explicit (PCE) algorithm [Chung and Hulbert 1993; Hulbert and Chung 1996]. Liang et al. [2014b, 2016b] investigated the suitability of the latter for efficient nonlinear seismic response of multi-degree of freedom (MDOF) reinforced concrete highway bridge systems and promising results in terms of accuracy and numerical stability were obtained.

This chapter proposed another Lyapunov-based approach to investigate Lyapunov stability of explicit direct integration algorithms for MDOF nonlinear systems [Liang and Mosalam 2015, 2016b-d]. Two general classes of MDOF nonlinear responses of structural systems are considered: stiffening systems, e.g., in situations where gaps between components of the system are closed, and softening systems, e.g., due to initiation and propagation of damage, which is common in modeling RC structures when subjected to extreme loads. The idealized backbone curves (force–displacement relationships) of these two systems are discussed later in the chapter.

In this study, the explicit algorithm is formulated for a generic MDOF nonlinear system with its response governed by nonlinear functions of the restoring forces. Based on this formulation, a systematic approach is proposed to investigate the Lyapunov stability of explicit algorithms for MDOF nonlinear systems by means of the strictly positive real lemma [Cains 1989]. This approach transforms the stability analysis to pursuing the strictly positive realness of the transfer function matrix for the formulated MDOF system. Furthermore, this is equivalent to a problem of convex optimization that can be solved graphically for SDOF systems, e.g., by a Nyquist plot [Franklin et al. 2015], or numerically for MDOF systems, e.g., by CVX [CVX Research Inc. 2011]. Using the proposed approach, *a sufficient condition* in terms of bounds for each basic resisting force in this study, where the explicit algorithm is stable in the sense of

Lyapunov, can be obtained. Specifically, the maximum and minimum bounds for each basic resisting force for stable (in the sense of Lyapunov) MDOF stiffening and softening systems, respectively, are determined. To study the stability performance of two types of commonly used explicit direct integration algorithms, this proposed Lyapunov stability analysis is applied to a SDOF system, a bridge structure, and a generic multi-story shear building with nonlinear stiffening or softening behavior

5.2 MATHEMATICAL PRELIMINARIES

In this section, definitions, notations, the generalized strictly positive real lemma and the corresponding corollary are introduced. Here, $(\bullet)^T$ and $(\bullet)^*$ denote transpose and complex conjugate transpose, respectively; $(\bullet) \succ 0$ and $(\bullet) \prec 0$ denote positive and negative definiteness, respectively. Denote

$$\mathbf{G}(z) \sim \left[\frac{\overline{\mathbf{A}} \mid \overline{\mathbf{B}}}{\overline{\mathbf{C}} \mid \overline{\mathbf{D}}}\right] \tag{5.1}$$

as a state-space realization [Cains 1989] of a transfer function matrix $\mathbf{G}(z)$ expressed as follows:

$$\mathbf{G}(z) = \overline{\mathbf{D}} + \overline{\mathbf{C}} (\mathbf{I} z - \overline{\mathbf{A}})^{-1} \overline{\mathbf{B}}$$
(5.2)

where $z = e^{j\theta}$ is a complex variable with $j = \sqrt{-1}$ and $\theta \in [0, 2\pi]$, $\overline{\mathbf{A}}$, $\overline{\mathbf{B}}$, $\overline{\mathbf{C}}$ and $\overline{\mathbf{D}}$ are real constant matrices and \mathbf{I} is the identity matrix with proper dimensions.

A square transfer function matrix $\mathbf{G}(z)$ is called strictly positive real [Kapila and Haddad 1996] if: (i) $\mathbf{G}(z)$ is asymptotically stable, which is stronger than Lyapunov stability as it guarantees convergence to a specific value as "time" approaches infinity; and (ii) $\mathbf{G}(e^{j\theta}) + \mathbf{G}^*(e^{j\theta})$ is positive definite $\forall \theta \in [0, 2\pi]$. Condition (i) can be guaranteed by the condition that the spectral radius of $\overline{\mathbf{A}}$ must be less than 1.0, i.e., $\rho(\overline{\mathbf{A}}) < 1.0$. Let \mathbf{Z} be the corresponding controllability matrix defined as follows:

$$\mathbf{Z} = [\mathbf{\overline{B}} \quad \mathbf{\overline{AB}} \quad \mathbf{\overline{A}}^2 \mathbf{\overline{B}} \quad \cdots \quad \mathbf{\overline{A}}^{\overline{n}-1} \mathbf{\overline{B}}]$$
(5.3)

where \overline{n} is the dimension of the square matrix \overline{A} .

With controllability of $(\overline{\mathbf{A}}, \overline{\mathbf{B}})$, i.e., rank $(\mathbf{Z}) = \overline{n}$ and $\rho(\overline{\mathbf{A}}) < 1.0$, based on the generalized discrete-time strictly positive real lemma [Kunimatsu et al. 2008; Xiao and Hill 1999], if $\mathbf{G}(z)$ is strictly positive real, then there exist matrices $\overline{\mathbf{M}} = \overline{\mathbf{M}}^T \succ \mathbf{0}$, $\overline{\mathbf{L}}$, and $\overline{\mathbf{W}}$, where the following conditions are satisfied:

$$\overline{\mathbf{M}} = \overline{\mathbf{A}}^T \overline{\mathbf{M}} \overline{\mathbf{A}} + \overline{\mathbf{L}}^T \overline{\mathbf{L}}$$
(5.4a)

$$\mathbf{0} = \overline{\mathbf{B}}^T \overline{\mathbf{M}} \overline{\mathbf{A}} - \overline{\mathbf{C}} + \overline{\mathbf{W}}^T \overline{\mathbf{L}}$$
(5.4b)

$$\mathbf{0} = \bar{\mathbf{D}} + \bar{\mathbf{D}}^T - \bar{\mathbf{B}}^T \bar{\mathbf{M}} \bar{\mathbf{B}} - \bar{\mathbf{W}}^T \bar{\mathbf{W}}$$
(5.4c)

Moreover, based on a corollary [Kottenstette and Antsaklis 2010; Lee and Chen 2003], the square transfer function matrix $\mathbf{G}(z)$ in Equation (5.2) is strictly positive real, and matrix $\overline{\mathbf{A}}$ is asymptotically stable if and only if there exists a matrix $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{P}^T \succ \mathbf{0}$ such that Equation (5.5) is satisfied.

$$\begin{bmatrix} \overline{\mathbf{A}}^T \mathbf{P} \overline{\mathbf{A}} - \mathbf{P} & \overline{\mathbf{A}}^T \mathbf{P} \overline{\mathbf{B}} - \overline{\mathbf{C}}^T \\ \left(\overline{\mathbf{A}}^T \mathbf{P} \overline{\mathbf{B}} - \overline{\mathbf{C}}^T \right)^T & -\left(\overline{\mathbf{D}}^T + \overline{\mathbf{D}} \right) + \overline{\mathbf{B}}^T \mathbf{P} \overline{\mathbf{B}} \end{bmatrix} \prec \mathbf{0}$$
(5.5)

5.3 EXPLICIT INTEGRATION ALGORITHMS

The discretized equations of motion of a MDOF system under an external dynamic force excitation is expressed as follows:

$$\mathbf{m}\ddot{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1} + \mathbf{c}\dot{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1} + \mathbf{f}_{i+1} = \mathbf{p}_{i+1}$$
(5.6)

where **m** and **c** are the mass and viscous damping matrices, and $\ddot{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1}$, $\dot{\mathbf{t}}_{i+1}$, \mathbf{f}_{i+1} and \mathbf{p}_{i+1} are the vectors of acceleration, velocity, restoring force, and external force at the time step i+1, respectively. Due to several factors, such as the random variation of the external force with time, e.g., earthquake shaking, and the nonlinear variation of the restoring force vector with deformation due to material and/or geometrical nonlinearities, closed form solution of Equation (5.6) is not always possible [Chopra 2006]; therefore, direct integration algorithms are used for the sought solution. Two categories of explicit integration algorithms are considered herein: standard single-step and predictor-corrector explicit algorithms.

5.3.1 Standard Single-Step Explicit Algorithms

Standard single-step explicit (SSE) direct integration algorithms considered here are defined by the following difference equations:

$$\mathbf{u}_{i+1} = \mathbf{u}_i + \eta_0 \left(\Delta t\right) \dot{\mathbf{u}}_i + \eta_1 \left(\Delta t\right)^2 \ddot{\mathbf{u}}_i$$
(5.7a)

$$\mathbf{u}_{i+1} = \mathbf{u}_i + \eta_2 \left(\Delta t\right) \ddot{\mathbf{u}}_i + \eta_3 \left(\Delta t\right) \ddot{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1}$$
(5.7b)

For example, $\mathbf{\eta} = \begin{bmatrix} \eta_0 & \eta_1 & \eta_2 & \eta_3 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1/2 & 1/2 & 1/2 \end{bmatrix}$ leads to the explicit Newmark algorithm [Newmark 1959]. Substituting Equation (5.7b) in Equation (5.6), the following linear system of equations is readily obtained.

$$\mathbf{m}_{eff}\ddot{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1} = \mathbf{p}_{eff} \tag{5.8a}$$

$$\mathbf{m}_{eff} = \mathbf{m} + \eta_3(\Delta t) \,\mathbf{c} \tag{5.8b}$$

$$\mathbf{p}_{eff} = \mathbf{p}_{i+1} - \mathbf{f}_{i+1} - \mathbf{c} \left[\dot{\mathbf{u}}_i + \eta_2 (\Delta t) \ddot{\mathbf{u}}_i \right]$$
(5.8c)

The acceleration can be determined by solving Equation (5.8) and then substituting in Equation (5.7b) to determine the velocity.

5.3.2 Predictor-Corrector Explicit Algorithms

The generalized- α predictor-corrector explicit (PCE) algorithm [Chung and Hulbert 1993; Hulbert and Chung 1996] is considered. The predicted displacement and velocity are:

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1} = \mathbf{u}_i + (\Delta t)(1-\gamma)\dot{\mathbf{u}}_i + (0.5-\beta)(\Delta t)^2 \ddot{\mathbf{u}}_i$$
(5.9a)

$$\hat{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1} = \dot{\mathbf{u}}_i + (1 - \gamma)(\Delta t) \ddot{\mathbf{u}}_i$$
(5.9b)

where parameters γ and β are defined in Equation (5.12). The balance equation of this method is:

$$\mathbf{m}\ddot{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1-\alpha_m} + \dot{\mathbf{c}}\ddot{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1-\alpha_f} + \tilde{\mathbf{f}}_{i+1-\alpha_f} = \mathbf{p}_{i+1-\alpha_f}$$
(5.10)

where $\tilde{\mathbf{f}}_{i+1-\alpha_f}$ is the restoring force vector corresponding to $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1-\alpha_f}$, and $\mathbf{p}_{i+1-\alpha_f}$ is the external force vector at time step $i+1-\alpha_f$ with other parameters defined as follows:

$$\ddot{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1-\alpha_m} = (1-\alpha_m)\ddot{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1} + \alpha_m \ddot{\mathbf{u}}_i$$
(5.11a)

$$\dot{\tilde{\mathbf{u}}}_{i+1-\alpha_f} = \left(1 - \alpha_f\right) \dot{\tilde{\mathbf{u}}}_{i+1} + \alpha_f \dot{\mathbf{u}}_i$$
(5.11b)

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1-\alpha_f} = \left(1 - \alpha_f\right) \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1} + \alpha_f \mathbf{u}_i$$
(5.11c)

$$t_{i+1-\alpha_f} = \left(1 - \alpha_f\right) t_{i+1} + \alpha_f t_i \tag{5.11d}$$

The algorithmic parameters are given by

$$\alpha_m = \frac{2\rho_\infty - 1}{\rho_\infty + 1}, \quad \alpha_f = \frac{\rho_\infty}{\rho_\infty + 1}, \quad \gamma = \frac{1}{2} - \alpha_m + \alpha_f, \quad \beta = \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{1}{2} + \gamma\right)^2 \tag{5.12}$$

where ρ_{∞} is the desired high-frequency dissipation. The acceleration at time step *i*+1, $\ddot{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1}$, can be calculated using Equations (5.10) and (5.11a). Subsequently, the displacement and velocity at time step *i*+1 can be determined by the following correctors:

$$\mathbf{u}_{i+1} = \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1} + \beta (\Delta t)^2 \ddot{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1}$$
(5.13a)

$$\dot{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1} = \dot{\widetilde{\mathbf{u}}}_{i+1} + \gamma (\Delta t) \ddot{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1}$$
(5.13b)

5.4 MDOF NONLINEAR SYSTEMS

For a MDOF system with n DOFs, the *j*-th term of the restoring force vector, f^{j} , $j \in [1, n]$, can be expressed as a linear combination of *N* basic resisting forces of the system, q^{l} , $l \in [1, N]$, i.e.,

$$f^{j} = \sum_{l=1}^{N} \alpha_{l}^{j} q^{l} = \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{j} \mathbf{q}$$
(5.14)

where
$$\mathbf{q}^{T} = [q^{1}, q^{2}, ..., q^{N}]$$
 and $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{j} = [\alpha_{1}^{j}, \alpha_{2}^{j}, ..., \alpha_{N}^{j}]$. Therefore,
 $\mathbf{f} = [f^{1}, f^{2}, ..., f^{n}]^{T} = \boldsymbol{\alpha}\mathbf{q}$
(5.15)

where $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = [\boldsymbol{\alpha}^1, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^2, \dots, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^n]^T$ is a $n \times N$ matrix. In general, N is the summation of the number of the basic resisting forces from each element that contribute to the *n* DOFs of the system. For the special case of a shear building, N = n because of its assumed shear mode behavior. The *l*th basic resisting force, q^1 , is defined here as a function of \overline{u}^l , which is in itself a linear combination of the displacement of each DOF, $u^j, j \in [1, n]$, i.e.,

$$\overline{u}^{l} = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \beta_{j}^{l} u^{j} = \boldsymbol{\beta}^{l} \mathbf{u}$$
(5.16)

where $\mathbf{u} = [u^1, u^2, \dots, u^n]$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}^l = [\beta_1^l, \beta_2^l, \dots, \beta_n^l]$. Therefore,

$$\overline{\mathbf{u}} = \left[\overline{\boldsymbol{u}}^1, \overline{\boldsymbol{u}}^2, \dots, \overline{\boldsymbol{u}}^N\right]^T = \boldsymbol{\beta} \mathbf{u}$$
(5.17)

where $\boldsymbol{\beta} = [\boldsymbol{\beta}^1, \boldsymbol{\beta}^2, \dots, \boldsymbol{\beta}^N]^T$ is a $N \times n$ matrix. Detailed explanation of N defining the number of columns and rows of the matrices $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}$, respectively, for the bridge and shear building examples are discussed in Appendices B and C, respectively. Moreover, the *l*th basic resisting force, q^1 , is restricted to the following range (to be determined in this chapter according to the outcome of the conducted Lyapunov stability analysis):

$$\bar{k}_{Min}^{l} \left(\bar{u}^{l} \right)^{2} \leq q^{l} \bar{u}^{l} \leq \bar{k}_{Max}^{l} \left(\bar{u}^{l} \right)^{2}$$
(5.18)

where \bar{k}_{Min}^{l} and \bar{k}_{Max}^{l} are the minimum and maximum bounds of q^{l} , respectively. Therefore, summing up all basic resisting forces from 1 to N gives

$$\sum_{l=1}^{N} \left[\bar{k}_{Min}^{l} \left(\bar{u}^{l} \right)^{2} \right] \leq \sum_{l=1}^{N} \left(q^{l} \bar{u}^{l} \right) \leq \sum_{l=1}^{N} \left[\bar{k}_{Max}^{l} \left(\bar{u}^{l} \right)^{2} \right]$$

$$(5.19)$$

Equation (5.19) is equivalent to the following:

$$\overline{\mathbf{u}}^T \overline{\mathbf{k}}_{Min} \overline{\mathbf{u}} \le \overline{\mathbf{u}}^T \mathbf{q} \le \overline{\mathbf{u}}^T \overline{\mathbf{k}}_{Max} \overline{\mathbf{u}}$$
(5.20)

where

$$\overline{\mathbf{k}}_{\mathrm{Min}} = \mathrm{diag}\left[\overline{k}_{\mathrm{Min}}^{1}, \overline{k}_{\mathrm{Min}}^{2}, \dots \overline{k}_{\mathrm{Min}}^{N}\right]$$
(5.21a)

$$\overline{\mathbf{k}}_{\text{Max}} = \text{diag}\left[\overline{k}_{\text{Max}}^1, \overline{k}_{\text{Max}}^2, \dots \overline{k}_{\text{Max}}^N\right]$$
(5.21b)

Defining \bar{k}_{l}^{l} as the initial bound of q^{l} , Figure 5.1 shows the schematic illustrations of the *l*th resisting force bounded in the sector between $\bar{k}_{Min}^{l}(\bar{u}^{l})$ and $\bar{k}_{Max}^{l}(\bar{u}^{l})$ for stiffening (Figure 5.1a) and softening (Figure 5.1b) systems. As mentioned before, the maximum, \bar{k}_{Max}^{l} and minimum, \bar{k}_{Min}^{l} , bounds of q^{l} , where $l: 1 \rightarrow N$, for stable (in the sense of Lyapunov) stiffening and softening MDOF systems, respectively, are to be determined herein. Next, the explicit integration algorithms

introduced in the previous section are formulated for MDOF (n DOFs) nonlinear systems with stiffening and softening behavior; see Figure 5.1.



Figure 5.1 Schematic illustrations of two nonlinear systems with sectorbounded basic resisting forces.

5.4.1 MDOF Stiffening Systems

For the two categories of explicit direct integration algorithms, the relationship between the kinematic quantities at time steps i+1 and i can be established as follows:

$$\boldsymbol{x}_{i+1} = \mathbf{A}\boldsymbol{x}_i - \mathbf{B}_1 \overline{\mathbf{f}}_{i+1} + \mathbf{D}\overline{\mathbf{p}}_{i+1} = \mathbf{A}\boldsymbol{x}_i - \mathbf{B}_1 \boldsymbol{\alpha} \overline{\mathbf{q}}_{i+1} + \mathbf{D}\overline{\mathbf{p}}_{i+1}$$
(5.22)

where $\mathbf{x}_i = \begin{bmatrix} (\Delta t)^2 \ddot{\mathbf{u}}_i^T & (\Delta t)\dot{\mathbf{u}}_i^T & \mathbf{u}_i^T \end{bmatrix}^T$. For the SSE algorithms, **A**, **B**₁ and **D** are as follows with $\bar{\mathbf{f}}_{i+1} = \mathbf{f}_{i+1}$, $\bar{\mathbf{p}}_{i+1} = \mathbf{p}_{i+1}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{q}}_{i+1} = \mathbf{q}_{i+1}$ are as follows:

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{bmatrix} -\eta_2(\Delta t)\mathbf{m}_{eff}^{-1}\mathbf{c} & -(\Delta t)\mathbf{m}_{eff}^{-1}\mathbf{c} & \mathbf{0} \\ \eta_2 \mathbf{I} - \eta_2 \eta_3(\Delta t)\mathbf{m}_{eff}^{-1}\mathbf{c} & \mathbf{I} - \eta_3(\Delta t)\mathbf{m}_{eff}^{-1}\mathbf{c} & \mathbf{0} \\ \eta_1 \mathbf{I} & \eta_0 \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix}$$
(5.23a)
$$\mathbf{B}_1 = \mathbf{D} = \begin{bmatrix} (\Delta t)^2 \mathbf{m}_{eff}^{-1} & \eta_3(\Delta t)^2 \mathbf{m}_{eff}^{-1} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}^T$$
(5.23b)

where **0** and **I** are $n \times n$ null and identity matrices, respectively. The external force vector, **p**, is generally independent of the kinematic quantities, *x*, and does not affect the Lyapunov stability of the direct integration algorithms [Liang and Mosalam 2015; 2016a]. Therefore, $\overline{\mathbf{p}}_{i+1}$ in Equation (5.22) is set to zero in the subsequent parts of this chapter. For the PCE algorithms, **A** is listed in Table 5.1 and considering $\overline{\mathbf{f}}_{i+1} = \widetilde{\mathbf{f}}_{i+1-\alpha_f}$, $\overline{\mathbf{p}}_{i+1} = \mathbf{p}_{i+1-\alpha_f}$ and $\overline{\mathbf{q}}_{i+1} = \widetilde{\mathbf{q}}_{i+1-\alpha_f}$, we have:

$$\mathbf{B}_{1} = \mathbf{D} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{(\Delta t)^{2} \mathbf{m}^{-1}}{1 - \alpha_{m}} & \frac{\gamma (\Delta t)^{2} \mathbf{m}^{-1}}{1 - \alpha_{m}} & \frac{\beta (\Delta t)^{2} \mathbf{m}^{-1}}{1 - \alpha_{m}} \end{bmatrix}^{T}$$
(5.24)

Element	Expression	Element	Expression
\mathbf{A}_{11}	$-\left(\mathbf{m}^{-1}\mathbf{c}(1-\alpha_{f})(1-\gamma)(\Delta t)-\alpha_{m}\mathbf{I}\right)/(1-\alpha_{m})$	\mathbf{A}_{22}	$\mathbf{I} + \gamma \mathbf{A}_{12}$
$\mathbf{A}_{_{21}}$	$(1-\gamma)\mathbf{I} + \gamma \mathbf{A}_{11}$	$\mathbf{A}_{_{32}}$	$\mathbf{I} + \beta \mathbf{A}_{12}$
$\mathbf{A}_{_{31}}$	$(0.5 - \beta)\mathbf{I} + \beta(\Delta t)^2 \mathbf{A}_{11}$	$A_{13} = A_{23}$	0
\mathbf{A}_{12}	$-\mathbf{m}^{-1}\mathbf{c}(\Delta t)/(1-\alpha_m)$	$\mathbf{A}_{_{33}}$	Ι

Table 5.1Elements of A matrix for PCE algorithms.

It is obvious that *n* of the eigenvalues of **A** are 1.0's, leading to failure thus validating the first condition (i) of the strictly positive realness of the transfer function matrix. Therefore, Equation (5.22) (after setting $\bar{\mathbf{p}}_{i+1} = \mathbf{0}$) is further manipulated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}_{i+1} &= \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_{i} - \mathbf{B}_{1}\boldsymbol{\alpha}\overline{\mathbf{k}}_{Min}\mathbf{C}\mathbf{x}_{i} + \mathbf{B}_{1}\boldsymbol{\alpha}\overline{\mathbf{k}}_{Min}\mathbf{C}\mathbf{x}_{i} - \mathbf{B}_{1}\boldsymbol{\alpha}\overline{\mathbf{q}}_{i+1} \\ &= \left(\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B}_{1}\boldsymbol{\alpha}\overline{\mathbf{k}}_{Min}\mathbf{C}\right)\mathbf{x}_{i} - \mathbf{B}_{1}\boldsymbol{\alpha}\left(\overline{\mathbf{q}}_{i+1} - \overline{\mathbf{k}}_{Min}\mathbf{C}\mathbf{x}_{i}\right) \\ &= \left(\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B}_{1}\boldsymbol{\alpha}\overline{\mathbf{k}}_{Min}\mathbf{C}\right)\mathbf{x}_{i} - \mathbf{B}_{1}\boldsymbol{\alpha}\left(\overline{\mathbf{q}}_{i+1} - \overline{\mathbf{k}}_{Min}\overline{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1}\right) \\ &= \mathbf{A}_{e1}\mathbf{x}_{i} - \mathbf{B}_{1}\boldsymbol{\alpha}\mathbf{q}_{e1} \end{aligned}$$
(5.25)

where

$$\mathbf{C} = \boldsymbol{\beta} \widetilde{\mathbf{C}} \tag{5.26a}$$

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{C}} = \begin{cases} \begin{bmatrix} \eta_1 \mathbf{I} & \eta_0 \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix} & \text{SSEalgorithms} \\ \\ \begin{bmatrix} (\mathbf{I} - \alpha_f)(0.5 - \beta)\mathbf{I} & (\mathbf{I} - \alpha_f)\mathbf{I} & \mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix} & \text{PCEalgorithms} \end{cases}$$
(5.26b)

$$\overline{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1} = \mathbf{C} \mathbf{x}_i \tag{5.26c}$$

$$\mathbf{A}_{e1} = \mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B}_{1} \boldsymbol{\alpha} \overline{\mathbf{k}}_{Min} \mathbf{C}$$
(5.26d)

$$\mathbf{q}_{e1} = \overline{\mathbf{q}}_{i+1} - \overline{\mathbf{k}}_{Min} \overline{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1}$$
(5.26e)

5.4.2 MDOF Softening Systems

Similar to Equation (5.22), for softening systems with $\mathbf{B}_2 = -\mathbf{B}_1$ and $\overline{\mathbf{p}}_{i+1} = \mathbf{0}$, as mentioned above, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}_{i+1} &= \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_i + \mathbf{B}_2 \boldsymbol{\alpha} \overline{\mathbf{q}}_{i+1} \\ &= \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_i + \mathbf{B}_2 \boldsymbol{\alpha} \overline{\mathbf{k}}_{Max} \mathbf{C} \mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{B}_2 \boldsymbol{\alpha} \overline{\mathbf{k}}_{Max} \mathbf{C} \mathbf{x}_i + \mathbf{B}_2 \boldsymbol{\alpha} \overline{\mathbf{q}}_{i+1} \\ &= \left(\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B}_2 \boldsymbol{\alpha} \overline{\mathbf{k}}_{Max} \mathbf{C}\right) \mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{B}_2 \boldsymbol{\alpha} \left(\overline{\mathbf{k}}_{Max} \mathbf{C} \mathbf{x}_i - \overline{\mathbf{q}}_{i+1}\right) \\ &= \left(\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B}_2 \boldsymbol{\alpha} \overline{\mathbf{k}}_{Max} \mathbf{C}\right) \mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{B}_2 \boldsymbol{\alpha} \left(\overline{\mathbf{k}}_{Max} \overline{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1} - \overline{\mathbf{q}}_{i+1}\right) \\ &= \mathbf{A}_{e2} \mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{B}_2 \boldsymbol{\alpha} \mathbf{q}_{e2} \end{aligned}$$
(5.27)

where

$$\mathbf{A}_{e2} = \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B}_2 \boldsymbol{\alpha} \mathbf{\bar{k}}_{Max} \mathbf{C}$$
(5.28a)

$$\mathbf{q}_{e2} = \overline{\mathbf{k}}_{Max} \overline{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1} - \overline{\mathbf{q}}_{i+1} \tag{5.28b}$$

Accordingly, both stiffening and softening systems can be expressed in Equation (5.29) with coefficients \mathbf{A}_e , \mathbf{B}_e and \mathbf{q}_e summarized in Table 5.2.

$$\boldsymbol{x}_{i+1} = \boldsymbol{A}_{e} \boldsymbol{x}_{i} - \boldsymbol{B}_{e} \boldsymbol{q}_{e} \tag{5.29}$$

 Table 5.2
 Coefficients of MDOF stiffening and softening systems.

Matrix	Stiffening Systems	Softening Systems
$\mathbf{A}_{_{e}}$	$\mathbf{A}_{e1} = \mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B}_{1} \boldsymbol{\alpha} \overline{\mathbf{k}}_{Min} \mathbf{C}$	$\mathbf{A}_{e2} = \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B}_2 \boldsymbol{\alpha} \overline{\mathbf{k}}_{Max} \mathbf{C}$
\mathbf{B}_{e}	$\mathbf{B}_{1}\boldsymbol{\alpha}$	$\mathbf{B}_{2}\boldsymbol{\alpha}$
$\mathbf{q}_{_{e}}$	$\mathbf{q}_{e1} = \overline{\mathbf{q}}_{i+1} - \overline{\mathbf{k}}_{Min} \mathbf{C} \mathbf{x}_{i}$	$\mathbf{q}_{e2} = \overline{\mathbf{k}}_{Max} \mathbf{C} \mathbf{x}_i - \overline{\mathbf{q}}_{i+1}$

5.5 LYAPUNOV STABILITY ANALYSIS AS A PROBLEM OF CONVEX OPTIMIZATION

Based on Equation (5.18) and Table 5.2, the *l*th effective basic resisting force, q_e^l , expressed as a function of $\overline{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1}^l$, has the following range:

$$0 \le q_e^l \overline{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1}^l \le \bar{k}^l \left(\overline{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1}^l \right)^2 \tag{5.30}$$

where $\bar{k}^{l} = \bar{k}_{Max}^{l} - \bar{k}_{Min}^{l}$. Summing up all effective basic resisting forces from 1 to N gives

$$0 \le \sum_{l=1}^{N} \left(q_{e}^{l} \overline{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1}^{l} \right) \le \sum_{l=1}^{N} \left[\overline{k}^{l} \left(\overline{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1}^{l} \right)^{2} \right]$$
(5.31)

Therefore, \mathbf{q}_{e} , expressed as a function of $\overline{\mathbf{u}}$, has the following range:

$$0 \le \overline{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1}^T \mathbf{q}_e \le \overline{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1}^T \overline{\mathbf{k}} \overline{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1} \tag{5.32}$$

where

$$\overline{\mathbf{k}} = \overline{\mathbf{k}}_{Max} - \overline{\mathbf{k}}_{Min} = \operatorname{diag}\left[\overline{k}^{1}, \overline{k}^{2}, \dots, \overline{k}^{N}\right]$$
(5.33)

For the system in Equation (5.29), based on the Lyapunov stability theory introduced in Chapter 3, a Lyapunov artificial energy function candidate v_{i+1} [Franklin et al. 2015] at the time step *i*+1 can be chosen as follows:

$$\boldsymbol{v}_{i+1} = \boldsymbol{x}_{i+1}^T \mathbf{M} \boldsymbol{x}_{i+1} \tag{5.34}$$

where $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{M}^T \succ \mathbf{0}$. A sufficient condition for the system, and thus the explicit direct integration algorithm, to be stable in the sense of Lyapunov, is as follows:

$$\Delta v_{i+1} = v_{i+1} - v_i = \mathbf{x}_{i+1}^T \mathbf{M} \mathbf{x}_{i+1} - \mathbf{x}_i^T \mathbf{M} \mathbf{x}_i$$

= $(\mathbf{A}_e \mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{B}_e \mathbf{q}_e)^T \mathbf{M} (\mathbf{A}_e \mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{B}_e \mathbf{q}_e) - \mathbf{x}_i^T \mathbf{M} \mathbf{x}$
= $\mathbf{x}_i^T (\mathbf{A}_e^T \mathbf{M} \mathbf{A}_e - \mathbf{M}) \mathbf{x}_i - 2\mathbf{q}_e^T \mathbf{B}_e^T \mathbf{M} \mathbf{A}_e \mathbf{x}_i + \mathbf{q}_e^T \mathbf{B}_e^T \mathbf{M} \mathbf{B}_e \mathbf{q}_e \le 0$ (5.35)

Defining the weight coefficient of the constraint in Equation (5.30) as $\lambda_l > 0$ with $\sum_{l=1}^{N} \lambda_l = 1$, multiplying Equation (5.30) by $\lambda_l q_e^l / \overline{u}_{i+1}^l , |\overline{u}_{i+1}^l| > 0$, which is always positive. By rearranging, one obtains:

$$\lambda_l q_e^l \left(q_e^l - \bar{k}^l \bar{u}_{l+1}^l \right) \le 0 \tag{5.36}$$

Summing up all effective basic resisting forces from 1 to N gives the following:

$$\sum_{l=1}^{N} \left[\lambda_{l} q_{e}^{l} \left(q_{e}^{l} - \overline{k}^{l} \overline{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1}^{l} \right) \right] = \mathbf{q}_{e}^{T} \lambda \left(\mathbf{q}_{e} - \overline{\mathbf{k}} \overline{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1} \right) = \mathbf{q}_{e}^{T} \lambda \left(\mathbf{q}_{e} - \overline{\mathbf{k}} \mathbf{C} \mathbf{x}_{i} \right) \leq 0$$
(5.37)

where the coefficient matrix $\lambda = \text{diag}[\lambda_1, \lambda_2, ..., \lambda_N]$. Defining $\Delta \overline{v}_{i+1}$ as an upper bound of Δv_{i+1} that incorporates the constraints in Equation (5.37), Equation (5.35) becomes

$$\Delta v_{i+1} \leq \Delta \overline{v}_{i+1} = \mathbf{x}_{i}^{T} \left(\mathbf{A}_{e}^{T} \mathbf{M} \mathbf{A}_{e} - \mathbf{M} \right) \mathbf{x}_{i} - 2\mathbf{q}_{e}^{T} \mathbf{B}_{e}^{T} \mathbf{M} \mathbf{A}_{e} \mathbf{x}_{i} + \mathbf{q}_{e}^{T} \mathbf{B}_{e}^{T} \mathbf{M} \mathbf{B}_{e} \mathbf{q}_{e} - 2\mathbf{q}_{e}^{T} \lambda \left(\mathbf{q}_{e} - \overline{\mathbf{k}} \mathbf{C} \mathbf{x}_{i} \right)$$

$$= \mathbf{x}_{i}^{T} \left(\mathbf{A}_{e}^{T} \mathbf{M} \mathbf{A}_{e} - \mathbf{M} \right) \mathbf{x}_{i} + \mathbf{q}_{e}^{T} \left(\mathbf{B}_{e}^{T} \mathbf{M} \mathbf{B}_{e} - 2\lambda \right) \mathbf{q}_{e} - 2\mathbf{q}_{e}^{T} \left(\mathbf{B}_{e}^{T} \mathbf{M} \mathbf{A}_{e} - \lambda \overline{\mathbf{k}} \mathbf{C} \right) \mathbf{x}_{i}$$

$$(5.38)$$

where $\Delta \overline{v}_{i+1}$ can be further transformed as follows:

$$\Delta \overline{v}_{i+1} = \Delta \overline{v}_{i+1} + \boldsymbol{x}_i^T \mathbf{L}^T \mathbf{L} \boldsymbol{x}_i - \boldsymbol{x}_i^T \mathbf{L}^T \mathbf{L} \boldsymbol{x}_i$$

= $\boldsymbol{x}_i^T (\mathbf{A}_e^T \mathbf{M} \mathbf{A}_e - \mathbf{M} + \mathbf{L}^T \mathbf{L}) \boldsymbol{x}_i - [\mathbf{q}_e^T (2\lambda - \mathbf{B}_e^T \mathbf{M} \mathbf{B}_e) \mathbf{q}_e - 2\mathbf{q}_e^T (\lambda \overline{\mathbf{k}} \mathbf{C} - \mathbf{B}_e^T \mathbf{M} \mathbf{A}_e) \boldsymbol{x}_i + \boldsymbol{x}_i^T \mathbf{L}^T \mathbf{L} \boldsymbol{x}_i]$ (5.39)

where **L** is a $3n \times 3n$ matrix. A sufficient condition for $\Delta \overline{v}_{i+1} \leq 0$ and thus $\Delta \overline{v}_{i+1}$ is as follows:

$$\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{A}_{e}^{T} \mathbf{M} \mathbf{A}_{e} + \mathbf{L}^{T} \mathbf{L}$$
(5.40a)

$$\mathbf{0} = \mathbf{B}_{e}^{T} \mathbf{M} \mathbf{A}_{e} - \lambda \overline{\mathbf{k}} \mathbf{C} + \mathbf{W}^{T} \mathbf{L}$$
(5.40b)

$$\mathbf{0} = \mathbf{\lambda} + \mathbf{\lambda}^T - \mathbf{B}_e^T \mathbf{M} \mathbf{B}_e - \mathbf{W}^T \mathbf{W}$$
(5.40c)

where W is a $3n \times N$ matrix. With Equation (5.40), Equation (5.35) becomes

$$\Delta v_{i+1} \leq \Delta \overline{v}_{i+1} = \mathbf{x}_i^T \mathbf{0} \mathbf{x}_i - \left(\mathbf{q}_e^T \mathbf{W}^T \mathbf{W} \mathbf{q}_e - 2\mathbf{q}_e^T \mathbf{W}^T \mathbf{L} \mathbf{x}_i + \mathbf{x}_i^T \mathbf{L}^T \mathbf{L} \mathbf{x}_i\right)$$

= $-\left(\mathbf{W} \mathbf{q}_e - \mathbf{L} \mathbf{x}_i\right)^T \left(\mathbf{W} \mathbf{q}_e - \mathbf{L} \mathbf{x}_i\right) \leq 0$ (5.41)

Therefore, the Lyapunov stability of the explicit integration algorithm depends solely on the existence of \mathbf{M} , \mathbf{L} , and \mathbf{W} such that Equation (5.40) is satisfied. Recall the generalized discrete-time strictly positive real lemma presented before, i.e., Equation (5.4), the comparison between Equations (5.4) and (5.40) gives

$$\overline{\mathbf{A}} = \mathbf{A}_e, \quad \overline{\mathbf{B}} = \mathbf{B}_e, \quad \overline{\mathbf{C}} = \lambda \overline{\mathbf{k}} \mathbf{C}, \quad \overline{\mathbf{D}} = \lambda, \quad \overline{\mathbf{M}} = \mathbf{M}, \quad \overline{\mathbf{L}} = \mathbf{L}, \quad \overline{\mathbf{W}} = \mathbf{W}$$
(5.42)

Accordingly, the stability analysis reduces to seeking $\overline{\mathbf{k}}$ such that the transfer function matrix $\mathbf{G}(z)$ in Equation (5.43) is strictly positive real.

$$\mathbf{G}(z) = \boldsymbol{\lambda} + \boldsymbol{\lambda} \overline{\mathbf{k}} \mathbf{C} (\mathbf{I} z - \mathbf{A}_e)^{-1} \mathbf{B}_e$$
(5.43)

For SDOF systems, the matrices α , β , and λ become 1; thus Equation (5.43) reduces to

$$G(z) = 1 + \bar{k}\mathbf{C}(\mathbf{I}z - \mathbf{A}_e)^{-1}\mathbf{B}_e$$
(5.44)

The strictly positive realness of G(z) can be guaranteed by the asymptotical stability of A_e and

$$\operatorname{Re}[G(z)] > 0 \tag{5.45}$$

which leads to

$$\operatorname{Re}[H(z)] > -1/\overline{k} \tag{5.46}$$

where

$$H(z) = \mathbf{C} \left(\mathbf{I}_{z} - \mathbf{A}_{e} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{B}_{e}$$
(5.47)

A Nyquist plot [Franklin et al. 2015] can be used to plot $H(e^{j\theta}) \forall \theta \in [0, 2\pi]$. From this plot, the minimum value of Re[H(z)] that corresponds to the $-1/\overline{k}$ can be obtained.

For MDOF systems, recall the corollary in Equation (5.5), the strictly positive realness of G(z) in Equation (5.43) becomes equivalent to Equation (5.48) with $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{P}^T \succ \mathbf{0}$:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A}_{e}^{T}\mathbf{P}\mathbf{A}_{e} - \mathbf{P} & \mathbf{A}_{e}^{T}\mathbf{P}\mathbf{B}_{e} - (\lambda \mathbf{\bar{k}}\mathbf{C})^{T} \\ [\mathbf{A}_{e}^{T}\mathbf{P}\mathbf{B}_{e} - (\lambda \mathbf{\bar{k}}\mathbf{C})^{T} \end{bmatrix}^{T} & -(\lambda^{T} + \lambda) + \mathbf{B}_{e}^{T}\mathbf{P}\mathbf{B}_{e} \end{bmatrix} \prec \mathbf{0}$$
(5.48)

Equation (5.48) is a linear matrix inequality (LMI) over variables **P** and $\overline{\mathbf{k}}$ [Boyd et al. 1994]. Accordingly, the stability analysis becomes a problem of convex optimization, which addresses the problem of minimizing convex functions over convex sets by which a wide range of problems can be formulated. In convex optimization, any local minimum must be a global minimum. This important property leads to reliable and efficient solutions, e.g., interior-point methods, which are suitable for computer-aided design or analysis tools [Boyd and Vandenberge 2004]. This problem of convex optimization in Equation (5.48), which seeks $\overline{\mathbf{k}}$ and the corresponding **P** by minimizing certain convex cost function, e.g., $\min(\sum_{t=1}^{N} \overline{k}^{t})$, subjected to the constraints of $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{P}^{T} \succ \mathbf{0}$ and $\overline{\mathbf{k}} \succ \mathbf{0}$, can be solved numerically by CVX, a package for specifying and solving convex problems [CVX Research Inc. 2011]. Note that a poorly chosen cost function or coefficient matrix may lead to reduced sufficient condition, i.e., the difference between the upper and lower bounds of the basic resisting force of the system ($\overline{\mathbf{k}}$). In general, a smaller value of the weight coefficient for the constraint λ_t leads to a larger value of \overline{k}^t . For example, in a two-DOF system, $\min(-\overline{k}^2)$ and $\lambda_2 = 0.1$ ($\lambda_1 = 1 - \lambda_2 = 0.9$) may not be a good cost function and weight coefficient if the basic force q^1 is of primary interest since this cost function may result in small \overline{k}^1 . In this case, $\min(-\overline{k}^{1})$ and $\lambda_{1} = 0.1$ would be an appropriate selection. Therefore, the selection of the cost function and coefficient matrix is important and should take all the basic resisting forces of interest into account.

Note: if \mathbf{q} in Equation (5.20) is strictly within the following range:

$$\overline{\mathbf{u}}^T \overline{\mathbf{k}}_{Min} \overline{\mathbf{u}} < \overline{\mathbf{u}}^T \mathbf{q} < \overline{\mathbf{u}}^T \overline{\mathbf{k}}_{Max} \overline{\mathbf{u}}$$
(5.49)

Equations (5.32), (5.37), and (5.41) become

$$0 < \overline{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1}^T \mathbf{q}_e < \overline{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1}^T \overline{\mathbf{k}} \overline{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1}$$
(5.50a)

$$\mathbf{q}_{e}^{T} \lambda \left(\mathbf{q}_{e} - \overline{\mathbf{k}} \overline{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1} \right) = \mathbf{q}_{e}^{T} \lambda \left(\mathbf{q}_{e} - \overline{\mathbf{k}} \mathbf{C} \mathbf{x}_{i} \right) < 0$$
(5.50b)

$$\Delta v_{i+1} < \Delta \overline{v}_{i+1} \le 0 \tag{5.50c}$$

Accordingly, the explicit direct integration algorithm is asymptotically stable in this case, i.e., $\mathbf{\bar{u}}^T \mathbf{q} \in (\mathbf{\bar{u}}^T \mathbf{\bar{k}}_{Min} \mathbf{\bar{u}}, \mathbf{\bar{u}}^T \mathbf{\bar{k}}_{Max} \mathbf{\bar{u}})$. It should be emphasized that Equation (5.41) is *a sufficient condition* for the direct explicit integration algorithm to be stable. Therefore, the matrix $\mathbf{\bar{k}}$ obtained by the approach proposed herein that satisfies Equation (5.48) implies that $\mathbf{\bar{u}}^T \mathbf{q} \in [\mathbf{\bar{u}}^T \mathbf{\bar{k}}_{Min} \mathbf{\bar{u}}, \mathbf{\bar{u}}^T \mathbf{\bar{k}}_{Max} \mathbf{\bar{u}}]$, where $\mathbf{\bar{k}}_{Max} = \mathbf{\bar{k}}_{Min} + \mathbf{\bar{k}}$, is *a sufficient range* for the direct explicit integration algorithm to be stable. However, having some basic resisting force vector \mathbf{q} that may fall outside this range does not indicate the instability of the direct explicit integration algorithm.

5.6 NUMERICAL EXAMPLES FOR SDOF SYSTEMS

In this section, the two categories of explicit direct integration algorithms previously discussed are used to demonstrate the approach proposed in the previous sections based on the following numerical conditions:

$$m = 1, \quad k_I = 1, \quad \omega_n = 2\pi/T_n = \sqrt{k_I/m}, \quad \zeta = c/(2m\omega_n) = 0.05, \quad \mu = (\Delta t)/T_n = 0.01$$
 (5.51)

For convenience, all units in this and subsequent sections are omitted.

Based on Equation (5.51), \mathbf{A}_{e} , \mathbf{C} , and $\rho(\mathbf{A}_{e})$ for the explicit Newmark algorithm, i.e., $\mathbf{\eta} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1/2 & 1/2 \end{bmatrix}$, are as follows:

$$\mathbf{A}_{e} = \begin{bmatrix} -0.0051 & -0.0102 & -0.0039 \\ 0.4975 & 0.9949 & -0.0020 \\ 0.5000 & 1.0000 & 1.0000 \end{bmatrix}$$
(5.52a)

$$\mathbf{C} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.5000 & 1.0000 & 1.0000 \end{bmatrix}$$
(5.52b)

$$\rho(\mathbf{A}_{e}) = 0.9969$$
 (5.52c)

 $\rho(\mathbf{A}_e) < 1$ implies that \mathbf{A}_e is asymptotically stable; thus the first condition of the strictly positive realness of G(z) in Equation (5.44) is satisfied.

5.6.1 Stiffening Systems

For stiffening systems, $\mathbf{B}_e = \mathbf{B}_1$ is as follows:

$$\mathbf{B}_{e} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.0039 & 0.0020 & 0 \end{bmatrix}^{T} \tag{5.53}$$

The row ranks of the Kalman's controllability matrix:

$$\mathbf{Z} = [\mathbf{B}_{e} \quad \mathbf{A}_{e} \mathbf{B}_{e} \quad \mathbf{A}_{e}^{2} \mathbf{B}_{e}]$$
(5.54)

is equal to 3, i.e., rank(\mathbf{Z}) = 3. Therefore, ($\mathbf{A}_{e}, \mathbf{B}_{e}$) is controllable.

A Nyquist plot of H(z) in Equation (5.46) corresponding to \mathbf{A}_e , \mathbf{C} and \mathbf{B}_e in Equations (5.52) and (5.53) is shown in Figure 5.2, where min $\{\operatorname{Re}[H(z)]\} = -4.7642$ is obtained. Based on Equation (5.45), one obtains:

$$-1/k < \min\left\{\operatorname{Re}\left[H(z)\right]\right\}$$
(5.55a)

$$k < -1/\min\left\{\operatorname{Re}[H(z)]\right\} = 0.2099$$
 (5.55b)

Accordingly, for stiffening systems, the explicit Newmark algorithm is stable—in the sense of Lyapunov—in the range that $f/u \in (k_I, k_I + k) = [1, 1.2099, |u|] > 0$ for the numerical conditions in Equation (5.51).



Figure 5.2 Nyquist plot of *H*(*z*) for a stiffening system of the explicit Newmark algorithm.

5.6.2 Softening Systems

For softening systems, $\mathbf{B}_e = \mathbf{B}_2$ is as follows:

$$\mathbf{B}_{e} = -\begin{bmatrix} 0.0039 & 0.0020 & 0 \end{bmatrix}^{T}$$
(5.56)

Figure 5.3 shows the Nyquist plot of H(z) in Equation (5.45) corresponding to \mathbf{A}_e , \mathbf{C} and \mathbf{B}_e in Equations (5.52) and (5.56). Similar to Equation (5.40), with min $\{\operatorname{Re}[H(z)]\} = -5.2586$ obtained from Figure 5.3, one obtains:

$$k < -1/\min\left\{\operatorname{Re}[H(z)]\right\} = 0.1902$$
 (5.57)

Therefore, for softening systems, the explicit Newmark algorithm is stable—in the sense of Lyapunov—in the range that $f/u \in (k_I - k, k_I) = [0.80981, |u|] > 0$ for the numerical conditions in Equation (5.51).



Figure 5.3 Nyquist plot of H(z) for a softening system of the explicit Newmark algorithm.

Table 5.3	The k values of different SSE algorithms for stiffening and
	softening systems.

η	$ ho(\mathbf{A}_{_{e}})$	Stiffening Systems	Softening Systems
[1 1/2 1/4 3/4]	0.9964	0.3333	0.2853
[1 1/2 3/4 1/4]	0.9974	0.1387	0.1308
[1 1/4 1/2 1/2]	0.9974	0.1727	0.1639

suitening and solitening systems.				
$ ho_{\scriptscriptstyle\infty}$	$ ho\!\!\left(\!\mathbf{A}_{_{e}} ight)$	Stiffening systems	Softening systems	
0.1	0.9969	0.2096	0.1901	
0.3	0.9969	0.2101	0.1904	
0.5	0.9969	0.2103	0.1905	
0.7	0.9969	0.2103	0.1905	
0.9	0.9969	0.2103	0.1905	

Table 5.4The k values of different generalized- $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ PCE algorithms for
stiffening and softening systems.

The proposed approach can be applied to investigate the stability of other explicit direct integration algorithms. The results of other SSE algorithms defined by the vector $\mathbf{\eta}$ and the generalized- α PCE algorithms defined by ρ_{∞} are listed in Tables 5.3 and 5.4, respectively.

5.7 NUMERICAL EXAMPLES FOR MDOF SYSTEMS

5.7.1 MDOF Bridge Structures

The MDOF bridge structure investigated in this section is shown in Figure 5.4 with mass per unit length and the flexural rigidity (*EI*) given for each member. This bridge structure has the six DOFs shown where axial deformation neglected in all members.

The derivation of the *N* basic resisting forces (**q** in terms of $\overline{\mathbf{u}}$) and the corresponding matrices $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ for this bridge structure is given in Appendix B. The row rank of the controllability matrix:

$$\mathbf{Z} = [\mathbf{B}_e \quad \mathbf{A}_e^2 \mathbf{B}_e \quad \mathbf{A}_e^2 \mathbf{B}_e \quad \cdots \quad \mathbf{A}_e^{17} \mathbf{B}_e]$$
(5.58)

is such that rank (**Z**) = 18. Therefore, $(\mathbf{A}_e, \mathbf{B}_e)$ is controllable and $\rho(\mathbf{A}_e) = 0.9999 < 1$.



Figure 5.4 A MDOF bridge structure.

In this section, the generalized- α PCE algorithm with $\rho_{\infty} = 0.6$ is used to demonstrate the approach for MDOF structural systems with nonlinear stiffening or softening behavior. The Lyapunov stability analysis is conducted for the bridge shown in Figure 5.4 assuming the following numerical values:

$$m_b = m_c = 1.0, \ L_i = 100.0, \ i = 1, 2, \cdots, 5, \ E_b I_b = E_c I_c = 1.0 \times 10^8$$
 (5.59a)

$$\lambda_l = l / \sum_{l=1}^{N} l, \quad \mu = (\Delta t) / T_n = 0.01$$
 (5.59b)

where λ_l is the weight coefficient of the *l*th constraint, refer to Equation (5.36), $l:1 \rightarrow N$, T_n is the period of the *n*-th mode of vibration, which is $T_n = T_6 = 0.19 \sec$ for the analyzed bridge. Rayleigh damping is assigned to the bridge [Chopra 2006], i.e.,

$$\mathbf{c} = a_0 \mathbf{m} + a_1 \mathbf{k} \tag{5.60}$$

where **m**, **c**, and **k** are the mass, viscous damping, and linear elastic stiffness matrices, respectively. The constants a_0 and a_1 are determined from specified damping ratio ζ_i and ζ_j for the *i*th and *j*th modes, respectively. With both modes are assumed to possess the same damping ratio, i.e., $\zeta = 0.05$, the constants a_0 and a_1 are determined as follows [Chopra 2006]:

$$a_0 = \frac{2\omega_i \omega_j \zeta}{\omega_i + \omega_j}, \quad a_1 = \frac{2\zeta}{\omega_i + \omega_j}$$
(5.61)

where ω_i and ω_j are the natural frequencies of the *i*th and *j*th modes. Therefore, the damping ratio for the *k*th mode is [Chopra 2006]:

$$\zeta_k = \frac{a_0}{2\omega_k} + \frac{a_1\omega_k}{2} \tag{5.62}$$

In this example, i = 1 and j = 4 are selected such that the mean value of the damping ratio of all modes, i.e., mean $(\zeta_1, \zeta_2...\zeta_6)$, has the closest value to the assigned damping ratio $\zeta = 0.05$. The determination of the damping matrices for the other examples in this chapter follows the same procedure presented above.

Under earthquake excitation, nonlinearity usually occurs in the columns of a bridge structure only, whereas the bridge deck can be modeled using linear elastic elements. Therefore, the basic resisting forces associated with the column are of primary interest. Based on Appendix B, only the first two basic resisting forces are associated with the horizontal translation DOF of the column, u^1 . Hence, the weight coefficients in Equation (5.59b) are chosen such that the two smallest weight coefficients are assigned to the constraints corresponding to the first two basic resisting forces. Moreover, the cost function for this bridge structure is selected as $\min[(\bar{k}^1 + \bar{k}^2)]$, which is equivalent to maximizing $(\bar{k}^1 + \bar{k}^2)$. Accordingly, we perform convex optimization over all possible $\bar{\mathbf{k}}$ that has the largest value of $(\bar{k}^1 + \bar{k}^2)$ and the obtained result is the $\bar{\mathbf{k}}$ for all the basic resisting forces. In this cost function, $\bar{k}^1 = \bar{k}_{Max}^1 - \bar{k}_{Min}^1$, and $\bar{k}^2 = \bar{k}_{Max}^2 - \bar{k}_{Min}^2$

are the differences of the upper and lower bounds of the basic resisting forces q^1 and q^2 associated with the column element. With the initial bounds and corresponding matrix $\bar{\mathbf{k}}_I$ presented in Appendix B, the difference of the upper and lower bounds, $\bar{k} = \bar{k}_{Max} - \bar{k}_{Min}$, of each resisting force are listed in Table 5.5 for both stiffening, $\bar{\mathbf{u}}^T \mathbf{q} \in [\bar{\mathbf{u}}^T \bar{\mathbf{k}}_I \bar{\mathbf{u}}, \bar{\mathbf{u}}^T (\bar{\mathbf{k}}_I + \bar{\mathbf{k}}) \bar{\mathbf{u}}]$, and softening systems, $\bar{\mathbf{u}}^T \mathbf{q} \in [\bar{\mathbf{u}}^T (\bar{\mathbf{k}}_I - \bar{\mathbf{k}}) \bar{\mathbf{u}}, \bar{\mathbf{u}}^T \bar{\mathbf{k}}_I \bar{\mathbf{u}}]$. Note: the obtained $\bar{\mathbf{k}}$ depends on the selection of the coefficient matrix λ and the cost function. For example, different coefficient matrix λ , e.g., $\lambda_I = 1/N$, or alternative cost function chosen to be minimized, e.g. $\min(-\bar{k}^1)$, will yield different $\bar{\mathbf{k}}$, as shown in Table 5.6.

Resisting force Number	Stiffening systems	Softening systems
1	11234.1	10084.7
2	3470.2	3478.0
3	836.4	707.1
4	725.9	612.7
5	769.1	723.8
6	1132.8	1015.1
7	691.7	644.9
8	437.6	413.0
9	908.3	857.2
10	550.0	528.6
11	372.8	353.9
12	527.7	494.7

Table 5.5 The \bar{k} of each basic resisting force for the bridge structure.

Table 5.6	The k of each basic resisting force for the bridge structure for
	different λ and cost function.

Resisting force Number	Stiffening systems	Softening systems
1	5791.6	5680.6
2	430.0	419.8
3	897.9	890.5
4	897.9	890.5
5	802.7	753.3
6	1144.5	1086.5
7	834.4	824.0
8	575.9	564.0
9	1144.5	1086.5
10	802.7	753.3
11	575.9	564.0
12	834.4	824.0

5.7.2 Multi-Story Shear Building Structures

The structures investigated in this section are multi-story shear buildings with stiffening or softening structural behavior. A general multi-story shear building structure is depicted in Figure 5.5. The detailed derivation of **q** and $\overline{\mathbf{u}}$ as well as corresponding matrices α and β for this shear building is given in Appendix C. Accordingly, the maximum, \overline{k}_{Max}^{j} , and minimum, \overline{k}_{Min}^{j} , stiffness values of the *j*th story, where $j:1 \rightarrow n$, for stable (in the sense of Lyapunov) stiffening and softening multi-story shear building systems, respectively, are to be determined for the explicit Newmark algorithm, i.e. $\mathbf{\eta} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1/2 & 1/2 \end{bmatrix}$.

The Lyapunov stability analysis is conducted for the following numerical values:

$$m_i = 0.5, \quad \zeta = 0.05, \quad \overline{k_I}^j = 1000.0$$
 (5.63a)

$$\lambda_j = \frac{\omega_j^2}{\left(\sum_{n=1}^n \omega_j^2\right)}, \quad \omega_j = \frac{2\pi}{T_j}, \quad \mu = \frac{(\Delta t)}{T_n} = 0.01$$
(5.63b)

where $j: 1 \rightarrow n$, T_j is the period of the *j*th mode of vibration of the analyzed structure, and T_n is the period of the *n*th mode of vibration, which depends on the number of stories, *n*, of the analyzed shear building. As in the previous example, the initial bound matrix $\mathbf{\bar{k}} = \text{diag}[\bar{k}_I^1, \bar{k}_I^2, ..., \bar{k}_I^n]$.



Figure 5.5 General multi-story shear building structure.

5.7.2.1 A Two-Story Shear Building

The Lyapunov stability analysis of the explicit Newmark integrator applied to a two-story (Figure 5.5 with n = 2) shear building is conducted. The two periods of this building are $T_1 = 0.23$ sec and $T_2 = 0.09$ sec. Based on Equations (5.63a) and (5.63b), \mathbf{A}_e and \mathbf{C} are given in Appendix D, and $\rho(\mathbf{A}_e) = 0.9988 < 1$.

5.7.2.1.1 Stiffening Systems

For stiffening systems, $\overline{\mathbf{k}}_{Min} = \overline{\mathbf{k}}_{I}$, $\mathbf{B}_{e} = \mathbf{B}_{1}\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ is given in Appendix D. The row rank of the controllability matrix:

$$\mathbf{Z} = [\mathbf{B}_e \quad \mathbf{A}_e^2 \mathbf{B}_e \quad \mathbf{A}_e^2 \mathbf{B}_e \quad \cdots \quad \mathbf{A}_e^5 \mathbf{B}_e]$$
(5.64)

is such that rank(\mathbf{Z}) = 6. Therefore, ($\mathbf{A}_{e}, \mathbf{B}_{e}$) is controllable and the following $\mathbf{\overline{k}} = \mathbf{\overline{k}}_{Max} - \mathbf{\overline{k}}_{I}$:

$$\overline{\mathbf{k}} = \begin{bmatrix} 205 & 0\\ 0 & 174 \end{bmatrix}$$
(5.65)

is obtained numerically using CVX [CVX Research Inc. 2011] as follows:

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{Minimize} \quad -\left(\bar{k}^{1}+\bar{k}^{2}\right) \\ \mathbf{P},\bar{\mathbf{k}} \end{array} \tag{5.66}$$

subjected to

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A}_{e}^{t}\mathbf{P}\mathbf{A}_{e} - \mathbf{P} & \mathbf{A}_{e}^{t}\mathbf{P}\mathbf{B}_{e} - (\mathbf{\bar{k}}\mathbf{C})^{T} \\ \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A}_{e}^{t}\mathbf{P}\mathbf{B}_{e} - (\mathbf{\bar{k}}\mathbf{C})^{T} \end{bmatrix}^{T} & -(\mathbf{I}^{T} + \mathbf{I}) + \mathbf{B}_{e}^{T}\mathbf{P}\mathbf{B}_{e} \end{bmatrix} \prec \mathbf{0}, \quad \mathbf{P} = \mathbf{P}^{T} \succ \mathbf{0}, \quad \mathbf{\bar{k}} \succ \mathbf{0}$$
(5.67)

where **P**, given in Appendix D, is a 6×6 matrix. Accordingly, for the two-story shear building with stiffening behavior, the explicit Newmark algorithm is stable—in the sense of Lyapunov—for the numerical values in Equation (5.63) in the following range:

$$\overline{\mathbf{u}}^T \overline{\mathbf{k}}_{Min} \overline{\mathbf{u}} \le \overline{\mathbf{u}}^T \mathbf{q} \le \overline{\mathbf{u}}^T \overline{\mathbf{k}}_{Max} \overline{\mathbf{u}}$$
(5.68)

where

$$\overline{\mathbf{k}}_{Min} = \overline{\mathbf{k}}_{I} = \begin{bmatrix} 1000 & 0\\ 0 & 1000 \end{bmatrix}$$
(5.69a)

$$\overline{\mathbf{k}}_{Max} = \overline{\mathbf{k}}_{Min} + \overline{\mathbf{k}} = \begin{bmatrix} 1205 & 0\\ 0 & 1174 \end{bmatrix}$$
(5.69b)

5.7.2.1.2 Softening Systems

For softening systems, $\overline{\mathbf{k}}_{Max} = \overline{\mathbf{k}}_{I}$, $\mathbf{B}_{e} = \mathbf{B}_{2}\boldsymbol{\alpha} = -\mathbf{B}_{1}\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ as given in Appendix D, and the following $\overline{\mathbf{k}} = \overline{\mathbf{k}}_{I} - \overline{\mathbf{k}}_{Min}$:

$$\overline{\mathbf{k}} = \begin{bmatrix} 184 & 0\\ 0 & 159 \end{bmatrix}$$
(5.70)

is obtained using similar procedure to Equations (5.66) and (5.67). The corresponding **P** is also given in Appendix D. Therefore, for the two-story shear building with softening behavior, the explicit Newmark algorithm is stable in the sense of Lyapunov for the numerical values in Equation (5.63) in the range of Equation (5.68) with

$$\overline{\mathbf{k}}_{Max} = \overline{\mathbf{k}}_{I} = \begin{bmatrix} 1000 & 0\\ 0 & 1000 \end{bmatrix}$$
(5.71a)

$$\overline{\mathbf{k}}_{Min} = \overline{\mathbf{k}}_{Max} - \overline{\mathbf{k}} = \begin{bmatrix} 816 & 0\\ 0 & 841 \end{bmatrix}$$
(5.71b)

5.7.2.2 A 20-Story Shear Building

A 20-story (Figure 5.5 with n = 20) shear building is used to investigate the Lyapunov stability analysis of the explicit Newmark algorithm. The fundamental and 20th periods of this building are $T_1 = 1.83 \operatorname{sec}$ and $T_{20} = 0.07 \operatorname{sec}$, which are within the practical range for the 20-story shear building. Same Lyapunov stability analysis as in previous sections is conducted for the analyzed 20-story shear building with stiffening or softening behavior. The cost function for this bridge structure is selected as $\min\left(-\sum_{j=1}^{20} \bar{k}^j\right)$, which is equivalent to maximizing $\sum_{j=1}^{20} \bar{k}^j$. In this cost function, $\bar{k}^j = \bar{k}_{Max}^j - \bar{k}_{Min}^j$ is the difference of the upper and lower bounds of the basic resisting force q^j associated with the *j*-th story, where $j:1 \rightarrow n$. Table 5.7 shows that the difference of the upper and lower bounds, $\bar{k} = \bar{k}_{Max} - \bar{k}_{Min}$, of each resisting force for the explicit Newmark algorithm to be stable—in the sense of Lyapunov)—for both stiffening, $\bar{\mathbf{u}}^T \mathbf{q} \in [\bar{\mathbf{u}}^T \bar{\mathbf{k}}_I \bar{\mathbf{u}}, \bar{\mathbf{u}}^T (\bar{\mathbf{k}}_I + \bar{\mathbf{k}}) \bar{\mathbf{u}}]$, and softening, $\bar{\mathbf{u}}^T \mathbf{q} \in [\bar{\mathbf{u}}^T (\bar{\mathbf{k}}_I - \bar{\mathbf{k}}) \bar{\mathbf{u}}, \bar{\mathbf{u}}^T \bar{\mathbf{k}}_I \bar{\mathbf{u}}]$, systems.

Table 5.7 The \overline{k} of each basic resisting force for the 20-story shear building.

Story number	Stiffening systems	Softening systems	Story number	Stiffening systems	Softening systems
1	716.1	203.7	11	31.3	35.9
2	125.1	149.6	12	25.3	30.8
3	98.8	150.4	13	21.8	28.5
4	133.0	166.5	14	19.6	26.7
5	163.4	140.0	15	17.3	24.0
6	119.7	97.7	16	15.0	21.2
7	76.9	74.8	17	14.2	20.4
8	56.5	64.1	18	16.9	23.7
9	46.7	55.3	19	29.6	37.3
10	39.0	44.8	20	116.1	106.7

Note in Table 5.7 that the largest difference of upper and lower bounds is obtained for the first story for both stiffening and softening systems. Define δ^{j} as the difference between the upper and lower bounds of the stiffness of the *j*th story normalized by the corresponding initial stiffness, i.e.,

$$\delta^{j} = \bar{k}^{j} / \bar{k}_{l}^{j} \tag{5.72}$$

For shear buildings, the first story is usually the most critical where high levels of nonlinearity may occur. Figure 5.6 presents the effects of the total number of stories and damping values (2%, 5%, and 10%) on δ^1 for stiffening (Figure 5.6a) and softening (Figure 5.6b) systems. The number of stories is investigated up to 25, i.e. $n:1 \rightarrow 25$. Note that in Figure 5.6, δ^1 increases with increasing damping values. For the stiffening system (Figure 5.6a), δ^1 also increases in general with the increase of the number of stories; however, for the softening system (see Figure 5.6b), δ^1 increases or decreases with the increase of the number of stories for low (2%) or high (10%) damping ratios, respectively, while no change is observed for moderate (5%) damping ratio.

5.8 DISCUSSION OF BROADER SCOPE

The proposed approach can be applied to investigate the stability of other explicit direct integration algorithms defined by the vector $\mathbf{\eta}$ or ρ_{∞} for any MDOF nonlinear system defined by the matrices $\mathbf{\alpha}$ and $\mathbf{\beta}$. Moreover, it is also noted that neither \overline{k}_{Min}^l nor \overline{k}_{Max}^l is necessarily equal to \overline{k}_I^l , where $l:1 \rightarrow N$, for the stiffening or the softening systems, respectively. These bounds values can take any other value along the loading path. Furthermore, besides strictly stiffening and softening systems as in Figure 5.1, other nonlinear problems can be treated using the proposed stability analysis approach. This is true as long as Equation (5.18) is satisfied; thus the nonlinear force is sector-bounded, e.g., those shown in Figure 5.7 with both stiffening and softening behavior including *occasionally tangent negative stiffness* values. Thus, the proposed approach is generally applicable to explicit direct integration algorithms for various MDOF nonlinear systems.



Figure 5.6 δ^1 of different number of stories and damping values.



Figure 5.7 Schematic illustrations of sector-bounded basic resisting forces not strictly stiffening or softening.

6 DEVELOPMENT OF THE BENCHMARK PROBABILITY DISTRIBUTION OF SEISMIC DEMANDS

6.1 INTRODUCTION

Another key challenge in the PBEE approach is the selection and modification of ground motions (GMs) to serve as input excitations for nonlinear time history analysis (NTHA) simulations of structures. The intricate nonlinear response of structures is highly sensitive to the ground motion selection and modification (GMSM) of the input records. Therefore, the GMSM of the input records is a vital prerequisite for accurate seismic analysis.

The GMSM procedures determine the necessary input GM records for the simulations of structures using NTHA. Numerous research efforts focused on developing different GMSM procedures, which are generally categorized into two approaches: (1) amplitude scaling and (2) spectrum shape matching procedures. The first approach selects and modifies the GM records based on scalar intensity measures (IMs). Some example choices of these scalar IMs include the spectral acceleration at a specific (e.g., fundamental) period of the structure [Shome et al. 1998; Watson-Lamprey and Abrahamson 2006] and certain peak response of inelastic single-degree of freedom (DOF) systems [Luco and Cornell 2007; Tothong and Luco 2007; and Kalkan and Chopra 2011] to account for nonlinear effects. The second approach takes the spectrum shape into account selects and scales a suite of GM records that has close matching to a target spectrum [Naeim et al. 2004; Kottke and Rathje 2008; and Baker 2011]. A comprehensive review of various GMSM procedures is given in Haselton et al. [2009] and Katsanos et al. [2010]. In addition, many simulated GM procedures were developed [e.g., Rezaeian and Der Kiureghian 2011] that are especially useful for design scenarios corresponding to scarce recorded GMs in existing databases. In this study, the two approaches of GMSM based on real GM records are of interest.

Although many GMSM procedures are available, there is no consensus regarding a single accurate method, and many studies have focused on evaluating these procedures. Hancock et al. [2008], Haselton et al. [2008], and Heo et al. [2010] compared different GMSM procedures in predicting median responses of seismic demands against developed reference benchmarks. Recently, Kwong et al. [2015] developed a framework for the evaluation of GMSM procedures by determining a benchmark seismic demand hazard curve. Later, Kwong and Chopra [2016] applied this framework to evaluate two GMSM procedures: (1) exact conditional spectrum [Lin et al. 2013a] and (2) generalized conditional intensity measures [Bradley 2010]. These evaluation studies were primarily focused on building structures and considered unidirectional input ground

motion. In general, bridge structures exhibit distinct behaviors in the longitudinal and transverse directions. Hence, bidirectional GM studies focused on highway bridges are needed.

In order to effectively evaluate the GMSM procedures, a reference benchmark the probability distribution of the seismic demands (*PDSD*) should be established. A framework of performance-based earthquake engineering (PBEE) was developed at the Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center(PEER) that explicitly takes into account uncertainties in earthquake hazard, structural response, damage, and loss estimation [Günay and Mosalam 2013]. The PEER PBEE methodology enables comprehensive understanding of the structural performance in a probabilistic manner. This study takes advantage of the PEER PBEE to develop the reference benchmark *PDSD* for structures.

6.2 BENCHMARK PROBABILITY DISTRIBUTION OF SEISMIC DEMANDS

The PEER PBEE methodology aims to divide the performance assessment and design process into logical stages that can be studied and resolved in a systematic and consistent manner [Moehle and Deierlein 2004]. These stages of the process contain the definition, description, and quantification of earthquake intensity measure, structural response, damage, and loss. Accordingly, uncertainties in these stages can be explicitly taken into account [Günay and Mosalam 2013] to enable comprehensive understanding of the structural performance in a probabilistic manner. The well-known PEER PBEE formula originally presented in Cornell and Krawinkler [2000] is restated as follows

$$\lambda(dv) = \int_{dm} \int_{edp} \int_{im} G(dv \mid dm) dG(dm \mid edp) dG(edp \mid im) d\lambda(im)$$
(6.1)

where *im*, *edp*, *dm*, and *dv* are the intensity measure, engineering demand parameter, damage measure, and decision variable, respectively, $\lambda(x)$ is the mean annual rate of events exceeding a given level for a given variable *x*, G(x) is the complementary cumulative distribution function (CCDF) for random variable *X*, i.e., $G(x) = \Pr(X > x)$, and the corresponding conditional CCDF is $G(x|y) = \Pr(X > x|Y = y)$. Moreover, the variables *im*, *edp*, and *dm* can be expressed in a vector form (e.g., Bradley [2012]), i.e., multiple folds are implied in the integrals.

In this study, a reference benchmark *PDSD* is developed based on the PEER PBEE framework considering the first two sources of uncertainties, i.e., the earthquake intensity measure and the structural response. In addition, this study is extended to account for structural collapse of a certain damage group corresponding to a group of structural components affected by the same *EDP* (e.g., Baker and Cornell [2005]; and Lin et al. [2013b]). This study makes use of Equation (6.2), which presents the general formula for the *PDSD*.

$$G(edp) = \Pr(EDP > edp) = \int_{im} G(edp \mid im) f_{IM}(im) dim$$
(6.2)

where *im* is the value of the intensity measure represented as a random variable *IM*, $G(edp | im) = \Pr(EDP > edp | IM = im)$ is the conditional probability of *EDP* exceeding the demand level *edp* given the intensity measure *im*, and $f_{IM}(im)$ is the probability density function (PDF) of the intensity measure, i.e., IM, which can be obtained through ground motion attenuation models.

When developing the *PDSD* of the investigated structures, it is necessary to account for the possibility that some GM records, whose *IM* are at high levels, may cause collapse of the structure. From Equation (6.2), the conditional probability of exceedance G(edp/im) is computed by the summation of probabilities of such occurrences conditioned on the two mutually exclusive categories of the bridge collapse (C) and non-collapse (NC), i.e.,

$$G(edp/im) = G(edp/im, C) \times \Pr(C/im) + G(edp/im, NC) \times \Pr(NC/im)$$
(6.3)

Intuitively, we can set G(edp/im, C) = 1.0. Thus, Equation (6.3) leads to the following:

$$G(edp \mid im) = \Pr(C \mid im) + G(edp \mid im, NC) \times [1 - \Pr(C \mid im)]$$
(6.4)

The conditional probability of collapse, i.e., Pr(C | im), is evaluated as follows:

$$\hat{Pr}(C|im) = \frac{\# \text{ of records causing collapse}}{\text{total } \# \text{ of selected records}} \quad \text{at intensity level } im \tag{6.5}$$

In Equation (6.4), the only term that has not been determined is the probability of *EDP* exceeding the demand level *edp* given the intensity measures for the non-collapse scenario, i.e., G(edp | im, NC). In this study, the distribution of *EDP*s conditioned on the intensity measures is evaluated using a non-parametric statistical inference, kernel density estimation [Härdle et al. 2004], as follows:

$$\hat{f}_{EDP|IM}\left(edp \mid im\right) = \frac{1}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^{n} K\left(\frac{edp \mid im - EDP_i \mid IM}{h}\right)$$
(6.6)

where *h* is the bandwidth for EDP | IM, *K* is a kernel function, and $EDP_i | IM$ is the *i*th observation of the random variable EDP | IM. The symbol "^" in Equation (6.6) denotes the estimation, i.e., $\hat{g}(x)$ is an estimate of g(x).

Combination of the intensity measure and the structural responses, including C and NC cases, i.e., substituting Equation (6.4) and required estimates of its different terms, as discussed above, into Equation (6.2), leads to the following:

$$\hat{G}(edp) = \int_{im} \hat{P}r(C \mid im) + \hat{G}(edp \mid im, NC) \times [1 - \hat{P}r(C \mid im)] f_{IM}(im) dim$$
(6.7)

The procedure of the benchmark *PDSD* development is readily extended to the case of multiple earthquake scenarios as follows:

$$\hat{G}_{m}(edp) \cong \sum_{l=1}^{N_{eqs}} v_{l} \cdot \left\{ \int_{im} \hat{\Pr}(\mathbf{C} \mid im) + \hat{G}(edp \mid im, \mathbf{NC}) \times [1 - \hat{\Pr}(\mathbf{C} \mid im)] f_{IM}(im) dim \right\}_{l}$$
(6.8)

where $\hat{G}_m(edp)$ is the *PDSD* for multiple earthquake scenarios with number N_{eqs} and v_l [Bradley 2013] the activity rate for the *l*th earthquake scenario.

6.3 EVALUATION OF THE GMSM PROCEDURES

Similar to the development of the reference benchmark *PDSD*, the *PDSD* estimates by the GM records selected from each GMSM procedure are developed. Analogous to Equations (6.3) and (6.4), G(edp) is divided into two mutually exclusive categories of C and NC, i.e.,

$$G(edp) = G(edp | C) \times Pr(C) + G(edp | NC) \times Pr(NC)$$

= Pr(C) + G(edp | NC) × [1 - Pr(C)] (6.9)

where it is assumed that G(edp | C) = 1.0 and Pr(C) is the probability of collapse estimated as follows:

$$\hat{Pr}(C) = \frac{\# \text{ of records causing collapse}}{\text{total } \# \text{ of records}}$$
(6.10)

The probability of exceedance for the NC cases, i.e., G(edp | NC), can be estimated by a nonparametric inference using the following empirical CCDF [Baker 2007; Vamvatsikos and Cornell 2004]

$$\hat{G}(edp \mid \text{NC}) = \frac{1}{\overline{m}} \sum_{l=1}^{\overline{m}} I(EDP_l > edp)$$
(6.11)

where \overline{m} is the number of GM records that produce NC, EDP_l is the value of EDP for the *l*th record, and $I(\cdot)$ represents the indicator function, i.e., $I(EDP_l > edp) = 1.0$ if $EDP_l > edp$; otherwise, $I(EDP_l > edp) = 0.0$. Accordingly, the *PDSD* estimate, i.e., $\hat{G}(edp)$, is obtained as follows:

$$\hat{G}(edp) = \hat{P}r(C) + \hat{G}(edp \mid NC) \times [1 - \hat{P}r(C)]$$
(6.12)

7 COMPUTATIONAL BRIDGE STRUCTURE MODELS

7.1 INTRODUCTION

In any urban transportation system, ordinary standard reinforced concrete (RC) highway bridges are essential lifeline structures for transporting goods and people around natural terrains. In California, for example, where numerous active faults exist and earthquakes occur fairly frequently, bridges should sustain minimal damage and remain operational in the aftermath of an earthquake. This requirement is essential for recovery and emergency management purposes. RC highway bridges were observed to have substandard performance during earthquakes due to the inherent lack of high redundancy of the structural system [Benzoti et al. 1996]. This is not a problem restricted to the West Coast of the U.S. Bridges designed according to modern codes were severely damaged or collapsed in different parts of the world during recent earthquakes. Accordingly, determination of the seismic response of existing and newly designed RC highway bridges, using techniques of structural analysis, is essential to ensure their seismic safety.

For a California bridge to be considered as an ordinary standard bridge, it should satisfy the following conditions [Caltrans SDC 2010]: (1) the span length should be less than 300 ft; (2) the bridge should be constructed with normal-weight concrete; (3) foundations must be supported on spread footings, pile caps with piles, or pile shafts; (4) the soil is not susceptible to liquefaction, lateral spreading or scour; and (5) the fundamental period of the transverse and longitudinal directions of the bridge should be greater than or equal to 0.7 sec. This chapter provides a brief description of selected ordinary standard RC highway bridge structures and reviews the related OpenSees [McKenna et al. 2010] computational bridge structure models by Kaviani et al. [2014].

7.2 BRIDGE STRUCTURES

Three representative RC highway bridge structures were selected for this study. The selected bridges, designed after 2000, reflect common bridge engineering practice in California. The first selected bridge is the *Jack Tone Road Overcrossing* (Bridge A), with two spans supported on a single column. The second bridge is the *La Veta Avenue Overcrossing* (Bridge B), with two spans supported on a two-column bridge bent. The third bridge is the *Jack Tone Road Overhead* (Bridge C), with three spans and two three-column bridge bents. The characteristics and configurations of the selected bridges are summarized in Table 7.1 and Figure 7.1.

Bridge	Α	В	С
Name	Jack Tone Road Overcrossing	La Veta Avenue Overcrossing	Jack Tone Road Overhead
No of spans	2	2	3
Column bent	Single-column	Two-column	Three-column
Column radius	33.1 in.	33.5 in.	33.1 in.
Column height	22.0 ft	22.0 ft	24.6 ft
Abutment	Seat type	Seat type	Seat type
Seat length	33.85 in.	33.85 in.	33.85 in.
Superstructure concrete	$f_c = 5$ ksi, $E_c = 4030.5$ ksi	$f_c = 5$ ksi, $E_c = 4030.5$ ksi	$f_c = 5 \text{ ksi}, E_c = 4030.5 \text{ ksi}$
Column bent concrete and	Concrete: 5 ksi	Concrete: 5 ksi	Concrete: 5 ksi
reinforcing materials	Steel: ASTM A706	Steel: ASTM A706	Steel: ASTM A706
	Long.: 44#11 (bundles of 2)	Long.: 44#11 (bundles of 2)	Long.: 44#11 (bundles of 2)
Reinforcement details of	$\rho_l = 2.00\%$	$\rho_l = 1.95\%$	$\rho_l = 2.20\%$
	Trans.: Spiral, #6 @ 3.34 in.	Trans.: Spiral, #4 @ 6.00 in.	Trans.: Spiral, #6 @ 3.34 in.

Table 7.1Characteristics of the selected bridges.



Figure 7.1

Configurations of the selected bridges.
7.3 COMPUTATIONAL MODELS

Extensive analytical simulations were conducted on these three bridges [Kaviani et al. 2012] using OpenSees [McKenna et al. 2010]; the modeling assumptions adopted were partly based on Aviram et al. [2008]. OpenSees has a sufficient element and material response library and empowers scripted execution of repetitive nonlinear time history analyses (NTHA) through which the model parameters and input ground motions can be systematically varied. A representative bridge model (Bridge B) used in the simulations is depicted in Figure 7.2. Seat-type abutments, shear keys, expansion joints, column-bents, and the superstructure were included in the model. A more detailed explanation of the modeling assumptions can be found in Kaviani et al. [2014].



Figure 7.2 Modeling of Bridge B [Kaviani et al. 2014].

7.3.1 Material Properties

Material properties assigned to the models were based on the Caltrans SDC [2010]. The model developed by Mander et al. [1988] was used for the RC column of the selected bridges. It is recommended by Caltrans SDC [2010] that confined as well as unconfined concrete should be taken into account to determine the local capacity of ductile concrete members.

In this study, the compressive strain for the unconfined concrete at the maximum compressive stress, $f_{ce} = 5ksi$, and the ultimate compression (spalling) strain were chosen as

 $\varepsilon_{c0} = 0.0028$ and $\varepsilon_{cp} = 0.005$, respectively. For the confined concrete, the compressive strain at the maximum compressive stress, $f_{cc} = 6.6 ksi$, and the ultimate compression strain were $\varepsilon_{cc} = 0.008$ and $\varepsilon_{cu} = 0.025$, respectively. The modulus of elasticity specified by Caltrans SDC [2010] is

$$E_c = 33 \times w^{1.5} \times \sqrt{f_c} (psi)$$
(7.1)

where $w = 143.96 \text{ lb/ft}^3$ and $f_c = 5 \text{ ksi}$ are the unit weight of concrete and the compressive strength of the unconfined concrete, respectively. Reinforcing steel A706/A706M (Grade 60/Grade 400) was used with the steel modulus of elasticity and the expected yield strength were chosen as $E_s = 29,000 \text{ ksi}$ and $f_{ye} = 68 \text{ ksi}$ in accordance with Caltrans SDC [2010].

7.3.2 Superstructure Modeling

The Caltrans SDC [2010] requires that the superstructure of a bridge to be capacity protected and remain elastic. Considering that the bridge is designed according to the code regulations, the bridge deck and the cap-beam that form the bridge superstructure are modeled with elastic beam–column elements using uncracked section properties, which is typical for prestressed concrete). The three-dimensional spine-line models for the bridge superstructures, with a series of elastic beam–column line elements located at the centroids of the cross sections following the bridge alignment, were used to strike a good balance between computational efficiency and accuracy. The width of the deck was incorporated in the model at the two extreme nodes of the spine model, which included a transverse rigid bar whose lengths was the same as the width of the deck.

This approach allows accounting for the passive resistance of backfill soil distributed along the width of the deck. The orientation of the rigid bars and their widths were selected according to the abutment skew angle. Zero-length elements with uniaxial behavior were distributed along the width of the rigid boundary elements to model the passive backfill reaction normal to the backwall as well as the transverse reactions by the shear-keys. At each abutment, the deck is resting on several elastomeric (polytetrafluoroethylene) bearings through which the vertical loads from the superstructure are transferred to the stem wall. The two-phase (compressible and incompressible) vertical response of the bearing pads and the stem wall is represented with a bilinear forcedeformation backbone curve [Kaviani et. al. 2012]. Horizontal resistance due to sliding friction between deck and bearing pads has been neglected, considering the relatively small value of the friction coefficient between the pads and their mating surface [Caltrans SDC 2010]. The integral cap beam is modeled with elastic beam-column elements—with very large torsional and bending (out-of-plane of bent) rigidities—and is rigidly connected at its central node to the deck spine model.

Each bridge span was divided into ten segments in the OpenSees model to achieve an accurate distribution of mass along the length of the superstructure. Also, the assignment of rotational mass (mass moment of inertia) was considered to achieve greater accuracy in the predicted dynamic responses and fundamental modes of the bridge, particularly for those modes associated with the torsional and transverse motions. The rotational moment of inertia of a segment of superstructure was calculated as follows:

$$M_{XX} = \frac{Md_w^2}{12} = \frac{(m/L)L_{trib}d_w^2}{12}$$
(7.2)

where M_{XX} is the rotational mass of the superstructure, *m* is the total mass of the superstructure, *M* is the total mass of the superstructure segment, tributary to the node, L_{trib} is the tributary length, d_w is the superstructure width, and *L* is the length of the superstructure. The rotational mass, M_{ZZ} , of the column was calculated as follows

$$M_{ZZ} = \frac{M_c R_{col}^2}{2} = \frac{(m_c/L_c) L_{trib}^c D_{col}^2}{8}$$
(7.3)

where m_c is the total mass of the column, M_c is the total mass of the column segment, tributary to the node, $L_{_{trib}}^c$ is the tributary length, R_{col} and D_{col} are the radius and diameter of the column, and L_c is the height of the column.

7.3.3 Column-Bent Modeling

To model the columns, nonlinear force-based beam–column elements were utilized with fiberdiscretized sections considering 10 integration points along the height; see Figure 7.3. This is usually deemed to control the numerical integration errors and provide adequate accuracy [Kaviani et al. 2012] by considering the progression of column yielding and damage expected under strong ground motions.

Three different constitutive rules are used simultaneously within a fiber-discretized crosssection: (i) confined concrete for the core concrete, (ii) unconfined concrete for the cover concrete, and (iii) steel rebar for the reinforcing bars (Figure 7.3). OpenSees *Concrete01* constitutive model is a uniaxial Kent-Scott-Park concrete material object with degraded linear unloading/reloading stiffness according to the work of Karsan-Jirsa and no tensile strength [OpenSees Wiki 2010]. It was used for both the cover and concrete core. The steel rebar is modeled by *Steel02* material, a uniaxial Giuffre-Menegotto-Pinto steel material object with isotropic strain hardening [OpenSees Wiki 2010]. A rigid element is attached to the top of the nonlinear beam-column element to model the portion of the column-bent embedded in the superstructure. The boundary condition of the column base proves to introduce significant impact on the seismic responses obtained from NLTA [Kaviani et al. 2012]. Herein, the single-column bridge (Bridge A) is modeled with a fixed base connection, while both pinned and fixed base connection is assigned to the multi-column bridge (Bridge B and C).



Figure 7.3 Column modeling scheme for Bridge B [Kaviani et al. 2014].

7.3.4 Abutment Modeling

The study focused on seat-type abutment modeling. A representative seat-type abutment is illustrated in Figure 7.4. Two modeling approaches, namely Type I and Type II, were considered for the abutment; see Figure 7.5. In both approaches, the longitudinal responses of the backfill and the expansion joint, the transverse responses of the shear keys, and the vertical responses of the bearing pads and the stem-wall were all explicitly considered. In the Type I modeling approach (Figure 7.5a), two nonlinear springs, one at each end, and connected in series to gap elements, were used to model the passive backfill response and the expansion joint [Aviram et al. 2008], respectively. The shear-key response was modeled using an elastic-perfectly-plastic backbone relationship. The vertical response of the bearing pads and stem-wall was modeled by two parallel springs, one at each end (note that only one side is labeled in Figure 7.5), to represent the stiffness values. The backfill passive pressure was produced by the abutment back-wall. The strength and initial stiffness of the soil springs were determined according to the Caltrans SDC [2010]. In the Type II modeling approach, the number of nonlinear springs connected in series to the gap elements was increased to five, as shown in Figure 7.5b, and the shear-key response was modeled using a nonlinear spring with a tri-linear backbone relationship; Figure 7.6.



Figure 7.4 Configuration of a typical seat-type abutment [Kaviani et al. 2014].







Figure 7.6 Shear key force-deformation backbone curves [Kaviani et al. 2014].

8 APPLICATION OF ROBUST INTEGRATION AND SOLUTION ALGORITHMS SELECTION

8.1 INTRODUCTION

The most suitable analysis method for determining the seismic response of existing and new designed reinforced concrete (RC) highway bridges is nonlinear time history analysis (NTHA). However, one challenge in conducting a NTHA is the problem of convergence for three reasons: (1) various forms of nonlinear modeling required for accurate representation of the major bridge components (e.g., distributed plasticity models with discretized fiber sections for columns, stiffening gap elements used for the abutments, and combination of various nonlinear springs required for modeling shear keys); (2) complexity introduced by the interaction of the responses in longitudinal, transverse, and sometimes vertical directions; and (3) dynamic complexity due to the mass distribution along the deck.

This chapter investigates solutions to the numerical problems of convergence through the use of efficient direct integration algorithms. Two of the explicit integration algorithms are the Explicit Newmark (EN) and the Operator-Splitting (OS) algorithms, which do not require iterations or convergence checks. The TRBDF2 is an implicit integration algorithm developed to rectify potential stability problems of the Implicit Newmark (IN) for problems involving large deformations. The formulations of these algorithms are already introduced in Chapter 2. Applicability of these integration algorithms to NTHA of RC highway bridges is explored herein by using three representative RC highway bridges described in Chapter 7, where modeling of these three bridges addresses the issue of convergence.

The considered three integration algorithms can be used individually during the complete course of NTHA or selectively during the time steps where the commonly used IN fails to converge. Applicability of such adaptive switching of the considered integration algorithms is demonstrated in this chapter. Methods of convergence improvement are also investigated for the IN integrator. Finally, the efficacy of the proposed solutions is presented for a challenging subject in the context of PBEE [Günay and Mosalam 2013] that requires a significant number of NTHA. This subject is the identification of predominantly first-mode engineering demand parameters (*EDP*s) under earthquake excitation by making use of different ground motion selection and modification methods.

8.2 APPLICABILITY OF INTEGRATION ALGORITHMS

The applicability of the discussed explicit and implicit integration algorithms introduced in Chapter 2 for NTHA is discussed below, which focuses on the three described RC highway bridges. Table 8.1 presents coefficients for the Newmark and the OS integration algorithms, i.e., the MDOF version of Table 4.1, where $\eta = \mathbf{m}/((\Delta t)^2 \beta) + \mathbf{k}_{i+1} + \mathbf{c}\gamma/(\Delta t\beta)$.

	algoritimis.		
	Coefficient	Newmark	OS
_	$\mathbf{\eta}_{_0}$	Ι	$\mathbf{I} - \left[l / \Delta t \right] \mathbf{\eta}^{-1} \mathbf{c}$
	$\mathbf{\eta}_{1}$	$[(1-2\beta)/2]$ I	$\left[\left(1-2\beta\right)/2\right]\mathbf{I}-\left[\left(1-\gamma\right)/\Delta t\right]\mathbf{\eta}^{-1}\mathbf{c}$
	η_2	$\beta \mathbf{I}$	0
	$\mathbf{\eta}_{3}$	0	$\boldsymbol{\eta}^{\text{-1}} \Big(\boldsymbol{p}_{_{i+1}} - \widetilde{\boldsymbol{f}}_{_{i+1}} \Big)$
	$\eta_{_4}$	Ι	$\mathbf{I} - \left[\gamma / \left(\beta \Delta t \right) \right] \mathbf{\eta}^{-1} \mathbf{c}$
	η_5	$(1 - \gamma)\mathbf{I}$	$(1-\gamma)\mathbf{I} - [\gamma(1-\gamma)/(\beta \Delta t)]\mathbf{\eta}^{-1}\mathbf{c}$
	$\mathbf{\eta}_{_6}$	$\gamma \mathbf{I}$	0
	$\mathbf{\eta}_7$	0	$\left[\gamma/(\beta \Delta t)\right] \mathbf{\eta}^{-1} \left(\mathbf{p}_{i+1} - \widetilde{\mathbf{f}}_{i+1}\right)$

Table 8.1MDOF eoefficients for the Newmark and the OS integration
algorithms.

8.2.1 Explicit Newmark (EN) Algorithm

By providing a straightforward and computationally efficient application, the EN integration algorithm is conditionally stable with the following stability limit for linear structures

$$\frac{\Delta t}{T_n} \le \frac{1}{\pi} \tag{8.1}$$

where T_n is the period of the highest mode of vibration of the analyzed structure. Equation (8.1) restricts the use of the EN method for structures with massless DOF since the presence of such DOF results in a singular mass matrix that yields zero-period modes. Accordingly, the EN method is not applicable to building and bridge structures that are modeled with massless rotational DOF, unless these DOFs are condensed out. Future objectives of this study include implementing a condensation algorithm in OpenSees [McKenna et al. 2010] to facilitate broader use of the EN algorithm. Therefore, the EN algorithm of the investigated bridge systems is not pursued further.

8.2.2 Operator-Splitting (OS) Algorithm

As mentioned in Chapter 4, the version of the OS algorithm considered herein possesses similar stability properties and accuracies to those of the IN integration [Liang and Mosalam 2015, 2016a].

The TRBDF2 algorithm is considered because of its superior stability and better convergence behavior due to numerical damping.



Figure 8.1 Superstructure and the column bent of Bridge B.

The NTHA was conducted for both abutment modeling approaches I and II of Bridges A, B, and C using the IN, OS, and TRBDF2 algorithms under 40 pulse-like three-component ground motions described in Jayaram et al. [2011] and documented in Appendix E. Because the pulse-like ground motions tend to introduce highly nonlinear responses, they were selected here to assess the validity of the discussed integration algorithms for NTHA of bridges. The results from the IN algorithm are considered as the reference results. Note that the use of a numerical solution as the reference is attributed to the lack of an available closed-form exact solution or reliable experimental data for the analyzed bridges under the selected earthquake excitations.

To compare the results, three *EDP*s were selected, namely, the peak response value of abutment unseating displacement, column drift ratio, and column base shear. As identified in Figure 8.1 for Bridge B, these three *EDP*s correspond to the longitudinal displacement of Node 100, column drift ratio of Node 12, and column base shear of Node 11. Similar nodes were used for Bridges A and C to investigate the NTHA results. The comparison was conducted quantitatively by using the error measure *Maxerror*, defined as follows:

$$Max_{error} = \left| \frac{Max_{alt} - Max_{ref}}{Max_{ref}} \right|$$
(8.2)

Where Max_{ref} and Max_{alt} are the maximum absolute response of the considered *EDPs* provided by the IN and by the other algorithms, respectively. The NTHA was conducted for all three bridges; detailed results are presented for Bridge B and brief results given for Bridges A and C. Figure 8.2 and 8.4 show the Max_{error} of the OS and TRBDF2 algorithms for the three selected *EDPs* of Bridge B, which were analyzed with both abutment modeling approaches I and II (Figure 7.5), for all 40 ground motions.

Note that all obtained errors are insignificant (< 0.2%). The abutment unseating displacement from IN and OS with Type I modeling is plotted in Figure 8.3a for GM #21 (Earthquake: Northridge – 01; Station: Sylmar – Olive View Med FF), which yielded the largest Max_{error} ; see Figure 8.2a. Figure 8.3b represents the corresponding moment-curvature plot ($M - \phi$) from the IN to reflect the obtained high level of nonlinearity in this case.

The good match of the time-history responses for the highly nonlinear case shown in Figure 8.3a and the small values of the error measure in Figure 8.2 indicate that the explicit OS algorithm not only successfully overcomes the problems of convergence in the NTHA of RC highway bridges, but also maintains the accuracy of the results provided by the IN method. Similarly, good match and small error levels were obtained for Bridges A and C as discussed in Section 8.4.

8.2.3 TRBDF2 Algorithm

Figure 8.4 shows the Max_{error} of the TRBDF2 algorithm for the three selected EDPs of Bridge B, analyzed with both abutment modeling approaches I and II (Figure 7.5), for all 40 GMs. Analogous to the OS results shown in Figure 8.2, small errors in Figure 8.4 imply that the accuracy of the implicit TRBDF2 and IN algorithms are comparable. Furthermore, the TRBDF2 algorithm exhibited superior convergence features; see Section 8.4.



Figure 8.2 *Max_{error}* of the OS algorithm for the three selected EDPs of Bridge B.



Figure 8.3 Comparison of the IN and OS algorithm results for NTHA of Bridge B with Type I abutment modeling (Ground motion #21 as an example).



(b) Type II abutment modeling

Figure 8.4 *Max*error of the OS algorithm for the three selected EDPs of Bridge B.

8.3 PARAMETRIC STUDY TO ASSESS CONVERGENCE PROPERTIES OF IN ALGORITHM

As demonstrated earlier, the explicit algorithms are suitable alternatives of the IN method to avoid convergence problems. However, there are some conditions where these explicit algorithms are not applicable, e.g., in the case of significant stiffening response due to closing of the gap elements in the above-mentioned bridge models. Moreover, aside from the chosen integration method, formulation of some of the elements, e.g., the force-based beam–column elements or the materials, e.g., Bouc-Wen type in OpenSees [McKenna et al. 2010] are iterative. Accordingly, the implicit algorithm, such as IN method, may be the only option for NTHA of models containing such elements and materials if the convergence problems at the element and material levels cannot be eliminated while using the alternative integrators.

The following sections investigate the effect of different parameters to improve the convergence properties of the IN method while preserving its accuracy for the bridge models described herein. Note that this investigation is based on the displacement formulation of the method, which is observed to result in an improved convergence performance compared to the acceleration formulation. The considered parameters are categorized in five groups:

- 1. Type and sequence of nonlinear equation solvers
- 2. Convergence test type
- 3. Convergence tolerance
- 4. Integration time step
- 5. Adaptive switching of integration algorithms

8.3.1 Type and Sequence of Nonlinear Equation Solvers

In order to achieve convergence, OpenSees [McKenna et al. 2010] lets the use try various nonlinear solvers consecutively for any iteration of an integration time step. Therefore, one potential avenue to consider is the type and sequence of the nonlinear equation solvers. This investigation is further divided into two sub-groups, namely, (a) determination of the most suitable initial solver; and (b) sequence of other solvers after the initial one. Nonlinear equation solvers considered are the regular Newton Raphson (NR), Broyden, Newton-Raphson with line search (NRLS), Broyden–Fletcher–Goldfarb–Shanno (BFGS), and Krylov-Newton algorithms.

Based on the results obtained in simulations with several relatively strong GMs (GM1, GM11, GM18, GM19, GM28, and GM31) with scale factors ranging from 1.0 to 2.0, the NRLS proves to be the most suitable initial solver. Table 8.2 shows the convergence condition for different scales of GM31 for Bridge A with Type II abutment modeling as an example. Note that all the simulations that used the NRLS solver as the initial solver are completed, whereas the simulations with other initial solvers fail to converge for some of the scales.

Using the NRLS as the initial solver, investigation of different subsequent orders of other solvers (NR, Broyden, BFGS, and Krylov-Newton) found no difference. Thus, once a suitable initial solver is determined, the order of subsequent other solvers have little impact on the convergence. Note that this finding may be specific to the investigated structure since this

investigation has not been repeated for other structures. However, it is still a useful conclusion for two reasons: (1) this finding sets the NLS to be a suitable initial solver as the first simulation trial of future nonlinear models; and (2) it demonstrates to the analyst the importance of proper selection of the initial solver compared to trying a variety of solver combinations afterwards. The same observations were found for the two other Bridges B and C.

		5			
Scale Factor	NR	Krylov-Newton	Broyden	NRLS	BFGS
1.0	Completed	21.820	Completed	Completed	Completed
1.1	35.645	21.820	35.660	Completed	35.820
1.2	35.650	21.820	Completed	Completed	41.010
1.3	35.655	6.115	35.655	Completed	Completed
1.4	Completed	6.115	35.260	Completed	27.985
1.5	Completed	6.115	77.505	Completed	Completed
1.6	Completed	6.115	Completed	Completed	42.600
1.7	Completed	6.115	Completed	Completed	36.155
1.8	35.710	6.115	Completed	Completed	37.270
1.9	Completed	6.115	35.265	Completed	35.915
2.0	35.730	6.115	52.540	Completed	24.675

Table 8.2The convergence failure time [sec] of simulations for different initial
nonlinear solvers under GM31 for Bridge A with Type II abutment
modeling.

8.3.2 Convergence Test Type

The following five convergence tests—Energy Increment, Norm Displacement Increment, Relative Norm Displacement Increment, Total Relative Displacement Increment, and Relative Energy Increment—were compared for four ground motions (GM18, GM19, GM28 and GM31) with scale factors ranging from 1.0 to 2.0. The comparisons are based on counting the total number of iterations for each simulation, see Table 8.3 for Bridge A with Type II abutment modeling. Note that the Energy Increment test led to significantly fewer number of iterations compared to the other tests. In addition, very small response differences were obtained from the simulations with different convergence tests, as indicated by Max_{error} for the longitudinal direction displacements of node 100 of the abutment; see Table 8.4 and Figure 8.1. Here, Max_{error} is calculated for the simulations with different convergence tests considering the simulations with the Energy Increment test as the reference.

The same tolerance value of 10⁻⁸ was used for all the convergence tests, which is the main reason why the Energy Increment test has the fewest number of iterations. Multiplication of the displacement increment with the unbalanced force, both less than 1.0, results in a norm value smaller than the other norms. Regardless, given that simulations with the less stringent Energy Increment test leads to practically the same results with significantly fewer iterations compared to the other tests, it is concluded that the Energy Increment test is the most suitable convergence test

for the analyzed model. Again, a note of caution: this finding may be specific to the investigated model. However, it is still useful in that it provides an initial trial suggestion for other models and simulations.

		-			
Scale Factor	EnergyIncr	NormDisIncr	RelativeNorm DispIncr	RelativeTotal NormDisIncr	Relative EnergyIncr
1.0	31227	48225	55821	55817	40949
1.1	31510	48514	56481	56472	41726
1.2	31671	48983	56656	56664	42324
1.3	32021	49340	56734	56733	42505
1.4	31979	49567	57093	57075	42605
1.5	32272	49844	57187	57187	42715
1.6	32580	50035	57023	57023	42522
1.7	32573	50074	57015	57011	42162
1.8	33077	50683	57291	57219	42077
1.9	33397	51537	57381	57372	42439
2.0	33780	Failed	61986	57876	42664

Table 8.3Total number of iterations for simulations with different
convergence tests under GM31 for Bridge A with Type II abutment
modeling.

Table 8.4	Maxerror in longitudinal deformation of node 100 for GM31 (different
	convergence tests) for Bridge A with Type II abutment modeling.

Scale Factor	NormDisIncr	RelativeNorm DispIncr	RelativeTotal NormDisIncr	Relative EnergyIncr
1.0	1.82×10-6	1.82×10-6	1.82×10-6	1.82×10-6
1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1.2	1.30×10-4	0.0	0.0	0.0
1.3	7.67×10-6	7.67×10-6	7.67×10-6	0.0
1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.21×10-6
1.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2.0	Failed	1.91×10-4	2.38×10-3	2.70×10-6

8.3.3 Convergence Tolerance

For Bridge B with Type II abutment modeling, the effect of different tolerances of 1.0, 0.1, 10⁻³, and 10⁻⁵ on the convergence and accuracy of the obtained results was investigated using the Energy

Increment test. Analyses were conducted for all 40 GMs with five different tolerances, including the ones with 10^{-8} , with scaling factors presented in Figure 8.5, i.e., the maximum scaling factors without convergence issues. For comparison, the longitudinal direction deformation of one of the nodes of the abutment, corresponding to node 100 (see Figure 8.1), and the longitudinal displacement of a column node, node12, were selected. Figure 8.6 presents the largest Max_{error} of 40 GMs of these selected two nodes for the simulations with four different tolerances. In calculating these error quantities, simulations with the tolerance of 10^{-8} were considered as the reference.

Selected tolerances may have considerable effect on the nonlinear response. A large tolerance may result in a premature convergence and corresponding deviation from the true response. The small errors between the simulations with tolerances of 10^{-5} and 10^{-8} under the effect of the considered GM, which resulted in highly nonlinear response, indicate that the increase of the tolerance can be used as a reasonable option to overcome convergence issues while still preserving accuracy. Note that the above tolerance values were used for all integration time steps of a particular simulation. Considering that a common application is the increase of the convergence tolerance only at the integration time steps with convergence problems, the errors in the obtained results in such cases of *selective adoption of tolerance values* will be even less than the errors plotted in Figure 8.6.



Figure 8.5 The maximum scaling factors for 40 GMs.



Figure 8.6 *Max_{error}* of each tolerance for node 100 and node 12 (longitudinal displacement).

8.3.4 Integration Time Step

Use of a smaller integration time step during the simulation does not necessarily improve the convergence behavior. Table 8.5 compares the convergence condition for simulations with different scales of GM31 using Newton-Raphson as the initial solver for Bridge A with Type II abutment modeling. Based on the results of simulations conducted with the seed Bridges A, B, and C, reducing the integration time step is useful in overcoming the convergence problems. However, this requires preventing completion of the simulation before the duration of the external excitation, whereby the integration time step should be reset to its original value after completion of all of the reduced time steps that represent the original step size, e.g., using *automatic adaptive time increments* [DIANA 2005].

Scale Factor	$\Delta t = 0.01$	$\Delta t = 0.005$	$\Delta t = 0.0025$	$\Delta t = 0.001$
1.0	Completed	Completed	Completed	Completed
1.1	35.6500	35.6450	35.6375	35.6360
1.2	35.6600	35.6500	35.6450	35.6430
1.3	35.6700	35.6550	35.6525	35.6510
1.4	Completed	Completed	Completed	Completed
1.5	Completed	Completed	Completed	Completed
1.6	Completed	Completed	Completed	Completed
1.7	Completed	Completed	Completed	Completed
1.8	35.7200	35.7100	35.7050	35.7040
1.9	Completed	Completed	41.7225	62.6450
2.0	35.7400	35.7300	36.3475	36.3460

Table 8.5The convergence failure time [sec] of simulations for different
integration time steps under GM31 for Bridge A with abutment
modeling.

8.3.5 Adaptive Switching of Integration Algorithms

As demonstrated earlier, the explicit OS integration algorithm is a suitable alternative of the IN to avoid the problem of convergence; however, there are some conditions fo which this algorithm is not applicable. For example, aside from the chosen integration method, formulations of some of the elements and materials are iterative, such as the force-based beam-column elements or the Bouc-Wen material in OpenSees [McKenna et al. 2010]. Accordingly, the implicit algorithms may be the only option for NLTA of models containing such elements and materials if problems of convergence at the element and material levels cannot be eliminated while using the explicit OS integrator. This does not prevent taking advantage of the explicit algorithms in certain time steps where the implicit algorithm fails to converge. In OpenSees (2010), the adaptive switching of integration algorithms, i.e., from IN to OS, is triggered when IN fails to converge, say at time step i+1. Then, the simulation automatically returns to the previously converged time step, i.e. time step i, and is rerun from time step i to i+1 using the OS algorithm. Subsequently, the integration algorithm is switched back to IN. Therefore, IN is reused for the simulation starting from time step i+1 until another convergence difficulty is encountered. As demonstrated earlier, the OS algorithm possesses similar stability and accuracy properties to those of the IN integration. Therefore, adaptive switching from IN to OS at problematic time steps, where convergence issues are bypassed, does not affect the stability and accuracy of simulations [Liang and Mosalam 2015, 2016a].

Table 8.6 shows the results of the NTHA for selected examples from simulations for the seismic response of bridges investigated in more detail in the next section. As shown in Table 8.6, the IN algorithm fails to converge at the indicated times in the fourth column where the responses are at high levels of nonlinearity; GMs in this table are identified by its sequence number in the

PEER NGA database [2011]. That said, the simulations with the same GMs are completed using adaptive switching between integration algorithms, i.e., from IN to OS, at the time steps when IN fails to converge. Therefore, the adaptive switching of algorithms is considered to be a viable and readily available option, e.g., in OpenSees [2010], to overcome the problems of convergence. Moreover, this statement is supported by the previously conducted theoretical investigation [Liang and Mosalam 2015, 2016a] and successful completion of the simulations discussed in the next chapter.

Note that simulations that experienced problems of convergence are all completed with the use of TRBDF2. This superior convergence performance of TRBDF2 is attributed to the numerical damping introduced by the three point backward Euler scheme. Several simulations in Table 8.6 failed to converge at as early as 0.495 sec when IN was used. Early stage convergence issues can be attributed to several possible reasons, such as near-fault GMs that cause nonlinear responses very early or the abrupt stiffness change due to the opening and closing of the gap elements used in the modeling of abutments.

NGA Sequence Number	Bridge	Scale factor	Implicit Newmark	Switching Integration algorithms	TRBDF2	
182	А	2.80	6.160	Completed	Completed	
1271	А	1.08	13.720	Completed	Completed	
964	А	1.47	2.690	Completed	Completed	
1263	В	3.00	17.420	Completed	Completed	
1011	В	2.10	1.310	Completed	Completed	
1541	С	1.00	31.120	Completed	Completed	
755	С	1.70	0.495	Completed	Completed	
1542	С	1.37	25.040	Completed	Completed	

Table 8.6	The convergence failure time [sec] of simulations for different
	implicit integration methods.

8.4 SEISMIC RESPONSE OF BRIDGES

Solutions developed for efficient NTHA were applied to investigation of the seismic response of the three RC highway bridges A, B, and C. The nonlinear structural response of the bridge systems, similar to other complex structures, is intricate and often highly sensitive to the selection and modification of the input GMs [Liang et al. 2014a, 2016a]. This section makes use of different GM selection and modification methods to identify predominantly first-mode *EDP*s under earthquake excitation. An important stage of PBEE [Günay and Mosalam 2013] is structural analysis, which may require an extensive number of NTHA. The results of computationally expensive NTHA can be predicted by computationally less demanding nonlinear static analysis procedures, such as pushover analysis, for structures with first-mode dominant response. In this regard, the identification of predominantly first-mode EDPs is beneficial for efficient, practical, and routine application of PBEE.

The maximum column drift ratio, column base shear, and deck total acceleration were selected as the investigated *EDPs*. With reference to Figure 8.1, these three *EDPs* correspond to the column drift ratio of Node 12, column base shear of Node 11, and deck total acceleration of Node 110 in Bridge B. Two groups of GMs were selected from the NGA database [PEER 2011] for the purpose of this investigation. The first group, expected to result primarily in first-mode response, was selected using the conditional mean spectrum, namely the *CMS* method [Baker

2011], which is a response spectrum associated with a target value of the spectral acceleration S_a

at a single period. The second group, which serves as the reference for comparison, is selected to match a chosen scenario response spectrum, the shape of which allows higher mode response. Therefore, the GMs in the second group are associated with higher mode effects. Both sets of GMs were selected using a method that seeks to match the mean and variance of the target spectrum [Jayaram et al. 2011].

For each bridge, three earthquake scenarios were considered, namely those with 2%, 10%, and 50% probability of exceedance (POE) in 50 years. The attenuation model by Campbell and Bozorgnia [2008] was used to generate these three hazard levels. The *CMS* [Baker 2011] is the target spectrum for the first group of GMs. In this study, this single period is the fundamental period of the bridge. The second "reference" group was selected to match the spectrum predicted by the attenuation model of Campbell and Bozorgnia [2008].

Figure 8.7a shows the response spectrum by the Campbell and Bozorgnia attenuation model [2008] at hazard level of 10% POE in 50 years for Bridge B site, i.e., the target spectrum for the second "reference" group. Also shown in Figure 8.7a is the *CMS* [Baker 2011] anchored at the Bridge B fundamental period of 1.1 sec, which is the target spectrum for the first group. As mentioned before, both groups of GMs are selected using a method proposed by Jayaram et al. [2011] that seeks to match the mean and variance of the target spectrum (Figure 8.7b). A detailed explanation of this method can be found in Jayaram et al. [2011].



(b) Median and variance

Figure 8.7 Campbell and Bozorgnia (CB) 2008 spectrum and CMS for 10% POE in 50 years for Bridge B site.

As shown in Figure 7.5, two approaches for abutment modeling, namely Type I and Type II, were considered. For each abutment modeling (2) of each scenario (3), 40 GM records were selected for each GM group (2). These GM records are documented in Appendix E. Therefore, 40 $\times 2 \times 3 \times 2 \times 3 = 1440$ NTHA simulations in total were conducted for the three considered bridge systems. A large number of problems related to convergence, e.g., those indicated in Table 8.6, were encountered; see Table 8.6. Most of these problems were overcome by the proposed solutions, i.e., OS, TRBDF2, and approaches to improve convergence properties of IN; see Section 8.3. The NTHA simulations that still fail to converge were primarily due to the large GMs, e.g., several ones in the "reference" group at a hazard level of 2% POE in 50 years, which led to significantly large nonlinear responses in the range of collapse limit state and probably corresponded to physical partial or complete bridge collapse.

Figures 8.8–8.10 present the ratios of the median *EDP*s obtained from the GMs of the first group (*CMS*), i.e., first-mode dominant, to those obtained from the GMs of the second "reference" group, i.e., higher-mode response. Therefore, the smaller the ratio, the more the considered *EDP* is affected by the higher modes. Note that the ratio for the column base shear is close to 1.0 and almost invariant for both modeling cases and all three scenarios. On the other hand, the ratios for the column drift and deck acceleration were always less than 1.0 and generally reduce as the hazard level and the corresponding nonlinearity level increased. Accordingly, higher-mode effects are clearly more pronounced on column displacements and deck accelerations than on column shear forces. Moreover, the effects of higher modes on the column base shear is likely to be a first-mode dominant *EDP*, irrespective of the hazard level. Accordingly, an investigation that uses the base shear as the *EDP* of interest may make use of computationally less demanding single-mode nonlinear static analyses in PBEE computations; however, NTHA must be used if the column drift and deck acceleration are considered the key *EDP*s.

Figures 8.8–8.10 agree with the research results presented by Kappos et al. [2013] agree that the higher modes affect the response of bridges to a greater extent than that of buildings in. To evaluate the accuracy of the two methods of EM selection, an estimate of the true response can be obtained using the concept of high-end prediction (HEP) [Haselton et al. 2009], which is discussed next.



Figure 8.8 Ratios of median EDPs for the two abutment modeling cases of Bridge A.



Figure 8.9 Ratios of median EDPs for the two abutment modeling cases of Bridge B.



Figure 8.10 Ratios of median EDPs for the two abutment modeling cases of Bridge C.

9 PROBABILISTIC EVALUATION OF GROUND-MOTION SELECTION AND MODIFICATION PROCEDURES

9.1 INTRODUCTION

The objective of this chapter is to evaluate several popular GMSM procedures in predicting the *PDSD* of RC highway bridges with nonlinear response due to large earthquakes [Liang 2016; Liang and Mosalam 2017a, 2017c]. In engineering practice, the common approach is to base the seismic design on the basis of a prescribed earthquake scenario. Therefore, all conducted analyses in this chapter are based on a selected large earthquake scenario. Taking advantage of the framework proposed in Chapter 6, a reference benchmark *PDSD* for the investigated bridge structures considering different intercept angles of the input GMs is developed. The intercept angle is defined herein as the angle between the fault-normal direction (i.e., strike-normal GM component) and the longitudinal direction of the bridge structure [Kaviani et al. 2014]; see Figure 9.1. The accuracy and reliability of all *PDSD* estimates from the investigated GMSM procedures are then evaluated against this reference benchmark *PDSD*. Such evaluations are conducted on several selected *EDP*s for the three selected RC highway bridges; see Chapter 7.



Figure 9.1 Ground-motion intercept angle scheme for the strike-normal component.

9.2 EARTHQUAKE SCENARIO

The evaluation of the *PDSD* estimates from the investigated GMSM procedures against the reference benchmark *PDSD* in this study is based on a selected large earthquake scenario defined as follows:

M7 Scenario: A magnitude (M) 7.0 earthquake event occurring on a strike-slip fault, at a site that is at a distance (R) 10 km from the fault rupture on a soil with V_{s30} (shear wave velocity for the top 30 m of the soil profile) based on the bridge soil profile from [Omrani et al. 2015]. The target spectrum for this scenario is selected as the one with 1.5 standard deviation above (i.e., $+1.5\sigma$) the median spectrum using the attenuation model in [Campbell and Bozorgnia 2008].

This scenario is selected to be consistent with a typical level of far-field GM used for the evaluation of a Caltrans bridge [Caltrans SDC 2013]. Figure 9.2 shows the median and $+1.5\sigma$ spectra in terms of spectral acceleration, S_a , associated with this scenario from the selected attenuation model [Campbell and Bozorgnia 2008]. Also shown in Figure 9.2 is the conditional mean spectrum (*CMS*) [Baker 2011] anchored at the fundamental period of Bridge B, i.e., T = 1.1 sec.



Figure 9.2 Response spectra for the selected earthquake scenario of Bridge B site.

9.3 BENCHMARK PROBABILITY DISTRIBUTION OF SEISMIC DEMANDS

The reference benchmark *PDSD*, i.e., the one that is consistent with the earthquake scenario selected in the previous section, was developed by performing a large amount of NTHA simulations. The GM records for these simulations were selected based on the following procedure:

1. Select bidirectional GM records from an expanded range of the given earthquake scenario. In this study, the selection criteria were as follows:

- a. $6.5 \le M \le 7.5$;
- b. $0.0 \ km < R \le 20.0 \ km$;
- c. $V_{s30} \ge 183 \, m/s$;
- d. Lowest usable frequency = 0.25 Hz;
- e. Faulting: Not constrained.

Thus, 99 pairs of bidirectional horizontal GM records (documented in Appendix F) are selected from the PEER NGA Project GM database [PEER 2011].

2. The research devoted to intensity measures is extensive; Bradley [2013] is one example. Various studies have shown that *PGV* provides a good correlation with the global nonlinear seismic demands and can be considered as a reasonable GM intensity measure that correlates well with the peak nonlinear oscillator response, e.g., Kurama and Farrow [2003], Akkar and Özen [2005], Riddell [2007], Küçükdoğan [2007], and Akkar and Küçükdoğan [2008]. Therefore, in this study, *PGV* is selected as the intensity measure. Scale the selected 99 pairs of GM records based on the distribution of *PGV* from [Campbell and Bozorgnia 2008]. In this study, 25 values of *PGV* are selected to represent this distribution.

For evaluating the *PDSD* estimates from different GMSM procedures, four *EDP*s were selected, namely, the peak abutment unseating displacement, the column drift ratio, and the column base shear. In addition, different intercept angles, varying from 0° to 150° with an increment of 30° , were investigated. Therefore, considering the three selected RC highway bridges, two abutment analytical modeling types I and II, and the above-mentioned six intercept angles for all 600 scaled GMs, $99 \times 25 \times 3 \times 2 \times 6 = 89,100$ NTHA simulations were performed in total for determining the reference benchmark *PDSD*.

In this study, two failure criteria were defined, assuming that whatever mechanisms takes place first will induce collapse: (1) deck unseating and (2) column excessive rotation. Deck unseating is assumed to occur when the relative displacement between the bridge deck and the abutment is larger than the length of the abutment seat, which is taken as 33.85 in.; see Table 6.1. The limit state corresponding to column excessive rotation is defined as exceeding certain threshold value of the column drift ratio, \overline{DR} . Hutchinson et al. [2004] demonstrated that if the maximum drift ratios are less than about 8%, the residual drift ratios are generally less than 1%, which is the allowable residual drift ratio suggested by MacRae and Kawashima [1997]. The bridge models used in this study are considered to be representative up to but not including bridge collapse. Thus, the maximum values for the column drift ratio and the abutment unseating displacement are set to be 8% and 34 in., respectively.

Following the procedures in Chapter 6, Eq. (6.7) gives the combination of the intensity measures and the structural responses, including C and NC cases (estimated from kernel density estimation). In general, it is impossible to determine the exact solution of the integrations in Equation (6.7). Instead, in practice, $\hat{G}(edp)$ in Equation (6.7) is computed from the following discretized form:

$$\hat{G}(edp) \cong \sum_{j} \left\{ \hat{\Pr}(\mathbf{C} \mid im_{j}) + \hat{G}(edp \mid im_{j}, \mathbf{NC}) \times [1 - \hat{\Pr}(\mathbf{C} \mid im_{j})] \right\} \hat{\Pr}(im_{j})$$
(9.1)

where $\hat{Pr}(im_i)$ are estimated from:

$$\hat{Pr}(im_j) = f_{IM}(im_j) / \sum_{j=1}^{25} f_{IM}(im_j)$$
(9.2)

Thus, as expected, $\sum_{j=1}^{25} \hat{Pr}(im_j) = 1.0$. Comparing Equation (6.7) with Equation (9.1), the integrals, the PDF and the joint PDF are replaced with the summations, the probability mass function (PMF) and the joint PMF, respectively. In Equation (9.1), the symbol " \cong " signifies the approximation due to the discretization of the continuous integral of the seismic hazard and structural demand.

9.4 GMSM PROCEDURES

Three GMSM procedures from the two categories previously mentioned in Chapter 6 are investigated. The first is an amplitude scaling procedure using the conventional first-mode spectral acceleration, i.e., $S_a(T_1)$, selection and scaling method. The other two, namely the conditional mean spectrum (*CMS*) and the unconditional selection (*US*) methods, are spectrum shape-matching procedures. These three methods and their selection procedures, as considered in this study, are discussed in detail below.

9.4.1 $S_a(T_1)$ Selection and Scaling Method

This method selects GM records from earthquakes with magnitude M and type of faulting F, recorded at sites with distance R and soil classification S as close as possible to those of the earthquake scenario of interest. After applying the selection criteria, the GMs are selected randomly from the candidate set of motions if the number of eligible ground motions is larger than the target number; otherwise, the selection criteria would need to be relaxed.

Once the GMs are selected, each of them is scaled in amplitude such that its $S_a(T_1)$ is equal to the target $S_a(T_1)$ of the earthquake scenario. This procedure to select and scale GMs does not take into account the shape or the variability of the target response spectrum, as it considers only the target $S_a(T_1)$. The selection procedure of $S_a(T_1)$ scaling method is summarized below:

- 1. Select the GM based on an *M-R-S-F* (magnitude, source-to-site distance, site classification, and type of faulting) bin that is consistent with the given earthquake scenario. The criteria utilized in this GMSM procedure are:
 - a. $6.6 \le M \le 7.4$;
 - b. $5.0 \ km < R \le 15.0 \ km;$
 - c. $V_{s30} \ge 183 \, m/s$;
 - d. Lowest usable frequency = 0.25 Hz;
 - e. Faulting: Not constrained.

It is noted that the selection criteria for the GMs used for the benchmark PDSD results in 60 GM records, which is more than the target 40 records. Therefore, the selection criteria used in this method is somewhat restricted.

2. Scale each component of record to the target GM level based on their geometric mean as given by Equation (9.3). The target $S_a(T_1)$ is the median +1.5 σ predicted by the attenuation model from Campbell and Bozorgnia [2008] for the given *M*, *R*, *S*, and *F* scenario.

$$SF_{i} = S_{a} (T_{1})_{\text{Target}} / \sqrt{[S_{a} (T_{1})]_{1}^{i} \cdot [S_{a} (T_{1})]_{2}^{i}}$$
(9.3)

where SF_i is the scaling factor of the *i*th GM pair of components with subscripts 1 and 2 and having the same scaling factor.

- 3. Select desired number of records from the bin. In this study, 40 records were selected, which were determined using the following two algorithms:
 - a. Based on the equation for the proportion of pulse-like records [Hayden et al. 2012],

Proportion of pulse motions =
$$\frac{\exp(0.891 - 0.188R + 1.230\varepsilon)}{1 + \exp(0.891 - 0.188R + 1.230\varepsilon)}$$
(9.4)

substitution of R = 10 km and $\varepsilon = 1.5$ in Equation (9.4) results in the value of proportion = 0.7. Thus, 28 of the 40 motions should be pulse-type. Select 28 records from the pulse-type bin and 12 records from the no pulse-type bin with smallest scaling factors from step 2. This procedure is denoted as $S_a(T_1)_p$ method in this report.

4. Another algorithm selected 40 records solely based on the scaling factors. Thus, 40 records with smallest scaling factors were selected from the bin with both pulse-type and no pulse-type GMs. This procedure is called $S_a(T_1)$ method in this report.

9.4.2 Conditional Mean Spectrum (CMS) Method

This method selects GMs such that their response spectra match the mean and variance of the *CMS* in the period range of interest. The method consists of: (1) determining the *CMS* and (2) application of the GM selection algorithm to match a target response spectrum mean and variance proposed by Jayaram et al. [2011]. The *CMS* is a response spectrum associated with a target S_a value at a single period, i.e., $S_a(T_1)$ in this study. The steps for computing this response spectrum [Baker 2011] are:

1. Determine the target S_a at a given period of interest T_1 , $S_a(T_1)$, for the associated M, R and ε . Similar to the previous GMSM method, the target $S_a(T_1)$ is computed as the median +1.5 ε predicted by the Campbell and Bozorgnia attenuation model [2008]. The M, R, and ε are those of the previously defined target GM scenario, i.e., M = 7.0, R = 10 km, and $\varepsilon = 1.5$. Given an arbitrary period, T, ε is defined as the number of standard

deviations by which the natural logarithm of $S_a(T_1)$, i.e., $\ln[S_a(T)]$, differs from the predicted mean of $\ln[S_a(T)]$ for a given *M* and *R*. ε is defined as follows:

$$\varepsilon(T) = \left[\ln(S_a(T)) - \mu_{\ln(S_a)}(M, R, T) \right] / \sigma_{\ln(S_a)}(M, R, T)$$
(9.5)

where $\mu_{\ln(S_a)}(M, R, T)$ and $\sigma_{\ln(S_a)}(M, R, T)$ are the predicted mean and standard deviation of $\ln[S_a(T)]$, respectively, computed from Campbell and Bozorgnia [2008]. From Equation (9.5), the target $\ln[S_a(T)]$ can be expressed as follows:

$$\ln\left[S_a(T_1)\right] = \varepsilon(T_1)\sigma_{\ln(S_a)}(M, R, T_1) + \mu_{\ln(S_a)}(M, R, T_1)$$
(9.6)

- 2. Compute the mean and standard deviation of the response spectrum at other periods, given M and R. They are the quantities in Step 1, i.e., $\mu_{\ln(S_a)}(M, R, T)$ and $\sigma_{\ln(S_a)}(M, R, T)$, respectively. In this step, these values are computed at periods included in the range of interest. Existing GM models, such as the Campbell and Bozorgnia attenuation model [2008] used in this study, can be used to compute these terms.
- 3. Compute ε at other periods, given $\varepsilon(T_1)$. This step consists of computing conditional mean ε -values, $\mu_{\varepsilon(T_i)|\varepsilon(T_1)}$, for the other periods T_i , which can be calculated as the product of $\varepsilon(T_1)$ and the correlation coefficient between the ε -values at the two periods $\rho(T_i, T_1)$, i.e.,

$$\mu_{\varepsilon(T_i)|\varepsilon(T_1)} = \rho(T_i, T_1)\varepsilon(T_1)$$
(9.7)

The following simple predictive equation, valid for periods between 0.05 and 5.0 sec. can be used to obtain $\rho(T_i, T_1)$ [Baker 2011]:

$$\rho(T_{\min}, T_{\max}) = 1 - \cos\left[\frac{\pi}{2} - \left(0.359 + 0.163I_{(T_{\min} < 0.189)} \ln\left(\frac{T_{\min}}{0.189}\right)\right) \ln\left(\frac{T_{\max}}{T_{\min}}\right)\right]$$
(9.8)

where $I_{(T_{\min}<0.189)}$ is an indicator function that equals 1.0 if $T_{\min}<0.189$ sec and 0.0 otherwise, and T_{\min} and T_{\max} are respectively smaller and larger periods of interest.

4. Compute *CMS*. At each period of interest, T_i , the corresponding spectral accelerations that define the *CMS* can be computed by substituting Equation (9.7) in place of $\varepsilon(T_1)$ in Equation (9.6) after replacing T_1 with T_i of both sides, i.e.,

$$\mu_{\ln(S_a(T_i))\ln(S_a(T_i))} = \mu_{\ln(S_a)}(M, R, T_i) + \rho(T_i, T_1)\varepsilon(T_1)\sigma_{\ln(S_a)}(M, R, T_i)$$
(9.9)

where $\mu_{\ln(S_a)}(M, R, T_i)$ and $\sigma_{\ln(S_a)}(M, R, T_i)$ are derived from Campbell and Bozorgnia [2008], $\rho(T_i, T_1)$ is computed from Equation (9.8), and values of M, R, and $\varepsilon(T_1)$ are those indicated in Step 1.

As mentioned earlier, once the *CMS* associated with a period of interest is determined, the GM selection algorithm proposed by Jayaram et al. [2011] is used to select and modify sets of records that match the target *CMS* and its variance. With a target distribution, a Monte Carlo simulation is used to probabilistically generate multiple realizations of response spectra, and then GM records whose response spectra individually match the simulated response spectra are selected. Furthermore, a greedy optimization is applied to improve the match between the target and the sample means and variances. This is performed by replacing one previously selected GM record at a time with a record from the database that generates the best improvement in the match. A detailed explanation of this method can be found in Jayaram et al. [2011]. Similar to the $S_a(T_1)$ scaling method, 40 records are considered herein.

9.4.3 Unconditional Selection (US) Method

This method uses exactly the same algorithm for matching both the mean and variance of the target spectrum mentioned in the previous section. However, instead of the *CMS*, the median $+1.5\sigma$ spectrum associated with the selected earthquake scenario defined with the Campbell and Bozorgnia attenuation model [2008] is used as the target spectrum. Similar to the first two methods, 40 GM records were selected herein. All the GMs selected from these investigated GMSM procedures for the three selected bridges are documented in Appendix F.

9.5 EVALUATION OF THE GMSM PROCEDURES

For each bridge with each abutment modeling, 40 GM records are selected for each investigated GMSM procedure, including two versions of $S_a(T_1)$ scaling and selection method, i.e. a total of four GMSM procedures. Similar to the development of the reference benchmark *PDSD*, these GMs are applied to each bridge with six different intercept angles. Thus, besides the 89,100 NTHA simulations for the development of the benchmark *PDSD*, $40 \times 4 \times 3 \times 2 \times 6 = 5760$ more NTHA analyses are performed for all the four GMSM procedures.

Figures 9.3–9.26 present the comparison of the *PDSD* estimates from the four investigated GMSM procedures and the benchmark *PDSD*. Such comparisons are given for all three selected *EDP*s of the six different intercept angles on Bridges A and B with both Types I and II abutment modeling. Figures 9.27–9.30 show the *PDSD* estimates of the peak column drift ratio from the four GMSM procedures on Bridge C with Types I and II abutment modeling. Similar small differences of the *PDSD* estimates from the six intercept angles are observed in Figures 9.3–9.30.

As shown in Figures 9.3–9.8, the *PDSD* estimates from the $S_a(T_1)$ and $S_a(T_1)_p$ procedures

generally underestimated the seismic demands from the benchmark *PDSD* for Bridge A with both abutment modeling. However, the $S_a(T_1)_p$ method gives reasonably accurate *PDSD* estimates of

the three *EDP*s, i.e., peak column-shear force (Figure 9.6a), drift ratio (Figure 9.7a), and abutment unseating displacement (Figure 9.8a), for Bridge A with Type I abutment modeling. Such

observations are attributed to the fact that more pulse motions that result in large responses were selected in the $S_a(T_1)_p$ procedure. Based on comparisons of Figures 9.15–9.17 and 9.18–9.20, the *PDSD* estimates from the $S_a(T_1)_p$ and $S_a(T_1)$ procedures are comparable.

From Figures 9.9-9.11 and 9.21-9.23, the PDSD estimates from the CMS method almost always underestimated the seismic demands of all three EDPs, especially for the large values of EDPs (the tail of the PDSD curve) for Bridges A and B with both abutment modeling. In contrast, as shown in Figures 9.12-9.14 and 9.24-9.26, the PDSD estimates by the US method are almost always on the conservative side with approximately 10-20% overestimation of the probability of exceedance over the benchmark PDSD. For bridge C, all four GMSM procedures overestimated the seismic demands of all three investigated EDPs (only the peak column drift ratio is shown in Figures 9.27–9.30 for brevity) for both Type I (Figures 9.27 and 9.28) and Type II (Figures 9.29 and 9.30) abutment modeling. It is noted that the first mode GMSM procedures, i.e., CMS, $S_a(T_1)$ and $S_a(T_1)_p$ methods, provide reasonably well estimates on the median seismic demands, i.e., the value corresponding to 50% probability of exceedance. This is consistent with the findings in [Haselton et al. 2009] for buildings in which only the median inter-story drift demand was pursued. However, it is observed from Figures 9.3–9.11 and 9.15-9.23 that the PDSD estimates by these three GMSM procedures generally underestimated the benchmark PDSD for Bridges A and B on the tail of the *PDSD* curve. Such observations indicate that the consideration of only the median seismic demands, without taking into account the variability, is not sufficient and sometimes can lead to incorrect decisions in design and assessment. All investigated GMSM procedures overestimate the benchmark PDSD for bridges C and the overestimations of PDSD by US method for Bridges A, B and C are about 10%, 20% and 30%, respectively. Among these three investigated RC highway bridges, it can be concluded that the effects of higher modes were most pronounced on Bridge A, a bridge with two spans supported on a single-column bent, and are the least pronounced on Bridge C, a bridge with three spans and two three-column bents.

Based on the simulation results, the estimates by the US procedure were almost always on the conservative side and were usually the most conservative of all GMSM procedures considered for all three bridges. Such conservative estimates are expected as the target spectrum used in the US procedure implies that large-amplitude spectral values take place at all periods. As discussed previously, RC highway bridges play a crucial role in transportation and thus require limited downtime after severe earthquakes from an emergency response standpoint and, more generally, from community resiliency point of view. Therefore, considering that the $S_a(T_1)$, $S_a(T_1)_p$, and

CMS procedures all tend to underestimate the responses, e.g., in Bridges A and B, among these four investigated GMSM procedures, it is suggested using the *US* method for the selection and modification of GMs.



Figure 9.3 *PDSD* estimates of column shear force of different intercept angles from $S_a(T_1)$ procedure for Bridge A.



Figure 9.4 *PDSD* estimates of column drift ratio of different intercept angles from $S_a(T_1)$ procedure for Bridge A.


Figure 9.5 *PDSD* estimates of abutment unseating displacement of different intercept angles from $S_a(T_1)$ procedure of for Bridge A.



Figure 9.6 **PDSD** estimates of column shear force of different intercept angles from $S_a(T_i)_a$ procedure for Bridge A.



Figure 9.7 **PDSD** estimates of column drift ratio of different intercept angles from $S_a(T_i)_p$ procedure for Bridge A.



Figure 9.8 *PDSD* estimates of abutment unseating displacement of different intercept angles from $S_a(T_1)_p$ procedure for Bridge A.



Figure 9.9 *PDSD* estimates of column shear force of different intercept angles from *CMS* procedure for Bridge A.



Figure 9.10 *PDSD* estimates of column drift ratio of different intercept angles from *CMS* procedure for Bridge A.



Figure 9.11 *PDSD* estimates of abutment unseating displacement of different intercept angles from *CMS* procedure for Bridge A.



Figure 9.12 *PDSD* estimates of column shear force of different intercept angles from *US* procedure for Bridge A.



Figure 9.13 *PDSD* estimates of column drift ratio of different intercept angles from *US* procedure for Bridge A.



Figure 9.14 *PDSD* estimates of abutment unseating displacement of different intercept angles from *US* procedure for Bridge A.



Figure 9.15 *PDSD* estimates of column shear force of different intercept angles from $S_a(T_1)$ procedure for Bridge B.



Figure 9.16 *PDSD* estimates of column drift ratio of different intercept angles from $S_a(T_1)$ procedure for Bridge B.



Figure 9.17 *PDSD* estimates of abutment unseating displacement of different intercept angles from $S_a(T_1)$ procedure for Bridge B.



Figure 9.18 **PDSD** estimates of column shear force of different intercept angles from $S_a(T_1)_p$ procedure for Bridge B.



Figure 9.19 **PDSD** estimates of column drift ratio of different intercept angles from $S_a(T_1)_p$ procedure for Bridge B.



Figure 9.20 *PDSD* estimates of abutment unseating displacement of different intercept angles from $S_a(T_1)_p$ procedure for Bridge B.



Figure 9.21 *PDSD* estimates of column shear force of different intercept angles from *CMS* procedure for Bridge B.



Figure 9.22 *PDSD* estimates of column drift ratio of different intercept angles from *CMS* procedure for Bridge B.



Figure 9.23 *PDSD* estimates of abutment unseating displacement of different intercept angles from *CMS* procedure for Bridge B.



Figure 9.24 *PDSD* estimates of column shear force of different intercept angles from *US* procedure for Bridge B.



Figure 9.25 *PDSD* estimates of column drift ratio of different intercept angles from *US* procedure for Bridge B.



Figure 9.26 *PDSD* estimates of abutment unseating displacement of different intercept angles from *US* procedure for Bridge B.



Figure 9.27 *PDSD* estimates of column drift ratio of different intercept angles from $S_a(T_1)$ and $S_a(T_1)_p$ procedures for Bridge C with Type I abutment modeling.



Figure 9.28 *PDSD* estimates of column drift ratio of different intercept angles from $S_a(T_1)$ and $S_a(T_1)_p$ procedures for Bridge C with Type II abutment modeling.



Figure 9.29 *PDSD* estimates of column drift ratio of different intercept angles from *CMS* and *US* procedures for Bridge C with Type I abutment modeling.



Figure 9.30 *PDSD* estimates of column drift ratio of different intercept angles from *CMS* and *US* procedures for Bridge C with Type II abutment modeling.

10 SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND FUTURE EXTENSIONS

10.1 SUMMARY

The study completed in this report investigated two key challenges related to the application of the performance-based earthquake engineering (PBEE) methodology developed by the Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center (PEER). Accurate and robust nonlinear time history analysis (NTHA) that is fundamental to estimate the seismic demands of structures was the first challenge investigated in this study. To ensure accurate and robust NTHA simulations, especially for nonlinear multi-degree of freedom (MDOF) structural systems, different types of direct integration algorithms and nonlinear equation solvers were used, where their stability performance and convergence behavior are of great significance. Lyapunov stability theory, the most complete framework for stability analysis of dynamical systems, was introduced. Based on this theory, a new nonlinear equation solver was developed, and its convergence performance was theoretically formulated and verified by several examples. In addition, two Lyapunov-based approaches were proposed to perform stability analysis of nonlinear structural systems. The first approach transformed the stability analysis to a problem of existence that can be solved via convex optimization over the discretized domain of interest of the restoring force. The second approach was specifically applicable to explicit algorithms for nonlinear single-degree of freedom (SDOF) and MDOF systems considering strictly positive real lemma. In this approach, a generic explicit algorithm was formulated for a system governed by a nonlinear function of the basic force without adopting any approximations. Starting from this formulation and based on the Lyapunov stability theory, the stability analysis of the formulated nonlinear system was transformed to an investigation the strictly positive realness of its corresponding transfer function matrix. The efficacy of the two Lyapunov-based approaches of stability analysis were demonstrated by several SDOF and MDOF numerical examples.

The second challenge to address when using PBEE methodology is which ground motion selection and modification (GMSM) procedure is most appropriate for the NTHA simulations. Therefore, proper selection of GMSM approach is vital and represents an important prerequisite for accurate and robust NTHA simulations. In this report, a framework for probabilistic evaluation of GMSM procedures was developed in the context of a specific large earthquake scenario with bidirectional GM excitations.

The aforementioned theoretical developments were investigated for reinforced concrete (RC) highway bridge systems, which are key components of the infrastructure in urban cities.

Solutions for overcoming the problem of convergence encountered in NTHA of RC highway bridges were presented and recommendations given. In addition, this report evaluated several GMSM procedures in predicting the probability distribution of the seismic demands (*PDSD*) of RC highway bridges subjected to large earthquakes that result in highly nonlinear response. The accuracy and reliability of all *PDSD* estimates from the investigated GMSM procedures were evaluated against the reference benchmark *PDSD* developed by the PEER PBEE framework. Such evaluations were conducted considering four selected engineering demand parameters (*EDPs*) of three representative RC highway bridges in California that accounted for two types of abutment modeling. In total, 94,860 NTHA simulations, where 89,100 ones for the development of the benchmark *PDSD* and 5760 ones for the *PDSD* estimates by the GMSM procedures, were performed.

10.2 CONCLUSIONS

The major developments and findings of this study are summarized as follows:

- A new nonlinear equation solver was developed based on reformulation of the equations of motion into a hypothetical dynamical system characterized by a set of ordinary differential equations. The equilibrium points of this hypothetical system are the solutions of the nonlinear structural problems. Starting from Lyapunov stability theory, it was demonstrated that this hypothetical dynamical system is characterized by a globally asymptotic stability, i.e., convergence, to equilibrium points for structural dynamics. This feature overcomes the inherent limitations of the traditional iterative minimization algorithms and has no restriction on the selection of the initial guess for various structural nonlinear behaviors.
- As shown in the several numerical examples, another important feature of the proposed Lyapunov-based nonlinear equation solvers its ability to solve the equilibrium equations for models where a numerically consistent tangent may be difficult to determine.
- An integration algorithm is stable if its Lyapunov artificial energy function is bounded. The general condition that the boundedness of $\sum_{j=i}^{1} \mathbf{A}_{j} = \mathbf{A}_{i} \mathbf{A}_{i-1} \cdots \mathbf{A}_{2} \mathbf{A}_{1}$ for $i \rightarrow \infty$ is derived from the boundedness of the Lyapunov function. For linear structures, the stability criterion requires that the spectral radius of the approximation operator is less than or equal to 1.0 (which is applied to nonlinear structures by some researchers). It should be emphasized that the stability limit for linear structures does not automatically hold for nonlinear structures. Therefore, basic methodologies used in some well-known stability limits of direct integration algorithms, e.g., the Operator-Splitting (OS) algorithm with initial stiffness (OS_{initial}), are not applicable to nonlinear problems.
- The study also investigates the OS algorithm that uses tangent stiffness in the formulation (OS_{tagent}), which has not been previously studied. It was demonstrated that this explicit algorithm possesses similar stability properties to those of the implicit Newmark (IN) integration.

- An approach was proposed to perform the stability analysis numerically. This approach transformed the stability analysis to the solution of a convex optimization problem over the discretized domain of interest of the restoring force. The proposed approach is shown to be generally applicable to direct integration algorithms for nonlinear problems and can potentially be extended to MDOF systems
- A geometrically nonlinear pendulum problem with a closed-form exact solution was used to investigate the accuracy of the investigated integration algorithms. The period was shortened by explicit Newmark and elongated by the other algorithms. The OS_{tangent} and IN algorithms presented similar period elongations. The more computationally expensive TRBDF2 had the smallest period change. None of the algorithms except the TRBDF2 method experienced amplitude decay, which was due to the introduced numerical damping. Observed period elongation (< \pm 3%) and amplitude decay (< 1%) values were acceptable. The incorrectness of the stability criterion of the OS_{initial} algorithm from past studies and the suitability of the proposed numerical stability analysis approach herein were demonstrated using the same nonlinear pendulum example.
- The systematic approach to investigate the Lyapunov stability of explicit direct integration algorithms for MDOF systems considering strictly positive real lemma was presented. The stability analysis of two types of MDOF nonlinear systems (stiffening and softening) was presented using the proposed approach. The explicit algorithm was formulated for a generic nonlinear MDOF system represented by a general nonlinear restoring force vector. In this study, the *l*th basic resisting force of the system was a nonlinear function bounded in the sector between $\bar{k}^{l}_{Min} \bar{u}^{l}$ and $\bar{k}^{l}_{Max} \bar{u}^{l}$, where \bar{k}^{l}_{Min} and \bar{k}_{Max}^{l} were the lower and upper bounds for the *l*th basic resisting force of the system and \overline{u}^{\prime} was a linear combination of the DOFs. Based on this formulation, the approach transformed the stability analysis to an investigation the strictly positive realness of the transfer function matrix for the formulated system. Furthermore, this is equivalent to a problem of convex optimization that can be solved numerically. A sufficient condition, in terms of the difference between the upper and lower bounds of each basic resisting force of the system, is where the explicit algorithm is stable in the sense of Lyapunov and can be obtained numerically. Moreover, the explicit algorithm is *asymptotically* stable if the basic resisting force vector is strictly within a specific range defined in Equation (5.49).
- The proposed approach to investigate the Lyapunov stability of the explicit Newmark and the generalized-α predictor-corrector explicit algorithms is demonstrated by several numerical examples of nonlinear SDOF and MDOF systems with stiffening or softening structural behavior. The structural systems investigated in these numerical examples include a bridge system and multi-story (number of stories ranging from 1 to 25) shear building systems. Detailed results from these examples have been presented. A detailed Lyapunov stability analysis has been demonstrated by an example of a nonlinear two-story shear building. For the multi-story shear building, the difference between the upper and lower bounds of the stiffness of the first story (δ¹), where high levels of nonlinearity may occur, was observed to increase with the increase of the number

of stories for the stiffening system or softening system with low damping. On the other hand, δ^1 decreased with the increase of the number of stories for the softening system with high damping. It was noted that the matrix $\bar{\mathbf{k}}$, which represented the difference between the upper and lower bounds of the basic resisting force of the system, depended on the selection of the coefficient matrix and the cost function. In conclusion, the proposed approach is shown to be applicable for investigating the Lyapunov stability of explicit direct integration algorithms used to determine the dynamic response of nonlinear MDOF structural systems.

- Solutions for overcoming the problem of convergence associated with the NTHA of RC highway bridges was presented in terms of efficient direct integration algorithms. For this purpose, the applicability of the explicit OS and implicit TRBDF2 was investigated for three RC highway bridges located in California. Simulations of these bridges demonstrated that the OS and TRBDF2 algorithms provided very close results compared to those of the IN algorithm. Moreover, the TRBDF2 algorithm showed improved convergence performance compared to the IN algorithm. Accordingly, the OS and TRBDF2 are suitable alternatives to the IN for NTHA of RC highway bridges.
- For the implicit integration methods, the Newton-Raphson with Line Search was observed to be the most suitable initial nonlinear solver in terms of convergence. Accordingly, an analyst can start with this method as the initial solver in the first simulation trial of an analytical model.
- The sequence of the nonlinear solvers after a proper selection of the initial solver was determined to be insignificant. Accordingly, an analyst should pay more attention to the determination of the initial solver than the determination of the sequence of the subsequent solvers in the NTHA.
- Simulations with the convergence test based on the Energy Increment led to the same solution with significantly fewer numbers of iterations compared to other convergence tests. Accordingly, an analyst can consider the Energy Increment test in the first simulation trial of an analytical model subjected to NTHA.
- Simulations conducted with tolerances of 10⁻⁵ and 10⁻⁸ selected for the Energy Increment test for all the integration time steps (of the simulation) were observed to result in very similar response calculations. Accordingly, the increase of the convergence tolerance for the integration time steps with convergence problems is a valid option to achieve convergence improvement.
- Using of a smaller integration time step during the simulation did not necessarily improve the convergence behavior. However, selective reduction of the integration time step was useful to overcome the convergence problem as long as the integration time step was reset to its original value after completion of the reduced time steps that represented the original size of a time step. This resetting process was essential to preventing completion of the simulation before the duration of the GM input was finished.
- Adaptive switching of integration algorithms showed improved convergence performance compared to using the IN algorithm only. Therefore, use of explicit

integrators, e.g., OS algorithm, only at the numerically problematic steps is a viable and effective option to overcome the problem of convergence.

- The efficacy of the proposed solutions was challenging, given that PBEE required conducting a significant number of NTHAs. First, the identification of predominantly first-mode *EDP*s under earthquake excitation by making use of different GMSM methods was performed: 1440 NTHA were conducted where a significant number of problems related to convergence were encountered and overcome using the proposed solutions. The results obtained from these NTHAs indicated that the higher mode effects are more pronounced on column displacements and deck accelerations than on column shear forces. Therefore, the column base shear is likely to be a first-mode dominant *EDP*, irrespective of the hazard level. Moreover, the effect of higher modes was observed to increase with increasing the hazard level and the nonlinearity.
- Taking advantage of the PBEE approach, a framework for probabilistic evaluation of the GMSM procedures is developed in the context of a selected large earthquake scenario with bidirectional GM excitations.
- A non-parametric inference, kernel density estimation, instead of lognormality assumption, was utilized to estimate the conditional distribution of seismic demands. The structural collapse scenario was considered and incorporated into the *PDSD* estimate.
- The reference benchmark PDSD is developed for each intercept angle. Small differences of *PDSD* estimates from the six intercept angles indicated that intercept angle has only minor impact on estimating the *PDSD*.
- The procedures of the benchmark *PDSD* development in the context of a given large earthquake scenario can be readily extended to the case of multiple earthquake scenarios. Future investigation will focus on simulations considering such multiple scenarios.
- The *PDSD* estimates from the amplitude-scaling procedure using the spectral acceleration at the fundamental period (T_1) with special attention to the pulse-like GMs, $S_a(T_1)_p$, are larger and more accurate than the ones estimated from the $S_a(T_1)$ procedure without special consideration of the pulse-like GMs for certain cases. In general, the *PDSD* estimates from the $S_a(T_1)$ and $S_a(T_1)_p$ procedures are comparable. The two procedures as well as the conditional mean spectrum (*CMS*) procedures underestimated the seismic response for some bridges.
- The *PDSD* estimates obtained by using the spectrum shape-matching procedure using the unconditional selection (*US*) were almost always on the conservative side and compared to the other GMSM procedures, the most conservative of all. The RC highway bridges are essential lifelines of the transportation infrastructure and thus long downtimes after severe earthquakes is not acceptable in terms of either emergency response and/or community resiliency. Thus, among all four investigated GMSM procedures, it is recommended to use the *US* for selection and modification of GMs.

10.3 FUTURE EXTENSIONS

Several research topics considered appropriate for future investigations are listed below:

- 1. Implementation of the proposed Lyapunov-based nonlinear equation solver in some software framework, e.g., OpenSees, and apply it to more complex structural systems, e.g., RC highway bridge systems utilized in this report.
- 2. Development of a new parameterized direct integration algorithm on the basis of Lyapunov stability theory and consider its applicability for nonlinear problems to investigate the stability performance.
- 3. The conditional distribution of seismic demands using kernel density estimation can be revisited considering, e.g., the Kernel Density Maximum Entropy Method (KDMEM), refer to [Alibrandi and Mosalam 2016], which is a method that determines the least biased distribution of a random variable from a sample data. This method is very useful for obtaining good approximations of the tails (corresponding to low probability as in collapse) of the distribution.
- 4. Including the stochastic GM simulated procedure in the evaluation process.
- 5. Extending the GMSM selection and evaluation to the case of multiple earthquake scenarios.

REFERENCES

- Abramowitz M., Stegun I.A. (1972). Handbook of Mathematical Functions with Formulas, Graphs, and Mathematical Tables, Dover Publications, New York.
- Alibrandi U., Mosalam K.M. (2016). Kernel density maximum entropy with generalized moments for the evaluation of probability distributions and applications to seismic fragility functions, *under preparation*.
- Aviram A., Mackie K.R., Stojadinović B. (2008). Guidelines for nonlinear analysis of bridge structures in California, *PEER Report No., 2008/03*, Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center, University of California, Berkeley, CA.
- Akkar S., Küçükdoğan B. (2008). Direct use of PGV for estimating peak nonlinear oscillator displacements, *Earthq. Eng. Struct. Dyn.*, 37(12): 1411–1433.
- Akkar S., Özen Ö. (2005). Effect of peak ground velocity on deformation demands for SDOF systems, *Earthq. Eng. Struct. Dyn.*, 34(13): 1551–1571.
- Baker J.W. (2007). Probabilistic structural response assessment using vector-valued intensity measures, *Earthq. Eng. Struct. Dyn.*, 36(13): 1861–1883.
- Baker J.W. (2011). Conditional mean spectrum: Tool for ground-motion selection, ASCE J. Struct. Eng., 137(3): 322–331.
- Baker J.W., Cornell C.A. (2005). A vector-valued ground motion intensity measure consisting of spectral acceleration and epsilon, *Earthq. Eng. Struct. Dyn.*, 34(10): 1193–1217.
- Baker J.W., Lin T., Shahi S.K. (2011). New ground motion selection procedures and selected motions for the PEER Transportation Research Program, *PEER Report No. 2011/03*, Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center, University of California, Berkeley, CA.
- Bank R.E., Coughran W.M., Fichter W., Grosse E.H., Rose D.J., Smith R.K. (1985). Transient simulations of silicon devices and circuits, *IEEE Transactions on Computer-Aided Design*, 4: 436–451.
- Bathe K.J. (2006). Finite Element Procedures, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.
- Bathe K.J. (2007). Conserving energy and momentum in nonlinear dynamics: A simple implicit time integration scheme, *Comput. Struct.*, 83(31–32): 437–445.
- Bathe K.J., Baig, M.M.I. (2005). On a composite implicit time integration procedure for nonlinear dynamics, *Comput. Struct.*, 83, 2513–2524.
- Bathe K.J., Cimento A.P. (1980). Some practical procedures for the solution of nonlinear finite element equations, *Comput. Method Appl. M.*, 22: 59–85.
- Bathe K.J., Wilson E.L. (1972). Stability and accuracy analysis of direct integration methods, *Earthq. Eng. Struct. Dyn.*, 1(3): 283–291.
- Beléndez A., Pascual C., Méndez D.I., Beléndez T., Neipp C. (2007). Exact solution for the nonlinear pendulum, *Revista Brasileira de Ensino de Física*, 29(4): 645–648.
- Benzoti G., Ohtaki T., Pristley M.J.N., Seible F. (1996). Seismic performance of circular reinforced concrete columns under varying axial load, Division of Structural Engineering, *96/04*, University of California, San Diego, CA.
- Boyd S., El Ghaoui L., Feron E., Balakrishnan V. (1994). *Linear Matrix Inequalities in System and Control Theory*, SIAM, Philadelphia, PA.
- Boyd S., Vandenberghe L. (2004). Convex Optimization, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.
- Bradley B.A. (2010). A generalized conditional intensity measure approach and holistic ground-motion selection, *Earthq. Eng. Struct. Dyn.*, 39(12): 1321–1342.
- Bradley B.A. (2012). The seismic demand hazard and importance of the conditioning intensity measure, *Earthq. Eng. Struct. Dyn.*, 41(11): 1417–1437.
- Bradley B.A. (2013). A comparison of intensity-based demand distributions and the seismic demand hazard for seismic

performance assessment, Earthq. Eng. Struct. Dyn., 42(15): 2235-2253.

- Broyden C.G. (1965). A class of methods for solving nonlinear simultaneous equations, *Math. Comput.*, 19(92): 577–593.
- Broyden C.G. (1970). The convergence of a double-rank minimization. 2: The new algorithm, *IMA J. Appl. Math.*, 6(3): 222–231.
- Cains P.E. (1989). Linear Stochastic Systems, New York, Wiley.
- Caltrans (2010). *Caltrans Seismic Design Criteria*, Version 1.6, California Department of Transportation, Sacramento, CA.
- Caltrans (2013). *Caltrans Seismic Design Criteria*, Version 1.7, California Department of Transportation, Sacramento, CA.
- Campbell K.W., Bozorgnia Y. (2008). NGA ground motion model for the geometric mean horizontal component of PGA, PGV, PGD and 5% damped linear elastic response spectra for periods ranging from 0.01 to 10s, *Earthq. Spectra*, 24(1): 139–171.
- Chen C., Ricles J.M. (2008). Stability analysis of direct integration algorithms applied to nonlinear structural dynamics, ASCE J. Eng. Mech., 134(9): 703–711.
- Chopra A.K. (2006). *Dynamics of Structures: Theory and Applications to Earthquake Engineering*, Pearson Prentice Hall, 3rd Edition, Upper Saddle River, N.J.
- Chung J., Hulbert G.M. (1993). A time integration algorithm for structural dynamics with improved numerical dissipation: the generalized- α method, ASME J. Appl. Mech., 60(2): 371–375.
- Combescure D., Pegon P. (1997). α-Operator splitting time integration technique for pseudodynamic testing error propagation analysis, *Soil Dyn. Earthq. Eng.*, 16: 427–443.
- Cornell, C. A. and Krawinkler, H. (2000). Progress and challenges in seismic performance assessment, *PEER Center News*, 3(2): 1–3.
- Crisfield M.A. (1991). Non-Linear Finite Element Analysis of Solids and Structures, Vol. 1, Wiley, New York.
- CVX Research, Inc. (2011). CVX: Matlab software for disciplined convex programming, version 2.0. http://cvxr.com/cvx.
- DIANA (2005). User's Manual: Analysis Procedures Edited by: Frits C. de Witte and Wijtze Pieter Kikstra, TNO DIANA.
- Dormand J.R., Prince P.J. (1980). A family of embedded Runge-Kutta formulae, J. Comput. Appl. Math., 6(1): 19–26.
- Franklin G.F., Powell J.D., Emami-Naeini A. (2015). *Feedback Control of Dynamic Systems*, 7th ed., Pearson Higher Education Inc., Upper Saddle River, N.J.
- Fletcher R. (1970). A new approach to variable metric algorithms, Comput. J., 13: 317-322.
- Goldfarb D. (1970). A family of variable-metric methods derived by variational means, *Math. Comput.*, 24(109): 23–26.
- Golub, G. H., and Van Loan, C. F. (1996). *Matrix computations*, 3rd Ed., Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, Md.
- Günay S., Mosalam K.M. (2013). PEER performance-based earthquake engineering methodology, revisited, *J. Earthq. Eng.*, 17(6): 829–858.
- Haddad W.M., Chellaboina V. (2008). *Nonlinear Dynamical Systems and Control: A Lyapunov-Based Approach*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J.
- Hancock J., Bommer J.J., Stafford P.J. (2008). Numbers of scaled and matched accelerograms required for inelastic dynamic analyses, *Earthq. Eng. Struct. Dyn.*, 37(14): 1585–1607.
- Härdle W., Muller M., Sperlich S., Werwatz, A. (2004). Nonparametric and Semiparametric Models: An Introduction, Springer New York.
- Haselton C.B., Baker J.W., Bozorgnia Y., Goulet C.A., Kalkan E., Luco N., Shantz T.J., Shome N., Stewart J.P.,

Tothong P., Watson-Lamprey J.A., Zareian, F. (2009). Evaluation of ground motion selection and modification methods: predicting median interstory drift response of buildings, *PEER Report No. 2009/01*, Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center, University of California, Berkeley, CA.

- Hayden C., Bray J., Abrahamson N.A., Acevedo-Cabrera A.L. (2012). Selection of near-fault pulse motions for use in design, In: *Proceedings 15th International World Conference on Earthquake Engineering*, Lisbon, Portugal.
- Heo Y., Kunnath S.K., Abrahamson, N.A. (2010). Amplitude-scaled versus spectrum-matched ground motions for seismic performance assessment, ASCE J. Struct. Eng., 137(3): 278–288.
- Hilber H.M., Hughes T.J.R., Taylor R.L. (1977). Improved numerical dissipation for time integration algorithms in structural mechanics, *Earthq. Eng. Struct. Dyn.*, 5(3): 283–292.
- Hughes T.J.R. (1976). Stability, convergence and growth and decay of energy of the average acceleration method in nonlinear structural dynamics, *Comput. Struct.*, 6(4–5): 313–324.
- Hughes T.J.R. (1987). *The Finite-Element Method: Linear Static and Dynamic Finite-Element Analysis*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.
- Hughes T.J.R., Pister K.S., Taylor R.L. (1979). Implicit-explicit finite elements in nonlinear transient analysis, *Comput. Method. Appl. Mech. Eng.*, 17(18): 159–182.
- Hulbert G.M., Chung J. (1996). Explicit time integration algorithms for structural dynamics with optimal numerical dissipation, *Comput. Method. Appl. Mech. Eng.*, 137(2): 175–188.
- Hutchinson T.C., Chai Y.H., Boulanger R.W. (2004). Inelastic seismic response of extended pile-shaft-supported bridge structures, *Earthq. Spectra*, 20(4): 1057–1080.
- Jayaram N., Lin T., Baker J.W. (2011). A computationally efficient ground-motion selection algorithm for matching a target response spectrum mean and variance, *Earthq. Spectra*, 27(3): 797–815.
- Kalkan E., Chopra A.K. (2011). Modal-pushover-based ground-motion scaling procedure, ASCE J. Struct. Eng., 137: 298–310.
- Kapila V., Haddad W.M. (1996). A multivariable extension of the tsypkin criterion using a lyapunov-function approach, *IEEE Trans. Automatic Control*, 41(1): 149–152.
- Katsanos E.I., Sextos A.G., Manolis G. D. (2010). Selection of earthquake ground motion records: A state-of-the-art review from a structural engineering perspective, *Soil Dyn. Earthq. Eng.*, 30(4): 157–169.
- Kappos A.J., Gkatzogias K.I., Gidaris I.G. (2013). Extension of direct displacement-based design methodology for bridges to account for higher mode effects, *Earthq. Eng. Struct. Dyn.*, 42: 581–602.
- Kaviani P., Zareian F., Taciroglu E. (2012). Seismic behavior of reinforced concrete bridges with skew-angled seattype abutments, *Eng. Struct.*, 45: 137–150.
- Kaviani P., Zareian F., Taciroglu E. (2014). Performance-based seismic assessment of skewed bridges, PEER Report No. 2014/01, Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center, University of California, Berkeley, CA.
- Khalil H.K. (2002). Nonlinear Systems, Pearson Prentice Hall, 3rd ed., Upper Saddle River, N.J.
- Kottenstette N., Antsaklis P.J. (2010). Relationship between positive real, passive dissipative, and positive systems, In: *Proceeding of American Control Conference*, Baltimore, MD.
- Kottke A., Rathje E.M. (2008). A semi-automated procedure for selecting and scaling recorded earthquake motions for dynamic analysis, *Earthq. Spectra*, 24(4): 911–932.
- Küçükdoğan B. (2007). Investigation of the effect of ground-motion intensity measures on seismic demand parameters using probabilistic methods. *M.Sc. Thesis*, Department of Civil Engineering, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Kuhl D., Crisfield M.A. (1999) Energy conserving and decaying algorithms in non-linear structural dynamics, *Int. J. Num. Method. Eng.*, 45: 569–599.
- Kunimatsu S., Sang-Hoon K., Fujii T., Ishitobi M. (2008). On positive Real Lemma for non-minimal realization systems, In: *Proceeding of the 17th World Congress, the International Federation of Automatic Control*, Seoul, Korea.

- Kurama Y.C., Farrow, K.T. (2003). Ground motion scaling methods for different site conditions and structure characteristics, *Earthq. Eng. Struct. Dyn.*, 32(15): 2425–2450.
- Kwong N.S., Chopra A.K. (2016). Evaluation of the exact conditional spectrum and generalized conditional intensity measure methods for ground motion selection, *Earthq. Eng. Struct. Dyn.*, 45(5): 757–777.
- Kwong N.S., Chopra A.K., McGuire R.K. (2015). A framework for the evaluation of ground motion selection and modification procedures, *Earthq. Eng. Struct. Dyn.*, 44(5): 795–815.
- Lee L., Chen J. (2003). Strictly positive Real Lemma and absolute stability for discrete-time descriptor systems, *IEEE Trans. Circuits System I: Fundamental Theory and Applications*, 50(6): 788–794.
- Liang X. (2016). Performance-Based Robust Nonlinear Seismic Analysis with Application to Reinforced Concrete Bridge Systems, *Ph.D. Dissertation*, University of California, Berkeley, USA.
- Liang X., Mosalam K.M. (2015). Lyapunov Stability and Accuracy of Direct Integration Algorithms in Nonlinear Dynamic Problems and Considering the Strictly Positive Real Lemma, SEMM Technical Report UCB/SEMM-2015/01, April.
- Liang X., Mosalam K.M. (2016a). Lyapunov stability and accuracy of direct integration algorithms applied to nonlinear dynamic problems, ASCE J. Eng. Mech., 142(5): 04016022.
- Liang X., Mosalam K.M. (2016b). Lyapunov stability analysis of explicit direct integration algorithms considering strictly positive Real Lemma, ASCE J. Eng. Mech., 142(10): 04016079.
- Liang X., Mosalam K.M. (2016c). Lyapunov stability analysis of explicit direct integration algorithms applied to multi-degree of freedom nonlinear dynamic problems, ASCE J. Eng. Mech., 142(12), 04016098.
- Liang X., Mosalam K.M. (2016d). Stability investigation of direct integration algorithms using Lyapunov-based approaches, In: *Proceedings* 7th *International Conference on Computational Methods*, Berkeley, CA, August 1–4.
- Liang X., Mosalam K.M. (2017a). Evaluation of ground motion selection and modification methods on reinforced concrete highway bridges, In: *Proceedings the 16th World Conference on Earthquake Engineering*, Santiago, Chile, January 9–13.
- Liang X., Mosalam K.M. (2017b). Lyapunov-based nonlinear solution algorithm for structural analysis, ASCE J. Eng. Mech. (under review).
- Liang X., Mosalam K.M. (2017c). Probabilistic evaluation of ground motion selection and modification procedures for reinforced concrete highway bridges, *Eng. Struct.*, (*in preparation*).
- Liang X., Günay S., Mosalam, K.M. (2014a). Seismic response of bridges considering different ground motion selection methods, In: *Proceedings Istanbul Bridge Conference*, Istanbul, Turkey, August 11–13.
- Liang X., Günay S., Mosalam, K.M. (2014b). Integrators for nonlinear response history analysis: revisited, In: Proceedings Istanbul Bridge Conference, Istanbul, Turkey, August 11–13.
- Liang X., Günay S., Mosalam, K.M. (2016a). Chapter 12: Seismic Response of Bridges Considering Different Ground Motion Selection Methods, In: Developments in International Bridge Engineering, Springer Tracts on Transportation and Traffic 9, Springer Int. Publishing, Switzerland.
- Liang X., Mosalam K.M., Günay, S. (2016b), Direct integration algorithms for efficient nonlinear seismic response of reinforced concrete highway bridges, ASCE J. Bridge Eng., 21(7): 04016041.
- Lin T., Haselton C.B., Baker, J.W. (2013a). Conditional spectrum-based ground motion selection. Part I: Hazard consistency for risk-based assessments, *Earthq. Eng. Struct. Dyn.*, 42(12): 1847–1865.
- Lin T., Harmsen S.C., Baker J.W., Luco N. (2013b). Conditional spectrum computation incorporating multiple causal earthquakes and ground-motion prediction models, *Bull. Seismol. Soc. Am.*, 103(2A): 1103–1116.
- Luco N., Cornell C.A. (2007). Structure-specific scalar intensity measures for near-source and ordinary earthquake ground motions, *Earthq. Spectra*, 23(2): 357–392.
- Lyapunov A.M. (1892). The general problem of the stability of motion (In Russian), *Doctoral report*, Kharkov National University, Ukraine.
- MacRae G.A., Kawashima K. (1997). Post-earthquake residual displacements of bilinear oscillators, *Earthq. Eng. Struct. Dyn.*, 26(7): 701–716.
- Mander J. B., Priestley M.J.N., Park R. (1988). Theoretical stress-strain model for confined concrete, ASCE J. Eng., 114(8): 1804–1825.
- McKenna, F., Fenves, G. L. and Filippou, F. C. (2010). *The Open System for Earthquake Engineering Simulation*, University of California, Berkeley, CA.
- Milando F. (2009). Continuous Newton's method for power flow analysis, IEEE Trans. Power Syst., 24(1): 50-57.
- Moehle J.P., Deierlein G.G. (2004). A framework methodology for performance-based earthquake engineering, In: *Proceedings 13th International World Conference on Earthquake Engineering*, Vancouver, Canada.
- Mosalam K.M., Liang X., Günay S., Schellenberg A. (2013). Alternative integrators and parallel computing for efficient nonlinear response history analyses, In: *Proceedings 4th International Conference on Computational Methods in Structural Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering (COMPDYN)*, Kos Island, Greece.
- Naeim F., Alimoradi A., Pezeshk S. (2004). Selection and scaling of ground motion time histories for structural design using genetic algorithms, *Earthq. Spectra*, 20(2): 413–426.
- Newmark N.M. (1959). A method of computation for structural dynamics, ASCE J. Eng. Mech. Div. 85(3): 67-94.
- Omrani R., Mobasher B., Liang, X., Günay S., Mosalam K.M., Zareian F., Taciroglu E. (2015). Guidelines for Nonlinear Seismic Analysis of Ordinary Bridges: Version 2.0, CA 15-2266, California Department of Transportation, Sacramento, CA.
- OpenSees Wiki: http://opensees.berkeley.edu/wiki/index.php/Command_Manual (Last Access: July, 2016).
- PEER (2011). *PEER NGA Ground Motion Database*, Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center, http://peer.berkeley.edu/nga.
- Rezaeian S., Der Kiureghian A. (2011). Simulation of orthogonal horizontal ground motion components for specified earthquake and site characteristics, *Earthq. Eng. Struct. Dyn.*, 41(2): 335–353.
- Riddell, R. (2007). On ground motion intensity indices, Earthq. Spectra, 23(1): 147–173.
- Schellenberg A., Mahin, S., Fenves, G. (2009). Advanced Implementation of Hybrid Simulation, *PEER Report No.* 2009/04, Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center, University of California, Berkeley, CA.
- Scott M.H., Fenves, G.L. (2010). Krylov subspace accelerated Newton algorithm: Application to dynamic progressive collapse simulation of frames, ASCE J. Struct. Eng., 136: 473–480.
- Shanno D.F. (1970). Conditioning of quasi-Newton methods for function minimization, Math. Comput., 24: 322-334.
- Shome N., Cornell C.A., Bazzurro P., Carballo J.E. (1998). Earthquakes, records, and nonlinear response, *Earthq. Spectra*, 14(3): 469–500.
- Spacone E., Filippou F.C., Taucer, F.F. (1996). Fibre beam-column model for non-linear analysis of R/C frames: Part I. Formulation, *Earthq. Eng. Struct. Dyn.*, 25(7): 711–726.
- Tamma K.K., Zhou X., Sha D. (2000). The time dimension: a theory towards the evolution, classification, characterization and design of computational algorithms for transient/dynamic applications, *Arch. Comput. Method. Eng.*, 7(2): 67–290.
- Tothong P., Luco N. (2007). Probabilistic seismic demand analysis using advanced ground motion intensity measures, *Earthq. Eng. Struct. Dyn.*, 36(13): 1837–1860.
- Vamvatsikos D., Cornell C.A. (2004). Applied incremental dynamic analysis, Earthq. Spectra, 20(2): 523-553.
- Watson-Lamprey J.A., Abrahamson N.A. (2006). Selection of ground motion time series and limits on scaling, Soil Dyn. Earthq. Eng., 26(5): 477–482.
- Xiao C., Hill D.J. (1999). Generalizations and new proof of the discrete-time Positive Real Lemma and Bounded Real Lemma, *IEEE Transactions on Circuits System I: Fundamental Theory and Applications*, 46(6): 740–743.
- Xie N., Torelli F., Bompard E., Vaccaro A. (2013). Dynamic computing paradigm for comprehensive power flow analysis, *IET Generation, Transmission and Distribution*, 7(8): 832–842.

Zhong H.G., Crisfield M.A. (1998). An energy conserving co-rotational procedure for the dynamics of shell structures, *Eng. Comput.*, 15(5): 552–576.

APPENDIX A BASE FUNCTIONS USED FOR NUMERICAL STABILITY ANALYSIS

This Appendix gives an example set of base functions used for numerical stability analysis presented in Chapter 4. This example set includes constant (Φ_1 to Φ_6), linear (Φ_7 to Φ_{12}) and nonlinear (Φ_{13} to Φ_{18}) base functions.

$$\begin{split} & \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{1} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{2} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{3} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{4} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \\ & \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{5} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{6} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{7} = \begin{bmatrix} \delta_{i+1} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{8} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \delta_{i+1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \\ & \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{9} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \delta_{i+1} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{10} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \delta_{i+1} & 0 \\ \delta_{i+1} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{11} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & \delta_{i+1} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \delta_{i+1} & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{12} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \delta_{i+1} \\ 0 & \delta_{i+1} & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \\ & \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{13} = \begin{bmatrix} \delta_{i+1}^{2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{14} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \delta_{i+1}^{2} & 0 \\ 0 & \delta_{i+1}^{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{15} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \delta_{i+1}^{2} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{16} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \delta_{i+1}^{2} & 0 \\ \delta_{i+1}^{2} & 0 & 0 \\ \delta_{i+1}^{2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \\ & \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{17} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & \delta_{i+1}^{2} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \delta_{i+1}^{2} & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{18} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \delta_{i+1}^{2} \\ 0 & \delta_{i+1}^{2} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \end{split}$$

This appendix presents the derivation of α and β for the MDOF bridge structure depicted in Figure 5.4 to illustrate the Lyapunov-based approach of stability analysis proposed in Chapter 5. In the linear range of the investigated bridge structure, shown in Figure B.1 with identified DOFs and circled element numbers, the restoring forces are as follows:

$$\begin{split} f^{1} &= \frac{12E_{c}I_{c}}{L_{1}^{3}}u^{1} + \frac{6E_{c}I_{c}}{L_{1}^{2}}u^{2} = \frac{6E_{c}I_{c}}{L_{1}^{2}}\left(\frac{2}{L_{1}}u^{1} + u^{2}\right) \\ f^{2} &= \frac{6E_{c}I_{c}}{L_{1}^{2}}u^{1} + \frac{4E_{c}I_{c}}{L_{1}}u^{2} + \frac{4E_{b}I_{b}}{L_{3}}u^{2} + \frac{4E_{b}I_{b}}{L_{4}}u^{2} + \frac{6E_{b}I_{b}}{L_{3}^{2}}u^{3} + \frac{2E_{b}I_{b}}{L_{3}}u^{4} - \frac{6E_{b}I_{b}}{L_{4}^{2}}u^{5} + \frac{2E_{b}I_{b}}{L_{4}}u^{6} \\ &= \frac{2E_{c}I_{c}}{L_{1}}\left(\frac{3}{L_{1}}u^{1} + 2u^{2}\right) + \frac{2E_{b}I_{b}}{L_{3}}\left(2u^{2} + \frac{3}{L_{3}}u^{3} + u^{4}\right) + \frac{2E_{b}I_{b}}{L_{4}}\left(2u^{2} - \frac{3}{L_{4}}u^{5} + u^{6}\right) \\ f^{3} &= \frac{6E_{b}I_{b}}{L_{3}^{2}}u^{2} + \frac{12E_{b}I_{b}}{L_{3}^{3}}u^{3} + \frac{3E_{b}I_{b}}{L_{2}^{3}}u^{3} + \frac{6E_{b}I_{b}}{L_{3}^{2}}u^{4} - \frac{3E_{b}I_{b}}{L_{2}^{2}}u^{4} \\ &= \frac{3E_{b}I_{b}}{L_{2}^{2}}\left(\frac{1}{L_{2}}u^{3} - u^{4}\right) + \frac{6E_{b}I_{b}}{L_{3}^{2}}\left(u^{2} + \frac{2}{L_{3}}u^{3} + u^{4}\right) \\ f^{4} &= \frac{2E_{b}I_{b}}{L_{3}}u^{2} + \frac{6E_{b}I_{b}}{L_{3}^{2}}u^{3} - \frac{3E_{b}I_{b}}{L_{2}^{2}}u^{3} + \frac{4E_{b}I_{b}}{L_{3}}u^{4} + \frac{3E_{b}I_{b}}{L_{2}}u^{4} \\ &= \frac{3E_{b}I_{b}}{L_{2}}\left(-\frac{1}{L_{2}}u^{3} + u^{4}\right) + \frac{2E_{b}I_{b}}{L_{3}^{2}}\left(u^{2} + \frac{2}{L_{3}}u^{3} + u^{4}\right) \\ f^{5} &= -\frac{6E_{b}I_{b}}{L_{3}}u^{2} + \frac{6E_{b}I_{b}}{L_{3}^{2}}u^{5} + \frac{3E_{b}I_{b}}{L_{3}^{2}}u^{4} + \frac{3E_{b}I_{b}}{L_{3}}u^{4} + \frac{3E_{b}I_{b}}{L_{2}^{2}}u^{6} \\ &= \frac{3E_{b}I_{b}}}{L_{2}^{2}}\left(-\frac{1}{L_{2}}u^{3} + u^{4}\right) + \frac{2E_{b}I_{b}}{L_{3}}\left(u^{2} + \frac{3}{L_{3}}u^{3} + 2u^{4}\right) \\ f^{5} &= -\frac{6E_{b}I_{b}}{L_{4}^{2}}u^{2} + \frac{12E_{b}I_{b}}{L_{3}^{4}}u^{5} + \frac{3E_{b}I_{b}}{L_{3}^{5}}u^{5} - \frac{6E_{b}I_{b}}{L_{4}^{2}}u^{6} + \frac{3E_{b}I_{b}}{L_{5}^{2}}u^{6} \\ &= \frac{6E_{b}I_{b}}{L_{4}^{2}}\left(-u^{2} + \frac{2}{L_{4}}u^{5} - u^{6}\right) + \frac{3E_{b}I_{b}}{L_{5}^{2}}\left(\frac{1}{L_{5}}u^{5} + u^{6}\right) \end{split}$$

Figure B.1 A MDOF bridge with identified DOFs and element numbers.

DOF Number	Number of Elements	Associated Elements
1	1	1
2	3	1, 3, 4
3	2	2, 3
4	2	2, 3
5	2	4, 5
6	2	4, 5

Table B.1List of elements contributing to the restoring force associated with
each DOF.

Table B.1 shows the list of basic resisting forces that contribute to the restoring force associated with each DOF. For example, only one basic resisting force, which is from the column element (element 1), contributes to the restoring force associated with u^1 . Therefore, the total number of the basic resisting forces is N=1+3+2+2+2=12. Based on the restoring forces in the linear range, redefine the DOFs $\mathbf{u}^T = [u^1, u^2, ..., u^6]$ using linear transformation to $\overline{\mathbf{u}}^T = [\overline{u}^1, \overline{u}^2, ..., \overline{u}^{12}]$, i.e. $\overline{\mathbf{u}} = \beta \mathbf{u}$, as follows:

$$\overline{u}^{1} = \frac{2}{L_{1}}u^{1} + u^{2}, \quad \overline{u}^{2} = \frac{3}{L_{1}}u^{1} + 2u^{2}, \quad \overline{u}^{3} = 2u^{2} + \frac{3}{L_{3}}u^{3} + u^{4}, \quad \overline{u}^{4} = 2u^{2} - \frac{3}{L_{4}}u^{5} + u^{6}$$

$$\overline{u}^{5} = \frac{1}{L_{2}}u^{3} - u^{4}, \quad \overline{u}^{6} = u^{2} + \frac{2}{L_{3}}u^{3} + u^{4}, \quad \overline{u}^{7} = -\frac{1}{L_{2}}u^{3} + u^{4}, \quad \overline{u}^{8} = u^{2} + \frac{3}{L_{3}}u^{3} + 2u^{4}$$

$$\overline{u}^{9} = -u^{2} + \frac{2}{L_{4}}u^{5} - u^{6}, \quad \overline{u}^{10} = \frac{1}{L_{5}}u^{5} + u^{6}, \quad \overline{u}^{11} = u^{2} - \frac{3}{L_{4}}u^{5} + 2u^{6}, \quad \overline{u}^{12} = \frac{1}{L_{5}}u^{5} + u^{6}$$

Accordingly, the 12×6 matrix β can be written as follows:

Defining the *l*th basic resisting force q^l as a function of \overline{u}^l , $l \in [1, N]$, the restoring forces in the nonlinear range, i.e. $\mathbf{f} = \alpha \mathbf{q}$, can be written as follows:

$$f^{1} = q^{1}, \quad f^{2} = q^{2} + q^{3} + q^{4}, \quad f^{3} = q^{5} + q^{6}, \quad f^{4} = q^{7} + q^{8}, \quad f^{5} = q^{9} + q^{10}, \quad f^{6} = q^{11} + q^{12}$$

Accordingly, the 6×12 matrix α can be written as follows:

The initial bounds, i.e., lower and upper bounds for stiffening and softening systems, respectively, for the basic resisting forces based on the numerical values in Equation (5.59a), are as follows:

$$\bar{k}_{I}^{1} = \frac{6E_{c}I_{c}}{L_{1}^{2}} = 6 \times 10^{4}, \quad \bar{k}_{I}^{2} = \frac{2E_{c}I_{c}}{L_{1}} = 2 \times 10^{6}, \quad \bar{k}_{I}^{3} = \frac{2E_{b}I_{b}}{L_{3}} = 2 \times 10^{6}, \quad \bar{k}_{I}^{4} = \frac{2E_{b}I_{b}}{L_{4}} = 2 \times 10^{6}$$
$$\bar{k}_{I}^{5} = \frac{3E_{b}I_{b}}{L_{2}^{2}} = 3 \times 10^{4}, \quad \bar{k}_{I}^{6} = \frac{6E_{b}I_{b}}{L_{3}^{2}} = 6 \times 10^{4}, \quad \bar{k}_{I}^{7} = \frac{3E_{b}I_{b}}{L_{2}} = 3 \times 10^{6}, \quad \bar{k}_{I}^{8} = \frac{2E_{b}I_{b}}{L_{3}} = 2 \times 10^{6}$$
$$\bar{k}_{I}^{9} = \frac{6E_{b}I_{b}}{L_{4}^{2}} = 6 \times 10^{4}, \quad \bar{k}_{I}^{10} = \frac{3E_{b}I_{b}}{L_{5}^{2}} = 3 \times 10^{4}, \quad \bar{k}_{I}^{11} = \frac{2E_{b}I_{b}}{L_{4}} = 2 \times 10^{6}, \quad \bar{k}_{I}^{12} = \frac{3E_{b}I_{b}}{L_{5}} = 3 \times 10^{6}.$$

Therefore, the initial bound matrix $\overline{\mathbf{k}}_{I}$ is defined as $\overline{\mathbf{k}}_{I} = \text{diag}[\overline{k}_{I}^{1}, \overline{k}_{I}^{2}, ..., \overline{k}_{I}^{12}]$.

APPENDIX C DERIVATION OF α AND β FOR THE MULTI-STORY SHEAR BUILDING

This appendix presents the derivation of α and β for the MDOF shear building depicted in Figure 5.5. Due to its assumed shear mode behavior, the number of the basic resisting forces, *N*, is equal to the number of DOFs, *n*. In the linear range of this shear building, the *j*th restoring force is as follows:

$$f^{j} = -\bar{k}_{I}^{j} u^{j-1} + (\bar{k}_{I}^{j} + \bar{k}_{I}^{j+1}) u^{j} - \bar{k}_{I}^{j+1} u^{j=1} = \bar{k}_{I}^{j} (u^{j} - u^{j-1}) - \bar{k}_{I}^{j+1} (u^{j+1} - u^{j})$$

where $j = l: 1 \rightarrow n$ with $\bar{k}_{I}^{n+1} = 0$, $u^{0} = 0$ and \bar{k}_{I}^{j} is the initial stiffness of the *j*th story. For such a building, the elements of the $n \times n$ (N = n) matrices α and β are as follows:

$$\alpha_{jl} = \begin{cases} 1 & j = l, \ j : 1 \to n \\ -1 & j = l - 1, \ j : 1 \to n - 1 \\ 0 & otherwise \end{cases} \qquad \beta_{lj} = \begin{cases} 1 & l = j, \ l : 1 \to n \\ -1 & l = j + 1, \ j : 1 \to n - 1 \\ 0 & otherwise \end{cases}$$

Thus, the elements of the row vectors $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{j}$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{l}$, based on Eqs. (10) and (12), are as follows:

$$\alpha_{l}^{j} = \begin{cases} 1 & l = j, \ j: 1 \to n \\ -1 & l = j+1, \ j: 1 \to n-1 \\ 0 & otherwise \end{cases} \qquad \beta_{j}^{l} = \begin{cases} 1 & j = l, \ l: 1 \to n \\ -1 & j = l-1, \ l: 1 \to n \\ 0 & otherwise \end{cases}$$

Based on Equations (5.14) and (5.16), we have

$$f^{j} = \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{j} \mathbf{q} = q^{l} - q^{l+1}$$
$$\overline{\mathbf{u}}^{l} = \boldsymbol{\beta}^{l} \mathbf{u} = u^{j} - u^{j-1} = \Delta u^{j}$$

where $j = l: 1 \rightarrow n$ with $q^{n+1} = 0$, $u^0 = 0$ and q^j is the resisting force of the *j*th story. Therefore, the resisting force of the *j*th story, q^j , is a function of the relative displacement of the *j*th story, Δu^j .

APPENDIX D NUMERICAL RESULTS FOR THE TWO-STORY SHEAR BUILDING

This appendix documents all the numerical results for the two-story shear building (Figure 5.5 with n = 2) with stiffening and softening systems using the Lyapunov-based approach of stability analysis proposed in Chapter 5.

	[-0.0041]	0.0016	-0.0082	0.0032	-0.0030	0.0015
	0.0016	-0.0025	0.0032	-0.0050	0.0015	-0.0015
•	0.4979	0.0008	0.9959	0.0016	-0.0015	0.0008
$\mathbf{A}_{e} =$	0.0008	0.4988	0.0016	0.9975	0.0008	-0.0008
	0.5000	0.0000	1.0000	0.0000	1.0000	0.0000
	0.0000	0.5000	0.0000	1.0000	0.0000	1.0000
	0.5000	0.0000 1	.0000 0.0	0000 1.00	000 0.000	00
C =	-0.5000	0.5000 -	1.0000 1.0	0000 -1.0	000 1.000	00

Stiffening Systems

$$\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{P}^{T} = 10^{9} \times \begin{bmatrix} 0.6215 & 0.0978 & 0.5915 & 0.1951 & 0.0029 & -0.0009 \\ 0.7211 & 0.1954 & 0.7910 & -0.0016 & 0.0027 \\ 1.1845 & 0.3906 & 0.0036 & -0.0008 \\ 1.5814 & -0.0022 & 0.0043 \\ (sym) & 0.0033 & -0.0013 \\ 0.0020 \end{bmatrix}$$

 $\mathbf{B}_{e} = \mathbf{B}_{1} \boldsymbol{\alpha} = 10^{-5} \times \begin{bmatrix} 0.1504 & 0.0001 & 0.0752 & 0.0001 & 0.0000 & 0.0000 \\ -0.1503 & 0.1504 & -0.0751 & 0.0752 & 0.0000 & 0.0000 \end{bmatrix}^{T}$

Softening Systems

$$\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{P}^{T} = 10^{9} \times \begin{bmatrix} 0.6154 & 0.0890 & 0.5773 & 0.1776 & 0.0026 & -0.0008 \\ 0.7033 & 0.1779 & 0.7357 & -0.0014 & 0.0025 \\ 1.1561 & 0.3556 & 0.0034 & -0.0008 \\ 1.5068 & -0.0019 & 0.0040 \\ (sym) & 0.0027 & -0.0011 \\ 0.0016 \end{bmatrix}$$
$$\mathbf{B}_{e} = \mathbf{B}_{2}\boldsymbol{\alpha} = -\mathbf{B}_{1}\boldsymbol{\alpha}$$

170

APPENDIX E DOCUMENTATION OF THE UTILIZED GROUND MOTIONS IN CHAPTER 8

This appendix documents all the 40 pulse-like GMs utilized to demonstrate the applicability of investigated integration algorithms and nonlinear solvers. Moreover, the GMs utilized for the identification of predominantly first-mode *EDP*s under earthquake excitation are documented in this appendix.

Record Number	NGA Record Sequence Number	Earthquake Name	Station	Magnitude
1	170	Imperial Valley-06	EC County Center FF	6.53
2	171	Imperial Valley-06	EC Meloland Overpass FF	6.53
3	179	Imperial Valley-06	El Centro Array #4	6.53
4	180	Imperial Valley-06	El Centro Array #5	6.53
5	181	Imperial Valley-06	El Centro Array #6	6.53
6	182	Imperial Valley-06	El Centro Array #7	6.53
7	183	Imperial Valley-06	El Centro Array #8	6.53
8	184	Imperial Valley-06	El Centro Differential Array	6.53
9	451	Morgan Hill	Coyote Lake Dam (SW Abut)	6.19
10	763	Loma Prieta	Gilroy-Gavilan Coll.	6.93
11	779	Loma Prieta	LGPC	6.93
12	879	Landers	Lucerne	7.28
13	900	Landers	Yermo Fire Station	7.28
14	982	Northridge-01	Jensen Filter Plant	6.69
15	983	Northridge-01	Jensen Filter Plant Generator	6.69
16	1044	Northridge-01	Newhall-Fire Sta	6.69
17	1045	Northridge-01	Newhall - W Pico Canyon Rd.	6.69
18	1063	Northridge-01	Rinaldi Receiving Sta	6.69
19	1084	Northridge-01	Sylmar-Converter Sta	6.69
20	1085	Northridge-01	Sylmar-Converter Sta East	6.69
21	1086	Northridge-01	Sylmar-Olive View Med FF	6.69
22	1106	Kobe, Japan	KJMA	6.90
23	1119	Kobe, Japan	Takarazuka	6.90
24	1161	Kocaeli, Turkey	Gebze	7.51
25	1197	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY028	7.62
26	1244	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY101	7.62
27	1489	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU049	7.62
28	1492	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU052	7.62
29	1493	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU053	7.62
30	1494	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU054	7.62
31	1505	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU068	7.62
32	1510	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU075	7.62
33	1511	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU076	7.62
34	1515	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU082	7.62
35	1519	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU087	7.62
36	1528	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU101	7.62
37	1529	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU102	7.62
38	1530	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU103	7.62
39	1546	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU122	7.62
40	1595	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	WGK	7.62

 Table E.1
 Documentation of 40 pulse-like GMs.

Record Number	NGA Record Sequence Number	Earthquake Name	Station	Magnitude	Scaling Factor
1	974	Northridge-01	Glendale-Las Palmas	6.69	1.65
2	1454	Chi-Chi. Taiwan	TAP090	7.62	0.73
3	2116	Denali, Alaska	TAPS Pump Station #12	7.90	2.03
4	1427	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TAP035	7.62	1.20
5	323	Coalinga-01	Parkfield-Cholame 12W	6.36	2.27
6	1211	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY052	7.62	1.23
7	756	Loma Prieta	Dublin-Fire Station	6.93	1.48
8	464	Morgan Hill	Hollister Diff Array #3	6.19	1.67
9	1293	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	HWA046	7.62	1.68
10	1275	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	HWA026	7.62	1.60
11	1797	Hector Mine	LA-City Terrace	7.13	2.67
12	1206	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY042	7.62	1.36
13	2472	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03	CHY046	6.20	2.30
14	184	Imperial Valley-06	El Centro Differential Array	6.53	0.37
15	1256	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	HWA002	7.62	2.29
16	993	Northridge-01	LA-Fletcher Dr	6.69	0.71
17	1574	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TTN022	7.62	1.46
18	1277	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	HWA028	7.62	0.92
19	881	Landers	Morongo Valley	7.28	0.56
20	1094	Northridge-01	West Covina-S Orange Ave	7.62	2.23
21	1541	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU116	7.62	0.68
22	1349	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	ILA066	7.62	1.19
23	1318	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	ILA014	7.62	1.47
24	779	Loma Prieta	LGPC	6.93	0.17
25	1068	Northridge-01	San Bernardino-Co Service	6.69	2.94
26	1247	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	HWA025	7.62	1.18
27	1795	Hector Mine	Joshua Tree N.MKeys View	7.62	2.53
28	760	Loma Prieta	Foster City-Menhaden Court	6.93	0.71
29	2743	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-04	CHY087	6.20	2.24
30	1433	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TAP047	7.62	2.03
31	3342	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-06	HWA029	6.30	2.27
32	1547	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU123	7.62	0.75
33	1452	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TAP086	7.62	2.55
34	1295	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	HWA049	7.62	1.25
35	126	Gazli, USSR	Karakyr	6.80	0.30
36	266	Victoria, Mexico	Chihuahua	6.33	0.98
37	549	Chalfant Valley-02	Bishop-LADWP South St	6.19	0.92
38	749	Loma Prieta	Berkeley-Strawberry Canyon	6.93	2.58
39	1019	Northridge-01	Lake Hughes #1	6.69	1.11
40	1789	Hector Mine	Hesperia-4th & Palm	7.13	2.09

Table E.2Documentation of 40 GMs of CMS group of Bridge A with Type I
abutment modeling for 50% POE in 50 years.

Record Number	NGA Record Sequence Number	Earthquake Name	Station	Magnitude	Scaling Factor
1	974	Northridge-01	Glendale-Las Palmas	6.69	1.24
2	1221	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY052	7.62	0.63
3	860	Landers	Hemet Fire Station	7.28	2.68
4	2490	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03	CHY074	6.20	1.40
5	1242	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY099	7.62	1.64
б	1427	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TAP035	7.62	1.43
7	1587	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TTN042	7.62	2.10
8	1271	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	HWA022	7.62	1.08
9	1256	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	HWA002	7.62	1.89
10	1155	Kocaeli, Turkey	Bursa Tofas	7.51	0.91
11	2699	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-04	CHY024	6.20	2.06
12	2694	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-04	CHY015	6.20	1.16
13	1291	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	HWA044	7.62	1.69
14	851	Landers	Downey-Co Maint Bldg	7.28	2.81
15	1177	Kocaeli, Turkey	Zeytinburnu	7.51	0.98
16	753	Loma Prieta	Corralitos	6.93	0.23
17	3313	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-06	CHY094	6.30	1.90
18	1452	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TAP086	7.62	2.41
19	1791	Hector Mine	Indio-Coachella Canal	7.13	1.29
20	1120	Kobe, Japan	Takatori	6.90	0.21
21	1211	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY052	7.62	0.96
22	734	Loma Prieta	APEEL 3E Hayward CSUH	6.93	2.07
23	990	Northridge-01	LA-City Terrace	6.69	0.96
24	1318	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	ILA014	7.62	1.41
25	1019	Northridge-01	Lake Hughes #1	6.69	1.24
26	1541	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU116	7.62	0.69
27	1775	Hector Mine	Castaic-Old Ridge Route	7.13	2.57
28	3503	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-06	TCU122	6.30	1.42
29	1426	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TAP034	7.62	2.13
30	1279	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	HWA030	7.62	1.61
31	796	Loma Prieta	SF-Presidio	6.93	0.96
32	964	Northridge-01	Compton-Castlegate St	6.69	1.47
33	1198	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY029	7.62	0.36
34	850	Landers	Desert Hot Springs	7.28	1.02
35	1445	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TAP075	7.62	1.72
36	993	Northridge-01	LA-Fletcher Dr	6.69	0.56
37	1210	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY050	7.62	1.91
38	2465	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03	CHY034	6.20	1.56
39	1345	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	ILA061	7.62	2.22
40	1528	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU101	7.62	0.53

Table E.3Documentation of 40 GMs of CMS group of Bridge A with Type II
abutment modeling for 50% POE in 50 years.

Record Number	NGA Record Sequence Number	Earthquake Name	Station	Magnitude	Scaling Factor
1	1238	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY092	7.62	2.43
2	1350	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	ILA067	7.62	1.48
3	547	Chalfant Valley-01	Zack Brothers Ranch	5.77	1.81
4	1176	Kocaeli, Turkey	Yarimca	7.51	0.80
5	838	Landers	Barstow	7.28	1.97
6	900	Landers	Yermo Fire Station	7.28	1.29
7	778	Loma Prieta	Hollister Diff. Array	6.93	0.68
8	1243	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY100	7.62	2.61
9	773	Loma Prieta	Hayward-BART Sta	6.93	2.74
10	1317	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	ILA013	7.62	1.03
11	1329	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	ILA037	7.62	2.45
12	1605	Duzce, Turkey	Duzce	7.14	0.45
13	162	Imperial Valley-06	Calexico Fire Station	6.53	1.70
14	1268	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	HWA017	7.62	2.48
15	756	Loma Prieta	Dublin-Fire Station	6.93	2.90
16	762	Loma Prieta	Fremont-Mission San Jose	6.93	2.34
17	779	Loma Prieta	LGPC	6.93	0.33
18	1206	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY042	7.62	2.66
19	139	Tabas, Iran	Dayhook	7.35	1.40
20	3271	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-06	CHY032	6.30	2.46
21	1303	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	HWA058	7.62	2.18
22	1234	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY086	7.62	1.25
23	1349	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	ILA066	7.62	2.34
24	170	Imperial Valley-06	EC County Center FF	6.53	0.98
25	467	Morgan Hill	Hollister Diff. Array	6.19	2.51
26	1784	Hector Mine	Frink	7.13	2.77
27	1490	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU050	7.62	1.37
28	1263	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	HWA012	7.62	2.53
29	761	Loma Prieta	Fremont-Emerson Court	6.93	1.80
30	772	Loma Prieta	Halls Valley	6.93	1.63
31	1149	Kocaeli, Turkey	Atakoy	7.51	2.84
32	1810	Hector Mine	Mecca-CVWD Yard	7.13	1.98
33	2715	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-04	CHY047	6.20	2.67
34	3276	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-06	CHY037	6.30	1.79
35	1187	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY015	7.62	1.36
36	2714	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-04	CHY046	6.20	2.64
37	1489	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU049	7.62	1.08
38	1048	Northridge-01	Northridge-17645 Saticoy St	6.69	0.73
39	850	Landers	Desert Hot Springs	7.28	1.71
40	1536	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU110	7.62	1.00

Table E.4Documentation of 40 GMs of CMS group of Bridge A with Type I
abutment modeling for 10% POE in 50 years.

Record Number	NGA Record Sequence Number	Earthquake Name	Station	Magnitude	Scaling Factor
1	1336	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	ILA048	7.62	1.90
2	3312	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-06	CHY093	6.30	2.92
3	2110	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-02	CHY111	5.90	2.52
4	1332	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	ILA042	7.62	2.03
5	1481	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU038	7.62	1.38
6	1350	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	ILA067	7.62	1.36
7	183	Imperial Valley-06	El Centro Array #8	6.53	0.73
8	1528	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU101	7.62	1.03
9	1810	Hector Mine	Mecca-CVWD Yard	7.13	1.79
10	126	Gazli, USSR	Karakyr	6.80	0.52
11	1211	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY052	7.62	1.88
12	1074	Northridge-01	Sandberg - Bald Mtn	6.69	2.71
13	1508	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU072	7.62	0.51
14	1293	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	HWA046	7.62	2.60
15	1187	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY015	7.62	1.42
16	3503	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-06	TCU122	6.30	2.78
17	1478	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU033	7.62	1.69
18	1206	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY042	7.62	2.89
19	3473	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-06	TCU078	6.30	1.05
20	801	Loma Prieta	San Jose-Santa Teresa Hills	6.93	1.08
21	3271	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-06	CHY032	6.30	2.08
22	1555	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU147	7.62	2.13
23	465	Morgan Hill	Hollister Diff Array #4	6.19	2.96
24	2461	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03	CHY028	6.20	1.68
25	2458	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03	CHY025	6.20	2.43
26	3510	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-06	TCU139	6.30	2.14
27	983	Northridge-01	Jensen Filter Plant Generator	6.69	0.58
28	1295	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	HWA049	7.62	2.54
29	1509	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU074	7.62	0.46
30	754	Loma Prieta	Coyote Lake Dam (Downst)	6.93	1.83
31	1049	Northridge-01	Pacific Palisades-Sunset	6.69	1.41
32	300	Irpinia, Italy-02	Calitri	6.20	1.34
33	1177	Kocaeli, Turkey	Zeytinburnu	7.51	1.92
34	2715	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-04	CHY047	6.20	2.50
35	1791	Hector Mine	Indio-Coachella Canal	7.13	2.53
36	1263	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	HWA012	7.62	2.70
37	1427	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TAP035	7.62	2.80
38	832	Landers	Amboy	7.28	2.36
39	1087	Northridge-01	Tarzana-Cedar Hill A	6.69	0.22
40	1546	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU122	7.62	1.13

Table E.5Documentation of 40 GMs of CMS group of Bridge A with Type II
abutment modeling for 10% POE in 50 years.

Record Number	NGA Record Sequence Number	Earthquake Name	Station	Magnitude	Scaling Factor
1	1520	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU088	7.62	2.39
2	1186	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY014	7.62	1.03
3	182	Imperial Valley-06	El Centro Array #7	6.53	0.81
4	1045	Northridge-01	Newhall-W Pico Canyon Rd.	6.69	1.36
5	1155	Kocaeli, Turkey	Bursa Tofas	7.51	2.43
6	1234	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY086	7.62	2.08
7	1794	Hector Mine	Joshua Tree	7.13	2.87
8	1282	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	HWA033	7.62	2.41
9	2632	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03	TCU084	6.20	2.59
10	776	Loma Prieta	Hollister-South & Pine	6.93	1.32
11	779	Loma Prieta	LGPC	6.93	0.54
12	821	Erzican, Turkey	Erzincan	6.69	0.95
13	900	Landers	Yermo Fire Station	7.28	2.15
14	1489	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU049	7.62	1.79
15	1454	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TAP090	7.62	2.38
16	1297	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	HWA051	7.62	2.87
17	1204	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY039	7.62	2.81
18	1120	Kobe, Japan	Takatori	6.90	0.66
19	1509	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU074	7.62	0.52
20	1493	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU053	7.62	1.94
21	1495	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU055	7.62	1.82
22	761	Loma Prieta	Fremont-Emerson Court	6.93	2.98
23	1158	Kocaeli, Turkey	Duzce	7.51	1.38
24	723	Superstition Hills-02	Parachute Test Site	6.54	1.06
25	803	Loma Prieta	Saratoga-W Valley Coll.	6.93	1.47
26	1198	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY029	7.62	1.16
27	1201	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY034	7.62	1.09
28	316	Westmorland	Parachute Test Site	5.90	1.99
29	1521	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU089	7.62	1.92
30	1044	Northridge-01	Newhall-Fire Sta	6.69	0.62
31	772	Loma Prieta	Halls Valley	6.93	2.71
32	1187	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY015	7.62	2.26
33	881	Landers	Morongo Valley	7.28	1.84
34	796	Loma Prieta	SF-Presidio	6.93	2.26
35	558	Chalfant Valley-02	Zack Brothers Ranch	6.19	0.84
36	1300	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	HWA055	7.62	2.84
37	1529	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU102	7.62	1.26
38	1481	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU038	7.62	2.43
39	1490	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU050	7.62	2.28
40	755	Loma Prieta	Coyote Lake Dam (SW Abut)	6.93	1.67

Table E.6Documentation of 40 GMs of CMS group of Bridge A with Type I
abutment modeling for 2% POE in 50 years.

Record Number	NGA Record Sequence Number	Earthquake Name	Station	Magnitude	Scaling Factor
1	1205	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY041	7.62	0.79
2	1088	Northridge-01	Terminal Island-S Seaside	6.69	2.57
3	412	Coalinga-05	Pleasant Valley P.Pyard	5.77	1.91
4	1350	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	ILA067	7.62	2.22
5	1201	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY034	7.62	0.92
6	1116	Kobe, Japan	Shin-Osaka	6.90	1.36
7	1481	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU038	7.62	2.25
8	184	Imperial Valley-06	El Centro Differential Array	6.53	1.26
9	755	Loma Prieta	Coyote Lake Dam (SW Abut)	6.93	1.48
10	1509	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU074	7.62	0.76
11	801	Loma Prieta	San Jose-Santa Teresa Hills	6.93	1.77
12	779	Loma Prieta	LGPC	6.93	0.61
13	1456	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TAP095	7.62	2.08
14	900	Landers	Yermo Fire Station	7.28	2.67
15	1434	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TAP049	7.62	2.92
16	1810	Hector Mine	Mecca-CVWD Yard	7.13	2.93
17	730	Spitak, Armenia	Gukasian	6.77	2.99
18	1155	Kocaeli, Turkey	Bursa Tofas	7.51	2.93
19	1317	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	ILA013	7.62	1.48
20	1234	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY086	7.62	2.10
21	1165	Kocaeli, Turkey	Izmit	7.51	1.96
22	986	Northridge-01	LA-Brentwood VA Hospital	6.69	2.00
23	1519	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU087	7.62	2.42
24	1292	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	HWA045	7.62	2.79
25	1508	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU072	7.62	0.83
26	1009	Northridge-01	LA-Wadsworth VA Hospital	6.69	2.2
27	1529	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU102	7.62	1.52
28	1187	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY015	7.62	2.33
29	1493	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU053	7.62	2.10
30	2461	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03	CHY028	6.20	2.75
31	1282	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	HWA033	7.62	2.55
32	1495	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU055	7.62	1.76
33	731	Loma Prieta	APEEL 10-Skyline	6.93	2.85
34	776	Loma Prieta	Hollister-South & Pine	6.93	1.38
35	778	Loma Prieta	Hollister Diff. Array	6.93	1.27
36	1158	Kocaeli, Turkey	Duzce	7.51	1.27
37	1515	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU082	7.62	1.70
38	1048	Northridge-01	Northridge-17645 Saticov St	6.69	1.08
39	1227	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY074	7.62	1.86
40	2467	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03	CHY036	6.20	2.94

Table E.7Documentation of 40 GMs of CMS group of Bridge A with Type II
abutment modeling for 2% POE in 50 years.

Record Number	NGA Record Sequence Number	Earthquake Name	Station	Magnitude	Scaling Factor
1	2650	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03	TCU116	6.20	3.00
2	2899	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-04	TCU141	6.20	1.60
3	1177	Kocaeli, Turkey	Zeytinburnu	7.51	2.70
4	900	Landers	Yermo Fire Station	7.28	0.80
5	1164	Kocaeli, Turkey	Istanbul	7.51	2.90
6	1315	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	ILA010	7.62	3.00
7	1799	Hector Mine	LA-Obregon Park	7.13	2.80
8	1531	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU104	7.62	0.50
9	1148	Kocaeli, Turkey	Arcelik	7.51	1.20
10	2756	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-04	CHY114	6.20	2.80
11	2695	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-04	CHY016	6.20	2.60
12	1350	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	ILA067	7.62	1.10
13	761	Loma Prieta	Fremont-Emerson Court	6.93	2.20
14	439	Borah Peak, ID-01	TAN-719	6.88	2.80
15	803	Loma Prieta	Saratoga-W Valley Coll.	6.93	0.60
16	2655	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03	TCU122	6.20	1.50
17	1577	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TTN025	7.62	2.70
18	833	Landers	Anaheim-W Ball Rd	7.28	2.30
19	776	Loma Prieta	Hollister-South & Pine	6.93	0.70
20	946	Northridge-01	Antelope Buttes	6.69	2.00
21	1049	Northridge-01	Pacific Palisades-Sunset	6.69	1.20
22	1783	Hector Mine	Fort Irwin	7.13	1.10
23	2706	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-04	CHY032	6.20	2.60
24	1762	Hector Mine	Amboy	7.13	1.00
25	780	Loma Prieta	Larkspur Ferry Terminal (FF)	6.93	2.30
26	1358	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	KAU012	7.62	1.90
27	751	Loma Prieta	Calaveras Reservoir	6.93	1.30
28	1206	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY042	7.62	1.90
29	1400	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	NCU	7.62	1.70
30	28	Parkfield	Cholame-Shandon Array #12	6.19	1.40
31	333	Coalinga-01	Parkfield-Cholame 8W	6.36	2.90
32	2994	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-05	CHY116	6.20	2.80
33	1503	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU065	7.62	0.70
34	2646	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03	TCU109	6.20	2.10
35	792	Loma Prieta	SF-1295 Shafter	6.93	1.20
36	247	Mammoth Lakes-06	Bishop-Paradise Lodge	5.94	2.10
37	2639	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03	TCU100	6.20	2.40
38	855	Landers	Fort Irwin	7.28	1.50
39	1551	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU138	7.62	0.60
40	1434	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TAP049	7.62	1.40

Table E.8Documentation of 40 GMs of reference group of Bridge A for 50%
POE in 50 years.

Record Number	NGA Record Sequence Number	Earthquake Name	Station	Magnitude	Scaling Factor
1	1310	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	ILA004	7.62	2.60
2	1201	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY034	7.62	3.00
3	1472	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU017	7.62	2.30
4	1488	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU048	7.62	1.10
5	1147	Kocaeli, Turkey	Ambarli	7.51	1.50
6	1244	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY101	7.62	0.60
7	1476	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU029	7.62	1.10
8	1794	Hector Mine	Joshua Tree	7.13	3.00
9	171	Imperial Valley-06	EC Meloland Overpass FF	6.53	1.70
10	1234	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY086	7.62	2.20
11	143	Tabas, Iran	Tabas	7.35	0.30
12	1350	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	ILA067	7.62	0.80
13	888	Landers	San Bernardino-E Hospitality	7.28	2.30
14	1614	Duzce, Turkey	Lamont 1061	7.14	2.90
15	126	Gazli, USSR	Karakyr	6.80	0.50
16	880	Landers	Mission Creek Fault	7.28	2.70
17	285	Irpinia, Italy-01	Bagnoli Irpinio	6.90	1.60
18	3509	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-06	TCU138	6.30	2.40
19	1193	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY024	7.62	1.20
20	825	Cape Mendocino	Cape Mendocino	7.01	0.60
21	767	Loma Prieta	Gilroy Array #3	6.93	0.60
22	1493	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU053	7.62	2.30
23	3266	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-06	CHY026	6.30	1.90
24	2458	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03	CHY025	6.20	1.10
25	184	Imperial Valley-06	El Centro Differential Array	6.53	0.80
26	1148	Kocaeli, Turkey	Arcelik	7.51	1.70
27	1116	Kobe, Japan	Shin-Osaka	6.90	1.90
28	1507	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU071	7.62	1.10
29	730	Spitak, Armenia	Gukasian	6.77	1.60
30	900	Landers	Yermo Fire Station	7.28	2.00
31	2655	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03	TCU122	6.20	0.70
32	755	Loma Prieta	Coyote Lake Dam (SW Abut)	6.93	2.60
33	1547	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU123	7.62	2.60
34	185	Imperial Valley-06	Holtville Post Office	6.53	1.40
35	879	Landers	Lucerne	7.28	1.20
36	1503	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU065	7.62	0.50
37	1521	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU089	7.62	0.70
38	2473	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03	CHY047	6.20	2.70
39	1495	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU055	7.62	2.00
40	1491	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU051	7.62	1.40

Table E.9Documentation of 40 GMs of reference group of Bridge A for 10%
POE in 50 years.

Record Number	NGA Record Sequence Number	Earthquake Name	Station	Magnitude	Scaling Factor
1	190	Imperial Valley-06	Superstition Mtn Camera	6.53	1.90
2	1476	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU029	7.62	1.90
3	1486	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU046	7.62	2.00
4	900	Landers	Yermo Fire Station	7.28	2.00
5	1505	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU068	7.62	0.80
6	1147	Kocaeli, Turkey	Ambarli	7.51	3.00
7	1521	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU089	7.62	2.40
8	1503	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU065	7.62	0.50
9	1478	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU033	7.62	2.70
10	1176	Kocaeli, Turkey	Yarimca	7.51	2.40
11	170	Imperial Valley-06	EC County Center FF	6.53	2.30
12	1511	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU076	7.62	2.30
13	285	Irpinia, Italy-01	Bagnoli Irpinio	6.90	2.80
14	1541	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU116	7.62	2.60
15	1488	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU048	7.62	1.70
16	1244	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY101	7.62	0.90
17	723	Superstition Hills-02	Parachute Test Site	6.54	2.30
18	879	Landers	Lucerne	7.28	1.60
19	728	Superstition Hills-02	Westmorland Fire Sta	6.54	2.50
20	182	Imperial Valley-06	El Centro Array #7	6.53	2.80
21	779	Loma Prieta	LGPC	6.93	1.00
22	1149	Kocaeli, Turkey	Atakoy	7.51	2.80
23	1048	Northridge-01	Northridge-17645 Saticoy St	6.69	1.20
24	1529	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU102	7.62	1.90
25	1525	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU096	7.62	3.00
26	126	Gazli, USSR	Karakyr	6.80	0.70
27	803	Loma Prieta	Saratoga-W Valley Coll.	6.93	1.80
28	184	Imperial Valley-06	El Centro Differential Array	6.53	3.00
29	721	Superstition Hills-02	El Centro Imp. Co. Cent	6.54	2.30
30	1534	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU107	7.62	2.60
31	1762	Hector Mine	Amboy	7.13	2.80
32	1297	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	HWA051	7.62	2.40
33	175	Imperial Valley-06	El Centro Array #12	6.53	2.30
34	1158	Kocaeli, Turkey	Duzce	7.51	2.70
35	1198	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY029	7.62	2.20
36	1546	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU122	7.62	2.40
37	1111	Kobe, Japan	Nishi-Akashi	6.90	1.90
38	3472	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-06	TCU076	6.30	2.40
39	1527	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU100	7.62	2.10
40	776	Loma Prieta	Hollister-South & Pine	6.93	1.60

Table E.10Documentation of 40 GMs of reference group of Bridge A for 2%
POE in 50 years.

Record Number	NGA Record Sequence Number	Earthquake Name	Station	Magnitude	Scaling Factor
1	2709	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-04	CHY035	6.20	1.05
2	354	Coalinga-01	Parkfield-Gold Hill 5W	6.36	2.13
3	900	Landers	Yermo Fire Station	7.28	0.73
4	12	Kern County	LA-Hollywood Stor FF	7.36	2.95
5	1551	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU138	7.62	0.77
6	1267	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	HWA016	7.62	2.12
7	838	Landers	Barstow	7.28	1.52
8	126	Gazli, USSR	Karakyr	6.80	0.46
9	1297	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	HWA051	7.62	1.22
10	993	Northridge-01	LA-Fletcher Dr	6.69	1.68
11	1092	Northridge-01	Ventura-Harbor & California	6.69	1.77
12	2490	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03	CHY074	6.20	2.98
13	762	Loma Prieta	Fremont-Mission San Jose	6.93	2.52
14	1262	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	HWA011	7.62	1.15
15	885	Landers	Pomona-4th & Locust FF	7.28	2.29
16	1791	Hector Mine	Indio-Coachella Canal	7.13	1.36
17	1177	Kocaeli, Turkey	Zeytinburnu	7.51	2.05
18	892	Landers	Sun Valley-Roscoe Blvd	7.28	2.95
19	1206	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY042	7.62	1.62
20	721	Superstition Hills-02	El Centro Imp. Co. Cent	6.54	0.78
21	1817	Hector Mine	North Shore - Durmid	7.13	2.39
22	266	Superstition Hills-02	El Centro Imp. Co. Cent	6.54	1.56
23	882	Landers	North Palm Springs	7.28	1.65
24	803	Loma Prieta	Saratoga-W Valley Coll.	6.93	0.41
25	1349	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	ILA066	7.62	2.35
26	1155	Kocaeli, Turkey	Bursa Tofas	7.51	1.17
27	1511	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU076	7.62	0.58
28	1459	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TAP100	7.62	1.36
29	2459	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03	CHY026	6.20	2.79
30	1275	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	HWA026	7.62	2.33
31	759	Loma Prieta	Foster City-APEEL 1	6.93	0.49
32	1243	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY100	7.62	2.14
33	1337	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	ILA049	7.62	1.22
34	1454	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TAP090	7.62	0.94
35	1489	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU049	7.62	0.75
36	730	Spitak, Armenia	Gukasian	6.77	1.21
37	2467	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03	CHY036	6.20	2.00
38	1334	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	ILA044	7.62	0.95
39	1476	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU029	7.62	1.34
40	2461	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03	CHY028	6.20	0.91

Table E.11Documentation of 40 GMs of CMS group of Bridge B for 50% POE in
50 years.

Record Number	NGA Record Sequence Number	Earthquake Name	Station	Magnitude	Scaling Factor
1	1080	Northridge-01	Simi Valley-Katherine Rd	6.69	1.04
2	1297	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	HWA051	7.62	2.64
3	1113	Kobe, Japan	OSAJ	6.90	2.55
4	900	Landers	Yermo Fire Station	7.28	1.58
5	827	Cape Mendocino	Fortuna-Fortuna Blvd	7.01	2.95
6	1550	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU136	7.62	1.38
7	1155	Kocaeli, Turkey	Bursa Tofas	7.51	2.52
8	1317	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	ILA013	7.62	2.14
9	1492	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU052	7.62	0.53
10	1530	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU103	7.62	2.08
11	1529	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU102	7.62	0.91
12	1534	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU107	7.62	1.73
13	1472	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU017	7.62	2.37
14	182	Imperial Valley-06	El Centro Array #7	6.53	0.93
15	1414	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TAP008	7.62	2.62
16	1204	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY039	7.62	2.96
17	856	Landers	Fountain Valley-Euclid	7.28	2.97
18	776	Loma Prieta	Hollister-South & Pine	6.93	0.91
19	1295	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	HWA049	7.62	2.58
20	1149	Kocaeli, Turkey	Atakoy	7.51	2.42
21	1264	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	HWA013	7.62	1.78
22	1787	Hector Mine	Hector	7.13	1.23
23	803	Loma Prieta	Saratoga-W Valley Coll.	6.93	0.89
24	1459	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TAP100	7.62	2.93
25	126	Gazli, USSR	Karakyr	6.80	1.00
26	1044	Northridge-01	Newhall-Fire Sta	6.69	0.63
27	1489	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU049	7.62	1.63
28	170	Imperial Valley-06	EC County Center FF	6.53	1.59
29	1329	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	ILA037	7.62	2.96
30	3265	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-06	CHY025	6.30	2.59
31	864	Landers	Joshua Tree	7.28	1.04
32	1262	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	HWA011	7.62	2.49
33	1234	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY086	7.62	2.32
34	1536	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU110	7.62	1.34
35	1147	Kocaeli, Turkey	Ambarli	7.51	1.29
36	1509	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU074	7.62	0.61
37	1039	Northridge-01	Moorpark-Fire Sta	6.69	2.31
38	285	Irpinia, Italy-01	Bagnoli Irpinio	6.90	2.06
39	1541	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU116	7.62	1.49
40	1334	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	ILA044	7.62	2.06

Table E.12Documentation of 40 GMs of CMS group of Bridge B for 10% POE in
50 years.

Record Number	NGA Record Sequence Number	Earthquake Name	Station	Magnitude	Scaling Factor
1	1419	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TAP017	7.62	2.35
2	732	Loma Prieta	APEEL 2-Redwood City	6.93	1.07
3	1264	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	HWA013	7.62	2.79
4	1410	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TAP003	7.62	2.48
5	1492	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU052	7.62	0.83
6	776	Loma Prieta	Hollister-South & Pine	6.93	1.43
7	1044	Northridge-01	Newhall-Fire Sta	6.69	0.99
8	1201	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY034	7.62	1.78
9	341	Coalinga-01	Parkfield-Fault Zone 2	6.36	2.85
10	1084	Northridge-01	Sylmar - Converter Sta	6.69	0.58
11	759	Loma Prieta	Foster City-APEEL 1	6.93	1.66
12	1045	Northridge-01	Newhall-W Pico Canyon Rd.	6.69	1.34
13	300	Irpinia, Italy-02	Calitri	6.20	2.17
14	1411	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TAP005	7.62	2.23
15	1504	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU067	7.62	1.22
16	780	Loma Prieta	Larkspur Ferry Terminal (FF)	6.93	2.42
17	1547	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU123	7.62	2.19
18	744	Loma Prieta	Bear Valley #12	6.93	1.81
19	1517	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU084	7.62	0.69
20	1529	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU102	7.62	1.43
21	1147	Kocaeli, Turkey	Ambarli	7.51	2.02
22	1182	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY006	7.62	1.53
23	1509	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU074	7.62	0.96
24	1116	Kobe, Japan	Shin-Osaka	6.90	2.75
25	900	Landers	Yermo Fire Station	7.28	2.48
26	1498	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU059	7.62	1.88
27	182	Imperial Valley-06	El Centro Array #7	6.53	1.46
28	771	Loma Prieta	Golden Gate Bridge	6.93	2.68
29	803	Loma Prieta	Saratoga-W Valley Coll.	6.93	1.40
30	126	Gazli, USSR	Karakyr	6.80	1.57
31	1536	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU110	7.62	2.11
32	864	Landers	Joshua Tree	7.28	1.63
33	1292	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	HWA045	7.62	2.35
34	527	N. Palm Springs	Morongo Valley	6.06	2.32
35	1550	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU136	7.62	2.16
36	1457	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TAP097	7.62	2.85
37	1120	Kobe, Japan	Takatori	6.90	0.51
38	1503	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU065	7.62	0.78
39	723	Superstition Hills-02	Parachute Test Site	6.54	1.24
40	1541	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU116	7.62	2.34

Table E.13Documentation of 40 GMs of CMS group of Bridge B for 2% POE in
50 years.

Record Number	NGA Record Sequence Number	Earthquake Name	Station	Magnitude	Scaling Factor
1	2497	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03	CHY082	6.20	1.40
2	1536	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU110	7.62	1.60
3	900	Landers	Yermo Fire Station	7.28	1.20
4	1397	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	KAU086	7.28	3.00
5	186	Imperial Valley-06	Niland Fire Station	6.53	2.00
6	2700	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-04	CHY025	6.20	2.10
7	879	Landers	Lucerne	7.28	0.40
8	880	Landers	Mission Creek Fault	7.28	0.60
9	1011	Northridge-01	LA-Wonderland Ave	6.69	2.10
10	1147	Kocaeli, Turkey	Ambarli	7.51	1.00
11	1553	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU141	7.28	1.10
12	1505	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU068	7.28	0.40
13	126	Gazli, USSR	Karakyr	6.80	0.50
14	728	Superstition Hills-02	Westmorland Fire Sta	6.54	1.30
15	1791	Hector Mine	Indio-Coachella Canal	7.13	2.30
16	762	Loma Prieta	Fremont-Mission San Jose	6.93	0.80
17	1148	Kocaeli, Turkey	Arcelik	7.51	1.50
18	1267	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	HWA016	7.28	1.90
19	2893	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-04	TCU122	6.20	2.00
20	549	Chalfant Valley-02	Bishop-LADWP South St	6.19	1.40
21	862	Landers	Indio-Coachella Canal	7.28	2.60
22	2115	Denali, Alaska	TAPS Pump Station #11	7.90	2.40
23	1057	Northridge-01	Playa Del Rey-Saran	6.69	1.50
24	739	Loma Prieta	Anderson Dam (Downstream)	6.93	1.40
25	293	Irpinia, Italy-01	Torre Del Greco	6.90	3.00
26	767	Loma Prieta	Gilroy Array #3	6.93	0.60
27	1193	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY024	7.28	1.00
28	1297	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	HWA051	7.28	1.80
29	171	Imperial Valley-06	EC Meloland Overpass FF	6.53	1.10
30	1074	Northridge-01	Sandberg - Bald Mtn	6.69	2.50
31	778	Loma Prieta	Hollister Diff. Array	6.93	2.00
32	2715	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-04	CHY047	6.20	2.30
33	1762	Hector Mine	Amboy	7.13	1.70
34	1113	Kobe, Japan	OSAJ	6.90	3.00
35	1324	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	ILA030	7.28	1.90
36	1158	Kocaeli, Turkey	Duzce	7.51	0.60
37	1552	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU140	7.28	2.90
38	1287	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	HWA038	7.28	2.50
39	1776	Hector Mine	Desert Hot Springs	7.13	2.20
40	761	Loma Prieta	Fremont-Emerson Court	6.93	2.60

Table E.14Documentation of 40 GMs of reference group of Bridge B for 50%
POE in 50 years.

Record Number	NGA Record Sequence Number	Earthquake Name	Station	Magnitude	Scaling Factor
1	587	New Zealand-02	Matahina Dam	5.99	3.00
2	755	Loma Prieta	Coyote Lake Dam (SW Abut)	6.93	3.00
3	1528	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU101	7.62	2.50
4	1762	Hector Mine	Amboy	7.13	2.50
5	161	Imperial Valley-06	Brawley Airport	6.53	2.10
6	1488	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU048	7.62	1.40
7	183	Imperial Valley-06	El Centro Array #8	6.53	1.20
8	2115	Denali, Alaska	TAPS Pump Station #11	7.90	3.00
9	1481	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU038	7.62	1.70
10	1147	Kocaeli, Turkey	Ambarli	7.51	1.70
11	143	Tabas, Iran	Tabas	7.35	0.60
12	1492	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU052	7.62	2.40
13	1509	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU074	7.62	1.30
14	2752	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-04	CHY101	6.20	3.00
15	900	Landers	Yermo Fire Station	7.28	2.40
16	1531	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU104	7.62	2.70
17	985	Northridge-01	LA-Baldwin Hills	6.69	2.20
18	1505	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU068	7.62	0.70
19	1483	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU040	7.62	3.00
20	1547	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU123	7.62	3.00
21	827	Cape Mendocino	Fortuna-Fortuna Blvd	7.01	2.30
22	855	Landers	Fort Irwin	7.28	2.30
23	1501	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU063	7.62	2.30
24	1201	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY034	7.62	1.30
25	1198	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY029	7.62	3.00
26	1503	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU065	7.62	1.00
27	1263	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	HWA012	7.62	3.00
28	723	Superstition Hills-02	Parachute Test Site	6.54	2.40
29	1471	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU015	7.62	1.00
30	803	Loma Prieta	Saratoga-W Valley Coll.	6.93	1.60
31	179	Imperial Valley-06	El Centro Array #4	6.53	2.10
32	1553	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU141	7.62	2.20
33	266	Victoria, Mexico	Chihuahua	6.33	2.10
34	730	Spitak, Armenia	Gukasian	6.77	2.60
35	719	Superstition Hills-02	Brawley Airport	6.54	1.70
36	1545	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU120	7.62	1.30
37	171	Imperial Valley-06	EC Meloland Overpass FF	6.53	1.50
38	1476	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU029	7.62	2.80
39	2710	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-04	CHY036	6.20	3.00
40	1045	Northridge-01	Newhall-W Pico Canyon Rd.	6.69	2.20

Table E.15Documentation of 40 GMs of reference group of Bridge B for 10%
POE in 50 years.

Record Number	NGA Record Sequence Number	Earthquake Name	Station	Magnitude	Scaling Factor
1	1468	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU010	7.62	2.90
2	1477	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU031	7.62	3.00
3	900	Landers	Yermo Fire Station	7.28	3.00
4	1550	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU136	7.62	3.00
5	728	Superstition Hills-02	Westmorland Fire Sta	6.54	2.50
6	1488	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU048	7.62	2.70
7	776	Loma Prieta	Hollister-South & Pine	6.93	3.00
8	1503	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU065	7.62	2.70
9	1148	Kocaeli, Turkey	Arcelik	7.51	3.00
10	1491	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU051	7.62	3.00
11	1198	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY029	7.62	3.00
12	1476	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU029	7.62	2.00
13	1149	Kocaeli, Turkey	Atakoy	7.51	2.10
14	1528	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU101	7.62	2.40
15	1492	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU052	7.62	2.40
16	143	Tabas, Iran	Tabas	7.35	1.00
17	1084	Northridge-01	Sylmar-Converter Sta	6.69	3.00
18	1505	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU068	7.62	1.60
19	1509	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU074	7.62	2.00
20	1078	Northridge-01	Santa Susana Ground	6.69	2.90
21	719	Superstition Hills-02	Brawley Airport	6.54	2.00
22	1787	Hector Mine	Hector	7.13	2.50
23	1548	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU128	7.62	2.80
24	1478	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU033	7.62	2.90
25	1106	Kobe, Japan	KJMA	6.90	2.50
26	803	Loma Prieta	Saratoga-W Valley Coll.	6.93	2.90
27	1486	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU046	7.62	2.70
28	1529	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU102	7.62	2.80
29	1176	Kocaeli, Turkey	Yarimca	7.51	3.00
30	184	Imperial Valley-06	El Centro Differential Array	6.53	2.20
31	723	Superstition Hills-02	Parachute Test Site	6.54	2.20
32	802	Loma Prieta	Saratoga-Aloha Ave	6.93	1.80
33	1498	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU059	7.62	3.00
34	1244	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY101	7.62	1.60
35	1510	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU075	7.62	2.80
36	1542	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU117	7.62	3.00
37	721	Superstition Hills-02	El Centro Imp. Co. Cent	6.54	2.20
38	170	Imperial Valley-06	EC County Center FF	6.53	2.10
39	779	Loma Prieta	LGPC	6.93	1.70
40	1501	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU063	7.62	2.80

Table E.16Documentation of 40 GMs of reference group of Bridge B for 2%
POE in 50 years.

Record Number	NGA Record Sequence Number	Earthquake Name	Station	Magnitude	Scaling Factor
1	2463	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03	CHY032	6.20	1.67
2	1538	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU112	7.62	0.69
3	1234	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY086	7.62	1.18
4	1817	Hector Mine	North Shore-Durmid	7.13	1.76
5	1304	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	HWA059	7.62	1.59
6	3297	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-06	CHY069	6.30	1.95
7	900	Landers	Yermo Fire Station	7.28	0.46
8	784	Loma Prieta	Oakland-Title & Trust	6.93	0.59
9	983	Northridge-01	Jensen Filter Plant Generator	6.69	0.25
10	1154	Kocaeli, Turkey	Bursa Sivil	7.51	1.34
11	1783	Hector Mine	Fort Irwin	7.13	2.36
12	2598	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03	TCU039	6.20	2.74
13	1359	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	KAU015	7.62	1.81
14	1491	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU051	7.62	0.54
15	464	Morgan Hill	Hollister Diff Array #3	6.19	1.81
16	1383	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	KAU062	7.62	2.41
17	1791	Hector Mine	Indio-Coachella Canal	7.13	1.30
18	1259	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	HWA006	7.62	2.57
19	803	Loma Prieta	Saratoga-W Valley Coll.	6.93	0.34
20	1426	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TAP034	7.62	2.54
21	1587	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TTN042	7.62	2.34
22	1834	Hector Mine	Sylmar-County Hospital	7.13	2.92
23	1185	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY012	7.62	1.51
24	1232	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY081	7.62	1.32
25	1504	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU067	7.62	0.22
26	981	Northridge-01	Inglewood-Union Oil	6.69	1.73
27	1574	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TTN022	7.62	1.31
28	1314	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	ILA008	7.62	0.83
29	176	Imperial Valley-06	El Centro Array #13	6.53	1.32
30	1495	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU055	7.62	0.49
31	800	Loma Prieta	Salinas-John & Work	6.93	1.64
32	1794	Hector Mine	Joshua Tree	7.13	0.99
33	1611	Duzce, Turkey	Lamont 1058	7.14	1.22
34	1503	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU065	7.62	0.17
35	1521	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU089	7.62	0.59
36	1287	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	HWA038	7.62	2.16
37	785	Loma Prieta	Olema-Point Reyes Station	6.93	1.01
38	1317	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	ILA013	7.62	0.59
39	2654	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03	TCU120	6.20	1.05
40	2711	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-04	CHY039	6.20	1.83

Table E.17Documentation of 40 GMs of CMS group of Bridge C for 50% POE in
50 years.

Record Number	NGA Record Sequence Number	Earthquake Name	Station	Magnitude	Scaling Factor
1	2459	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03	CHY026	6.20	2.37
2	1361	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	KAU020	7.62	1.63
3	1542	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU117	7.62	0.84
4	2649	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03	TCU115	6.20	2.84
5	2718	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-04	CHY054	6.20	2.74
6	883	Landers	Northridge-17645 Saticoy St	7.28	2.93
7	1295	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	HWA049	7.62	1.41
8	740	Loma Prieta	Anderson Dam (L Abut)	6.93	2.00
9	1418	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TAP014	7.62	1.53
10	1457	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TAP097	7.62	2.45
11	1232	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY081	7.62	2.80
12	1574	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TTN022	7.62	2.79
13	1509	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU074	7.62	0.41
14	2650	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03	TCU116	6.20	1.23
15	1412	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TAP006	7.62	2.69
16	1494	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU054	7.62	0.97
17	1541	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU116	7.62	1.00
18	1787	Hector Mine	Hector	7.13	0.99
19	1297	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	HWA051	7.62	2.26
20	1791	Hector Mine	Indio-Coachella Canal	7.13	2.78
21	2744	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-04	CHY088	6.20	2.64
22	1263	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	HWA012	7.62	1.81
23	1147	Kocaeli, Turkey	Ambarli	7.51	1.17
24	169	Imperial Valley-06	Delta	6.53	0.79
25	1536	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU110	7.62	0.54
26	900	Landers	Yermo Fire Station	7.28	0.97
27	1165	Kocaeli, Turkey	Izmit	7.51	1.19
28	1508	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU072	7.62	0.69
29	1193	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY024	7.62	0.91
30	2458	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03	CHY025	6.20	1.48
31	1317	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	ILA013	7.62	1.26
32	755	Loma Prieta	Coyote Lake Dam (SW Abut)	6.93	1.70
33	2710	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-04	CHY036	6.20	2.72
34	326	Coalinga-01	Parkfield-Cholame 2WA	6.36	2.66
35	1158	Kocaeli, Turkey	Duzce	7.51	0.80
36	3265	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-06	CHY025	6.30	1.70
37	2708	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-04	CHY034	6.20	2.68
38	319	Westmorland	Westmorland Fire Sta	5.90	0.99
39	756	Loma Prieta	Dublin-Fire Station	6.93	2.59
40	836	Landers	Baker Fire Station	7.28	2.47

Table E.18Documentation of 40 GMs of CMS group of Bridge C for 10% POE in
50 years.

Record Number	NGA Record Sequence Number	Earthquake Name	Station	Magnitude	Scaling Factor
1	341	Coalinga-01	Parkfield-Fault Zone 2	6.36	1.66
2	1575	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TTN023	7.62	2.42
3	732	Loma Prieta	APEEL 2-Redwood City	6.93	1.73
4	1316	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	ILA012	7.62	2.20
5	2509	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03	CHY104	6.20	1.83
6	1295	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	HWA049	7.62	2.28
7	1418	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TAP014	7.62	2.48
8	1509	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU074	7.62	0.67
9	1527	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU100	7.62	1.98
10	885	Landers	Fort Irwin	7.28	2.91
11	1328	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	ILA036	7.62	2.83
12	2650	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03	TCU116	6.20	1.99
13	1492	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU052	7.62	0.48
14	1320	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	ILA016	7.62	2.83
15	1263	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	HWA012	7.62	2.93
16	1494	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU054	7.62	1.58
17	1044	Northridge-01	Newhall-Fire Sta	6.69	0.83
18	1455	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TAP094	7.62	2.61
19	1311	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	ILA005	7.62	2.87
20	1292	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	HWA045	7.62	2.64
21	1204	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY039	7.62	2.35
22	2507	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03	CHY101	6.20	1.98
23	1194	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY025	7.62	1.45
24	2458	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03	CHY025	6.20	2.40
25	2752	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-04	CHY101	6.20	2.43
26	1534	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU107	7.62	1.59
27	776	Loma Prieta	Hollister-South & Pine	6.93	1.47
28	2663	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03	TCU141	6.20	2.80
29	77	San Fernando	Pacoima Dam (upper left abut)	6.61	0.84
30	1187	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY015	7.62	2.02
31	864	Landers	Joshua Tree	7.28	1.63
32	1536	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU110	7.62	0.87
33	1116	Kobe, Japan	Shin-Osaka	6.90	2.26
34	1262	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	HWA011	7.62	2.22
35	900	Landers	Yermo Fire Station	7.28	1.58
36	803	Loma Prieta	Saratoga-W Valley Coll.	6.93	1.18
37	1542	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU117	7.62	1.37
38	1317	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	ILA013	7.62	2.04
39	1361	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	KAU020	7.62	2.65
40	170	Imperial Valley-06	EC County Center FF	6.53	1.41

Table E.19Documentation of 40 GMs of CMS group of Bridge C for 2% POE in
50 years.

Record Number	NGA Record Sequence Number	Earthquake Name	Station	Magnitude	Scaling Factor
1	1498	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU059	7.62	1.90
2	1424	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TAP028	7.62	2.20
3	1117	Kobe, Japan	TOT	6.90	1.20
4	1476	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU029	7.62	1.00
5	2893	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-04	TCU122	6.20	2.40
6	1377	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	KAU050	7.62	1.30
7	2714	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-04	CHY046	6.20	0.90
8	2756	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-04	CHY114	6.20	3.00
9	1618	Duzce, Turkey	Lamont 531	7.14	1.20
10	1817	Hector Mine	North Shore-Durmid	7.13	2.90
11	1223	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY067	7.62	0.90
12	265	Victoria, Mexico	Cerro Prieto	6.33	1.30
13	1301	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	HWA056	7.62	1.60
14	2115	Denali, Alaska	TAPS Pump Station #11	7.90	1.20
15	1214	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY057	7.62	2.10
16	1308	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	ILA002	7.62	3.00
17	1190	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY019	7.62	2.20
18	1450	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TAP083	7.62	1.90
19	1148	Kocaeli, Turkey	Arcelik	7.51	0.90
20	1182	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY006	7.62	1.00
21	891	Landers	Silent Valley-Poppet Flat	7.28	2.70
22	1489	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU049	7.62	1.00
23	266	Victoria, Mexico	Chihuahua	6.33	1.30
24	1261	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	HWA009	7.62	0.70
25	1465	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU007	7.62	1.70
26	1512	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU078	7.62	0.60
27	326	Coalinga-01	Parkfield-Cholame 2WA	6.36	2.10
28	1149	Kocaeli, Turkey	Atakoy	7.51	2.10
29	1164	Kocaeli, Turkey	Istanbul	7.51	1.80
30	2948	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-05	CHY032	6.20	2.20
31	1475	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU026	7.62	1.80
32	178	Imperial Valley-06	El Centro Array #3	6.53	0.50
33	3267	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-06	CHY027	6.30	2.90
34	68	San Fernando	LA-Hollywood Stor FF	6.61	1.00
35	862	Landers	Indio-Coachella Canal	7.28	2.00
36	180	Imperial Valley-06	El Centro Array #5	6.53	0.20
37	2951	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-05	CHY039	6.20	1.70
38	808	Loma Prieta	Treasure Island	6.93	1.20
39	838	Landers	Barstow	7.28	1.20
40	2711	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-04	CHY039	6.20	2.70

Table E.20Documentation of 40 GMs of reference group of Bridge C for 50%
POE in 50 years.

Record Number	NGA Record Sequence Number	Earthquake Name	Station	Magnitude	Scaling Factor
1	2492	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03	CHY076	6.20	1.50
2	1410	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TAP003	7.62	3.00
3	1147	Kocaeli, Turkey	Ambarli	7.51	1.70
4	1611	Duzce, Turkey	Lamont 1058	7.14	2.50
5	900	Landers	Yermo Fire Station	7.28	1.40
6	2115	Denali, Alaska	TAPS Pump Station #11	7.90	2.90
7	744	Loma Prieta	Bear Valley #12	6.93	2.70
8	1184	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY010	7.62	2.80
9	762	Loma Prieta	Fremont-Mission San Jose	6.93	3.00
10	1489	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU049	7.62	1.20
11	1762	Hector Mine	Amboy	7.13	1.40
12	1541	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU116	7.62	1.60
13	1615	Duzce, Turkey	Lamont 1062	7.14	2.40
14	801	Loma Prieta	San Jose-Santa Teresa Hills	6.93	1.90
15	1223	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY067	7.62	3.00
16	730	Spitak, Armenia	Gukasian	6.77	1.20
17	1476	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU029	7.62	1.20
18	1553	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU141	7.62	3.00
19	1013	Northridge-01	LA Dam	6.69	1.50
20	1149	Kocaeli, Turkey	Atakoy	7.51	2.90
21	1498	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU059	7.62	3.00
22	1554	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU145	7.62	2.10
23	1198	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY029	7.62	2.20
24	2700	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-04	CHY025	6.20	2.00
25	779	Loma Prieta	LGPC	6.93	0.70
26	1350	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	ILA067	7.62	0.80
27	2457	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03	CHY024	6.20	2.70
28	1492	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU052	7.62	0.70
29	880	Landers	Mission Creek Fault	7.28	1.50
30	1318	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	ILA014	7.62	3.00
31	879	Landers	Lucerne	7.28	0.70
32	2893	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-04	TCU122	6.20	2.50
33	169	Imperial Valley-06	Delta	6.53	0.90
34	1513	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU079	7.62	0.70
35	796	Loma Prieta	SF-Presidio	6.93	3.00
36	184	Imperial Valley-06	El Centro Differential Array	6.53	1.50
37	143	Tabas, Iran	Tabas	7.35	0.50
38	838	Landers	Barstow	7.28	2.40
39	549	Chalfant Valley-02	Bishop-LADWP South St	6.19	1.70
40	767	Loma Prieta	Gilroy Array #3	6.93	1.30

Table E.21Documentation of 40 GMs of reference group of Bridge C for 10%
POE in 50 years.

1 1605 Duzce, Turkey Duzce 7.14	2.60
2 1176 Kocaeli, Turkey Yarimca 7.51	2.90
3 1492 Chi-Chi, Taiwan TCU052 7.62	2.40
4 1509 Chi-Chi, Taiwan TCU074 7.62	1.40
5 825 Cape Mendocino Cape Mendocino 7.01	0.30
6 1147 Kocaeli, Turkey Ambarli 7.51	2.40
7 1149 Kocaeli, Turkey Atakoy 7.51	3.00
8 2115 Denali, Alaska TAPS Pump Station #11 7.90	3.00
9 1234 Chi-Chi, Taiwan CHY086 7.62	3.00
10 169 Imperial Valley-06 Delta 6.53	1.10
11 900 Landers Yermo Fire Station 7.28	1.50
12 1528 Chi-Chi, Taiwan TCU101 7.62	1.50
13 803 Loma Prieta Saratoga-W Valley Coll. 6.93	1.20
14 779 Loma Prieta LGPC 6.93	0.70
15 744 Loma Prieta Bear Valley #12 6.93	3.00
16 1201 Chi-Chi Taiwan CHY034 7.62	1.80
17 1505 Chi-Chi Taiwan TCU068 7.62	1.00
18 721	1.70
19 143 Tabas Iran Tabas 7.35	0.30
20 1148 Kocaeli Turkey Arcelik 7.51	3.00
20 1140 Rocach, Turkey Recent 7.51 21 1472 Chi-Chi Taiwan TCU017 7.62	2.90
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	1.20
22 1156 Rocach, Turkey Duzze 7.51 23 175 Imperial Valley-06 El Centro Array #12 6.53	2 30
25 175 Inpertar Valcy-00 El Centro Array #12 0.55 24 776 Loma Prieta Hollister-South & Pine 6.93	1.80
24770Lonia FricaHomsel-South & Fric0.55251792Hector MineIndio-Riverside Co Fair Grade7.13	2.30
26 1042 Northridge-01 NHollywood-Coldwater 6.69	2.40
27 549 Chalfant Valley-02 Bishon-LADWP South St 6.19	2.30
28 767 Loma Prieta Gilrov Array #3 6.93	2.80
29 183 Imperial Valley-06 El Centro Array #8 6.53	1.30
30 879 Landers Lucerne 7.28	1 20
31 186 Imperial Valley-06 Niland Fire Station 6.53	2.80
32 1491 Chi-Chi Taiwan TCU051 7.62	2.00
32 1101 Chi Chi, Taiwan TCU075 7.62 33 1510 Chi-Chi Taiwan TCU075 7.62	1.90
35 1910 Chi Chi, Taiwan TCU057 7.62 34 1497 Chi-Chi Taiwan TCU057 7.62	2 40
35 729 Superstition Hills- 02 Wildlife Liquef. Array 6.54	3.00
36 184 Imperial Valley-06 Fl Centro Differential Array 6.53	2.60
37 1488 Chi-Chi Taiwan TCU048 7.62	1 90
37 1400 Chi Chi Taiwan 100040 7.02 38 1504 Chi Chi Taiwan TCU067 7.62	2 10
30 1504 Chi-Chi, Taiwan TCU106 7.02 30 1533 Chi-Chi Taiwan TCU106 7.62	2.10
40 1476 Chi-Chi, Taiwan TCU029 7.62	2.00

Table E.22Documentation of 40 GMs of reference group of Bridge C for 2%
POE in 50 years.
APPENDIX F: DOCUMENTATION OF THE UTILIZED GROUND MOTIONS IN CHAPTER 9

This appendix documents all the GMs utilized to develop reference benchmark *PDSD* for the investigated RC highway bridge systems. The GMs selected by the investigated four GMSM procedures are also documented in this appendix.

Record Number	NGA Record Sequence Number	Earthquake Name	Station	Magnitude
1	125	Friuli, Italy-01	Tolmezzo	6.50
2	126	Gazli, USSR	Karakyr	6.80
3	143	Tabas, Iran	Tabas	7.35
4	158	Imperial Valley-06	Aeropuerto Mexicali	6.53
5	159	Imperial Valley-06	Agrarias	6.53
6	161	Imperial Valley-06	Brawley Airport	6.53
7	165	Imperial Valley-06	Chihuahua	6.53
8	170	Imperial Valley-06	EC County Center FF	6.53
9	171	Imperial Valley-06	EC Meloland Overpass FF	6.53
10	173	Imperial Valley-06	El Centro Array #10	6.53
11	174	Imperial Valley-06	El Centro Array #11	6.53
12	179	Imperial Valley-06	El Centro Array #4	6.53
13	180	Imperial Valley-06	El Centro Array #5	6.53
14	181	Imperial Valley-06	El Centro Array #6	6.53
15	182	Imperial Valley-06	El Centro Array #7	6.53
16	183	Imperial Valley-06	El Centro Array #8	6.53
17	184	Imperial Valley-06	El Centro Differential Array	6 53
18	185	Imperial Valley-06	Holtville Post Office	6.53
19	285	Irpinia Italy-01	Bagnoli Irpinio	6.90
20	203	Irpinia, Italy-01	Sturno	6.90
20	721	Superstition Hills-02	Fl Centro Imp. Co. Cent	6 54
21	721	Superstition Hills-02	Kornbloom Road (temp)	6 54
22	722	Superstition Hills-02	Parachute Test Site	6.54
23	725	Superstition Hills-02	Poe Road (temp)	6.54
25	728	Superstition Hills-02	Westmorland Fire Sta	6.54
25	720	Loma Prieta	BRAN	6.03
20	753	Loma Prieta	Correlitos	6.93
27	764	Loma Prieta	Gilroy-Historic Bldg	6.93
28	766	Loma Prieta	Gilroy Array #2	6.93
30	768	Loma Prieta	Gilroy Array $\#4$	6.93
31	708	Loma Priota		6.03
31	773 801	Loma Prieta	LOFC San Josa Santa Tarasa Hills	6.03
32	802	Loma Prieta	San Jose-Santa Teresa Hills	6.03
33	802	Loma Prieta	Saratoga W Vallay Coll	6.03
34 25	803	Erziaan Turkay	Saratoga-W Valley Coll.	0.93
35	821 827	Capa Mandaging	Erzincan Fortung Fortung Blyd	0.09
30	827	Cape Mendocino	Portulia-Portulia Divu	7.01
29	820 820	Cape Mendocino	Pio Doll Overness FE	7.01
38 20	829	Landara	Kio Dell Overpass-FF	7.01
39	804 870	Landers	Josnua Tree	7.28
40	0/9	Landers Nextheider 01	Lucerne Arlata Nandhaff Eire Sta	1.28
41	949	Northridge-01	Arieta-Nordnoii Fire Sta	0.09
42	955	Northridge-01	Beverly Hills-14145 Mulhol	0.09
43	959	Northridge-01	Canoga Park-Topanga Can	6.69
44	960	Northridge-01	Canyon Country-W Lost Cany	6.69
45	1004	Northridge-01	LA-Sepulveda VA Hospital	6.69
46	1013	Northridge-01	LA Dam	6.69
47	1042	Northridge-01	N Hollywood-Coldwater Can	6.69
48	1044	Northridge-01	Newhall-Fire Sta	6.69

Table F.1Documentation of 60 GMs used for the development of benchmark
PDSD.

	NGA Record			
Record	Sequence	Eartnquake	Station	Magnitude
Number	Number	Name		
49	1045	Northridge-01	Newhall-W Pico Canyon Rd	6 69
50	1048	Northridge-01	Northridge-17645 Saticov St	6.69
51	1050	Northridge-01	Pacoima Dam (downstr)	6.69
52	1052	Northridge-01	Pacoima Kagel Canyon	6.69
53	1063	Northridge-01	Rinaldi Receiving Sta	6.69
54	1086	Northridge-01	Sylmar-Olive View Med FF	6.69
55	1106	Kobe, Japan	KIMA	6.90
56	1111	Kobe, Japan	Nishi-Akashi	6.90
57	1116	Kobe, Japan	Shin-Osaka	6.90
58	1602	Duzce. Turkey	Bolu	7.14
59	1605	Duzce, Turkey	Duzce	7.14
60	1787	Hector Mine	Hector	7.13
61	139	Tabas Iran	Davhook	7 35
62	160	Imperial Valley-06	Bonds Corner	6.53
63	162	Imperial Valley-06	Calexico Fire Station	6 53
64	164	Imperial Valley-06	Cerro Prieto	6 53
65	167	Imperial Valley-06	Compuertas	6 53
66	175	Imperial Valley-06	El Centro Array #12	6 53
67	187	Imperial Valley-06	Parachute Test Site	6 53
68	189	Imperial Valley-06	SAHOP Casa Flores	6.53
69	192	Imperial Valley-06	Westmorland Fire Sta	6.53
70	284	Irpinia Italy-01	Auletta	6.90
70	289	Irpinia, Italy-01 Irpinia Italy-01	Calitri	6.90
72	495	Nahanni Canada	Site 1	6.76
73	496	Nahanni, Canada	Site 2	676
74	497	Nahanni, Canada	Site 2	6.76
75	719	Superstition Hills-02	Brawley Airport	6.54
76	752	Loma Prieta	Capitola	6.93
77	763	Loma Prieta	Gilroy - Gavilan Coll.	6.93
78	765	Loma Prieta	Gilrov Arrav #1	6.93
79	767	Loma Prieta	Gilroy Array #3	6.93
80	769	Loma Prieta	Gilroy Array #6	6.93
81	809	Loma Prieta	UCSC	6.93
82	810	Loma Prieta	UCSC Lick Observatory	6.93
83	811	Loma Prieta	WAHO	6.93
84	825	Cape Mendocino	Cape Mendocino	7.01
85	881	Landers	Morongo Valley	7.28
86	952	Northridge-01	Beverly Hills - 12520 Mulhol	6.69
87	957	Northridge-01	Burbank - Howard Rd.	6.69
88	983	Northridge-01	Jensen Filter Plant Generator	6.69
89	1051	Northridge-01	Pacoima Dam (upper left)	6.69
90	1078	Northridge-01	Santa Susana Ground	6.69
91	1082	Northridge-01	Sun Valley - Roscoe Blvd	6.69
92	1083	Northridge-01	Sunland - Mt Gleason Ave	6.69
93	1087	Northridge-01	Tarzana - Cedar Hill A	6.69
94	1611	Duzce, Turkey	Lamont 1058	7.14
95	1612	Duzce, Turkey	Lamont 1059	7.14
96	1614	Duzce, Turkey	Lamont 1061	7.14
97	1615	Duzce, Turkey	Lamont 1062	7.14
98	1617	Duzce, Turkey	Lamont 375	7.14
99	1618	Duzce, Turkey	Lamont 531	7.14

	NGA				
Record	Record	Earthquake	Station.	Magnituda	Scaling
Number	Sequence	Name	Station	Magnitude	Factor
	Number				
1	179	Imperial Valley-06	El Centro Array #4	6.53	1.94
2	292	Irpinia, Italy-01	Sturno	6.90	2.41
3	829	Cape Mendocino	Rio Dell Overpass-FF	7.01	1.52
4	189	Imperial Valley-06	SAHOP Casa Flores	6.53	2.12
5	495	Nahanni, Canada	Site 1	6.76	1.65
6	725	Superstition Hills- 02	Poe Road (temp)	6.54	2.34
7	949	Northridge-01	Arleta-Nordhoff Fire Sta	6.69	1.54
8	1082	Northridge-01	Sun Valley-Roscoe Blvd	6.69	1.45
9	170	Imperial Valley-06	EC County Center FF	6.53	1.94
10	184	Imperial Valley-06	El Centro Differential Array	6.53	1.43
11	766	Loma Prieta	Gilroy Array #2	6.93	1.64
12	767	Loma Prieta	Gilroy Array #3	6.93	2.13
13	802	Loma Prieta	Saratoga-Aloha Ave	6.93	2.28
14	803	Loma Prieta	Saratoga-W Valley Coll.	6.93	1.75
15	825	Cape Mendocino	Cape Mendocino	7.01	1.75
16	828	Cape Mendocino	Petrolia	7.01	0.61
17	983	Northridge-01	Jensen Filter Plant Generator	6.69	0.89
18	1013	Northridge-01	LA Dam	6.69	1 42
19	1044	Northridge-01	Newhall-Fire Sta	6.69	0.74
20	1045	Northridge-01	Newhall-W Pico Canyon Rd	6.69	1.62
20	1050	Northridge_01	Pacoima Dam (downstr)	6.69	1.02
21	1051	Northridge-01	Pacoima Dam (upper left)	6.69	0.67
22	1063	Northridge_01	Rinaldi Receiving Sta	6.69	0.07
23	1005	Northridge 01	Sylmar Converter Sta	6.69	0.71
24	1084	Northridge 01	Sylmar-Converter Sta	0.09	0.78
25	1085	Northridge-01	Sylmar-Converter Sta East	0.09	1.00
26	1086	Northridge-01	Sylmar-Olive View Med FF	0.69	0.96
27	1602	Duzce, Turkey	Bolu	7.14	0.96
28	1605	Duzce, Turkey	Duzce	7.14	0.89
29	126	Gazli, USSR	Karakyr	6.80	1.15
30	165	Imperial Valley-06	Chihuahua	6.53	1.31
31	727	Superstition Hills- 02	Superstition Mtn Camera	6.54	1.02
32	741	Loma Prieta	BRAN	6.93	0.91
33	864	Landers	Joshua Tree	7.28	1.21
34	959	Northridge-01	Canoga Park-Topanga Can	6.69	1.39
35	960	Northridge-01	Canyon Country-W Lost Cyn	6.69	0.99
36	1004	Northridge-01	LA-Sepulveda VA Hospital	6.69	0.68
37	1048	Northridge-01	Northridge-17645 Saticov St	6.69	1.45
38	1052	Northridge-01	Pacoima Kagel Canvon	6.69	1.19
39	1080	Northridge-01	Simi Valley-Katherine Rd	6.69	0.90
40	1111	Kobe, Japan	Nishi-Akashi	6.90	1.02

Table F.2Documentation of 40 GMs of $S_a(T_1)$ procedure for Bridge A with
Type I abutment modeling.

Record Number	NGA Record Sequence Number	Earthquake Name	Station	Magnitude	Scaling Factor
1	173	Imperial Valley-06	El Centro Array #10	6.53	4.42
2	174	Imperial Valley-06	El Centro Array #11	6.53	2.50
3	179	Imperial Valley-06	El Centro Array #4	6.53	1.94
4	185	Imperial Valley-06	Holtville Post Office	6.53	2.72
5	292	Irpinia, Italy-01	Sturno	6.90	2.41
6	763	Loma Prieta	Gilrov - Gavilan Coll.	6.93	3.30
7	764	Loma Prieta	Gilrov - Historic Blda.	6.93	3.59
8	765	Loma Prieta	Gilrov Arrav #1	6.93	3.31
9	170	Imperial Valley-06	EC County Center FF	6.53	1.94
10	184	Imperial Valley-06	El Centro Differential Array	6.53	1.43
11	766	Loma Prieta	Gilroy Array #2	6.93	1.64
12	767	Loma Prieta	Gilroy Array #3	6.93	2.13
13	802	Loma Prieta	Saratoga-Aloha Ave	6.93	2.28
14	803	Loma Prieta	Saratoga-W Valley Coll.	6.93	1.75
15	825	Cape Mendocino	Cape Mendocino	7.01	1.75
16	828	Cape Mendocino	Petrolia	7.01	0.61
17	983	Northridge-01	Jensen Filter Plant Generator	6.69	0.89
18	1013	Northridge-01	LA Dam	6.69	1.42
19	1044	Northridge-01	Newhall-Fire Sta	6.69	0.74
20	1045	Northridge-01	Newhall-W Pico Canyon Rd.	6.69	1.62
21	1050	Northridge-01	Pacoima Dam (downstr)	6.69	1.99
22	1051	Northridge-01	Pacoima Dam (upper left)	6.69	0.67
23	1063	Northridge-01	Rinaldi Receiving Sta	6.69	0.71
24	1084	Northridge-01	Sylmar-Converter Sta	6.69	0.78
25	1085	Northridge-01	Sylmar-Converter Sta East	6.69	1.00
26	1086	Northridge-01	Sylmar-Olive View Med FF	6.69	0.96
27	1602	Duzce, Turkey	Bolu	7.14	0.96
28	1605	Duzce, Turkey	Duzce	7.14	0.89
29	126	Gazli, USSR	Karakyr	6.80	1.15
30	165	Imperial Valley-06	Chihuahua	6.53	1.31
31	727	Superstition Hills- 02	Superstition Mtn Camera	6.54	1.02
32	741	Loma Prieta	BRAN	6.93	0.91
33	864	Landers	Joshua Tree	7.28	1.21
34	959	Northridge-01	Canoga Park-Topanga Cyn	6.69	1.39
35	960	Northridge-01	Canyon Country-W Lost Cyn	6.69	0.99
36	1004	Northridge-01	LA-Sepulveda VA Hospital	6.69	0.68
37	1048	Northridge-01	Northridge-17645 Saticoy St	6.69	1.45
38	1052	Northridge-01	Pacoima Kagel Canyon	6.69	1.19
39	1080	Northridge-01	Simi Valley-Katherine Rd	6.69	0.90
40	1111	Kobe, Japan	Nishi-Akashi	6.90	1.02

Table F.3Documentation of 40 GMs of $S_a(T_1)_p$ procedure for Bridge A with
Type I abutment modeling.

Record Number	NGA Record Sequence Number	Earthquake Name	Station	Magnitude	Scaling Factor
1	139	Tabas, Iran	Dayhook	7.35	2.02
2	768	Loma Prieta	Gilroy Array #4	6.93	1.75
3	829	Cape Mendocino	Rio Dell Overpass-FF	7.01	1.10
4	189	Imperial Valley-06	SAHOP Casa Flores	6.53	2.01
5	495	Nahanni, Canada	Site 1	6.76	1.63
6	725	Superstition Hills- 02	Poe Road (temp)	6.54	1.90
7	949	Northridge-01	Arleta-Nordhoff Fire Sta	6.69	1.61
8	1082	Northridge-01	Sun Valley-Roscoe Blvd	6.69	1.48
9	170	Imperial Valley-06	EC County Center FF	6.53	1.70
10	184	Imperial Valley-06	El Centro Differential Array	6.53	1.47
11	766	Loma Prieta	Gilrov Arrav #2	6.93	1.84
12	767	Loma Prieta	Gilroy Array #3	6.93	1 73
13	802	Loma Prieta	Saratoga-Aloha Ave	6.93	1 93
14	803	Loma Prieta	Saratoga-W Valley Coll.	6.93	1.96
15	825	Cape Mendocino	Cape Mendocino	7.01	1.55
16	828	Cape Mendocino	Petrolia	7.01	0.64
17	983	Northridge-01	Jensen Filter Plant Generator	6.69	1.11
18	1013	Northridge-01	LA Dam	6.69	1.58
19	1044	Northridge-01	Newhall-Fire Sta	6.69	0.66
20	1045	Northridge-01	Newhall-W Pico Canyon Rd.	6.69	1.58
21	1050	Northridge-01	Pacoima Dam (downstr)	6.69	1.56
22	1051	Northridge-01	Pacoima Dam (upper left)	6.69	0.57
23	1063	Northridge-01	Rinaldi Receiving Sta	6.69	0.78
24	1084	Northridge-01	Sylmar-Converter Sta	6.69	0.69
25	1085	Northridge-01	Sylmar-Converter Sta East	6.69	1.09
26	1086	Northridge-01	Sylmar-Olive View Med FF	6.69	0.80
27	1602	Duzce, Turkev	Bolu	7.14	0.79
28	1605	Duzce, Turkey	Duzce	7.14	1.12
29	126	Gazli, USSR	Karakvr	6.80	0.98
30	165	Imperial Valley-06	Chihuahua	6.53	1.42
31	727	Superstition Hills- 02	Superstition Mtn Camera	6.54	1.00
32	741	Loma Prieta	BRAN	6.93	0.86
33	864	Landers	Joshua Tree	7.28	1.77
34	959	Northridge-01	Canoga Park-Topanga Cyn	6.69	0.85
35	960	Northridge-01	Canyon Country-W Lost Cvn	6.69	0.88
36	1004	Northridge-01	LA-Sepulveda VA Hospital	6.69	0.74
37	1048	Northridge-01	Northridge-17645 Saticov St	6.69	1.26
38	1052	Northridge-01	Pacoima Kagel Canvon	6.69	1.13
39	1080	Northridge-01	Simi Valley-Katherine Rd	6.69	0.72
40	1111	Kobe, Japan	Nishi-Akashi	6.90	1.31

Table F.4Documentation of 40 GMs of $S_a(T_1)$ procedure for Bridge A with
Type II abutment modeling.

Record Number	NGA Record Sequence Number	Earthquake Name	Station	Magnitude	Scaling Factor
1	173	Imperial Valley-06	El Centro Array #10	6.53	3.51
2	174	Imperial Valley-06	El Centro Array #11	6.53	2.07
3	179	Imperial Valley-06	El Centro Array #4	6.53	2.04
4	185	Imperial Valley-06	Holtville Post Office	6.53	2.90
5	292	Irpinia, Italy-01	Sturno	6.90	2.25
6	763	Loma Prieta	Gilroy-Gavilan Coll.	6.93	2.53
7	764	Loma Prieta	Gilroy-Historic Bldg.	6.93	2.56
8	765	Loma Prieta	Gilroy Array #1	6.93	2.41
9	170	Imperial Valley-06	EC County Center FF	6.53	1.70
10	184	Imperial Valley-06	El Centro Differential Array	6.53	1.47
11	766	Loma Prieta	Gilroy Array #2	6.93	1.84
12	767	Loma Prieta	Gilroy Array #3	6.93	1.73
13	802	Loma Prieta	Saratoga-Aloha Ave	6.93	1.93
14	803	Loma Prieta	Saratoga-W Valley Coll.	6.93	1.96
15	825	Cape Mendocino	Cape Mendocino	7.01	1.55
16	828	Cape Mendocino	Petrolia	7.01	0.64
17	983	Northridge-01	Jensen Filter Plant Generator	6.69	1.11
18	1013	Northridge-01	LA Dam	6.69	1.58
19	1044	Northridge-01	Newhall-Fire Sta	6.69	0.66
20	1045	Northridge-01	Newhall-W Pico Canyon Rd.	6.69	1.58
21	1050	Northridge-01	Pacoima Dam (downstr)	6.69	1.56
22	1051	Northridge-01	Pacoima Dam (upper left)	6.69	0.57
23	1063	Northridge-01	Rinaldi Receiving Sta	6.69	0.78
24	1084	Northridge-01	Sylmar-Converter Sta	6.69	0.69
25	1085	Northridge-01	Sylmar-Converter Sta East	6.69	1.09
26	1086	Northridge-01	Sylmar-Olive View Med FF	6.69	0.80
27	1602	Duzce, Turkey	Bolu	7.14	0.79
28	1605	Duzce, Turkey	Duzce	7.14	1.12
29	126	Gazli, USSR	Karakyr	6.80	0.98
30	165	Imperial Valley-06	Chihuahua	6.53	1.42
31	727	Superstition Hills- 02	Superstition Mtn Camera	6.54	1.00
32	741	Loma Prieta	BRAN	6.93	0.86
33	864	Landers	Joshua Tree	7.28	1.10
34	959	Northridge-01	Canoga Park-Topanga Cyn Canvon Country-W I ost	6.69	0.85
35	960	Northridge-01	Cyn	6.69	0.88
36	1004	Northridge-01	LA-Sepulveda VA Hospital	6.69	0.74
37	1048	Northridge-01	Northridge-17645 Saticoy St	6.69	1.26
38	1052	Northridge-01	Pacoima Kagel Canyon	6.69	1.13
39	1080	Northridge-01	Simi Valley-Katherine Rd	6.69	0.72
40	1111	Kobe, Japan	Nishi-Akashi	6.90	1.31

Table F.5Documentation of 40 GMs of $S_a(T_1)_p$ procedure for Bridge A with
Type II abutment modeling.

Record Number	NGA Record Sequence Number	Earthquake Name	Station	Magnitude	Scaling Factor
1	1111	Kobe, Japan	Nishi-Akashi	6.90	1.02
2	1350	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	ILA067	7.62	2.94
3	1425	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TAP032	7.62	2.16
4	739	Loma Prieta	Anderson Dam (Downstream)	6.93	2.01
5	1317	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	ILA013	7.62	2.06
6	757	Loma Prieta	Dumbarton Bridge West End	6.93	2.60
7	776	Loma Prieta	Hollister-South & Pine	6.93	1.58
8	829	Cape Mendocino	Rio Dell Overpass-FF	7.01	1.53
9	721	Superstition Hills- 02	El Centro Imp. Co. Cent	6.54	2.45
10	900	Landers	Yermo Fire Station	7.28	2.58
11	881	Landers	Morongo Valley	7.28	2.20
12	169	Imperial Valley-06	Delta	6.53	1.72
13	1084	Northridge-01	Sylmar-Converter Sta	6.69	0.78
14	1508	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU072	7.62	0.78
15	778	Loma Prieta	Hollister Diff. Array	6.93	1.35
16	527	N. Palm Springs	Morongo Valley	6.06	1.94
17	1490	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU050	7.62	2.73
18	1521	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU089	7.62	2.31
19	1155	Kocaeli, Turkey	Bursa Tofas	7.51	2.92
20	1202	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY035	7.62	1.53
21	1504	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU067	7.62	1.25
22	1529	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU102	7.62	1.51
23	1234	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY086	7.62	2.49
24	1187	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY015	7.62	2.71
25	1198	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY029	7.62	1.40
26	1506	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU070	7.62	1.55
27	1493	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU053	7.62	2.33
28	343	Coalinga-01	Parkfield-Fault Zone 4	6.36	2.94
29	1227	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY074	7.62	2.64
30	171	Imperial Valley-06	EC Meloland Overpass FF	6.53	1.49
31	983	Northridge-01	Jensen Filter Plant Generator	6.69	0.90
32	729	Superstition Hills- 02	Wildlife Liquef. Array	6.54	2.70
33	808	Loma Prieta	Treasure Island	6.93	2.40
34	1550	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU136	7.62	2.68
35	1203	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY036	7.62	1.22
36	1045	Northridge-01	Newhall-W Pico Canyon Rd.	6.69	1.64
37	170	Imperial Valley-06	EC County Center FF	6.53	1.95
38	1500	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU061	7.62	2.83
39	159	Imperial Valley-06	Agrarias	6.53	2.29
40	1456	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TAP095	7.62	2.24

Table F.6Documentation of 40 GMs of CMS procedure for Bridge A with Type
I abutment modeling.

Record Number	NGA Record Sequence Number	Earthquake Name	Station	Magnitude	Scaling Factor
1	337	Coalinga-01	Parkfield-Fault Zone 12	6.36	2.88
2	1087	Northridge-01	Tarzana-Cedar Hill A	6.69	0.43
3	1184	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY010	7.62	2.52
4	1317	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	ILA013	7.62	1.76
5	1221	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY065	7.62	2.40
6	1234	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY086	7.62	2.50
7	864	Landers	Joshua Tree	7.28	1.82
8	721	Superstition Hills- 02	El Centro Imp. Co. Cent	6.54	2.26
9	808	Loma Prieta	Treasure Island	6.93	2.24
10	776	Loma Prieta	Hollister-South & Pine	6.93	1.65
11	1787	Hector Mine	Hector	7.13	2.21
12	778	Loma Prieta	Hollister Diff. Array	6.93	1.51
13	184	Imperial Valley-06	El Centro Differential Array	6.53	1.50
14	1227	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY074	7.62	2.21
15	1456	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TAP095	7.62	2.48
16	342	Coalinga-01	Parkfield-Fault Zone 3	6.36	2.50
17	1515	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU082	7.62	2.02
18	1509	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU074	7.62	0.90
19	1160	Kocaeli, Turkey	Fatih	7.51	1.96
20	316	Westmorland	Parachute Test Site	5.90	2.33
21	1493	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU053	7.62	2.50
22	779	Loma Prieta	LGPC	6.93	0.73
23	1063	Northridge-01	Rinaldi Receiving Sta	6.69	0.79
24	1519	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU087	7.62	2.88
25	1158	Kocaeli, Turkey	Duzce	7.51	1.51
26	1491	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU051	7.62	2.73
27	1506	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU070	7.62	1.14
28	1187	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY015	7.62	2.77
29	1536	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU110	7.62	2.18
30	1198	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY029	7.62	1.38
31	1202	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY035	7.62	1.16
32	1504	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU067	7.62	1.31
33	169	Imperial Valley-06	Delta	6.53	1.69
34	1770	Hector Mine	Big Bear Lake-Fire Station	7.13	2.68
35	1508	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU072	7.62	0.99
36	183	Imperial Valley-06	El Centro Array #8	6.53	1.42
37	527	N. Palm Springs	Morongo Valley	6.06	2.30
38	1484	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU042	7.62	2.27
39	170	Imperial Valley-06	EC County Center FF	6.53	1.74
40	1541	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU116	7.62	2.65

Table F.7Documentation of 40 GMs of CMS procedure for Bridge A with Type
Il abutment modeling.

Record Number	NGA Record Sequence Number	Earthquake Name	Station	Magnitude	Scaling Factor
1	1518	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU085	7.62	2.00
2	1515	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU082	7.62	2.60
3	1491	Chi-Chi. Taiwan	TCU051	7.62	2.80
4	1537	Chi-Chi. Taiwan	TCU111	7.62	3.00
5	1502	Chi-Chi. Taiwan	TCU064	7.62	3.00
6	1529	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU102	7.62	3.00
7	187	Imperial Valley-06	Parachute Test Site	6.53	1.80
8	1494	Chi-Chi. Taiwan	TCU054	7.62	3.00
9	1476	Chi-Chi Taiwan	TCU029	7.62	3.00
10	180	Imperial Valley-06	El Centro Array #5	6.53	2.00
11	1496	Chi-Chi Taiwan	TCU056	7.62	3.00
12	1492	Chi-Chi Taiwan	TCU052	7.62	1 70
12	1172	Chi Chi, Turwan	Sylmar-Olive View Med	1.02	1.70
13	1086	Northridge-01	FF	6.69	2.90
14	1148	Kocaeli, Turkey	Arcelik	7.51	3.00
15	1508	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU072	7.62	2.10
16	1493	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU053	7.62	2.80
17	1489	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU049	7.62	2.60
18	169	Imperial Valley-06	Delta	6.53	3.00
19	1488	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU048	7.62	3.00
20	729	Superstition Hills- 02	Wildlife Liquef. Array	6.54	3.00
21	1504	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU067	7.62	2.80
22	721	Superstition Hills- 02	El Centro Imp. Co. Cent	6.54	2.00
23	1490	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU050	7.62	2.90
24	1787	Hector Mine	Hector	7.13	2.90
25	728	Superstition Hills- 02	Westmorland Fire Sta	6.54	2.90
26	172	Imperial Valley-06	El Centro Array #1	6.53	2.80
27	285	Irpinia, Italy-01	Bagnoli Irpinio	6.90	3.00
28	900	Landers	Yermo Fire Station	7.28	3.00
29	1505	Chi-Chi. Taiwan	TCU068	7.62	1.30
30	1472	Chi-Chi. Taiwan	TCU017	7.62	3.00
31	1526	Chi-Chi. Taiwan	TCU098	7.62	2.60
32	1546	Chi-Chi. Taiwan	TCU122	7.62	2.00
33	1527	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU100	7.62	3.00
34	182	Imperial Valley-06	El Centro Array #7	6.53	2.40
35	832	Landers	Amboy	7.28	3.00
36	1528	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU101	7.62	2.40
37	179	Imperial Vallev-06	El Centro Arrav #4	6.53	1.70
38	1202	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY035	7.62	2.90
39	1231	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY080	7.62	1.00
40	1521	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU089	7.62	2.00

Table F.8Documentation of 40 GMs of US procedure for Bridge A.

Table F.9Documentation of 40 GMs of $S_a(T_1)$ procedure for Bridge B.

Record Number	NGA Record Sequence Number	Earthquake Name	Station	Magnitude	Scaling Factor
1	1084	Northridge-01	Sylmar-Converter Sta	6.69	0.53
2	1063	Northridge-01	Rinaldi Receiving Sta	6.69	0.73
3	1085	Northridge-01	Sylmar-Converter Sta East	6.69	0.86
4	1044	Northridge-01	Newhall-Fire Sta	6.69	0.89
5	983	Northridge-01	Jensen Filter Plant Generator	6.69	1.07
6	1602	Duzce, Turkey	Bolu	7.14	1.11
7	1051	Northridge-01	Pacoima Dam (upper left)	6.69	1.11
8	1045	Northridge-01	Newhall-W Pico Canyon Rd.	6.69	1.20
9	803	Loma Prieta	Saratoga-W Valley Coll.	6.93	1.26
10	1086	Northridge-01	Sylmar-Olive View Med FF	6.69	1.28
11	828	Cape Mendocino	Petrolia	7.01	1.28
12	1013	Northridge-01	LA Dam	6.69	1.35
13	179	Imperial Valley-06	El Centro Array #4	6.53	1.60
14	1605	Duzce, Turkey	Duzce	7.14	1.78
15	825	Cape Mendocino	Cape Mendocino	7.01	1.80
16	766	Loma Prieta	Gilroy Array #2	6.93	2.04
17	802	Loma Prieta	Saratoga-Aloha Ave	6.93	2.12
18	764	Loma Prieta	Gilroy-Historic Bldg.	6.93	2.16
19	184	Imperial Valley-06	El Centro Differential Array	6.53	2.23
20	170	Imperial Valley-06	EC County Center FF	6.53	2.25
21	185	Imperial Valley-06	Holtville Post Office	6.53	2.46
22	292	Irpinia, Italy-01	Sturno	6.90	2.51
23	1004	Northridge-01	LA-Sepulveda VA Hospital	6.69	1.11
24	126	Gazli, USSR	Karakyr	6.80	1.41
25	864	Landers	Joshua Tree	7.28	1.46
26	1080	Northridge-01	Simi Valley-Katherine Rd	6.69	1.47
27	1048	Northridge-01	Northridge-17645 Saticoy St	6.69	1.58
28	1787	Hector Mine	Hector	7.13	1.74
29	1082	Northridge-01	Sun Valley-Roscoe Blvd	6.69	1.74
30	829	Cape Mendocino	Rio Dell Overpass-FF	7.01	1.80
31	741	Loma Prieta	BRAN	6.93	1.87
32	727	Superstition Hills- 02	Superstition Mtn Camera	6.54	1.91
33	960	Northridge-01	Canyon Country-W Lost Cyn	6.69	2.09
34	728	Superstition Hills- 02	Westmorland Fire Sta	6.54	2.27
35	1052	Northridge-01	Pacoima Kagel Cyn	6.69	2.31
36	725	Superstition Hills- 02	Poe Road (temp)	6.54	2.36
37	768	Loma Prieta	Gilroy Arrav #4	6.93	2.37
38	949	Northridge-01	Arleta-Nordhoff Fire Sta	6.69	2.47
39	1042	Northridge-01	N Hollywood-Coldwater Can	6.69	2.47
40	495	Nahanni, Canada	Site 1	6.76	2.59

Record Number	NGA Record Sequence Number	Earthquake Name	Station	Magnitude	Scaling Factor
1	1084	Northridge-01	Sylmar-Converter Sta	6.69	0.53
2	1063	Northridge-01	Rinaldi Receiving Sta	6.69	0.73
3	1085	Northridge-01	Sylmar-Converter Sta East	6.69	0.86
4	1044	Northridge-01	Newhall-Fire Sta	6.69	0.89
5	983	Northridge-01	Jensen Filter Plant Generator	6.69	1.07
6	1602	Duzce, Turkey	Bolu	7.14	1.11
7	1051	Northridge-01	Pacoima Dam (upper left)	6.69	1.11
8	1045	Northridge-01	Newhall-W Pico Canyon Rd.	6.69	1.20
9	803	Loma Prieta	Saratoga-W Valley Coll.	6.93	1.26
10	1086	Northridge-01	Sylmar-Olive View Med FF	6.69	1.28
11	828	Cape Mendocino	Petrolia	7.01	1.28
12	1013	Northridge-01	LA Dam	6.69	1.35
13	179	Imperial Valley-06	El Centro Array #4	6.53	1.60
14	1605	Duzce, Turkey	Duzce	7.14	1.78
15	825	Cape Mendocino	Cape Mendocino	7.01	1.80
16	766	Loma Prieta	Gilroy Array #2	6.93	2.04
17	802	Loma Prieta	Saratoga-Aloha Ave	6.93	2.12
18	764	Loma Prieta	Gilroy-Historic Bldg.	6.93	2.16
19	184	Imperial Valley-06	El Centro Differential Array	6.53	2.23
20	170	Imperial Valley-06	EC County Center FF	6.53	2.25
21	185	Imperial Valley-06	Holtville Post Office	6.53	2.46
22	292	Irpinia, Italy-01	Sturno	6.90	2.51
23	1004	Northridge-01	LA-Sepulveda VA Hospital	6.69	1.11
24	126	Gazli, USSR	Karakyr	6.80	1.41
25	864	Landers	Joshua Iree	1.28	1.46
26	1080	Northridge-01	Simi Valley-Katherine Rd	6.69	1.47
27	1048	Northridge-01	Northridge-1/645 Saticoy St	6.69	1.58
28	1/8/	Hector Mine	Hector	/.13	1.74
29	1082	Northridge-01	Sun Valley-Roscoe Bivd	6.69 7.01	1.74
30 21	829	Lama Driata	RIO DEII OVErpass-FF	7.01	1.80
51	/41	Lonia Prieta	DKAN	0.95	1.87
32	727	02	Superstition Mtn Camera	6.54	1.91
33	960	Northridge-01	Canyon Country-W Lost Cyn	6.69	2.09
34	728	Superstition Hills- 02	Westmorland Fire Sta	6.54	2.27
35	173	Imperial Valley-06	El Centro Array #10	6.53	2.94
36	767	Loma Prieta	Gilroy Array #3	6.93	2.96
37	1050	Northridge-01	Pacoima Dam (downstr)	6.69	3.06
38	174	Imperial Valley-06	El Centro Array #11	6.53	3.08
39	161	Imperial Valley-06	Brawley Airport	6.53	3.35
40	765	Loma Prieta	Gilroy Array #1	6.93	4.87

Table F.10Documentation of 40 GMs of $S_a(T_1)_p$ procedure for Bridge B.

Record Number	NGA Record Sequence Number	Earthquake Name	Station	Magnitude	Scaling Factor
1	959	Northridge-01	Canoga Park-Topanga Can	6.69	2.61
2	1457	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TAP097	7.62	2.57
3	729	Superstition Hills- 02	Wildlife Liquef. Array	6.54	2.70
4	1410	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TAP003	7.62	2.23
5	1045	Northridge-01	Newhall-W Pico Canyon Rd.	6.69	1.20
6	776	Loma Prieta	Hollister-South & Pine	6.93	1.29
7	1454	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TAP090	7.62	2.87
8	1198	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY029	7.62	2.17
9	1555	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU147	7.62	2.91
10	285	Irpinia, Italy-01	Bagnoli Irpinio	6.90	2.91
11	1425	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TAP032	7.62	2.82
12	1334	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	ILA044	7.62	2.91
13	182	Imperial Valley-06	El Centro Array #7	6.53	1.31
14	723	Superstition Hills- 02	Parachute Test Site	6.54	1.11
15	1418	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TAP014	7.62	2.87
16	771	Loma Prieta	Golden Gate Bridge	6.93	2.41
17	1515	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU082	7.62	2.51
18	1530	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU103	7.62	2.93
19	1286	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	HWA037	7.62	2.84
20	1541	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU116	7.62	2.10
21	1494	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU054	7.62	2.52
22	1504	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU067	7.62	1.10
23	1264	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	HWA013	7.62	2.51
24	1529	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU102	7.62	1.29
25	1503	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU065	7.62	0.70
26	1537	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCUIII	7.62	2.97
27	1547	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU123	7.62	1.97
28	1492	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU052	7.62	0.75
29	1536	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCUIIO	7.62	1.90
30	1147	Kocaeli, Turkey	Ambarlı	7.51	1.82
31	527	N. Palm Springs	Morongo Valley	6.06	2.09
32	900	Landers	Yermo Fire Station	7.28	2.23
33	1550	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCUI36	7.62	1.94
34	864	Landers	Joshua Tree	7.28	1.46
35	1456	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TAP095	7.62	2.86
36	721	Superstition Hills- 02	El Centro Imp. Co. Cent	6.54	2.38
37	2461	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03	CHY028	6.20	2.77
38	1551	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU138	7.62	2.34
39	1534	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU107	7.62	2.45
40	1265	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	HWA014	7.62	2.98

Table F.11 Documentation of 40 GMs of CMS procedure for Bridge B.

Record Number	NGA Record Sequence Number	Earthquake Name	Station	Magnitude	Scaling Factor
1	2492	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03	CHY076	6.20	2.90
2	1534	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU107	7.62	3.00
3	1498	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU059	7.62	3.00
4	1537	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU111	7.62	3.00
5	1506	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU070	7.62	3.00
6	1515	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU082	7.62	3.00
7	1538	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU112	7.62	3.00
8	1491	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU051	7.62	2.10
9	1492	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU052	7.62	3.00
10	1475	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU026	7.62	3.00
11	1504	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU067	7.62	2.60
12	1496	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU056	7.62	3.00
13	1489	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU049	7.62	1.80
14	1529	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU102	7.62	3.00
15	721	Superstition Hills- 02	El Centro Imp. Co. Cent	6.54	2.90
16	1490	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU050	7.62	3.00
17	1546	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU122	7.62	2.10
18	729	Superstition Hills- 02	Wildlife Liquef. Array	6.54	2.70
19	1494	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU054	7.62	2.70
20	1527	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU100	7.62	3.00
21	832	Landers	Amboy	7.28	2.90
22	1158	Kocaeli, Turkey	Duzce	7.51	3.00
23	1202	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY035	7.62	2.30
24	1508	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU072	7.62	1.40
25	1501	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU063	7.62	2.80
26	1493	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU053	7.62	2.70
27	1482	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU039	7.62	2.60
28	1505	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU068	7.62	1.20
29	169	Imperial Valley-06	Delta	6.53	1.40
30	1528	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU101	7.62	3.00
31	1176	Kocaeli, Turkey	Yarimca	7.51	3.00
32	1148	Kocaeli, Turkey	Arcelik	7.51	2.40
33	1084	Northridge-01	Sylmar-Converter Sta	6.69	2.20
34	179	Imperial Valley-06	El Centro Array #4	6.53	2.10
35	1555	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU147	7.62	2.90
36	285	Irpinia, Italy-01	Bagnoli Irpinio	6.90	2.20
37	1436	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TAP052	7.62	3.00
38	811	Loma Prieta	WAHO	6.93	2.00
39	1536	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU110	7.62	2.70
40	1488	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU048	7.62	2.80

Table F.12Documentation of 40 GMs of US procedure for Bridge B.

Record Number	NGA Record Sequence Number	Earthquake Name	Station	Magnitude	Scaling Factor
1	1084	Northridge-01	Sylmar-Converter Sta	6.69	0.70
2	1063	Northridge-01	Rinaldi Receiving Sta	6.69	0.89
3	1085	Northridge-01	Sylmar-Converter Sta East	6.69	0.94
4	1045	Northridge-01	Newhall-W Pico Canyon Rd.	6.69	0.95
5	1086	Northridge-01	Sylmar-Olive View Med FF	6.69	1.03
6	1044	Northridge-01	Newhall-Fire Sta	6.69	1.13
7	983	Northridge-01	Jensen Filter Plant Generator	6.69	1.16
8	1605	Duzce, Turkey	Duzce	7.14	1.53
9	803	Loma Prieta	Saratoga-W Valley Coll.	6.93	1.59
10	1013	Northridge-01	LA Dam	6.69	1.60
11	766	Loma Prieta	Gilroy Array #2	6.93	1.65
12	179	Imperial Valley-06	El Centro Array #4	6.53	1.73
13	802	Loma Prieta	Saratoga-Aloha Ave	6.93	1.82
14	170	Imperial Valley-06	EC County Center FF	6.53	1.90
15	825	Cape Mendocino	Cape Mendocino	7.01	1.91
16	184	Imperial Valley-06	El Centro Differential Array	6.53	1.94
17	828	Cape Mendocino	Petrolia	7.01	1.96
18	1602	Duzce, Turkey	Bolu	7.14	1.98
19	292	Irpinia, Italy-01	Sturno	6.90	2.04
20	1051	Northridge-01	Pacoima Dam (upper left)	6.69	2.09
21	173	Imperial Valley-06	EC Meloland Overpass FF	6.53	2.13
22	767	Loma Prieta	Gilroy Array #3	6.93	2.55
23	764	Loma Prieta	Gilroy-Historic Bldg.	6.93	2.62
24	174	Imperial Valley-06	El Centro Array #11	6.53	2.69
25	161	Imperial Valley-06	Brawley Airport	6.53	3.02
26	126	Gazli, USSR	Karakyr	6.80	1.19
27	1048	Northridge-01	Northridge-17645 Saticoy St	6.69	1.71
28	1004	Northridge-01	LA-Sepulveda VA Hospital	6.69	1.90
29	960	Northridge-01	Canyon Country-W Lost Cyn	6.69	2.06
30	768	Loma Prieta	Gilroy Array #4	6.93	2.15
31	1787	Hector Mine	Hector	7.13	2.16
32	959	Northridge-01	Canoga Park-Topanga Can	6.69	2.20
33	864	Landers	Joshua Tree	7.28	2.20
34	1111	Kobe, Japan	Nishi-Akashi	6.90	2.58
35	1080	Northridge-01	Simi Valley-Katherine Rd	6.69	2.64
36	285	Irpinia, Italy-01	Bagnoli Irpinio	6.90	2.68
37	1052	Northridge-01	Pacoima Kagel Canyon	6.69	2.78
38	728	Superstition Hills-02	Westmorland Fire Sta	6.54	2.87
39	829	Cape Mendocino	Rio Dell Overpass-FF	7.01	2.88
40	1082	Northridge-01	Sun Valley-Roscoe Blvd	6.69	2.89

Table F.13Documentation of 40 GMs of $S_a(T_1)$ procedure for Bridge C.

Record Number	NGA Record Sequence Number	Earthquake Name	Station	Magnitude	Scaling Factor
1	1084	Northridge-01	Sylmar-Converter Sta	6.69	0.70
2	1063	Northridge-01	Rinaldi Receiving Sta	6.69	0.89
3	1085	Northridge-01	Sylmar-Converter Sta East	6.69	0.94
4	1045	Northridge-01	Newhall-W Pico Canyon Rd.	6.69	0.95
5	1086	Northridge-01	Sylmar-Olive View Med FF	6.69	1.03
6	1044	Northridge-01	Newhall-Fire Sta	6.69	1.13
7	983	Northridge-01	Jensen Filter Plant Generator	6.69	1.16
8	1605	Duzce, Turkey	Duzce	7.14	1.53
9	803	Loma Prieta	Saratoga-W Valley Coll.	6.93	1.59
10	1013	Northridge-01	LA Dam	6.69	1.60
11	766	Loma Prieta	Gilroy Array #2	6.93	1.65
12	179	Imperial Valley-06	El Centro Array #4	6.53	1.73
13	802	Loma Prieta	Saratoga-Aloha Ave	6.93	1.82
14	170	Imperial Valley-06	EC County Center FF	6.53	1.90
15	825	Cape Mendocino	Cape Mendocino	7.01	1.91
16	184	Imperial Valley-06	El Centro Differential Array	6.53	1.94
17	828	Cape Mendocino	Petrolia	7.01	1.96
18	1602	Duzce, Turkey	Bolu	7.14	1.98
19	292	Irpinia, Italy-01	Sturno	6.90	2.04
20	1051	Northridge-01	Pacoima Dam (upper left)	6.69	2.09
21	173	Imperial Valley-06	EC Meloland Overpass FF	6.53	2.13
22	767	Loma Prieta	Gilroy Array #3	6.93	2.55
23	764	Loma Prieta	Gilroy-Historic Bldg.	6.93	2.62
24	174	Imperial Valley-06	El Centro Array #11	6.53	2.69
25	161	Imperial Valley-06	Brawley Airport	6.53	3.02
26	126	Gazli, USSR	Karakyr	6.80	1.19
27	1048	Northridge-01	Northridge-17645 Saticoy St	6.69	1.71
28	1004	Northridge-01	LA-Sepulveda VA Hospital	6.69	1.90
29	960	Northridge-01	Canyon Country-W Lost Cyn	6.69	2.06
30	768	Loma Prieta	Gilroy Array #4	6.93	2.15
31	1787	Hector Mine	Hector	7.13	2.16
32	959	Northridge-01	Canoga Park-Topanga Cyn	6.69	2.20
33	864	Landers	Joshua Tree	7.28	2.20
34	1111	Kobe, Japan	Nishi-Akashi	6.90	2.58
35	1080	Northridge-01	Simi Valley-Katherine Rd	6.69	2.64
36	285	Irpinia, Italy-01	Bagnoli Irpinio	6.90	2.68
37	1052	Northridge-01	Pacoima Kagel Canyon	6.69	2.78
38	185	Imperial Valley-06	Holtville Post Office	6.53	2.72
39	1050	Northridge-01	Pacoima Dam (downstr)	6.69	3.98
40	765	Loma Prieta	Gilroy Array #1	6.93	4.84

Table F.14Documentation of 40 GMs of $S_a(T_1)_p$ procedure for Bridge C.

Record Number	NGA Record Sequence Number	Earthquake Name	Station	Magnitude	Scaling Factor
1	1537	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU111	7.62	2.55
2	1547	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU123	7.62	1.58
3	1147	Kocaeli, Turkey	Ambarli	7.51	2.55
4	1329	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	ILA037	7.62	2.50
5	1262	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	HWA011	7.62	2.99
6	1492	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU052	7.62	0.65
7	1203	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY036	7.62	1.96
8	1553	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU141	7.62	2.79
9	1536	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU110	7.62	1.17
10	1472	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU017	7.62	2.64
11	316	Westmorland	Parachute Test Site	5.90	2.72
12	1182	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY006	7.62	1.80
13	721	Superstition Hills- 02	El Centro Imp. Co. Cent	6.54	2.23
14	1317	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	ILA013	7.62	2.75
15	173	Imperial Valley-06	El Centro Array #10	6.53	2.13
16	1187	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	CHY015	7.62	2.72
17	1503	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU065	7.62	0.80
18	1166	Kocaeli, Turkey	Iznik	7.51	2.28
19	1264	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	HWA013	7.62	2.71
20	2509	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03	CHY104	6.20	2.47
21	285	Irpinia, Italy-01	Bagnoli Irpinio	6.90	2.68
22	1504	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU067	7.62	1.01
23	1534	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU107	7.62	2.13
24	1509	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU074	7.62	0.90
25	1084	Northridge-01	Sylmar-Converter Sta	6.69	0.70
26	1494	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU054	7.62	2.13
27	1419	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TAP017	7.62	2.76
28	1529	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU102	7.62	1.34
29	1515	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU082	7.62	2.20
30	900	Landers	Yermo Fire Station	7.28	2.13
31	1045	Northridge-01	Newhall-W Pico Canyon Rd.	6.69	0.95
32	1787	Hector Mine	Hector	7.13	2.16
33	1410	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TAP003	7.62	1.78
34	1316	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	ILA012	7.62	2.97
35	808	Loma Prieta	Treasure Island	6.93	2.43
36	169	Imperial Valley-06	Delta	6.53	1.73
37	289	Irpinia, Italy-01	Calitri	6.90	2.71
38	1491	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU051	7.62	2.52
39	3317	Chi-Chi, Taiwan-06	CHY101	6.30	2.78
40	864	Landers	Joshua Tree	7.28	2.20

 Table F.15
 Documentation of 40 GMs of CMS procedure for Bridge C.

Record Number	NGA Record Sequence Number	Earthquake Name	Station	Magnitude	Scaling Factor
1	2115	Denali, Alaska	TAPS Pump Station #11	7.90	1.80
2	1436	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TAP052	7.62	2.60
3	729	Superstition Hills- 02	Wildlife Liquef. Array	6.54	1.40
4	1489	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU049	7.62	1.50
5	1505	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU068	7.62	1.00
6	732	Loma Prieta	APEEL 2-Redwood City	6.93	3.00
7	1491	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU051	7.62	2.60
8	1490	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU050	7.62	2.60
9	285	Irpinia, Italy-01	Bagnoli Irpinio	6.90	2.80
10	1787	Hector Mine	Hector	7.13	2.70
11	1494	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU054	7.62	2.40
12	1492	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU052	7.62	2.30
13	1504	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU067	7.62	2.60
14	1527	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU100	7.62	3.00
15	1526	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU098	7.62	2.80
16	1488	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU048	7.62	3.00
17	1048	Northridge-01	Northridge-17645 Saticoy St	6.69	2.80
18	801	Loma Prieta	San Jose-Santa Teresa Hills	6.93	3.00
19	1475	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU026	7.62	3.00
20	1478	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU033	7.62	2.80
21	1496	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU056	7.62	2.80
22	832	Landers	Amboy	7.28	3.00
23	1472	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU017	7.62	3.00
24	1515	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU082	7.62	2.20
25	1503	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU065	7.62	2.00
26	169	Imperial Valley-06	Delta	6.53	1.90
27	1546	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU122	7.62	3.00
28	1482	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU039	7.62	2.90
29	1529	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU102	7.62	3.00
30	1045	Northridge-01	Newhall-W Pico Cyn Rd.	6.69	3.00
31	1176	Kocaeli, Turkey	Yarimca	7.51	3.00
32	1508	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU072	7.62	2.50
33	1493	Chi-Chi. Taiwan	TCU053	7.62	3.00
34	1476	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU029	7.62	2.80
35	1528	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU101	7.62	1.90
36	180	Imperial Valley-06	El Centro Array #5	6.53	2.00
37	829	Cape Mendocino	Rio Dell Overpass-FF	7.01	2.10
38	1499	Chi-Chi, Taiwan	TCU060	7.62	2.80
39	179	Imperial Valley-06	El Centro Array #4	6.53	2.70
40	139	Tabas, Iran	Dayhook	7.35	1.80

 Table F.16
 Documentation of 40 GMs of US procedure for Bridge C.

PEER REPORTS

PEER reports are available as a free PDF download from <u>http://peer.berkeley.edu/publications/peer reports complete.html</u>. Printed hard copies of PEER reports can be ordered directly from our printer by following the instructions at <u>http://peer.berkeley.edu/publications/peer reports.html</u>. For other related questions about the PEER Report Series, contact the Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center, 325 Davis Hall, Mail Code 1792, Berkeley, CA 94720. Tel.: (510) 642-3437; Fax: (510) 642-1655; Email: peer_center.berkeley.edu

- PEER 2016/10 Performance-Based Robust Nonlinear Seismic Analysis with Application to Reinforced Concrete Bridge Systems. Xiao Ling and Khalid M. Mosalam. December 2016.
- PEER 2016/09 Resilience of Critical Structures, Infrastructure, and Communities. Gian Paolo Cimellaro, Ali Zamani-Noori, Omar Kamouh, Vesna Terzic, and Stephen A. Mahin. December 2016.
- PEER 2016/08 Processing and Development of Iran Earthquake Ground-Motion Database. Tadahiro Kishida, Sahar Derakhshan, Sifat Muin, Yousef Bozorgnia, Sean K. Ahdi, Jonathan P. Stewart, Robert B. Darragh, Walter J. Silva, and Esmael Farzanegan. December 2016.
- **PEER 2016/07** *Hybrid Simulation Theory for a Classical Nonlinear Dynamical System.* Paul L. Drazin and Sanjay Govindjee. September 2016.
- PEER 2016/06 California Earthquake Early Warning System Benefit Study. Laurie A. Johnson, Sharyl Rabinovici, Grace S. Kang, and Stephen A. Mahin. July 2006.
- **PEER 2016/05** Ground-Motion Prediction Equations for Arias Intensity Consistent with the NGA-West2 Ground-Motion Models. Charlotte Abrahamson, Hao-Jun Michael Shi, and Brian Yang. July 2016.
- **PEER 2016/04** The M_W 6.0 South Napa Earthquake of August 24, 2014: A Wake-Up Call for Renewed Investment in Seismic Resilience Across California. Prepared for the California Seismic Safety Commission, Laurie A. Johnson and Stephen A. Mahin. May 2016.
- PEER 2016/03 Simulation Confidence in Tsunami-Driven Overland Flow. Patrick Lynett. May 2016.
- PEER 2016/02 Semi-Automated Procedure for Windowing time Series and Computing Fourier Amplitude Spectra for the NGA-West2 Database. Tadahiro Kishida, Olga-Joan Ktenidou, Robert B. Darragh, and Walter J. Silva. May 2016.
- PEER 2016/01 A Methodology for the Estimation of Kappa (κ) from Large Datasets: Example Application to Rock Sites in the NGA-East Database and Implications on Design Motions. Olga-Joan Ktenidou, Norman A. Abrahamson, Robert B. Darragh, and Walter J. Silva. April 2016.
- PEER 2015/13 Self-Centering Precast Concrete Dual-Steel-Shell Columns for Accelerated Bridge Construction: Seismic Performance, Analysis, and Design. Gabriele Guerrini, José I. Restrepo, Athanassios Vervelidis, and Milena Massari. December 2015.
- PEER 2015/12 Shear-Flexure Interaction Modeling for Reinforced Concrete Structural Walls and Columns under Reversed Cyclic Loading. Kristijan Kolozvari, Kutay Orakcal, and John Wallace. December 2015.
- **PEER 2015/11** Selection and Scaling of Ground Motions for Nonlinear Response History Analysis of Buildings in Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering. N. Simon Kwong and Anil K. Chopra. December 2015.
- PEER 2015/10 Structural Behavior of Column-Bent Cap Beam-Box Girder Systems in Reinforced Concrete Bridges Subjected to Gravity and Seismic Loads. Part II: Hybrid Simulation and Post-Test Analysis. Mohamed A. Moustafa and Khalid M. Mosalam. November 2015.
- PEER 2015/09 Structural Behavior of Column-Bent Cap Beam-Box Girder Systems in Reinforced Concrete Bridges Subjected to Gravity and Seismic Loads. Part I: Pre-Test Analysis and Quasi-Static Experiments. Mohamed A. Moustafa and Khalid M. Mosalam. September 2015.
- PEER 2015/08 NGA-East: Adjustments to Median Ground-Motion Models for Center and Eastern North America. August 2015.
- PEER 2015/07 NGA-East: Ground-Motion Standard-Deviation Models for Central and Eastern North America. Linda Al Atik. June 2015.
- **PEER 2015/06** Adjusting Ground-Motion Intensity Measures to a Reference Site for which V_{S30} = 3000 m/sec. David M. Boore. May 2015.
- PEER 2015/05 Hybrid Simulation of Seismic Isolation Systems Applied to an APR-1400 Nuclear Power Plant. Andreas H. Schellenberg, Alireza Sarebanha, Matthew J. Schoettler, Gilberto Mosqueda, Gianmario Benzoni, and Stephen A. Mahin. April 2015.
- PEER 2015/04 NGA-East: Median Ground-Motion Models for the Central and Eastern North America Region. April 2015.

- PEER 2015/03 Single Series Solution for the Rectangular Fiber-Reinforced Elastomeric Isolator Compression Modulus. James M. Kelly and Niel C. Van Engelen. March 2015.
- PEER 2015/02 A Full-Scale, Single-Column Bridge Bent Tested by Shake-Table Excitation. Matthew J. Schoettler, José I. Restrepo, Gabriele Guerrini, David E. Duck, and Francesco Carrea. March 2015.
- PEER 2015/01 Concrete Column Blind Prediction Contest 2010: Outcomes and Observations. Vesna Terzic, Matthew J. Schoettler, José I. Restrepo, and Stephen A Mahin. March 2015.
- **PEER 2014/20** Stochastic Modeling and Simulation of Near-Fault Ground Motions for Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering. Mayssa Dabaghi and Armen Der Kiureghian. December 2014.
- **PEER 2014/19** Seismic Response of a Hybrid Fiber-Reinforced Concrete Bridge Column Detailed for Accelerated Bridge Construction. Wilson Nguyen, William Trono, Marios Panagiotou, and Claudia P. Ostertag. December 2014.
- PEER 2014/18 Three-Dimensional Beam-Truss Model for Reinforced Concrete Walls and Slabs Subjected to Cyclic Static or Dynamic Loading. Yuan Lu, Marios Panagiotou, and Ioannis Koutromanos. December 2014.
- PEER 2014/17 PEER NGA-East Database. Christine A. Goulet, Tadahiro Kishida, Timothy D. Ancheta, Chris H. Cramer, Robert B. Darragh, Walter J. Silva, Youssef M.A. Hashash, Joseph Harmon, Jonathan P. Stewart, Katie E. Wooddell, and Robert R. Youngs. October 2014.
- **PEER 2014/16** Guidelines for Performing Hazard-Consistent One-Dimensional Ground Response Analysis for Ground Motion Prediction. Jonathan P. Stewart, Kioumars Afshari, and Youssef M.A. Hashash. October 2014.
- PEER 2014/15 NGA-East Regionalization Report: Comparison of Four Crustal Regions within Central and Eastern North America using Waveform Modeling and 5%-Damped Pseudo-Spectral Acceleration Response. Jennifer Dreiling, Marius P. Isken, Walter D. Mooney, Martin C. Chapman, and Richard W. Godbee. October 2014.
- **PEER 2014/14** Scaling Relations between Seismic Moment and Rupture Area of Earthquakes in Stable Continental Regions. Paul Somerville. August 2014.
- PEER 2014/13 PEER Preliminary Notes and Observations on the August 24, 2014, South Napa Earthquake. Grace S. Kang and Stephen A. Mahin, Editors. September 2014.
- PEER 2014/12 Reference-Rock Site Conditions for Central and Eastern North America: Part II Attenuation (Kappa) Definition. Kenneth W. Campbell, Youssef M.A. Hashash, Byungmin Kim, Albert R. Kottke, Ellen M. Rathje, Walter J. Silva, and Jonathan P. Stewart. August 2014.
- PEER 2014/11 Reference-Rock Site Conditions for Central and Eastern North America: Part I Velocity Definition. Youssef M.A. Hashash, Albert R. Kottke, Jonathan P. Stewart, Kenneth W. Campbell, Byungmin Kim, Ellen M. Rathje, Walter J. Silva, Sissy Nikolaou, and Cheryl Moss. August 2014.
- **PEER 2014/10** Evaluation of Collapse and Non-Collapse of Parallel Bridges Affected by Liquefaction and Lateral Spreading. Benjamin Turner, Scott J. Brandenberg, and Jonathan P. Stewart. August 2014.
- PEER 2014/09 PEER Arizona Strong-Motion Database and GMPEs Evaluation. Tadahiro Kishida, Robert E. Kayen, Olga-Joan Ktenidou, Walter J. Silva, Robert B. Darragh, and Jennie Watson-Lamprey. June 2014.
- PEER 2014/08 Unbonded Pretensioned Bridge Columns with Rocking Detail. Jeffrey A. Schaefer, Bryan Kennedy, Marc O. Eberhard, and John F. Stanton. June 2014.
- PEER 2014/07 Northridge 20 Symposium Summary Report: Impacts, Outcomes, and Next Steps. May 2014.
- **PEER 2014/06** Report of the Tenth Planning Meeting of NEES/E-Defense Collaborative Research on Earthquake Engineering. December 2013.
- **PEER 2014/05** Seismic Velocity Site Characterization of Thirty-One Chilean Seismometer Stations by Spectral Analysis of Surface Wave Dispersion. Robert Kayen, Brad D. Carkin, Skye Corbet, Camilo Pinilla, Allan Ng, Edward Gorbis, and Christine Truong. April 2014.
- PEER 2014/04 Effect of Vertical Acceleration on Shear Strength of Reinforced Concrete Columns. Hyerin Lee and Khalid M. Mosalam. April 2014.
- PEER 2014/03 Retest of Thirty-Year-Old Neoprene Isolation Bearings. James M. Kelly and Niel C. Van Engelen. March 2014.
- **PEER 2014/02** Theoretical Development of Hybrid Simulation Applied to Plate Structures. Ahmed A. Bakhaty, Khalid M. Mosalam, and Sanjay Govindjee. January 2014.
- PEER 2014/01 Performance-Based Seismic Assessment of Skewed Bridges. Peyman Kaviani, Farzin Zareian, and Ertugrul Taciroglu. January 2014.
- PEER 2013/26 Urban Earthquake Engineering. Proceedings of the U.S.-Iran Seismic Workshop. December 2013.

- PEER 2013/25 Earthquake Engineering for Resilient Communities: 2013 PEER Internship Program Research Report Collection. Heidi Tremayne (Editor), Stephen A. Mahin (Editor), Jorge Archbold Monterossa, Matt Brosman, Shelly Dean, Katherine deLaveaga, Curtis Fong, Donovan Holder, Rakeeb Khan, Elizabeth Jachens, David Lam, Daniela Martinez Lopez, Mara Minner, Geffen Oren, Julia Pavicic, Melissa Quinonez, Lorena Rodriguez, Sean Salazar, Kelli Slaven, Vivian Steyert, Jenny Taing, and Salvador Tena. December 2013.
- PEER 2013/24 NGA-West2 Ground Motion Prediction Equations for Vertical Ground Motions. September 2013.
- PEER 2013/23 Coordinated Planning and Preparedness for Fire Following Major Earthquakes. Charles Scawthorn. November 2013.
- PEER 2013/22 *GEM-PEER Task 3 Project: Selection of a Global Set of Ground Motion Prediction Equations.* Jonathan P. Stewart, John Douglas, Mohammad B. Javanbarg, Carola Di Alessandro, Yousef Bozorgnia, Norman A. Abrahamson, David M. Boore, Kenneth W. Campbell, Elise Delavaud, Mustafa Erdik, and Peter J. Stafford. December 2013.
- **PEER 2013/21** Seismic Design and Performance of Bridges with Columns on Rocking Foundations. Grigorios Antonellis and Marios Panagiotou. September 2013.
- PEER 2013/20 Experimental and Analytical Studies on the Seismic Behavior of Conventional and Hybrid Braced Frames. Jiun-Wei Lai and Stephen A. Mahin. September 2013.
- PEER 2013/19 Toward Resilient Communities: A Performance-Based Engineering Framework for Design and Evaluation of the Built Environment. Michael William Mieler, Bozidar Stojadinovic, Robert J. Budnitz, Stephen A. Mahin, and Mary C. Comerio. September 2013.
- PEER 2013/18 Identification of Site Parameters that Improve Predictions of Site Amplification. Ellen M. Rathje and Sara Navidi. July 2013.
- PEER 2013/17 Response Spectrum Analysis of Concrete Gravity Dams Including Dam-Water-Foundation Interaction. Arnkjell Løkke and Anil K. Chopra. July 2013.
- PEER 2013/16 Effect of Hoop Reinforcement Spacing on the Cyclic Response of Large Reinforced Concrete Special Moment Frame Beams. Marios Panagiotou, Tea Visnjic, Grigorios Antonellis, Panagiotis Galanis, and Jack P. Moehle. June 2013.
- PEER 2013/15 A Probabilistic Framework to Include the Effects of Near-Fault Directivity in Seismic Hazard Assessment. Shrey Kumar Shahi, Jack W. Baker. October 2013.
- **PEER 2013/14** Hanging-Wall Scaling using Finite-Fault Simulations. Jennifer L. Donahue and Norman A. Abrahamson. September 2013.
- **PEER 2013/13** Semi-Empirical Nonlinear Site Amplification and its Application in NEHRP Site Factors. Jonathan P. Stewart and Emel Seyhan. November 2013.
- PEER 2013/12 Nonlinear Horizontal Site Response for the NGA-West2 Project. Ronnie Kamai, Norman A. Abramson, Walter J. Silva. May 2013.
- PEER 2013/11 Epistemic Uncertainty for NGA-West2 Models. Linda AI Atik and Robert R. Youngs. May 2013.
- PEER 2013/10 NGA-West 2 Models for Ground-Motion Directionality. Shrey K. Shahi and Jack W. Baker. May 2013.
- **PEER 2013/09** *Final Report of the NGA-West2 Directivity Working Group.* Paul Spudich, Jeffrey R. Bayless, Jack W. Baker, Brian S.J. Chiou, Badie Rowshandel, Shrey Shahi, and Paul Somerville. May 2013.
- PEER 2013/08 NGA-West2 Model for Estimating Average Horizontal Values of Pseudo-Absolute Spectral Accelerations Generated by Crustal Earthquakes. I. M. Idriss. May 2013.
- PEER 2013/07 Update of the Chiou and Youngs NGA Ground Motion Model for Average Horizontal Component of Peak Ground Motion and Response Spectra. Brian Chiou and Robert Youngs. May 2013.
- PEER 2013/06 NGA-West2 Campbell-Bozorgnia Ground Motion Model for the Horizontal Components of PGA, PGV, and 5%-Damped Elastic Pseudo-Acceleration Response Spectra for Periods Ranging from 0.01 to 10 sec. Kenneth W. Campbell and Yousef Bozorgnia. May 2013.
- PEER 2013/05 NGA-West 2 Equations for Predicting Response Spectral Accelerations for Shallow Crustal Earthquakes. David M. Boore, Jonathan P. Stewart, Emel Seyhan, and Gail M. Atkinson. May 2013.
- PEER 2013/04 Update of the AS08 Ground-Motion Prediction Equations Based on the NGA-West2 Data Set. Norman Abrahamson, Walter Silva, and Ronnie Kamai. May 2013.
- PEER 2013/03 PEER NGA-West2 Database. Timothy D. Ancheta, Robert B. Darragh, Jonathan P. Stewart, Emel Seyhan, Walter J. Silva, Brian S.J. Chiou, Katie E. Wooddell, Robert W. Graves, Albert R. Kottke, David M. Boore, Tadahiro Kishida, and Jennifer L. Donahue. May 2013.

- PEER 2013/02 Hybrid Simulation of the Seismic Response of Squat Reinforced Concrete Shear Walls. Catherine A. Whyte and Bozidar Stojadinovic. May 2013.
- PEER 2013/01 Housing Recovery in Chile: A Qualitative Mid-program Review. Mary C. Comerio. February 2013.
- PEER 2012/08 Guidelines for Estimation of Shear Wave Velocity. Bernard R. Wair, Jason T. DeJong, and Thomas Shantz. December 2012.
- PEER 2012/07 Earthquake Engineering for Resilient Communities: 2012 PEER Internship Program Research Report Collection. Heidi Tremayne (Editor), Stephen A. Mahin (Editor), Collin Anderson, Dustin Cook, Michael Erceg, Carlos Esparza, Jose Jimenez, Dorian Krausz, Andrew Lo, Stephanie Lopez, Nicole McCurdy, Paul Shipman, Alexander Strum, Eduardo Vega. December 2012.
- PEER 2012/06 Fragilities for Precarious Rocks at Yucca Mountain. Matthew D. Purvance, Rasool Anooshehpoor, and James N. Brune. December 2012.
- **PEER 2012/05** Development of Simplified Analysis Procedure for Piles in Laterally Spreading Layered Soils. Christopher R. McGann, Pedro Arduino, and Peter Mackenzie–Helnwein. December 2012.
- PEER 2012/04 Unbonded Pre-Tensioned Columns for Bridges in Seismic Regions. Phillip M. Davis, Todd M. Janes, Marc O. Eberhard, and John F. Stanton. December 2012.
- PEER 2012/03 Experimental and Analytical Studies on Reinforced Concrete Buildings with Seismically Vulnerable Beam-Column Joints. Sangjoon Park and Khalid M. Mosalam. October 2012.
- PEER 2012/02 Seismic Performance of Reinforced Concrete Bridges Allowed to Uplift during Multi-Directional Excitation. Andres Oscar Espinoza and Stephen A. Mahin. July 2012.
- **PEER 2012/01** Spectral Damping Scaling Factors for Shallow Crustal Earthquakes in Active Tectonic Regions. Sanaz Rezaeian, Yousef Bozorgnia, I. M. Idriss, Kenneth Campbell, Norman Abrahamson, and Walter Silva. July 2012.
- **PEER 2011/10** Earthquake Engineering for Resilient Communities: 2011 PEER Internship Program Research Report Collection. Heidi Faison and Stephen A. Mahin, Editors. December 2011.
- PEER 2011/09 Calibration of Semi-Stochastic Procedure for Simulating High-Frequency Ground Motions. Jonathan P. Stewart, Emel Seyhan, and Robert W. Graves. December 2011.
- PEER 2011/08 Water Supply in regard to Fire Following Earthquake. Charles Scawthorn. November 2011.
- **PEER 2011/07** Seismic Risk Management in Urban Areas. Proceedings of a U.S.-Iran-Turkey Seismic Workshop. September 2011.
- **PEER 2011/06** The Use of Base Isolation Systems to Achieve Complex Seismic Performance Objectives. Troy A. Morgan and Stephen A. Mahin. July 2011.
- **PEER 2011/05** Case Studies of the Seismic Performance of Tall Buildings Designed by Alternative Means. Task 12 Report for the Tall Buildings Initiative. Jack Moehle, Yousef Bozorgnia, Nirmal Jayaram, Pierson Jones, Mohsen Rahnama, Nilesh Shome, Zeynep Tuna, John Wallace, Tony Yang, and Farzin Zareian. July 2011.
- PEER 2011/04 Recommended Design Practice for Pile Foundations in Laterally Spreading Ground. Scott A. Ashford, Ross W. Boulanger, and Scott J. Brandenberg. June 2011.
- PEER 2011/03 New Ground Motion Selection Procedures and Selected Motions for the PEER Transportation Research Program. Jack W. Baker, Ting Lin, Shrey K. Shahi, and Nirmal Jayaram. March 2011.
- **PEER 2011/02** A Bayesian Network Methodology for Infrastructure Seismic Risk Assessment and Decision Support. Michelle T. Bensi, Armen Der Kiureghian, and Daniel Straub. March 2011.
- PEER 2011/01 Demand Fragility Surfaces for Bridges in Liquefied and Laterally Spreading Ground. Scott J. Brandenberg, Jian Zhang, Pirooz Kashighandi, Yili Huo, and Minxing Zhao. March 2011.
- **PEER 2010/05** Guidelines for Performance-Based Seismic Design of Tall Buildings. Developed by the Tall Buildings Initiative. November 2010.
- **PEER 2010/04** Application Guide for the Design of Flexible and Rigid Bus Connections between Substation Equipment Subjected to Earthquakes. Jean-Bernard Dastous and Armen Der Kiureghian. September 2010.
- **PEER 2010/03** Shear Wave Velocity as a Statistical Function of Standard Penetration Test Resistance and Vertical Effective Stress at Caltrans Bridge Sites. Scott J. Brandenberg, Naresh Bellana, and Thomas Shantz. June 2010.
- **PEER 2010/02** Stochastic Modeling and Simulation of Ground Motions for Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering. Sanaz Rezaeian and Armen Der Kiureghian. June 2010.

- PEER 2010/01 Structural Response and Cost Characterization of Bridge Construction Using Seismic Performance Enhancement Strategies. Ady Aviram, Božidar Stojadinović, Gustavo J. Parra-Montesinos, and Kevin R. Mackie. March 2010.
- **PEER 2009/03** The Integration of Experimental and Simulation Data in the Study of Reinforced Concrete Bridge Systems Including Soil-Foundation-Structure Interaction. Matthew Dryden and Gregory L. Fenves. November 2009.
- PEER 2009/02 Improving Earthquake Mitigation through Innovations and Applications in Seismic Science, Engineering, Communication, and Response. Proceedings of a U.S.-Iran Seismic Workshop. October 2009.
- PEER 2009/01 Evaluation of Ground Motion Selection and Modification Methods: Predicting Median Interstory Drift Response of Buildings. Curt B. Haselton, Editor. June 2009.
- PEER 2008/10 Technical Manual for Strata. Albert R. Kottke and Ellen M. Rathje. February 2009.
- PEER 2008/09 NGA Model for Average Horizontal Component of Peak Ground Motion and Response Spectra. Brian S.-J. Chiou and Robert R. Youngs. November 2008.
- **PEER 2008/08** Toward Earthquake-Resistant Design of Concentrically Braced Steel Structures. Patxi Uriz and Stephen A. Mahin. November 2008.
- PEER 2008/07 Using OpenSees for Performance-Based Evaluation of Bridges on Liquefiable Soils. Stephen L. Kramer, Pedro Arduino, and HyungSuk Shin. November 2008.
- PEER 2008/06 Shaking Table Tests and Numerical Investigation of Self-Centering Reinforced Concrete Bridge Columns. Hyung IL Jeong, Junichi Sakai, and Stephen A. Mahin. September 2008.
- PEER 2008/05 Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering Design Evaluation Procedure for Bridge Foundations Undergoing Liquefaction-Induced Lateral Ground Displacement. Christian A. Ledezma and Jonathan D. Bray. August 2008.
- PEER 2008/04 Benchmarking of Nonlinear Geotechnical Ground Response Analysis Procedures. Jonathan P. Stewart, Annie On-Lei Kwok, Youssef M. A. Hashash, Neven Matasovic, Robert Pyke, Zhiliang Wang, and Zhaohui Yang. August 2008.
- **PEER 2008/03** Guidelines for Nonlinear Analysis of Bridge Structures in California. Ady Aviram, Kevin R. Mackie, and Božidar Stojadinović. August 2008.
- **PEER 2008/02** Treatment of Uncertainties in Seismic-Risk Analysis of Transportation Systems. Evangelos Stergiou and Anne S. Kiremidjian. July 2008.
- PEER 2008/01 Seismic Performance Objectives for Tall Buildings. William T. Holmes, Charles Kircher, William Petak, and Nabih Youssef. August 2008.
- PEER 2007/12 An Assessment to Benchmark the Seismic Performance of a Code-Conforming Reinforced Concrete Moment-Frame Building. Curt Haselton, Christine A. Goulet, Judith Mitrani-Reiser, James L. Beck, Gregory G. Deierlein, Keith A. Porter, Jonathan P. Stewart, and Ertugrul Taciroglu. August 2008.
- **PEER 2007/11** Bar Buckling in Reinforced Concrete Bridge Columns. Wayne A. Brown, Dawn E. Lehman, and John F. Stanton. February 2008.
- PEER 2007/10 Computational Modeling of Progressive Collapse in Reinforced Concrete Frame Structures. Mohamed M. Talaat and Khalid M. Mosalam. May 2008.
- PEER 2007/09 Integrated Probabilistic Performance-Based Evaluation of Benchmark Reinforced Concrete Bridges. Kevin R. Mackie, John-Michael Wong, and Božidar Stojadinović. January 2008.
- PEER 2007/08 Assessing Seismic Collapse Safety of Modern Reinforced Concrete Moment-Frame Buildings. Curt B. Haselton and Gregory G. Deierlein. February 2008.
- PEER 2007/07 Performance Modeling Strategies for Modern Reinforced Concrete Bridge Columns. Michael P. Berry and Marc O. Eberhard. April 2008.
- PEER 2007/06 Development of Improved Procedures for Seismic Design of Buried and Partially Buried Structures. Linda Al Atik and Nicholas Sitar. June 2007.
- **PEER 2007/05** Uncertainty and Correlation in Seismic Risk Assessment of Transportation Systems. Renee G. Lee and Anne S. Kiremidjian. July 2007.
- PEER 2007/04 Numerical Models for Analysis and Performance-Based Design of Shallow Foundations Subjected to Seismic Loading. Sivapalan Gajan, Tara C. Hutchinson, Bruce L. Kutter, Prishati Raychowdhury, José A. Ugalde, and Jonathan P. Stewart. May 2008.
- PEER 2007/03 Beam-Column Element Model Calibrated for Predicting Flexural Response Leading to Global Collapse of RC Frame Buildings. Curt B. Haselton, Abbie B. Liel, Sarah Taylor Lange, and Gregory G. Deierlein. May 2008.

- PEER 2007/02 Campbell-Bozorgnia NGA Ground Motion Relations for the Geometric Mean Horizontal Component of Peak and Spectral Ground Motion Parameters. Kenneth W. Campbell and Yousef Bozorgnia. May 2007.
- PEER 2007/01 Boore-Atkinson NGA Ground Motion Relations for the Geometric Mean Horizontal Component of Peak and Spectral Ground Motion Parameters. David M. Boore and Gail M. Atkinson. May 2007.
- **PEER 2006/12** Societal Implications of Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering. Peter J. May. May 2007.
- PEER 2006/11 Probabilistic Seismic Demand Analysis Using Advanced Ground Motion Intensity Measures, Attenuation Relationships, and Near-Fault Effects. Polsak Tothong and C. Allin Cornell. March 2007.
- PEER 2006/10 Application of the PEER PBEE Methodology to the I-880 Viaduct. Sashi Kunnath. February 2007.
- **PEER 2006/09** *Quantifying Economic Losses from Travel Forgone Following a Large Metropolitan Earthquake.* James Moore, Sungbin Cho, Yue Yue Fan, and Stuart Werner. November 2006.
- PEER 2006/08 Vector-Valued Ground Motion Intensity Measures for Probabilistic Seismic Demand Analysis. Jack W. Baker and C. Allin Cornell. October 2006.
- PEER 2006/07 Analytical Modeling of Reinforced Concrete Walls for Predicting Flexural and Coupled–Shear-Flexural Responses. Kutay Orakcal, Leonardo M. Massone, and John W. Wallace. October 2006.
- **PEER 2006/06** Nonlinear Analysis of a Soil-Drilled Pier System under Static and Dynamic Axial Loading. Gang Wang and Nicholas Sitar. November 2006.
- PEER 2006/05 Advanced Seismic Assessment Guidelines. Paolo Bazzurro, C. Allin Cornell, Charles Menun, Maziar Motahari, and Nicolas Luco. September 2006.
- PEER 2006/04 Probabilistic Seismic Evaluation of Reinforced Concrete Structural Components and Systems. Tae Hyung Lee and Khalid M. Mosalam. August 2006.
- PEER 2006/03 Performance of Lifelines Subjected to Lateral Spreading. Scott A. Ashford and Teerawut Juirnarongrit. July 2006.
- PEER 2006/02 Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center Highway Demonstration Project. Anne Kiremidjian, James Moore, Yue Yue Fan, Nesrin Basoz, Ozgur Yazali, and Meredith Williams. April 2006.
- PEER 2006/01 Bracing Berkeley. A Guide to Seismic Safety on the UC Berkeley Campus. Mary C. Comerio, Stephen Tobriner, and Ariane Fehrenkamp. January 2006.
- **PEER 2005/16** Seismic Response and Reliability of Electrical Substation Equipment and Systems. Junho Song, Armen Der Kiureghian, and Jerome L. Sackman. April 2006.
- PEER 2005/15 CPT-Based Probabilistic Assessment of Seismic Soil Liquefaction Initiation. R. E. S. Moss, R. B. Seed, R. E. Kayen, J. P. Stewart, and A. Der Kiureghian. April 2006.
- PEER 2005/14 Workshop on Modeling of Nonlinear Cyclic Load-Deformation Behavior of Shallow Foundations. Bruce L. Kutter, Geoffrey Martin, Tara Hutchinson, Chad Harden, Sivapalan Gajan, and Justin Phalen. March 2006.
- PEER 2005/13 Stochastic Characterization and Decision Bases under Time-Dependent Aftershock Risk in Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering. Gee Liek Yeo and C. Allin Cornell. July 2005.
- **PEER 2005/12** *PEER Testbed Study on a Laboratory Building: Exercising Seismic Performance Assessment.* Mary C. Comerio, Editor. November 2005.
- PEER 2005/11 Van Nuys Hotel Building Testbed Report: Exercising Seismic Performance Assessment. Helmut Krawinkler, Editor. October 2005.
- PEER 2005/10 First NEES/E-Defense Workshop on Collapse Simulation of Reinforced Concrete Building Structures. September 2005.
- PEER 2005/09 Test Applications of Advanced Seismic Assessment Guidelines. Joe Maffei, Karl Telleen, Danya Mohr, William Holmes, and Yuki Nakayama. August 2006.
- PEER 2005/08 Damage Accumulation in Lightly Confined Reinforced Concrete Bridge Columns. R. Tyler Ranf, Jared M. Nelson, Zach Price, Marc O. Eberhard, and John F. Stanton. April 2006.
- **PEER 2005/07** Experimental and Analytical Studies on the Seismic Response of Freestanding and Anchored Laboratory Equipment. Dimitrios Konstantinidis and Nicos Makris. January 2005.
- PEER 2005/06 Global Collapse of Frame Structures under Seismic Excitations. Luis F. Ibarra and Helmut Krawinkler. September 2005.
- **PEER 2005**//05 *Performance Characterization of Bench- and Shelf-Mounted Equipment.* Samit Ray Chaudhuri and Tara C. Hutchinson. May 2006.

- PEER 2005/04 Numerical Modeling of the Nonlinear Cyclic Response of Shallow Foundations. Chad Harden, Tara Hutchinson, Geoffrey R. Martin, and Bruce L. Kutter. August 2005.
- **PEER 2005/03** A Taxonomy of Building Components for Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering. Keith A. Porter. September 2005.
- PEER 2005/02 Fragility Basis for California Highway Overpass Bridge Seismic Decision Making. Kevin R. Mackie and Božidar Stojadinović. June 2005.
- PEER 2005/01 Empirical Characterization of Site Conditions on Strong Ground Motion. Jonathan P. Stewart, Yoojoong Choi, and Robert W. Graves. June 2005.
- PEER 2004/09 Electrical Substation Equipment Interaction: Experimental Rigid Conductor Studies. Christopher Stearns and André Filiatrault. February 2005.
- **PEER 2004/08** Seismic Qualification and Fragility Testing of Line Break 550-kV Disconnect Switches. Shakhzod M. Takhirov, Gregory L. Fenves, and Eric Fujisaki. January 2005.
- **PEER 2004/07** Ground Motions for Earthquake Simulator Qualification of Electrical Substation Equipment. Shakhzod M. Takhirov, Gregory L. Fenves, Eric Fujisaki, and Don Clyde. January 2005.
- PEER 2004/06 Performance-Based Regulation and Regulatory Regimes. Peter J. May and Chris Koski. September 2004.
- **PEER 2004/05** *Performance-Based Seismic Design Concepts and Implementation: Proceedings of an International Workshop.* Peter Fajfar and Helmut Krawinkler, Editors. September 2004.
- PEER 2004/04 Seismic Performance of an Instrumented Tilt-up Wall Building. James C. Anderson and Vitelmo V. Bertero. July 2004.
- PEER 2004/03 Evaluation and Application of Concrete Tilt-up Assessment Methodologies. Timothy Graf and James O. Malley. October 2004.
- PEER 2004/02 Analytical Investigations of New Methods for Reducing Residual Displacements of Reinforced Concrete Bridge Columns. Junichi Sakai and Stephen A. Mahin. August 2004.
- PEER 2004/01 Seismic Performance of Masonry Buildings and Design Implications. Kerri Anne Taeko Tokoro, James C. Anderson, and Vitelmo V. Bertero. February 2004.
- PEER 2003/18 Performance Models for Flexural Damage in Reinforced Concrete Columns. Michael Berry and Marc Eberhard. August 2003.
- PEER 2003/17 Predicting Earthquake Damage in Older Reinforced Concrete Beam-Column Joints. Catherine Pagni and Laura Lowes. October 2004.
- PEER 2003/16 Seismic Demands for Performance-Based Design of Bridges. Kevin Mackie and Božidar Stojadinović. August 2003.
- PEER 2003/15 Seismic Demands for Nondeteriorating Frame Structures and Their Dependence on Ground Motions. Ricardo Antonio Medina and Helmut Krawinkler. May 2004.
- **PEER 2003/14** Finite Element Reliability and Sensitivity Methods for Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering. Terje Haukaas and Armen Der Kiureghian. April 2004.
- PEER 2003/13 Effects of Connection Hysteretic Degradation on the Seismic Behavior of Steel Moment-Resisting Frames. Janise E. Rodgers and Stephen A. Mahin. March 2004.
- PEER 2003/12 Implementation Manual for the Seismic Protection of Laboratory Contents: Format and Case Studies. William T. Holmes and Mary C. Comerio. October 2003.
- PEER 2003/11 Fifth U.S.-Japan Workshop on Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering Methodology for Reinforced Concrete Building Structures. February 2004.
- **PEER 2003/10** A Beam-Column Joint Model for Simulating the Earthquake Response of Reinforced Concrete Frames. Laura N. Lowes, Nilanjan Mitra, and Arash Altoontash. February 2004.
- PEER 2003/09 Sequencing Repairs after an Earthquake: An Economic Approach. Marco Casari and Simon J. Wilkie. April 2004.
- **PEER 2003/08** A Technical Framework for Probability-Based Demand and Capacity Factor Design (DCFD) Seismic Formats. Fatemeh Jalayer and C. Allin Cornell. November 2003.
- PEER 2003/07 Uncertainty Specification and Propagation for Loss Estimation Using FOSM Methods. Jack W. Baker and C. Allin Cornell. September 2003.

- PEER 2003/06 Performance of Circular Reinforced Concrete Bridge Columns under Bidirectional Earthquake Loading. Mahmoud M. Hachem, Stephen A. Mahin, and Jack P. Moehle. February 2003.
- **PEER 2003/05** Response Assessment for Building-Specific Loss Estimation. Eduardo Miranda and Shahram Taghavi. September 2003.
- PEER 2003/04 Experimental Assessment of Columns with Short Lap Splices Subjected to Cyclic Loads. Murat Melek, John W. Wallace, and Joel Conte. April 2003.
- **PEER 2003/03** *Probabilistic Response Assessment for Building-Specific Loss Estimation.* Eduardo Miranda and Hesameddin Aslani. September 2003.
- **PEER 2003/02** Software Framework for Collaborative Development of Nonlinear Dynamic Analysis Program. Jun Peng and Kincho H. Law. September 2003.
- PEER 2003/01 Shake Table Tests and Analytical Studies on the Gravity Load Collapse of Reinforced Concrete Frames. Kenneth John Elwood and Jack P. Moehle. November 2003.
- PEER 2002/24 Performance of Beam to Column Bridge Joints Subjected to a Large Velocity Pulse. Natalie Gibson, André Filiatrault, and Scott A. Ashford. April 2002.
- PEER 2002/23 Effects of Large Velocity Pulses on Reinforced Concrete Bridge Columns. Greg L. Orozco and Scott A. Ashford. April 2002.
- PEER 2002/22 Characterization of Large Velocity Pulses for Laboratory Testing. Kenneth E. Cox and Scott A. Ashford. April 2002.
- PEER 2002/21 Fourth U.S.-Japan Workshop on Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering Methodology for Reinforced Concrete Building Structures. December 2002.
- PEER 2002/20 Barriers to Adoption and Implementation of PBEE Innovations. Peter J. May. August 2002.
- PEER 2002/19 Economic-Engineered Integrated Models for Earthquakes: Socioeconomic Impacts. Peter Gordon, James E. Moore II, and Harry W. Richardson. July 2002.
- PEER 2002/18 Assessment of Reinforced Concrete Building Exterior Joints with Substandard Details. Chris P. Pantelides, Jon Hansen, Justin Nadauld, and Lawrence D. Reaveley. May 2002.
- **PEER 2002/17** Structural Characterization and Seismic Response Analysis of a Highway Overcrossing Equipped with Elastomeric Bearings and Fluid Dampers: A Case Study. Nicos Makris and Jian Zhang. November 2002.
- PEER 2002/16 Estimation of Uncertainty in Geotechnical Properties for Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering. Allen L. Jones, Steven L. Kramer, and Pedro Arduino. December 2002.
- PEER 2002/15 Seismic Behavior of Bridge Columns Subjected to Various Loading Patterns. Asadollah Esmaeily-Gh. and Yan Xiao. December 2002.
- PEER 2002/14 Inelastic Seismic Response of Extended Pile Shaft Supported Bridge Structures. T.C. Hutchinson, R.W. Boulanger, Y.H. Chai, and I.M. Idriss. December 2002.
- PEER 2002/13 Probabilistic Models and Fragility Estimates for Bridge Components and Systems. Paolo Gardoni, Armen Der Kiureghian, and Khalid M. Mosalam. June 2002.
- PEER 2002/12 Effects of Fault Dip and Slip Rake on Near-Source Ground Motions: Why Chi-Chi Was a Relatively Mild M7.6 Earthquake. Brad T. Aagaard, John F. Hall, and Thomas H. Heaton. December 2002.
- PEER 2002/11 Analytical and Experimental Study of Fiber-Reinforced Strip Isolators. James M. Kelly and Shakhzod M. Takhirov. September 2002.
- **PEER 2002/10** Centrifuge Modeling of Settlement and Lateral Spreading with Comparisons to Numerical Analyses. Sivapalan Gajan and Bruce L. Kutter. January 2003.
- PEER 2002/09 Documentation and Analysis of Field Case Histories of Seismic Compression during the 1994 Northridge, California, Earthquake. Jonathan P. Stewart, Patrick M. Smith, Daniel H. Whang, and Jonathan D. Bray. October 2002.
- **PEER 2002/08** Component Testing, Stability Analysis and Characterization of Buckling-Restrained Unbonded Braces[™]. Cameron Black, Nicos Makris, and Ian Aiken. September 2002.
- PEER 2002/07 Seismic Performance of Pile-Wharf Connections. Charles W. Roeder, Robert Graff, Jennifer Soderstrom, and Jun Han Yoo. December 2001.
- **PEER 2002/06** The Use of Benefit-Cost Analysis for Evaluation of Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering Decisions. Richard O. Zerbe and Anthony Falit-Baiamonte. September 2001.

- **PEER 2002/05** Guidelines, Specifications, and Seismic Performance Characterization of Nonstructural Building Components and Equipment. André Filiatrault, Constantin Christopoulos, and Christopher Stearns. September 2001.
- **PEER 2002/04** Consortium of Organizations for Strong-Motion Observation Systems and the Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center Lifelines Program: Invited Workshop on Archiving and Web Dissemination of Geotechnical Data, 4–5 October 2001. September 2002.
- PEER 2002/03 Investigation of Sensitivity of Building Loss Estimates to Major Uncertain Variables for the Van Nuys Testbed. Keith A. Porter, James L. Beck, and Rustem V. Shaikhutdinov. August 2002.
- **PEER 2002/02** The Third U.S.-Japan Workshop on Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering Methodology for Reinforced Concrete Building Structures. July 2002.
- PEER 2002/01 Nonstructural Loss Estimation: The UC Berkeley Case Study. Mary C. Comerio and John C. Stallmeyer. December 2001.
- PEER 2001/16 Statistics of SDF-System Estimate of Roof Displacement for Pushover Analysis of Buildings. Anil K. Chopra, Rakesh K. Goel, and Chatpan Chintanapakdee. December 2001.
- PEER 2001/15 Damage to Bridges during the 2001 Nisqually Earthquake. R. Tyler Ranf, Marc O. Eberhard, and Michael P. Berry. November 2001.
- **PEER 2001/14** Rocking Response of Equipment Anchored to a Base Foundation. Nicos Makris and Cameron J. Black. September 2001.
- PEER 2001/13 Modeling Soil Liquefaction Hazards for Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering. Steven L. Kramer and Ahmed-W. Elgamal. February 2001.
- PEER 2001/12 Development of Geotechnical Capabilities in OpenSees. Boris Jeremić. September 2001.
- **PEER 2001/11** Analytical and Experimental Study of Fiber-Reinforced Elastomeric Isolators. James M. Kelly and Shakhzod M. Takhirov. September 2001.
- PEER 2001/10 Amplification Factors for Spectral Acceleration in Active Regions. Jonathan P. Stewart, Andrew H. Liu, Yoojoong Choi, and Mehmet B. Baturay. December 2001.
- **PEER 2001/09** Ground Motion Evaluation Procedures for Performance-Based Design. Jonathan P. Stewart, Shyh-Jeng Chiou, Jonathan D. Bray, Robert W. Graves, Paul G. Somerville, and Norman A. Abrahamson. September 2001.
- **PEER 2001/08** Experimental and Computational Evaluation of Reinforced Concrete Bridge Beam-Column Connections for Seismic Performance. Clay J. Naito, Jack P. Moehle, and Khalid M. Mosalam. November 2001.
- **PEER 2001/07** The Rocking Spectrum and the Shortcomings of Design Guidelines. Nicos Makris and Dimitrios Konstantinidis. August 2001.
- **PEER 2001/06** Development of an Electrical Substation Equipment Performance Database for Evaluation of Equipment Fragilities. Thalia Agnanos. April 1999.
- PEER 2001/05 Stiffness Analysis of Fiber-Reinforced Elastomeric Isolators. Hsiang-Chuan Tsai and James M. Kelly. May 2001.
- PEER 2001/04 Organizational and Societal Considerations for Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering. Peter J. May. April 2001.
- **PEER 2001/03** A Modal Pushover Analysis Procedure to Estimate Seismic Demands for Buildings: Theory and Preliminary Evaluation. Anil K. Chopra and Rakesh K. Goel. January 2001.
- PEER 2001/02 Seismic Response Analysis of Highway Overcrossings Including Soil-Structure Interaction. Jian Zhang and Nicos Makris. March 2001.
- **PEER 2001/01** Experimental Study of Large Seismic Steel Beam-to-Column Connections. Egor P. Popov and Shakhzod M. Takhirov. November 2000.
- PEER 2000/10 The Second U.S.-Japan Workshop on Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering Methodology for Reinforced Concrete Building Structures. March 2000.
- PEER 2000/09 Structural Engineering Reconnaissance of the August 17, 1999 Earthquake: Kocaeli (Izmit), Turkey. Halil Sezen, Kenneth J. Elwood, Andrew S. Whittaker, Khalid Mosalam, John J. Wallace, and John F. Stanton. December 2000.
- PEER 2000/08 Behavior of Reinforced Concrete Bridge Columns Having Varying Aspect Ratios and Varying Lengths of Confinement. Anthony J. Calderone, Dawn E. Lehman, and Jack P. Moehle. January 2001.
- PEER 2000/07 Cover-Plate and Flange-Plate Reinforced Steel Moment-Resisting Connections. Taejin Kim, Andrew S. Whittaker, Amir S. Gilani, Vitelmo V. Bertero, and Shakhzod M. Takhirov. September 2000.

- PEER 2000/06 Seismic Evaluation and Analysis of 230-kV Disconnect Switches. Amir S. J. Gilani, Andrew S. Whittaker, Gregory L. Fenves, Chun-Hao Chen, Henry Ho, and Eric Fujisaki. July 2000.
- PEER 2000/05 Performance-Based Evaluation of Exterior Reinforced Concrete Building Joints for Seismic Excitation. Chandra Clyde, Chris P. Pantelides, and Lawrence D. Reaveley. July 2000.
- PEER 2000/04 An Evaluation of Seismic Energy Demand: An Attenuation Approach. Chung-Che Chou and Chia-Ming Uang. July 1999.
- **PEER 2000/03** Framing Earthquake Retrofitting Decisions: The Case of Hillside Homes in Los Angeles. Detlof von Winterfeldt, Nels Roselund, and Alicia Kitsuse. March 2000.
- PEER 2000/02 U.S.-Japan Workshop on the Effects of Near-Field Earthquake Shaking. Andrew Whittaker, Editor. July 2000.
- PEER 2000/01 Further Studies on Seismic Interaction in Interconnected Electrical Substation Equipment. Armen Der Kiureghian, Kee-Jeung Hong, and Jerome L. Sackman. November 1999.
- PEER 1999/14 Seismic Evaluation and Retrofit of 230-kV Porcelain Transformer Bushings. Amir S. Gilani, Andrew S. Whittaker, Gregory L. Fenves, and Eric Fujisaki. December 1999.
- PEER 1999/13 Building Vulnerability Studies: Modeling and Evaluation of Tilt-up and Steel Reinforced Concrete Buildings. John W. Wallace, Jonathan P. Stewart, and Andrew S. Whittaker, Editors. December 1999.
- PEER 1999/12 Rehabilitation of Nonductile RC Frame Building Using Encasement Plates and Energy-Dissipating Devices. Mehrdad Sasani, Vitelmo V. Bertero, James C. Anderson. December 1999.
- PEER 1999/11 Performance Evaluation Database for Concrete Bridge Components and Systems under Simulated Seismic Loads. Yael D. Hose and Frieder Seible. November 1999.
- PEER 1999/10 U.S.-Japan Workshop on Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering Methodology for Reinforced Concrete Building Structures. December 1999.
- PEER 1999/09 Performance Improvement of Long Period Building Structures Subjected to Severe Pulse-Type Ground Motions. James C. Anderson, Vitelmo V. Bertero, and Raul Bertero. October 1999.
- PEER 1999/08 Envelopes for Seismic Response Vectors. Charles Menun and Armen Der Kiureghian. July 1999.
- PEER 1999/07 Documentation of Strengths and Weaknesses of Current Computer Analysis Methods for Seismic Performance of Reinforced Concrete Members. William F. Cofer. November 1999.
- PEER 1999/06 Rocking Response and Overturning of Anchored Equipment under Seismic Excitations. Nicos Makris and Jian Zhang. November 1999.
- PEER 1999/05 Seismic Evaluation of 550 kV Porcelain Transformer Bushings. Amir S. Gilani, Andrew S. Whittaker, Gregory L. Fenves, and Eric Fujisaki. October 1999.
- PEER 1999/04 Adoption and Enforcement of Earthquake Risk-Reduction Measures. Peter J. May, Raymond J. Burby, T. Jens Feeley, and Robert Wood. August 1999.
- PEER 1999/03 Task 3 Characterization of Site Response General Site Categories. Adrian Rodriguez-Marek, Jonathan D. Bray and Norman Abrahamson. February 1999.
- PEER 1999/02 Capacity-Demand-Diagram Methods for Estimating Seismic Deformation of Inelastic Structures: SDF Systems. Anil K. Chopra and Rakesh Goel. April 1999.
- PEER 1999/01 Interaction in Interconnected Electrical Substation Equipment Subjected to Earthquake Ground Motions. Armen Der Kiureghian, Jerome L. Sackman, and Kee-Jeung Hong. February 1999.
- PEER 1998/08 Behavior and Failure Analysis of a Multiple-Frame Highway Bridge in the 1994 Northridge Earthquake. Gregory L. Fenves and Michael Ellery. December 1998.
- PEER 1998/07 Empirical Evaluation of Inertial Soil-Structure Interaction Effects. Jonathan P. Stewart, Raymond B. Seed, and Gregory L. Fenves. November 1998.
- PEER 1998/06 Effect of Damping Mechanisms on the Response of Seismic Isolated Structures. Nicos Makris and Shih-Po Chang. November 1998.
- **PEER 1998/05** Rocking Response and Overturning of Equipment under Horizontal Pulse-Type Motions. Nicos Makris and Yiannis Roussos. October 1998.
- PEER 1998/04 Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Invitational Workshop Proceedings, May 14–15, 1998: Defining the Links between Planning, Policy Analysis, Economics and Earthquake Engineering. Mary Comerio and Peter Gordon. September 1998.

- PEER 1998/03 Repair/Upgrade Procedures for Welded Beam to Column Connections. James C. Anderson and Xiaojing Duan. May 1998.
- PEER 1998/02 Seismic Evaluation of 196 kV Porcelain Transformer Bushings. Amir S. Gilani, Juan W. Chavez, Gregory L. Fenves, and Andrew S. Whittaker. May 1998.
- PEER 1998/01 Seismic Performance of Well-Confined Concrete Bridge Columns. Dawn E. Lehman and Jack P. Moehle. December 2000.

ONLINE PEER REPORTS

The following PEER reports are available by Internet only at http://peer.berkeley.edu/publications/peer reports complete.html.

- PEER 2012/103 Performance-Based Seismic Demand Assessment of Concentrically Braced Steel Frame Buildings. Chui-Hsin Chen and Stephen A. Mahin. December 2012.
- PEER 2012/102 Procedure to Restart an Interrupted Hybrid Simulation: Addendum to PEER Report 2010/103. Vesna Terzic and Bozidar Stojadinovic. October 2012.
- PEER 2012/101 Mechanics of Fiber Reinforced Bearings. James M. Kelly and Andrea Calabrese. February 2012.
- PEER 2011/107 Nonlinear Site Response and Seismic Compression at Vertical Array Strongly Shaken by 2007 Niigata-ken Chuetsu-oki Earthquake. Eric Yee, Jonathan P. Stewart, and Kohji Tokimatsu. December 2011.
- PEER 2011/106 Self Compacting Hybrid Fiber Reinforced Concrete Composites for Bridge Columns. Pardeep Kumar, Gabriel Jen, William Trono, Marios Panagiotou, and Claudia Ostertag. September 2011.
- PEER 2011/105 Stochastic Dynamic Analysis of Bridges Subjected to Spacially Varying Ground Motions. Katerina Konakli and Armen Der Kiureghian. August 2011.
- PEER 2011/104 Design and Instrumentation of the 2010 E-Defense Four-Story Reinforced Concrete and Post-Tensioned Concrete Buildings. Takuya Nagae, Kenichi Tahara, Taizo Matsumori, Hitoshi Shiohara, Toshimi Kabeyasawa, Susumu Kono, Minehiro Nishiyama (Japanese Research Team) and John Wallace, Wassim Ghannoum, Jack Moehle, Richard Sause, Wesley Keller, Zeynep Tuna (U.S. Research Team). June 2011.
- PEER 2011/103 In-Situ Monitoring of the Force Output of Fluid Dampers: Experimental Investigation. Dimitrios Konstantinidis, James M. Kelly, and Nicos Makris. April 2011.
- **PEER 2011/102** Ground-Motion Prediction Equations 1964–2010. John Douglas. April 2011.
- PEER 2011/101 Report of the Eighth Planning Meeting of NEES/E-Defense Collaborative Research on Earthquake Engineering. Convened by the Hyogo Earthquake Engineering Research Center (NIED), NEES Consortium, Inc. February 2011.
- PEER 2010/111 Modeling and Acceptance Criteria for Seismic Design and Analysis of Tall Buildings. Task 7 Report for the Tall Buildings Initiative Published jointly by the Applied Technology Council. October 2010.
- PEER 2010/110 Seismic Performance Assessment and Probabilistic Repair Cost Analysis of Precast Concrete Cladding Systems for Multistory Buildlings. Jeffrey P. Hunt and Božidar Stojadinovic. November 2010.
- PEER 2010/109 Report of the Seventh Joint Planning Meeting of NEES/E-Defense Collaboration on Earthquake Engineering. Held at the E-Defense, Miki, and Shin-Kobe, Japan, September 18–19, 2009. August 2010.
- PEER 2010/108 Probabilistic Tsunami Hazard in California. Hong Kie Thio, Paul Somerville, and Jascha Polet, preparers. October 2010.
- PEER 2010/107 Performance and Reliability of Exposed Column Base Plate Connections for Steel Moment-Resisting Frames. Ady Aviram, Božidar Stojadinovic, and Armen Der Kiureghian. August 2010.
- PEER 2010/106 Verification of Probabilistic Seismic Hazard Analysis Computer Programs. Patricia Thomas, Ivan Wong, and Norman Abrahamson. May 2010.
- PEER 2010/105 Structural Engineering Reconnaissance of the April 6, 2009, Abruzzo, Italy, Earthquake, and Lessons Learned. M. Selim Günay and Khalid M. Mosalam. April 2010.
- **PEER 2010/104** Simulating the Inelastic Seismic Behavior of Steel Braced Frames, Including the Effects of Low-Cycle Fatigue. Yuli Huang and Stephen A. Mahin. April 2010.
- PEER 2010/103 Post-Earthquake Traffic Capacity of Modern Bridges in California. Vesna Terzic and Božidar Stojadinović. March 2010.
- PEER 2010/102 Analysis of Cumulative Absolute Velocity (CAV) and JMA Instrumental Seismic Intensity (I_{JMA}) Using the PEER– NGA Strong Motion Database. Kenneth W. Campbell and Yousef Bozorgnia. February 2010.
- PEER 2010/101 Rocking Response of Bridges on Shallow Foundations. Jose A. Ugalde, Bruce L. Kutter, and Boris Jeremic. April 2010.
- PEER 2009/109 Simulation and Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering Assessment of Self-Centering Post-Tensioned Concrete Bridge Systems. Won K. Lee and Sarah L. Billington. December 2009.

- PEER 2009/108 PEER Lifelines Geotechnical Virtual Data Center. J. Carl Stepp, Daniel J. Ponti, Loren L. Turner, Jennifer N. Swift, Sean Devlin, Yang Zhu, Jean Benoit, and John Bobbitt. September 2009.
- PEER 2009/107 Experimental and Computational Evaluation of Current and Innovative In-Span Hinge Details in Reinforced Concrete Box-Girder Bridges: Part 2: Post-Test Analysis and Design Recommendations. Matias A. Hube and Khalid M. Mosalam. December 2009.
- PEER 2009/106 Shear Strength Models of Exterior Beam-Column Joints without Transverse Reinforcement. Sangjoon Park and Khalid M. Mosalam. November 2009.
- PEER 2009/105 Reduced Uncertainty of Ground Motion Prediction Equations through Bayesian Variance Analysis. Robb Eric S. Moss. November 2009.
- PEER 2009/104 Advanced Implementation of Hybrid Simulation. Andreas H. Schellenberg, Stephen A. Mahin, Gregory L. Fenves. November 2009.
- PEER 2009/103 Performance Evaluation of Innovative Steel Braced Frames. T. Y. Yang, Jack P. Moehle, and Božidar Stojadinovic. August 2009.
- PEER 2009/102
 Reinvestigation of Liquefaction and Nonliquefaction Case Histories from the 1976 Tangshan Earthquake. Robb

 Eric Moss, Robert E. Kayen, Liyuan Tong, Songyu Liu, Guojun Cai, and Jiaer Wu. August 2009.
- PEER 2009/101 Report of the First Joint Planning Meeting for the Second Phase of NEES/E-Defense Collaborative Research on Earthquake Engineering. Stephen A. Mahin et al. July 2009.
- PEER 2008/104 Experimental and Analytical Study of the Seismic Performance of Retaining Structures. Linda Al Atik and Nicholas Sitar. January 2009.
- PEER 2008/103 Experimental and Computational Evaluation of Current and Innovative In-Span Hinge Details in Reinforced Concrete Box-Girder Bridges. Part 1: Experimental Findings and Pre-Test Analysis. Matias A. Hube and Khalid M. Mosalam. January 2009.
- PEER 2008/102 Modeling of Unreinforced Masonry Infill Walls Considering In-Plane and Out-of-Plane Interaction. Stephen Kadysiewski and Khalid M. Mosalam. January 2009.
- PEER 2008/101 Seismic Performance Objectives for Tall Buildings. William T. Holmes, Charles Kircher, William Petak, and Nabih Youssef. August 2008.
- PEER 2007/101 Generalized Hybrid Simulation Framework for Structural Systems Subjected to Seismic Loading. Tarek Elkhoraibi and Khalid M. Mosalam. July 2007.
- PEER 2007/100 Seismic Evaluation of Reinforced Concrete Buildings Including Effects of Masonry Infill Walls. Alidad Hashemi and Khalid M. Mosalam. July 2007.

The Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center (PEER) is a multi-institutional research and education center with headquarters at the University of California, Berkeley. Investigators from over 20 universities, several consulting companies, and researchers at various state and federal government agencies contribute to research programs focused on performance-based earthquake engineering.

These research programs aim to identify and reduce the risks from major earthquakes to life safety and to the economy by including research in a wide variety of disciplines including structural and geotechnical engineering, geology/ seismology, lifelines, transportation, architecture, economics, risk management, and public policy.

PEER is supported by federal, state, local, and regional agencies, together with industry partners.



PEER Core Institutions: University of California, Berkeley (Lead Institution) California Institute of Technology Oregon State University Stanford University University of California, Davis University of California, Irvine University of California, Los Angeles University of California, San Diego University of Southern California University of Washington

PEER reports can be ordered at http://peer.berkeley.edu/publications/peer_reports.html or by contacting

Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center University of California, Berkeley 325 Davis Hall, Mail Code 1792 Berkeley, CA 94720-1792 Tel: 510-642-3437 Fax: 510-642-1655 Email: peer center@berkeley.edu

ISSN 1547-0587X