

Stochastic Dynamic Analysis of Bridges Subjected to Spatially Varying Ground Motions

Katerina Konakli Armen Der Kiureghian

Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering University of California, Berkeley

PEER 2011/105 AUGUST 2011

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.

Stochastic Dynamic Analysis of Bridges Subjected to Spatially Varying Ground Motions

Katerina Konakli

Armen Der Kiureghian

Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering University of California, Berkeley

PEER Report 2011/105 Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center College of Engineering University of California, Berkeley

August 2011

ABSTRACT

Using response spectrum and time-history analysis methods, we perform a thorough investigation of the response of bridges subjected to spatially varying support motions. Three main causes of spatial variability are considered: the *incoherence effect*, which represents random differences in the amplitudes and phases of seismic waves due to reflections and refractions that occur during wave propagation in the heterogeneous medium of the ground and due to differential superposition of waves arriving from different parts of an extended source; the *wave-passage effect*, which describes the differences in the arrival times of waves at separate locations; and the *site-response effect*, which accounts for differences in the intensities and frequency contents of surface motions due to variable soil profiles underneath the supports.

The multiple-support response spectrum (MSRS) method, originally developed by Der Kiureghian and Neuenhofer (1992), is generalized to allow consideration of response quantities that depend on the support degrees of freedom, and is extended to account for quasi-static contributions of truncated modes. Efficient algorithms and a computer code are developed for the implementation of this generalized and extended MSRS method. The code is used for comprehensive parametric analyses of four real bridge models with vastly different characteristics. The analyses identify cases of ground motion spatial variability and types of bridges for which the effects of spatial variability are significant.

Methods are developed for simulation of spatially varying ground motion arrays incorporating the effects of incoherence, wave passage, and differential site response. The simulated motions inherit statistical characteristics of a specified acceleration record at a reference site. The *conditional* simulation approach preserves time-history characteristics of the specified record; however, the array of motions exhibits increasing variability with distance from the reference site. The *unconditional* simulation method generates an array of motions that preserve the overall temporal and spectral characteristics of the specified record and exhibit uniform variability at all locations. The simulated motions are validated by examining their physical compliance and by comparing their response spectra, coherency characteristics, and power spectral densities with corresponding target models.

Sets of simulated support motions are used to investigate the effect of spatial variability on linear and nonlinear bridge response by time-history analyses. Comparisons between linear and nonlinear pier drifts are performed to assess the accuracy of the "equal displacement" rule (Veletsos and Newmark, 1960) for spatially varying ground motions. Comparisons between mean peak responses obtained from linear time-history and MSRS analyses provide information on the range of errors induced by the approximations involved in MSRS analyses. Finally, coherency analysis of a recorded array of near-fault ground motions is performed. The ability of commonly used models to describe the incoherence component of this array is assessed.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by the California Department of Transportation under Contract Nos. 59A0580 and 59A0582. Additional support was provided by the Taisei Chair in Civil Engineering at the University of California, Berkeley. The first author acknowledges financial support from the Onassis Foundation in Greece. Any opinions, findings, conclusions, or recommendations expressed in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the funding agencies.

We thank Professors David Brillinger and Douglas Dreger and Dr. Yousef Bozorgnia for valuable discussions during the course of this study. We also thank Mr. Paul Chung of the California Department of Transportation for his guidance in the development of the bridge models used in this study.

This document is disseminated in the interest of information exchange. The contents of this report reflect the views of the authors who are responsible for the facts and accuracy of the data presented herein. The contents do not necessarily reflect the official views or policies of the State of California or the Federal Highway Administration. This publication does not constitute a standard, specification, or regulation. This report does not constitute an endorsement by the Department of any product described herein.

CONTENTS

ABS	STRA	CT	iii
ACI	KNO	WLEDGMENTS	v
TAI	BLE (OF CONTENTS	vii
LIS	T OF	FIGURES	xiii
LIS	T OF	TABLES	xxi
1	INT	RODUCTION	1
-	1.1	MOTIVATION AND BACKGROUND	1
	1.2	OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE	5
		1.2.1 Development of Analysis Tools	5
		1.2.1.1 Response Spectrum Approach	5
		1.2.2 Synthetic Motions for RHA	6
		1.2.3 Parametric Analyses of Real Bridge Models	6
		1.2.4 Investigation of Coherency Models	7
	1.3	ORGANIZATION OF THE REPORT	7
2	GEI	NFRALIZED AND EXTENDED MSRS RULF	11
2	2 1		11
	2.1	GENERALIZED FORMULATION OF THE MSRS RULE	12
	2.2	2.2.1 Equations of Motion	12
		2.2.2 The MSRS Rule	15
		2.2.3 The Coherency Function	17
		2.2.4 Modeling of the Site Response.	19
	2.3	MODE TRUNCATION CRITERIA FOR RESPONSE TO DIFFERENTIAL SUPPORT MOTIONS	21
	2.4	EXTENDED MSRS RULE	22
	2.5	PARAMETRIC ANALYSIS OF THE NEW CROSS-CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS	25
		2.5.1 Cross-correlation Coefficient between Ground Accelerations at Stations k and l	26
		2.5.2 Cross-correlation Coefficient between Ground Displacement at Station k and Ground acceleration at Station 1	27

		2.5.3	Cross-correlation Coefficient between Oscillator Response at Station k and Ground Acceleration at Station 1	27
	2.6	COM	PUTER IMPLEMENTATION OF THE EXTENDED MSRS RULE	28
		2.6.1	Computation of the a_k , b_{ki} , and d_k Coefficients	28
		2.6.2	Computation of the Cross-correlation Coefficients	29
			2.6.2.1 Symmetries	29
			2.6.2.2 Integration Method	30
		2.6.3	Cut-off Frequency	31
	2.7	SUM	MARY	31
3	API MO	PLICA DELS	TION OF THE EXTENDED MSRS RULE TO REAL BRIDGE	39
	3.1	INTR	ODUCTION	39
	3.2	DESC	RIPTION OF BRIDGE MODELS	40
		3.2.1	Auburn Ravine Bridge	40
		3.2.2	Big Rock Wash Bridge	41
		3.2.3	South Ingram Slough Bridge	42
		3.2.4	Penstock Bridge	43
	3.3	DESC SPEC	CRIPTION OF INPUT EXCITATIONS THROUGH RESPONSE TRA AND A COHERENCY FUNCTION	43
	3.4	MOD	E TRUNCATION BASED ON PARTICIPATING MODAL MASS	45
	3.5	INVE VAR	STIGATION OF THE EFFECTS OF GROUND MOTION SPATIAL ABILITY	46
		3.5.1	Auburn Ravine Bridge	46
			3.5.1.1 Total responses	46
			3.5.1.2 Pseudo-static Responses	47
			3.5.1.3 Dynamic Responses	47
		3.5.2	Big Rock Wash Bridge	49
			3.5.2.1 Total Responses	49
			3.5.2.2 Pseudo-static Responses	49
			3.5.2.3 Dynamic Responses	50
		3.5.3	South Ingram Slough Bridge	50
			3.5.3.1 Total Responses	50
			3.5.3.2 Pseudo-static Responses	51
			3.5.3.3 Dynamic Responses	51

3.5.4.1 Total Responses 52 3.5.4.2 Pseudo-static Responses 52 3.5.4.3 Dynamic Responses 53 3.5.5 Summary of Results 53 3.6.4 ASSESSMENT OF THE EXTENDED MSRS RULE 54 3.6.1 Auburn Ravine Bridge 55 3.6.2 Big Rock Wash Bridge 56 3.6.3 South Ingram Slough Bridge 57 3.6.4 Penstock Bridge 58 3.7 SUMMARY 58 4 SIMULATION OF SPATIALLY VARYING GROUND MOTIONS 107 4.1 INTRODUCTION 107 4.1 INTRODUCTION 107 4.2 DISCRETE REPRESENTATION OF AN ARRAY OF STATIONARY GAUSSIAN PROCESSES 108 4.3 ESTIMATION OF STATISTICAL PROPERTIES OF GIVEN REALIZATIONS 109 4.4 SIMULATION OF AN ARRAY OF STATIONARY GROUND MOTIONS 111 4.4.1 Unconditioned Simulation 111 4.4.2 Conditioned Simulation 111 4.4.1 Unconditioned Simulation 113 4.5 EXTENSION TO NONSTATIONARY MOTIONS 115			3.5.4 Penstock Bridge	52
3.5.4.2 Pseudo-static Responses 52 3.5.4.3 Dynamic Responses 53 3.5.5 Summary of Results 53 3.6 ASSESSMENT OF THE EXTENDED MSRS RULE 54 3.6.1 Auburn Ravine Bridge 55 3.6.2 Big Rock Wash Bridge 56 3.6.3 South Ingram Slough Bridge 57 3.6.4 Penstock Bridge 58 3.7 SUMMARY 58 4 SIMULATION OF SPATIALLY VARYING GROUND MOTIONS 107 4.1 INTRODUCTION 107 4.2 DISCRETE REPRESENTATION OF AN ARRAY OF STATIONARY GAUSSIAN PROCESSES 108 4.3 ESTIMATION OF STATISTICAL PROPERTIES OF GIVEN REALIZATIONS 109 4.4 SIMULATION OF AN ARRAY OF STATIONARY GROUND MOTIONS 111 4.4.1 Unconditioned Simulation 111 4.4.2 Conditioned Simulation 113 4.5 EXTENSION TO NONSTATIONARY MOTIONS 115 4.5.1 Unconditioned Simulation 116 4.5.2 Conditioned Simulation 120 4.6.1 Uniform Soil Conditions 121			3.5.4.1 Total Responses	52
3.5.4.3 Dynamic Responses 53 3.5.5 Summary of Results 53 3.6 ASSESSMENT OF THE EXTENDED MSRS RULE 54 3.6.1 Auburn Ravine Bridge 55 3.6.2 Big Rock Wash Bridge 56 3.6.3 South Ingram Slough Bridge 57 3.6.4 Penstock Bridge 58 3.7 SUMMARY 58 4 SIMULATION OF SPATIALLY VARYING GROUND MOTIONS 107 4.1 INTRODUCTION 107 4.1 INTRODUCTION 107 4.2 DISCRETE REPRESENTATION OF AN ARRAY OF STATIONARY 108 4.3 ESTIMATION OF STATISTICAL PROPERTIES OF GIVEN 109 4.4 SIMULATION OF AN ARRAY OF STATIONARY GROUND MOTIONS 109 4.4 SIMULATION OF AN ARRAY OF STATIONARY GROUND MOTIONS 111 4.4.1 Unconditioned Simulation 113 4.5 EXTENSION TO NONSTATIONARY MOTIONS 115 4.5.1 Unconditioned Simulation 116 4.5.2 Conditioned Simulation 120 4.6.1 Uniord Simulation 121 <			3.5.4.2 Pseudo-static Responses	52
3.5.5 Summary of Results 53 3.6 ASSESSMENT OF THE EXTENDED MSRS RULE 54 3.6.1 Auburn Ravine Bridge 55 3.6.2 Big Rock Wash Bridge 56 3.6.3 South Ingram Slough Bridge 57 3.6.4 Penstock Bridge 58 3.7 SUMMARY 58 4 SIMULATION OF SPATIALLY VARYING GROUND MOTIONS 107 4.1 INTRODUCTION 107 4.1 INTRODUCTION 107 4.2 DISCRETE REPRESENTATION OF AN ARRAY OF STATIONARY 108 4.3 ESTIMATION OF STATISTICAL PROPERTIES OF GIVEN 109 4.4 SIMULATION OF AN ARRAY OF STATIONARY GROUND MOTIONS 109 4.4 SIMULATION OF AN ARRAY OF STATIONARY GROUND MOTIONS 111 4.4.1 Unconditioned Simulation 111 4.4.2 Conditioned Simulation 113 4.5 EXTENSION TO NONSTATIONARY MOTIONS 115 4.5.1 Unconditioned Simulation 116 4.5.2 Conditioned Simulation 120 4.6.1 Uniform Soil Conditions 121 <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td>3.5.4.3 Dynamic Responses</td><td> 53</td></t<>			3.5.4.3 Dynamic Responses	53
3.6 ASSESSMENT OF THE EXTENDED MSRS RULE .54 3.6.1 Auburn Ravine Bridge .55 3.6.2 Big Rock Wash Bridge .56 3.6.3 South Ingram Slough Bridge .57 3.6.4 Penstock Bridge .58 3.7 SUMMARY .58 4 SIMULATION OF SPATIALLY VARYING GROUND MOTIONS .107 4.1 INFRODUCTION .107 4.2 SIMULATION OF AN ARRAY OF STATIONARY GROUND MOTIONS .111 4.4.1 Unconditioned Simulation .111 4.4.2 Conditioned Simulation <			3.5.5 Summary of Results	53
3.6.1 Auburn Ravine Bridge 55 3.6.2 Big Rock Wash Bridge 56 3.6.3 South Ingram Slough Bridge 57 3.6.4 Penstock Bridge 58 3.7 SUMMARY 58 4 SIMULATION OF SPATIALLY VARYING GROUND MOTIONS 107 4.1 INTRODUCTION 107 4.1 INTRODUCTION 107 4.2 DISCRETE REPRESENTATION OF AN ARRAY OF STATIONARY GAUSSIAN PROCESSES 108 4.3 ESTIMATION OF STATISTICAL PROPERTIES OF GIVEN REALIZATIONS 109 4.4 SIMULATION OF AN ARRAY OF STATIONARY GROUND MOTIONS WITH VARYING SITE EFFECTS 111 4.4.1 Unconditioned Simulation 111 4.4.2 Conditioned Simulation 113 4.5 EXTENSION TO NONSTATIONARY MOTIONS 115 4.5.1 Unconditioned Simulation 116 4.5.2 Conditioned Simulation 111 4.6 EXAMPLE APPLICATIONS 120 4.6.1 Uniform Soil Conditiones 121 4.6.2.2 Conditioned Simulations 121 4.6.2.1 Modeling the Soil-columns using the		3.6	ASSESSMENT OF THE EXTENDED MSRS RULE	54
3.6.2 Big Rock Wash Bridge .56 3.6.3 South Ingram Slough Bridge .57 3.6.4 Penstock Bridge .58 3.7 SUMMARY .58 3.8 STIMATION OF SPATIALLY VARYING GROUND MOTIONS .107 4.1 INTRODUCTION .107 4.3 ESTIMATION OF STATISTICAL PROPERTIES OF GIVEN REALIZATIONS .108 4.3 ESTIMATION OF AN ARRAY OF STATIONARY GROUND MOTIONS .109 4.4 SIMULATION OF AN ARRAY OF STATIONARY GROUND MOTIONS .111 4.4.1 Unconditioned Simulation .111 4.4.2 Conditioned Simulation .111 4.4.3 EXTENSION TO NONSTATIONARY MOTIONS .115 4.5.1 Unconditioned Simulation .116 4.5.2 Conditioned Simulations .121 4.6.1.1 Unconditioned Simulations .121 4.6.1.2 Conditioned Simulat			3.6.1 Auburn Ravine Bridge	55
3.6.3 South Ingram Slough Bridge .57 3.6.4 Penstock Bridge .58 3.7 SUMMARY .107 4.1 INTRODUCTION .107 4.2 DISCRETE REPRESENTATION OF AN ARRAY OF STATIONARY GROUND MOTIONS .108 4.3 ESTIMATION OF AN ARRAY OF STATIONARY GROUND MOTIONS .111 4.4 Inconditioned Simulation .111 4.4.1 Unconditioned Simulation .111 4.4.2 Conditioned Simulation .115 4.5.1 Unconditioned Simulation <			3.6.2 Big Rock Wash Bridge	56
3.6.4 Penstock Bridge 58 3.7 SUMMARY 107 4.1 INTRODUCTION 107 4.2 DISCRETE REPRESENTATION OF AN ARRAY OF STATIONARY 108 4.3 ESTIMATION OF STATISTICAL PROPERTIES OF GIVEN REALIZATIONS 109 4.4 SIMULATION OF AN ARRAY OF STATIONARY GROUND MOTIONS 109 4.4 SIMULATION OF AN ARRAY OF STATIONARY GROUND MOTIONS 111 4.4.1 Unconditioned Simulation 111 4.4.2 Conditioned Simulation 113 4.5 EXTENSION TO NONSTATIONARY MOTIONS 115 4.5.1 Unconditioned Simulation 116 4.5.2 Conditioned Simulations 120 4.6.1 Uniform Soil Conditions <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td>3.6.3 South Ingram Slough Bridge</td><td>57</td></td<>			3.6.3 South Ingram Slough Bridge	57
3.7 SUMMARY 58 4 SIMULATION OF SPATIALLY VARYING GROUND MOTIONS 107 4.1 INTRODUCTION 107 4.2 DISCRETE REPRESENTATION OF AN ARRAY OF STATIONARY GAUSSIAN PROCESSES 108 4.3 ESTIMATION OF STATISTICAL PROPERTIES OF GIVEN REALIZATIONS 109 4.4 SIMULATION OF AN ARRAY OF STATIONARY GROUND MOTIONS WITH VARYING SITE EFFECTS 111 4.4.1 Unconditioned Simulation 111 4.4.2 Conditioned Simulation 113 4.5 EXTENSION TO NONSTATIONARY MOTIONS 115 4.5.1 Unconditioned Simulation 116 4.5.2 Conditioned Simulation 118 4.6 EXAMPLE APPLICATIONS 120 4.6.1 Uniform Soil Conditions 121 4.6.1.1 Unconditioned Simulations 121 4.6.2.1 Modeling the Soil-columns using the SDOF Idealization 124 4.6.2.1 Modeling the Soil-columns using the Theory of Wave Propagation through Elastic Media 126			3.6.4 Penstock Bridge	58
4 SIMULATION OF SPATIALLY VARYING GROUND MOTIONS 107 4.1 INTRODUCTION 107 4.2 DISCRETE REPRESENTATION OF AN ARRAY OF STATIONARY GAUSSIAN PROCESSES 108 4.3 ESTIMATION OF STATISTICAL PROPERTIES OF GIVEN REALIZATIONS 109 4.4 SIMULATION OF AN ARRAY OF STATIONARY GROUND MOTIONS WITH VARYING SITE EFFECTS 111 4.4.1 Unconditioned Simulation 111 4.4.2 Conditioned Simulation 111 4.4.3 EXTENSION TO NONSTATIONARY MOTIONS 115 4.5.1 Unconditioned Simulation 116 4.5.2 Conditioned Simulation 111 4.6 EXAMPLE APPLICATIONS 120 4.6.1 Uniform Soil Conditions 121 4.6.1.1 Unconditioned Simulations 121 4.6.2.2 Conditioned Simulations 122 4.6.2.1 Modeling the Soil-columns using the SDOF Idealization 124 4.6.2.1 Modeling the Soil-columns using the Theory of Wave Propagation through Elastic Media 126 4.7 SUMMARY 127		3.7	SUMMARY	58
4.1 INTRODUCTION 107 4.2 DISCRETE REPRESENTATION OF AN ARRAY OF STATIONARY GAUSSIAN PROCESSES 108 4.3 ESTIMATION OF STATISTICAL PROPERTIES OF GIVEN REALIZATIONS 109 4.4 SIMULATION OF AN ARRAY OF STATIONARY GROUND MOTIONS WITH VARYING SITE EFFECTS 111 4.4.1 Unconditioned Simulation 111 4.4.2 Conditioned Simulation 113 4.5 EXTENSION TO NONSTATIONARY MOTIONS 115 4.5.1 Unconditioned Simulation 116 4.5.2 Conditioned Simulation 118 4.6 EXAMPLE APPLICATIONS 120 4.6.1 Uniform Soil Conditions 121 4.6.2 Conditioned Simulations 121 4.6.2 Varying Soil Conditions 122 4.6.2 Varying Soil Conditions 124 4.6.2.1 Modeling the Soil-columns using the SDOF Idealization 124 4.6.2.2 Modeling the Soil-columns using the Theory of Wave Propagation through Elastic Media 126	4	SIM	IULATION OF SPATIALLY VARYING GROUND MOTIONS	107
4.2 DISCRETE REPRESENTATION OF AN ARRAY OF STATIONARY GAUSSIAN PROCESSES 108 4.3 ESTIMATION OF STATISTICAL PROPERTIES OF GIVEN REALIZATIONS 109 4.4 SIMULATION OF AN ARRAY OF STATIONARY GROUND MOTIONS WITH VARYING SITE EFFECTS 111 4.4.1 Unconditioned Simulation 111 4.4.2 Conditioned Simulation 113 4.5 EXTENSION TO NONSTATIONARY MOTIONS 115 4.5.1 Unconditioned Simulation 116 4.5.2 Conditioned Simulation 118 4.6 EXAMPLE APPLICATIONS 120 4.6.1 Uniform Soil Conditions 121 4.6.1.2 Conditioned Simulations 121 4.6.2.1 Modeling the Soil-columns using the SDOF Idealization 124 4.6.2.1 Modeling the Soil-columns using the Theory of Wave Propagation through Elastic Media 126		4.1	INTRODUCTION	107
4.3 ESTIMATION OF STATISTICAL PROPERTIES OF GIVEN REALIZATIONS		4.2	DISCRETE REPRESENTATION OF AN ARRAY OF STATIONARY GAUSSIAN PROCESSES	108
4.4 SIMULATION OF AN ARRAY OF STATIONARY GROUND MOTIONS WITH VARYING SITE EFFECTS. 111 4.4.1 Unconditioned Simulation. 111 4.4.2 Conditioned Simulation. 113 4.5 EXTENSION TO NONSTATIONARY MOTIONS 115 4.5.1 Unconditioned Simulation. 116 4.5.2 Conditioned Simulation. 116 4.6 EXAMPLE APPLICATIONS 120 4.6.1 Uniform Soil Conditions 121 4.6.1.1 Unconditioned Simulations. 121 4.6.2.2 Conditioned Simulations 121 4.6.2.1 Modeling the Soil-columns using the SDOF Idealization 124 4.6.2.1 Modeling Soil-columns using the Theory of Wave Propagation 124 4.6.2.2 Modeling Soil-columns using the Theory of Wave Propagation 126 4.7 SUMMARY 127		4.3	ESTIMATION OF STATISTICAL PROPERTIES OF GIVEN REALIZATIONS	109
4.4.1 Unconditioned Simulation 111 4.4.2 Conditioned Simulation 113 4.5 EXTENSION TO NONSTATIONARY MOTIONS 115 4.5.1 Unconditioned Simulation 116 4.5.2 Conditioned Simulation 116 4.5.2 Conditioned Simulation 118 4.6 EXAMPLE APPLICATIONS 120 4.6.1 Uniform Soil Conditions 121 4.6.1.1 Unconditioned Simulations 121 4.6.1.2 Conditioned Simulations 122 4.6.2 Varying Soil Conditions 124 4.6.2.1 Modeling the Soil-columns using the SDOF Idealization 124 4.6.2.2 Modeling Soil-columns using the Theory of Wave Propagation through Elastic Media 126 4.7 SUMMARY 127		4.4	SIMULATION OF AN ARRAY OF STATIONARY GROUND MOTIONS WITH VARYING SITE EFFECTS	111
4.4.2 Conditioned Simulation.1134.5 EXTENSION TO NONSTATIONARY MOTIONS1154.5.1 Unconditioned Simulation.1164.5.2 Conditioned Simulation.1184.6 EXAMPLE APPLICATIONS1204.6.1 Uniform Soil Conditions1214.6.1 Uniform Soil Conditioned Simulations.1214.6.2 Conditioned Simulations1214.6.2 Varying Soil Conditions1224.6.2 Varying Soil Conditions1244.6.2.1 Modeling the Soil-columns using the SDOF Idealization1244.6.2.2 Modeling Soil-columns using the Theory of Wave Propagation through Elastic Media1264.7 SUMMARY127			4.4.1 Unconditioned Simulation	111
4.5 EXTENSION TO NONSTATIONARY MOTIONS 115 4.5.1 Unconditioned Simulation 116 4.5.2 Conditioned Simulation 118 4.6 EXAMPLE APPLICATIONS 120 4.6.1 Uniform Soil Conditions 121 4.6.1 Unconditioned Simulations 121 4.6.1.1 Unconditioned Simulations 121 4.6.2 Conditioned Simulations 122 4.6.2 Varying Soil Conditions 124 4.6.2.1 Modeling the Soil-columns using the SDOF Idealization 124 4.6.2.2 Modeling Soil-columns using the Theory of Wave Propagation 126 4.7 SUMMARY 127			4.4.2 Conditioned Simulation	113
4.5.1 Unconditioned Simulation1164.5.2 Conditioned Simulation1184.6 EXAMPLE APPLICATIONS1204.6.1 Uniform Soil Conditions1214.6.1.1 Unconditioned Simulations1214.6.1.2 Conditioned Simulations1224.6.2 Varying Soil Conditions1244.6.2.1 Modeling the Soil-columns using the SDOF Idealization1244.6.2.2 Modeling Soil-columns using the Theory of Wave Propagation through Elastic Media1264.7 SUMMARY127		4.5	EXTENSION TO NONSTATIONARY MOTIONS	115
4.5.2 Conditioned Simulation1184.6 EXAMPLE APPLICATIONS1204.6.1 Uniform Soil Conditions1214.6.1 Uniform Soil Conditioned Simulations1214.6.1.2 Conditioned Simulations1224.6.2 Varying Soil Conditions1244.6.2.1 Modeling the Soil-columns using the SDOF Idealization1244.6.2.2 Modeling Soil-columns using the Theory of Wave Propagation through Elastic Media1264.7 SUMMARY127			4.5.1 Unconditioned Simulation	116
4.6 EXAMPLE APPLICATIONS 120 4.6.1 Uniform Soil Conditions 121 4.6.1 Unconditioned Simulations 121 4.6.1.1 Unconditioned Simulations 121 4.6.1.2 Conditioned Simulations 122 4.6.2 Varying Soil Conditions 124 4.6.2.1 Modeling the Soil-columns using the SDOF Idealization 124 4.6.2.2 Modeling Soil-columns using the Theory of Wave Propagation through Elastic Media 126 4.7 SUMMARY 127			4.5.2 Conditioned Simulation	118
4.6.1Uniform Soil Conditions1214.6.1.1Unconditioned Simulations1214.6.1.2Conditioned Simulations1224.6.2Varying Soil Conditions1244.6.2.1Modeling the Soil-columns using the SDOF Idealization1244.6.2.2Modeling Soil-columns using the Theory of Wave Propagation through Elastic Media1264.7SUMMARY127		4.6	EXAMPLE APPLICATIONS	120
4.6.1.1Unconditioned Simulations			4.6.1 Uniform Soil Conditions	121
4.6.1.2Conditioned Simulations1224.6.2Varying Soil Conditions1244.6.2.1Modeling the Soil-columns using the SDOF Idealization1244.6.2.2Modeling Soil-columns using the Theory of Wave Propagation through Elastic Media1264.7SUMMARY127			4.6.1.1 Unconditioned Simulations	. 121
4.6.2 Varying Soil Conditions1244.6.2.1 Modeling the Soil-columns using the SDOF Idealization1244.6.2.2 Modeling Soil-columns using the Theory of Wave Propagation through Elastic Media1264.7 SUMMARY127			4.6.1.2 Conditioned Simulations	122
 4.6.2.1 Modeling the Soil-columns using the SDOF Idealization			4.6.2 Varying Soil Conditions	124
4.6.2.2 Modeling Soil-columns using the Theory of Wave Propagation through Elastic Media			4.6.2.1 Modeling the Soil-columns using the SDOF Idealization	124
4.7 SUMMARY			4.6.2.2 Modeling Soil-columns using the Theory of Wave Propagation through Elastic Media	126
		4.7	SUMMARY	127

5	LIN SIM WI	IEAR A IULAT FH MS	AND NONLINEAR TIME-HISTORY ANALYSIS USING FED DIFFERENTIAL SUPPORT MOTIONS AND COMPARISON SRS ESTIMATES	157
	5.1	INTR	ODUCTION	157
	5.2	DESC	CRIPTION OF BRIDGE MODELS	157
		5.2.1	Pier Ductility	158
		5.2.2	Damping	159
	5.3	GRO	UND MOTION INPUT	159
	5.4	ANA	LYSIS OF BRIDGE RESPONSE	162
		5.4.1	Effect of Ground Motion Spatial Variability on Peak Linear and Nonlinear Pier Drifts	163
		5.4.2	Investigation of the "Equal Displacement" Rule	166
		5.4.3	Assessment of the MSRS Rule by Comparisons with RHA Results	169
	5.5	SUM	MARY	170
6	CO UPS	HERE SAR A	NCY ANALYSIS OF ACCELERATIONS RECORDED BY THE RRAY	207
	6.1	INTR		207
	6.2	DESC	CRIPTION OF DATA	208
	6.3	POW	ER SPECTRAL DENSITY ESTIMATES	209
	6.4	COH	ERENCY ESTIMATES	209
	6.5	MOD	PARISON OF COHERENCY ESTIMATES WITH EXISTING ELS	212
		6.5.1	Comparison with Theoretical Model	212
		6.5.2	Comparison with Empirical Models	213
	6.6	SUM	MARY	214
7	SUN	MMAF	RY, CONCLUSIONS, AND FURTHER STUDIES	237
	7.1	MAJ	OR DEVELOPMENTS AND FINDINGS	237
	7.2	RECO	OMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDIES	239
		7.2.1	Implementation of MSRS Method in Commercial Codes	240
		7.2.2	Extension of the MSRS Method to Account for Spatially Correlated Orthogonal Components	240
		7.2.3	Extension of the MSRS Method to Account for Directional Dependencies	240

7.2.4	Investigation of the Influence of the Direction of Propagation of Seismic Waves	240
7.2.5	Development of Analysis Tools for Bridges in the Near-fault Regions	241
7.2.6	Incorporation of the Effect of Soil-structure Interaction	241
REFERENCES.		243

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1	Power spectral densities of ground accelerations for firm, medium, and soft soils.	32
Figure 2.2	Power spectral densities of ground displacements for firm, medium, and soft soils.	32
Figure 2.3	Cross-correlation coefficient between ground accelerations at stations <i>k</i> and <i>l</i>	33
Figure 2.4	Cross-correlation coefficient between ground displacement at station <i>k</i> and ground acceleration at station <i>l</i> .	34
Figure 2.5	Cross-correlation coefficient between oscillator response at station k and ground acceleration at station l for similar soil conditions and wave direction k to l .	35
Figure 2.6	Cross-correlation coefficient between oscillator response at station k and ground acceleration at station l for similar soil conditions and wave direction l to k .	36
Figure 2.7	Cross-correlation coefficient between oscillator response at station k and ground acceleration at station l for dissimilar soil conditions and wave direction k to l .	37
Figure 2.8	Cross-correlation coefficient between oscillator response at station k and ground acceleration at station l for dissimilar soil conditions and wave direction l to k .	38
Figure 3.1	Auburn Ravine Bridge: Elevation and plan (dimensions in meters).	63
Figure 3.2	Auburn Ravine Bridge: Box-girder cross section (dimensions in meters)	63
Figure 3.3	Auburn Ravine Bridge: First eight mode shapes and modal frequencies	64
Figure 3.4	Big Rock Wash Bridge: Elevation and plan (dimensions in meters)	65
Figure 3.5	Big Rock Wash Bridge: Box-girder cross section (dimensions in meters)	65
Figure 3.6	Big Rock Wash Bridge: First eight mode shapes and modal frequencies	66
Figure 3.7	South Ingram Slough Bridge: Elevation and plan (dimensions in meters)	67
Figure 3.8	South Ingram Slough Bridge: Box-girder cross section (dimensions in meters)	67
Figure 3.9	South Ingram Slough Bridge: First eight mode shapes and modal frequencies.	68
Figure 3.10	Penstock Bridge: Elevation (dimensions in meters).	69
Figure 3.11	Penstock Bridge: Box-girder cross section (dimensions in meters).	69

Figure 3.12	Penstock Bridge: First eight mode shapes and modal frequencies	70
Figure 3.13	Normalized acceleration response spectra for an event of magnitude 6.5 and peak rock acceleration 0.3 g.	71
Figure 3.14	Ground acceleration PSDs for an event of magnitude 6.5 and peak rock acceleration 0.3 <i>g</i> .	71
Figure 3.15	Normalized acceleration response spectra for an event of magnitude 8.0 and peak rock acceleration 0.6 g	72
Figure 3.16	Ground acceleration PSDs for an event of magnitude 8.0 and peak rock acceleration 0.6 <i>g</i> .	72
Figure 3.17	Auburn Ravine Bridge: Measures of mass participation.	73
Figure 3.18	Big Rock Wash Bridge: Measures of mass participation.	73
Figure 3.19	South Ingram Slough Bridge: Measures of mass participation.	74
Figure 3.20	Penstock Bridge: Measures of mass participation.	74
Figure 3.21	Auburn Ravine Bridge: Mean peak responses along the deck.	75
Figure 3.22	Auburn Ravine Bridge: Mean peak responses normalized with respect to the case of uniform excitation	76
Figure 3.23	Auburn Ravine Bridge: Mean peak pseudo-static responses along the deck.	77
Figure 3.24	Auburn Ravine Bridge: Relative pseudo-static contributions to mean peak responses.	78
Figure 3.25	Auburn Ravine Bridge: Modal contributions to dynamic component of mean peak responses	79
Figure 3.26	Auburn Ravine Bridge: Mean peak responses with <i>n</i> modes normalized with respect to "exact" mean peak responses.	80
Figure 3.27	Big Rock Wash Bridge: Mean peak responses along the deck	81
Figure 3.28	Big Rock Wash Bridge: Mean peak responses normalized with respect to the case of uniform excitation	82
Figure 3.29	Big Rock Wash Bridge: Mean peak pseudo-static responses along the deck.	83
Figure 3.30	Big Rock Wash Bridge: Relative pseudo-static contributions to mean peak responses.	84
Figure 3.31	Big Rock Wash Bridge: Modal contributions to dynamic component of mean peak responses	85
Figure 3.32	Big Rock Wash Bridge: Mean peak responses with <i>n</i> modes normalized with respect to "exact" mean peak responses.	86
Figure 3.33	South Ingram Slough Bridge: Mean peak responses along the deck	87

Figure 3.34	South Ingram Slough Bridge: Mean peak responses normalized with respect to the case of uniform excitation.	88
Figure 3.35	South Ingram Slough Bridge: Mean peak pseudo-static responses along the deck.	89
Figure 3.36	South Ingram Slough Bridge: Relative pseudo-static contributions to mean peak responses.	90
Figure 3.37	South Ingram Slough Bridge: Modal contributions to dynamic component of mean peak responses.	91
Figure 3.38	South Ingram Slough Bridge: Mean peak responses with <i>n</i> modes normalized with respect to 'exact" mean peak responses	92
Figure 3.39	Penstock Bridge: Mean peak responses along the deck	93
Figure 3.40	Penstock Bridge: Mean peak responses normalized with respect to the case of uniform excitation	94
Figure 3.41	Penstock Bridge: Mean peak pseudo-static responses along the deck	95
Figure 3.42	Penstock Bridge: Relative pseudo-static contributions to mean peak responses.	96
Figure 3.43	Penstock Bridge: Modal contributions to dynamic component of mean peak responses.	97
Figure 3.44	Penstock Bridge: Mean peak responses with <i>n</i> modes normalized with respect to "exact" mean peak responses.	98
Figure 3.45	Auburn Ravine Bridge: Comparison of original and extended MSRS rules (middle of span 3).	99
Figure 3.46	Auburn Ravine Bridge: Comparison of original and extended MSRS rules (left end of span 4).	100
Figure 3.47	Big Rock Wash Bridge: Comparison of original and extended MSRS rules (left end of span 2).	101
Figure 3.48	Big Rock Wash Bridge: Comparison of original and extended MSRS rules (middle of span 2).	102
Figure 3.49	South Ingram Slough Bridge: Comparison of original and extended MSRS rules (middle of span 1).	103
Figure 3.50	South Ingram Slough Bridge: Comparison of original and extended MSRS rules (left end of span 2).	104
Figure 3.51	Penstock Bridge: Comparison of original and extended MSRS rules (middle of span 2).	105
Figure 3.52	Penstock Bridge: Comparison of original and extended MSRS rules (left end of span 3)	106

Figure 4.1	"Stationary" segments of an accelerogram selected based on integral measures of evolving cumulative energy, predominant frequency, and bandwidth	129
Figure 4.2	Comparison of displacement time history of the original record with conditioned simulated displacement time histories at zero distance.	130
Figure 4.3	Comparison of ratios of PSDs of the remainder motion over the original motion for two filters (left) and of acceleration auto-PSDs of the corresponding low-frequency extracted motions (right)	130
Figure 4.4	Example set of unconditioned simulations (uniform soil conditions)	131
Figure 4.5	Acceleration coherency estimates from 20 unconditioned simulations (uniform soil conditions)	132
Figure 4.6	Displacement coherency estimates from 20 unconditioned simulations (uniform soil conditions)	132
Figure 4.7	Acceleration response spectra of 20 unconditioned simulations (uniform soil conditions).	133
Figure 4.8	Median acceleration response spectra of 20 unconditioned simulations (uniform soil conditions)	134
Figure 4.9	Median acceleration response spectra of 20 unconditioned simulations using smoothed periodograms (uniform soil conditions).	134
Figure 4.10	Example set of conditioned simulations without initial filtering (uniform soil conditions).	135
Figure 4.11	Acceleration coherency estimates from 20 conditioned simulations without initial filtering (uniform soil conditions).	136
Figure 4.12	Displacement coherency estimates from 20 conditioned simulations without initial filtering (uniform soil conditions).	136
Figure 4.13	Acceleration response spectra of 20 conditioned simulations without initial filtering (uniform soil conditions)	137
Figure 4.14	Median acceleration response spectra of 20 conditioned simulations without initial filtering (uniform soil conditions).	138
Figure 4.15	Example set of conditioned simulations with initial Butterworth filtering (uniform soil conditions)	139
Figure 4.16	Acceleration coherency estimates from 20 conditioned simulations with initial Butterworth filtering (uniform soil conditions).	140
Figure 4.17	Displacement coherency estimates from 20 conditioned simulations with initial Butterworth filtering (uniform soil conditions).	140
Figure 4.18	Acceleration response spectra of 20 conditioned simulations with initial Butterworth filtering (uniform soil conditions).	141
Figure 4.19	Median acceleration response spectra of 20 conditioned simulations with initial Butterworth filtering (uniform soil conditions).	142

Figure 4.20	Comparison of the PSD of the recorded motion and the fitted theoretical model under the SDOF idealization.	142
Figure 4.21	Example set of unconditioned simulations (varying soil conditions: SDOF model).	143
Figure 4.22	Acceleration coherency estimates from 20 unconditioned simulations (varying soil conditions: SDOF model)	144
Figure 4.23	Ratios of estimated acceleration auto-PSDs from 20 unconditioned simulations (varying soil conditions: SDOF model).	144
Figure 4.24	Median acceleration response spectra of 20 unconditioned simulations (varying soil conditions: SDOF model)	145
Figure 4.25	Example set of conditioned simulations with initial Butterworth filtering (varying soil conditions: SDOF model, only wave passage accounted for in low-frequency component).	146
Figure 4.26	Acceleration coherency estimates from 20 conditioned simulations with initial Butterworth filtering (varying soil conditions: SDOF model, only wave passage accounted for in low-frequency component).	147
Figure 4.27	Ratios of estimated acceleration auto-PSDs from 20 conditioned simulations with initial Butterworth filtering (varying soil conditions: SDOF model, only wave passage accounted for in low-frequency component).	147
Figure 4.28	Median acceleration response spectra of 20 conditioned simulations with initial Butterworth filtering (varying soil conditions SDOF model, only wave passage accounted for in low-frequency component).	148
Figure 4.29	Acceleration coherency estimates from 20 conditioned simulations with initial Butterworth filtering (varying soil conditions: SDOF model, wave passage and site effect accounted for in low-frequency component).	149
Figure 4.30	Ratios of estimated acceleration auto-PSDs from 20 simulations with initial Butterworth filtering (varying soil conditions: SDOF oscillator model, wave passage and site effect accounted for in low-frequency component).	149
Figure 4.31	Example set of unconditioned simulations (varying soil conditions: elastic- medium model).	150
Figure 4.32	Acceleration coherency estimates from 20 unconditioned simulations (varying soil conditions: elastic-medium model).	151
Figure 4.33	Ratios of estimated acceleration auto-PSDs from 20 unconditioned simulations (varying soil conditions: elastic-medium model)	151
Figure 4.34	Median acceleration response spectra of 20 unconditioned simulations (varying soil conditions: elastic-medium model).	152

Figure 4.35	Example set of conditioned simulations with initial Butterworth filtering (varying soil conditions: elastic-medium model, only wave passage accounted for in low-frequency component).	153
Figure 4.36	Acceleration coherency estimates from 20 conditioned simulations with initial Butterworth filtering (varying soil conditions, elastic-medium model, only wave passage accounted for in low-frequency component)	154
Figure 4.37	Ratios of estimated acceleration auto-PSDs from 20 conditioned simulations with initial Butterworth filtering (varying soil conditions, elastic-medium model, only wave passage accounted for in low-frequency component).	154
Figure 4.38	Median acceleration response spectra of 20 conditioned simulations with initial Butterworth filtering (varying soil conditions, elastic-medium model, only wave passage accounted for in the low-frequency component).	155
Figure 5.1	"Stationary" segments of the HSP accelerogram selected based on integral measures of evolving cumulative energy, predominant frequency, and bandwidth.	183
Figure 5.2	"Stationary" segments of the PUL accelerogram selected based on integral measures of evolving cumulative energy, predominant frequency, and bandwidth.	183
Figure 5.3	Comparison of estimated and fitted theoretical PSD for the HSP record	184
Figure 5.4	Example set of simulated support motions for Penstock Bridge (PUL record as seed, case 2)	185
Figure 5.5	Example set of simulated support motions for South Ingram Slough Bridge (HSP record as seed, case 2).	186
Figure 5.6	Example set of simulated support motions for Big Rock Wash bridge (HSP record as seed, case 4).	187
Figure 5.7	Example set of simulated support motions for Auburn Ravine bridge (HSP record as seed, case 3).	189
Figure 5.8	Median acceleration response spectra for support motions of Penstock Bridge (PUL record as seed, case 2)	189
Figure 5.9	Median acceleration response spectra for support motions of South Ingram Slough Bridge (HSP record as seed, case 2)	190
Figure 5.10	Median acceleration response spectra for support motions of Big Rock Wash bridge (HSP record as seed, case 4)	190
Figure 5.11	Median acceleration response spectra for support motions of Auburn Ravine bridge (HSP record as seed, case 3).	191
Figure 5.12	Coherency estimates for support motions of Penstock Bridge (PUL record as seed, case 2).	191

Figure 5.13	Coherency estimates for support motions of South Ingram Slough Bridge (HSP record as seed, case 2).	192
Figure 5.14	Coherency estimates for support motions of Big Rock Wash bridge (HSP record as seed, case 4)	192
Figure 5.15	Coherency estimates for support motions of Auburn Ravine bridge (HSP record as seed, case 3)	192
Figure 5.16	C_{μ} ratio versus ductility for Penstock Bridge (HSP record as seed, scaling factor = 1.5).	193
Figure 5.17	C_{μ} ratio versus ductility for Penstock Bridge (PUL record as seed, scaling factor = 1.0)	194
Figure 5.18	C_{μ} ratio versus ductility for South Ingram Slough Bridge (HSP record as seed, scaling factor = 1.5).	195
Figure 5.19	C_{μ} ratio versus ductility for South Ingram Slough Bridge (PUL record as seed, scaling factor = 1.0).	196
Figure 5.20	C_{μ} ratio versus ductility for Big Rock Wash Bridge (HSP record as seed, scaling factor = 1.5).	198
Figure 5.21	C_{μ} ratio versus ductility for Big Rock Wash Bridge (PUL record as seed, scaling factor = 1.0).	199
Figure 5.22	C_{μ} ratio versus ductility for Auburn Ravine Bridge (HSP record as seed, scaling factor = 1.5).	203
Figure 5.23	C_{μ} ratio versus ductility for Auburn Ravine Bridge (PUL record as seed, scaling factor = 1.0).	205
Figure 6.1	Geometry of UPSAR array.	216
Figure 6.2	Acceleration time histories of the N-S components.	217
Figure 6.3	Acceleration time histories of the E-W components.	218
Figure 6.4	Acceleration time histories of the vertical components	219
Figure 6.5	Estimated acceleration PSDs of the N-S components.	220
Figure 6.6	Estimated acceleration PSDs of the E-W components.	221
Figure 6.7	Estimated acceleration PSDs of the vertical components	222
Figure 6.8	Estimates of coherency modulus for the horizontal components for three levels of smoothing.	223
Figure 6.9	Estimates of coherency modulus for the vertical components for three levels of smoothing.	224
Figure 6.10	Estimates of the real part of coherency for the horizontal components	225
Figure 6.11	Estimates of the real part of coherency for the vertical components	226

Figure 6.12	Estimates of the imaginary part of coherency for the horizontal components.	227
Figure 6.13	Estimates of the imaginary part of coherency for the vertical components	228
Figure 6.14	Estimates of coherency phase angle for the horizontal components.	229
Figure 6.15	Estimates of coherency phase angle for the vertical components	230
Figure 6.16	Comparison of horizontal coherency estimates $(tanh^{-1} \gamma_{kl})$ with the fitted Luco and Wong model.	231
Figure 6.17	Comparison of horizontal coherency estimates (γ_{kl}) with the fitted Luco and Wong model.	232
Figure 6.18	Comparison of vertical coherency estimates $(tanh^{-1} \gamma_{kl})$ with the fitted Luco and Wong model.	233
Figure 6.19	Comparison of vertical coherency estimates (γ_{kl}) with the fitted Luco and Wong model	234
Figure 6.20	Comparison of horizontal coherency estimates (γ_{kl}) with the Harichandran and Vanmarcke model	235
Figure 6.21	Comparison of horizontal coherency estimates $(tanh^{-1} \gamma_{kl})$ with the Abrahamson et al. model.	236
Figure 6.22	Comparison of horizontal coherency estimates (γ_{kl}) with the Abrahamson et al. model.	

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1	PSD filter parameters for model soil types	32
Table 3.1	Stiffness values of the springs used to model the abutment responses	59
Table 3.2	Soil types at each support for each case of ground motion spatial variability.	59
Table 3.3	Soil type characteristics according to Caltrans specifications.	59
Table 3.4	Peak Ground Acceleration (PGA) for each soil-type and direction of excitation.	60
Table 3.5	Frequencies of soil columns modeled with the SDOF-oscillator idealization.	60
Table 3.6	Measures of participating modal mass, r_n^U and r_n^{TI} , for the number of modes, <i>n</i> , included in the analysis of each bridge model	60
Table 3.7	Auburn Ravine Bridge: Mean peaks of pier drifts	60
Table 3.8	Auburn Ravine Bridge: Pseudo-static contributions to mean peaks of pier drifts (z_s^2/z^2) .	61
Table 3.9	Big Rock Wash Bridge: Mean peaks of pier drifts	61
Table 3.10	Big Rock Wash Bridge: Pseudo-static contributions to mean peaks of pier drifts (z_s^2/z^2) .	61
Table 3.11	South Ingram Slough Bridge: Mean peaks of pier drifts.	61
Table 3.12	South Ingram Slough Bridge: Pseudo-static contributions to mean peaks of pier drifts (z_s^2/z^2) .	62
Table 3.13	Penstock Bridge: Mean peaks of pier drifts	62
Table 3.14	Penstock Bridge: Pseudo-static contributions to mean peaks of pier drifts (z_s^2/z^2) .	62
Table 3.15	Range of values for ratios of responses in case 2 over responses in case 1	62
Table 3.16	Range of values for ratios of responses in case 3 over responses in case 2	62
Table 4.1	Variation of soil-column properties for the SDOF model.	128
Table 4.2	Variation of soil-column properties for the elastic-medium model	128
Table 5.1	Yield drifts of the piers of the Penstock Bridge	171
Table 5.2	Yield drifts of the piers of the South Ingram Slough Bridge	171
Table 5.3	Yield drifts of the piers of the Big Rock Wash Bridge	. 171

Table 5.4	Yield drifts of the piers of the Auburn Ravine Bridge	171
Table 5.5	Modal damping ratios (%) for the first three modes	171
Table 5.6	Considered cases of ground motion spatial variability	172
Table 5.7	Variation of soil-column properties for each soil type.	172
Table 5.8	Variation of soil types underneath supports in case 4	172
Table 5.9	Penstock Bridge: Mean (standard deviation) peak linear drifts as % of pier height	172
Table 5.10	Penstock Bridge: Mean (standard deviation) peak nonlinear drifts as % of pier height.	173
Table 5.11	Penstock Bridge: Mean (standard deviation) ductility ratios	173
Table 5.12	South Ingram Slough Bridge: Mean (standard deviation) peak linear pier drifts as % of pier height	173
Table 5.13	South Ingram Slough Bridge: Mean (standard deviation) peak nonlinear pier drifts as % of pier height	174
Table 5.14	South Ingram Slough Bridge: Mean (standard deviation) ductility ratios	174
Table 5.15	Big Rock Wash Bridge: Mean (standard deviation) peak linear pier drifts as % of pier height.	174
Table 5.16	Big Rock Wash Bridge: Mean (standard deviation) peak nonlinear pier drifts as % of pier height.	175
Table 5.17	Big Rock Wash Bridge: Mean (standard deviation) ductility ratios	175
Table 5.18	Auburn Ravine Bridge: Mean (standard deviation) peak linear pier drifts as % of pier height.	176
Table 5.19	Auburn Ravine Bridge: Mean (standard deviation) peak nonlinear pier drifts as % of pier height.	177
Table 5.20	Auburn Ravine Bridge: Mean (standard deviation) ductility ratios	178
Table 5.21	Penstock Bridge: Mean (standard deviation) values of C_{μ} ratios.	179
Table 5.22	South Ingram Slough Bridge: Mean (standard deviation) values of C_{μ} ratios.	179
Table 5.23	Big Rock Wash Bridge: Mean (standard deviation) values of C_{μ} ratios	179
Table 5.24	Auburn Ravine Bridge: Mean (standard deviation) values of C_{μ} ratios	180
Table 5.25	Penstock Bridge: Comparison of RHA and MSRS mean peak pier drift estimates	181
Table 5.26	South Ingram Slough Bridge: Comparison of RHA and MSRS mean peak pier drift estimates	181
Table 5.27	Big Rock Wash Bridge: Comparison of RHA and MSRS mean peak pier drift estimates	182

Table 5.28	Auburn Ravine Bridge: Comparison of RHA and MSRS mean peak pier drift estimates.	182
Table 6.1	Distance bins for station pairs	215
Table 6.2	PGA (in units of <i>g</i>) for each component and station.	215
Table 6.3	Estimated values of $(\alpha/v_s) \times 10^{-4}$ for horizontal components	215
Table 6.4	Estimated values of $(\alpha/v_s) \times 10^{-4}$ for vertical components	216

1 Introduction

1.1 MOTIVATION AND BACKGROUND

Seismic design of extended structures, such as bridges, requires accounting for the spatial variability of the earthquake motion. Spatial variability of ground motions is mainly caused by three phenomena: (a) the incoherence effect, which arises from random differences in the amplitudes and phases of seismic waves due to reflections and refractions that occur during their propagation in the heterogeneous medium of the ground and also due to the superpositioning of waves arriving from different parts of an extended source; (b) the wave-passage effect, which arises due to the differences in the arrival times of seismic waves at separate stations; and (c) the differential site-response effect, which arises from differences in the intensity and frequency content of the surface motions due to propagation of seismic waves from the bedrock level to the ground surface through soil layers with different dynamic properties (Der Kiureghian 1996). Under uniform soil conditions, spatial variations in earthquake ground motions are only due to the incoherence and wave-passage effects, and in this case, ground motions at separate surface locations are realizations of random processes characterized by the same intensity and frequency content.

Under spatially varying support excitations, the response of a bridge can be expressed as the sum of two components: a pseudo-static component and a dynamic component. The dynamic component is the response of the bridge to the dynamic inertia forces induced by the support motions. At each time instant, the pseudo-static component is the static response of the bridge (neglecting inertia and damping forces) to the differential support displacements prescribed by the spatially varying ground motions. This component is zero in the case of uniform support excitations. Under uniform soil conditions, the effects of incoherence and wave passage tend to decrease the dynamic response due to random cancellations. However, by inducing a pseudostatic response component, these effects may increase or decrease the total bridge response, depending on the structural characteristics and the ground motion field. Thus, even in the case of uniform soil conditions, accounting for the spatial variability of ground motion is important. The additional consideration of the differential site-response effect tends to increase the pseudo-static component, whereas the influence on the dynamic component depends on the types of soils considered. In all cases, neglecting the spatial variability of ground motion may or may not be on the safe side. Thus, it is necessary to incorporate all three effects of incoherence, wave passage, and site response in the earthquake response analysis of bridges.

The response of extended structures to differential support motions has been studied by various researchers using linear time-history analyses (e.g., Price and Eberhard, 1998; Lou and Zerva, 2005), nonlinear time-history analyses (e.g., Saxena et al., 2000, Zanardo et al., 2002; Kim and Feng, 2003; Sextos et al., 2004; Lou and Zerva, 2005; Lupoi et al., 2005), the methods of random vibration (e.g., Zerva, 1990; Heredia-Zavoni and Vanmarcke, 1994; Hao, 1998; Dumanogluid and Soyluk, 2003; Zembaty and Rutenberg, 2004; Zhang et al., 2009), or response spectrum methods (e.g., Berrah and Kausel, 1992; Der Kiureghian and Neuenhofer, 1992).

The random vibration approach is based on a statistical characterization of the support excitations. Typically, the set of support motions is assumed to be jointly stationary and specified in terms of a matrix of auto- and cross-power spectral density (PSD) functions. The cross-PSDs are obtained in terms of the respective auto-PSDs and a coherency function that models the spatial variability of the ground motion random field in the frequency domain. The main advantage of this approach is that it provides a statistical measure of the response, which is not controlled by a particular set of selected ground motions. However, this approach remains rather uncommon in engineering practice, which typically defines earthquake input in terms of response spectra or ground motion time histories. Furthermore, the random vibration approach used in previous studies is based on the strict assumption of stationarity.

Response spectrum methods are based on the random vibration approach, but have the additional advantage of using a response spectrum characterization of the ground motion, which is particularly appealing from a design standpoint. Furthermore, response spectra inherently include the nonstationarity of the ground motion. The multiple-support response spectrum (MSRS) method, developed by Der Kiureghian and Neuenhofer (1992), obtains the mean of the peak structural response in terms of the response spectra and peak ground displacements at the support points of the structure and the coherency function characterizing the spatial variability of the ground motion. This method properly accounts for cross-correlations that occur between the

support motions and between modal responses. The MSRS rule has been used by a growing number of researchers to investigate seismic responses of bridges and other multiply supported structures: Nakamura et al. (1993) used it for the analysis of the Golden Gate Bridge; Kahan et al. (1996) used it to perform sensitivity analysis of the bridge response and develop mode truncation criteria; Der Kiureghian et al. (1997) performed parametric studies of example bridge models incorporating the site-response effect; Soyluk (2004) compared results from MSRS analysis with results from conventional random vibration analysis; Loh and Ku (1995) and Wang and Chen (2005) developed approximations of the correlation coefficient terms in the MSRS rule; and Yu and Zhou (2008) extended the MSRS method for analysis of non-classically damped structures. As a method employing modal superposition, the MSRS method is necessarily limited to linear analysis. However, under severe earthquake loading, bridges as well as other extended structures are expected to experience inelastic response.

One way to account for nonlinear behavior is to conduct response history analysis (RHA) for specified time histories of ground motions at support points of the structure. As recordings of closely spaced earthquake ground motions are rare, nonlinear response history analysis of multiply supported structures must rely on synthetic ground motions. Simulation methods have been developed that use the coherency function in conjunction with theoretical target PSD functions. The resulting simulated stationary motions are then modulated in time to provide temporal nonstationarity (e.g., Hao et al., 1989, Saxena et al., 2000). However, this approach cannot account for spectral nonstationarity of the ground motion, which can be critical in analysis of hysteretic structures. An earlier work by Deodatis (1996) incorporated spectral nonstationarity, but required specification of an evolutionary PSD, and no investigation of the physical compliance of the synthetic motions was carried out. An alternative approach to simulation of an array of synthetic ground motions with specified coherency function is to use probabilistic conditioning with a seed recorded or simulated motion at a reference site (Vanmarcke and Fenton, 1991; Kameda and Morikawa, 1992; Liao and Zerva, 2006). Applying this approach on segmented records, Vanmarcke and Fenton (1991) and Liao and Zerva (2006) generated motions with temporal and spectral nonstationarities. One disadvantage of generating ground motions by conditioning on a seed accelerogram is that the variance of the array of simulated motions increases with increasing distance from the site of the target motion. This is clearly an undesirable property when performing statistical analysis of bridge response, say, by Monte Carlo simulation. This issue can be addressed by conditioning the simulated array of motions on the PSDs of the segmented seed accelerogram rather than its specific realization. Vanmarcke and Fenton (1991) used this approach to simulate accelerograms, but did not examine the physical compliance of the simulated motions in terms of displacement time histories and response spectra. Furthermore, all previous studies using probabilistic conditioning have been limited to the case of uniform soil conditions.

Another way to account for nonlinear behavior by avoiding the computationally costly nonlinear time-history analysis is to relate nonlinear displacement demands to corresponding linear responses. In the "displacement-based" design approach (Moehle, 1992), elements of the structure are designed for a prescribed ductility ratio using seismic demands that are specified in terms of maximum displacement. One can show that, under certain conditions, the displacement computed for the linear structure provides a good approximation of the inelastic displacement demand (Veletsos and Newmark, 1960). This finding, commonly known as the "equal displacement" rule, has been examined for the case of uniform excitations by a number of investigators, including Rahnama and Krawinkler (1993), Miranda and Bertero (1994), Vidic et al. (1994), Gupta and Krawinkler (2000), and Miranda (2000). However, to our knowledge, the validity of the "equal displacement" rule under varying support motions has not been investigated.

In all analysis approaches discussed above, a coherency function is typically employed to describe the spatial variability of support motions. Because of the random nature of the incoherence component of this function, it is not possible to develop a theoretical model of this phenomenon solely based on physics. One approach to characterize the incoherence component is to use a probabilistic model employing parameters that can be determined through statistical inference. A general form for such a theoretical model was derived by Der Kiureghian (1996) based on elementary principles, and a special case is the well-known model by Luco and Wong (1986). Another approach to model the incoherence component is to develop empirical models using data from recorded acceleration arrays (e.g., Harichandran and Vanmarcke, 1986; Abrahamson et al., 1991). Empirical models account for the complex phenomena that occur during wave propagation and are not captured by simplified mathematical models, but characterize only the specific rupture mechanisms and soil topographies present in the data. We note that the incoherence component for near-fault ground motions has not been properly examined.

1.2 OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE

In this study, we develop accurate and practical tools for the analysis of bridges subjected to spatially varying support motions considering both the response spectrum and the RHA approaches. These analysis tools are used to investigate effects of several cases of spatial variability on the responses of real bridge models with vastly different structural characteristics. In the RHA approach, we investigate both linear and nonlinear responses with the aim of assessing the accuracy of the "equal displacement" rule. We compare the responses obtained with the response spectrum and the RHA analysis approaches. To make RHA possible, we develop a method to generate synthetic arrays of ground motions. An additional objective is the investigation of existing coherency models, commonly used to describe the spatial variability of ground motion, through comparisons with coherency estimates from an array of near-fault records. These objectives are further described in the following subsections.

1.2.1 Development of Analysis Tools

1.2.1.1 Response Spectrum Approach

Since its development in 1992, the MSRS rule has become a popular method of analysis of extended structures under differential support motions. As in response spectrum analysis under uniform excitation, use of the MSRS rule in practice involves truncation of modes beyond a number that is usually far smaller than the total number of modes of the structure. In this study, we present a generalized and extended formulation of the original MSRS method. The original MSRS formulation only considered response quantities that could be expressed as linear combinations of the displacements at the unconstrained degrees of freedom (DOF) of the structure. The generalized formulation presented here also allows consideration of response quantities that involve one or more support DOFs, e.g., drifts of bridge piers. The extended version of the MSRS rule accounts for the quasi-static contribution of the truncated modes. Furthermore, we develop a computer algorithm for the implementation of the generalized and extended MSRS method. In this algorithm, the evaluation of the cross-model, cross-support correlation coefficients is performed with a numerical integration method that accounts for the behavior of the integrand for specific modal quantities. The computational efficiency achieved with this integration method is particularly important due to the large number of correlation coefficients involved in MSRS analysis of typical bridge models. Computing these coefficients

with a general-purpose integration algorithm quickly becomes impractical for a structure with a large number of modes and many support points. This problem, which has been noted by a number of investigators (see, e.g., Loh and Ku, 1995; Wang and Chen 2005), is now resolved with the specialized integration algorithm. Another advantage of this algorithm is the ability to evaluate the required response coefficients with a method that can be applied with any "black box" structural analysis software that restricts access to the source code.

1.2.2 Synthetic Motions for RHA

As discussed earlier, the main challenge in the time-history analysis of bridges under differential support motions is the simulation of the input support motions. In this study, we develop methods for simulation of nonstationary, spatially varying support motions accounting for the effects of incoherence, wave passage, and differential site response. Efficient computer algorithms developed for the implementation of the simulation methods are described in detail. We consider two approaches: the unconditional approach, which generates support motion arrays consistent with the PSDs of a segmented accelerogram, and the conditional approach, which generates support motions by conditioning on the specific realization of the record. The simulation methods are validated by examining the physical compliance of the motions, by comparing the statistical properties of a sample of realizations (i.e., coherency characteristics and PSDs) with the corresponding target models, and by examining the corresponding response spectra. By incorporating the differential site-response effect, this study provides an important enhancement of the previously developed methods of conditional simulation. Another contribution of this study is that it provides detailed discussions on the selection of various parameters involved in the process and their effects on the characteristics of the generated motions.

1.2.3 Parametric Analyses of Real Bridge Models

Comparative response analyses of four real bridges allow insightful observations on the influence of differential support motions on the structural response for several cases of ground motion spatial variability. The bridges have been designed by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and the respective models are developed here based on the Caltrans blueprints and following Caltrans specifications. Analyses of the bridge models are performed using both the MSRS and the RHA approaches. When performing MSRS analyses, we also

examine the effect of spatial variability of ground motion on modal contributions and assess the effectiveness of the extended rule to approximately account for the contributions of truncated modes. In the RHA approach, of special interest is the effect of spatial variability on the ratios of pier drifts obtained from nonlinear and linear analyses. According to the "equal displacement" rule, for sufficiently flexible systems, these ratios are expected to be close to unity. In this study, we investigate the validity of this rule for several cases of varying support motions. Furthermore, we perform comparisons of the MSRS and RHA results for linear structures in order to assess the level of accuracy achieved by the MSRS method.

1.2.4 Investigation of Coherency Models

As described earlier, several models have been developed to describe the incoherence component of the coherency function. These are mostly based on far-field recordings. In this study, we perform a detailed coherency analysis of the near-fault recordings of the UPSAR array from the 2004 Parkfield (California) earthquake and determine if there is a substantial difference in the coherency characteristics of these near-fault records relative to the existing models.

1.3 ORGANIZATION OF THE REPORT

This report is organized into seven chapters. Chapter 2 discusses the derivation and implementation of the generalized and extended MSRS method, which is used for the MSRS analysis of real bridge models in Chapter 3. Chapter 4 describes methods for simulation of spatially varying ground motions, which are used in Chapter 5 to investigate linear and nonlinear RHA of bridge models under differential support motions. Chapter 6 develops models for the incoherence component of the coherency function using the UPSAR array of recordings.

In Chapter 2, we first introduce a generalization of the original formulation of the MSRS method, which allows consideration of response quantities that involve the support DOFs. An example is drifts of bridge piers. This condition also applies to most response quantities of interest when the structural model has rotational DOFs that are condensed out. After an investigation of mode truncation criteria for the case of differential support motions, we develop the extended version of the MSRS rule, which accounts for the quasi-static contributions of the truncated modes. We perform a parametric study of additional cross-correlation coefficients introduced in the extended MSRS method to gain insight into their behavior and identify cases of

ground motion variability for which these terms are significant. Finally, we present an overview of the computer program developed for the implementation of the generalized and extended MSRS method and address the main computational issues.

In Chapter 3, we apply the theory presented in Chapter 2 to investigate the effect of ground motion spatial variability on models of four real bridges designed by the California Department of Transportation. The selected bridges have vastly different characteristics such as length, number of spans, number of piers per bent, and fundamental period. We perform a comprehensive response analysis of the four bridge models using the MSRS rule and investigate the total, pseudo-static, and dynamic responses for three cases of excitation: uniform support motions, varying support motions due only to wave passage and incoherence, and varying support motions due to wave passage, incoherence, and differential site effect. The response quantities examined are element forces along the deck and pier drifts. Finally, we compare the accuracies of the extended and original MSRS rules when only the first few modes are included and investigate conditions under which the extended rule provides improved approximations.

In Chapter 4, we develop methods for simulation of nonstationary spatially varying support motions accounting for the effects of incoherence, wave passage, and differential site response. Using the unconditional approach, we simulate arrays of support motions characterized by similar variability at all sites. Using the conditional approach, we simulate arrays of motions for which the variance increases with increasing distance from the reference site with a specified motion. (The increase levels off after sufficient distance.) In the conditional approach, we investigate a method that preserves the low-frequency content and, thus, the waveform of the displacement time history of the seed record. In an example application, we simulate support motions for a bridge in California considering both simulation approaches and both cases of uniform and variable soil conditions. The simulation methods are validated by (1) examining the physical compliance of example simulated time histories (e.g., zero acceleration, velocity, and displacement residuals), (2) comparing statistical characteristics of an ensemble of realizations with the corresponding target theoretical models, and (3) examining the response spectra of the simulated motions. We also investigate the selection of various parameters involved in the simulation methods and their effect on the characteristics of the generated motions.

In Chapter 5, we use arrays of motions simulated with the unconditional approach developed in Chapter 4 to investigate responses of bridge models under differential support excitation through linear and nonlinear RHA. For the four example bridges, we consider both

linear and nonlinear models and investigate the effect of ground motion spatial variability on pier drifts, which are quantities particularly important in bridge design. Additionally, we examine the ratios of nonlinear over linear drifts to investigate the effect of spatial variability on the accuracy of the commonly used "equal displacement" rule. Another objective of this chapter is to assess the accuracy of the MSRS method by comparisons of the mean peak linear responses from RHA with corresponding MSRS estimates.

In Chapter 6, we examine spatial variations observed during the 2004 Parkfield (California) earthquake using the UPSAR array of closely spaced acceleration records and compare coherency estimates from these data with existing theoretical and empirical models. As the distances of the UPSAR recordings from the fault rupture are shorter than those for most arrays used in previous studies, we examine if there is a substantial difference in the coherency characteristics of these near-fault records relative to the existing models. We note that, though near-fault, the records used in this study do not exhibit directivity pulses.

Chapter 7 summarizes the main results and conclusions of the study and provides recommendations for future studies.
2 Generalized and Extended MSRS Rule

2.1 INTRODUCTION

The MSRS (Multiple-Support Response Spectrum) modal combination rule developed by Der Kiureghian and Neuenhofer (1992) evaluates the mean peak response of multiply supported linear structures subjected to spatially varying ground motions. This rule has become a popular method of analysis and has been used by a growing number of researchers to investigate seismic responses of bridges and other multiply supported structures (e.g., Kahan et al., 1996; Soyluk, 2004; Yu and Zhou, 2008). The original formulation of this method only considered responses that could be expressed as linear functions of the total displacements at unconstrained degrees of freedom (DOF) of the structure. In this chapter, we generalize the original formulation to account for response quantities that depend not only on the displacements at the unconstrained DOF, but also on support motions. One example response in a multiply supported structure that involves the support motion is the drift response of a pier of a bridge. Der Kiureghian and Neuenhofer (1992) suggested introducing an "unconstrained" DOF near the support point to allow computation of such a response. However, dependence on support motions is pervasive among response quantities of interest. In fact, when the structure has rotational DOF that are condensed out in the analysis, most response quantities of interest indirectly depend on the support motions.

As in modal analysis of ordinary structures, when using the MSRS rule for multiply supported structures the analyst must truncate modes beyond a number far smaller than the total number of DOF of the structure. In this chapter, following a discussion of mode truncation criteria for the case of differential support motions, we develop an extended version of the MSRS rule to account for the quasi-static contribution of the truncated modes. This formulation introduces new terms in the MSRS formula, which include three new sets of cross-correlation coefficients. A parametric study of the newly introduced cross-correlation coefficients is performed to gain insight into their behavior and identify cases of ground motion variability for which these terms are significant.

Finally, we present an overview of the computer program developed for the implementation of the generalized and extended MSRS method and address its main computational issues.

2.2 GENERALIZED FORMULATION OF THE MSRS RULE

2.2.1 Equations of Motion

Consider an *N*-DOF linear structural model subjected to motions at *m* support DOF. Let $\mathbf{x} = [x_1 \ \dots \ x_N]^T$ be the *N*-vector of total displacements at the unconstrained DOF and $\mathbf{u} = [u_1 \ \dots \ u_m]^T$ be the *m*-vector of prescribed support displacements. Both \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{u} may contain translational as well as rotational components. The equations of motion for the model can be written in the matrix form (Der Kiureghian and Neuenhofer, 1992):

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{M} & \mathbf{M}_c \\ \mathbf{M}_c^{\mathrm{T}} & \mathbf{M}_g \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \ddot{\mathbf{x}} \\ \ddot{\mathbf{u}} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{C} & \mathbf{C}_c \\ \mathbf{C}_c^{\mathrm{T}} & \mathbf{C}_g \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \dot{\mathbf{x}} \\ \dot{\mathbf{u}} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{K} & \mathbf{K}_c \\ \mathbf{K}_c^{\mathrm{T}} & \mathbf{K}_g \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{u} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{F} \end{bmatrix},$$
(2.1)

where **M**, **C**, and **K** are $N \times N$ mass, damping, and stiffness matrices associated with the unconstrained DOF, respectively; \mathbf{M}_g , \mathbf{C}_g , and \mathbf{K}_g are $m \times m$ matrices associated with the support DOF; \mathbf{M}_c , \mathbf{C}_c , and \mathbf{K}_c are $N \times m$ coupling matrices associated with both sets of DOF; and **F** is the *m*-vector of reacting forces at the support DOF.

The total displacement vector at the unconstrained DOF is decomposed into pseudo-static and dynamic components: $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}^s + \mathbf{x}^d$. The pseudo-static component, \mathbf{x}^s , is the response of the system when dynamic effects are neglected and is obtained from the set of equations for unconstrained DOF in Equation (2.1) in terms of the support displacements as $\mathbf{x}^s = \mathbf{R}\mathbf{u}$, where $\mathbf{R} = -\mathbf{K}^{-1}\mathbf{K}_c$ is the influence matrix. The *k*th column of the influence matrix, \mathbf{r}_k , can be interpreted as the displacements at the unconstrained DOF when the *k*th support DOF is displaced by a unit amount while all other support DOF remain fixed. Employing the above decomposition in Equation (2.1), the equation of motion for the dynamic component of the response is obtained as

$$\mathbf{M}\ddot{\mathbf{x}}^{d} + \mathbf{C}\dot{\mathbf{x}}^{d} + \mathbf{K}\mathbf{x}^{d} = -(\mathbf{M}\mathbf{R} + \mathbf{M}_{c})\ddot{\mathbf{u}} - (\mathbf{C}\mathbf{R} + \mathbf{C}_{c})\dot{\mathbf{u}}.$$
(2.2)

The damping forces on the right-hand side are usually much smaller than the inertia forces on the same side and can be neglected (Chopra, 2001). Thus, for a lumped mass model, i.e., $\mathbf{M}_c = 0$, the dynamic component of the response is obtained in the differential form

$$\mathbf{M}\ddot{\mathbf{x}}^d + \mathbf{C}\dot{\mathbf{x}}^d + \mathbf{K}\mathbf{x}^d = -\mathbf{M}\mathbf{R}\ddot{\mathbf{u}}.$$
(2.3)

Assuming classical damping, let $\mathbf{\Phi} = [\mathbf{\Phi}_1 \quad \dots \quad \mathbf{\Phi}_N]$, ω_i , and ζ_i , $i = 1, \dots, N$, respectively denote the modal matrix, natural frequencies, and modal damping ratios of the fixed-base structure. Using the transformation $\mathbf{x}^d = \mathbf{\Phi}\mathbf{y}$, $\mathbf{y} = [y_1 \quad \dots \quad y_N]^T$, in Equation (2.3) and employing the orthogonality of the mode shapes, the decoupled equations of motion are

$$\ddot{y}_{i}(t) + 2\zeta_{i}\omega_{i}\dot{y}_{i}(t) + \omega_{i}^{2}y_{i}(t) = -\sum_{k=1}^{m}\beta_{ki}\ddot{u}_{k}(t),$$
(2.4)

where $\beta_{ki} = \mathbf{\Phi}_i^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{M} \mathbf{r}_k / \mathbf{\Phi}_i^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{M} \mathbf{\Phi}_i$ is the modal participation factor associated with mode *i* and support DOF *k*. We can write

$$y_i(t) = \sum_{k=1}^{m} \beta_{ki} s_{ki}(t),$$
(2.5)

where $s_{ki}(t)$ is the normalized response of mode *i* to the *k*th support motion, which is obtained as the solution to

$$\ddot{s}_{ki}(t) + 2\zeta_i \omega_i \dot{s}_{ki}(t) + \omega_i^2 s_{ki}(t) = -\ddot{u}_k(t).$$
(2.6)

Substituting for the pseudo-static component of \mathbf{x} in terms of the support displacements and for the dynamic component in terms of the normalized modal responses, we obtain

$$\mathbf{x}(t) = \sum_{k=1}^{m} \mathbf{r}_{k} u_{k}(t) + \sum_{k=1}^{m} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbf{\phi}_{i} \beta_{ki} s_{ki}(t).$$
(2.7)

A generic response quantity of interest, z(t), such as the relative displacement between two DOF or an internal force component, can be written as a linear combination of the support displacements and the displacements at the unconstrained DOF, i.e.,

$$z(t) = \mathbf{q}_u^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{u}(t) + \mathbf{q}_x^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{x}(t), \qquad (2.8)$$

where $\mathbf{q}_u = [q_{u,1} \cdots q_{u,m}]^T$ and $\mathbf{q}_x = [q_{x,1} \cdots q_{x,N}]^T$ are coefficient vectors. Equation (2.8) represents a generalization of the original formulation by Der Kiureghian and Neuenhofer (1992), which considered z(t) a function of only $\mathbf{x}(t)$. This generalization allows consideration

of response quantities that are functions of displacements at both the constrained as well as the support DOF, e.g., the drift of a bridge column or an internal force of a structural model with condensed rotational degrees of freedom. Equation (2.8) can be written as

$$z(t) = \sum_{k=1}^{m} a_k u_k(t) + \sum_{k=1}^{m} \sum_{i=1}^{N} b_{ki} s_{ki}(t),$$
(2.9)

where

$$a_k = q_{u,k} + \mathbf{q}_x^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{r}_k \tag{2.10}$$

is interpreted as the response quantity of interest when the kth support DOF is statically displaced by a unit amount with all other support DOF remaining fixed, and

$$b_{ki} = \mathbf{q}_x^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{\Phi}_i \beta_{ki}, \tag{2.11}$$

called the effective modal participation factor (Der Kiureghian and Neuenhofer, 1992), is interpreted as the contribution of the *i*th mode to the response z(t) arising from the excitation at the *k*th support DOF when the normalized modal response $s_{ki}(t)$ is equal to unity. The coefficients a_k and b_{ki} depend only on the structural properties and the response quantity of interest and, as described in Section 2.6.1, can be computed by use of any conventional static analysis program. Properties of these coefficients have been derived by Nakamura et al. (1993) for the original MSRS formulation and are given next for the generalized formulation.

The properties of the coefficients a_k remain the same, as in the original formulation: When the vector **u** contains only translational components, $\sum_{k=1}^{m} a_k = 1$, if z(t) is a nodal translational displacement, and $\sum_{k=1}^{m} a_k = 0$, if z(t) is a nodal rotational displacement or an internal force component. These identities are derived by employing the principle of superposition (which holds for the response of linear systems) and noticing that the sum of the a_k coefficients represents the response quantity of interest when all support DOF are statically displaced by a unit amount, i.e., $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{1}$. Note that when the vector **u** contains only translational components, the state $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{1}$ corresponds to a rigid body motion, which causes no rotations or internal forces in the structure.

However, for the generalized formulation, the identity $a_k = \sum_{i=1}^{N} b_{ki}$ (Nakamura et al., 1993) holds under the condition that the response quantity of interest depends only on the displacements at the unconstrained DOF and not on the support displacements, i.e., the case

where $q_{u,k} = 0$ in Equation (2.8). This identity is derived by using the definition of β_{ki} in conjunction with the orthogonality properties of the modal eigenvectors to obtain $\mathbf{Mr}_k = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbf{M} \mathbf{\Phi}_i \beta_{ki}$ and by multiplying both sides of the latter equation by $\mathbf{q}_x^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{M}^{-1}$.

The above properties can be used to check the accuracy of the computed a_k and b_{ki} coefficients under the specified conditions. The b_{ki} coefficients do not necessarily decrease in magnitude with increasing mode number, and hence, the latter identity is useful only when all modes of the structure are included in the analysis.

2.2.2 The MSRS Rule

In earthquake engineering practice, it is common to specify the design ground motion in terms of response spectra. Hence, methods for computing structural response directly in terms of the response spectra defining input support motions are of interest. The MSRS rule provides a fundamental solution to this problem. Using Equation (2.9) and the principles of stationary random vibration theory, Der Kiureghian and Neuenhofer (1992) showed that for the case of translational support motions, the mean of the peak of the generic response quantity z(t) can be approximately obtained in the form

$$E[\max|z(t)|] \approx \left[\sum_{k=1}^{m} \sum_{l=1}^{m} a_{k}a_{l}\rho_{u_{k}u_{l}}u_{k,\max}u_{l,\max}\right] + 2\sum_{k=1}^{m} \sum_{l=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{m} a_{k}b_{lj}\rho_{u_{k}s_{lj}}u_{k,\max}D_{l}(\omega_{j}, \zeta_{j}) + \sum_{k=1}^{m} \sum_{l=1}^{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{N} b_{ki}b_{lj}\rho_{s_{ki}s_{lj}}D_{k}(\omega_{i}, \zeta_{i})D_{l}(\omega_{j}, \zeta_{j})\right]^{1/2}.$$
(2.12)

Equation (2.12) represents the MSRS combination rule. The first, double-sum term inside the square brackets is the pseudo-static component of the response, the third, quadruple-sum term is the dynamic component, and the second, triple-sum term is a cross term of the pseudo-static and dynamic components. The mean of the peak response is given in terms of the structural properties as reflected in the coefficients a_k and b_{ki} , the mean peak ground displacements, $u_{k,\max}$, the ordinates of the mean displacement response spectrum, $D_k(\omega_i, \zeta_i)$, for each support motion and each modal frequency and damping ratio, and three sets of cross-correlation

coefficients: $\rho_{u_k u_l}$, describing the correlation between the *k*th and *l*th support displacements, $\rho_{u_k s_{lj}}$, describing the correlation between the *k*th support displacement and the response of mode *j* to the *l*th support motion, and $\rho_{s_{ki} s_{lj}}$, describing the correlation between the responses of modes *i* and *j* to the *k*th and *l*th support motions, respectively. These cross-correlation coefficients are given by

$$\rho_{u_k u_l} = \frac{1}{\sigma_{u_k} \sigma_{u_l}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} G_{u_k u_l}(\omega) d\omega$$

$$\rho_{u_k s_{lj}} = \frac{1}{\sigma_{u_k} \sigma_{s_{lj}}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} H_j(-\omega) G_{u_k \ddot{u}_l}(\omega) d\omega$$

$$\rho_{s_{kl} s_{lj}} = \frac{1}{\sigma_{s_{kl}} \sigma_{s_{lj}}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} H_i(\omega) H_j(-\omega) G_{\ddot{u}_k \ddot{u}_l}(\omega) d\omega,$$
(2.13)

where $G_{xy}(\omega)$ denotes the cross-power spectral density (PSD) of processes x and y, $H_i(\omega) = -(\omega_i^2 - \omega^2 + 2i\zeta_i\omega_i\omega)^{-1}$ represents the *i*th mode frequency response function (FRF) for relative displacement response with respect to the base acceleration; and σ_{u_k} and $\sigma_{s_{ki}}$ are the root-mean-squares of $u_k(t)$ and $s_{ki}(t)$, respectively, given by

$$\sigma_{u_k}^2 = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} G_{u_k u_k}(\omega) d\omega$$

$$\sigma_{s_{ki}}^2 = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |H_i(\omega)|^2 G_{\ddot{u}_k \ddot{u}_k}(\omega) d\omega.$$
(2.14)

To circumvent the dependence of the cross-correlation coefficients on the PSDs of the support motions, we use the correspondence between the response spectrum and the PSD of a ground acceleration process. Der Kiureghian and Neuenhofer (1992) derived the following approximate relation,

$$G_{\ddot{u}_k \ddot{u}_k}(\omega) = \frac{\omega^{p+2}}{\omega^p + \omega_f^p} \left(\frac{2\zeta\omega}{\pi} + \frac{4}{\pi\tau}\right) \left[\frac{D_k(\omega,\zeta)}{p_s(\omega)}\right]^2,$$
(2.15)

in which p and ω_f are parameters selected by adjusting the PSD for low frequencies so that it is consistent with the peak ground displacement (the condition $p \gg 2$ satisfies the requirement that the spectral density of the ground displacement approaches a finite or zero value as $\omega \rightarrow 0$), τ is the duration of the strong motion phase of the ground motion, ζ is a reference damping ratio, and $p_s(\omega)$ is a peak factor associated with the response of an oscillator (Der Kiureghian, 1980). Der Kiureghian and Neuenhofer (1992) showed that the correlation coefficients in Equations (2.13) are relatively insensitive to the selection of the parameters p, ω_f , ζ , and τ . In the current study, we use p = 3, $\zeta = 0.05$, and $\tau = 10$ s. According to Der Kiureghian and Neuenhofer (1992), the value of ω_f that is consistent with p = 3 is $\omega_f = 0.705$.

The cross-PSD of ground accelerations can be obtained in terms of the auto-PSDs and a coherency function that characterizes the spatial variability of ground motion, as described in the following section. All the other required PSDs can be evaluated using the well-known relation for the PSD of a derivative process:

$$G_{\chi^{(r)}\gamma^{(r)}}(\omega) = (\mathrm{i}\omega)^r (-\mathrm{i}\omega)^s G_{\chi\gamma}(\omega),$$
(2.16)

where $x^{(r)}$ denotes the *r*th derivative of x(t). The above analysis shows that the cross-correlation coefficients $\rho_{u_k u_l}$ are only functions of the support excitations, whereas the cross-correlation coefficients $\rho_{u_k s_{lj}}$ and $\rho_{s_{kl} s_{lj}}$ additionally depend on the modal frequencies and damping ratios of the structure. The set of response spectra for all support DOF (including the limits at infinite period, which equal the respective peak ground displacements) and the set of coherency functions for all pairs of support motions represent a complete specification of the input ground motions for the evaluation of the needed cross-correlation coefficients.

2.2.3 The Coherency Function

The coherency function characterizes the spatial variability of the ground motion random field in the frequency domain. Spatial variations of earthquake-induced ground motions occur due to four distinct phenomena (Der Kiureghian, 1996). The first phenomenon, the *incoherence effect*, arises from the loss of coherency of the motion as a result of the propagation of seismic waves in a heterogeneous medium with numerous reflections and refractions, and of the differential superpositioning of waves arriving from different parts of an extended source. The second phenomenon, the *wave-passage effect*, arises from the difference in the arrival times of waves at separate stations. The third is the *site-response effect*, the effect of the local soil profiles on the amplitude and frequency content of the bedrock motion as it propagates upward at each support location. The fourth, the *attenuation effect*, is the gradual decay of wave amplitudes with distance from the source of the earthquake. This effect is insignificant for the distances of interest and is neglected in the following analysis.

For a pair of stationary ground acceleration processes $\ddot{u}_k(t)$ and $\ddot{u}_l(t)$, the complexvalued coherency function is a normalized version of their cross-PSD:

$$\gamma_{kl}(\omega) = \frac{G_{\ddot{u}_k \ddot{u}_l}(\omega)}{\left[G_{\ddot{u}_k \ddot{u}_k}(\omega)G_{\ddot{u}_l \ddot{u}_l}(\omega)\right]^{1/2}}.$$
(2.17)

Der Kiureghian (1996) showed that the modulus of the coherency function characterizes the incoherency effect, whereas its phase angle characterizes the wave passage and variable site-response effects. Thus, the coherency function can be written in the form

$$\gamma_{kl}(\omega) = |\gamma_{kl}(\omega)|^{ic} \exp\{i[\theta_{kl}(\omega)^{wp} + \theta_{kl}(\omega)^{sr}]\}.$$
(2.18)

One form of the incoherence component that has been extensively used is (Luco and Wong, 1986)

$$|\gamma_{kl}(\omega)|^{ic} = \exp\left[-\left(\frac{\alpha d_{kl}\omega}{v_s}\right)^2\right],\tag{2.19}$$

in which d_{kl} is the distance between the sites k and l, v_s is the average shear wave velocity of the ground medium along the wave travel path, and α is an incoherence coefficient that can be empirically estimated from data (Luco and Wong, 1986) or determined in terms of the soil properties and depth of the layers (Zerva and Harada, 1984). The phase shift due to the wavepassage effect is given by (Luco and Wong, 1986; Der Kiureghian, 1996)

$$\theta_{kl}(\omega)^{wp} = \frac{\omega d_{kl}^L}{v_{app}},\tag{2.20}$$

where d_{kl}^{L} is the projected algebraic horizontal distance in the longitudinal direction of propagation of waves and v_{app} is the surface apparent wave velocity. The phase shift due to the site-response effect is given by (Der Kiureghian, 1996)

$$\theta_{kl}(\omega)^{sr} = \tan^{-1} \frac{\text{Im}[h_k(\omega)h_l(-\omega)]}{\text{Re}[h_k(\omega)h_l(-\omega)]},$$
(2.21)

where $h_s(\omega)$, s = k, l is the FRF for the absolute acceleration response of the site associated with the sth support DOF. The derivation of Equation (2.21) is based on the assumptions of linear (or linearized) behavior of the soil column, vertical wave propagation at each site, and neglect of dynamic interaction between sites. Further details on the modeling of the soil FRF are presented below.

2.2.4 Modeling of the Site Response

The FRF at each support point is required for two purposes: (1) to determine the response spectrum at the site when the input response spectrum is specified for only a reference site and (2) to evaluate the site-response component of the coherency function. The FRF of a site is also used later in this study to simulate arrays of coherent ground motions (see Chapter 4).

When a detailed description of the soil profile at a site is available (i.e., soil types, thicknesses, and constitutive properties of the various layers), the site FRF can be determined as the Fourier transform of the unit-impulse response function of the soil column, which is obtained by time-domain analysis to an impulsive loading at the bedrock level. The impulsive load may be scaled to approximately account for nonlinear soil behavior (Der Kiureghian et al., 1997). If down-hole recorded motions are available at the surface and bedrock levels, an empirical estimate of the FRF is given by the ratio of the cross-PSD of the surface and bedrock motions over the auto-PSD of the bedrock motion (see Der Kiureghian et al., 1997, for example cases). Alternatively, the FRF of the soil layer can be described using theoretical models, as described below.

A theoretical model that properly reflects the physics of vertical propagation of shear waves in an elastic medium is given by (Safak, 1995)

$$h_k(\omega) = \frac{\left(1 + r_k - \operatorname{sgn}(\omega) \frac{i}{4Q_k}\right) \exp\left[-i\omega\tau_k \left(1 - \operatorname{sgn}(\omega) \frac{i}{2Q_k}\right)\right]}{1 + \left(r_k - \operatorname{sgn}(\omega) \frac{i}{4Q_k}\right) \exp\left[-2i\omega\tau_k \left(1 - \operatorname{sgn}(\omega) \frac{i}{2Q_k}\right)\right]}.$$
(2.22)

Here the subscript k refers to the kth site, τ_k is the time it takes for waves to travel from the bedrock to the ground surface, Q_k is a quality factor, r_k is the reflection coefficient of vertically propagating waves, and sgn(·) is the signum function. If the depth to bedrock is z_k and the shear wave velocity of the soil layer is $v_{s,k}$, then $\tau_{s,k} = z_k/v_{s,k}$. The quality factor is related to the damping of the soil layer, ζ_k , through $Q_k = 1/2\zeta_k$. The reflection coefficient is given by $r_k = (\rho_b v_b - \rho_{s,k} v_{s,k})/(\rho_b v_b + \rho_{s,k} v_{s,k})$, in which the sets (ρ_b, v_b) and $(\rho_{s,k}, v_{s,k})$ represent the density and shear wave velocity of the bedrock and the soil layer at the kth site, respectively.

According to this model, the resonant frequencies of the soil layer are $\omega_{j,k} = j\pi v_{s,k}/2z_k$, $j = 1, 3, 5, \dots$ The rate of decay of the corresponding peaks in the modulus of the FRF depends on the Q_k factor. The signum function in Equation (2.22) does not appear in the expression given by Safak (1995), but is introduced here to obtain an FRF consistent with rules in random vibration theory, where negative frequencies are also considered.

When the behavior of the soil column is dominated by its first mode, or when highfrequency components of the ground motion do not have significant contributions to the structural response, a single-degree-of-freedom (SDOF) filter idealization of the soil column can be used. In this case, the site FRF is given by (Clough and Penzien, 1993)

$$h_k(\omega) = \frac{\omega_k^2 + 2i\zeta_k\omega_k\omega}{\omega_k^2 - \omega^2 + 2i\zeta_k\omega_k\omega'},$$
(2.23)

where ω_k and ζ_k represent the filter frequency and damping ratio. The frequency ω_k can be approximated by the first resonant frequency of the soil layer, $\omega_k = \pi v_{s,k}/2z_k$, where z_k and $v_{s,k}$ are the corresponding depth and effective shear wave velocity, respectively. The filter damping ratio, ζ_k , primarily controls the bandwidth of the process and tends to be larger for firmer grounds. Values of this parameter for various soil types were suggested by Der Kiureghian and Neuenhofer (1992). When the response spectrum at a site is known, one way to select these two parameters for the site FRF is to fit the theoretical acceleration PSD to the approximate PSD estimated through Equation (2.15), using, for example, least-squares minimization. Under the assumptions of linear (or linearized) behavior of the soil column and vertical wave propagation, a theoretical model that relates the acceleration PSD at the surface of site k, $G_{\ddot{u}_k \ddot{u}_k}(\omega)$, to the corresponding PSD at the bedrock level, $G_{\ddot{u}_k \ddot{u}_k}(\omega)^{bedrock}$, is

$$G_{\ddot{u}_k\ddot{u}_k}(\omega) = |h_k(\omega)|^2 G_{\ddot{u}_k\ddot{u}_k}(\omega)^{bedrock}.$$
(2.24)

Assuming for simplicity that the motion at the bedrock level is a white noise process, the theoretical PSD is given by the squared modulus of $h_k(\omega)$ factored by a constant. The parameters to estimate then are ω_k , ζ_k , and the scale parameter.

Selection from among the methods for modeling the site response described above should be based on the available information.

2.3 MODE TRUNCATION CRITERIA FOR RESPONSE TO DIFFERENTIAL SUPPORT MOTIONS

In practical application of the MSRS rule, it is often necessary to truncate the modal contributions beyond a mode $n \ll N$. Of course this truncation only affects the dynamic component of the response, i.e., the triple- and quadruple-sum terms in Equation (2.12). For the for sake of simplicity in developing criteria modal truncation, we neglect the triple-sum cross term and the cross-modal contributions in the quadrupleconsider the extreme cases of uniform support motions term. We also sum and totally incoherent (statistically independent) support motions. In the case of uniform support motions, $\rho_{s_{ki}s_{li}} = 1$ for all k, l and, thus, the main term in Equation (2.12) affected by modal truncation is $\sum_{i=1}^{N} \left[\sum_{k=1}^{m} b_{ki} D_k(\omega_i, \zeta_i) \right]^2$. In the case of totally incoherent motions, $\rho_{s_{ki}s_{li}} = 1$ when k = l and $\rho_{s_{ki}s_{li}} = 0$ when $k \neq l$, leading support this term to $\sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{k=1}^{m} [b_{ki} D_k(\omega_i, \zeta_i)]^2$. Under the stated conditions, the *i*th modal contribution $\left[\sum_{k=1}^{m} b_{ki} D_k(\omega_i, \zeta_i)\right]^2 =$ of uniform support motions is in the case $(\mathbf{q}_x^{\mathrm{T}}\mathbf{\phi}_i)^2 [D_k(\omega_i, \zeta_i)]^2 (\sum_{k=1}^m \beta_{ki})^2$, whereas in the case of totally incoherent support motions it is $\sum_{k=1}^{m} \left[b_{ki} D_k(\omega_i, \zeta_i) \right]^2 = (\mathbf{q}_x^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{\Phi}_i)^2 \left[D_k(\omega_i, \zeta_i) \right]^2 \sum_{k=1}^{m} \beta_{ki}^2.$ Thus, for a given response quantity and specified response spectra, the relation between the modal contributions in the two cases depends on the relation between $(\sum_{k=1}^{m} \beta_{ki})^2$ and $\sum_{k=1}^{m} \beta_{ki}^2$. We note that if the modal participation factors of the *i*th mode, β_{ki} , have the same sign for all k, then $(\sum_{k=1}^{m} \beta_{ki})^2 =$ $(\sum_{k=1}^{m} |\beta_{ki}|)^2$ and the *i*th modal contribution is the largest in the case of uniform support excitations among all cases of ground motion spatial variability. If the modal participation factors β_{ki} have alternating signs so that $\sum_{k=1}^{m} \beta_{ki} = 0$, then the *i*th modal contribution is the smallest in the case of uniform support excitations among all other cases.

The extreme cases of uniform and totally incoherent support motions, discussed above, can be used to provide simplified guidelines for mode truncation for intermediate cases of spatial variability. To derive an expression for the modal contributions that is independent of the input support motions, we assume that modal frequencies fall in the region of constant spectral pseudo-acceleration and that the modal damping ratios are all identical. In that case, each $D_k(\omega_i, \zeta_i)$ is proportional to $1/\omega_i^2$. Using this simplification, in the case of uniform support motions, the contribution of the *i*th mode is proportional to $(\sum_{k=1}^m b_{ki})^2/\omega_i^4$. Specializing for the

total base shear, the latter expression becomes $(M_i \gamma_i^2)^2$, where $M_i = \mathbf{\Phi}_i^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{M} \mathbf{\Phi}_i$ and $\gamma_i = \sum_{k=1}^m \beta_{ki}$ (Kahan et al., 1996). Employing the identity $\sum_{i=1}^N M_i \gamma_i^2 = \mathbf{s}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{M} \mathbf{s}$, where $\mathbf{s} = \sum_{k=1}^m \mathbf{r}_k$, the ratio

$$r_n^U = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n M_i \gamma_i^2}{\mathbf{s}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{M} \mathbf{s}} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n M_i (\sum_{k=1}^m \beta_{ki})^2}{\sum_{k=1}^m \mathbf{r}_k^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{M} \sum_{k=1}^m \mathbf{r}_k}$$
(2.25)

is introduced, which provides a measure of the participating modal mass for the case of uniform support motions. This ratio is commonly used in engineering practice to determine the number of modes required in the dynamic analysis of ordinary structures. In the case of totally incoherent support motions, the *i*th modal contribution is proportional to $\sum_{k=1}^{m} b_{ki}^2 / \omega_i^4$. Kahan et al. (1996) showed that for the total base shear the latter expression becomes $(M_i \sum_{k=1}^{m} \beta_{ki}^2)^2$. Accounting for the property $\sum_{i=1}^{N} M_i \sum_{k=1}^{m} \beta_{ki}^2 = \sum_{k=1}^{m} \mathbf{r}_k^T \mathbf{M} \mathbf{r}_k$ (Kahan et al., 1996), the ratio

$$r_n^{TI} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n M_i \sum_{k=1}^m \beta_{ki}^2}{\sum_{k=1}^m \mathbf{r}_k^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{M} \mathbf{r}_k}$$
(2.26)

is introduced, which provides a measure of the participating modal mass for the case of totally incoherent support motions. This ratio was proposed by Kahan et al. (1996) as a measure of the number of modes required in the MSRS analysis. The ratios r_n^U and r_n^{TI} have the advantages of being non-decreasing in n and not depending on the modal properties of the truncated modes. These ratios are indicative of the accuracy of the dynamic component only and not of the total response, since the latter also depends on the pseudo-static component, not affected by mode truncation. Numerical examination of these ratios for example bridge models is presented in Chapter 3.

2.4 EXTENDED MSRS RULE

When high-frequency modes are truncated, we obtain an improved approximation of the response by accounting for the quasi-static contributions of the truncated modes. This concept has been used for structures subjected to uniform support motions (Singh and McCown, 1986; Leger and Wilson, 1988; Der Kiureghian and Nakamura, 1993). Here, we apply the method to spatially varying support motions by extending the MSRS rule.

When ω_i is large relative to important frequencies of the input excitation, the last term in the left-hand side of Equation (2.6) is dominant and the *i*th normalized modal response to the *k*th

support motion can be approximated as $s_{ki}(t) \approx -\omega_i^{-2}\ddot{u}_k(t)$. Using this relation in Equation (2.7) for modes i > n, we have

$$z(t) \approx \sum_{k=1}^{m} a_k u_k(t) + \sum_{k=1}^{m} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n} b_{ki} s_{ki}(t) - \sum_{i=n+1}^{N} \frac{b_{ki}}{\omega_i^2} \ddot{u}_k(t) \right].$$
(2.27)

The effective modal participation factors b_{ki} for i > n can be eliminated from Equation (2.27) by employing the identity

$$-\sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{b_{ki}}{\omega_i^2} = -\mathbf{q}_x^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{K}^{-1} \mathbf{M} \mathbf{r}_k.$$
(2.28)

The right-hand side of this equality represents the response $\mathbf{q}_x^T \mathbf{x}^d$ when a static excitation defined by $\ddot{u}_k = 1$ and $\ddot{u}_l = 0$ for $l \neq k$ is specified in Equation (2.3). The left-hand side is the same response obtained by modal decomposition, i.e., from Equation (2.6) and the second term in Equation (2.9). Rearranging terms, we obtain

$$\sum_{i=n+1}^{N} \frac{b_{ki}}{\omega_i^2} = \mathbf{q}_x^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{K}^{-1} \mathbf{M} \mathbf{r}_k - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{b_{ki}}{\omega_i^2} = d_k.$$
(2.29)

Using the above identity, Equation (2.27) can be written in a form that involves the dynamic properties of only the first n modes:

$$z(t) \approx \sum_{k=1}^{m} a_k u_k(t) + \sum_{k=1}^{m} \sum_{i=1}^{n} b_{ki} s_{ki}(t) - \sum_{k=1}^{m} d_k \ddot{u}_k(t).$$
(2.30)

Note that this improved expression of the response now additionally involves the support accelerations, $\ddot{u}_k(t)$.

Assuming jointly stationary, zero-mean support motions $u_k(t)$, and following the steps involved in the derivation of the original MSRS rule (Der Kiureghian and Neuenhofer, 1992), we can obtain the mean of the extreme peak of the process z(t) in Equation (2.30). The derivation involves five steps: (1) using Equation (2.30) to obtain the PSD of the generic response z(t) in terms of the auto- and cross-PSDs of the processes $u_k(t)$, $\ddot{u}_k(t)$, and $s_{ki}(t)$, (2) integrating over the frequency domain to obtain the mean-square of z(t), $\sigma_z^2 = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} G_{zz}(\omega)d\omega$, in terms of the mean-squares of $u_k(t)$, $\ddot{u}_k(t)$, and $s_{ki}(t)$ and their covariances, (3) replacing the root-mean squares of $u_k(t)$, $\ddot{u}_k(t)$, and $s_{ki}(t)$ by respectively the mean peak ground displacement, the mean peak ground acceleration, and the mean response spectrum ordinate for mode *i*, each divided by its corresponding peak factor (Der Kiureghian, 1980), (4) multiplying the root-mean-square of z(t) with its peak factor to obtain the mean of the extreme peak response, and (5) approximating the ratios of the peak factors by unity. This last assumption is valid as the peak factors are only mildly dependent on the characteristics of each process (Der Kiureghian, 1980). This procedure leads to the following extended MSRS rule:

$$E[max|z(t)|] \approx \left[\sum_{k=1}^{m} \sum_{l=1}^{m} a_{k}a_{l}\rho_{u_{k}u_{l}}u_{k,\max}u_{l,\max}\right]^{m} + 2\sum_{k=1}^{m} \sum_{l=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{n} a_{k}b_{lj}\rho_{u_{k}s_{lj}}u_{k,\max}D_{l}(\omega_{j}, \zeta_{j}) + \sum_{k=1}^{m} \sum_{l=1}^{m} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} b_{ki}b_{lj}\rho_{s_{ki}s_{lj}}D_{k}(\omega_{i}, \zeta_{i})D_{l}(\omega_{j}, \zeta_{j}) + \sum_{k=1}^{m} \sum_{l=1}^{m} d_{k}d_{l}\rho_{\ddot{u}_{k}\ddot{u}_{l}}\ddot{u}_{k,\max}\ddot{u}_{l,\max} - 2\sum_{k=1}^{m} \sum_{l=1}^{m} \rho_{u_{k}\ddot{u}_{l}}u_{k,\max}\ddot{u}_{l,\max}u_{l,\max} - 2\sum_{k=1}^{m} \sum_{l=1}^{m} \rho_{u_{k}\ddot{u}_{l}}u_{k,\max}\ddot{u}_{l,\max}u_{l,\max} - 2\sum_{k=1}^{m} \sum_{l=1}^{m} \sum_{l=1}^{n} b_{ki}d_{l}\rho_{s_{ki}\ddot{u}_{l}}D_{k}(\omega_{i}, \zeta_{i})\ddot{u}_{l,\max}\right]^{1/2}.$$

$$(2.31)$$

In comparison to the original MSRS rule, the extended MSRS rule additionally involves the last three terms. The first of these terms represents the quasi-static contribution of the truncated modes. The second term arises from the covariances of the support displacements and accelerations, and the third term arises from the covariances between the responses of the included modes and the quasi-static responses of the truncated modes. These terms involve three sets of new cross-correlation coefficients, $\rho_{\ddot{u}_k\ddot{u}_l}$, $\rho_{u_k\ddot{u}_l}$, and $\rho_{s_ki\ddot{u}_l}$, which respectively represent the correlation between the ground accelerations at support DOF *k* and *l*, the correlation between the ground acceleration at support DOF *l*, and the ground acceleration at support DOF *l*. The newly introduced cross-correlation coefficients are given by

$$\rho_{\ddot{u}_{k}\ddot{u}_{l}} = \frac{1}{\sigma_{\ddot{u}_{k}}\sigma_{\ddot{u}_{l}}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} G_{\ddot{u}_{k}\ddot{u}_{l}}(\omega)d\omega$$

$$\rho_{u_{k}\ddot{u}_{l}} = \frac{1}{\sigma_{u_{k}}\sigma_{\ddot{u}_{l}}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} G_{u_{k}\ddot{u}_{l}}(\omega)d\omega$$

$$\rho_{s_{ki}\ddot{u}_{l}} = \frac{1}{\sigma_{s_{ki}}\sigma_{\ddot{u}_{l}}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} H_{i}(\omega)G_{\ddot{u}_{k}\ddot{u}_{l}}(\omega)d\omega.$$
(2.32)

In the above expression, the root-mean-squares σ_{u_k} and $\sigma_{s_{ki}}$ are given in Equation (2.14), whereas the root-mean-square of $\sigma_{\ddot{u}_k}$ is given by

$$\sigma_{\ddot{u}_k}^2 = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} G_{\ddot{u}_k \ddot{u}_k}(\omega) d\omega.$$
(2.33)

Recall that the PSDs in these expressions are all given in terms of the response spectra defining the support motions; see Equations (2.15) and (2.16).

The parametric study in the following section provides insight into the behavior of the three new cross-correlation coefficients.

2.5 PARAMETRIC ANALYSIS OF THE NEW CROSS-CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS

A parametric study of the cross-correlation coefficients $\rho_{\hat{u}_k\hat{u}_l}$, $\rho_{u_k\hat{u}_l}$, and $\rho_{s_kl\hat{u}_l}$ is presented in this section to determine the influences of various model parameters and evaluate the significances of the new cross-terms in the extended MSRS rule. For this purpose, we adopt the coherency model described in Section 2.2.3. Considering the range of values that might be of engineering interest, the parameter $\alpha d_{kl}/v_s$ of the coherency function (see Equation (2.19)) is varied between 0 and 2 s, and the parameter d_{kl}^L/v_{app} (see Equation (2.20)) is given the values 0, 0.5, and 1 s. The case $\alpha d_{kl}/v_s = 0$ neglects the incoherence effect, whereas the case $d_{kl}^L/v_{app} = 0$ neglects the wave passage effect. For the PSD of the ground acceleration at each station k we consider a modified version of the Kanai-Tajimi spectral density (Clough and Penzien, 1993). The Kanai-Tajimi model assumes that the input acceleration at the bedrock level is a white noise and the soil layer behaves as a SDOF oscillator. This model implies an infinite power for ground displacement when $\omega \rightarrow 0$. This problem is solved in the Clough-Penzien model by introducing a high-pass filter, such that the modified PSD is given by

$$H_{k}(\omega) = G_{kk} \frac{\omega_{fk}^{4} + 4\zeta_{fk}^{2}\omega_{fk}^{2}\omega^{2}}{\left(\omega_{fk}^{2} - \omega^{2}\right)^{2} + 4\zeta_{fk}^{2}\omega_{fk}^{2}\omega^{2}} \frac{\omega^{4}}{\left(\omega_{gk}^{2} - \omega^{2}\right)^{2} + 4\zeta_{gk}^{2}\omega_{gk}^{2}\omega^{2}}$$
(2.34)

in which G_{kk} is a scale factor, ω_{fk} and ζ_{fk} are the filter parameters of the Kanai-Tajimi model representing respectively the natural frequency and damping of the soil layer at station k, and ω_{gk} and ζ_{gk} are parameters of the high-pass filter. For $\omega_{gk} \ll \omega_{fk}$, the second filter influences only the region of very low frequencies, since the second quotient quickly approaches unity with increasing ω . The filter parameter values for firm, medium, and soft soils, as suggested by Der Kiureghian and Neuenhofer (1992), are listed in Table 2.1. The corresponding PSDs for the ground acceleration and ground displacement are shown in Figure 2.1 and Figure 2.2, respectively (figures and tables are presented at the end of each chapter).

2.5.1 Cross-correlation Coefficient between Ground Accelerations at Stations k and I

Figure 2.3 shows plots of the cross-correlation coefficient $\rho_{\ddot{u}_k\ddot{u}_l}$ for pairs of sites with firm, medium, and soft soil conditions. The charts on the left are for identical soil conditions at the two sites, while those on the right are for dissimilar soil conditions. In the top chart on the left, the ground motion spatial variability arises only from the incoherence effect. The correlation coefficient is consistently smaller for firmer soil conditions, for which the acceleration process is richer in high-frequency components. We note that waves with such frequencies tend to lose coherency faster than low-frequency waves. In the top right chart, the lack of perfect correlation when $\alpha d_{kl}/v_s = 0$ is indicative of the differential site effect. In both of the top charts, $\rho_{\ddot{u}_k\ddot{u}_l}$ takes only positive values. However, in the presence of the wave passage effect, the correlation coefficient can take on positive or negative values, typically smaller in magnitude than those in the cases without the wave passage effect. In all cases, the correlation between the two ground acceleration processes is nearly negligible for $\alpha d_{kl}/v_s \ge 0.5$.

Figure 4 in the paper by Der Kiureghian and Neuenhofer (1992) shows plots of the correlation coefficient $\rho_{u_k u_l}$ between ground displacements for similar site conditions and coherency function parameters. A comparison of Figure 2.3 with that figure reveals that the correlation coefficient $\rho_{\ddot{u}_k\ddot{u}_l}$ decays much faster with increasing incoherence and wave passage than $\rho_{u_k u_l}$. This is due to the higher frequency content of the acceleration processes.

2.5.2 Cross-correlation Coefficient between Ground Displacement at Station k and Ground acceleration at Station I

Figure 2.4 shows plots of the cross-correlation coefficient $\rho_{u_k \ddot{u}_l}$ against the parameter $\alpha d_{kl}/v_s$ for the selected values of d_{kl}^L/v_{app} and for identical (left) and variable (right) soil conditions. For the latter, we only consider the cases where station k (displacement) has firmer soil than station l (acceleration). In the absence of the wave-passage effect, the ground displacement at station k is negatively correlated with the ground acceleration at station l. (Note that displacement and acceleration at a given site generally are negatively correlated processes.) This correlation is generally more significant for softer soils and for cases where the soil for the acceleration site is softer than the soil for the displacement site. Both the incoherence and wave-passage effects tend to reduce the correlation between the two processes. For $\alpha d_{kl}/v_s > 1$ or $d_{kl}^L/v_{app} \ge 1$, $\rho_{u_k \ddot{u}_l}$ is close to zero.

2.5.3 Cross-correlation Coefficient between Oscillator Response at Station k and Ground Acceleration at Station I

Figures 2.5–2.8 show selected plots of the cross-correlation coefficient $\rho_{s_{kl}\ddot{u}_l}$ against the oscillator frequency ω_i when the oscillator damping ratio is $\zeta_i = 0.05$. Sites with firm or soft soil conditions are considered. Figures 2.5 and 2.6 are for identical soil conditions at the two stations, and Figures 2.7 and 2.8 are for dissimilar soil conditions. Furthermore, Figures 2.5 and 2.7 are for waves arriving first at station k and then at station l, whereas Figures 2.6 and 2.8 are for waves travelling in the opposite direction. The charts from top to bottom are for increasing values of the magnitude of the wave passage parameter d_{kl}^L/v_{app} , which is varied from 0 to $\mp 1 s$. The curves in each chart represent three different values of the incoherence parameter, $\alpha d_{kl}/v_s = 0$, 0.1, and 0.2 s.

For $\omega_i \to \infty$, i.e., for an infinitely stiff oscillator, $s_{ki} \to -\ddot{u}_k/\omega_i^2$ and thus $\rho_{s_{ki}\ddot{u}_l} \to -\rho_{\ddot{u}_k\ddot{u}_l}$. If we additionally consider identical soil conditions and neglect the wave passage and incoherence effects, the ground motions at the two stations would be perfectly correlated and hence $\rho_{s_{kl}\ddot{u}_l} \to -1$. In Figures 2.5 and 2.6, for the cases with $\alpha d_{kl}/v_s = 0$ and $d_{kl}^L/v_{app} = 0$, when ω_i is large, $\rho_{s_{kl}\ddot{u}_l}$ assumes large negative values that approach -1 at a pace that is faster for softer than for firmer soils. The wave-passage effect and the wave propagate from the

oscillator site to the acceleration site (Figures 2.5 and 2.7), $\rho_{s_{kl}\ddot{u}_l}$ oscillates with ω_i at a period of approximately v_{app}/d_{kl}^L . This is because of the correlation of the oscillator response with the ground acceleration at an earlier time. When the direction of the wave passage is reversed (Figures 2.6 and 2.8), the correlation is practically zero for ground accelerations on firm soil. This is because the oscillator response is independent of the later excitation when the excitation is broadband.

2.6 COMPUTER IMPLEMENTATION OF THE EXTENDED MSRS RULE

The MSRS rule evaluates the mean peak response in terms of the structural properties reflected in the coefficients a_k and b_{ki} for each response quantity of interest, the support motions as described in terms of the peak ground displacements and the response spectra, and three sets of cross-correlation coefficients. The extended MSRS rule additionally requires the coefficients d_k , which are functions of the structural properties, the peak ground accelerations, and three additional sets of cross-correlation coefficients. The cross-correlation coefficients, in turn, involve the coherency function describing the spatial variability of the ground motion random field. Once the support motions have been specified in terms of response spectra, peak ground displacements, peak ground accelerations, and a coherency function, the implementation of the extended MSRS rule only requires computation of the coefficients a_k , b_{ki} , and d_k and the crosscorrelation coefficients. In the remainder of this section we describe the computation of these last quantities, as implemented in the computer code developed for this study.

2.6.1 Computation of the a_k, b_{ki}, and d_k Coefficients

Any existing structural analysis code that allows specification of imposed nodal displacements and forces can be used to compute the coefficients a_k , b_{ki} , and d_k . For the present study, we have used the open-source software OpenSees; however, any "black box" structural analysis program that provides restricted access to the code can also be used.

For a response quantity of interest, the coefficient a_k is computed as the response of the structure to a unit static displacement at the *k*th support DOF, while all other support DOF remain fixed. Thus, the computation of the full set of the coefficients a_k for a set of desired response quantities requires *m* static analyses.

Considering Equations (2.8) and (2.11), the coefficient b_{ki} is interpreted as the response quantity of interest when the displacements at the support DOF are zero and the displacements at the unconstrained DOF are $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{\Phi}_i \beta_{ki}$. Hence, using the notion of equivalent static forces, the coefficient b_{ki} is determined by static analysis of the fixed-base structure subjected to the set of forces $\mathbf{f}_{ki} = \mathbf{K} \mathbf{\Phi}_i \beta_{ki} = \omega_i^2 \mathbf{M} \mathbf{\Phi}_i \beta_{ki}$ applied at the unconstrained DOF. Thus, once the natural frequencies and modal shapes of the fixed-base structure have been determined and provided the mass matrix is available, the set of *n* b_{ki} coefficients can be computed through $m \times n$ static analyses.

Finally, the coefficient d_k is computed from Equation (2.29), in which the term $\mathbf{q}_x^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{K}^{-1} \mathbf{M} \mathbf{r}_k$ is obtained as the static response of the fixed-base structure to the set of forces $\mathbf{M} \mathbf{r}_k$. Thus, the full set of the coefficients d_k is determined in terms of the b_{ki} coefficients and the results from *m* static analyses.

2.6.2 Computation of the Cross-correlation Coefficients

Evaluation of the cross-correlation coefficients is the most demanding computational task in the MSRS analysis. For a structure with many support points and a large number of contributing modes, the number of coefficients to be computed can be very large. This has prompted several investigators to declare the MSRS rule "impractical" and to develop further approximations (Loh and Ku, 1995; Wang and Chen, 2005). However, by careful consideration of the properties of these coefficients and the behavior of the integrands involved, it is possible to develop highly efficient algorithms that perform the required computations in a reasonable time. Below, we discuss computational aspects of the algorithm developed in this study, specifically the symmetries considered, the integration scheme, and selection of the cut-off frequency. This algorithm has been implemented in a MATLAB code.

2.6.2.1 Symmetries

In the original MSRS rule, the total number of cross-correlation coefficients is $m^2 + m^2N + m^2N^2$, where *n* is the number of modes considered and *m* is the number of support motions. Accounting for the symmetries $\rho_{u_k u_l} = \rho_{u_l u_k}$ and $\rho_{s_{ki} s_{lj}} = \rho_{s_{lj} s_{ki}}$ and the identities $\rho_{u_k u_k} = 1$ and $\rho_{s_{ki} s_{ki}} = 1$, the number of distinct coefficients to be computed reduces to $m(m + 2mn + mn^2 - n - 1)/2$. The extended MSRS rule involves $m^2(2 + n)$ additional coefficients. However, accounting for the symmetries $\rho_{\ddot{u}_k\ddot{u}_l} = \rho_{\ddot{u}_l\ddot{u}_k}$ and $\rho_{u_k\ddot{u}_l} = \rho_{u_l\ddot{u}_k}$ and the identity $\rho_{\ddot{u}_k\ddot{u}_k} = 1$, the number of additional coefficients to be computed is $m^2(1+n)$. Obviously, the additional computational effort required by the extended rule is small.

The computational time can be further reduced by noticing that the integrands in Equations (2.13) and (2.32) have symmetric real and antisymmetric imaginary parts. Thus, the integrals can be evaluated in the interval $(0, \infty)$ by neglecting the imaginary parts and doubling the real parts of the integrand quantities. The integrals in Equations (2.14) and (2.33) have real and symmetric integrands and can also be evaluated over the interval $(0, \infty)$ and doubled.

2.6.2.2 Integration Method

The integration scheme developed in this study is based on dividing the integration domain into frequency intervals $(\widehat{\omega}_r, \widehat{\omega}_{r+1})$ within which the integrands vary slowly. Assuming that within these intervals the integrand can be approximated by a low-degree polynomial, we evaluate the corresponding integral with an *n* point Gaussian quadrature rule, where *n* is selected according to the desired accuracy. As described next, the discretization along the frequency domain is determined by accounting for the behavior of the relevant integrand.

Design response spectra are usually defined at discrete frequency points, denoted herein as $\tilde{\omega}_s$. Equation (2.15) is used to determine the consistent auto-PSDs, $G_{\ddot{u}_k\ddot{u}_k}(\omega)$, at these points, whereas linear interpolation is employed for intermediate points. These functions together with the coherency function are used to compute the cross-PSDs $G_{\ddot{u}_k\ddot{u}_l}$, $G_{u_k\ddot{u}_l}$, and $G_{u_ku_l}$. As both the auto-PSDs and the coherency function are smooth functions of frequency, all PSDs that appear in Equations (2.13) and (2.14) and (2.32) and (2.33) can be well described by low-degree polynomials in the intervals ($\tilde{\omega}_s, \tilde{\omega}_{s+1}$).

The integrands in the expressions for the root-mean-squares σ_{u_k} and $\sigma_{\ddot{u}_k}$ and the correlation coefficients $\rho_{u_k u_l}$ and $\rho_{u_k \ddot{u}_l}$ only involve the PSDs of the support motions. In this case, the frequency points $\tilde{\omega}_s$ define the discretization along the frequency axis for the evaluation of the corresponding integrals. The integrands in the expressions for the root-mean-squares $\sigma_{s_{ki}}$ and the correlation coefficients $\rho_{s_{ki}s_{lj}}$, $\rho_{u_ks_{lj}}$, and $\rho_{s_{ki}\ddot{u}_l}$ additionally involve one or two modal FRF and, thus, include sharp peaks around the corresponding modal frequencies. To ensure accurate representation of the integrands in these cases, the discretization along the frequency

axis, additionally to the points $\tilde{\omega}_s$, includes closely spaced points in the neighborhoods of the modal frequencies involved.

As an example of the computational efficiency of the developed integration scheme, for a model with m = 7 and n = 30 (Auburn Ravine Bridge in the example application of Chapter 3), computation of the required 23,436 correlation coefficients in the original MSRS rule (for one direction of excitation) with accuracy of three significant digits takes 489 s with our MATLAB code on an Intel Core2 Duo computer. The additional time for the extended MSRS rule is only 23 s. Only one set of correlation coefficients is needed for all response quantities of interest; however, new sets of correlation coefficients must be computed if the support response spectra or coherency function are altered.

2.6.3 Cut-off Frequency

Equations (2.13), (2.14), (2.32), and (2.33) assume unbounded frequency content in the input excitation. However, an upper bound is implicitly assumed in most seismic analyses (Der Kiureghian and Nakamura, 1993). When the input excitation is described in terms of the time history of the ground motion, this upper bound is related to the size of the time step. When a design response spectrum is used, the upper bound is defined by the frequency beyond which the pseudo-spectral acceleration is effectively equal to the peak ground acceleration. In the current study, the cut-off frequency for each type of integral is selected such that the values of the integrand beyond this point are considered negligible. The cut-off frequency in the evaluation of the terms σ_{u_k} , $\sigma_{\ddot{u}_k}$, $\rho_{u_k \ddot{u}_l}$, and $\rho_{u_k \ddot{u}_l}$ depends only on the power of the input excitation, whereas the cut-off frequency for the evaluation of $\sigma_{s_{ki}}$, $\rho_{u_k s_{lj}}$, $\rho_{s_{ki} s_{lj}}$, and $\rho_{s_{ki} \ddot{u}_l}$ additionally depends on the frequencies of the relevant modes.

2.7 SUMMARY

In this chapter, the MSRS method was generalized to allow consideration of response quantities that involve the support DOFs. Following an investigation of mode truncation criteria for the case of differential support motions, the MSRS rule was extended to account for the quasi-static contributions of the truncated modes. A parametric study of additional cross-correlation coefficients introduced in the extended MSRS method was performed to gain insight into their behavior. Finally, an overview of the computer program developed for the implementation of the

generalized and extended MSRS method was presented and the main computational issues were addressed.

Soil type	ω_{fk} , rad/s	ζ_{fk}	ω_{gk} , rad/s	ζ_{gk}
Firm	15.0	0.6	1.5	0.6
Medium	10.0	0.4	1.0	0.6
Soft	5.0	0.2	0.5	0.6

 Table 2.1
 PSD filter parameters for model soil types.



Figure 2.1 Power spectral densities of ground accelerations for firm, medium, and soft soils.



Figure 2.2 Power spectral densities of ground displacements for firm, medium, and soft soils.



Figure 2.3 Cross-correlation coefficient between ground accelerations at stations *k* and *l*.



Figure 2.4 Cross-correlation coefficient between ground displacement at station *k* and ground acceleration at station *l*.



Figure 2.5 Cross-correlation coefficient between oscillator response at station *k* and ground acceleration at station /for similar soil conditions and wave direction *k* to *l*.



Figure 2.6 Cross-correlation coefficient between oscillator response at station *k* and ground acceleration at station /for similar soil conditions and wave direction /to *k*.



Figure 2.7 Cross-correlation coefficient between oscillator response at station *k* and ground acceleration at station /for dissimilar soil conditions and wave direction *k* to *l*.



Figure 2.8 Cross-correlation coefficient between oscillator response at station *k* and ground acceleration at station /for dissimilar soil conditions and wave direction /to *k*.

3 Application of the Extended MSRS Rule to Real Bridge Models

3.1 INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, we apply the theory presented in Chapter 2 to investigate the effect of ground motion spatial variability on four real bridges designed by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). The bridges were selected to provide vastly different characteristics such as length, number of spans, number of piers per bent, and fundamental period.

In Section 3.2, we describe the models developed for each bridge following Caltrans specifications (Caltrans Seismic Design Criteria, 2004). The bridge models are presented in order of increasing fundamental period, from the stiffest to the most flexible. In Section 3.3, we describe the earthquake input in terms of response spectra and an assumed coherency function. We consider three cases: uniform support motions, varying support motions due to wave passage and incoherence only, and varying support motions due to the wave-passage, incoherence, and site-response effects. In Section 3.4, we select the number of modes considered for each bridge using the mode truncation criteria described in the previous chapter. In Section 3.5, we perform a comprehensive response analysis of the four bridge models using the MSRS rule and investigate the total, pseudo-static, and dynamic responses for the three cases of excitation. The response quantities examined are element forces along the deck and pier drifts. Finally, in Section 3.6, we compare the accuracies of the extended versus the original MSRS rules when only the first few modes are included and discuss conditions under which the extended rule provides improved approximations.

3.2 DESCRIPTION OF BRIDGE MODELS

In this section, we describe the models of four real bridges designed by Caltrans: the Auburn Ravine Bridge, the South Ingram Slough Bridge, the Big Rock Wash Bridge, and the Penstock Bridge. The models were developed based on drawings provided by Caltrans.

3.2.1 Auburn Ravine Bridge

The Auburn Ravine Bridge is a reinforced-concrete, six-span bridge with two piers per bent. The elevation and plan of the bridge model are shown in Figure 3.1. The deck has a constant vertical grade of 0.3% and a horizontal curvature of radius R = 1616 m. The box-girder cross-section of the bridge is shown in Figure 3.2. The piers have circular cross sections of diameter D = 1.38 m. The concrete material of the bridge has a nominal compressive strength of 25 MPa for the piers and 28 MPa for the girders. The reinforcing steel has a nominal yield strength of 420 MPa. The longitudinal reinforcement of each pier consists of 25 equally spaced bundles, with two #32 bars per bundle, whereas the transverse reinforcement consists of #22 hoops at a spacing of 0.125 m. Moment-curvature analysis indicated that the flexural stiffness of the piers should be reduced to 42% of its initial value to account for cracking. Following Caltrans specifications, the effective torsional moment of inertia is taken to be 20% of its uncracked value.

The piers are considered rigidly connected to the deck at the top, whereas the bottom supports are fixed in all translational directions and free in all rotational directions. The two ends of the bridge are supported on seat abutments. The abutment response is modeled through two translational springs, one longitudinal and one transverse. The stiffness values of these springs are calculated according to Caltrans specifications: The stiffness of the longitudinal spring, K_x , is calculated by adjusting the initial embankment fill stiffness proportional to the backwall height. The stiffness of the nominal transverse spring, K_y , is equal to 50% of the transverse stiffness of the end supports are fully constrained.

The finite element model of the bridge consists of three elements per pier and four elements per span. The longitudinal axis of the deck elements passes through the centroid of the girder cross-section. The top of each pier is connected with the deck through two rigid frame elements: one vertical and one in the direction of the line connecting the tops of the piers in the bent. Condensing out the rotational DOF and accounting for the constraints imposed by the rigid elements, the structure has 163 translational unconstrained DOF and 36 translational support DOF. The fundamental period of the bridge model is T = 0.59 s. The first eight modes and their natural frequencies are shown in Figure 3.3. All modes are assumed to have 5% damping.

3.2.2 Big Rock Wash Bridge

The Big Rock Wash Bridge is a prestressed-concrete, three-span bridge with three piers per bent. The elevation and plan of the bridge model are shown in Figure 3.4. In the elevation, two numbers are given for the pier height at each bent, the height of the central pier on the left and the common height of the side piers on the right. The longitudinal axis of the bridge, X, is a straight line. The deck is characterized by a constant profile grade of 0.5%. The box-girder cross section of the bridge is shown in Figure 3.5. The piers have circular cross sections of diameter D = 1.68 m. The concrete material throughout has a nominal compressive strength of 28 MPa. The reinforcing steel has a nominal yield strength of 420 MPa. The longitudinal reinforcement consists of #19 hoops at a spacing of 0.12 m. Moment-curvature analysis indicated a reduction of 27% in the flexural stiffness of the piers to account for cracking. The effective torsional moment of inertia of the piers is 20% of its uncracked value. No stiffness reduction is required for the prestressed-concrete box girder (Caltrans Seismic Design Criteria, 2004).

The piers are assumed to be rigidly connected to the deck at the top, whereas the bottom supports are fixed in all translational directions and free in all rotational directions. The two ends of the bridge are supported on seat abutments. The abutment response is modeled through two translational springs, one longitudinal and one transverse. The stiffness values of these springs are calculated according to Caltrans specifications (see Section 3.2.1) and listed in Table 3.1. Vertical translations at the end supports are fully constrained.

The finite element model of the bridge consists of three elements per pier and four elements per span. The longitudinal axis of a girder element passes through the centroid of the box girder cross section. Vertical rigid frame elements are used for the connection of the upper column elements with the girder elements. Condensing out the rotational DOF and accounting for the constraints imposed by the rigid elements, the structure is modeled with 89 translational unconstrained and 24 translational support DOF. The fundamental period of the structure is T = 0.61 s. The first eight mode shapes and their corresponding natural frequencies are shown in Figure 3.6. All modes are assumed to have 5% modal damping.

3.2.3 South Ingram Slough Bridge

The South Ingram Slough Bridge is a prestressed-concrete, two-span bridge with two piers per bent. The elevation and plan of the bridge model are shown in Figure 3.7. In the elevation, two numbers describe the height of the bent, each corresponding to one of the piers. The deck has a vertical grade varying from -0.52% to -0.85% and a constant horizontal curvature of radius R = 1542.3 m. The box-girder cross section of the bridge is shown in Figure 3.8. The piers have circular cross sections of diameter D = 1.68 m. The structure is made of concrete with a nominal compressive strength of 25 MPa for the piers and 28 MPa for the girder. The reinforcing steel has a nominal yield strength of 420 MPa. The longitudinal reinforcement of each column consists of 22 equally spaced bundles, with two #36 bars per bundle, whereas the transverse reinforcement consists of #22 hoops at a spacing of 0.15 m. Moment-curvature analysis indicated a reduction of 35% in the flexural stiffness of the piers to account for cracking. The effective torsional moment of inertia of the piers is 20% of its uncracked value. No stiffness reduction is required for the prestressed-concrete box girder.

The columns are considered rigidly connected to the deck at the top and fixed in all translational and rotational directions at the bottom. The two ends of the bridge are supported on seat abutments. The abutment response is modeled through two translational springs, one longitudinal and one transverse. The stiffness values of these springs are calculated according to Caltrans specifications (see Section 3.2.1) and listed in Table 3.1. Vertical translations at the end supports are fully constrained.

The finite element model of the bridge consists of three elements per pier and six elements in each span. The longitudinal axis of the girder elements passes through the centroid of the girder cross-section. Vertical rigid frame elements are used to connect the tops of the piers with the deck. Condensing out the rotational DOF and accounting for the constraints imposed by the rigid elements, the structure has 55 translational unconstrained and 12 translational support DOF. The fundamental period of the bridge model is T = 1.24 s. The first eight modes, together with the corresponding natural frequencies, are shown in Figure 3.9. All modes are assumed to have 5% damping.

3.2.4 Penstock Bridge

The Penstock bridge is a prestressed-concrete, four-span bridge with a single pier per bent. The elevation of the bridge model is shown in Figure 3.10. The deck has a vertical grade varying from 0.3% to 2.1% and a constant horizontal curvature of radius R = 458 m. The box-girder cross section of the bridge is shown in Figure 3.11. The piers have circular cross sections of diameter D = 2.13 m. The structure is made of concrete with a nominal compressive strength of 25 MPa for the piers and 28 MPa for the girder. The reinforcing steel has a nominal yield strength of 420 MPa. The longitudinal reinforcement of each column consists of 40 equally spaced #36 bars, whereas the transverse reinforcement consists of #25 hoops at a spacing of 0.15 m. Moment-curvature analysis indicated a reduction of 28% in the flexural stiffness of the piers to account for cracking. The effective torsional moment of inertia of the piers is 20% of its uncracked value. No stiffness reduction is required for the prestressed-concrete box girder.

The columns are considered rigidly connected to the deck at the top and fixed in all translational and rotational directions at the bottom. The two ends of the bridge are supported on seat abutments. The abutment response is modeled through two translational springs, one longitudinal and one transverse. The stiffness values of these springs are calculated according to Caltrans specifications (see Section 3.2.1) and listed in Table 3.1. Vertical translations at the end supports are fully constrained.

The finite element model of the bridge consists of three elements per pier and six, eight, eight, and four elements in spans 1, 2, 3, and 4, respectively. The longitudinal axis of the girder elements passes through the centroid of the girder cross-section. Vertical rigid frame elements are used to connect the tops of the piers with the deck. Condensing out the rotational DOF and accounting for the constraints imposed by the rigid elements, the structure has 103 translational unconstrained and 15 translational support DOF. The fundamental period of the bridge model is T = 2.38 s. The first eight modes and their corresponding natural frequencies are shown in Figure 3.12. All modes are assumed to have 5% damping.

3.3 DESCRIPTION OF INPUT EXCITATIONS THROUGH RESPONSE SPECTRA AND A COHERENCY FUNCTION

The supports of each bridge are subjected to translational ground motions in the longitudinal (X), transverse (Y), and vertical (Z) directions. The three components of the ground motion are

assumed to be statistically independent. In the response analysis of each bride, we consider three cases of ground motion spatial variability: uniform support motions (case 1), variable support motions with incoherency ($v_s/\alpha = 600$ m/s) and wave passage ($v_{app} = 400$ m/s) but uniform soil conditions (case 2), and case 2 but with varying soil conditions (case 3). For each bridge, the soil types at the supports for both uniform and varying soil conditions are given in Table 3.2. Characteristics of the corresponding soil profiles according to Caltrans Seismic Design Criteria (2004) are listed in Table 3.3. For cases 2 and 3, the waves are assumed to propagate in the direction opposite to the X axis; furthermore, the incoherence in the Y direction is considered negligible for the dimensions of the bridges examined. Thus, for the bridge models with multiple piers per bent, if the piers are aligned in the direction of the Y axis, they all undergo the same support motion. This is the case for the Big Rock Wash Bridge and the South Ingram Slough Bridge. However, the piers of the bents of the Auburn Ravine Bridge are not aligned in the Y direction; in this case, we assume that they undergo the motion corresponding to the point midway between the two piers.

The horizontal components of the support motions are described by acceleration response spectra (ARS) provided by Caltrans Seismic Design Criteria (2004). The appropriate ARS curve is selected in terms of the peak rock acceleration and moment magnitude (M_w) for the maximum credible earthquake and the soil type at the relevant support. The vertical components are described by response spectra proposed by Bozorgnia and Campbell (2004). The proposed spectrum for the vertical component consists of a flat portion with amplitude A_{vs} for periods $T \le 0.15$ s, and a decaying portion described by $A_{vs}(0.15/T)^{0.75}$ for periods T > 0.15 s. The amplitude of the flat portion, A_{vs} , is determined in terms of the horizontal spectral acceleration at T = 0.1 s, the source-to-site distance, and the soil type. In our analyses, a distance of 20 km from the earthquake source is assumed in all cases. Both sets of spectra are defined for frequencies greater than 0.25 Hz. For lower frequencies, a spectral shape varying in proportion to the square of the frequency is assumed. To estimate the corresponding peak ground displacements, which occur at zero frequency, a reduction factor of 1.39 is applied to the peak spectral displacement (Newmark and Hall, 1969).

The Auburn Ravine Bridge, South Ingram Slough Bridge, and Penstock Bridge were all designed for the same event magnitude of $M_w = 6.5$ and a peak rock acceleration of $\ddot{u}_{max}^{rock} = 0.3 \ g$. Figure 3.13 shows the acceleration response spectra for soil types B, C, and D, normalized by the corresponding peak ground acceleration (PGA). Figure 3.14 shows the corresponding

consistent auto-PSDs obtained by the method described in Section 2.2.2. The auto-PSDs, together with the coherency function, are used to compute the correlation coefficients in the MSRS method. The Big Rock Wash Bridge was designed for an event magnitude of $M_w = 8.0$ and a peak rock acceleration of $\ddot{u}_{max}^{rock} = 0.6 g$. Figure 3.15 shows the acceleration response spectra for soil types B, C, and D, normalized by the corresponding PGA, and Figure 3.16 shows the corresponding consistent auto-PSDs. For each case, the PGAs for each soil type and direction of excitation are summarized in Table 3.4.

The site-response effect is modeled using the SDOF idealization of the soil layer (Equation (2.23)) for the soil FRF in determining the corresponding phase angle of the coherency function (see Equation (2.21)). For each response spectrum, the values of ω_s and ζ_s in Equation (2.23) are determined by fitting the Kanai-Tajimi PSD to the corresponding PSD in Figure 3.13 or Figure 3.15 by use of a nonlinear least-squares minimization method. The resulting ω_s values are listed in Table 3.5. The resulting ζ_s values are 0.8 in all cases.

3.4 MODE TRUNCATION BASED ON PARTICIPATING MODAL MASS

In Section 2.3 we investigated criteria for mode truncation in dynamic analysis of structures subjected to differential support motions. In this section, we use these criteria to select the number of modes to include in the MSRS analysis of the bridge models described earlier.

Figures 3.17 through 3.20 show how the ratios r_n^U and r_n^{TI} (given by Equations (2.25) and (2.26), respectively) vary with mode number for the four bridge models. The number of modes to be included in the response analysis of each bridge model (see the following section) is selected so that both ratios have values greater than 0.90. For each bridge, the number of modes included and the corresponding values of r_n^U and r_n^{TI} are given in Table 3.6. In the following analysis, the mean peak responses computed with these numbers of modes are referred to as "exact".

3.5 INVESTIGATION OF THE EFFECTS OF GROUND MOTION SPATIAL VARIABILITY

3.5.1 Auburn Ravine Bridge

3.5.1.1 Total responses

Figure 3.21 shows the mean peak responses—axial forces F_x , shear forces F_y and F_z , torques M_x , and bending moments M_y and M_z —along the deck of the Auburn Ravine Bridge for the three cases of ground motion spatial variability described in Section 3.3. The subscripts of these forces are consistent with the local axes of the cross-section shown in Figure 3.2. Figure 3.21 allows comparison of the absolute values of the mean peak forces between the cases of uniform support excitations (case 1) and differential support excitations under uniform or varying soil conditions (cases 2 and 3, respectively). To elaborate on the effect of ground motion spatial variability on structural response, in Figure 3.22, we plot the mean peak responses of cases 2 and 3 normalized with respect to the corresponding mean peak responses of case 1. Normalized responses smaller than unity indicate cases where the ground motion spatial variability has a beneficial effect, i.e., it reduces the demand imposed on the structure. When normalized responses exceed unity, the ground motion spatial variability amplifies the response and its neglect may lead to non-conservative designs.

First consider cases 1 and 2. Figure 3.22 shows that the ground motion spatial variability has a more severe effect on the axial forces and torques, for which the ratios of responses in case 2 over responses in case 1 can be as large as 12.7 or 3.0, respectively. These responses, however, are typically small in absolute magnitude and normally do not control the design. The effects on shear forces and bending moments, which are more critical in design, are smaller and the corresponding normalized responses vary within the range 0.7–1.9. The normalized values of a specified force along the deck can be smaller or larger than unity depending on the location of the cross section within the bridge. Now, comparing cases 2 and 3 in Figure 3.22 shows that variation of soil conditions results in large amplifications of all response quantities with the exception of F_x . To assess the significance of the response amplifications from a design standpoint, Figure 3.22 should be examined in conjunction with Figure 3.21.

Table 3.7 lists the mean peak values of the percent pier drifts (pier top displacement divided by pier height) in the global X and Y directions for the same three cases. The ratios of responses in case 2 over responses in case 1 vary within the range 0.7–1.1 for the X drifts and
within the range 0.6-1.0 for the *Y* drifts. Thus, for this bridge, the combined effect of wave passage and incoherence is more mild on pier drifts than on element forces along the deck. The effect of soil variation is significant only on piers located on softer (type D) soils. For these piers, the site effect causes amplification of the response, which is more pronounced in the *X* direction.

As the MSRS rule in Equation (2.12) indicates, the total response is composed of pseudostatic and dynamic contributions as well as a cross term between them. In the following sections, we separately examine the two contributions in order to gain insight into the nature of the effect of spatial variability on bridge response.

3.5.1.2 Pseudo-static Responses

Figure 3.23 shows the pseudo-static contributions, i.e., the square root of the first double-sum in the MSRS rule in Equation (2.12), to the generalized element forces along the deck. Note that uniform support motions do not generate pseudo-static forces and, hence, all contributions for case 1 are zero. In case 2, the pseudo-static shear forces and bending moments induced by the variability in the support motions tend to be balanced out by reductions in the corresponding dynamic forces, resulting in only small changes in the total response (see previous section and Figure 3.22). Comparison between cases 2 and 3 indicates that the variation of soil conditions largely amplifies the pseudo-static forces, except for F_x . Figure 3.24 shows the relative contributions of the pseudo-static forces to the total responses, represented by the ratio z_s^2/z^2 , where z_s^2 is the double-sum term in the MSRS rule and z is the mean peak total response. This figure indicates that, under varying soil conditions (case 3), most responses tend to be dominated by pseudo-static contributions. Also, comparison of Figure 3.24 with Figure 3.22 indicates that amplification of bridge responses is associated with large pseudo-static contributions.

Table 3.8 lists the relative pseudo-static contributions, z_s^2/z^2 , for pier drifts in global X and Y directions, and for cases 2 and 3. For both cases 2 and 3, these contributions are much larger in the X direction, in which the bridge is stiffer. Soil variation largely increases pseudo-static contributions for piers located on softer soil (type D), but has a smaller influence on other piers.

3.5.1.3 Dynamic Responses

To investigate the effect of differential support motions on the dynamic component of the response, i.e., the quadruple-sum in the MSRS rule, we separately examine the individual modal

contributions $\sum_{k=1}^{m} \sum_{l=1}^{m} b_{kl} b_{ll} \rho_{s_{kl}s_{ll}} D_k(\omega_l, \zeta_l) D_l(\omega_l, \zeta_l)$, i = 1, 2, ..., n. For each mode, this term includes the correlations arising from the multiple support excitations, but neglects the correlations between different modes. For the three cases of support motions described above, Figure 3.25 shows the contributions of each of the first 10 modes to the generalized element forces at two locations along the deck of Auburn Ravine Bridge: the middle of span 3 and the left end of span 4. These example locations were selected because they are critical for the design of the bridge, as indicated by Figure 3.21. We observe that the modal contributions between cases 2 and 3 differ only slightly. However, comparison of these cases with case 1 indicates that modal responses to differential support motions can differ greatly from modal responses to uniform excitation. For example, spatial variability significantly reduces the contributions of modes 1 and 2 and amplifies the contributions of modes 5 and 8. The latter observations are consistent with the analysis in Section 2.3, since $(\sum_{k=1}^{m} \beta_{ki})^2 \approx (\sum_{k=1}^{m} |\beta_{ki}|)^2$ for mode 1 in direction *X* and for mode 2 in direction *X*, but $(\sum_{k=1}^{m} \beta_{ki})^2 / \sum_{k=1}^{m} \beta_{ki}^2 \approx 0$ for modes 5 and 8 in direction *Z*.

To assess the relative importance of modal contributions to the total responses, in Figure 3.26 we plot the mean peak total values of the generalized element forces examined in Figure 3.25, computed by including n modes in the MSRS rule, n = 1, ..., 10, and normalized with the "exact" mean peak total responses. Our two main observations are these: (1) Depending on the response quantity, variability of the support motions can make the contributions of higher modes more or less significant. (2) When differential support motions induce large pseudo-static contributions, only the first few modes are sufficient to obtain good approximations of the total responses, even in cases when higher modes are important for a fairly accurate representation of the dynamic component. To gain insight, let us look at some representative cases: For the torques at both locations, higher modes are more significant under varying support motions. As a result, in case 2, despite the large contributions from pseudo-static forces, a certain level of accuracy requires a larger number of modes than in case 1. Next, we examine M_v in the middle of span 3. This response quantity is characterized by small pseudo-static contributions in both cases 2 and 3. When 10 modes are included in the MSRS rule, the approximation is fairly good in cases 2 and 3, but extremely poor in case 1, which indicates the large influence of the ground motion spatial variability on the dynamic component of the M_y response. Last, we look at the F_z response at the left end of span 4. Comparing cases 1 and 2, we observe that higher modes have larger contributions under uniform support motions: 80% accuracy requires 9 modes in case 2, but more than 10 modes in case 1. We note that the same level of accuracy is achieved only with

one mode in case 3, due to the large pseudo-static forces induced by the variation in soil conditions.

Pier drifts are generally contributed by the first two or three modes and are not shown here.

3.5.2 Big Rock Wash Bridge

3.5.2.1 Total Responses

Figure 3.27 and Figure 3.28 show the mean peak responses and mean peak responses normalized with respect to the case of uniform excitation, respectively, for the generalized element forces along the deck of the Big Rock Wash Bridge. The three cases of excitation described in Section 3.3 are investigated. These figures suggest that ground motion spatial variability has a relatively mild effect on F_z and M_y . In particular, the effect on F_z is beneficial along the deck for both cases 2 and 3. The influence of spatial variability is more pronounced on F_x , F_y , and M_z . (The large normalized values of M_x in Figure 3.28 are of no engineering significance, as the corresponding absolute values are very small.) To assess the significance of the large normalized values of F_x along the deck from a design viewpoint, we should examine in parallel the corresponding absolute values of the F_x mean peak response. Variation of soil conditions significantly amplifies F_y and M_z at certain locations, but only slightly affects other responses.

Table 3.9 lists the mean peak values of the percent pier drifts in the global X and Y directions for the same three cases of excitation. The combined effect of wave passage and incoherence is reduction of all pier drifts. Soil variation increases all pier drifts in the *X* direction, but has negligible influence on pier drifts in the *Y* direction.

3.5.2.2 Pseudo-static Responses

Figure 3.29 shows pseudo-static contributions to the mean peak generalized element forces along the deck (cases 2 and 3). Their relative importance can be assessed by examining the ratios of their squared values to the corresponding squared mean peak responses, shown in Figure 3.30. In both cases 2 and 3, the pseudo-static components dominate the F_x response. Under uniform soil conditions (case 2), pseudo-static contributions are particularly large for F_y and M_z at certain locations. Variation of soil conditions (case 3) amplifies all pseudo-static responses with the exception of F_x . Similar to the Auburn Ravine Bridge, when pseudo-static contributions are dominant, the corresponding total responses of Big Rock Wash Bridge tend to be amplified. However, although the pseudo-static contributions for F_z and M_y are significant at certain locations, the corresponding total responses are only slightly affected, which indicates that ground motion spatial variability reduces the corresponding dynamic responses. Table 3.10 lists the percent pseudo-static contributions for the pier drifts in the global X and Y directions for cases 2 and 3. These are much larger in the X direction, in which the bridge is stiffer. Variation of soil conditions increases these contributions for all pier drifts in both directions.

3.5.2.3 Dynamic Responses

Figure 3.31 shows the individual modal contributions (neglecting cross-modal correlations, but including cross-support and cross-support-modal correlations) for the generalized element forces at two example locations along the deck: the left end and the middle of span 2. The figure indicates that the combined effect of wave passage and incoherence on modal responses is significant, whereas the additional effect of soil variation is only slight. In particular, ground motion spatial variability (cases 2 and 3) largely amplifies the response of modes 3, 4, 8, 9, and 10, but significantly reduces the response of modes 1, 2, and 6.

For the same response quantities, in Figure 3.32, we examine how the ground motion spatial variability affects the level of accuracy of the total mean peak values when a certain number of modes is considered. This depends on the individual modal contributions and also on the pseudo-static contributions. As a result, convergence can be faster under uniform or differential support motions, depending on the response quantity examined.

Pier drifts are generally contributed by the first two or three modes and are not shown here.

3.5.3 South Ingram Slough Bridge

3.5.3.1 Total Responses

Figure 3.33 shows the mean peak generalized element forces along the deck of the South Ingram Slough Bridge for the three cases of excitation described in Section 3.3. The figure indicates that except for F_x , the effect of ground motion variability on bridge response is mild and tends to be beneficial at locations that are critical for design. For F_x , spatial variability significantly amplifies the response around the middle support, resulting in a more uniform variation of axial forces along the deck. Figure 3.34 shows the same responses for cases 2 and 3 normalized with

respect to the responses in case 1. Except for F_x , the normalized responses at most locations range close to unity. Comparing Figure 3.34 and Figure 3.33, we observe that the few locations where the normalized responses exceed unity are not critical in terms of design.

Table 3.11 lists the mean peak pier drifts in the global *X* and *Y* directions for the three cases examined above. The combined effect of wave passage and incoherence is reduction of all pier drifts. Additional variation of soil conditions has only a slight influence.

3.5.3.2 Pseudo-static Responses

Figure 3.35 shows pseudo-static contributions to the mean peak generalized element forces along the deck (cases 2 and 3). For all generalized element forces, soil variation amplifies the pseudostatic responses at all locations examined. To assess the relative importance of these responses, Figure 3.36 shows the ratios of their squared values to the corresponding squared mean peak responses. As with the two bridges examined previously, the F_x response along the deck of the South Ingram Slough Bridge is dominated by the pseudo-static forces. For the other response quantities, the pseudo-static contributions are very small, except for a few locations, at which the total response is not critical in terms of design (compare Figure 3.36 with Figure 3.33).

Table 3.12 lists the percent pseudo-static contributions to pier drifts. These are much smaller than the pseudo-static contributions to pier drifts of the two stiffer bridges studied earlier. In direction Y, they are negligible for both cases 2 and 3. In direction X, they are amplified by variation of soil conditions.

3.5.3.3 Dynamic Responses

Figure 3.37 shows how individual modal contributions vary in the three cases of excitation for the generalized element forces at the middle of span 1 and the left end of span 2. Again, the individual modal contributions are computed by neglecting correlations between different modes, but including the correlations between support motions and between support motions and modal responses. Compared to the case of uniform support motions, the modal responses under differential support motions are higher for modes 2 and 4, smaller for modes 3 and 5, and vary similarly for modes 1, 6, 7, and 10. As with the bridges examined previously, variation of soil conditions is not significant for the individual modal contributions.

For the same response quantities, Figure 3.38 shows the accuracy in the total mean peak values when n = 1, ..., 10 modes are considered. Except for the axial force, the pseudo-static

contributions in case 2 are small, and thus comparison of cases 1 and 2 is indicative of the effect of spatial variability on the convergence of the dynamic component with n. Note that under differential support motions, the contribution of higher modes is more significant for F_z , among other responses. In case 3, increased pseudo-static contributions can make convergence faster. Pier drifts are contributed by the first two or three modes and are not shown here.

3.5.4 Penstock Bridge

3.5.4.1 Total Responses

Figure 3.39 shows the mean peak generalized element forces along the deck of the Penstock Bridge. Figure 3.40 shows the responses under differential support motions normalized with respect to the responses under uniform support motions. The combined effect of wave passage and incoherence is mild on F_z , M_y , and M_z but more pronounced on F_x , F_y , and M_x . In case 2, the normalized F_y and M_z responses always exceed unity, whereas the other normalized responses are greater or smaller than unity depending on the location along the deck. Variation of soil conditions reduces F_y , M_x , and M_z and amplifies F_z and M_y .

Table 3.13 lists the mean peak pier drifts in the global *X* and *Y* directions. The combined effect of wave passage and incoherence is a small reduction of the drifts in the *X* direction and a small increase of the drifts in the *Y* direction. In the *X* direction, variation of soil conditions increases the drift of the middle pier, which is located on softer (type D) soil, and has negligible effect on other pier drifts. In the *Y* direction, variation of soil conditions decreases all pier drifts.

3.5.4.2 Pseudo-static Responses

For the pseudo-static generalized element forces along the deck, Figure 3.41 and Figure 3.42 show their mean peak values and relative contributions to the total response, respectively. Under uniform soil conditions, the pseudo-static contributions are very small, except for the axial force. The variation of soil conditions is more critical for the F_z and M_y responses, causing large amplifications of the pseudo-static contributions and also of the total responses (compare Figure 3.42 with Figure 3.39). These responses have large contributions from excitation in the vertical direction, in which the bridge is stiffer and the support motions are richer in high-frequency components and thus more incoherent.

Table 3.14 lists the pseudo-static contributions to pier drifts for cases 2 and 3. As with the bridges examined previously, these contributions are much larger in the X direction, in which the bridge is stiffer, than in the Y direction. For all responses examined herein, variation of soil conditions increases pseudo-static contributions. This increase is more pronounced in the X direction.

3.5.4.3 Dynamic Responses

In Figure 3.43, we examine the individual modal contributions to the element forces at the middle of span 2 and the left end of span 3, for the three cases of excitation. These are computed as for the bridges studied earlier. However, in contrast with the other bridges, the modal responses of the Penstock Bridge are influenced not only by wave-passage and incoherence effects, but also by variation of soil conditions.

Next, we examine the convergence of the corresponding total responses as a function of the number of modes considered, shown in Figure 3.44 for the three cases of excitation. This figure shows interesting features for modes 7 and 8, which have closely spaced frequencies of 25.8 rad/s and 25.9 rad/s, respectively. As can be seen in the charts for F_y , when seven modes are considered the response can be largely overestimated. However, this overestimation is balanced when the eighth mode is also considered. The corresponding charts in Figure 3.43 indicate that these two modes individually make significant contributions of nearly equal magnitude to the F_y responses at both locations. However, the cross term arising from these two modes has nearly twice the magnitude and a negative sign, so that the total contribution of these two modes is rather small. This observation indicates the importance of cross-modal terms for closely spaced frequencies. It also highlights the importance of not truncating modes in the middle of a group of closely spaced modes.

The pier drifts are contributed from the first two or three modes and are not shown here.

3.5.5 Summary of Results

The analysis of the four bridges demonstrates that ground motion spatial variability affects the bridge response in a rather complex way: Although differential support motions induce pseudostatic forces, which are not present in the case of uniform excitations, they can either amplify or reduce the total response depending on their additional influence on the dynamic component of the response. The effect on the dynamic component is the additive effect on individual modal responses. Ground motion spatial variability reduces contributions of certain modes and amplifies contributions of others, and the total effect on the dynamic component of a response quantity is often hard to predict. However, in cases when pseudo-static contributions are dominant, the dynamic component is of less importance, and ground motion spatial variability can cause large response amplifications. In this section, we summarize the effects of ground motion spatial variability, analyzed earlier for each individual model, and identify general trends.

In Table 3.15 we list the range of values for the ratio of responses in case 2 over responses in case 1 for each bridge model and each response quantity. Thus, this table provides a summary of the combined effect of incoherence and wave passage on bridge response. Wave passage together with incoherence may amplify or reduce element forces, depending on the response quantity and the location along the deck examined. Their combined effect tends to be more severe (larger ratios) on F_x , F_y , M_x , and M_z , which have larger contributions from horizontal excitations, and more mild or beneficial (smaller ratios) on F_z and M_y , which have larger contributions from the vertical excitation. Also, their effect is more pronounced for the two stiffer bridges, the Auburn Ravine and Big Rock Wash Bridges. For pier drifts, wave passage and incoherence tend to reduce their mean peak values; only small amplifications occur in a few cases.

In Table 3.16 we list the range of values for the ratio of responses in case 3 over responses in case 2, for each bridge model and each response quantity. Thus, this table provides a summary of the additional effect of soil variation on bridge response. Previous analyses demonstrated that, except for a few cases, variation of soil conditions increased pseudo-static responses. For the dynamic responses, the additional effect of soil variation was significant only for the more flexible Penstock Bridge. Table 3.16 indicates that additional variation of soil conditions has a small influence on F_x but amplifies all other responses for the three stiffer bridges. The effect is more pronounced for the Auburn Ravine Bridge. Looking at pier drifts, variation of soil conditions is more significant in the X direction, amplifying the responses in all cases.

3.6 ASSESSMENT OF THE EXTENDED MSRS RULE

In this section, we compare the accuracy in the approximations of the mean peak total responses, with n = 1, ..., 10 modes included in the analysis, using the extended versus the original MSRS

rule. For each bridge model, we look into the same response quantities examined in the analyses of the dynamic components, investigating cases 2 and 3 separately. In the assessment of the extended MSRS rule, consideration should be given to the modal frequencies of each bridge in conjunction with the normalized acceleration response spectra $A(\omega)/PGA$ in Figure 3.13 or Figure 3.15 (whichever applies). We expect that the extended MSRS rule significantly improves the results when truncated modes with significant contributions have frequencies ω_i such that $A(\omega_i)/\ddot{u}_g \approx 1$. When truncated modes with large contributions have frequencies ω_i such that $A(\omega_i)/\ddot{u}_g \ll 1$, the extended MSRS rule may overestimate the response, and when truncated modes with large contributions have frequencies ω_i such that $A(\omega_i)/\ddot{u}_g \gg 1$, the extended rule may provide smaller improvements.

3.6.1 Auburn Ravine Bridge

We begin by examining the Auburn Ravine Bridge. Figure 3.45 and Figure 3.46 show the ratio of the response when n modes are included, z_n , over the "exact" response, z, for the generalized element forces at the middle of span 3 and the left end of span 4, respectively. In each figure, the upper charts are for case 2 and the bottom charts for case 3. In each chart, the mean peak total response is evaluated with the original and extended MSRS rules.

Let us first look into case 2. In assessing the effectiveness of the extended MSRS rule, F_x in Figure 3.45 and F_x and F_y in Figure 3.46 are not of interest as they are almost perfectly approximated by the first mode alone. Among the other responses, in some cases the extended MSRS rule provides small improvements in the approximation of the response (F_y , F_z , and M_z in Figure 3.45; M_z in Figure 3.46) while in others it provides significant improvements (M_x and M_y in Figure 3.45; F_z , M_x , and M_y in Figure 3.46). For the latter responses, the approximation when only one or two modes are included is nearly perfect with the extended MSRS rule but very poor with the original MSRS rule. Also, in some cases the extended MSRS rule converges to unity from larger values, i.e., can overestimate the responses. For the responses examined here, this overestimation is more pronounced for F_z in Figure 3.46, but it is generally not significant.

To interpret the above results, we need to examine the values of $A(\omega)/PGA$ in Figure 3.13 for the modal frequencies of the Auburn Ravine Bridge. Let us examine these values for the first eight modal frequencies, given in Figure 3.3: The curve that corresponds to horizontal excitation and soil type C takes values between 1 and 2.5, but is greater than 2 for n > 2. Thus,

for the forces that are dominantly contributed by the response to the horizontal excitation (in either X or Y direction), we expect that the extended MSRS rule will provide only small improvements. The curve that corresponds to vertical excitation (same for all soil types) takes values less than 0.5 for $n \le 3$, but is close to unity for n > 4. Thus, for the forces that are dominantly contributed by the response to the vertical excitation, the MSRS rule will generally provide much better approximations, but can also overestimate the response. This analysis is consistent with the results shown in Figure 3.45 and Figure 3.46 if we consider the directions of excitation that contribute to each response: At the middle of span 3, responses F_y , F_z , and M_z are mainly contributed from horizontal excitations, M_y from vertical excitation, and M_x has nearly equal contributed by the bridge response to horizontal excitations, F_z is dominated by the response to vertical excitations, and M_x and M_y have significant contributions from both.

Now, let us look at case 3. Comparing the charts for case 3 with the corresponding ones for case 2, we note somewhat faster convergence of modal responses for case 3 with both the original and extended MSRS rules. This is due to larger contributions of the pseudo-static components in case 3 relative to case 2 (see Figure 3.24).

3.6.2 Big Rock Wash Bridge

Let us perform a similar analysis for the Big Rock Wash Bridge. To understand the way the extended MSRS rule influences the approximation of the response with a certain number of modes, we first examine the values of the normalized pseudo-acceleration in Figure 3.15 for the modal frequencies given in Figure 3.6. In the horizontal directions, $A(\omega)/PGA$ takes values larger than unity, which exceed 2 for modes 1 through 7. In the vertical direction, the values of $A(\omega)/PGA$ are very small (< 0.5) for the first four modes, but are close to unity or unity for n > 4. We should note that the Big Rock Wash Bridge is not curved in the XY plan, and thus its response is uncoupled in the XZ and XY plans. As a result, F_y , M_x , and M_z are entirely contributed from the bridge response to excitation in the Y direction, whereas F_x , F_z , and M_y are additively contributed from the bridge response to excitations in the X and Z directions.

Figure 3.47 and Figure 3.48 compare the approximations of the mean peak generalized element forces at the left end of span 2 and the middle of span 2, respectively, with the extended versus the original MSRS rule with n = 1, ..., 10 modes in the analysis. Again, we first examine

analytically the results for case 2. The forces contributed only from the bridge response to excitation in the Y direction are F_y , M_x , and M_z . The results for M_x are of no particular engineering interest as the absolute values of M_x are very small. For F_y and M_z , when the contributions of higher modes are not negligible, use of the extended MSRS rule provides small improvements. The other forces are contributed additively from the bridge response to excitations in the X and Z directions. Apparently, F_x is of no interest in our analysis. For the F_z and M_y responses, use of the extended MSRS rule results in smaller absolute error than the original rule, as long as four or more modes are considered. If fewer modes are considered, the MSRS rule can largely overestimate the response. Comparing the charts for case 2 with the corresponding charts for case 3, we observe that the higher pseudo-static contributions in case 3 (see Figure 3.30) result in improved approximations in all cases with the original and the extended MSRS rules.

3.6.3 South Ingram Slough Bridge

Figure 3.49 and Figure 3.50 compare the original and extended MSRS rules for the generalized element forces at the middle of span 1 and the left end of span 2, respectively, of the South Ingram Slough Bridge. We look into the modal frequencies in Figure 3.9 and the corresponding values of the relevant curves in Figure 3.13. For the first eight modes, the curve for the horizontal excitations takes values in the range from ≈ 1 to ≈ 2.5 . The curve for the vertical excitation takes values less than 0.5 for the first three modes but equal to unity for n > 5. The South Ingram Slough Bridge is characterized by only a small curvature in the *XY* plan, which results in nearly uncoupled bridge response in the *XZ* and *YZ* plans. Again, we examine separately the groups of responses contributed by the excitation in the *Y* direction and excitations in the *X* and *Z* directions. The M_x response is of no engineering significance as the corresponding absolute values are very small. For the F_x , F_y , and M_z responses, which are contributed $\approx 100\%$ by excitation in either the *X* or *Y* direction, the extended MSRS rule is slightly better than the original rule when higher mode contributions are not negligible. For the F_z and M_y responses, including fewer than five modes can result in large overestimation of the response. This overestimation is smaller in case 3.

3.6.4 Penstock Bridge

Figure 3.51 and Figure 3.52 compare the mean peak response estimates for the generalized element forces at the middle of span 2 and the left end of span 3, respectively, of the Penstock Bridge. This is the most flexible of the bridges considered in this study. For the horizontal direction of excitation, the normalized pseudo-acceleration curve for soil C in Figure 3.13 takes values smaller than unity for the first two modes, but exceeds unity for the other modes. The maximum values of the curve occur at the modal frequencies of the closely spaced modes 7 and 8. For the excitation in the vertical direction, the pseudo-acceleration curve takes values in the range 0.1–0.5 for the first five modes and in the range 0.5–0.7 for modes 6 through 8.

Let us now use the above information to study Figure 3.51 and Figure 3.52. We begin with case 2. In both figures, the F_x response is of no interest as it is almost perfectly estimated by only the first mode. The F_y , M_x , and M_z responses are almost entirely due to horizontal excitations. For these response quantities, the extended MSRS rule provides significant improvement compared to the original rule for n = 1 and smaller improvements for larger n. The generalized forces F_z and M_y are mainly contributed from the bridge response to excitation in the vertical direction. The corresponding charts demonstrate that when truncated modes have very small $A(\omega)/PGA$ values, i.e., for n < 6, the extended rule can result in very large overestimations, but when truncated modes have $A(\omega)/PGA$ values close to unity, i.e., for $n \ge 6$, the extended rule provides improved approximations. When variation of soil conditions significantly increases the pseudo-static contributions (F_z at middle of span 2, M_y at left end of span 3), both the original and the extended rules are more accurate in case 3 than in case 2 for a certain number of modes considered.

3.7 SUMMARY

The MSRS analysis of four real bridge models demonstrated the complex way in which differential support motions influence structural response. The analysis showed that neglecting spatial variability of the support motions leads to conservative design in some cases, but in other cases is highly non-conservative. The effect of spatial variability was, in general, more severe on element forces along the deck and milder on pier drifts. Also, for pier drifts the effect was beneficial, decreasing the response, more often than for element forces. Under varying support motions and except for Penstock Bridge (the most flexible among the bridges examined),

variation of soil conditions increased all responses except for M_x . Compared to the original MSRS rule, the extended MSRS rule provided improved approximations of the responses, when truncated modes had nearly static responses. Another important result of this chapter is that a pair of closely spaced modes should not be separated in the analysis, but should be either both included or both truncated.

Dridaa noma	Left ab	utment	Right abutment		
Bridge name	K_x (KN/m)	K_y (KN/m)	K_x (KN/m)	K_y (KN/m)	
Auburn Ravine Bridge	59,604	33,800	59,604	24,300	
Big Rock Wash Bridge	131,520	60,301	131,520	54,709	
South Ingram Slough Bridge	76,763	9,430	76,763	9,430	
Penstock Bridge	59,556	4,897	59,556	6,875	

Table 3.1Stiffness values of the springs used to model the abutment
responses.

Table 3.2Soil types at each support for each case of ground motion
spatial variability.

Bridge name Case Support num		Support number: soil type	
Auburn Pavina Bridga	1 & 2	All supports: C	
Auburn Ravine Bridge	3	1: B, 2: C, 3: D, 4: C, 5: D, 6: C, 7: B	
Dig Dook Wash Pridgo	1 & 2	All supports: D	
Big Rock Wash Bridge	3	1: C, 2: D, 3: D, 4: C	
South Ingram Clough Dridge	1 & 2	All supports: C	
South Ingram Slough Bridge	3	1: B, 2: C, 3: D	
Denote als Dridge	1 & 2	All supports: C	
relisiock blidge	3	1: B, 2: C, 3: D, 4: C, 5: B	

Table 3.3 Soil type characteristics according to Caltrans specifications.

Soil type	Description	Shear wave velocity (m/s)
В	Rock	$760 < v_s < 1500$
С	Very dense soil/soft rock	$360 < v_s < 760$
D	Stiff soil	$180 < v_s < 360$

Table 3.4Peak Ground Acceleration (PGA) for each soil-type and
direction of excitation.

	PGA(g)					
Soil type	Case: $M_w = 6.5$, $\ddot{u}_{max}^{rock} = 0.3 g$		Case: $M_w = 8.0, \ddot{u}_{max}^{rock} = 0.6 g$			
	Horizontal	Vertical	Horizontal	Vertical		
В	0.30	0.51	0.60	1.06		
С	0.33	0.56	0.60	1.06		
D	0.36	0.75	0.60	1.30		

Table 3.5Frequencies of soil columns modeled with the SDOF-
oscillator idealization.

Excitation direction: soil	$\omega_k/2\pi$ (Hz)		
type	Case: $M_w = 6.5$, $\ddot{u}_{max}^{rock} = 0.3 g$	Case: $M_w = 8.0, \ddot{u}_{max}^{rock} = 0.6 g$	
Horizontal: B	3.25	2.50	
Horizontal: C	2.50	1.75	
Horizontal: D	2.25	1.25	
Vertical: B, C, D	7.50	7.50	

Table 3.6Measures of participating modal mass, r_n^U and r_n^T , for the
number of modes, *n*, included in the analysis of each bridge
model.

Bridge name	n	r_n^U	r_n^{TI}
Auburn Ravine Bridge	30	0.90	0.94
Big Rock Wash Bridge	25	0.95	0.91
South Ingram Slough Bridge	25	0.99	0.99
Penstock Bridge	30	0.96	0.93

Table 3.7	Auburn Ravine	Bridge: Mean	peaks of	pier drifts.

Diorlocation		% drift in <i>X</i> direction			% drift in <i>Y</i> direction		
Flet It		Case 1	Case 2	Case 3	Case 1	Case 2	Case 3
Dont 2	Left pier	0.77	0.72	0.73	0.53	0.54	0.54
Defit 2	Right pier	0.81	0.74	0.75	0.56	0.55	0.56
Dont 2	Left pier	0.77	0.54	0.81	0.73	0.55	0.63
Defit 5	Right pier	0.79	0.55	0.82	0.77	0.57	0.64
Pont 4	Left pier	0.73	0.48	0.48	0.88	0.57	0.65
Bent 4	Right pier	0.74	0.49	0.48	0.92	0.58	0.66
Dont F	Left pier	0.69	0.57	0.78	0.91	0.55	0.62
Delit 5	Right pier	0.68	0.56	0.79	0.93	0.56	0.63
Dont 6	Left pier	0.72	0.79	0.80	0.93	0.60	0.62
Delito	Right pier	0.70	0.78	0.79	0.94	0.61	0.63

Diarlocation % (% drift in 2	K direction	% drift in Y direction	
Pier	location	Case 2	Case 3	Case 2	Case 3
Pont 2	Left pier	70.5	72.5	3.7	9.5
Dent Z	Right pier	69.6	71.4	4.7	9.7
Dont 2	Left pier	50.0	87.7	6.7	36.8
Dent 5	Right pier	49.4	87.2	6.8	35.2
Pont 1	Left pier	42.1	42.8	6.8	14.9
Dent 4	Right pier	42.7	43.8	6.6	14.3
Bont F	Left pier	59.6	85.4	6.9	33.6
Dent 5	Right pier	60.6	87.1	6.6	34.7
Pont 6	Left pier	73.4	73.6	7.2	12.3
Dent o	Right pier	74.4	75.3	7.2	12.7

Table 3.8Auburn Ravine Bridge: Pseudo-static contributions to mean
peaks of pier drifts (z_s^2/z^2) .

Table 3.9Big Rock Wash Bridge: Mean peaks of pier drifts.

Pier location		% drift in X direction			% drift in <i>Y</i> direction		tion
		Case 1	Case 2	Case 3	Case 1	Case 2	Case 3
	Middle pier	1.56	1.37	1.59	1.91	1.52	1.53
Bent 2	Side pier 1	1.60	1.49	1.68	1.97	1.57	1.57
	Side pier 2	1.60	1.49	1.68	1.97	1.57	1.57
	Middle pier	1.51	1.36	1.53	2.14	1.44	1.41
Bent 3	Side pier 1	1.55	1.48	1.63	2.20	1.48	1.45
	Side pier 2	1.55	1.48	1.63	2.20	1.48	1.45

Table 3.10Big Rock Wash Bridge: Pseudo-static contributions to mean
peaks of pier drifts (z_s^2/z^2) .

Pier location		% drift in .	X direction	% drift in Y direction	
		Case 2 Case 3		Case 2	Case 3
	Middle pier	58.9	80.6	4.3	17.2
Bent 2	Side pier 1	59.8	79.4	4.3	17.2
	Side pier 2	59.8	79.4	4.3	17.2
	Middle pier	59.2	79.4	4.5	19.4
Bent 3	Side pier 1	60.2	78.2	4.5	19.4
	Side pier 2	60.2	78.2	4.5	19.4

Table 3.11	South Ingram Slough Bridge: Mean peaks of pier drifts.
------------	--

Pier location		% d	rift in X direc	ction	% drift in <i>Y</i> direction			
		Case 1	Case 2	Case 3	Case 1	Case 2	Case 3	
Bent 2	Pier 1	0.30	0.21	0.22	0.70	0.64	0.62	
	Pier 2	0.30	0.21	0.22	0.69	0.64	0.62	

Table 3.12South Ingram Slough Bridge: Pseudo-static contributions to
mean peaks of pier drifts (z_s^2/z^2) .

Pier location		% drift in 2	K direction	% drift in Y direction		
		Case 2	Case 3	Case 2	Case 3	
Bent 2	Pier 1	9.5	19.7	0.3	0.8	
	Pier 2	9.7	20.2	0.3	0.8	

Table 3.13 Penstock Bridge: Mean peaks of pier drifts.

Dianlogation	% d	rift in X direc	tion	% drift in Y direction			
Plei location	Case 1	Case 2	Case 3	Case 1	Case 2	Case 3	
Bent 2	0.38	0.31	0.30	0.88	0.95	0.76	
Bent 3	0.39	0.29	0.37	0.81	0.84	0.69	
Bent 4	0.43	0.34	0.33	0.72	0.78	0.62	

Table 3.14Penstock Bridge: Pseudo-static contributions to mean peaks
of pier drifts (z_s^2/z^2) .

Diorlocation	% drift in 2	X direction	% drift in <i>Y</i> direction		
Fiel location	Case 2	Case 3	Case 2	Case 3	
Bent 2	33.1	67.3	6.3	7.7	
Bent 3	25.3	87.0	9.0	20.7	
Bent 4	31.9	66.1	6.9	10.5	

Table 3.15Range of values for ratios of responses in case 2 over
responses in case 1.

Bridge	F_{χ}	F_y	F_z	M_x	M_y	M_z	X drift	Y drift
Auburn Ravine	1.3-12.7	0.7-1.9	0.7-1.0	0.9-3.0	0.7-1.1	0.8-1.5	0.7-1.1	0.6-1.0
Big Rock Wash	1.8-43.0	0.7-3.1	0.7-0.9	2.6-2.6	0.7-1.3	0.9-3.7	0.9-1.0	0.7-0.8
S. Ingram Slough	0.9-10.3	0.9-1.2	0.7-1.0	0.8-0.9	0.7-1.0	0.9-1.2	0.7-0.7	0.9-0.9
Penstock	0.9-1.8	1.1-1.7	0.7-1.2	0.7-1.7	0.7-1.2	1.1-1.2	0.7-0.8	1.0-1.1

Table 3.16Range of values for ratios of responses in case 3 over
responses in case 2.

Bridge	F_{x}	F_{y}	F_z	M_{χ}	My	M _z	X drift	Y drift
Auburn Ravine	0.9-1.1	1.1-2.1	1.1-3.4	1.1-2.6	1.1-3.3	1.3-2.1	1.0-1.5	1.0-1.1
Big Rock Wash	0.9-0.9	1.0-2.1	1.0-1.2	1.0-1.0	1.0-1.2	1.2-2.1	1.1-1.2	1.0-1.0
S. Ingram Slough	1.2-1.7	1.0-1.1	1.0-1.1	1.0-1.2	1.0-1.5	1.0-1.2	1.0-1.0	1.0-1.0
Penstock	0.8-0.8	0.8-1.0	1.0-1.3	0.8-1.1	1.0-1.7	0.8-0.9	1.0-1.3	0.8-0.8



Figure 3.1 Auburn Ravine Bridge: Elevation and plan (dimensions in meters).



Figure 3.2 Auburn Ravine Bridge: Box-girder cross section (dimensions in meters).





 $\omega_1 = 10.6 \text{ rad/s}$





 $\omega_2 = 11.4 \text{ rad/s}$

 $\omega_3 = 12.7 \text{ rad/s}$



 $\omega_5 = 30.8 \text{ rad/s}$



 $\omega_6 = 31.8 \text{ rad/s}$





 $\omega_7=34.4\ rad/s$

 $\omega_8 = 39.9 \text{ rad/s}$





Figure 3.4 Big Rock Wash Bridge: Elevation and plan (dimensions in meters).



Figure 3.5 Big Rock Wash Bridge: Box-girder cross section (dimensions in meters).





 $\omega_1 = 10.3 \text{ rad/s}$







 $\omega_3 = 12.2 \text{ rad/s}$







 $\omega_4=20.2 \; \text{rad/s}$

 $\omega_6 = 36.7 \text{ rad/s}$





 $\omega_7=54.9\ rad/s$

 $\omega_8=69.6\ rad/s$





Figure 3.7 South Ingram Slough Bridge: Elevation and plan (dimensions in meters).



Figure 3.8 South Ingram Slough Bridge: Box-girder cross section (dimensions in meters).





 $\omega_1 = 5.1 \text{ rad/s}$



 $\omega_3 = 10.8 \text{ rad/s}$



 $\omega_5 = 28.2 \text{ rad/s}$





 $\omega_8=65.2 \text{ rad/s}$



 $\omega_2=6.4\ rad/s$



 $\omega_4 = 19.0 \text{ rad/s}$



 $\omega_6 = 61.8 \text{ rad/s}$





Figure 3.10 Penstock Bridge: Elevation (dimensions in meters).



Figure 3.11 Penstock Bridge: Box-girder cross section (dimensions in meters).





 $\omega_1 = 2.6 \text{ rad/s}$







 $\omega_3 = 7.0 \text{ rad/s}$



 $\omega_5 = 13.4 \text{ rad/s}$



 $\omega_4 = 10.4 \text{ rad/s}$









 $\omega_8 = 25.9 \text{ rad/s}$





Figure 3.13 Normalized acceleration response spectra for an event of magnitude 6.5 and peak rock acceleration 0.3 *g*.



Figure 3.14 Ground acceleration PSDs for an event of magnitude 6.5 and peak rock acceleration 0.3 *g*.



Figure 3.15 Normalized acceleration response spectra for an event of magnitude 8.0 and peak rock acceleration 0.6 g.



Figure 3.16 Ground acceleration PSDs for an event of magnitude 8.0 and peak rock acceleration 0.6 *g*.



Figure 3.17 Auburn Ravine Bridge: Measures of mass participation.



Figure 3.18 Big Rock Wash Bridge: Measures of mass participation.



Figure 3.19 South Ingram Slough Bridge: Measures of mass participation.



Figure 3.20 Penstock Bridge: Measures of mass participation.



Figure 3.21 Auburn Ravine Bridge: Mean peak responses along the deck.



Figure 3.22 Auburn Ravine Bridge: Mean peak responses normalized with respect to the case of uniform excitation.



Figure 3.23 Auburn Ravine Bridge: Mean peak pseudo-static responses along the deck.



Figure 3.24 Auburn Ravine Bridge: Relative pseudo-static contributions to mean peak responses.



Figure 3.25 Auburn Ravine Bridge: Modal contributions to dynamic component of mean peak responses.



Figure 3.26 Auburn Ravine Bridge: Mean peak responses with *n* modes normalized with respect to "exact" mean peak responses.



Figure 3.27 Big Rock Wash Bridge: Mean peak responses along the deck.



Figure 3.28 Big Rock Wash Bridge: Mean peak responses normalized with respect to the case of uniform excitation.


Figure 3.29 Big Rock Wash Bridge: Mean peak pseudo-static responses along the deck.



Figure 3.30 Big Rock Wash Bridge: Relative pseudo-static contributions to mean peak responses.



Figure 3.31 Big Rock Wash Bridge: Modal contributions to dynamic component of mean peak responses.



Figure 3.32 Big Rock Wash Bridge: Mean peak responses with *n* modes normalized with respect to "exact" mean peak responses.



Figure 3.33 South Ingram Slough Bridge: Mean peak responses along the deck.



Figure 3.34 South Ingram Slough Bridge: Mean peak responses normalized with respect to the case of uniform excitation.



Figure 3.35 South Ingram Slough Bridge: Mean peak pseudo-static responses along the deck.



Figure 3.36 South Ingram Slough Bridge: Relative pseudo-static contributions to mean peak responses.



Figure 3.37 South Ingram Slough Bridge: Modal contributions to dynamic component of mean peak responses.



Figure 3.38 South Ingram Slough Bridge: Mean peak responses with *n* modes normalized with respect to 'exact" mean peak responses.



Figure 3.39 Penstock Bridge: Mean peak responses along the deck.



Figure 3.40 Penstock Bridge: Mean peak responses normalized with respect to the case of uniform excitation.



Figure 3.41 Penstock Bridge: Mean peak pseudo-static responses along the deck.



Figure 3.42 Penstock Bridge: Relative pseudo-static contributions to mean peak responses.



Figure 3.43 Penstock Bridge: Modal contributions to dynamic component of mean peak responses.



Figure 3.44 Penstock Bridge: Mean peak responses with *n* modes normalized with respect to "exact" mean peak responses.



Figure 3.45 Auburn Ravine Bridge: Comparison of original and extended MSRS rules (middle of span 3).



Figure 3.46 Auburn Ravine Bridge: Comparison of original and extended MSRS rules (left end of span 4).



Figure 3.47 Big Rock Wash Bridge: Comparison of original and extended MSRS rules (left end of span 2).



Figure 3.48 Big Rock Wash Bridge: Comparison of original and extended MSRS rules (middle of span 2).



Figure 3.49 South Ingram Slough Bridge: Comparison of original and extended MSRS rules (middle of span 1).



Figure 3.50 South Ingram Slough Bridge: Comparison of original and extended MSRS rules (left end of span 2).



Figure 3.51 Penstock Bridge: Comparison of original and extended MSRS rules (middle of span 2).



Figure 3.52 Penstock Bridge: Comparison of original and extended MSRS rules (left end of span 3).

4 Simulation of Spatially Varying Ground Motions

4.1 INTRODUCTION

In Chapter 3 we investigated the effect of differential support motions on bridge response using the multiple support response spectrum (MSRS) method. A main disadvantage of this method is that it cannot account for nonlinear behavior, the evaluation of which is fundamental in performance-based earthquake engineering. One way to account for nonlinear behavior is to conduct response history analyses for specified time histories of ground motions at support points of the structure. As recordings of closely spaced earthquake ground motions are rare, nonlinear response history analysis of multiply supported structures must rely on generation of synthetic ground motions consistent with a prescribed spatial variability model for the region of interest. Synthetic arrays of ground motions are also needed when performing statistical analysis of structural response by the Monte Carlo simulation approach.

Simulation of spatially varying ground motions is based on the notion of the coherency function, which models the ground motion variability in the frequency domain, under the assumption of stationarity. Simulation methods have been developed that use the coherency function in conjunction with theoretical target power spectral density functions. The resulting simulated stationary motions are then modulated in time to provide temporal nonstationarity. However, this approach cannot account for spectral nonstationarity of the ground motion, which can be critical in analysis of hysteretic structures. An alternative approach to simulation of an array of ground motions with specified coherency function is to use probabilistic conditioning with a target recorded or simulated motion at a reference site (Vanmarcke and Fenton, 1991; Kameda and Morikawa, 1992; Liao and Zerva, 2006). Segmenting in the time domain is used to preserve the nonstationary character of the ground motion. However, for an ensemble of arrays of ground motions generated by conditioning on a given accelerogram, the ensemble variance

tends to increase with increasing distance from the site of the given motion. This is clearly an undesirable property when performing statistical analysis of bridge response by Monte Carlo simulation. We address this issue here by conditioning the simulated array of motions on the power spectral density (PSD) of the segmented target accelerogram rather than its specific realization. Vanmarcke and Fenton (1991) used this approach to simulate accelerograms, but did not examine the physical compliance of the simulated motions, e.g., the requirement that the velocity and displacement time series have zero residuals.

Previous works on conditional simulation of ground motions have been limited to the case of uniform soil conditions. However, variations in local soil profiles can contribute significantly to the spatial variability of ground motions and therefore influence the response of multiply supported structures. By incorporating the site effect, this study provides an important extension of the previously developed methods of conditional simulation.

This chapter begins by revisiting the theory of modeling ground motions using Gaussian processes. Following an overview of the conditional simulation method for stationary processes, we describe the extension of the method to account for nonstationarity and varying soil conditions. In an example application, we simulate support motions for an existing bridge in California for both cases of uniform and variable soil conditions. The application presents support motions generated by conditioning on a given segmented PSD and support motions generated by conditioning on a given segmented PSD and support motions for the simulation methods is discussed along with their effect on the characteristics of the generated motions. To assess these methods, we compare statistical properties of the simulated motions from a sample of realizations with the corresponding target properties, as defined by theoretical models. The response spectra of the simulated motions are also examined, as they are quantities of particular interest in engineering practice.

4.2 DISCRETE REPRESENTATION OF AN ARRAY OF STATIONARY GAUSSIAN PROCESSES

Consider an array of zero-mean, jointly stationary Gaussian acceleration processes at n sites on the ground defined by auto-PSDs $G_{kk}(\omega)$, k = 1, 2, ..., n, and cross-PSDs $G_{kl}(\omega)$, $k, l = 1, 2, ..., n, k \neq l$. For each process, let N be the number of discrete observations sampled at equal time intervals Δt . We denote the corresponding time instants $t_i = i\Delta t$, i = 0, ..., N - 1. To simplify the algebra, we consider the case where N is even, but the analysis can be easily extended to the case when N is odd (see, e.g., Anderson, 1971). It is well known that such an array of processes can be represented in terms of the finite Fourier series (see, e.g., Chatfield, 2004)

$$a_k(t_i) = A_{0k} + \sum_{p=1}^{N/2-1} \left[A_{pk} \cos(\omega_p t_i) + B_{pk} \sin(\omega_p t_i) \right] + (-1)^i A_{(N/2)k}, \qquad (4.1)$$

in which $\omega_p = \frac{2\pi p}{N\Delta t}$ and $\{A_{pk}, B_{pk}\}$ are the Fourier coefficients. We note that the above representation uses *N* parameters to describe *N* observations and thus can be made to exactly fit the given realizations.

The Fourier coefficients $\{A_{pk}, B_{pk}\}$ are zero-mean, jointly Gaussian random variables that are uncorrelated for different frequencies, i.e., $E[A_{pk}A_{qk}] = E[B_{pk}B_{qk}] = E[A_{pk}B_{qk}] = 0$ for $p \neq q$. At frequency ω_p , the following relations hold:

$$E[A_{pk} A_{pl}] = E[B_{pk} B_{pl}] = \begin{cases} G_{kk}(\omega_p) \Delta \omega, & \text{if } k = l \\ \text{Re}[G_{kl}(\omega_p)] \Delta \omega, & \text{if } k \neq l \end{cases}$$

$$E[A_{pk} B_{pl}] = -E[B_{pk} A_{pl}] = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } k = l \\ \text{Im}[G_{kl}(\omega_p)] \Delta \omega, & \text{if } k \neq l \end{cases}$$
(4.2)

in which $\Delta \omega = 2\pi / N\Delta t$. Thus, given the auto- and cross-PSDs, the variance/covariances of all Fourier coefficients can be determined.

The cross-PSD between the acceleration processes at sites k and l is related to the corresponding auto-PSDs through the relation

$$G_{kl}(\omega) = \gamma_{kl}(\omega) [G_{kk}G_{ll}(\omega)]^{1/2}, \qquad (4.3)$$

in which $\gamma_{kl}(\omega)$ is the coherency function, described in Section 2.2.3 of Chapter 2.

4.3 ESTIMATION OF STATISTICAL PROPERTIES OF GIVEN REALIZATIONS

Let $a_k(t_i)$, i = 1, ..., N, represent a realization of the ground acceleration process at location k. Using orthogonality properties of the trigonometric terms, the Fourier coefficients in Equation (4.1) are evaluated as (Chatfield, 2004)

$$A_{pk} = \frac{2}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} a_k(t_i) \cos(\omega_p t_i), \quad p = 1, ..., N/2 - 1$$

$$A_{0k} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} a_k(t_i)/N$$

$$A_{(N/2)k} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} (-1)^i a_k(t_i)/N$$

$$B_{-k} = \frac{2}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} a_i(t_i) \sin(\omega_i t_i), \quad n = 1, ..., N/2 - 1$$
(4.4)

$$B_{pk} = \frac{2}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} a_k(t_i) \sin(\omega_p t_i), \quad p = 1, \dots, N/2 - 1.$$

An estimator of the auto-PSD of the acceleration process at this location is the periodogram, given by the expression (Chatfield, 2004)

$$I_{kk}(\omega_p) = \frac{N\Delta t}{4\pi} \left(A_{pk}^2 + B_{pk}^2 \right) = \frac{\Delta t}{\pi N} \left| \sum_{i=1}^N a_k(t_i) \exp(i\omega_p t_i) \right|^2.$$
(4.5)

To obtain a consistent estimator, $I_{kk}(\omega_p)$ may be smoothed along the frequency axis with one of various techniques available in the literature (see, e.g., Chatfield, 2004). The smoothed values at the ends are obtained by treating the periodogram as symmetric about $\omega_0 = 0$ and $\omega_{N/2} = \pi/\Delta t$.

For a given pair of realizations, $a_k(t_i)$ and $a_l(t_i)$, a consistent estimator of the cross-PSD of the corresponding processes is the smoothed cross-periodogram, $I_{kl}(\omega_p)$. The real and imaginary parts of the cross-periodogram are determined through the relations (Chatfield, 2004)

$$\operatorname{Re}\left[I_{kl}(\omega_{p})\right] = \frac{N\Delta t}{4\pi} \left(A_{pk}A_{pl} + B_{pk}B_{pl}\right)$$

$$\operatorname{Im}\left[I_{kl}(\omega_{p})\right] = \frac{N\Delta t}{4\pi} \left(A_{kl}B_{kl} - A_{kl}B_{ll}\right)$$

$$(4.6)$$

$$\operatorname{Im}[I_{kl}(\omega_p)] = \frac{N\Delta L}{4\pi} \left(A_{pk} B_{pl} - A_{pl} B_{pk} \right)$$

To obtain the smoothed values at the ends, the real and imaginary parts are treated as being symmetric and antisymmetric, respectively, about $\omega_0 = 0$ and $\omega_{N/2} = \pi/\Delta t$.

4.4 SIMULATION OF AN ARRAY OF STATIONARY GROUND MOTIONS WITH VARYING SITE EFFECTS

Earthquake ground motions in general have nonstationary characteristics in both time and frequency domains. However, most ground motions can be approximated with temporal segments that are nearly stationary. (An exception is the case of near-fault ground motions that contain directivity pulses. In this chapter we exclude consideration of such ground motions.) For this reason, we study the case of stationary processes first.

Since ground motions result from the superpositioning of waves randomly arriving at a site from intermittent ruptures at the earthquake source, on the basis of the central limit theorem, it is reasonable to assume that the ground motion process is Gaussian. This assumption may not be valid at a soft soil site under intense motion, where the soil behavior is nonlinear. For this reason, we limit our study to sites with moderate to stiff soils, where the Gaussian assumption remains approximately valid. For soft sites, ground motions may be generated by first simulating Gaussian motions at the bedrock level and then propagating them to the surface by nonlinear time-history analysis.

Next, we present two methods for generating realizations of an array of stationary Gaussian ground acceleration processes. These methods were named by Vanmarcke and Fenton (1991) as "unconditioned simulation" and "conditioned simulation" methods. In the unconditioned simulation method, the array of motions is consistent with the PSD of a random realization of the process at a given site. In the conditioned simulation method, the array of motions is conditioned simulation method accelerogram at a given site. The unconditioned simulation method has the advantage that the variability observed in an ensemble of realizations of the array is uniform over the array, whereas in the conditioned simulation method the variability increases with distance from the site of the observed motion. Uniform variability in the array of ground motions is essential when the synthetic motions are used for statistical analysis of the response of a multiply supported structure.

4.4.1 Unconditioned Simulation

In this section, we consider the problem of simulating arrays of zero-mean stationary Gaussian acceleration processes at locations with known site conditions and for a specified spatial variability model, when a random realization of the array at one site is given. The site conditions are described through the FRFs of the corresponding soil-columns (see Section 2.2.4), and the

ground motion spatial variability is described through a coherency function. The problem involves simulation of Fourier coefficients at separate frequencies and locations. At each location, the simulated Fourier coefficients are substituted in Equation (4.1) to obtain the corresponding realization of the acceleration time-history. The sets of Fourier coefficients at each frequency are obtained by sampling from a joint Gaussian distribution, which is fully defined in terms of the auto-PSD of the given realization, the site FRFs, and the coherency function.

To elaborate, let us consider simulating zero-mean acceleration processes at locations k = 1, ..., n with specified site FRFs, $h_k(\omega)$, and consistent with a coherency function and a given realization at a site sampled at N points. Let $\mathbf{X}_p = [A_{p1} \ B_{p1} \ ... \ A_{pn} \ B_{pn}]$ denote the set of Fourier coefficients at frequency ω_p for the n sites and let $\mathbf{\Sigma}_{pp}$ denote the $2n \times 2n$ covariance matrix of these coefficients. The covariance matrix fully defines the joint distribution of the zero-mean Gaussian vector \mathbf{X}_p . The elements $\Sigma_{pp,ij}$ of this matrix are determined using Equations (4.2), which involve the auto-PSDs $G_{kk}(\omega_p)$, k = 1, ..., n, and the cross-PSDs, $G_{kl}(\omega_p)$, $k, l = 1, ..., n, k \neq l$. To determine the auto-PSDs, first we estimate the auto-PSD of the given realization through the (optionally smoothed) periodogram given in Equation (4.5). Employing the expression for the PSD of the surface ground motion described in Equation (2.24) (in Section 2.2.4), and assuming that the bedrock motion has the same spectral density at all sites, the auto-PSDs at two separate locations k and l are related through

$$G_{ll}(\omega) = G_{kk}(\omega) \frac{|h_l(\omega)|^2}{|h_k(\omega)|^2}.$$
(4.7)

Using this equation, the full set of auto-PSDs is determined in terms of the estimated auto-PSD of the given realization and the site FRFs. Equation (4.3) is then used to determine the full set of cross-PSDs in terms of the auto-PSDs and the coherency function. Once the covariance matrix is determined, sample vectors from the 2*n*-dimensional zero-mean joint Gaussian distribution are obtained as $\mathbf{x}_p = \mathbf{L}_p^T \mathbf{z}_p$, where \mathbf{L}_p is an upper triangular matrix such that $\mathbf{L}_p^T \mathbf{L}_p = \mathbf{\Sigma}_{pp}$ and \mathbf{z}_p is a vector of 2*n* uncorrelated standard normal variables. We note that a computationally efficient and stable method to obtain \mathbf{L}_p is to write it as $\mathbf{L}_p = \mathbf{D}_p \mathbf{R}_p$, where \mathbf{D}_p is the diagonal matrix of standard deviations and \mathbf{R}_p is the Cholesky decomposition of the correlation matrix. After sampling at all frequencies $\omega_p = \frac{2\pi p}{N\Delta t}$, p = 0, 1, ..., N/2, Equation (4.1)

is used to obtain the acceleration time-histories at the *n* sites. At $\omega_p = 0$, the ground motions are fully coherent and the Fourier coefficients have the same values at all locations. Thus, at $\omega_p = 0$, we only need to sample from a one-dimensional zero-mean Gaussian distribution with variance $G_{kk}(0)\Delta\omega$. According to Equations (4.4) and (4.5) the periodogram has zero value at $\omega_p = 0$, but the auto-PSD estimate at zero frequency may have a small non-zero value due to smoothing. The implemented algorithm used for unconditioned simulation is summarized as follows:

Algorithm 1: Unconditioned simulation of an array of stationary spatially varying ground accelerations

- 1. Estimate the auto-PSD of the given realization in terms of the periodogram in Equation (4.5). Smoothing of the periodogram is optional.
- 2. Use Equation (4.7) to evaluate the auto-PSDs at all sites in terms of the respective soil column FRFs.
- 3. Use Equation (4.3) to evaluate cross-PSDs for all pairs of sites in terms of the auto-PSDs and the coherency function.
- 4. Repeat the following steps for each frequency $\omega_p = \frac{2\pi p}{N\Delta t}$, p = 1, ..., N/2:
 - a. Evaluate the elements of the covariance matrix Σ_{pp} , using Equations (4.2) and the estimated auto- and cross-PSDs.
 - b. Simulate the 2*n*-dimensional vector of Fourier coefficients by sampling from the zero-mean joint Gaussian distribution defined by the covariance matrix obtained in step 4a.

For p = 0, sample from a 1-dimensional Gaussian distribution with variance $G_{kk}(0)\Delta\omega$, since at $\omega_p = 0$ the Fourier coefficients have identical values at all locations.

5. For each of the sites k = 1, ..., n, use Equation (4.1) to obtain the corresponding realization of the acceleration time-history.

4.4.2 Conditioned Simulation

Consider now the case where the realization of the ground motion at one or more sites is given, and acceleration time histories at other sites that are consistent with a prescribed coherency function need to be generated. As in the case of unconditioned simulation, we assume that the site characteristics at all locations are described through the site FRFs. In this case, the Fourier coefficients of the acceleration processes at the target locations are sampled from a joint Gaussian distribution derived by probabilistic conditioning.

Adopting the notation of the previous section, we consider the set of zero-mean Fourier coefficients $\mathbf{X}_p = \begin{bmatrix} A_{p1} & B_{p1} & \dots & A_{pn} & B_{pn} \end{bmatrix}$ at frequency ω_p for all *n* sites, and the $2n \times 2n$ covariance matrix $\mathbf{\Sigma}_{pp}$ of these coefficients. We partition \mathbf{X}_p into two subsets, $\mathbf{X}_{p1} =$

 $[A_{p1} \quad B_{p1} \quad \dots \quad A_{pm} \quad B_{pm}], m < n, \text{ and } \mathbf{X}_{p2} = [A_{p(m+1)} \quad B_{p(m+1)} \quad \dots \quad A_{pn} \quad B_{pn}], \text{ where}$ $k = 1, \dots, m \text{ are the sites with known ground motions. It is well known that the conditional distribution of <math>\mathbf{X}_{p2}$ given $\mathbf{X}_{p1} = \mathbf{x}_{p1}$ is jointly normal with mean

$$\mathbf{M}_{p,2|1} = \mathbf{\Sigma}_{pp,21} \left(\mathbf{\Sigma}_{pp,11} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{x}_{p1}$$
(4.8)

and covariance matrix

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{p,22|11} = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{pp,22} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{pp,21} (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{pp,11})^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{pp,12}, \qquad (4.9)$$

where $\Sigma_{pp,ij}$ denotes the submatrix of Σ_{pp} giving the covariance of vectors \mathbf{X}_{pi} and \mathbf{X}_{pj} .

In this study, we only consider the case where the acceleration process at location k = 1is specified at N points in time and conditioned acceleration time-histories are simulated for locations k = 2, ..., n. The 2(n - 1)-dimensional joint Gaussian distribution of the Fourier coefficients for the target n-1 locations is defined through the mean vector and covariance matrix in Equations (4.8) and (4.9), respectively. In these equations, $\mathbf{x}_{p1} = \begin{bmatrix} A_{p1} & B_{p1} \end{bmatrix}$ is the set of Fourier coefficients of the given realization determined from Equations (4.4). The covariance matrix Σ_{pp} , is obtained as described in Section 4.4.1, i.e., using Steps 1-4a of Algorithm 1. At each frequency, $\omega_p = \frac{2\pi p}{N\Delta t}$, p = 1, ..., N/2, a sample-set of Fourier coefficients for the target locations is obtained as $\mathbf{x}_{p2} = \mathbf{M}_{p,2|1} + \mathbf{L}_p^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{z}_p$, where \mathbf{L}_p is an upper triangular matrix such that $\mathbf{L}_p^{\mathrm{T}}\mathbf{L}_p = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{pp,22|11}$, and \mathbf{z}_p is a vector of 2(n-1) uncorrelated standard normal variables. As in the previous section, $\mathbf{L}_p = \mathbf{D}_p \mathbf{R}_p$, where \mathbf{D}_p is the diagonal matrix of standard deviations and \mathbf{R}_p is the Cholesky decomposition of the correlation matrix. We note that sampling is not required for p = 0, because at $\omega_p = 0$ the ground motions are fully coherent and the Fourier coefficients have the same values at all locations. (If one is given time-histories at more than one location, Equations (4.4) and (4.6) indicate that they automatically satisfy this condition as long as their temporal averages are zero.) After the vectors \mathbf{x}_{p2} at all frequencies are obtained, Equation (4.1) is used to assemble the realizations of acceleration time-histories at the target locations.

The implemented algorithm used for conditioned simulation is summarized as follows:

Algorithm 2: Conditioned simulation of an array of stationary spatially varying ground accelerations

1. Estimate the auto-PSD of the given realization in terms of the periodogram in Equation (4.5). Smoothing of the periodogram is optional.

- 2. Use Equation (4.7) to evaluate the auto-PSDs at all sites in terms of their respective soil column FRFs.
- 3. Use Equation (4.3) to evaluate cross-PSDs for all pairs of sites in terms of the auto-PSDs and the coherency function.
- 4. Repeat the following steps for each frequency $\omega_p = \frac{2\pi p}{N\Delta t}$, p = 1, ..., N/2:
 - a. Evaluate the elements of the covariance matrix Σ_{pp} using Equations (4.2) and the estimated auto- and cross-PSDs.
 - b. Determine the Fourier coefficients of the given realization at site k = l using Equation (4.4).
 - c. Using Equations (4.8) and (4.9), determine the conditional mean vector and covariance matrix of the Fourier coefficients at locations k = 2, ..., n.
 - d. Simulate a 2(n-1)-dimensional vector of conditioned Fourier coefficients by sampling from a joint Gaussian distribution with the mean and covariance determined in step 4c.

For p = 0, only apply step 4b, since at $\omega_p = 0$ the Fourier coefficients have identical values at all locations.

5. For each of the sites k = 2, ..., n, use Equation (4.1) to obtain the corresponding realization of the acceleration time-history.

4.5 EXTENSION TO NONSTATIONARY MOTIONS

In Section 4.4, we developed a method for simulating stationary ground motions consistent with a given accelerogram or the PSD of a given accelerogram, and for a prescribed spatial variability model and specified site conditions. The methods described were based on the assumption of stationarity, which is unrealistic for earthquake motions. However, typical earthquake ground motions that do not contain a directivity pulse can be seen as consisting of nearly stationary segments. Each segment can then be treated as a stationary process in the manner described in Section 4.4. Vanmarcke and Fenton (1991) used an arbitrary division of a given accelerogram into stationary segments to simulate nonstationary acceleration time-histories. Liao and Zerva (2006) further investigated the problem of conditioned simulation with segmentation and incorporated necessary post-processing to obtain physically compliant motions.

In this study, the original accelerogram is divided into segments that maintain nearly time-invariant statistical characteristics. The characteristics considered are the variance, the predominant frequency, and the bandwidth of the ground acceleration process. Following the work of Rezaeian and Der Kiureghian (2008), instantaneous values of these characteristics are respectively measured as the slopes of the integral of the squared acceleration in time, the cumulative count of zero-level up-crossings, and the cumulative count of negative maxima or

positive minima. As an illustrative example, consider the fault-normal component of the Izmit record of the 1999 Kocaeli earthquake. Figure 4.1 shows the corresponding acceleration time history and the evolving integral measures of the variance, the predominant frequency and the bandwidth, respectively denoted p_1 , p_2 , and p_3 . The vertical dashed lines demarcate the segments where the slopes of all three curves are more or less constant and hence the process can be considered nearly stationary. Although the aforementioned measures provide guidance, selection of the segment bounds ultimately involves some judgment. It is important to note that a denser segmentation leads to a more accurate representation of the nonstationary nature and the high-frequency content of the original record, but alters the low-frequency content of the motion to a larger extent.

In the following, we employ the concept of segmentation to extend the simulation methods described in Section 4.4 to nonstationary motions.

4.5.1 Unconditioned Simulation

The basic idea of the nonstationary extension of the unconditioned simulation method is to apply the algorithm in Section 4.4.1 to each "stationary" segment of the given accelerogram and then, for each location, assemble the entire realization by joining together the corresponding simulated time-history segments. To avoid shifting the segments for different sites, the wave-passage effect is separately applied as a deterministic time-shift on the entire realization.

Following the segmentation of the given accelerogram, both ends of each segment are tapered with appropriate functions to avoid introducing fake high-frequency components in the Fourier series. In this study, the tapering is done with cosine-type functions that evolve from 0 to 1 at the left end and from 1 to 0 at the right end. Each tapered segment is used as the given realization for the unconditioned simulation of acceleration segments at all locations, employing Algorithm 1 in Section 4.4.1, but without the wave-passage effect in the coherency function. The simulated time-history segments extend beyond the time window defined by the original segment by 1–5% of the latter on each side. The overlapping regions of neighboring segments are then combined using cosine weighting functions. To account for the wave-passage effect, the resulting accelerograms are shifted in time by d_{kl}^L/v_{app} , where d_{kl}^L is the horizontal projection of the distance of the relevant station from the location with k = 0 along the direction of propagation of waves and v_{app} is the apparent wave velocity. Finally, the shifted accelerograms are further processed following standard techniques in earthquake engineering (e.g., Boore et al.,

2002; Liao and Zerva, 2006). In this study, the post-processing involves subtracting the mean value of the entire acceleration time history, application of a short cosine taper function to set the initial value to zero, and application of a high-pass filter to ensure zero residual velocity and displacement values at the end of the record. The filter we use here is the critically damped oscillator described by the equation

$$\ddot{x}(t) + 2\omega_c \dot{x}(t) + \omega_c^2 x(t) = y(t),$$
(4.10)

where ω_c is the selected corner frequency of the filter and y(t) and $\ddot{x}(t)$ are the input (unfiltered) and output (filtered) acceleration time-histories, respectively. The resulting acceleration time-histories are integrated to obtain the corresponding realizations of velocity and displacement time histories.

The steps involved in the nonstationary extension of the unconditioned simulation method are summarized as follows:

Algorithm 3: Unconditioned simulation of array of nonstationary spatially varying ground accelerations

- 1. Apply segmentation of the given accelerogram. Slopes of the integral of squared acceleration, the cumulative count of zero-level up-crossings, and the cumulative count of negative maxima and positive minima may be used to guide the selection of the segment boundaries.
- 2. Repeat steps 2a and 2b for each segment:
 - a. Taper both ends of the segment with cosine-type functions.
 - b. Apply Algorithm 1 in Section 4.4.1 to simulate acceleration time-histories at locations $k = 1, \dots, n$ for a time window that extends beyond the time-window of the original segment by 1–5% of the latter on each side. Disregard the wave-passage component of the coherency function for this analysis.
- 3. Join the simulated time-histories in step 2 using cosine-type weighting functions over the extended overlapping intervals.
- 4. Make deterministic time-shifts of the simulated time-histories at locations k = 2, ..., n by d_{kl}^L/v_{app} , where d_{kl}^L is the horizontal projection of the distance of the relevant station from the location with k = 1 along the direction of propagation of waves and v_{app} is the apparent wave velocity, to account for the wave-passage effect.
- 5. Repeat steps 5a–5d for each location:
 - a. Subtract the mean of the entire acceleration time-history.
 - b. Apply a cosine-type taper function to set the initial value to zero.
 - c. Apply a high-pass filter (e.g., the critically damped oscillator) to enforce zero residual velocity and displacement values.

d. Integrate the filtered accelerograms to obtain corresponding velocity and displacement time-histories.

4.5.2 Conditioned Simulation

The nonstationary extension for the conditioned simulation is performed with an algorithm similar to Algorithm 3, in which the first sentence in step 2b is modified to read:

"Apply Algorithm 2 in Section 4.4.2 to simulate acceleration time-histories at locations $k = 2, \dots, n$ for a time window that extends beyond the time-window of the original segment by 1–5% of the latter on each side."

To obtain a consistent set of ground motions, the given acceleration time history at location 1 must be slightly modified. Specifically, we join together tapered segments of the accelerogram and perform post-processing in a manner identical to the simulated motions. The resulting simulated motion at location 1 does not have any random characteristics but is slightly different from the given record.

The segmentation and post-processing mainly influence the low-frequency content of the motion, which is more apparent in the displacement waveform. As a result, the displacement time history of the original record can differ somewhat from the simulated displacement time history at zero distance. If accurate representation of the displacement time history of the original record is important, the following alternative procedure can be applied: (1) Separate the low-frequency content of the original record, e.g., by use of a high-pass filter and subtracting from the original record; (2) generate conditioned nonstationary simulations using the remaining motion; (3) assuming that the low-frequency contents at different sites are perfectly coherent, add the separated low-frequency content for the wave-passage effect and, optionally, for the site-response effect. More details are given below.

Two different filters are investigated in this study for the separation of the low-frequency content of a given accelerogram: a fourth-order causal Butterworth filter (see, e.g., Rabiner and Gold, 1975) and the critically damped SDOF oscillator in Equation (4.10), both having a corner frequency of $f_c = \omega_c/2\pi = 0.2$ Hz. To investigate criteria for the choice of the initial filter, we consider again the Izmit record shown in Figure 4.1. Figure 4.2 compares the original displacement time history with the simulated ones at zero distance for the two choices of the initial filter. The differences between the simulated time histories and the original one are due to the segmentation, the tapering and subsequent joining of the segments, and the post-processing
of the resulting time-history. For the two filters, the left graph of Figure 4.3 compares the ratio of the PSD of the remainder motion (after extracting the low-frequency content) over the PSD of the initial accelerogram. Ideally, this ratio should be close to a step-function that evolves from 0 to 1 at the corner frequency f_c . The right graph of Figure 4.3 compares the corresponding acceleration auto-PSDs of the separated low-frequency components. It is evident from Figure 4.2 that the critically damped oscillator is a more suitable filter in terms of preserving the initial displacement time-history. However, as indicated in Figure 4.3, the Butterworth filter has the advantage of leaving less high-frequency power in the separated "coherent" component. Thus, the choice of filter depends on the criterion that is more important in the specific analysis: preserving the initial displacement waveform or excluding high-frequency power from the remainder motion.

As stated earlier, the low-frequency separated component of the motion is assumed to be perfectly coherent. This is reasonable because long-period waves are less affected by heterogeneity of the ground medium. Thus, when uniform soil conditions are considered, it is only necessary to shift the separated waveform in time to account for the wave-passage effect and then add it back to the simulated time-histories at all sites. When varying soil conditions are present, the low-frequency separated waveform may need to be further modified. We suggest two approaches. In the first approach, one assumes that, for small frequencies, the site FRFs have values close to unity, i.e., the soil columns do not alter the low-frequency component of the ground motion. In that case no further modification of the low-frequency component is necessary. In the second approach, we additionally account for the site-response effect by applying a filter on the low-frequency component. The filter is applied in the frequency domain and only the steady-state response is considered; thus, it is fully described in terms of its FRF. The latter is given by the ratio of the FRF of the soil-column at the target site over the FRF of the soil-column at location k = 1. This filtering models an inverse propagation of the low-frequency component through the soil-column at location k = 1 to obtain the motion at the bedrock level and propagation of the latter to the ground surface at the location of the target site. The filter is applied to the Fourier transform of the low-frequency component, which is then transformed back to the time domain and shifted in time to account for the wave-passage effect.

The steps involved in the nonstationary extension of the conditioned simulation method, as described above, are summarized as follows:

Algorithm 4: Conditioned simulation of nonstationary spatially varying ground accelerations with deterministic treatment of the low-frequency content

- 1. Separate the low-frequency content using a fourth-order causal Butterworth filter or a critically damped SDOF oscillator.
- 2. Apply segmentation of the remaining acceleration time-history. Slopes of the integral of squared acceleration, the cumulative count of zero-level up-crossings, and the cumulative count of negative maxima and positive minima may be used to guide the selection of the segment boundaries.
- 3. Repeat steps 3a–3b for each segment:
 - a. Taper both ends of the segment with cosine-type functions.
 - b. Apply Algorithm 2 in Section 4.4.2 to simulate acceleration time histories at locations $2, \dots, n$ for a time window that extends beyond the time-window of the original segment by 1–5% of the latter on each side. Disregard the wave-passage component of the coherency function for this analysis.
- 4. Join the simulated time-histories in step 3 using cosine-type weighting functions over the extended overlapping intervals.
- 5. Make deterministic time-shift of the simulated time-histories at locations 2, ..., *n* according to the formula d_{kl}^L/v_{app} to account for the wave-passage effect.
- 6. Repeat steps 6a–6f for each location:
 - a. Subtract the mean of the entire acceleration time history.
 - b. Apply a cosine-type taper function to set the initial value to zero.
 - c. Apply a high-pass filter (e.g., the critically damped oscillator) to enforce zero residual velocity and displacement values.
 - d. Make deterministic time-shift of the separated low-frequency component to account for the wave-passage effect and, optionally, apply an additional filter to account for the site effect.
 - e. Add back the modified low-frequency component.
 - f. Integrate the resulting accelerograms to obtain corresponding velocity and displacement time-histories.

4.6 EXAMPLE APPLICATIONS

As an example application, we simulate support motions for the Penstock Bridge, described in Section 3.2.4. The elevation of the bridge is shown in Figure 3.10. We consider abutment 1 to be the location corresponding to site k = 1. The Izmit record, introduced in the analysis of Section 4.5, is used as the original motion for the simulation of unconditioned and conditioned support motions. The segments considered stationary are the ones shown in Figure 4.1. We assume that the waves propagate in the direction from abutment 1 to abutment 5. The incoherence is modeled as in Equation (2.19) with the parameter values a = 0.2 and $v_s = 600$ m/s. The time-lag caused

by the wave-passage effect is determined using $v_{app} = 400$ m/s. We examine both cases of uniform and varying soil conditions.

4.6.1 Uniform Soil Conditions

In this section, we generate sets of support motions under the assumption that soil conditions at all sites are identical with those at the site of the given record. We analyze sets of motions simulated with the unconditioned and the conditioned methods. Unless stated otherwise, the non-smoothed periodogram of each stationary segment is used. In the conditioned method, we examine both cases of no initial filtering and initial filtering to separate the low-frequency content. Based on the analysis in Section 4.5, only the fourth-order causal Butterworth filter is used for this purpose. To validate the simulation method, we compare the coherency estimates from the simulated motions with the corresponding theoretical models. The coherency estimates are obtained by averaging the estimates from 20 realizations, where the estimate for each realization is obtained by dividing the cross-PSD estimate from Equations (4.6) by the square roots of the corresponding auto-PSDs estimated from Equations (4.5). Although the time histories have been generated in segments, the entire realizations are used in the above equations. An 11-point Hamming window is applied to smooth the periodograms and cross-periodograms in evaluating the coherency estimates. The response spectra of the simulated motions are also examined.

4.6.1.1 Unconditioned Simulations

An example set of unconditioned simulations of the support motions, including time histories of acceleration, velocity, and displacement for all support points, is shown in Figure 4.4. The corner frequency of the post-processing filter used is $f_c = 0.15$ Hz. Note that the simulation method preserves the nonstationary nature of the ground motion, and that all records approach zero with increasing time (i.e., have zero residuals). The wave-passage effect is clearly visible. Figure 4.5 and Figure 4.6 compare coherency estimates of the simulated support accelerations and displacements, respectively, with the corresponding theoretical models. Two example support pairs are considered: bents 3 and 4, and abutments 1 and 5. According to the theory of stationary processes, the coherency function for a process must be invariant of differentiation, hence the theoretical coherency models for accelerations and displacements in the two figures are the same. For the acceleration time-histories, the coherency estimates are in excellent agreement with the

theoretical models over the entire range of frequencies shown in Figure 4.5. For the displacement time-histories, the coherency estimates diverge from the theoretical models for frequencies greater than about 2.5 Hz. However, this is inconsequential because the auto-PSDs of the corresponding displacement processes are practically zero for these frequencies. Figure 4.7 shows 5% damped pseudo-acceleration response spectra for 20 realizations at each support point. It is clear that the variances at all support points are similar, a desirable characteristic for ground motions to be used in statistical analyses of bridge response under differential support motions. Figure 4.8 shows the corresponding median spectra of the five support points, which are in excellent agreement over the entire frequency range considered. Compared with the spectrum of the recorded motion, which should be regarded as just one realization of the underlying random process, the median response spectra of the simulated motions are smoother and have slightly smaller values in the lower frequency range. Even smoother median response spectra are obtained by using smoothed periodograms of the stationary segments. The smoothed periodograms tend to have more power than the non-smoothed ones at frequencies close to zero. This results in larger variances for the low-frequency components of the simulated motions compared to the case with no smoothing and, thus, a higher level of post-processing is required to enforce zero velocity and displacement residuals in about the same time length. Figure 4.9 shows the median 5% damped pseudo-acceleration response spectra when the periodograms are smoothed with a seven-point Hamming window. A filter with a corner frequency of $f_c =$ 0.20 was used for the post-processing of the corresponding simulations.

4.6.1.2 Conditioned Simulations

Next, we examine support motions generated with the conditioned simulation method. We first consider the case of simulation without separation of the low-frequency content (the corresponding algorithm is described at the beginning of Section 4.5.2). In this case, for all sets of simulations, the motion at abutment 1 is the same and the displacement time history is identical with that shown as a dashed line in the upper chart of Figure 4.2. Figure 4.10 shows an example set of simulations for this case. Note again the nonstationary nature of the motions, the zero velocity and displacement residuals, and the time shift due to the wave-passage effect. The coherency estimates for accelerations and displacements for the selected pairs of support motions are compared with the corresponding theoretical models in Figure 4.11 and Figure 4.12, respectively. Again, the acceleration coherency estimates are in excellent agreement with the

corresponding theoretical models, while the displacement estimates diverge for frequencies greater than about 3 Hz. Figure 4.13 shows 5% damped pseudo-acceleration response spectra of 20 realizations at each support. We observe increasing variance of the spectral amplitudes with increasing distance from location k = 1 (abutment 1), at which the variance is zero. This inconsistent variability of the support motions obviously is problematic if the simulations are to be used for statistical analysis of structural response. The median response spectra for the conditioned simulations, shown in Figure 4.14, are jagged and closely follow the response spectrum of the recorded motion, except for a range of frequencies close to the corner frequency of the post-processing filter, which is taken as $f_c = 0.1$ Hz for the present case. A lower level of filtering is required in this case, because the conditioned simulation results in smaller variations over the array than the unconditioned case. The jagged behavior is, of course, due to the small variance of the simulated motions for locations close to the site with the specified accelerogram.

Next, we examine conditioned simulations with deterministic treatment of the lowfrequency content, which is separated from the original motion with a fourth-order causal Butterworth filter. In this case, a lower level of filtering is required in the post-processing to ensure zero-residual velocities and displacements. The corner frequency used for this case is $f_c = 0.05$ Hz. An example set of support motions (accelerations, velocities, displacements) is shown in Figure 4.15. The displacement time history at abutment 1, the same in all simulations, is identical to that shown as a dashed line in the middle chart of Figure 4.2. Figure 4.16 and Figure 4.17 respectively compare the acceleration and displacement coherency estimates with the corresponding theoretical models for the selected pairs of supports. The acceleration coherency estimates are in excellent agreement with the theoretical models in the whole range of frequencies considered. The displacement coherency estimates are satisfactory for frequencies less than about 2 Hz. This range of frequencies is smaller than that in the case of conditioned simulations without initial filtering (see Figure 4.12), but still includes the important frequencies of the displacement processes. In Figure 4.18, we observe increasing variance of the acceleration response spectra of the simulated motions with increasing distance from abutment 1, similar to that in Figure 4.13. Finally, Figure 4.19 shows the corresponding median acceleration response spectra, which are jagged and diverge slightly from the response spectrum of the original record for frequencies less than about 1 Hz. In this range of frequencies, the low-frequency separated component has significant power, as indicated by Figure 4.3.

Concluding this section, we note that the decision to initially separate or not separate the low-frequency component of the motion depends on the relative importance of the target characteristics of the simulated motions, e.g., preserving the original displacement waveform, matching the target response spectrum, or matching the coherency characteristics in a certain frequency range.

4.6.2 Varying Soil Conditions

In this section, we generate sets of support motions under the assumption of varying soil conditions. In modeling the soil profiles, we consider two approaches. In the first approach, each soil-column is modeled as a SDOF system using the FRF in Equation (2.23). In the second approach, each soil-column is modeled as a continuous elastic medium using the FRF in Equation (2.22). Again, we consider both cases of unconditioned and conditioned simulations, using Algorithms 3 and 4 in Sections 4.5.1 and 4.5.2, respectively. For the conditioned simulations, we only examine the case with initial Butterworth filtering, i.e., conditioned simulations that preserve the original low-frequency content. In all cases, the unsmoothed periodogram is used in the simulation process. To validate these proposed methods, in addition to the coherency estimates we examine ratios of acceleration auto-PSD estimates for support points with different soil conditions. The latter are compared with the corresponding theoretical values, determined through the site FRFs, using Equation (4.7). The auto-PSD estimates are obtained by averaging the periodograms of 20 realizations, each smoothed with an 11-point Hamming window.

4.6.2.1 Modeling the Soil-columns using the SDOF Idealization

Description of the site FRF by the SDPF model in Equation (2.23) requires specification of the soil-column frequency ω_k and damping ratio ζ_k . At abutment 1, we assume that the site conditions are identical to those at the site of the given record. To determine the frequency and damping ratio of the soil-column at this location (k = 1), we employ the method described in Section 2.2.4, i.e., we assume a white-noise excitation at the bedrock level and fit the theoretical PSD of the acceleration response at the ground surface to the smoothed periodogram of the record. Nonlinear least-squares minimization with MATLAB results in $\omega_1 \approx 2.07$ rad/s and $\zeta_1 \approx 0.6$, when the periodogram of the record is smoothed with a 41-point Hamming window. The acceleration auto-PSD estimate (smoothed periodogram) of the recorded motion and the fitted theoretical model are compared in Figure 4.20. A higher level of smoothing of the periodogram results in a higher damping value, but values larger than 0.6 are not typically used (Zembaty and Rutenberg, 2002). For the other support points, the selected frequencies and damping ratios of the soil-columns are listed in Table 4.1. Note that identical soil conditions have been assumed for abutments 1 and 5 and for bents 2 and 4.

Unconditioned Simulations: Figure 4.21 shows an example set of realizations, including time histories of acceleration, velocity, and displacement for all support points, of the support motions obtained with the unconditioned simulation method. The motions in each pair of abutments 1 and 5 and of bents 3 and 4 differ only due to the incoherence and wave-passage effects, and thus have the same spectral contents. For any other pair of support motions, the variability is due to the incoherence effect, the wave-passage effect, and the additional effect of differential site response. The latter effect also causes variations in the frequency contents of the motions, e.g., supports located on softer soils are richer in lower frequency components. The differences in frequency contents are more apparent in the acceleration time histories than in the velocity and displacement time histories. This is because different soil FRFs differ more strongly at high frequencies. In Figure 4.22 and Figure 4.23 we examine the coherency characteristics and the acceleration auto-PSD ratios for two example support pairs (abutment 1 and bent 3, and bents 3 and 4), each pair consisting of support points with dissimilar soil conditions. The excellent agreement of the estimates with the theoretical values validates the simulation method. Figure 4.24 shows the median 5% damped pseudo-acceleration response spectra of 20 simulations. Response spectra at sites with similar soil conditions, i.e., for abutments 1 and 5 and for bents 2 and 4, are in excellent agreement.

Conditioned Simulations: Next, we present a similar analysis using the method of conditioned simulation with separation of the low-frequency content with a Butterworth filter and modification of the low-frequency component to account for the wave-passage effect only (see step 6d of Algorithm 4 in Section 4.5.2). Figure 4.25 shows an example set of simulations. In all simulated arrays, the displacement at abutment 1 is identical with the dashed line in the middle chart of Figure 4.2. Figure 4.26 and Figure 4.27 show the estimates of the acceleration coherency and ratio of acceleration PSDs, respectively. These estimates are in good agreement with the theoretical models. Figure 4.28 shows the corresponding median pseudo-acceleration response spectra. It can be seen that sites with similar soil conditions have nearly identical median response spectra.

Next we apply modification of the extracted low-frequency component for both the wave-passage and the site-response effects. The coherency estimates and ratios of auto-PSDs for this case are shown in Figure 4.29 and Figure 4.30, respectively. Comparing Figure 4.26 with Figure 4.29 and Figure 4.27 with Figure 4.30 indicates that the modification of the separated low-frequency component to account for the site-response effect degrades the agreement with the theoretical results. We suspect that the assumption of steady-state response for the low-frequency component of the motion, which is implicit in the frequency-domain modification, introduces an error. On the other hand, the close agreements observed in Figure 4.26 and Figure 4.27 suggest that the effect of site response on the low-frequency component of the motion is insignificant and can be neglected.

4.6.2.2 Modeling Soil-columns using the Theory of Wave Propagation through Elastic Media

We now consider the case where the FRF of each soil-column is given by Equation (2.22). With this model, the site characteristics at the kth location are fully described in terms of the damping ratio ζ_k , the depth to bedrock z_k , the shear-wave velocity $v_{s,k}$, and the reflection coefficient r_k . Assuming the typical values $v_b = 1500 \text{ m/s}$ for the shear-wave velocity and $\rho_b = 1500 \text{ g/cm}^3$ for the density at the bedrock level, evaluation of the reflection coefficient only requires additional specification of the soil-column density $\rho_{s,k}$. Again, we assume that the site conditions at abutment 1 are identical to those at the site of the given record. The shear-wave velocity for the Izmit record is known, $v_{s,1} = 811 \text{ cm/s}$. The depth to bedrock z_1 is selected such that the first resonant frequency of the soil layer coincides with the frequency of the site under the SDOF idealization in Section 4.6.2.1. Assuming the bedrock is horizontal, the values of z_k at the other support points are selected such that the variation of the depths of the soil layers is consistent with the (known) variation of the elevations of the bridge supports. The value of $v_{s,k}$ at each support is then determined so that the first resonant frequency matches the corresponding frequency considered in Section 4.6.2.1. Finally, typical values are selected for the soil-column densities $\rho_{s,k}$. Parameter values that describe the site characteristics at all support points for this model are listed in Table 4.2.

Unconditioned Simulations: For the unconditioned simulation method, an example set of support motions is shown in Figure 4.31. Figure 4.32 and Figure 4.33 validate the method by examining the coherency characteristics and auto-PSDs ratios, respectively, and Figure 4.34

shows the median pseudo-acceleration response spectra. Note that because of the multimodal site effect, the coherency function is a lot more complicated than in the case with a SDOF idealization of the soil column. Comparisons with the theoretical models again confirm the validity of the simulation method.

Conditioned Simulations: Here we only consider the case of conditioned simulation with initial Butterworth filtering and only the wave-passage effect accounted for in the deterministic modification of the low-frequency component. Figure 4.35 shows an example set of simulations, Figure 4.36 shows the coherency estimates, Figure 4.37 shows the acceleration auto-PSDs ratios, and Figure 4.38 presents the median pseudo-acceleration response spectra. Once again the results confirm validity of the simulation approach. However, it is important to recall that this conditioned simulation will yield realizations with nonuniform variance for different sites.

4.7 SUMMARY

In this chapter, we developed methods for simulating an array of nonstationary differential support motions by probabilistic conditioning. Nonstationarity is achieved by considering the process as composed of stationary segments. The arrays of simulated motions properly account for the effects of incoherence, wave passage, and spatially varying soil conditions. We considered two approaches: In the first, we simulated support motions characterized by uniform variance with distance by conditioning on a specified set of PSDs, which are obtained as the periodograms of "stationary" segments of a recorded motion. In the second, we simulated support motions characterized by increasing variance with distance, by conditioning on a specified realization. In the latter approach, we investigated a method that preserves the low-frequency content and thus the waveform of the displacement time history of the original motion. The method involves deterministic treatment of the low-frequency content of the motion, which is extracted from the original motion through high-pass filtering. The simulated time histories, (2) comparing statistical characteristics of an ensemble of realizations with the corresponding target theoretical models, and (3) investigating the response spectra of the simulated motions.

Table 4.1Variation of soil-column properties for the SDOF model.

	Abutment 1	Bent 2	Bent 3	Bent 4	Abutment 5
$\omega/2\pi$, rad/s	2.07	1.75	1.43	1.75	2.07
ζ_k	0.6	0.5	0.4	0.5	0.6

Table 4.2Variation of soil-column properties for the elastic-medium
model.

	Abutment 1	Bent 2	Bent 3	Bent 4	Abutment 5
$v_{s,k}$, cm/s	811	556	459	584	835
h_k , m	98	79	80	83	101
$\rho_{s,k}$, g/cm ³	2.2	2	1.8	2.0	1.8



Figure 4.1 "Stationary" segments of an accelerogram selected based on integral measures of evolving cumulative energy, predominant frequency, and bandwidth.



Figure 4.2 Comparison of displacement time history of the original record with conditioned simulated displacement time histories at zero distance.



Figure 4.3 Comparison of ratios of PSDs of the remainder motion over the original motion for two filters (left) and of acceleration auto-PSDs of the corresponding low-frequency extracted motions (right).





Figure 4.4 Example set of unconditioned simulations (uniform soil conditions).

Accelerations at bent 3 and bent 4



Accelerations at abutment 1 and abutment 5



Figure 4.5 Acceleration coherency estimates from 20 unconditioned simulations (uniform soil conditions).



Figure 4.6 Displacement coherency estimates from 20 unconditioned simulations (uniform soil conditions).



Figure 4.7 Acceleration response spectra of 20 unconditioned simulations (uniform soil conditions).



Figure 4.8 Median acceleration response spectra of 20 unconditioned simulations (uniform soil conditions).



Figure 4.9 Median acceleration response spectra of 20 unconditioned simulations using smoothed periodograms (uniform soil conditions).



Figure 4.10 Example set of conditioned simulations without initial filtering (uniform soil conditions).

Accelerations at bent 3 and bent 4



Figure 4.11 Acceleration coherency estimates from 20 conditioned simulations without initial filtering (uniform soil conditions).



Figure 4.12 Displacement coherency estimates from 20 conditioned simulations without initial filtering (uniform soil conditions).



Figure 4.13 Acceleration response spectra of 20 conditioned simulations without initial filtering (uniform soil conditions).



Figure 4.14 Median acceleration response spectra of 20 conditioned simulations without initial filtering (uniform soil conditions).



Figure 4.15 Example set of conditioned simulations with initial Butterworth filtering (uniform soil conditions).

Accelerations at bent 3 and bent 4



Figure 4.16 Acceleration coherency estimates from 20 conditioned simulations with initial Butterworth filtering (uniform soil conditions).



Figure 4.17 Displacement coherency estimates from 20 conditioned simulations with initial Butterworth filtering (uniform soil conditions).



Figure 4.18 Acceleration response spectra of 20 conditioned simulations with initial Butterworth filtering (uniform soil conditions).



Figure 4.19 Median acceleration response spectra of 20 conditioned simulations with initial Butterworth filtering (uniform soil conditions).



Figure 4.20 Comparison of the PSD of the recorded motion and the fitted theoretical model under the SDOF idealization.





Figure 4.21 Example set of unconditioned simulations (varying soil conditions: SDOF model).



Figure 4.22 Acceleration coherency estimates from 20 unconditioned simulations (varying soil conditions: SDOF model).



Figure 4.23 Ratios of estimated acceleration auto-PSDs from 20 unconditioned simulations (varying soil conditions: SDOF model).



Figure 4.24 Median acceleration response spectra of 20 unconditioned simulations (varying soil conditions: SDOF model).



Figure 4.25 Example set of conditioned simulations with initial Butterworth filtering (varying soil conditions: SDOF model, only wave passage accounted for in low-frequency component).





Figure 4.26 Acceleration coherency estimates from 20 conditioned simulations with initial Butterworth filtering (varying soil conditions: SDOF model, only wave passage accounted for in low-frequency component).



Figure 4.27 Ratios of estimated acceleration auto-PSDs from 20 conditioned simulations with initial Butterworth filtering (varying soil conditions: SDOF model, only wave passage accounted for in low-frequency component).



Figure 4.28 Median acceleration response spectra of 20 conditioned simulations with initial Butterworth filtering (varying soil conditions SDOF model, only wave passage accounted for in low-frequency component).



Figure 4.29 Acceleration coherency estimates from 20 conditioned simulations with initial Butterworth filtering (varying soil conditions: SDOF model, wave passage and site effect accounted for in low-frequency component).



Figure 4.30 Ratios of estimated acceleration auto-PSDs from 20 simulations with initial Butterworth filtering (varying soil conditions: SDOF oscillator model, wave passage and site effect accounted for in low-frequency component).



Figure 4.31 Example set of unconditioned simulations (varying soil conditions: elastic-medium model).



Figure 4.32 Acceleration coherency estimates from 20 unconditioned simulations (varying soil conditions: elastic-medium model).



Figure 4.33 Ratios of estimated acceleration auto-PSDs from 20 unconditioned simulations (varying soil conditions: elasticmedium model).



Figure 4.34 Median acceleration response spectra of 20 unconditioned simulations (varying soil conditions: elastic-medium model).



Figure 4.35 Example set of conditioned simulations with initial Butterworth filtering (varying soil conditions: elastic-medium model, only wave passage accounted for in low-frequency component).



Figure 4.36 Acceleration coherency estimates from 20 conditioned simulations with initial Butterworth filtering (varying soil conditions, elastic-medium model, only wave passage accounted for in low-frequency component).



Figure 4.37 Ratios of estimated acceleration auto-PSDs from 20 conditioned simulations with initial Butterworth filtering (varying soil conditions, elastic-medium model, only wave passage accounted for in low-frequency component).


Figure 4.38 Median acceleration response spectra of 20 conditioned simulations with initial Butterworth filtering (varying soil conditions, elastic-medium model, only wave passage accounted for in the low-frequency component).

5 Linear and Nonlinear Time-history Analysis using Simulated Differential Support Motions and Comparison with MSRS Estimates

5.1 INTRODUCTION

In Chapter 3, we used the MSRS method to investigate the effect of spatial variability of ground motions on the mean peak linear responses of four real bridge models with vastly different structural characteristics. In this chapter, we investigate responses of the same bridge models under differential support motions using time-history analysis methods. Specifically, we perform linear and nonlinear response history analyses (RHA) to evaluate the mean peak responses to ensembles of support motion arrays generated with the unconditioned simulation method described in Chapter 4. The responses we examine are pier drifts, which are quantities particularly important in bridge design. We investigate the effect of ground motion spatial variability on the mean peak linear and nonlinear drifts, and also on the ratios of nonlinear over linear drifts. According to the "equal displacement" rule, for sufficiently flexible systems, these ratios are expected to be close to unity. This rule is commonly used in practice to evaluate the nonlinear drift demand from linear analyses. Another objective of this chapter is to assess the accuracy of the MSRS method by comparing mean peak linear responses obtained from RHA with corresponding MSRS estimates.

5.2 DESCRIPTION OF BRIDGE MODELS

In Chapter 3 (Section 3.2), we described the linear models used in MSRS analysis of the four example bridges. In these models, both the piers and the decks were modeled using linear elastic elements. For the piers, we used effective stiffness properties determined through moment-curvature analyses and consistent with the Caltrans specifications (Caltrans Seismic Design

Criteria, 2004). We use the same models in the linear RHA in this chapter. The models used in the nonlinear RHA differ only in the modeling of the piers.

Similar to the linear models, in the nonlinear finite-element models we use three elements along each bridge pier. The elements are force-based with distributed plasticity. For the piers of the Penstock Bridge and the South Ingram Slough Bridge, we define five integration points for each element (i.e., a total of 15 integration points along each pier), whereas for the shorter piers of the Big Rock Wash Bridge and the Auburn Ravine Bridge we define three integration points for each element (i.e., a total of nine integration points along each pier). For all four bridges, the pier elements are modeled as having fiber sections with 12 subdivisions in the circumferential direction and eight and four subdivisions in the radial direction for the core and the cover, respectively. The reinforcing steel bars are specified as additional layers. The properties of the unconfined concrete and the reinforcing steel are selected as the expected material properties defined in the Caltrans specifications, whereas the properties of the confined concrete are determined according to Mander's model (Mander et al., 1988). See Section 3.2 in Chapter 3 for information on the steel reinforcement and the type of material in the piers of each bridge. The fiber model of the pier section accounts for interaction between axial force and bending moment. The shear and torsional behaviors are described by aggregated uniaxial models (OpenSees manual, accessed in April 2011). The yield force for the shear model is determined from Caltrans specifications, whereas the yield force for the torsional model is evaluated according to the theory of strength of materials (e.g., Hjelmstad, 2005).

5.2.1 Pier Ductility

Ductility characterizes the ability of structural components to undergo several cycles of inelastic deformation without significant degradation of strength or stiffness. The ductility capacity of structural elements is quantified through the ductility factor, defined as the ratio of maximum deformation (e.g., strain, displacement, rotation, curvature) over the deformation at yield.

The notion of ductility is fundamental in displacement-based design, which focuses on evaluating the displacement demands imposed by the earthquake excitation. In Caltrans design, of main interest is the displacement ductility capacity of bridge piers. In this study, we evaluate the displacement ductility ratios of the bridge piers, determined as the ratios of maximum pier drifts obtained from nonlinear time-history analysis over pier drifts at yield. Following Caltrans specifications, the yield drifts are obtained by double integration of the curvature along the pier height, assuming that the section with the largest curvature (i.e., with the largest bending moment) has just yielded. The yield curvature is determined from moment-curvature analysis at the section level. However, determining the yield point in a moment-curvature relationship involves some subjectivity. Furthermore, the yield drift evaluated by exact integration over the pier height may differ slightly from the yield drift evaluated with the numerical integration method used in the nonlinear analysis. Thus, in determining the yield curvature, we check to make sure that displacement ductility factors close to 1.0 correspond to similar values of the strain ductility factors for the most critical fiber. For the bridges examined in this study, all piers of the bridge have identical diameter and reinforcement and thus identical yield curvature. For each bridge, the yield curvature and the corresponding yield displacements of the piers are listed in Table 5.1 to 5.4.

5.2.2 Damping

In the RHA analysis, we use Rayleigh damping with the parameters adjusted so that the damping ratios of the lower modes are close to 5%. The corresponding damping values for the first three modes of each bridge are listed in Table 5.5.

5.3 GROUND MOTION INPUT

The support excitations used for our time-history analyses are synthetic ground motions generated with the unconditioned simulation method (nonstationary case) described in Section 4.5.1. As we pointed out in Chapter 4, the arrays of motions generated with this method exhibit similar variability at all support points and, thus, are appropriate as input in statistical analyses of bridge response. This simulation method requires specification of a seed accelerogram, a coherency function that describes the spatial variability of the ground motion random field, and additionally in the case of varying soil conditions, the FRFs of the soil-columns underneath the supports. In this section, we simulate ensembles of ground motion arrays for the four bridge models considering two seed accelerograms and several cases of spatial variability.

The two seed accelerograms are the fault-normal components of the Hollister South & Pine (HSP) record from the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake and the Pacoima Dam (PUL) record from the 1971 San Fernando earthquake. Figure 5.1 and Figure 5.2 respectively show the corresponding acceleration time histories and the evolving integral measures of the variance,

predominant frequency, and bandwidth, denoted p_1 , p_2 , and p_3 (see Section 4.5 for more details). The vertical dashed lines demarcate the nearly stationary segments of the accelerograms.

To model the ground motion spatial variability, we use the coherency function in Equation (2.18) with its components given by Equations (2.19)–(2.21) in Chapter 2. To describe variations in the soil conditions, we employ the SDOF idealization of the soil-columns and use the FRF in Equation (2.23). In all cases, we assume that waves propagate in the direction from abutment 1 to the abutment at the other end of the deck. We consider four cases of spatial variability as listed in Table 5.6: Case 1 is uniform support excitations; cases 2 and 3 include the effects of incoherence and wave passage and represent two different levels of incoherence; and case 4 is case 2 plus spatially varying site effects. In all cases, the values of the shear wave velocity and the apparent wave velocity are taken to be $v_s = 600 \text{ m/s}$ and $v_{app} = 400 \text{ m/s}$, respectively. The same values of v_s and v_{app} were used in the parametric analyses in Chapter 3; however, the values of the incoherence parameter considered here ($\alpha = 0.2, 0.4$) are smaller than the value used in Chapter 3 ($\alpha = 1$). Smaller values of the incoherence parameter α represent a slower decay of the incoherence component, i.e., more coherent motions. Analyses of recorded arrays of motions (e.g., Harichandran and Vanmarcke, 1986; Abrahamson et al., 1991) have shown that the rate of decay of the incoherence component can vary significantly between different arrays. (See Chapter 6 for more details on this subject.)

For the Penstock Bridge, the support excitations in case 1 are the ground motion at bent 3 for case 2. For the South Ingram Slough Bridge, the support excitations in case 1 are the ground motion at bent 2 for case 2. For the Big Rock Wash Bridge, the support excitations in case 1 are the ground motion at bent 2 for case 2. For the Auburn Ravine Bridge, the support excitations in case 1 are the ground motion at bent 4 for case 2.

The case of varying soil conditions (case 4) is investigated only for the HSP record as seed. To determine the frequency and damping ratio of the FRF model idealizing the soil-column at the site of the record, we use the method described in Section 2.2.4 and employed in Section 4.6.2, assuming white-noise excitation at the bedrock level and fitting the theoretical PSD of the acceleration at the ground surface to the smoothed periodogram of the record. Nonlinear least-squares minimization with MATLAB gives $\omega_1/2\pi \approx 1.19$ Hz and $\zeta_1 \approx 0.6$, when the periodogram of the record is smoothed with a 101-point Hamming window. (For this specific accelerogram, the level of smoothing only slightly affects these least-squares estimates.) These values represent the characteristics of the soil at abutment 1. Figure 5.3 compares the

acceleration PSD estimate of the recorded motion and the fitted theoretical model. For case 4, we consider three soil types with idealized SDOF frequencies and damping ratios as listed in Table 5.7. Soil type 1 represents the site of the record, as described above. For each bridge, the assumed variation of soil conditions in case 4 is given in Table 5.8.

We now present samples of simulated support motion arrays from the generated ensembles used in the subsequent time-history analyses. (In all simulations, we have used the non-smoothed periodograms and a corner frequency of $f_c = 0.15$ Hz for the post-processing filter.) Figure 5.4 shows a sample set of acceleration, velocity, and displacement time histories simulated for the Penstock Bridge using the PUL record as seed and for case 2 of spatial variability (only incoherence and wave-passage effects). Figure 5.5 shows these time histories simulated for the South Ingram Slough Bridge for case 2 of spatial variability but using the HSP record as seed. Figure 5.6 shows time histories simulated for the Big Rock Wash Bridge using the HSP record as seed and for case 4 of spatial variability (site effect in addition to incoherence and wave-passage effects). In this figure, note the differences in the frequency contents of the motions at locations with different soil conditions. These differences are more apparent in the acceleration time histories, which are richer in high-frequency contents. Figure 5.7 shows time histories simulated for the Auburn Ravine Bridge using the HSP record as seed and for case 3 of spatial variability (higher level of incoherence than in case 2 and wave-passage effect). Note that all velocity and displacement time histories have zero or nearly zero residual values after the high-pass filtering.

For each bridge and each case of ground motion spatial variability described above (see Table 5.6), we now validate the simulations of support motions by examining the corresponding response spectra and coherency estimates for samples of 20 simulated arrays. In Figure 5.8 through Figure 5.11, we present the median 5% damped pseudo-acceleration response spectra. Each figure shows the median response spectra at each support of the relevant bridge and also the response spectrum of the original seed record. The median spectra of the simulated motions are a smoother version of the spectrum of the corresponding recorded seed motion. Differences between the spectra of the simulated and recorded motions also arise from the segmentation and post-processing of the simulation procedure. The median response spectra at support points with similar soil conditions are nearly identical, i.e., spectra at all support points in Figure 5.8, Figure 5.9, and Figure 5.11 and spectra at abutments 1 and 4 in Figure 5.10. These observations indicate that the simulated motions are realistic. In Figure 5.12 through Figure 5.15, we compare

coherency estimates of the simulated support motions with the corresponding target models. One example support pair for each bridge model is examined. The real and imaginary parts of the coherency function are shown in the left and right charts, respectively. The figures demonstrate excellent agreement between the estimated and theoretical coherency, which further validates the simulations.

For the Auburn Ravine Bridge, which has relatively short spans, the Cholesky decomposition of the correlation matrix (required in the simulation algorithm, see Section 4.4.1), was problematic for the lower frequencies at which the motions are nearly coherent. (MATLAB returned the message that the correlation matrix is not positive definite.) To overcome this problem, which arises from numerical instability due to a near-singular covariance matrix at low frequencies, we considered the support motions perfectly coherent at the first two or three frequency points in each segment (depending on the case), and at these frequencies, we used the Fourier coefficients simulated at location k = 1 for all support points. As indicated by the coherency estimates in Figure 5.15, this approximation is justified. (Similar good agreement between the estimates and the target coherency model justified the approximation for other cases, not shown here.)

5.4 ANALYSIS OF BRIDGE RESPONSE

In this section, we investigate the mean peak responses of the bridge models described in Section 5.2 to the ensembles of simulated support motions described in Section 5.3. Specifically, we consider cases 1–4 using the HSP record as seed and cases 1 and 2 using the PUL record as seed. For each case of spatial variability, each ensemble consists of 20 simulated support motion arrays. To achieve nonlinear behavior, the motions simulated using the HSP record as seed are scaled with a factor of 1.5. (No scaling is applied to the motions simulated using the stronger PUL record as seed.) The support excitations are applied in the transverse direction. OpenSees software is used to perform linear and nonlinear RHA of the corresponding bridge models. The response quantities of interest are the transverse pier drifts. First we investigate the effect of ground motion spatial variability on their mean peak values for both the linear and the nonlinear models. We also examine how the ratios of nonlinear over linear drifts vary for each bridge model and case of spatial variability. The latter analysis aims to assess the "equivalent displacement" rule, commonly used in engineering practice to approximately evaluate nonlinear drifts from linear analysis for sufficiently flexible systems. Finally, we assess the accuracy of the

MSRS rule by comparisons between the mean peak responses evaluated with the MSRS method and those obtained from linear RHA.

For each type of analysis, we present the results by ordering the bridges according to their fundamental periods. We start with the more flexible Penstock Bridge (T = 2.38 s), followed by the South Ingram Slough Bridge (T = 1.24 s), then the Big Rock Wash Bridge (T = 0.61 s) and the Auburn Ravine Bridge (T = 0.59 s). We note that for all bridge models, the first mode is largely transverse displacement.

5.4.1 Effect of Ground Motion Spatial Variability on Peak Linear and Nonlinear Pier Drifts

In this section, for each bridge model, we examine the effect of spatial variability on the peak linear and nonlinear drifts and on the displacement ductilities of the piers. Drifts are specified as percent ratios of the pier heights. The displacement ductility is calculated as the ratio of the peak nonlinear drift over the corresponding yield drift. The latter are listed in Table 5.1 through Table 5.4.

For the Penstock Bridge, Table 5.9 and Table 5.10 list the means and standard deviations of the peak linear and nonlinear pier drifts, respectively, and Table 5.11 lists the means and standard deviations of the displacement ductilities. Let us first examine the results for the HSP record as seed. Comparing cases 2 and 3 with case 1, we note that the presence of wave passage and incoherence may increase or decrease pier drifts of the linear model, but it tends to decrease pier drifts of the nonlinear model. Comparing cases 2 and 3, increasing the level of incoherence may increase or decrease pier drifts of the linear model, but it increases all pier drifts of the nonlinear model. When the site effect is also included, i.e., in case 4, pier drifts are the largest among all cases for both the linear and the nonlinear models. With the exception of pier 4 (the stiffest among the three piers) in case 1, nonlinear drifts are smaller than the corresponding linear ones. For motions simulated using the PUL record as seed, trends are similar to those observed with the HSP record as seed in cases 1 and 2. Ductilities follow similar trends with nonlinear drifts, and their means are in the range 1.44–1.99 for the HSP record (cases 1–4) and in the range 1.39–1.81 for the PUL record (cases 1 and 2).

For the South Ingram Slough Bridge, Table 5.12 and Table 5.13 lists the means and standard deviations of peak linear and nonlinear pier drifts, respectively, and Table 5.14 lists the means and standard deviations of the displacement ductilities. First, we examine the results for

the HSP record as seed. For both the linear and the nonlinear models, mean peak drifts under spatially varying ground motions (cases 2, 3, and 4) are smaller than those under uniform support motions (case 1). For both models, increasing level of incoherence (compare cases 2 and 3) or the additional differential site effect (compare cases 2 and 4) decreases pier drifts. In all cases, the mean peak nonlinear response is slightly smaller than the linear response. Results for the PUL record follow trends similar to those for the HSP record for the corresponding cases, but are slightly larger. Overall, the effect of spatial variability on pier drifts of the South Ingram Slough Bridge is mild. Ductilities follow trends similar to nonlinear drifts; their means are in the range 1.87–2.06 for the HSP record (cases 1–4) and in the range 2.43–2.56 for the PUL record (cases 1 and 2).

For the Big Rock Wash Bridge, Table 5.15 and Table 5.16 lists the means and standard deviations of peak linear and nonlinear pier drifts, respectively, and Table 5.17 lists the means and standard deviations of the displacement ductilities. First, we examine the results for the HSP record as seed. In case 4, there was one set of motions (in the ensemble of 20 sets) for which convergence in the nonlinear time-history analysis with OpenSees was not achieved. This set of motions was not considered in the statistics presented here, so the results for case 4 are from 19 simulations. For both the linear and the nonlinear models, mean peak drifts under spatially varying ground motions (cases 2, 3, and 4) are significantly smaller than those under uniform support motions (case 1), particularly for the piers of bent 2, which are shorter and thus stiffer. For both models, increasing level of incoherence (compare cases 2 and 3) increases pier drifts, but the effect is mild. For both models, the additional differential site effect (compare cases 2 and 4) decreases pier drifts, but again the effect is mild. In the results for the PUL record as seed, spatial variability significantly decreases linear and nonlinear pier drifts in bent 2, but has a relatively mild effect on pier drifts in bent 3. Mean peak nonlinear drifts can be smaller or larger than mean peak linear drifts, depending on the seed record, the case of spatial variability, and the location of the pier. Ductilities follow trends similar to nonlinear drifts; their means are in the range 1.90–3.81 for the HSP record (cases 1–4) and in the range 2.67–3.92 for the PUL record (cases 1 and 2), which are larger than the ductilities of the two bridges examined earlier.

For the Auburn Ravine Bridge, Table 5.18 and Table 5.19 list the means and standard deviations of peak linear and nonlinear pier drifts, respectively, and Table 5.20 lists the means and standard deviations of the displacement ductilities. First, we examine the results for the HSP record as seed. Again, in case 4, one set of motions did not achieve convergence in the nonlinear

time-history analysis, and the statistics for this case are from 19 simulations. For both the linear and the nonlinear models, mean peak drifts under spatially varying ground motions (cases 2, 3, and 4) are smaller than those under uniform support motions (case 1) for all piers. The differences are more pronounced for the piers in bents 3, 4, and 5, which are located farther away from the abutments. For both models, increasing level of incoherence (compare cases 2 and 3) increases all pier drifts, but the effect is relatively mild. The additional differential site effect (compare cases 2 and 4) may decrease or increase pier drifts. In the results for the PUL record as seed, spatial variability significantly decreases linear and nonlinear pier drifts for bents 3, 4, and 5, but tends to slightly increase pier drifts for other bents. Mean peak nonlinear drifts are always smaller than mean peak linear drifts. Ductility ratios follow trends similar to nonlinear drifts; their means are in the range 0.74–2.13 for the HSP record (cases 1–4) and in the range 1.09–2.75 for the PUL record (cases 1 and 2).

Summarizing the above results, the effect of spatial variability is more pronounced for the two stiffer bridges (Big Rock Wash and Auburn Ravine). In all cases for the Big Rock Wash Bridge and in almost all cases for the Auburn Ravine Bridge, spatial variability decreased pier drifts. For certain cases and piers, the reductions were very significant. Over all bridges and cases examined, whenever spatial variability increased pier drifts, the increase was relatively mild. These trends are true for both the linear and the nonlinear models and are consistent with the results of the MSRS analysis reported in Chapter 3.

For the linear models, we further interpret the above results by considering the decomposition of the total response into dynamic and pseudo-static components (the latter are zero in the case of uniform excitation) and the decomposition of the dynamic response into modal responses. For the cases with uniform soil conditions, the spatial variability of ground motion generally induces pseudo-static responses; however, for transverse pier drifts, these have small contributions to the total response. For the four bridge models, the dynamic responses of the pier drifts are mainly contributed by the first two transverse modes (see Section 3.2 for the modes of the four bridges). Under differential support motions, the contribution of the second transverse mode becomes larger. For the two more flexible bridges (Penstock and South Ingram Slough) and for both records used as seed, the displacement spectral values for the first two transverse modes do not differ significantly. As a result, the effect of spatial variability on the corresponding pier drifts is relatively mild. For the two stiffer bridges and for both records used as seed, displacement spectral values decrease fast with increasing modal frequency. As a result,

spatial variability results in significant reductions of the dynamic component and, consequently, of the total responses. The additional effect from differential site response tends to increase pseudo-static responses, whereas the effect on the dynamic responses depends on the differences between the spectral amplitudes for different soils at the modal frequencies of the bridge (see Figure 5.10). Thus, the total response may increase or decrease.

We compare the nonlinear and linear responses in detail in the following section.

5.4.2 Investigation of the "Equal Displacement" Rule

In Caltrans design practice, the displacement demands of a bridge with fundamental period within the range 0.7 s to 3 s are estimated from linear elastic response spectrum analysis using the effective element stiffnesses of the bridge. Estimating inelastic displacements with elastic analysis is based on the observation that the inelastic displacement of an SDOF oscillator with a bilinear force-deformation relationship is approximately equal to the displacement of a corresponding linear oscillator, provided that the period of the system is larger than the predominant site period (Veletsos and Newmark. 1960). The applicability of the "equal displacement" rule has been investigated by several researchers, including Rahnama and Krawinkler (1993), Miranda and Bertero (1994), Vidic et al. (1994), Gupta and Krawinkler (2000), and Miranda (2000). These studies have demonstrated that the "equal displacement" rule is a reasonable approximation for structures on firm sites, with fundamental periods in the medium (velocity-controlled) or long (displacement-controlled) period range, with relatively stable and full hysteretic loops. In general, a slightly conservative estimate of the mean value of the inelastic displacement may be obtained under these conditions. (According to Gupta and Krawinkler, the mean inelastic to elastic displacement ratio is around 0.85.) Miranda (2000) investigated the dispersion of the results and found that the coefficient of variation is below 0.3, for a ductility factor of 3, and that it tends to increase as the inelastic deformation increases. The transition period below which the "equal displacement" rule is unconservative depends on the frequency content of the ground motion and the ductility factor. It tends to increase (decrease) with increasing (decreasing) ductility factor (Vivic et al., 1994; Miranda, 2000).

In this section, we examine the applicability of the "equivalent displacement" rule to bridges under spatially varying ground motions. Adopting Caltrans notation, in the following analysis, we denote the ratio of nonlinear over linear drifts as C_{μ} .

Table 5.21 lists the means and standard deviations of the ratio C_{μ} for each pier of the Penstock Bridge. For the HSP record as seed, the means vary in the range 0.87–1.06 in case 1 and in the range 0.82–0.93 in cases 2–4. For the PUL record as seed, the means vary in the range 0.87–1.07 in case 1 and in the range 0.78–0.90 in case 2. In all cases, spatial variability reduces the mean C_{μ} values and slightly deteriorates the approximation of the "equal displacement" rule, but on the conservative side. The effect of spatial variability is more pronounced for pier 4, which is the stiffest of the three piers. Comparing cases 2 and 4, we note that under varying soil conditions, mean C_{μ} values are slightly larger. For each case in Table 5.21,Figure 5.16 and Figure 5.17 show plots of C_{μ} versus ductility for each of the 20 simulations. The ductility ratios for individual simulations exceed 3 in many cases and reach as high as 4 when spatially varying site effects are included (e.g., see case 4 in Figure 5.16).

Table 5.22 lists the means and standard deviations of C_{μ} for each pier of the South Ingram Slough Bridge. In all cases, the means for the two piers are the same: For the HSP record, they are equal to 0.92 in cases 1–3 and 0.94 in case 4. For the PUL record, they are equal to 0.97 in case 1 and 0.98 in case 2. Thus, in all cases, the approximation of the "equal displacement" rule is very good and the effect of spatial variability is negligible. For the cases in Table 5.22, Figure 5.18 and Figure 5.19 show plots of C_{μ} versus ductility for each of the 20 simulations. Again, the ductility is higher than 3 in many cases and reaches as high as 4 or 5 for the HSP or the PUL record as seed, respectively.

Table 5.23 lists the means and standard deviations of C_{μ} for each pier of the Big Rock Wash Bridge. For the HSP record as seed, the means vary in the range 1.13–1.15 in case 1 (slightly on the unconservative side) and in the range 0.94–1.00 in cases 2–4. For the PUL record as seed, the means vary in the range 1.04–1.05 in case 1 and in the range 0.91–1.04 in case 2. Spatial variability reduces the mean C_{μ} values, and in all cases of spatial variability the approximation of the "equal displacement" rule is fairly good. Comparing cases 2 and 4, we note that under varying soil conditions, mean C_{μ} values are slightly larger. For each case in Table 5.23, Figure 5.20 and Figure 5.21 show plots of C_{μ} versus ductility ratio for each simulation (19 simulations for case 4 in Figure 5.20 and 20 simulations in other cases). Under uniform support motions (case 1), ductility reaches as high as 6 for the HSP record as seed and as high as 8 for the PUL record as seed. Spatial variability of ground motions significantly reduces ductility ratios. Table 5.24 lists the means and standard deviations of C_{μ} for each pier of the Auburn Ravine Bridge. For the HSP record as seed, the means vary in the range 0.72–0.82 in case 1 and in the range 0.61–0.92 in cases 2–4. For the PUL record as seed, the means vary in the range 0.79–0.94 in case 1 and in the range 0.82–0.93 in case 2. Let us first consider uniform soil conditions, i.e., cases 1–3. For bents 2 and 6, which are located farther away from the abutments, the effect of spatial variability is mild. For other bents, spatial variability always decreases mean C_{μ} values, and this effect is more pronounced for the HSP record. In general, for the PUL record as seed, the approximation of the "equivalent displacement" rule is better for both cases 1 and 2. Comparing cases 2 and 4 (for the HSP record as seed) under varying soil conditions, mean C_{μ} values are larger, particularly for bents 3 and 5 which are located on softer soils. For each case in Table 5.24, Figure 5.22 and Figure 5.23 show plots of C_{μ} versus ductility ratio for each simulation (19 simulations for case 4 in Figure 5.20 and 20 simulations in other cases). Ductility reaches as high as 4 for the HSP record as seed and in some cases exceeds 4 for the PUL record as seed.

In assessing the above results, we note that the two more flexible bridges (Penstock and South Ingram Slough) have fundamental periods (T = 2.38 s and T = 1.24 s, respectively) within the range 0.7–3.0 s, in which the "equal displacement" rule is employed by Caltrans. For these bridges, under uniform excitation, the "equal displacement" approximation is fairly good, mostly on the conservative side. The two stiffer bridges (Big Rock Wash and Auburn Ravine)have fundamental periods (T = 0.61 s and T = 0.59 s, respectively) slightly lower than the lower bound considered by Caltrans. These periods are smaller than the predominant period of the site of the HSP record (≈ 0.84 s), but larger than the predominant period of the site of the PUL record (≈ 0.40 s). For the HSP record, under uniform excitation, the "equal displacement" rule is slightly unconservative for the Big Rock Wash Bridge, with corresponding ductility factors in the range 3.54–3.81, but significantly conservative for the Auburn Ravine Bridge, with ductility factors in the range of 1.12–2.13. For the PUL record, under uniform excitation, the "equal displacement" rule gives fairly good approximations, particularly for the Big Rock Wash Bridge, which experienced larger ductilities. These results are consistent with findings by Vivic et al. (1994) and Miranda (2000) that, in the short period range, C_{μ} values depend on the frequency content of the ground motion and the ductility factor. Under uniform soil conditions, spatial variability decreases mean C_{μ} values in almost all cases. Comparing cases 2 and 4, which differ only in the site conditions, locating piers on softer sites increases C_{μ} values for all bridges. Finally, the dispersion of the results is consistent with the finding by Miranda (2000): The coefficient of variation of C_{μ} tends to increase with increasing ductility factor and is below 0.3 for ductility factors smaller than 3. This can be verified by examining the ratio of the standard deviation to the mean of C_{μ} in Tables 5.21 through 5.24.

5.4.3 Assessment of the MSRS Rule by Comparisons with RHA Results

In this section, we assess the accuracy of the MSRS method by comparing MSRS estimates with the corresponding mean peak responses obtained from linear RHA. For a fair evaluation of the MSRS method, we compare mean peak responses from MSRS analysis using Equation (2.12) with mean peak responses from linear RHA using the decomposition formula in Equation (2.9), by employing the same integration method for the evaluation of the *i*th modal time-history response $s_{ki}(t)$ as the *i*th-mode spectral value $D_k(\omega_i, \zeta_i)$. We note that OpenSees does not use the decomposition approach in RHA, but performs integration of the system of equations in matrix form.

We consider the ensembles of simulations described in Section 5.3 for cases 1 and 3 and for the HSP record as seed. In our MSRS analysis, the mean response spectra are obtained by averaging 5% damped spectra for all simulations in case 1, and for all simulations and all support points in case 3. (In case 3, we average over all support points because, under uniform soil conditions, the response spectra at all support points should be the same. Indeed, in Section 5.3 we saw that the median response spectra at support points with similar soil conditions were in good agreement.) Response spectra values for damping ratios other than 5% are evaluated by adjusting the 5% damped spectral values according to Caltrans specifications (Caltrans Seismic Design Criteria, 2004). In case 1 the MSRS rule reduces to the square root of the quadruple-sum term (see Equation (2.12)) representing the dynamic component of the response. This has the same form as the well known CQC rule (Der Kiureghian, 1981), but with a more accurate approximation of the cross-modal correlation coefficients. (Evaluation of the modal cross-correlation coefficient in the MSRS rule employs the response-spectrum-compatible power spectral density shape, whereas in the CQC rule it employs a white-noise idealization.)

Preliminary analysis indicates that, for pier drifts, considering the first four modes in the analysis is sufficient for the four bridges examined. Table 5.25 and Table 5.28 list for the four respective bridges, absolute mean peak values of pier drifts from RHA with OpenSees, from

RHA with Equation (2.9) considering the first four modes, and from MSRS analysis with the first four modes, as well as the percent errors of the MSRS results relative to the results of RHA with Equation (2.9). The results from RHA with OpenSees are the same as those derived in Section 5.4.1 for the linear models and the corresponding cases, but are given in absolute values, not ratios. In all cases, the differences between the two RHA results are small, which validates our analyses. Note that the two RHA analysis methods are vastly different: the one with OpenSees involves integration of matrix equations with Rayleigh damping and the one with Equation (2.9) involves modal superposition considering only the first four modes.

Considering the absolute values of the MSRS errors, the maximum error observed is 8.5% in case 1 (Auburn Ravine Bridge, bent 2: pier 2) and 12.5% in case 3 (Auburn Ravine Bridge, bent 4: pier 1). Recall that the MSRS method is intended for use in conjunction with smooth response spectra that represent broadband excitations and a smooth coherency function. In our analysis, jagged response spectra from a relatively narrowband excitation were used. Furthermore, the smooth coherency function used for evaluation of the correlation coefficients in the MSRS analysis differs from the actual coherency values for pairs of simulated support motions, which can exhibit large fluctuations around the theoretical model. Thus, considering these differences, the results of the MSRS analysis are remarkably accurate.

5.5 SUMMARY

In this chapter, we performed analyses of linear and nonlinear responses of four bridge models with vastly different structural characteristics to several ensembles of support motion arrays simulated with the unconditioned method introduced in Chapter 4, for different cases of spatial variability of ground motions. For each ensemble of motions, we evaluated the means and standard deviations of the peak linear and nonlinear drifts, the ductility values, and the ratios of nonlinear to linear drifts. The effects of spatial variability on the linear and nonlinear mean peak drifts followed similar trends. These effects were more pronounced for the stiffer bridges. For these bridges, spatial variability reduced pier drifts. The approximation based on the "equivalent displacement" rule was found to perform fairly well for the more flexible bridges. For the stiffer bridges, the results were sensitive to the frequency content of the support motions and the ductility factors. When the predominant period of the site was smaller than the fundamental period of the bridge, the approximations were fairly good; otherwise, the "equivalent displacement" rule was slightly non-conservative for large ductility ratios and overly

conservative for small ductility ratios. We performed comparisons of the mean peak linear drifts with results from consistent MSRS analysis. The good agreement between the two methods validates that the MSRS method provides an accurate tool for the analysis of bridges under differential support motions.

Table 5.1Yield drifts of the piers of the Penstock Bridge.

Yield curvature at section level = 0.0035						
Bent 2 Bent 3 Bent 4						
Yield drift (m) 0.263 0.260 0.210						

Table 5.2	Yield drifts of the	piers of the South	Ingram Slough Bridge.
			ingram olough bhage.

Yield curvature at section level = 0.0031					
Bent 2					
	Pier 1	Pier 2			
Yield drift (m) 0.146 0.149					

Table 5.3Yield drifts of the piers of the Big Rock Wash Bridge.

Yield curvature at section level = 0.0024						
Bent 2 Bent 3						
	Middle pier	Side pier	Middle pier	Side pier		
Yield drift (m) 0.031 0.029 0.033 0.031						

Table 5.4Yield drifts of the piers of the Auburn Ravine Bridge.

Yield curvature at section level = 0.0035										
YieldBent 2Bent 3Bent 4Bent 5Bent 6							nt 6			
drift	Pier 1	Pier 2								
(m) 0.037 0.039 0.038 0.040 0.043 0.045 0.051 0.053 0.046 0							0.048			

Table 5.5Modal damping ratios (%) for the first three modes.

	Bridge name						
Mode number	Penstock	South Ingram Slough	Big Rock Wash	Auburn Ravine			
1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0			
2	3.8	4.3	4.6	4.9			
3	3.4	3.5	4.6	4.9			

Table 5.6Considered cases of ground motion spatial variability.

	Description of support motions variability
Case 1	Uniform motions
Case 2	Variable motions with incoherence ($\alpha = 0.2$) and wave passage
Case 3	Variable motions with strong incoherence ($\alpha = 0.4$) and wave passage
Case 4	Variable motions with incoherence ($\alpha = 0.2$), wave passage, and site effect

Table 5.7Variation of soil-column properties for each soil type.

Soil type	1	2	3
$\omega_k/2\pi$, Hz	1.19	1.03	0.80
ζ_k	0.60	0.50	0.40

Table 5.8	Variation of soil types underneath supports in case 4.
-----------	--

Penstock Bridge										
Support	Abu	ment 1		Bent 2	1	Bent 3		Bent 4	ŀ	Abutment 5
Soil type		1		2		3		2		1
			Sc	outh Ingran	n Slougł	n Bridge	ļ			
SupportAbutment 1Bent 2Abutment 3					ment 3					
Soil type		1			3			1		
				Big Rock	Wash B	ridge				
Support	А	utment 1		Bent	: 2		Bent 3		A	butment 4
Soil type		1		2	2 3 1			1		
Auburn Ravine Bridge										
Support	Abutment	l Ber	t 2	Bent 3	B	ent 4	Bent 5	5 F	Bent 6	Abutment 7
Soil type	1	2		3		2	3		2	1

Table 5.9Penstock Bridge: Mean (standard deviation) peak linear drifts
as % of pier height.

	Bent 2	Bent 3	Bent 4					
HSP record, scaling factor = 1.5								
Case 1	2.33 (0.63)	2.18 (0.57)	1.95 (0.51)					
Case 2	2.17 (0.61)	2.05 (0.55)	2.48 (0.74)					
Case 3	2.38 (0.93)	2.17 (0.83)	2.43 (0.76)					
Case 4	Case 4 2.50 (0.99)		2.55 (0.77)					
Case 1	2.24 (0.89)	2.08 (0.83)	1.89 (0.69)					
Case 2	2.20 (0.86)	1.98 (0.74)	2.42 (0.90)					

	Bent 2	Bent 3	Bent 4					
HSP record, scaling factor = 1.5								
Case 1	2.01 (0.55)	2.04 (0.55)	2.04 (0.50)					
Case 2	1.78 (0.45)	1.88 (0.49)	1.98 (0.53)					
Case 3	1.98 (0.79)	2.00 (0.75)	2.04 (0.71)					
Case 4	Case 4 2.09 (0.84)		2.20 (0.79)					
	PUL record, sca	ling factor = 1.0						
Case 1	1.95 (0.83)	1.99 (0.82)	2.00 (0.75)					
Case 2	1.72 (0.69)	1.80 (0.76)	2.00 (0.79)					

Table 5.10Penstock Bridge: Mean (standard deviation) peak nonlinear
drifts as % of pier height.

Table 5.11	Penstock Bridge: Mean (standard deviation) ductility ratios.
------------	--

	Bent 2	Bent 3	Bent 4		
	HSP record, sca	ling factor $= 1.5$			
Case 1	1.63 (0.44)	1.65 (0.44)	1.84 (0.46)		
Case 2	1.44 (0.37)	1.53 (0.40)	1.79 (0.48)		
Case 3	1.59 (0.64)	1.62 (0.61)	1.84 (0.65)		
Case 4	1.69 (0.68)	1.80 (0.71)	1.99 (0.72)		
PUL record, scaling factor = 1.0					
Case 1	1.58 (0.67)	1.61 (0.67)	1.81 (0.68)		
Case 2	1.39 (0.55)	1.46 (0.62)	1.81 (0.71)		

Table 5.12South Ingram Slough Bridge: Mean (standard deviation) peak
linear pier drifts as % of pier height.

	Bent 2: pier 1	Bent 2: pier 2			
	HSP record, scaling factor = 1.5				
Case 1	1.97 (0.70)	1.95 (0.69)			
Case 2	1.89 (0.66)	1.88 (0.66)			
Case 3	1.80 (0.54)	1.79 (0.53)			
Case 4	1.81 (0.71)	1.79 (0.70)			
PUL record, scaling factor = 1.0					
Case 1	2.34 (0.86)	2.32 (0.85)			
Case 2	2.25 (0.82)	2.23 (0.81)			

	Bent 2: pier 1	Bent 2: pier 2		
	HSP record, scaling factor = 1.5			
Case 1	1.79 (0.61)	1.77 (0.61)		
Case 2	1.72 (0.59)	1.70 (0.58)		
Case 3	1.65 (0.52)	1.64 (0.51)		
Case 4	1.66 (0.57)	1.65 (0.57)		
PUL record, scaling factor = 1.0				
Case 1	2.22 (0.77)	2.21 (0.77)		
Case 2	2.15 (0.74)	2.13 (0.74)		

Table 5.13South Ingram Slough Bridge: Mean (standard deviation) peak
nonlinear pier drifts as % of pier height.

Table 5.14South Ingram Slough Bridge: Mean (standard deviation)
ductility ratios.

	Bent 2: pier 1	Bent 2: pier 2		
	HSP record, scaling factor $= 1.5$			
Case 1	2.06 (0.71)	2.02 (0.69)		
Case 2	1.98 (0.68)	1.95 (0.66)		
Case 3	1.90 (0.60)	1.87 (0.59)		
Case 4	1.92 (0.66)	1.88 (0.65)		
PUL record, scaling factor $= 1.0$				
Case 1	2.56 (0.89)	2.52 (0.87)		
Case 2	2.47 (0.86)	2.43 (0.84)		

Table 5.15Big Rock Wash Bridge: Mean (standard deviation) peak linear
pier drifts as % of pier height.

	Bent 2: middle pier	Bent 2: side pier	Bent 3: middle pier	Bent 3: side pier	
	HS	SP record, scaling facto	br = 1.5		
Case 1	1.55 (0.46)	1.60 (0.48)	1.68 (0.55)	1.72 (0.57)	
Case 2	1.06 (0.24)	1.09 (0.24)	1.43 (0.35)	1.47 (0.36)	
Case 3	1.16 (0.29)	1.19 (0.29)	1.52 (0.38)	1.56 (0.39)	
Case 4	0.96 (0.24)	0.99 (0.25)	1.33 (0.35)	1.36 (0.36)	
	PUL record, scaling factor $= 1.0$				
Case 1	1.86 (0.67)	1.91 (0.69)	1.95 (0.74)	2.00 (0.76)	
Case 2	1.28 (0.33)	1.32 (0.34)	1.97 (0.76)	2.02 (0.79)	

	Bent 2: middle pier	Bent 2: side pier	Bent 3: middle pier	Bent 3: side pier
	HS	P record, scaling facto	or = 1.5	
Case 1	1.75 (0.53)	1.81 (0.55)	1.84 (0.53)	1.89 (0.55)
Case 2	1.02 (0.25)	1.05 (0.26)	1.36 (0.34)	1.40 (0.35)
Case 3	1.08 (0.28)	1.11 (0.29)	1.44 (0.33)	1.49 (0.34)
Case 4	0.94 (0.28)	0.97 (0.29)	1.34 (0.42)	1.38 (0.43)
PUL record, scaling factor $= 1.0$				
Case 1	1.83 (0.82)	1.89 (0.84)	1.88 (0.84)	1.93 (0.86)
Case 2	1.32 (0.36)	1.36 (0.37)	1.67 (0.42)	1.72 (0.43)

Table 5.16Big Rock Wash Bridge: Mean (standard deviation) peak
nonlinear pier drifts as % of pier height.

Table 5.17Big Rock Wash Bridge: Mean (standard deviation) ductility
ratios.

	Bent 2: middle pier	Bent 2: side pier	Bent 3: middle pier	Bent 3: side pier
	HS	P record, scaling facto	br = 1.5	
Case 1	3.54 (1.07)	3.75 (1.14)	3.60 (1.04)	3.81 (1.10)
Case 2	2.06 (0.50)	2.19 (0.53)	2.67 (0.63)	2.82 (0.71)
Case 3	2.17 (0.57)	2.30 (0.61)	2.83 (0.65)	2.99 (0.69)
Case 4	1.90 (0.57)	2.02 (0.60)	2.62 (0.82)	2.77 (0.87)
	PUL record, scaling factor $= 1.0$			
Case 1	3.70 (1.65)	3.92 (1.75)	3.67 (1.64)	3.88 (1.73)
Case 2	2.67 (0.73)	2.83 (0.78)	3.26 (0.82)	3.46 (0.87)

HSP record, scaling factor = 1.5				
	Case 1	Case 2	Case 3	Case 4
Bent 2: pier 1	1.12 (0.29)	0.95 (0.27)	0.96 (0.17)	1.00 (0.26)
Bent 2: pier 2	1.05 (0.27)	0.93 (0.27)	0.94 (0.18)	0.98 (0.26)
Bent 3: pier 1	1.57 (0.42)	0.86 (0.16)	0.99 (0.22)	1.25 (0.32)
Bent 3: pier 2	1.48 (0.40)	0.80 (0.16)	0.92 (0.21)	1.18 (0.30)
Bent 4: pier 1	1.85 (0.53)	0.90 (0.25)	1.10 (0.29)	0.87 (0.16)
Bent 4: pier 2	1.78 (0.51)	0.85 (0.22)	1.04 (0.25)	0.88 (0.18)
Bent 5: pier 1	1.89 (0.56)	1.14 (0.32)	1.26 (0.32)	1.09 (0.20)
Bent 5: pier 2	1.84 (0.54)	1.06 (0.30)	1.19 (0.32)	0.98 (0.19)
Bent 6: pier 1	1.92 (0.56)	1.53 (0.40)	1.57 (0.47)	1.15 (0.29)
Bent 6: pier 2	1.90 (0.55)	1.46 (0.37)	1.50 (0.45)	1.12 (0.27)
	PUL	record, scaling factor	r = 1.0	
	Case 1	Case 2		
Bent 2: pier 1	1.45 (0.53)	1.62 (0.75)		
Bent 2: pier 2	1.39 (0.51)	1.63 (0.74)		
Bent 3: pier 1	1.88 (0.73)	1.32 (0.50)		
Bent 3: pier 2	1.79 (0.69)	1.28 (0.51)		
Bent 4: pier 1	2.13 (0.85)	1.01 (0.27)		
Bent 4: pier 2	2.06 (0.82)	0.99 (0.27)		
Bent 5: pier 1	2.02 (0.79)	1.11 (0.44)		
Bent 5: pier 2	1.99 (0.78)	1.03 (0.39)		
Bent 6: pier 1	1.94 (0.74)	1.95 (0.81)		
Bent 6: pier 2	1.91 (0.72)	1.78 (0.76)		

Table 5.18Auburn Ravine Bridge: Mean (standard deviation) peak linear
pier drifts as % of pier height.

HSP record, scaling factor = 1.5				
	Case 1	Case 2	Case 3	Case 4
Bent 2: pier 1	0.80 (0.20)	0.69 (0.20)	0.71 (0.13)	0.75 (0.21)
Bent 2: pier 2	0.75 (0.19)	0.67 (0.20)	0.69 (0.15)	0.74 (0.20)
Bent 3: pier 1	1.17 (0.35)	0.54 (0.13)	0.59 (0.11)	1.15 (0.42)
Bent 3: pier 2	1.10 (0.32)	0.50 (0.12)	0.55 (0.10)	1.08 (0.40)
Bent 4: pier 1	1.46 (0.48)	0.58 (0.17)	0.69 (0.18)	0.70 (0.15)
Bent 4: pier 2	1.39 (0.45)	0.53 (0.15)	0.63 (0.16)	0.70 (0.14)
Bent 5: pier 1	1.52 (0.49)	0.73 (0.21)	0.87 (0.29)	1.01 (0.30)
Bent 5: pier 2	1.48 (0.48)	0.66 (0.18)	0.81 (0.28)	0.90 (0.27)
Bent 6: pier 1	1.56 (0.47)	1.07 (0.33)	1.22 (0.38)	0.84 (0.24)
Bent 6: pier 2	1.54 (0.47)	1.00 (0.30)	1.14 (0.35)	0.81 (0.23)
	PUL	record, scaling factor	r = 1.0	
	Case 1	Case 2		
Bent 2: pier 1	1.30 (0.37)	1.40 (0.37)		
Bent 2: pier 2	1.24 (0.35)	1.36 (0.35)		
Bent 3: pier 1	1.73 (0.59)	1.18 (0.36)		
Bent 3: pier 2	1.64 (0.56)	1.13 (0.35)		
Bent 4: pier 1	1.95 (0.66)	0.83 (0.26)		
Bent 4: pier 2	1.89 (0.65)	0.79 (0.23)		
Bent 5: pier 1	1.70 (0.58)	0.95 (0.42)		
Bent 5: pier 2	1.70 (0.58)	0.87 (0.36)		
Bent 6: pier 1	1.45 (0.41)	1.70 (0.68)		
Bent 6: pier 2	1.46 (0.43)	1.55 (0.63)		

Table 5.19Auburn Ravine Bridge: Mean (standard deviation) peak
nonlinear pier drifts as % of pier height.

HSP record, scaling factor = 1.5				
	Case 1	Case 2	Case 3	Case 4
Bent 2: pier 1	1.22 (0.31)	1.06 (0.30)	1.08 (0.20)	1.15 (0.32)
Bent 2: pier 2	1.12 (0.28)	1.00 (0.30)	1.03 (0.22)	1.10 (0.30)
Bent 3: pier 1	1.76 (0.53)	0.80 (0.19)	0.89 (0.16)	1.74 (0.64)
Bent 3: pier 2	1.61 (0.48)	0.74 (0.18)	0.80 (0.15)	1.59 (0.59)
Bent 4: pier 1	2.05 (0.67)	0.82 (0.24)	0.98 (0.25)	0.98 (0.21)
Bent 4: pier 2	1.92 (0.63)	0.74 (0.20)	0.87 (0.22)	0.97 (0.20)
Bent 5: pier 1	1.98 (0.64)	0.95 (0.27)	1.14 (0.37)	1.32 (0.39)
Bent 5: pier 2	1.89 (0.62)	0.84 (0.23)	1.03 (0.35)	1.15 (0.34)
Bent 6: pier 1	2.13 (0.64)	1.47 (0.45)	1.67 (0.52)	1.15 (0.33)
Bent 6: pier 2	2.06 (0.63)	1.34 (0.40)	1.52 (0.47)	1.09 (0.31)
	PUL	record, scaling factor	r = 1.0	
	Case 1	Case 2		
Bent 2: pier 1	1.99 (0.57)	2.14 (0.57)		
Bent 2: pier 2	1.85 (0.52)	2.03 (0.52)		
Bent 3: pier 1	2.60 (0.89)	1.78 (0.54)		
Bent 3: pier 2	2.41 (0.82)	1.66 (0.51)		
Bent 4: pier 1	2.75 (0.93)	1.16 (0.36)		
Bent 4: pier 2	2.60 (0.89)	1.09 (0.32)		
Bent 5: pier 1	2.22 (0.75)	1.23 (0.55)		
Bent 5: pier 2	2.17 (0.73)	1.11 (0.46)		
Bent 6: pier 1	1.98 (0.56)	2.32 (0.93)		
Bent 6: pier 2	1.95 (0.57)	2.07 (0.84)		

Table 5.20Auburn Ravine Bridge: Mean (standard deviation) ductility
ratios.

	Bent 2	Bent 3	Bent 4	
	HSP record, sca	ling factor = 1.5		
Case 1	0.87 (0.09)	0.94 (0.10)	1.06 (0.13)	
Case 2	0.83 (0.12)	0.92 (0.10)	0.82 (0.15)	
Case 3	0.84 (0.12)	0.93 (0.13)	0.85 (0.16)	
Case 4	0.85 (0.09)	0.93 (0.11)	0.86 (0.16)	
PUL record, scaling factor $= 1.0$				
Case 1	0.87 (0.14)	0.96 (0.14)	1.07 (0.17)	
Case 2	0.78 (0.13)	0.90 (0.14)	0.83 (0.19)	

Table 5.21 Penstock Bridge: Mean (standard deviation) values of C_{μ} ratios.

Table 5.22South Ingram Slough Bridge: Mean (standard deviation)
values of C_{μ} ratios.

	Bent 2: pier 1 Bent 2: pier 2				
HSP record, scaling factor = 1.5					
Case 1	0.92 (0.11)	0.92 (0.11)			
Case 2	0.92 (0.11)	0.92 (0.11)			
Case 3	0.92 (0.10)	0.92 (0.10)			
Case 4	0.94 (0.14)	0.94 (0.14)			
	PUL record, scaling factor = 1.0				
Case 1	0.97 (0.15)	0.97 (0.15)			
Case 2	0.98 (0.14)	0.98 (0.14)			

Table 5.23Big Rock Wash Bridge: Mean (standard deviation) values of
 C_{μ} ratios.

	Bent 2: middle pier	Bent 2: side pier	Bent 3: middle pier	Bent 3: side pier
	HS	SP record, scaling facto	br = 1.5	
Case 1	1.15 (0.26)	1.15 (0.26)	1.13 (0.26)	1.13 (0.26)
Case 2	0.97 (0.14)	0.97 (0.14)	0.96 (0.12)	0.96 (0.12)
Case 3	Case 3 0.94 (0.17)		0.96 (0.14)	0.96 (0.14)
Case 4	0.98 (0.13)	0.98 (0.13)	1.00 (0.14)	1.00 (0.14)
PUL record, scaling factor $= 1.0$				
Case 1	1.05 (0.54)	1.05 (0.54)	1.04 (0.53)	1.04 (0.53)
Case 2 1.04 (0.19)		1.04 (0.19)	0.91 (0.24)	0.91 (0.24)

HSP record, scaling factor = 1.5					
	Case 1	Case 2	Case 3	Case 4	
Bent 2: pier 1	0.72 (0.10)	0.74 (0.16)	0.74 (0.11)	0.76 (0.13)	
Bent 2: pier 2	0.72 (0.10)	0.73 (0.16)	0.74 (0.08)	0.76 (0.12)	
Bent 3: pier 1	0.75 (0.11)	0.63 (0.11)	0.61 (0.09)	0.92 (0.13)	
Bent 3: pier 2	0.74 (0.11)	0.63 (0.13)	0.61 (0.11)	0.91 (0.13)	
Bent 4: pier 1	0.79 (0.13)	0.66 (0.14)	0.64 (0.08)	0.81 (0.13)	
Bent 4: pier 2	0.79 (0.13)	0.64 (0.15)	0.61 (0.09)	0.81 (0.13)	
Bent 5: pier 1	0.81 (0.12)	0.65 (0.12)	0.69 (0.11)	0.92 (0.16)	
Bent 5: pier 2	0.81 (0.12)	0.63 (0.13)	0.67 (0.11)	0.92 (0.16)	
Bent 6: pier 1	0.82 (0.11)	0.70 (0.11)	0.79 (0.13)	0.74 (0.09)	
Bent 6: pier 2	0.82 (0.11)	0.69 (0.11)	0.76 (0.13)	0.73 (0.09)	
	PUL 1	record, scaling factor	r = 1.0		
	Case 1	Case 2			
Bent 2: pier 1	0.92 (0.14)	0.92 (0.17)			
Bent 2: pier 2	0.92 (0.15)	0.89 (0.16)			
Bent 3: pier 1	0.94 (0.12)	0.93 (0.14)			
Bent 3: pier 2	0.94 (0.12)	0.92 (0.15)			
Bent 4: pier 1	0.94 (0.13)	0.83 (0.17)			
Bent 4: pier 2	0.94 (0.12)	0.82 (0.16)			
Bent 5: pier 1	0.87 (0.13)	0.85 (0.11)			
Bent 5: pier 2	0.88 (0.13)	0.85 (0.11)			
Bent 6: pier 1	0.79 (0.15)	0.88 (0.09)			
Bent 6: pier 2	0.80 (0.14)	0.88 (0.09)			

Table 5.24 Auburn Ravine Bridge: Mean (standard deviation) values of \mathcal{C}_{μ} ratios.

Table 5.25	Penstock Bridge: Comparison of RHA and MSRS mean peak
	pier drift estimates.

Case 1						
Location	Location RHA with OpenSees (m)		MSRS (m)	Error (%)		
Bent 2	0.494	0.484	0.482	-0.4		
Bent 3	0.460	0.452	0.444	-1.8		
Bent 4 0.370		0.362	0.345 -4.7			
		Case 3				
Location	RHA with OpenSees (m)	RHA with Equation (2.9) (m)	MSRS (m)	Error (%)		
Bent 2	0.505	0.487	0.480	-1.4		
Bent 3	0.459	0.449	0.452	0.7		
Bent 4	0.460	0.442	0.410	-7.2		

Table 5.26South Ingram Slough Bridge: Comparison of RHA and MSRS
mean peak pier drift estimates.

Case 1					
Location	RHA with	RHA with	MSRS (m)	Error (%)	
Location	OpenSees (m)	Equation (2.9) (m)		LII01 (70)	
Bent 2: pier 1	0.331	0.325	0.325	0.0	
Bent 2: pier 2	0.331	0.325	0.325	0.0	
		Case 3			
Location	RHA with	RHA with	MSDS(m)	$\mathbf{E}\mathbf{rror}(0/\mathbf{)}$	
Location	OpenSees (m)	Equation (2.9) (m)	MSKS (III)	EIIOI (%)	
Bent 2: pier 1	0.303	0.295	0.294	-0.3	
Bent 2: pier 2	0.303	0.295	0.294	-0.3	

Case 1					
Location	RHA with	$\begin{array}{c c} RHA \text{ with} \\ F & (2,0) \\ \end{array} \qquad MSRS (m)$		Error (%)	
	OpenSees (m)	Equation (2.9) (m)			
Bent 2: middle	0.096	0.094	0.092	-2.1	
Bent 2: side	0.096	0.094	0.092	-2.1	
Bent 3: middle	0.107	0.105	0.106	1.0	
Bent 3: side	0.107 0.105 0.106		1.0		
		Case 3			
Location	RHA with	RHA with		$E_{rror}(0/)$	
Location	OpenSees (m)	Equation (2.9) (m)	MSKS (III)	Effor (%)	
Bent 2: middle	0.072	0.067	0.063	-6.0	
Bent 2: side	0.072	0.067	0.063	-6.0	
Bent 3: middle	0.097	0.093	0.088	-5.4	
Bent 3: side	0.097	0.093	0.088	-5.4	

Table 5.27Big Rock Wash Bridge: Comparison of RHA and MSRS mean
peak pier drift estimates .

Table 5.28Auburn Ravine Bridge: Comparison of RHA and MSRS mean
peak pier drift estimates.

Case 1					
Location	RHA with	RHA with	MCDC (m)	error (%)	
Location	OpenSees (m)	Equation (2.9) (m)	MSKS (III)		
Bent 2: pier 1	0.063	0.062	0.057	-8.1	
Bent 2: pier 2	0.061	0.059	0.054	-8.5	
Bent 3: pier 1	0.089	0.088	0.085	-3.4	
Bent 3: pier 2	0.087	0.086	0.082	-4.7	
Bent 4: pier 1	0.113	0.111	0.110	-0.9	
Bent 4: pier 2	0.111	0.109	0.108	-0.9	
Bent 5: pier 1	0.124	0.121	0.122	0.8	
Bent 5: pier 2	0.124	0.121	0.122	0.8	
Bent 6: pier 1	0.120	0.116	0.117	0.9	
Bent 6: pier 2	0.122	0.117	1.7		
		Case 3			
	RHA with	RHA with	MSPS(m)	$\operatorname{orror}(0/)$	
	OpenSees (m)	Equation (2.9) (m)			
Bent 2: pier 1	0.054	0.050	0.049	-2.0	
Bent 2: pier 2	0.054	0.050	0.049	-2.0	
Bent 3: pier 1	0.057	0.052	0.046	-11.5	
Bent 3: pier 2	0.054	0.050	0.045	-10.0	
Bent 4: pier 1	0.067	0.064	0.056	-12.5	
Bent 4: pier 2	0.065	0.061	0.054	-11.5	
Bent 5: pier 1	0.083	0.078	0.071	-9.0	
Bent 5: pier 2	0.080	0.077	0.069	-10.4	
Bent 6: pier 1	0.098	0.093	0.086	-7.5	
Bent 6: pier 2	0.096	0.092	0.084	-8.7	



Figure 5.1 "Stationary" segments of the HSP accelerogram selected based on integral measures of evolving cumulative energy, predominant frequency, and bandwidth.



Figure 5.2 "Stationary" segments of the PUL accelerogram selected based on integral measures of evolving cumulative energy, predominant frequency, and bandwidth.



Figure 5.3 Comparison of estimated and fitted theoretical PSD for the HSP record.

Acceleration time-histories (g)



н1 1	100 L.	-roman	deman	_					
ā	-100 L	<u> </u>							
.00	1000	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40
H2	100 F~~		Admin						
æ	-100 L	<u> </u>							
م	0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40
H3	100 L		Alexandren						
8	-100	V 1 1 V 11	,		1	1	1	1	
٩	0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40
H4	100 L	_ non he	at when a second						
æ	-100	<u>v</u> iv	· · · ·						
2	0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40
H2	¹⁰ 8	_ r and the	all and the second s						
ā	-100	<u> </u>	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						
(T	0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40
					t, s				





Figure 5.4 Example set of simulated support motions for Penstock Bridge (PUL record as seed, case 2).



Acceleration time-histories (g)

Figure 5.5 Example set of simulated support motions for South Ingram Slough Bridge (HSP record as seed, case 2).





Figure 5.6 Example set of simulated support motions for Big Rock Wash bridge (HSP record as seed, case 4).

Acceleration time-histories (g)







Displacement time-histories (cm)



Figure 5.7 Example set of simulated support motions for Auburn Ravine bridge (HSP record as seed, case 3).



Figure 5.8 Median acceleration response spectra for support motions of Penstock Bridge (PUL record as seed, case 2).



Figure 5.9 Median acceleration response spectra for support motions of South Ingram Slough Bridge (HSP record as seed, case 2).



Figure 5.10 Median acceleration response spectra for support motions of Big Rock Wash bridge (HSP record as seed, case 4).


Figure 5.11 Median acceleration response spectra for support motions of Auburn Ravine bridge (HSP record as seed, case 3).



Figure 5.12 Coherency estimates for support motions of Penstock Bridge (PUL record as seed, case 2).



Figure 5.13 Coherency estimates for support motions of South Ingram Slough Bridge (HSP record as seed, case 2).



Figure 5.14 Coherency estimates for support motions of Big Rock Wash bridge (HSP record as seed, case 4).



Figure 5.15 Coherency estimates for support motions of Auburn Ravine bridge (HSP record as seed, case 3).



Figure 5.16 C_{μ} ratio versus ductility for Penstock Bridge (HSP record as seed, scaling factor = 1.5).



Figure 5.17 C_{μ} ratio versus ductility for Penstock Bridge (PUL record as seed, scaling factor = 1.0).



Figure 5.18 C_{μ} ratio versus ductility for South Ingram Slough Bridge (HSP record as seed, scaling factor = 1.5).



Figure 5.19 C_{μ} ratio versus ductility for South Ingram Slough Bridge (PUL record as seed, scaling factor = 1.0).







Figure 5.20 C_{μ} ratio versus ductility for Big Rock Wash Bridge (HSP record as seed, scaling factor = 1.5).



Figure 5.21 C_{μ} ratio versus ductility for Big Rock Wash Bridge (PUL record as seed, scaling factor = 1.0).

case 1



case 2



case 3



case 4



Figure 5.22 C_{μ} ratio versus ductility for Auburn Ravine Bridge (HSP record as seed, scaling factor = 1.5).







case 2

Figure 5.23 C_{μ} ratio versus ductility for Auburn Ravine Bridge (PUL record as seed, scaling factor = 1.0).

6 Coherency Analysis of Accelerations Recorded by the UPSAR Array

6.1 INTRODUCTION

In previous chapters, we used the notion of the coherency function to evaluate the crosscorrelation coefficients required in response spectrum analysis of multiply supported structures (Chapters 2 and 3). We also used the coherency function to determine distributions of Fourier coefficients in simulating arrays of spatially varying ground motions (Chapter 4). The complexvalued coherency function was defined in Chapter 2 and models that describe its components (the incoherence, wave-passage, and site-response effects) were introduced. We saw that the modulus of the coherency function represents the incoherence component, whereas the phase angle is associated with the wave-passage and site-response effects. The phase angle caused by wave-passage is evaluated in terms of the projected algebraic inter-station distance in the direction of propagation of waves and the apparent wave velocity. The phase angle caused by differential site response is determined in terms of the frequency response functions (FRFs) of soil columns under certain simplifying assumptions of upward wave propagation. However, due to the completely random nature of the incoherence effect, it is not possible to determine a specific form for the modulus of the coherency function.

One approach to model the incoherence component is to use a theoretical model employing parameters that can be determined through statistical inference. A general form for such a theoretical model was derived by Der Kiureghian (1996) by using a probabilistic approach. A special case is the model by Luco and Wong (1986), which we have adopted in our analysis so far. This model is based on the theory of wave propagation and describes the incoherence component in terms of the inter-station distance, the shear-wave velocity, and an incoherence parameter. The incoherence parameter is estimated empirically (Luco and Wong, 1986) or determined in terms of the soil properties and depth of soil layers (Zerva and Harada,

1984). Another approach to model the incoherence component is to develop empirical models using data from recorded acceleration arrays (e.g., Harichandran and Vanmarcke, 1986; Abrahamson et al., 1991). Empirical models account for the complex phenomena that occur during wave propagation and are not captured by simplified mathematical models, but they characterize only the specific rupture mechanisms and soil topographies.

In this chapter, we examine spatial variations observed during the 2004 Parkfield (California) earthquake using the UPSAR array of closely spaced acceleration records (Fletcher et al., 2006; Kim and Dreger, 2008) and compare coherency estimates from these data with existing theoretical and empirical models. The recording sites are approximately 12 km from the fault rupture, which is a shorter distance than those for most arrays used in previous studies (see, e.g., Harichandran and Vanmarcke, 1986; Abrahamson et al., 1991). Therefore, one objective of this study is to determine if there is a substantial difference in the coherency characteristics of these near-fault records relative to existing models. Note that, though near-fault, the records used in this study do not exhibit directivity pulses.

6.2 DESCRIPTION OF DATA

The data analyzed in this chapter consist of the acceleration time-histories recorded at 12 stations of the UPSAR array during the 2004 Parkfield earthquake of magnitude $M_w = 6.0$ (Fletcher et al., 2006; Kim and Dreger, 2008). The array is located approximately 12 km from the fault rupture. The geometry of the station locations is shown in Figure 6.1, where each station is identified by the letter S followed by a number from 1 to 12. The horizontal and vertical axes indicate the E-W and N-S orientations, respectively. The earthquake source is located to the east of the recording sites. For the coherency analysis, station 5 is selected as the point with zero coordinates. This choice does not affect the results as we are only interested in relative station distances. The inter-station distances of all 66 station pairs vary in the range 25.0–951.9 m. In the following analysis, we only consider inter-station distances in the range 0–500 m and separate those in ten 50-m bins. Table 6.1 lists the number of station pairs and the mean inter-station distance for each bin.

For each station, recordings of the acceleration components in the N-S, E-W, and vertical directions are available. Each acceleration time history has a total duration of 200 s and is sampled at N = 40,000 points with a time step of $\Delta t = 0.005$ s. The acceleration time histories for the first 20 s, which include the strong shaking phase, are shown in Figure 6.2, 6.3, and 6.4

for the N-S, E-W, and vertical components, respectively. A common scale for the vertical axis is selected for all horizontal components and another for all vertical components to facilitate comparison of the intensities. The peak ground accelerations (PGAs) for all components and stations are listed in Table 6.2.

6.3 POWER SPECTRAL DENSITY ESTIMATES

The acceleration time-histories in Figure 6.2 to Figure 6.4 indicate spatial variations in both intensities and frequency contents. To gain insight, we plot the acceleration PSD estimates of the N-S and E-W components in Figure 6.5 and Figure 6.6, respectively, and the PSD estimates of the vertical components in Figure 6.7. These estimates are obtained by smoothing the corresponding periodograms (see Equation (4.5) in Chapter 4) with a Hamming window of 0.5 Hz width. In general, vertical accelerations are smaller than the horizontal ones.

The PSD of surface ground acceleration at a site is influenced by the characteristics of the local soil layers. For stiffer soils, the acceleration PSD tends to be broader and richer in high-frequency components, whereas for softer soils, it tends to be narrow-band and richer in low-frequency content, sometimes exhibiting a predominant resonant frequency. Comparing Figure 6.4 with Figure 6.2 and Figure 6.3, it appears that the vertical accelerations are more broadband processes than the horizontal ones, suggesting that the soil is stiffer in the vertical direction. Several of the stations show predominant peaks, which may be due to local soil effects or topology. These effects are naturally included in the coherency estimates described below.

6.4 COHERENCY ESTIMATES

In this section, we present coherency estimates from the accelerograms recorded by the UPSAR array. Specifically, we examine estimates of the modulus of the coherency function $|\gamma_{kl}|$, its real and imaginary parts, Re(γ_{kl}) and Im(γ_{kl}), respectively, and the coherency phase angle θ_{kl} . See Section 2.2.3 for the definitions of these quantities. Estimates of these coherency measures are obtained as functions of frequency for each inter-station distance bin and for the horizontal and vertical components separately. In estimating the coherency of the horizontal components, we do not account for any directional dependence, i.e., we combine the results for the N-S and E-W components.

The steps involved in estimating each of the above functions for a given inter-station distance bin and pair of acceleration components (or horizontal or vertical) are the following:

- 1. For each pair of accelerograms in the inter-station distance bin and for the component direction considered:
 - Evaluate the real and imaginary parts of the cross-periodogram using Equations (4.6) (in Chapter 4) and smooth them using a Hamming window of a selected width. This represents an estimate of the cross-PSD of the pair of accelerograms.
 - b. Evaluate the periodogram for each component of the pair and smooth it using a Hamming window having the same width as that used in step 1a. This represents an estimate of the auto-PSD of the accelerogram.
 - c. Use the estimates of the auto- and cross-PSDs to evaluate $\text{Re}(\gamma_{kl})$ and $\text{Im}(\gamma_{kl})$, where γ_{kl} is defined as in Equation (2.17) of Chapter 2.
 - d. Use the estimates of $\operatorname{Re}(\gamma_{kl})$ and $\operatorname{Im}(\gamma_{kl})$ from step 1c to evaluate $|\gamma_{kl}| = \{[\operatorname{Re}(\gamma_{kl})]^2 + [\operatorname{Im}(\gamma_{kl})]^2\}^{1/2}$ and $\theta_{kl} = \tan^{-1}[\operatorname{Im}(\gamma_{kl})/\operatorname{Re}(\gamma_{kl})]$.
- 2. For each of the functions $\text{Re}(\gamma_{kl})$, $\text{Im}(\gamma_{kl})$, $|\gamma_{kl}|$, and θ_{kl} , we average the estimates obtained in steps 1c and 1d for all pairs in the bin for the considered component. For the horizontal components, we average the estimates in both N-S and E-W directions. Each considered pair consists of records in the same direction.

Estimation of auto- and cross-PSDs through the cross-periodograms and periodograms is valid for stationary processes, but is applied here under the assumption that the strong-motion segment of the accelerograms, which accounts for most of the power in the frequency domain, is nearly stationary. The results of the analysis are shown in Figure 6.8 to Figure 6.15. In these figures, each inter-station distance bin is represented by the middle point of the corresponding range and is denoted as d_{kl} .

Figure 6.8 and Figure 6.9 show estimates of the modulus of the coherency function $|\gamma_{kl}|$ for the horizontal and vertical components, respectively, and for three levels of smoothing corresponding to Hamming-window widths of 0.25, 0.50, and 1 Hz. For a given window width, the smoothness of the coherency estimate varies depending on the number of station pairs in the inter-station distance bin. As expected, both the vertical and horizontal estimates for bin 7 (inter-

station distances 300–350 m) are smoothest because that bin has the largest number of records (13) (see Table 6.1).

In general in Figure 6.8 and Figure 6.9, the wider the smoothing window, the more biased the coherency estimate is. For the higher level of smoothing considered, i.e., for the 1 Hz window width, estimates of the modulus of coherency deviate from the theoretical unity value at zero frequency. On the other hand, for the lower level of smoothing considered, i.e., for the 0.25 Hz window width, the estimates are too jagged, which makes it difficult to interpret the results and identify trends. Thus, we select the 0.50 Hz Hamming window width as the most appropriate for our analysis. In the following, we only examine coherency estimates for this level of smoothing.

Figure 6.8 and Figure 6.9 indicate decay of the modulus of the coherency function with increasing frequency and increasing inter-station distance. We note that the coherency modulus for the vertical components decays slightly faster than that of the horizontal components, except for the first bin. At high frequencies, the estimate of the coherency modulus does not approach zero, even for large distance bins. The value approached represents the coherency of the random noise in the recorded motions.

Figure 6.10 and Figure 6.11 show estimates of the real part of the coherency function, $\text{Re}(\gamma_{kl})$, for the horizontal and vertical components, respectively. In the absence of wave passage and for similar soil conditions, $|\gamma_{kl}|$ and $\text{Re}(\gamma_{kl})$ are identical. Thus, the differences between the estimates in Figure 6.8 and Figure 6.10 and between the estimates in Figure 6.9 and Figure 6.11 are indicative of the wave-passage and site-response effects. These differences are greater when the actual coherency approaches zero. In these regions, the estimates of the real parts tend to be scattered on either side of zero, whereas the estimates of the coherency modulus are always positive. Thus, smoothing with a wider window would result in nearly zero estimates for the real parts, but not for the modulus.

Figure 6.12 and Figure 6.13 show estimates of the imaginary part of the coherency function, $Im(\gamma_{kl})$, for the horizontal and vertical components, respectively. These figures are rather hard to interpret because of the small values of the imaginary parts of the coherency function and the large scatter due to noise when the actual coherency is small. However, for each bin, we can identify the frequency ranges dominated by noise by comparison with the corresponding graphs in Figure 6.8 and Figure 6.9, in which these ranges are more apparent.

Figure 6.14 and Figure 6.15 show estimates of the coherency phase angle function θ_{kl} , which is wrapped within the interval $-1 \le \theta_{kl}/\pi \le 1$, for the horizontal and vertical components, respectively. Again, we can identify the frequency ranges that are dominated by noise by comparison with the graphs in Figure 6.8 and 6.9, respectively. For other frequencies, phase angles increase with increasing frequency and separation distance.

6.5 COMPARISON OF COHERENCY ESTIMATES WITH EXISTING MODELS

6.5.1 Comparison with Theoretical Model

In this section, we examine how the coherency estimates from the UPSAR recordings compare with the theoretical model by Luco and Wong (1986). This model was introduced in Chapter 2 (see Equation (2.19)) and describes the incoherence component in terms of the inter-station distance d_{kl} , the shear-wave velocity v_s , and a single incoherence parameter α . Luco and Wong suggested that typical values of the ratio α/v_s are in the range $(2 - 3) \times 10^{-4}$. In the following, we determine values of the ratio α/v_s that fit the estimates of the modulus of the coherency function obtained for the UPSAR data.

First consider the coherency estimates of the horizontal components. We apply the MATLAB nonlinear least-squares minimization algorithm on the variance-stabilizing transformation of the coherency modulus, $\tanh^{-1}|\gamma_{kl}|$ (Brillinger, 2001). Estimates of $\tanh^{-1}|\gamma_{kl}|$ are obtained by applying the procedure described in Section 6.4, but for $\tanh^{-1}|\gamma_{kl}|$ instead of $|\gamma_{kl}|$ in step 1d. In Section 6.4 we saw that for large frequencies, the coherency estimates tend to be dominated by noise. This is not captured by the Luco and Wong model, which gives asymptotically zero values for large frequencies. Thus, we expect that the range of frequencies considered in the least-squares minimization process may affect the results. In Table 6.3, for each inter-station distance bin, we list the values of α/v_s obtained by fitting in the range of frequencies ($0, \omega_{end}$), with $\omega_{end}/2\pi$ taking the values 2, 4, and 8 Hz. With the exception of the first bin, the results are not affected or are only slightly affected by the choice of ω_{end} . Figure 6.16 compares the estimates of $\tanh^{-1}|\gamma_{kl}|$ with the fitted Luco and Wong model for the α/v_s values obtained when $\omega_{end}/2\pi = 4$ Hz. For the same values of α/v_s , Figure 6.17 compares the estimated and fitted curves for $|\gamma_{kl}|$.

A similar analysis is repeated for the coherency of the vertical components. Table 6.4 shows the values of α/v_s obtained by fitting in the same ranges of frequencies considered for the

horizontal components. We note that the choice of ω_{end} affects the results in the first three bins. Figure 6.18 compares the estimates of $\tanh^{-1}|\gamma_{kl}|$ with the fitted Luco and Wong model for the α/v_s values obtained when $\omega_{end}/2\pi = 4$ Hz. For the same values of α/v_s , Figure 6.19 compares the estimated and fitted curves for $|\gamma_{kl}|$.

We note that if we were to fit $|\gamma_{kl}|$ instead of $\tanh^{-1}|\gamma_{kl}|$, the results would be largely affected by the choice of ω_{end} , which should be carefully selected so that the region dominated by noise is excluded. This would obviously involve more subjectivity. We also note that the estimated values of α/v_s in Table 6.3 and Table 6.4 are somewhat larger than the range suggested by Luco and Wong (1986). This could be due the topology of the recording sites or due to the near-source nature of the recordings. Comparing Table 6.3 and Table 6.4, it is clear that the decay of coherency with frequency is faster for the vertical components than the horizontal components.

6.5.2 Comparison with Empirical Models

In this section, we compare the estimates of the coherency modulus from the UPSAR data with two well-known empirical models by Harichandran and Vanmarcke (1986) and Abrahamson et al. (1991).

Harichandran and Vanmarcke developed a coherency model using horizontal recordings from the SMART 1 array in Taiwan, which is characterized by a minimum station spacing of 100 m. This model is based on data from one far-field event and describes the modulus of coherency as

$$|\gamma_{kl}| = A \exp\left[-\frac{2\nu}{\alpha \,\theta(\omega)} (1 - A + \alpha A)\right] + (1 - A) \exp\left[-\frac{2\nu}{\theta(\omega)} (1 - A + \alpha A)\right],\tag{6.1}$$

where $\theta(\omega) = k[1 + (\omega/\omega_0)^b]^{-1/2}$, A = 0.736, $\alpha = 0.147$, k = 5210, $\omega_0 = 1.09/2\pi$, and b = 2.78. Abrahamson et al. used data from 15 earthquakes recorded by the Lotung LSST array, a dense array located within the SMART 1 array. The set of data includes both near-fault and far-field records. The model was derived from analysis of the horizontal components only and for separation distances less than 100 m. According to this model, $tanh^{-1}|\gamma_{kl}|$ is given by

 $\tanh^{-1}|\gamma_{kl}| = (2.54 - 0.012d_{kl})\{\exp[(-0.115 - 0.00084d_{kl})f] + (1/3)f^{-0.878}\} + 0.35 \quad (6.2)$ where $f = \omega/2\pi$. In Figure 6.20, we compare the estimates of the coherency modulus from the horizontal UPSAR accelerograms with the model by Harichandran and Vanmarcke for distances greater than 100 m, i.e., for the inter-station distance bins 3–10. The coherency estimates from the UPSAR data differ significantly from the coherency described by this model. For frequencies close to zero, the model by Harichandran and Vanmarcke gives values smaller than unity, which is not reasonable. Earlier, we saw that the estimated coherency for zero values depends on the level of smoothing (see Figure 6.8 and Figure 6.9). But, on physical grounds, the modulus of coherency function must approach 1 at zero frequencies, the coherency of the UPSAR accelerograms decays at a much faster rate than the coherency described by the Harichandran and Vanmarcke model. However, for larger frequencies, when noise is dominant, the model by Harichandran and Vanmarcke gives smaller coherency values.

In Figure 6.21, we compare the estimates of $\tanh^{-1}|\gamma_{kl}|$ from the horizontal UPSAR accelerograms with the model of Abrahamson et al. for distances less than 100 m, i.e., for the first two inter-station distance bins. In Figure 6.22, we plot the corresponding curves for the modulus of coherency $|\gamma_{kl}|$. In contrast with the model by Harichandran and Vanmarcke, the model of Abrahamson et al. describes perfectly coherent motions at zero frequency. However, in the range of frequencies of interest (when noise is not dominant), the coherency of the UPSAR accelerograms decays at a much slower rate than the coherency represented by the Abrahamson et al. model. This empirical model also corrects for the effect of noise on the coherency at large frequencies.

6.6 SUMMARY

In this chapter, we investigated spatial variations in the accelerograms recorded by the UPSAR array during the 2004 Parkfield earthquake. The recordings indicate significant variations in the acceleration intensities and frequency contents. The coherency estimates obtained from these recordings were fitted to the theoretical model by Luco and Wong (1986) compared with commonly used empirical models by Harichandran and Vanmarcke (1986) for distances greater than 100 m and by Abrahamson et al. (1991) for distances less than 100 m. The coherency modulus estimated from the UPSAR array diverged significantly from those given by both empirical models in the range of frequencies of interest. The model by Harichandran and Vanmarcke described a slower decay of the coherency modulus than that estimated from the

UPSAR array, whereas the model by Abrahamson et al. described a much faster decay. The theoretical model by Luco and Wong (1986), when fitted to the estimated modulus of coherency, provided a fairly good approximation of the incoherence component of the UPSAR recordings, but for larger values of the incoherence parameter α/v_s than recommended values. This can be attributed to the particularly anomalous topography of the site of the UPSAR array, or to near-source effects. Further analyses with near-source array recordings need to be conducted to determine if this phenomenon is indeed a near-source effect. Finally, the UPSAR recordings suggest a faster decay of coherency with frequency for vertical components than for horizontal components.

Bin number	Distance range (m)	Number of station pairs	Mean distance (m)			
1	0-50	3	31.1			
2	50-100	1	88.7			
3	100-150	5	129.8			
4	150-200	3	183.7			
5	200-250	5	222.7			
6	250-300	4	274.8			
7	300-350	13	334.4			
8	350-400	4	377.6			
9	400-450	4	422.3			
10	450-500	5	478.2			

Table 6.1Distance bins for station pairs.

Table 6.2PGA (in units of g) for each component and station.

Component	Station number											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
N-S	0.14	0.17	0.15	0.24	0.23	0.38	0.18	0.20	0.28	0.36	0.25	0.23
E-W	0.18	0.31	0.25	0.37	0.25	0.33	0.26	0.28	0.31	0.47	0.22	0.30
Vertical	0.09	0.09	0.11	0.18	0.11	0.19	0.13	0.14	0.17	0.24	0.11	0.16

Table 6.3 Estimated values of $(\alpha/\nu_s) \times 10^{-4}$ for horizontal components.

$\omega_{end}/2\pi$	d_{kl} (m)									
(Hz)	25	75	125	175	225	275	325	375	425	475
2	8	8	5	5	4	4	4	4	3	3
4	11	6	4	4	3	3	3	4	3	3
8	9	5	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	3

$\omega_{end}/2\pi$	d_{kl} (m)									
(Hz)	25	75	125	175	225	275	325	375	425	475
2	11	10	6	5	5	6	5	5	5	5
4	10	10	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5
8	9	9	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5

Table 6.4 Estimated values of $(\alpha/\nu_s) \times 10^{-4}$ for vertical components.



Figure 6.1 Geometry of UPSAR array.



Figure 6.2 Acceleration time histories of the N-S components.



Figure 6.3 Acceleration time histories of the E-W components.



Figure 6.4 Acceleration time histories of the vertical components.



Figure 6.5 Estimated acceleration PSDs of the N-S components.



Figure 6.6 Estimated acceleration PSDs of the E-W components.



Figure 6.7 Estimated acceleration PSDs of the vertical components.



Figure 6.8 Estimates of coherency modulus for the horizontal components for three levels of smoothing.



Figure 6.9 Estimates of coherency modulus for the vertical components for three levels of smoothing.



Figure 6.10 Estimates of the real part of coherency for the horizontal components.



Figure 6.11 Estimates of the real part of coherency for the vertical components.


Figure 6.12 Estimates of the imaginary part of coherency for the horizontal components.



Figure 6.13 Estimates of the imaginary part of coherency for the vertical components.



Figure 6.14 Estimates of coherency phase angle for the horizontal components.



Figure 6.15 Estimates of coherency phase angle for the vertical components.



Figure 6.16 Comparison of horizontal coherency estimates $(tanh^{-1}|\gamma_{kl}|)$ with the fitted Luco and Wong model.



Figure 6.17 Comparison of horizontal coherency estimates ($|\gamma_{kl}|$) with the fitted Luco and Wong model.



Figure 6.18 Comparison of vertical coherency estimates $(tanh^{-1}|\gamma_{k}|)$ with the fitted Luco and Wong model.



Figure 6.19 Comparison of vertical coherency estimates ($|\gamma_k|$) with the fitted Luco and Wong model.



Figure 6.20 Comparison of horizontal coherency estimates ($|\gamma_{kl}|$) with the Harichandran and Vanmarcke model.



Figure 6.21 Comparison of horizontal coherency estimates $(\tanh^{-1}|\gamma_{kl}|)$ with the Abrahamson et al. model.



Figure 6.22 Comparison of horizontal coherency estimates ($|\gamma_{kl}|$) with the Abrahamson et al. model.

7 Summary, Conclusions, and Further Studies

7.1 MAJOR DEVELOPMENTS AND FINDINGS

In this study, we investigated the response of bridges under differential support excitations employing response spectrum and time-history analysis methods. We considered spatial variability of ground motions due to incoherence, wave passage, and site-response effects. We developed new analysis tools and performed comprehensive parametric studies of real bridge models under varying conditions. The main developments and findings of the study are summarized below:

- The MSRS method was generalized to account for response quantities that depend on the support DOF, e.g., element forces when rotational DOF are condensed out and bridge pier drifts.
- The MSRS method was extended to account for quasi-static contributions of truncated highfrequency modes. A parametric analysis of the newly introduced cross-correlation coefficients identified cases in which these terms are important.
- The generalized and extended MSRS method was implemented in an efficient computer code. For the computation of the correlation coefficients, a fast and accurate numerical integration method was developed by accounting for the properties of the specific integrand quantities. Another advantage of this code is that it computes the required structural properties using an algorithm that is applicable to any "black-box" structural analysis software.
- MSRS analysis of four real bridge models with vastly different structural characteristics indicated that spatial variability can significantly influence bridge response, even under uniform soil conditions. Among the four bridges, the effect of spatial variability was more pronounced for stiffer bridges, and between bridges with similar fundamental periods the

effect was more pronounced in longer bridges. In general, the effect of spatial variability was found to be more significant on element forces along the deck and to be relatively mild on pier drifts. For pier drifts, in most cases, spatial variability reduced the response. For the stiffer bridges, additional variation of support soil properties caused large amplifications of many pseudo-static responses and, consequently, of the respective total responses. When soil conditions rapidly vary in space, the effect of differential site response on the bridge performance can be more significant than the effect of incoherence and wave passage.

- Comparisons between the original and the extended MSRS methods indicated that when high-frequency truncated modes have significant contributions to the response, the extended rule provides improved approximations with small additional computational effort.
- Methods for simulation of arrays of nonstationary spatially varying ground motions were developed. These methods generate arrays of motions that are consistent with a prescribed coherency model and inherit temporal and spectral characteristics of a specified reference record. The simulation methods account for all three effects of incoherence, wave passage, and differential site response. Two approaches were considered:
 - a. In the conditional approach, the variability of the motions increases with increasing distance from the location of the specified record. A method that preserves the lowfrequency content and thus the displacement waveform of the reference record was investigated.
 - b. In the unconditional approach, the arrays of motions are characterized by uniform variability with distance and, thus, are appropriate as input for statistical analysis of bridge response through Monte Carlo simulation analysis.

Example simulated arrays for both approaches and for both cases of uniform and varying soil conditions were presented. For the case of varying soil conditions, two different methods of modeling the varying soil profiles were considered. The simulation methods were validated by examining the physical compliance of individual time histories and also by examining median response spectra, coherency characteristics, and PSDs of ensembles of simulated arrays.

• Time-history analyses of the same four bridge models used in the MSRS analysis were performed, using as input ensembles of support motion arrays simulated with the unconditional approach. Mean peak pier drifts from linear and nonlinear analyses were

examined for several cases of spatial variability. For both linear and nonlinear responses, the effect of spatial variability was more pronounced for the stiffer bridges. For these bridges, spatial variability reduced pier drifts. These trends are consistent with the results from the MSRS analysis.

- The effect of spatial variability on the "equal displacement" rule was investigated by examining the means and standard deviations of the ratios of peak nonlinear over peak linear drifts from time-history analyses. It was shown that under uniform soil conditions, spatial variability tends to decrease these ratios. The effect was more pronounced for stiffer bridges and smaller ductility ratios. When softer soils were considered, these ratios were increased. Similar to the case of uniform support excitations, the "equivalent displacement" rule gave fairly good approximations of the nonlinear pier drifts for cases when the fundamental period of the bridge was larger than the predominant period of the site. Otherwise, the results depended on the ductility. For small ductility ratios, the "equal displacement" rule was conservative.
- Comparisons between mean peak responses from linear time-history analyses and the corresponding MSRS estimates demonstrated that the MSRS method is an accurate tool for the analysis of bridges under differential support excitations. This rule is ideal for parametric studies required when designing a bridge.
- Coherency analysis of the UPSAR array of near-fault motions recorded during the 2004 Parkfield earthquake was performed and estimates of the incoherence components were compared with commonly used models. First, the model by Luco and Wong (1986) was considered. This model is based on the physics of wave propagation, but includes a parameter that must be empirically estimated. Fitting the model to estimates from the UPSAR array yielded smaller values of the incoherence parameter than those previously recommended. The commonly used empirical models by Harichandran and Vanmarcke (1986) and by Abrahamson et al. (1991), which are based on recordings from earthquakes in Taiwan, did not describe well the incoherence component of the UPSAR array.

7.2 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDIES

We recommend the following topics for future studies in the area of bridge response under differential support excitations.

7.2.1 Implementation of MSRS Method in Commercial Codes

This study has demonstrated the accuracy of the MSRS method and its advantages for response analysis of multiply supported structures subjected to spatially varying ground motions, particularly in the design stage where parametric analysis is often needed. For this method to be adopted in practice, it is necessary that it be implemented in commercial codes, such as SAP2000. The material in Chapter 2 provides all the details that are needed for such implementation.

7.2.2 Extension of the MSRS Method to Account for Spatially Correlated Orthogonal Components

Studies dealing with spatial variability of ground motions, including this one, assume that the components of ground motion in orthogonal directions are statistically independent. This assumption is based on the work of Penzien and Watabe (1975), who investigated correlations between orthogonal components at a single point. However, considering the propagation pattern of surface waves, it is possible that orthogonal components of ground motions at separate locations are correlated. These correlations may influence structural response, and thus their presence and effects need to be investigated to fully account for the effect of spatial variability of ground motion on multiply supported structures. We recommend investigation of the cross-correlation between orthogonal components of ground motion at different locations and extension of the MSRS method to account for this effect, if it is found to be significant.

7.2.3 Extension of the MSRS Method to Account for Directional Dependencies

In this study, we examined pier drifts in the longitudinal and transverse directions of each bridge. However, the actual displacement demand on a pier is the vectorial sum of the drifts in two orthogonal directions. For the case of uniform support motions, a response spectrum method for evaluation of vectorial response quantities was developed by Menun and Der Kiureghian (2000). This method needs to be extended for application in the case of differential support motions.

7.2.4 Investigation of the Influence of the Direction of Propagation of Seismic Waves

In the parametric studies of bridge responses in Chapters 3 and 5, a single direction of propagation of seismic waves was considered. However, preliminary studies have indicated that

the direction of wave propagation can have an important influence on bridge response. Further studies on the influence of this phenomenon are recommended.

7.2.5 Development of Analysis Tools for Bridges in the Near-fault Regions

Near-fault ground motions often include strong directivity pulses that can have significant influence on the bridge response. Such motions are strongly nonstationary and narrow-band and, thus, violate the fundamental assumptions behind the MSRS method and the simulation methods developed in Chapter 4. Investigation of possible modifications of the MSRS method to incorporate near-fault effects is recommended. Simulating arrays of near-fault ground motions requires examination of the spatial variability of the directivity pulse.

7.2.6 Incorporation of the Effect of Soil-structure Interaction

The MSRS method does not explicitly account for the effect of soil-structure interaction. An approximate method to account for this effect for multiply supported structures, applicable to linear/linearized systems, was developed by Keshishian (2001) employing the sub-structuring technique. Further investigations of the issue are recommended.

REFERENCES

- Abrahamson NA, Schneider JF, Stepp JC. Empirical spatial coherency functions for application to soil-structure interaction analyses. *Earthquake Spectra* 1991; 7:1-28.
- Anderson TW. The Statistical Analysis of Time Series. Wiley: New York, 1971.
- Berrah M, Kausel E. Response spectrum analysis of structures subjected to spatially varying motions. *Earthquake Engineering and Structural Dynamics* 1992; **21**:461-470.
- Boore DM, Stephens CD, Joyner WB. Comments on baseline correction of digital strong-motion data: examples from the 1999 Hector Mine, California Earthquake. *Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America* 2002; 92:1543-1560.
- Bozorgnia Y Campbell KW. The vertical-to-horizontal response spectral ratio and tentative procedures for developing simplified V/H and vertical design spectra. *Journal of Earthquake Engineering* 2004; **8**:175-208.
- Brillinger RD. Time Series: Data Analysis and Theory. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2001.
- Caltrans Seismic Design Criteria (version 1.3). California Department of Transportation: Sacramento, CA, 2004.
- Chatfield C. The Analysis of Time Series: An Introduction (6th edition). CRC Press LLC, 2004.
- Chopra AK. Dynamics of Structures: Theory and Applications to Earthquake Engineering (2nd edition). Prentice-Hall: New Jersey, 2001.
- Clough RW, Penzien J. Dynamics of Structures (2nd edition). McGraw-Hill: New York, 1993.
- Deodatis G. Non-stationary stochastic vector processes: Seismic ground motion applications. *Probabilistic Engineering Mechanics* 1996; **11**:149-167.
- Der Kiureghian A. Structural response to stationary excitation. *Journal of the Engineering Mechanics Division* 1980; **106**:1195-1213.
- Der Kiureghian A. A response spectrum method for random vibration analysis of MDF systems. *Earthquake Engineering and Structural Dynamics* 1981; **9**: 419-435.
- Der Kiureghian A. A coherency model for spatially varying ground motions. *Earthquake Engineering and Structural Dynamics* 1996; **25**:99-111.
- Der Kiureghian A, Keshishian P, Hakobian A. Multiple-support response spectrum analysis of bridges including the site-response effect and the MSRS code. *Report No. UCB/EERC-97/02*, Earthquake Engineering Research Center, University of California, Berkeley, 1997.
- Der Kiureghian A, Nakamura Y. CQC modal combination rule for high-frequency modes. *Earthquake Engineering and Structural Dynamics* 1993; **22**:943-956.
- Der Kiureghian A, Neuenhofer A. Response spectrum method for multiple-support seismic excitation. *Earthquake Engineering and Structural Dynamics* 1992; **21**:713-740.
- Dumanogluid A, Soyluk K. A stochastic analysis of long span structures subjected to spatially varying ground motions including the site-response effect. *Engineering Structures* 2003; **25**:1301-1310.
- Fletcher JB, Spudich P, Baker LM. Rupture propagation of the 2004 Parkfield, California, earthquake from observations at the UPSAR. *Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America* 2006; **96**:129-142.
- Gupta A, Krawinkler H. Estimation of seismic drift demands for frame structures. *Earthquake Engineering and Structural Dynamics* 2000; **29**: 1287-1306.
- Hao H. A parametric study of the required seating length for bridge decks during earthquake. *Earthquake Engineering and Structural Dynamics* 1998; **27**: 91-103.
- Hao H, Oliveira CS, Penzien J. Multiple-station ground motion processing and simulation based on SMART-1 array data. *Nuclear Engineering and Design* 1989; 111:293–310.
- Harichandran RS, Vanmarcke EH. Stochastic variation of earthquake ground motion in space and time. *Journal of Engineering Mechanics* 1986; **112**:154-174.

- Heredia-Zavoni E, Vanmarcke EH. Seismic random-vibration analysis of multisupport-structural systems. *Journal* of Engineering Mechanics 1994; **120**: 1107-1128.
- Hjelmstad KD. Fundamentals of structural mechanics (2nd edition). Springer Science+Business Media, Inc: New York, 2005.
- Kahan M, Gibert RJ, Bard PY. Influence of seismic waves spatial variability on bridges: a sensitivity analysis. *Earthquake Engineering and Structural Dynamics* 1996; **25**:795-814.
- Kameda H, Morikawa H. An interpolating stochastic process for simulation of conditional random fields. *Probabilistic Engineering Mechanics* 1992; 7:243-254.
- Keshishian P. Analysis of interconnected systems accounting for spatial variability of ground motions and soil– structure interaction. Dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Civil Engineering, University of California, Berkeley, 2008.
- Kim A, Dreger D. Rupture process of the 2004 Parkfield earthquake from near-fault seismic waveform and geodetic records. *Journal of Geophysical Research* 2008; 113:B07308.
- Kim SH, Feng MQ. Fragility analysis of bridges under ground motion with spatial variation. *International Journal* of Non-Linear Mechanics 2003; **5**:705-721.
- Leger P, Wilson EL. Modal summation method for structural dynamic computations. *Earthquake Engineering and Structural Dynamics* 1988; 16:23-27.
- Liao S, Zerva A. Physically compliant, conditionally simulated spatially variable seismic ground motions for performance-based design. *Earthquake Engineering and Structural Dynamics* 2006; **35**:891-919.
- Loh CH, Ku BD. An efficient analysis of structural response for multiple-support seismic excitations. *Engineering* Structures 1995; 17:15-26.
- Lou L, Zerva A. Effects of spatially variable ground motions on the seismic response of a skewed, multi-span, RC highway bridge. *Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering* 2005; **25**: 729-740.
- Luco JE, Wong HL. Response of a rigid foundation to a spatially random ground motion. *Earthquake Engineering and Structural Dynamics* 1986; **14**:891-908.
- Lupoi A, Franchin P, Pinto PE, Monti G. Seismic design of bridges accounting for spatial variability of ground motion. *Earthquake Engineering and Structural Dynamics* 2005; 34:327-348.
- Mander JB, Priestley MJN, Park R. Theoretical stress-strain model for confined concrete. *Journal of Structural Engineering* 1988; **114**:1804-1826.
- Menun C, Der Kiureghian A. A replacement for the 30%, 40%, and SRSS rules for multicomponent seismic analysis. *Earthquake Spectra* 2000; 14:153-163.
- Miranda E. Inelastic displacement ratios for displacement-based earthquake resistant design. *Proceedings of the 12th World Conference on Earthquake Engineering*, Auckland, CD-ROM, Paper 1096, New Zealand Society for Earthquake Engineering, 2000.
- Miranda E, Bertero V. Evaluation of strength reduction factors for earthquake resistant design. *Earthquake Spectra* 1994; **10**:357-379.
- Moehle JP. Displacement-based design of RC structures subjected to earthquakes. *Earthquake Spectra* 1992; **8**:403-428.
- Nakamura Y, Der Kiureghian A, Liu D. Multiple-support response spectrum analysis of the Golden Gate Bridge. *Report No. UCB/EERC-93/05*, Earthquake Engineering Research Center, University of California, Berkeley, 1993.
- Newmark N, Hall WJ. Seismic design criteria for nuclear reactor facilities. *Proceedings of the 4th World Conference* on Earthquake Engineering, Santiago, Chile, 1969.
- OpenSees (Open System for Earthquake Engineering Simulation) manual. http:// opensees.berkeley.edu/ Accessed in April 2011.
- Penzien J, Watabe M. Characteristics of 3-dimensional earthquake ground motion. *Earthquake Engineering and Structural Dynamics* 1975; **3**:365-373.

- Price TE., Eberhard MO. Effects of spatially varying ground motions on short bridges. *Journal of Structural Engineering* 1998; **124**:948-955.
- Rabiner LR, Gold B. *Theory and application of digital signal processing*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, 1975.
- Rahnama M, Krawinkler H. Effects of soft soil and hysteresis model on seismic demands. *Report No. 108*. The John A. Blume Earthquake Engineering Center. Stanford University, Stanford, CA, 1993.
- Rezaeian S, Der Kiureghian A. A stochastic ground motion model with separable temporal and spectral nonstationarities. *Earthquake Engineering and Structural Dynamics* 2008; **37**:1565-1584.
- Safak E. Discrete-time analysis of seismic site amplification. Journal of Engineering Mechanics 1995; 121:801-809.
- Saxena V, Deodatis G, Shinozuka M, Feng MQ. Development of fragility curves for multi-span reinforced concrete bridges. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Monte Carlo Simulation*, Principality of Monaco, Austria, 2000.
- Sextos A, Kappos AJ, Mergos P. Effect of soil-structure interaction and spatial variability of ground motion on irregular bridges: the case of the Krystallopigi Bridge. *Proceedings of the 13th World Conference on Earthquake Engineering*, Paper No. 2298, Vancouver, BC, Canada, 2004.
- Singh MP, McCown BE. Mode acceleration-based response spectrum approach for nonclassically damped structures. Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering 1986; 5:226-233.
- Soyluk K. Comparison of random vibration methods for multi-support seismic excitation analysis of long-span bridges. *Engineering Structures* 2004; **26**:1573–1583.
- Vanmarcke EH, Fenton GA. Conditioned simulation of local fields of earthquake ground motion. *Structural Safety* 1991; 10:247-264.
- Veletsos AS, Newmark NM. Effect of inelastic behavior on the response of simple systems to earthquake motions. Proceedings of the 2nd World Conference on Earthquake Engineering, Japan, 2:895-912, 1960.
- Vidic T, Fajfar P, Fischinger M. Consistent inelastic design spectra: strength and displacement. *Earthquake Engineering and Structural Dynamics* 1994; **23**:502-521.
- Wang J, Chen H. A new spatial coherence model and analytical coefficients for multi-support response spectrum combination. *Earthquake Engineering and Engineering Vibration* 2005, **6**:225-235.
- Yu RF, Zhou XY. Response spectrum analysis for non-classically damped linear system with multiple-support excitations. *Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering* 2008; **6**:261–284.
- Zanardo G, Hao H, Modena C. Seismic response of multi-span simply supported bridges to a spatially varying earthquake ground motion. *Earthquake Engineering and Structural Dynamics* 2002; **31**:1325-1345.
- Zembaty Z, Rutenberg A. Spatial response spectra and site amplification effects. *Engineering Structures* 2002; **24**:1485-1496.
- Zerva A. Response of multi-span beams to spatially incoherent seismic ground motions. *Earthquake Engineering and Structural Dynamics* 1990; **19**:819-832.
- Zerva A, Harada T. A site-specific model for the spatial incoherence of the seismic ground motions. *Proceedings of the 5th National Conference on Earthquake Engineering*, Chicago, Illinois, 1994.
- Zhang YH, Li QS, Lin JH, Williams FW. Random vibration analysis of long-span structures subjected to spatially varying ground motions. *Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering* 2009; **29**:620-629.

PEER REPORTS

PEER reports are available individually or by yearly subscription. PEER reports can be ordered at <u>http://peer.berkeley.edu/publications/peer reports.html</u> or by contacting the Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center, 325 Davis Hall mail code 1792, Berkeley, CA 94720. Tel.: (510) 642-3437; Fax: (510) 665-1655; Email: peer_editor@berkeley.edu

- **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, Ed. 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, Yousseff 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.

- Keith A. Porter, Jonathan P. Stewart, and Ertugrul Taciroglu. August 2008. February 2008. Computational Modeling of Progressive Collapse in Reinforced Concrete Frame Structures. Mohamed M. Talaat and Khalid M. Mosalam. May 2008. 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 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. 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. May 2007. PEER 2006/12 Societal Implications of Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering. Peter J. May. May 2007. 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. 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. 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. 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 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,
- PEER 2007/11 Bar Buckling in Reinforced Concrete Bridge Columns. Wayne A. Brown, Dawn E. Lehman, and John F. Stanton.
- PEER 2007/10
- PEER 2007/09

- Loading. Sivapalan Gajan, Tara C. Hutchinson, Bruce L. Kutter, Prishati Raychowdhury, José A. Ugalde, and
- PEER 2007/02

- PEER 2006/11
- PEER 2006/09 Quantifying Economic Losses from Travel Forgone Following a Large Metropolitan Earthquake. James Moore,

- PEER 2006/05

- PEER 2006/02

- 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.SJapan 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	<i>Cover-Plate and Flange-Plate Reinforced Steel Moment-Resisting Connections.</i> 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.SJapan Workshop on the Effects of Near-Field Earthquake Shaking. Andrew Whittaker, ed. 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.SJapan 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.
- 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 REPORTS

The following PEER reports are available by Internet only at http://peer.berkeley.edu/publications/peer_reports.html

- 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 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 editor@berkeley.edu

ISSN 1547-0587X