

Seismic Velocity Site Characterization of Thirty-One Chilean Seismometer Stations by Spectral Analysis of Surface Wave Dispersion

Robert Kayen

Brad D. Carkin

Skye Corbet

Camilo Pinilla

Allan Ng

Edward Gorbis

Christine Truong

PEER 2014/05 APRIL 2014

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.

Seismic Velocity Site Characterization of Thirty-One Chilean Seismometer Stations by Spectral Analysis of Surface Wave Dispersion

Robert Kayen

Brad D. Carkin

Skye Corbet

Camilo Pinilla

Allan Ng

Edward Gorbis

Christine Truong

PEER Report 2014/05 Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center Headquarters at the University of California, Berkeley

April 2014

ABSTRACT

We present one-dimensional shear-wave velocity (V_S) profiles at 31 strong-motion sites in Chile, from Valdivia in southern Chile to Copiapo in the northern Atacama Desert. We estimate the V_S profiles with the spectral analysis of surface waves (SASW) method. The SASW method is a non-invasive method that is useful for indirect estimate of the V_S at depth from variations in the Rayleigh wave phase velocity at the surface. The purpose of the study is to determine the detailed site velocity profile, the average velocity in the upper 30 m of the profile V_{S30} , the average velocity for the entire profile, $V_{S,z}$, and the NEHRP site classification.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by the USGS Award Number G12AP20008, and the Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center (PEER) as part of NGA-Subduction Research Project. This support is gratefully acknowledged. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the sponsoring agencies.

ABST	'RAC'I	Г БРОМ		iii				
ACKI	NOWL	LEDGM	EN 15	V				
TABL	E OF	CONTE	NTS	vii				
LIST	OF FI	GURES	AND TABLES	ix				
1	SEIS	MIC VI	ELOCITY CHACTERIZATION AT CHILEAN SITES	1				
	1.1	Intro	luction	1				
	1.2	Maule	e Earthquake	1				
	1.3	Study	Sites	2				
		1.3.1	Region A: Santiago Area	5				
		1.3.2	Region B: Valparaiso Area	6				
		1.3.3	Region C: San Antonio Area	7				
		1.3.4	Region D: Talca Area	8				
		1.3.5	Regions E and F: Olmue Area and Papudo	9				
		1.3.6	Region G: Concepcion Area	10				
		1.3.7	Regions H and I: Angol and Valdivia Areas	11				
		1.3.8	Region J: Copiapo Area					
	1.4	Rayleigh Wave Dispersion13						
		1.4.1	Adjustments for Missing First-Wrapped Phase					
	1.5	Invers	16					
	1.6	Results1						
REFE	CRENC	CES	DEL DDOFH ES AND SITE DHOTOS					

CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES AND TABLES

Figure 1	Surface wave test locations for 31 sites in Chile affected by the 2010 Maule Mw8.8 earthquake
Figure 2	Station locations in the Santiago, Metropolitan, and Libertador regions5
Figure 3	Station locations at Valparaiso and Vin Del Mar in the Valpariso region
Figure 4	Station locations in the San Antonio region
Figure 5	Station locations in the Maule region near Talca, Constitucion, Curico, and Hualane
Figure 6	Station locations near Olmue and Papudo northwest of Santiago9
Figure 7	Station locations near the city of Concepcion in the Bio Bio region10
Figure 8	Station locations near Angol and Valdiva areas, in de Los Rios region11
Figure 9	Station locations near Vallenar, Coquimbo, and Copiapo, Atacama12
Table 1	Chilean seismometer, SASW test number, inversion V_{s30} 's, NEHRP code, PGA from Maule event, latitude, longitude, and site name

1 Seismic Velocity Chacterization at Chilean Sites

1.1 INTRODUCTION

This project focuses on the measurement of shear-wave velocity (V_S) of the near-surface materials at strong-motion recording stations in Chile. During four data collection campaigns, data were collected in the states of Atacama, Coquimbo, Valpariso, Metro Region, Libertador, Maule, Bio Bio, Araucania, and Los Rios. These states are regionally instrumented with permanent seismometer recording stations. In addition, these stations have been supplemented with more closely-spaced temporary aftershock recorders in response to local seismic activity. The V_S profiles presented in this report are collected for calibration of strong-motion site amplification models based on direct measurement of velocity, by topography, or by surface geologic unit. Data presented here were gathered using the continuous harmonic sine wave approach for the spectral analysis of surface waves presented by Kayen et al. [2004, 2013], which is a stepped-sine wave method that utilizes a notch-filter methodology that improves on the approach developed by Satoh et al. [1991). The continuous swept-sine wave spectral analysis of surface waves (CSS-SASW) test is an inexpensive and efficient means of non-invasively estimating the near-surface V_S of the ground. Though it is possible to measure V_S in cased boreholes or by penetration tests, these approaches tend not to be useful for evaluation of Chilean strong-motion sites as they cannot reach the meaningful depths required for seismic site response analysis without expensive drilling and casing. Because many of the Chilean sites are stiff profiles with weathered bedrock, near the surface penetration methods are not useful.

1.2 MAULE EARTHQUAKE

The 27 February 2010 Maule, Chile, earthquake (Mw = 8.8) is the fifth largest earthquake to occur since 1900. Its effects were felt over 600 km of the central Chile coast. The Mw = 8.8 earthquake occurred in a subduction zone where the Nazca plate passes eastward and downward beneath the South American plate. The rate of convergence of the two plates is 70 mm/year. The mainshock occurred at 3:34 AM local time on 27 February 2010; its epicenter was located at - 36.027° and -72.834° with a hypocentral depth of 30 km. Field observations suggest that tectonic displacement of the hanging wall produced both uplift of over 2 m and subsidence of up to 1 m in coastal regions. Strong shaking lasted for over a minute in some areas, and widespread

damage occurred in some cities. A large number of significant aftershocks resulted in additional damage to an already fragile infrastructure.

1.3 STUDY SITES

Between 25 September 2012 and 25 June 2013, testing was performed at 31 sites across a broad region of Chile, from Latitude 40°S in Valdivia, Region de Los Rios to Latitude 27°S in Copiapo, Atacama Region; see Figure 1. Listed in Table 1 are the V_S profiles for local site conditions in nine administrative regions in Chile.



Figure 1 Surface wave test locations for 31 sites in Chile affected by the 2010 Maule Mw8.8 earthquake.

ID	Station	SASW Test #	Vs30 Man	Vs30 Auto	NEHRP Man.	NEHRI Auto	PGA (g) 2/27/10	Latitude	Longitude	Site
1	COPI	993COPI	349	339	D	D	0.022	-27.374	-70.322	COPIAP-HOSPITAL
2	VALLE	992VALLE	561	549	С	С	0.019	-28.576	-70.755	VALLENAR-HOSPITAL
3	PAP	991PAPU	687	714	С	С	0.352	-32.507	-71.448	PAPUDO
4	ROBL	990ROBLE	1951	1999	A	A	0.188	-32.976	-71.016	CERRO EL ROBLE
5	OLMU	981-OLMU	372	376	С	С	0.354	-32.994	-71.173	OLMU-Casa
6	VINA	979VIN	289	290	D	D	0.27	-33.0253	-71.553	VINA DEL MAR
7	VALU	967VALU	925.6	1026	В	В	0.204	-33.035	-71.596	VALPARASO-UTFSM
8	MAR	980MAR	280	261	D	D	0.345	-33.048	-71.51	VDM-MARGA MARGA
9	VAL	968VALP	454	429	С	С	0.244	-33.048	-71.604	VALPARASO-Almendral
10	CASB	983CASB	303	312	D	D	0.328	-33.321	-71.411	CASABLANCA-Teatro
11	LCON	963LCON	619	615	С	С	0.224	-33.396	-70.537	LASCONDES
12	SLUC	965SLUC	1411	1400	В	В	0.338	-33.441	-70.643	SANTIAGO-CerroSTA. LUCIA
13	LRNA	964LRN	574	615	С	С	0.308	-33.452	-70.531	LA REINA
14	SANT	966SANT	420	483	С	С	0.26	-33.467	-70.652	SANTIAGO-Conjunto
15	HTIS	962HTIS	312	307	D	D	0.294	-33.501	-70.579	PENALOLEN-Hospital
16	CRMA	985CRMA	428	466	С	С	0.518	-33.509	-70.772	MAIP-Centro
17	MET	988MET	598	638	С	С	0.197	-33.514	-70.606	LA FLORIDA METRO
18	ANTU	970ANTU	621	621	С	С	0.272	-33.569	-70.634	LA PINTANA
19	HSOR	989HSOR	496	524	С	С	0.264	-33.577	-70.581	PUENTEALTO HOSP
20	LLO	984LLO	360	377	С	С	0.424	-33.616	-71.611	LLOLLEO
21	SNJM	969SJM	495	491	С	С	0.48	-33.641	-70.354	SAN JOSE DE MAIPO
22	MELP	986MELP	636	620	С	С	0.777	-33.687	-71.214	MELIPILLA-Compaa
23	MAT	987MAT	370	372	С	С	0.325	-33.96	-71.873	MATANZAS-Escuela
24	HUAL	973HUA	528	541	С	С	0.423	-34.977	-71.805	HUALA-Hospital
25	CURI	971CUR	537	510	С	С	0.439	-34.99	-71.236	CURIC-Hospital
26	CONT	974CONST	294	NO SOL	D		0.594	-35.34	-72.406	CONSTITUCIN-Hospital

Table 1Chilean seismometer, SASW test number, inversion V_{s30} 's, NEHRP code, PGA from Maule event, latitude,
longitude, and site name.

ID	Station	SASW Test #	Vs30 Man.	Vs30 Auto.	NEHRP Man.	NEHRI Auto.	PGA (g) 2/27/10	Latitude	Longitude	Site
27	TAL	972TAL	548	551	С	С	0.45	-35.43	-71.665	TALCA-Colegio Integrado SAN PO X
28	CONC	977CONC	423	361	С	С	0.338	-36.828	-73.048	CONCEPCIN-Colegio Inmaculada Concepcin
29	CCSP	978CCSP	332	340	D	D	0.649	-36.844	-73.109	CONCEPCIN-Colegio San Pedro De La Paz
30	ANGO	975ANG	417	419	С	С	0.796	-37.795	-72.706	ANGOL-Hospital
31	VALD	976VLD	454	429	С	С	0.113	-39.831	-73.239	QDR

1.3.1 Region A: Santiago Area

Stations near the city of Santiago experienced an average peak ground acceleration (PGA) of about 0.32g. Figure 2 shows that 9 stations are located within a 15-km-radius circle. The station San Jose De Maipo (SNJM) is located on a thick fluvial gravel deposit in a river valley above and south of the city of Santiago. All stations are located on the gravel soils; shear-wave velocities were available for three stations using two different survey methods.



Figure 2 Station locations in the Santiago, Metropolitan, and Libertador regions.

1.3.2 Region B: Valparaiso Area

As shown in Figure 3, four stations are located in Valparaiso and Vin del Mar within a 10-kmradius circle area, which felt an average PGA of 0.32g. Midorikawa [1992] studied this region by comparing the acceleration recordings at rock site (VALU) and soil sites (VINA and VAL). That report describes a V_S profile estimated at VINA from a boring and measured at Station VAL (the V_S profile is available in Sargoni [2005]). Midorikawa noted that the VINA measurement may include soil-structure interaction effects due to the adjacent building. The paper describes granite rock exposed at Station VALU for which V_{S30} was estimated as 1300 m/sec; see Arenda and Saragoni [1994]. The V_{S30} at Station MAR was estimated at 280 m/sec; see Daza [2003].



Figure 3 Station locations at Valparaiso and Vin Del Mar in the Valpariso region.

1.3.3 Region C: San Antonio Area

Four stations near the city of San Antonio felt an average PGA of 0.46g. Figure 4 shows four stations within a 40-km-radius circle; thus CASB is about 80 km away from MAT. Of the four stations, down-hole measurements are available at CASB, MELP, and MAT; see Boroschek et al. [2012]. The other station (LLO) also has a V_{S30} profile up to 19 m; see Arenda and Saragoni [1994].



Figure 4 Station locations in the San Antonio region.

1.3.4 Region D: Talca Area

Four stations near city of Talca felt an average PGA of 0.48g. Figure 4 shows these stations within a 40-km-radius circle; thus, CURI is about 110 km away from CONT. The shear-wave velocity measurements were obtained for all these stations by the down-hole method and by micro-tremor measurements; see Boroschek et al. [2012] and Kataoka [2011], respectively.



Figure 5 Station locations in the Maule region near Talca, Constitucion, Curico, and Hualane.

1.3.5 Regions E and F: Olmue Area and Papudo

Three stations located near the cities of Olmue and Papudo felt an average PGA of 0.27g in the Olmue area and 0.45g in Papudo. As shown in Figure 6, two stations are within a 10-km-radius circle of Olmue and one station in Papudo; these stations are separated by 60 km. There are no available shear-wave velocity measurements for the two stations (ROBL, OLMU) located in Olmue. In Papudo, the shear-wave velocity profile is available up to depth of 16 m; see Arenda and Saragoni [1994].



Figure 6 Station locations near Olmue and Papudo northwest of Santiago.

1.3.6 Region G: Concepcion Area

Two stations are located near the city of Concepcion, which felt an average PGA of 0.49*g*. Figure 7 shows the two stations within a 5-km-radius circle. Boroschek et al. [2012] obtained shear-wave velocity measurements for both stations.



Figure 7 Station locations near the city of Concepcion in the Bio Bio region.

1.3.7 Regions H and I: Angol and Valdivia Areas

The cities of Angol and Valdivia have one station each. During the Maule earthquake, PGAs of 0.80g and 0.11g were felt in in Angol and Valdivia, respectively. Figure 8 shows that the two stations are separated by 240 km. The shear-wave velocity is available at ANGO in Angol [Boroschek et al. 2012], but not available at VALD in Valdivia.



Figure 8 Station locations near Angol and Valdiva areas, in de Los Rios region.

1.3.8 Region J: Copiapo Area

Table 1 and Figure 8 show the station information and their locations near the city of Copiapo. Peak ground accelerations were 0.022g at COPI and 0.019g at VALL. Figure 8 shows that the two stations are separated by 140 km; VALL is about 500 km north of the city of Santiago. Because the shaking level was small and far away from the other stations, these sites were considered a low priority in obtaining shear-wave velocity profiles.



Figure 9 Station locations near Vallenar, Coquimbo, and Copiapo, Atacama.

1.4 RAYLEIGH WAVE DISPERSION

Active-source surface wave analysis testing typically profiles the upper tens of meters of the ground using drop weights or harmonic sources. The upper 30 m is needed to compute the widely used site parameter V_{S30} , defined as 30 m divided by the shear-wave travel time to 30 m depth. The SASW method employed in this study by the U.S. Geological Survey is a technique that uses a parallel array of mass shakers. This method allows for profiling to depths up to 100 m without the use of massive drop weights or heavy track-mounted machinery. For this method, we substituted using a low-frequency array, in the 100 Hz-1 Hz range, with electro-mechanical shakers. Surface waves were generated with an array of up to several APS Dynamics Model 400 shakers and amplifier units, powered by a generator and controlled by a spectral analyzer.

The shakers have a long-stroke capable of cycling to as low as 1 Hz. The output signal from the spectral analyzer is split into a parallel circuit and sent to the separate amplifiers. The amplifiers power the shakers to produce a continuously vibrating, coherent, in-phase harmonic-wave that vertically loads the ground. Most of this energy produces Rayleigh retrograde elliptical surface waves that propagate away from the source in a vertical cylindrical wavefront perpendicular to the ground surface. The amplitude of the surface waves decay exponentially with depth, such that the energy of the wavefront is centered at a depth of approximately one-third to one-half the wavelength.

Frequency domain analyses are made on two or more signals received by sensors placed in the field in the linear array some distance from the source. First, all channels of time domain data are transformed into their equivalent linear spectrum in the frequency domain using a Fourier transform. One of the sensor's signals (typically the sensor closest to the source) is used for a reference input signal, and the other sensor signals are used to compute the linear spectrums of the output. The separation of the reference seismometer and output seismometer ($d_s - d_{ref}$) radially from the source is later used to compute the wave velocity. The cross-power spectrum, $G_{xy}(\omega)$, is determined by multiplying the complex conjugate of the linear spectrum of the input signal, $S_x^*(\omega)$, and the real portion of the linear spectrum of the output signal, $S_y(\omega)$. The cross-power spectrum is defined as

$$G_{xy}(\omega) = S_x^*(\omega) \cdot S_y(\omega) \tag{1}$$

The autopower spectrum, a measure of the energy at each frequency of the sweep, can be used to determine the strength of individual frequencies and is equal to the linear spectrum of a given sensor times its complex conjugate pair:

$$G_{xx}(\omega) = S_x(\omega) \cdot S_x^*(\omega) \tag{2}$$

and

$$G_{yy}(\omega) = S_y(\omega) \cdot S_y^*(\omega)$$
(3)

A cross-power spectrum can be represented by its real and imaginary components, and by its phase θ and magnitude *m*. The phase θ is the relative lag between the signals at each frequency; the magnitude is a measure of the power between the two signals at each frequency. Because the phases are relative, they can be stacked to enhance signal-to-noise ratio of the phase lag at each frequency.

The phase of the cross-power spectrum is computed as the inverse tangent of the ratio of the imaginary and real portions of the cross-power spectrum:

$$\theta_{xy}(\omega) = \tan^{-1} \frac{\operatorname{Im} \left[G_{xy}(\omega) \right]}{\operatorname{Re} \left[G_{xy}(\omega) \right]}$$
(4)

The travel time t(f) of one cycle of a wave of frequency (f) is computed as,

$$t(f) = \theta(\omega) / \omega \tag{5}$$

and the wavelength, λ , at each frequency is

$$\lambda(\theta) = \left(d_s - d_{ref}\right) / \theta(f) \tag{6}$$

The Rayleigh wave velocity, V_r , is computed as

$$V_{r}(f) = (d_{s} - d_{ref})/t(f)$$

$$= f \cdot (d_{s} - d_{ref}) 360^{\circ}/\theta \quad (\text{degrees})$$

$$= f \cdot (d_{s} - d_{ref}) 2\pi/\theta(\phi) \quad (\text{radians})$$

$$= f \cdot \lambda(f)$$
(7)

The SASW procedure maps the change in θ across the frequency spectrum and merges these phase lags with the sensor array geometry to measure velocity. Typically with the shaker source, the discrete frequencies are cycled in a swept (stepped)-sine fashion across a range of low frequencies (1–200 Hz). Rayleigh-wave phase velocity is then mapped in frequency or wavelength space. This velocity map or profile—called a dispersion curve—characterizes changes in the frequency-dependent Rayleigh wave velocity. The evaluation of velocities is constrained to the wavelength zone, where $\lambda(f)/3 < (d_s - d_{ref}) < 2\lambda(f)$ for typical data and $\lambda(f)/3 < (d_s - d_{ref}) < 3\lambda(f)$ for excellent data, corresponding to phase lags of 180°–1080° (typical data) and 120°–1080° (excellent data). At longer and shorter wavelengths, the data become unreliable for computing velocities.

As the useable wavelengths are constrained by the seismometer separation, the array is expanded to capture Rayleigh wave dispersion representative of a specific range of wavelengths. The near surface is characterized by short wavelengths and high frequencies, whereas the deeper portion of the profile is characterized by long wavelengths and low frequencies. Each wavelength range requires a separate independent test that is merged together with other wavelength ranges to determine an average dispersion curve for the site.

At the largest seismometer separations, the increasing area of the wave front causes the wave amplitude to diminish due to geometric damping, and the overall quality of the data diminishes. Two measures of data quality are used to evaluate the field measurements in the frequency domain. Coherence, $\gamma^2(\omega)$, is a normalized real function with values between 0 and 1, corresponding to the ratio of the power of the cross-power spectrum, $G_{yx}(\omega) \cdot G_{yx}^*(\omega)$, to the autopower spectrum of the outboard seismometer, $G_{xx}(\omega) \cdot G_{yy}(\omega)$. Values close to 1 indicate high correlation between the reference and outboard seismometers across narrow frequency bands. This is a useful data quality parameter for hammer impact data.

$$\gamma_{xy}^{2}(\omega) = \frac{G_{yx}(\omega) \cdot G_{yx}(\omega)}{G_{xx}(\omega) \cdot G_{yy}(\omega)}$$
(8)

For swept sine data where discrete frequencies are used to compute phase rather than narrow frequency bands, the frequency response function (FRF) is a complex measure of the data quality of the output (outboard) seismometer, and is sometimes called the "transfer function":

$$FRF(\omega) = \frac{G_{yx}(\omega)}{G_{xx}(\omega)}$$
(9)

where x is the input (reference) signal and y is the response (output) signal.

The FRF is a two-sided complex parameter. To evaluate the amplitude of the output response to the input stimulus, a rectangular-to-polar coordinate conversion is used to convert to the frequency response gain (magnitude).

1.4.1 Adjustments for Missing First-Wrapped Phase

At some sensor separations, the field data have a poorly formed first phase such that the first clear wrapped phase crossing occurs not at 180°, but at 540°. For these dispersion data files, a simple reprocessing was done to add one phase jump (360°, 2π) to the dispersion curves preceding the 540° jump, which then adjusts the file to the correct wrapped phase number. This adjustment corrects the wavelength calculation as follows:

$$\lambda(corrected) = 2\pi d / (\theta + 2\pi) \tag{10}$$

With the wavelength adjusted, the velocity, V_R , decreases by

$$V_R = f \cdot 2\pi d / (\theta + 2\pi) \tag{11}$$

The effect of correcting the phase wrap and reducing the calculated wavelength is to reduce the depth of influence of the adjusted dispersion curve.

1.5 INVERSION OF THE V_S PROFILE

The relation between Rayleigh-wave (V_R) , shear-wave (V_S) , and compression-wave (V_P) velocities can be formulated through Navier's equations for dynamic equilibrium. On the surface of the ground and in the case of plane strain, the following characteristic equation may be used:

$$\frac{V_R^6}{V_S} - 8\frac{V_R^4}{V_S} + \left\{24 - 16\left[\frac{1 - 2\nu}{2(1 - \nu)}\right]\right\}\frac{V_R^2}{V_S} + 16\left\{\left[\frac{1 - 2\nu}{2(1 - \nu)}\right] - 1\right\} = 0$$
(12)

where v is the Poisson ratio and

$$\frac{V_S}{V_P} = \gamma = \sqrt{\left[\frac{1-2\nu}{2(1-\nu)}\right]}$$
(13)

For reasonable values of Poisson ratio for earth materials between 0.20 and 0.49, Viktorov [1967] demonstrated that the shear-wave velocity ranges between 105%–115% of the measured Rayleigh wave velocity.

$$\frac{V_R}{V_S} = K = \frac{0.87 + 1.12\nu}{1 + \nu} \tag{14}$$

such that across the range 0.2 < v < 0.49, the range of K is 0.87 < K < 0.96.

The inversion method seeks to infer an acceptable best-fit *model* of seismic shear-wave velocity, V_S , of the ground given the *measured* dispersive characteristics of Rayleigh waves observed in the frequency domain, and the estimated profile of Poisson ratio and material density. The inversion attempts to build a model from observations, as opposed to the normal prediction of behavior based upon a model. If the inversion model is simple and linear, it will result in a unique and stable solution. The French mathematician Hadamard defined mathematical problems that have solutions that exist as being unique; those that are stable are "well-posed" [Zhdanov 2002]. However, surface wave inversion is an "ill-posed" inverse problem, as solutions are not unique; therefore, the solutions may become unstable, and multiple shear way velocity profiles can result in approximately the same dispersion curve [Zhdanov 2002].

The dispersive characteristic of Rayleigh wave propagation allows us to infer the V_S at depth based on measurements at the free surface. The inversion problem computes the Rayleigh wave phase velocity (V_R) from laterally constant layers of an infinite half space. For each of these layers, the shear modulus, Poisson ratio, density, and thickness are unknown. In the far field, displacements for a vertically acting harmonic point load can be computed as follows if we neglect body wave components:

$$u_{\beta}(r,z,\omega) = F_{z} \cdot G_{\beta} \cdot (r,z,\omega) \cdot e^{i\left[\omega t - \psi_{\beta}(r,z,\omega)\right]}$$
(15)

where β stands for the generic component either vertical or radial, $G_{\beta} \cdot (\rho, \zeta, \omega)$ is the Rayleigh geometrical spreading function, and $\psi_{\beta} \cdot (\rho, \zeta, \omega)$ is the composite phase function [Lai and Rix 1998].

Regularization methods have been developed for solving the ill-posed inversion problem e.g., the velocity profiles computed herein). The Levenberg-Marquardt method, also called damped least squares, is one example of a regularization method. These and other techniques, such as artificial neural networks and genetic algorithms, are discussed by Santamarina and Fratta [1998]. One drawback of these stochastic methods is that they often require many more iterations; therefore, they are much more computationally intensive.

The parameters of the inversion problem can be chosen such that the difference between the observational dispersion data and the output of the inversion problem are minimized. Such a constraint is insufficient for ill-posed problems because many solutions can fit the data equally well, and some of these solutions will be physically unrealistic. The most common approach is to constrain the inversion solution space by selecting the smoothest solution from a suite of solutions that all exhibit a sufficient goodness-of-fit to the observed data, as indicated by a root mean square (RMS) error minimum.

An empirical approach serves as a counterpoint to the inversion methods used in this report. Pelekis and Athanosopoulos [2011] advanced the work of Satoh et al. [1991] in a technique termed the Simplified Inversion Method (SIM), which computes the shear-wave velocity profile as a function of the incremental slope of the Rayleigh wave dispersion curve where:

$$V_{Sn,normal \,dispersion} = 1.1 \cdot \frac{\overline{V}_{Rn} D_n - \overline{V}_{Rn-1} D_{n-1}}{D_n - D_{n-1}} \tag{16}$$

$$V_{Sn,inverted \ dispersion} = 1.1 \cdot \frac{D_n - D_{n-1}}{D_n / \overline{V}_{Rn} - D_{n-1} / \overline{V}_{Rn-1}}$$
(17)

The dispersion curve V_R plotted against λ_R is converted into an apparent velocity (\overline{V}_R) and depth (z) by converting λ_R to an estimated depth of $z_{eq} = a_R \cdot \lambda_R \approx 0.635 \lambda_R$. The parameter a_R is a penetration depth coefficient optimized to achieve a minimum weighted average difference between the simplified velocity profile and that computed through the more advanced inversion of Pelekis and Athansopoulos [2011]. The apparent phase velocity, \overline{V}_R , is approximated as the velocity at each segment node (layer interface) of a multi-linear curve fit to the dispersion curve. A positive slope of a segment indicates normal dispersion; a negative slope indicates inverted dispersion. The value of V_S for each individual layer is calculated using the equations above for the cases of normal dispersion or inverted dispersion, respectively. The approach of Pelekis and Athansopoulos [2011] improves on the Satoh et al. [1991] method notably by optimizing the penetration depth coefficient a_R .

1.6 RESULTS

We provide two profile solutions at each site (Inversion and SIM model). We varied the assumptions about the layer thicknesses and the threshold RMS error that determines if the inversion has converged to best characterize the site. The decision as to whether or not the more complex model is warranted by the fit of the theoretical dispersion curve (TDC) to the empirical dispersion curve (EDC) is subjective. Table 1 summarizes results and provides the SASW site ID, the site description, the date of data collection, the latitude and longitude of the SASW test site, and the V_{S30} .

Appendix A includes plots of the model profiles and the EDC and TDC's for each site. Appendix A also includes the site photos and a vicinity map for each site. Where possible, we have indicated the location of the strong-motion station in the site photographs and vicinity maps to assess the distance between the SASW survey and the strong-motion station. A NEHRP classification was used to average the site conditions in the upper 30 m of ground (V_{s30} from the IBC, [2002]). Equation (18) was used to compute this average velocity based on the unit layer thickness (d_i) and the corresponding interval-velocity (V_{Si}).

$$V_{S-depth \ averaged} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{d_i}{V_{Si}}}$$
(18)

These site categories were used to assign design spectra in the evaluation of performance for new and built structures

REFERENCES

- Arenda C., Saragoni G.R. (1994). Project of Geological Survey of Strong Motion Site in Central Chile, Report for: Kajima Institute of Construction Technology of Tokyo, Department of Civil Engineering, University of Chile, Santiago, Chile.
- Boroschek R.L., Yáñez U.F., Bejarano I.B., Molnar S., Torres A.G. (2012). Summary of the Geotechnical Characterization University of Chile Strong Motion Accelerograph Stations, University of Chile, Santiago, Chile.
- Constable S.C., Parker R.L., Constable G.G. (1987). Occam's inversion: A practical algorithm for generating smooth models from electromagnetic sounding data, *Geophys.*, 52, 289–300.
- Daza V. (2003). Interacción Sísmica Suelo-Estructura en el Puente Marga-Marga, Memoria para Optar al Título de Ingeniero Civil, Facultad de Ciencias Físicas y Matemáticas, Universidad de Chile. Santiago, Chile (in Spanish).
- Hisada Y. (1994). An efficient method for computing Green's functions for a layered half-space with sources and receivers at close depths, *Bull. Seismol. Soc. Am.*, 84: 1456–1472.
- Kataoka S. (2011), Microtremor exploration at seven strong motion stations in Chile, Proceedings, 4th IASPEI / IAEE International Symposium: Effects of Surface Geology on Seismic Motion, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA.
- Kayen R., Seed R.B., Moss R.E.S., Cetin K.O., Tanaka Y., Tokimatsu K. (2004). Global shear wave velocity database for probabilistic assessment of the initiation of seismic soil liquefaction, *Proceedings*, 11th International Conference on Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering (The 3rd International Conference on Earthquake Geotechnical Engineering), 2: 506–513, Berkeley, CA.
- Kayen R., Moss R., Thompson E., Seed R., Cetin K., Der Kiureghian A., Tanaka Y., Tokimatsu, K. (2013). Shearwave velocity-based probabilistic and deterministic assessment of seismic soil liquefaction potential, J. Geotech. Geoenviron. Eng., 139(3): 407–419.
- Lai C.G., Rix G.L. (1998). Simultaneous inversion of Rayleigh phase velocity and attenuation for near-surface site characterization, *Report No. GIT-CEE/GEO-98-2*, School of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, 258 pgs.
- Midorikawa S. (1992). Site effects on strong-motion records of the 1985 Chile earthquake and their nonlinear behavior, *Proceedings, Tenth World Conference on Earthquake Engineering*, Balkema, Rotterdam.
- Pelekis P.C., Athanasopoulos G.A. (2011). An overview of surface wave methods and a reliability study of a simplified inversion technique, *Soil. Dyn. Earthq. Eng.*, doi:10.1016/j.soildyn.2011.06.012.
- Santamarina J.C., Fratta D. (1998). Introduction to Discrete Signals and Inverse Problems in Civil Engineering, ASCE, 327 pgs.
- Satoh T., Poran C.I., Yamagata K., Rondriquez J.A. (1991). Soil profiling by spectral analysis of surface waves, Proceedings, 2nd International Conference on Recent Advances in Geotechnical Earthquake Engineering and Soil Dynamics, 2: 1429–1434.
- Viktorov I.A. (1967). Rayleigh and Lamb Waves: Physical Theory and Applications, Plenum Press: New York.
- Zhdanov M.S. (2002) Geophysical inverse theory and regularization problems, in: *Methods in Geochemistry and Geophysics*, 36, Elsevier, 628 pgs.

Appendix A: Model Profiles and Site Photos

Appendix A can be downloaded from the following PEER website: *http://peer.berkeley.edu/nga/index.html*.

PEER REPORTS

PEER reports are available as a free PDF download from http://peer.berkeley.edu/publications/peer_reports_complete.html. Printed hard copies of PEER reports can be ordered directly from our printer by following the instructions at http://peer.berkeley.edu/publications/peer_reports_complete.html. For other related questions about the PEER Report Series, contact the Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center, 325 Davis Hall mail code 1792, Berkeley, CA 94720. Tel.: (510) 642-3437; Fax: (510) 665-1655; Email: peer_editor@berkeley.edu

- PEER 2014/05 Seismic Velocity Site Characterization of Thirty-One Chilean Seismometer Stations by Spectral Analysis of Surface Wave Dispersion. Robert Kayen, Brad D. Carkin, Skye Corbet, Camilo Pinilla, Allan Ng, Edward Gorbis, and Christine Truong. April 2014.
- PEER 2014/04 Effect of Vertical Acceleration on Shear Strength of Reinforced Concrete Columns. Hyerin Lee and Khalid M. Mosalam. April 2014.
- PEER 2014/03 Retest of Thirty-Year-Old Neoprene Isolation Bearings. James M. Kelly and Niel C. Van Engelen. March 2014.
- **PEER 2014/02** Theoretical Development of Hybrid Simulation Applied to Plate Structures. Ahmed A. Bakhaty, Khalid M. Mosalam, and Sanjay Govindjee. January 2014.
- PEER 2014/01 Performance-Based Seismic Assessment of Skewed Bridges. Peyman Kaviani, Farzin Zareian, and Ertugrul Taciroglu. January 2014.
- PEER 2013/25 Earthquake Engineering for Resilient Communities: 2013 PEER Internship Program Research Report Collection. Heidi Tremayne (Editor), Stephen A. Mahin (Editor), Jorge Archbold Monterossa, Matt Brosman, Shelly Dean, Katherine deLaveaga, Curtis Fong, Donovan Holder, Rakeeb Khan, Elizabeth Jachens, David Lam, Daniela Martinez Lopez, Mara Minner, Geffen Oren, Julia Pavicic, Melissa Quinonez, Lorena Rodriguez, Sean Salazar, Kelli Slaven, Vivian Steyert, Jenny Taing, and Salvador Tena. December 2013.
- PEER 2013/24 NGA-West2 Ground Motion Prediction Equations for Vertical Ground Motions. September 2013.
- **PEER 2013/23** Coordinated Planning and Preparedness for Fire Following Major Earthquakes. Charles Scawthorn. November 2013.
- PEER 2013/22 *GEM-PEER Task 3 Project: Selection of a Global Set of Ground Motion Prediction Equations.* Jonathan P. Stewart, John Douglas, Mohammad B. Javanbarg, Carola Di Alessandro, Yousef Bozorgnia, Norman A. Abrahamson, David M. Boore, Kenneth W. Campbell, Elise Delavaud, Mustafa Erdik and Peter J. Stafford. December 2013.
- **PEER 2013/21** Seismic Design and Performance of Bridges with Columns on Rocking Foundations. Grigorios Antonellis and Marios Panagiotou. September 2013.
- **PEER 2013/20** Experimental and Analytical Studies on the Seismic Behavior of Conventional and Hybrid Braced Frames. Jiun-Wei Lai and Stephen A. Mahin. September 2013.
- PEER 2013/19 Toward Resilient Communities: A Performance-Based Engineering Framework for Design and Evaluation of the Built Environment. Michael William Mieler, Bozidar Stojadinovic, Robert J. Budnitz, Stephen A. Mahin and Mary C. Comerio. September 2013.
- PEER 2013/18 Identification of Site Parameters that Improve Predictions of Site Amplification. Ellen M. Rathje and Sara Navidi. July 2013.
- PEER 2013/17 Response Spectrum Analysis of Concrete Gravity Dams Including Dam-Water-Foundation Interaction. Arnkjell Løkke and Anil K. Chopra. July 2013.
- **PEER 2013/16** Effect of hoop reinforcement spacing on the cyclic response of large reinforced concrete special moment frame beams. Marios Panagiotou, Tea Visnjic, Grigorios Antonellis, Panagiotis Galanis, and Jack P. Moehle. June 2013.
- PEER 2013/15 A Probabilistic Framework to Include the Effects of Near-Fault Directivity in Seismic Hazard Assessment. Shrey Kumar Shahi, Jack W. Baker. October 2013.
- **PEER 2013/14** Hanging-Wall Scaling using Finite-Fault Simulations. Jennifer L. Donahue and Norman A. Abrahamson. September 2013.
- **PEER 2013/13** Semi-Empirical Nonlinear Site Amplification and its Application in NEHRP Site Factors. Jonathan P. Stewart and Emel Seyhan. November 2013.
- PEER 2013/12 Nonlinear Horizontal Site Response for the NGA-West2 Project. Ronnie Kamai, Norman A. Abramson, Walter J. Silva. May 2013.

- PEER 2013/11 Epistemic Uncertainty for NGA-West2 Models. Linda Al Atik and Robert R. Youngs. May 2013.
- PEER 2013/10 NGA-West 2 Models for Ground-Motion Directionality. Shrey K. Shahi and Jack W. Baker. May 2013.
- PEER 2013/09 Final Report of the NGA-West2 Directivity Working Group. Paul Spudich, Jeffrey R. Bayless, Jack W. Baker, Brian S.J. Chiou, Badie Rowshandel, Shrey Shahi, and Paul Somerville. May 2013.
- PEER 2013/08 NGA-West2 Model for Estimating Average Horizontal Values of Pseudo-Absolute Spectral Accelerations Generated by Crustal Earthquakes. I. M. Idriss. May 2013.
- PEER 2013/07 Update of the Chiou and Youngs NGA Ground Motion Model for Average Horizontal Component of Peak Ground Motion and Response Spectra. Brian Chiou and Robert Youngs. May 2013.
- **PEER 2013/06** NGA-West2 Campbell-Bozorgnia Ground Motion Model for the Horizontal Components of PGA, PGV, and 5%-Damped Elastic Pseudo-Acceleration Response Spectra for Periods Ranging from 0.01 to 10 sec. Kenneth W. Campbell and Yousef Bozorgnia. May 2013.
- PEER 2013/05 NGA-West 2 Equations for Predicting Response Spectral Accelerations for Shallow Crustal Earthquakes. David M. Boore, Jonathan P. Stewart, Emel Seyhan, Gail M. Atkinson. May 2013.
- PEER 2013/04 Update of the AS08 Ground-Motion Prediction Equations Based on the NGA-West2 Data Set. Norman Abrahamson, Walter Silva, and Ronnie Kamai. May 2013.
- PEER 2013/03 PEER NGA-West2 Database. Timothy D. Ancheta, Robert B. Darragh, Jonathan P. Stewart, Emel Seyhan, Walter J. Silva, Brian S.J. Chiou, Katie E. Wooddell, Robert W. Graves, Albert R. Kottke, David M. Boore, Tadahiro Kishida, and Jennifer L. Donahue. May 2013.
- **PEER 2013/02** *Hybrid Simulation of the Seismic Response of Squat Reinforced Concrete Shear Walls.* Catherine A. Whyte and Bozidar Stojadinovic. May 2013.
- PEER 2013/01 Housing Recovery in Chile: A Qualitative Mid-program Review. Mary C. Comerio. February 2013.
- **PEER 2012/08** Guidelines for Estimation of Shear Wave Velocity. Bernard R. Wair, Jason T. DeJong, and Thomas Shantz. December 2012.
- PEER 2012/07 Earthquake Engineering for Resilient Communities: 2012 PEER Internship Program Research Report Collection. Heidi Tremayne (Editor), Stephen A. Mahin (Editor), Collin Anderson, Dustin Cook, Michael Erceg, Carlos Esparza, Jose Jimenez, Dorian Krausz, Andrew Lo, Stephanie Lopez, Nicole McCurdy, Paul Shipman, Alexander Strum, Eduardo Vega. December 2012.
- PEER 2012/06 Fragilities for Precarious Rocks at Yucca Mountain. Matthew D. Purvance, Rasool Anooshehpoor, and James N. Brune. December 2012.
- **PEER 2012/05** Development of Simplified Analysis Procedure for Piles in Laterally Spreading Layered Soils. Christopher R. McGann, Pedro Arduino, and Peter Mackenzie–Helnwein. December 2012.
- PEER 2012/04 Unbonded Pre-Tensioned Columns for Bridges in Seismic Regions. Phillip M. Davis, Todd M. Janes, Marc O. Eberhard, and John F. Stanton. December 2012.
- PEER 2012/03 Experimental and Analytical Studies on Reinforced Concrete Buildings with Seismically Vulnerable Beam-Column Joints. Sangjoon Park and Khalid M. Mosalam. October 2012.
- PEER 2012/02 Seismic Performance of Reinforced Concrete Bridges Allowed to Uplift during Multi-Directional Excitation. Andres Oscar Espinoza and Stephen A. Mahin. July 2012.
- PEER 2012/01 Spectral Damping Scaling Factors for Shallow Crustal Earthquakes in Active Tectonic Regions. Sanaz Rezaeian, Yousef Bozorgnia, I. M. Idriss, Kenneth Campbell, Norman Abrahamson, and Walter Silva. July 2012.
- **PEER 2011/10** Earthquake Engineering for Resilient Communities: 2011 PEER Internship Program Research Report Collection. Eds. Heidi Faison and Stephen A. Mahin. December 2011.
- PEER 2011/09 Calibration of Semi-Stochastic Procedure for Simulating High-Frequency Ground Motions. Jonathan P. Stewart, Emel Seyhan, and Robert W. Graves. December 2011.
- PEER 2011/08 Water Supply in regard to Fire Following Earthquake. Charles Scawthorn. November 2011.
- **PEER 2011/07** Seismic Risk Management in Urban Areas. Proceedings of a U.S.-Iran-Turkey Seismic Workshop. September 2011.
- **PEER 2011/06** The Use of Base Isolation Systems to Achieve Complex Seismic Performance Objectives. Troy A. Morgan and Stephen A. Mahin. July 2011.
- **PEER 2011/05** Case Studies of the Seismic Performance of Tall Buildings Designed by Alternative Means. Task 12 Report for the Tall Buildings Initiative. Jack Moehle, Yousef Bozorgnia, Nirmal Jayaram, Pierson Jones, Mohsen Rahnama, Nilesh Shome, Zeynep Tuna, John Wallace, Tony Yang, and Farzin Zareian. July 2011.

- PEER 2011/04 Recommended Design Practice for Pile Foundations in Laterally Spreading Ground. Scott A. Ashford, Ross W. Boulanger, and Scott J. Brandenberg. June 2011.
- PEER 2011/03 New Ground Motion Selection Procedures and Selected Motions for the PEER Transportation Research Program. Jack W. Baker, Ting Lin, Shrey K. Shahi, and Nirmal Jayaram. March 2011.
- **PEER 2011/02** A Bayesian Network Methodology for Infrastructure Seismic Risk Assessment and Decision Support. Michelle T. Bensi, Armen Der Kiureghian, and Daniel Straub. March 2011.
- PEER 2011/01 Demand Fragility Surfaces for Bridges in Liquefied and Laterally Spreading Ground. Scott J. Brandenberg, Jian Zhang, Pirooz Kashighandi, Yili Huo, and Minxing Zhao. March 2011.
- **PEER 2010/05** Guidelines for Performance-Based Seismic Design of Tall Buildings. Developed by the Tall Buildings Initiative. November 2010.
- **PEER 2010/04** Application Guide for the Design of Flexible and Rigid Bus Connections between Substation Equipment Subjected to Earthquakes. Jean-Bernard Dastous and Armen Der Kiureghian. September 2010.
- **PEER 2010/03** Shear Wave Velocity as a Statistical Function of Standard Penetration Test Resistance and Vertical Effective Stress at Caltrans Bridge Sites. Scott J. Brandenberg, Naresh Bellana, and Thomas Shantz. June 2010.
- **PEER 2010/02** Stochastic Modeling and Simulation of Ground Motions for Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering. Sanaz Rezaeian and Armen Der Kiureghian. June 2010.
- PEER 2010/01 Structural Response and Cost Characterization of Bridge Construction Using Seismic Performance Enhancement Strategies. Ady Aviram, Božidar Stojadinović, Gustavo J. Parra-Montesinos, and Kevin R. Mackie. March 2010.
- **PEER 2009/03** The Integration of Experimental and Simulation Data in the Study of Reinforced Concrete Bridge Systems Including Soil-Foundation-Structure Interaction. Matthew Dryden and Gregory L. Fenves. November 2009.
- **PEER 2009/02** Improving Earthquake Mitigation through Innovations and Applications in Seismic Science, Engineering, Communication, and Response. Proceedings of a U.S.-Iran Seismic Workshop. October 2009.
- PEER 2009/01 Evaluation of Ground Motion Selection and Modification Methods: Predicting Median Interstory Drift Response of Buildings. Curt B. Haselton, 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.
- **PEER 2008/02** Treatment of Uncertainties in Seismic-Risk Analysis of Transportation Systems. Evangelos Stergiou and Anne S. Kiremidjian. July 2008.
- PEER 2008/01 Seismic Performance Objectives for Tall Buildings. William T. Holmes, Charles Kircher, William Petak, and Nabih Youssef. August 2008.
- PEER 2007/12 An Assessment to Benchmark the Seismic Performance of a Code-Conforming Reinforced Concrete Moment-Frame Building. Curt Haselton, Christine A. Goulet, Judith Mitrani-Reiser, James L. Beck, Gregory G. Deierlein, Keith A. Porter, Jonathan P. Stewart, and Ertugrul Taciroglu. August 2008.
- **PEER 2007/11** Bar Buckling in Reinforced Concrete Bridge Columns. Wayne A. Brown, Dawn E. Lehman, and John F. Stanton. February 2008.
- PEER 2007/10 Computational Modeling of Progressive Collapse in Reinforced Concrete Frame Structures. Mohamed M. Talaat and Khalid M. Mosalam. May 2008.

- PEER 2007/09 Integrated Probabilistic Performance-Based Evaluation of Benchmark Reinforced Concrete Bridges. Kevin R. Mackie, John-Michael Wong, and Božidar Stojadinović. January 2008.
- PEER 2007/08 Assessing Seismic Collapse Safety of Modern Reinforced Concrete Moment-Frame Buildings. Curt B. Haselton and Gregory G. Deierlein. February 2008.
- PEER 2007/07 Performance Modeling Strategies for Modern Reinforced Concrete Bridge Columns. Michael P. Berry and Marc O. Eberhard. April 2008.
- **PEER 2007/06** Development of Improved Procedures for Seismic Design of Buried and Partially Buried Structures. Linda Al Atik and Nicholas Sitar. June 2007.
- **PEER 2007/05** Uncertainty and Correlation in Seismic Risk Assessment of Transportation Systems. Renee G. Lee and Anne S. Kiremidjian. July 2007.
- PEER 2007/04 Numerical Models for Analysis and Performance-Based Design of Shallow Foundations Subjected to Seismic Loading. Sivapalan Gajan, Tara C. Hutchinson, Bruce L. Kutter, Prishati Raychowdhury, José A. Ugalde, and Jonathan P. Stewart. May 2008.
- PEER 2007/03 Beam-Column Element Model Calibrated for Predicting Flexural Response Leading to Global Collapse of RC Frame Buildings. Curt B. Haselton, Abbie B. Liel, Sarah Taylor Lange, and Gregory G. Deierlein. May 2008.
- **PEER 2007/02** Campbell-Bozorgnia NGA Ground Motion Relations for the Geometric Mean Horizontal Component of Peak and Spectral Ground Motion Parameters. Kenneth W. Campbell and Yousef Bozorgnia. May 2007.
- PEER 2007/01 Boore-Atkinson NGA Ground Motion Relations for the Geometric Mean Horizontal Component of Peak and Spectral Ground Motion Parameters. David M. Boore and Gail M. Atkinson. May. May 2007.
- PEER 2006/12 Societal Implications of Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering. Peter J. May. May 2007.
- PEER 2006/11 Probabilistic Seismic Demand Analysis Using Advanced Ground Motion Intensity Measures, Attenuation Relationships, and Near-Fault Effects. Polsak Tothong and C. Allin Cornell. March 2007.
- PEER 2006/10 Application of the PEER PBEE Methodology to the I-880 Viaduct. Sashi Kunnath. February 2007.
- **PEER 2006/09** *Quantifying Economic Losses from Travel Forgone Following a Large Metropolitan Earthquake.* James Moore, Sungbin Cho, Yue Yue Fan, and Stuart Werner. November 2006.
- PEER 2006/08 Vector-Valued Ground Motion Intensity Measures for Probabilistic Seismic Demand Analysis. Jack W. Baker and C. Allin Cornell. October 2006.
- PEER 2006/07 Analytical Modeling of Reinforced Concrete Walls for Predicting Flexural and Coupled–Shear-Flexural Responses. Kutay Orakcal, Leonardo M. Massone, and John W. Wallace. October 2006.
- **PEER 2006/06** Nonlinear Analysis of a Soil-Drilled Pier System under Static and Dynamic Axial Loading. Gang Wang and Nicholas Sitar. November 2006.
- PEER 2006/05 Advanced Seismic Assessment Guidelines. Paolo Bazzurro, C. Allin Cornell, Charles Menun, Maziar Motahari, and Nicolas Luco. September 2006.
- PEER 2006/04 Probabilistic Seismic Evaluation of Reinforced Concrete Structural Components and Systems. Tae Hyung Lee and Khalid M. Mosalam. August 2006.
- PEER 2006/03 Performance of Lifelines Subjected to Lateral Spreading. Scott A. Ashford and Teerawut Juirnarongrit. July 2006.
- PEER 2006/02 Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center Highway Demonstration Project. Anne Kiremidjian, James Moore, Yue Yue Fan, Nesrin Basoz, Ozgur Yazali, and Meredith Williams. April 2006.
- **PEER 2006/01** Bracing Berkeley. A Guide to Seismic Safety on the UC Berkeley Campus. Mary C. Comerio, Stephen Tobriner, and Ariane Fehrenkamp. January 2006.
- PEER 2005/16 Seismic Response and Reliability of Electrical Substation Equipment and Systems. Junho Song, Armen Der Kiureghian, and Jerome L. Sackman. April 2006.
- PEER 2005/15 CPT-Based Probabilistic Assessment of Seismic Soil Liquefaction Initiation. R. E. S. Moss, R. B. Seed, R. E. Kayen, J. P. Stewart, and A. Der Kiureghian. April 2006.
- **PEER 2005/14** Workshop on Modeling of Nonlinear Cyclic Load-Deformation Behavior of Shallow Foundations. Bruce L. Kutter, Geoffrey Martin, Tara Hutchinson, Chad Harden, Sivapalan Gajan, and Justin Phalen. March 2006.
- PEER 2005/13 Stochastic Characterization and Decision Bases under Time-Dependent Aftershock Risk in Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering. Gee Liek Yeo and C. Allin Cornell. July 2005.
- PEER 2005/12 PEER Testbed Study on a Laboratory Building: Exercising Seismic Performance Assessment. Mary C. Comerio, editor. November 2005.

PEER 2005/11 Van Nuys Hotel Building Testbed Report: Exercising Seismic Performance Assessment. Helmut Krawinkler, editor. October 2005. PEER 2005/10 First NEES/E-Defense Workshop on Collapse Simulation of Reinforced Concrete Building Structures. September 2005. PEER 2005/09 Test Applications of Advanced Seismic Assessment Guidelines. Joe Maffei, Karl Telleen, Danya Mohr, William Holmes, and Yuki Nakayama. August 2006. Damage Accumulation in Lightly Confined Reinforced Concrete Bridge Columns. R. Tyler Ranf, Jared M. Nelson, PEER 2005/08 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. Electrical Substation Equipment Interaction: Experimental Rigid Conductor Studies. Christopher Stearns and PEER 2004/09 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. Effects of Connection Hysteretic Degradation on the Seismic Behavior of Steel Moment-Resisting Frames. Janise PEER 2003/13 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.

Takhirov. November 2000. PEER 2000/10 The Second U.S.-Japan Workshop on Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering Methodology for Reinforced Concrete Building Structures. March 2000. Structural Engineering Reconnaissance of the August 17, 1999 Earthquake: Kocaeli (Izmit), Turkey. Halil Sezen, PEER 2000/09 Kenneth J. Elwood, Andrew S. Whittaker, Khalid Mosalam, John J. Wallace, and John F. Stanton. December 2000. PEER 2000/08 Behavior of Reinforced Concrete Bridge Columns Having Varying Aspect Ratios and Varying Lengths of Confinement. Anthony J. Calderone, Dawn E. Lehman, and Jack P. Moehle. January 2001. PEER 2000/07 Cover-Plate and Flange-Plate Reinforced Steel Moment-Resisting Connections. Taejin Kim, Andrew S. Whittaker, Amir S. Gilani, Vitelmo V. Bertero, and Shakhzod M. Takhirov. September 2000. PEER 2000/06 Seismic Evaluation and Analysis of 230-kV Disconnect Switches. Amir S. J. Gilani, Andrew S. Whittaker, Gregory L. Fenves, Chun-Hao Chen, Henry Ho, and Eric Fujisaki. July 2000. PEER 2000/05 Performance-Based Evaluation of Exterior Reinforced Concrete Building Joints for Seismic Excitation. Chandra Clyde, Chris P. Pantelides, and Lawrence D. Reaveley. July 2000. PEER 2000/04 An Evaluation of Seismic Energy Demand: An Attenuation Approach. Chung-Che Chou and Chia-Ming Uang. July 1999. Framing Earthquake Retrofitting Decisions: The Case of Hillside Homes in Los Angeles. Detlof von Winterfeldt, PEER 2000/03 Nels Roselund, and Alicia Kitsuse. March 2000. PEER 2000/02 U.S.-Japan 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. Seismic Evaluation and Retrofit of 230-kV Porcelain Transformer Bushings. Amir S. Gilani, Andrew S. Whittaker, PEER 1999/14 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. Rehabilitation of Nonductile RC Frame Building Using Encasement Plates and Energy-Dissipating Devices. PEER 1999/12 Mehrdad Sasani, Vitelmo V. Bertero, James C. Anderson. December 1999. PEER 1999/11 Performance Evaluation Database for Concrete Bridge Components and Systems under Simulated Seismic Loads. Yael D. Hose and Frieder Seible. November 1999. PEER 1999/10 U.S.-Japan Workshop on Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering Methodology for Reinforced Concrete Building Structures. December 1999. PEER 1999/09 Performance Improvement of Long Period Building Structures Subjected to Severe Pulse-Type Ground Motions. James C. Anderson, Vitelmo V. Bertero, and Raul Bertero. October 1999. PEER 1999/08 Envelopes for Seismic Response Vectors. Charles Menun and Armen Der Kiureghian. July 1999. PEER 1999/07 Documentation of Strengths and Weaknesses of Current Computer Analysis Methods for Seismic Performance of Reinforced Concrete Members. William F. Cofer. November 1999. PEER 1999/06 Rocking Response and Overturning of Anchored Equipment under Seismic Excitations. Nicos Makris and Jian Zhang. November 1999. Seismic Evaluation of 550 kV Porcelain Transformer Bushings. Amir S. Gilani, Andrew S. Whittaker, Gregory L. PEER 1999/05 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.

Experimental Study of Large Seismic Steel Beam-to-Column Connections. Egor P. Popov and Shakhzod M.

PEER 2001/01

PEER 1998/08 Behavior and Failure Analysis of a Multiple-Frame Highway Bridge in the 1994 Northridge Earthquake. Gregory L. Fenves and Michael Ellery. December 1998.

- PEER 1998/07 Empirical Evaluation of Inertial Soil-Structure Interaction Effects. Jonathan P. Stewart, Raymond B. Seed, and Gregory L. Fenves. November 1998.
- PEER 1998/06 Effect of Damping Mechanisms on the Response of Seismic Isolated Structures. Nicos Makris and Shih-Po Chang. November 1998.
- PEER 1998/05 Rocking Response and Overturning of Equipment under Horizontal Pulse-Type Motions. Nicos Makris and Yiannis Roussos. October 1998.
- PEER 1998/04 Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Invitational Workshop Proceedings, May 14–15, 1998: Defining the Links between Planning, Policy Analysis, Economics and Earthquake Engineering. Mary Comerio and Peter Gordon. September 1998.
- PEER 1998/03 Repair/Upgrade Procedures for Welded Beam to Column Connections. James C. Anderson and Xiaojing Duan. May 1998.
- PEER 1998/02 Seismic Evaluation of 196 kV Porcelain Transformer Bushings. Amir S. Gilani, Juan W. Chavez, Gregory L. Fenves, and Andrew S. Whittaker. May 1998.
- PEER 1998/01 Seismic Performance of Well-Confined Concrete Bridge Columns. Dawn E. Lehman and Jack P. Moehle. December 2000.

ONLINE PEER REPORTS

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

- PEER 2012/103 Performance-Based Seismic Demand Assessment of Concentrically Braced Steel Frame Buildings. Chui-Hsin Chen and Stephen A. Mahin. December 2012.
- PEER 2012/102 Procedure to Restart an Interrupted Hybrid Simulation: Addendum to PEER Report 2010/103. Vesna Terzic and Bozidar Stojadinovic. October 2012.
- PEER 2012/101 Mechanics of Fiber Reinforced Bearings. James M. Kelly and Andrea Calabrese. February 2012.
- PEER 2011/107 Nonlinear Site Response and Seismic Compression at Vertical Array Strongly Shaken by 2007 Niigata-ken Chuetsu-oki Earthquake. Eric Yee, Jonathan P. Stewart, and Kohji Tokimatsu. December 2011.
- PEER 2011/106 Self Compacting Hybrid Fiber Reinforced Concrete Composites for Bridge Columns. Pardeep Kumar, Gabriel Jen, William Trono, Marios Panagiotou, and Claudia Ostertag. September 2011.
- PEER 2011/105 Stochastic Dynamic Analysis of Bridges Subjected to Spacially Varying Ground Motions. Katerina Konakli and Armen Der Kiureghian. August 2011.
- PEER 2011/104 Design and Instrumentation of the 2010 E-Defense Four-Story Reinforced Concrete and Post-Tensioned Concrete Buildings. Takuya Nagae, Kenichi Tahara, Taizo Matsumori, Hitoshi Shiohara, Toshimi Kabeyasawa, Susumu Kono, Minehiro Nishiyama (Japanese Research Team) and John Wallace, Wassim Ghannoum, Jack Moehle, Richard Sause, Wesley Keller, Zeynep Tuna (U.S. Research Team). June 2011.
- PEER 2011/103 In-Situ Monitoring of the Force Output of Fluid Dampers: Experimental Investigation. Dimitrios Konstantinidis, James M. Kelly, and Nicos Makris. April 2011.
- PEER 2011/102 Ground-motion prediction equations 1964 2010. John Douglas. April 2011.
- PEER 2011/101 Report of the Eighth Planning Meeting of NEES/E-Defense Collaborative Research on Earthquake Engineering. Convened by the Hyogo Earthquake Engineering Research Center (NIED), NEES Consortium, Inc. February 2011.
- PEER 2010/111 Modeling and Acceptance Criteria for Seismic Design and Analysis of Tall Buildings. Task 7 Report for the Tall Buildings Initiative Published jointly by the Applied Technology Council. October 2010.
- PEER 2010/110 Seismic Performance Assessment and Probabilistic Repair Cost Analysis of Precast Concrete Cladding Systems for Multistory Buildlings. Jeffrey P. Hunt and Božidar Stojadinovic. November 2010.
- **PEER 2010/109** Report of the Seventh Joint Planning Meeting of NEES/E-Defense Collaboration on Earthquake Engineering. Held at the E-Defense, Miki, and Shin-Kobe, Japan, September 18–19, 2009. August 2010.
- PEER 2010/108 Probabilistic Tsunami Hazard in California. Hong Kie Thio, Paul Somerville, and Jascha Polet, preparers. October 2010.
- PEER 2010/107 Performance and Reliability of Exposed Column Base Plate Connections for Steel Moment-Resisting Frames. Ady Aviram, Božidar Stojadinovic, and Armen Der Kiureghian. August 2010.
- **PEER 2010/106** Verification of Probabilistic Seismic Hazard Analysis Computer Programs. Patricia Thomas, Ivan Wong, and Norman Abrahamson. May 2010.
- PEER 2010/105 Structural Engineering Reconnaissance of the April 6, 2009, Abruzzo, Italy, Earthquake, and Lessons Learned. M. Selim Günay and Khalid M. Mosalam. April 2010.
- **PEER 2010/104** Simulating the Inelastic Seismic Behavior of Steel Braced Frames, Including the Effects of Low-Cycle Fatigue. Yuli Huang and Stephen A. Mahin. April 2010.
- PEER 2010/103 Post-Earthquake Traffic Capacity of Modern Bridges in California. Vesna Terzic and Božidar Stojadinović. March 2010.
- **PEER 2010/102** Analysis of Cumulative Absolute Velocity (CAV) and JMA Instrumental Seismic Intensity (I_{JMA}) Using the PEER– NGA Strong Motion Database. Kenneth W. Campbell and Yousef Bozorgnia. February 2010.
- PEER 2010/101 Rocking Response of Bridges on Shallow Foundations. Jose A. Ugalde, Bruce L. Kutter, and Boris Jeremic. April 2010.
- PEER 2009/109 Simulation and Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering Assessment of Self-Centering Post-Tensioned Concrete Bridge Systems. Won K. Lee and Sarah L. Billington. December 2009.
- PEER 2009/108 PEER Lifelines Geotechnical Virtual Data Center. J. Carl Stepp, Daniel J. Ponti, Loren L. Turner, Jennifer N. Swift, Sean Devlin, Yang Zhu, Jean Benoit, and John Bobbitt. September 2009.
- **PEER 2009/107** Experimental and Computational Evaluation of Current and Innovative In-Span Hinge Details in Reinforced Concrete Box-Girder Bridges: Part 2: Post-Test Analysis and Design Recommendations. Matias A. Hube and Khalid M. Mosalam. December 2009.

- PEER 2009/106 Shear Strength Models of Exterior Beam-Column Joints without Transverse Reinforcement. Sangjoon Park and Khalid M. Mosalam. November 2009.
- **PEER 2009/105** Reduced Uncertainty of Ground Motion Prediction Equations through Bayesian Variance Analysis. Robb Eric S. Moss. November 2009.
- PEER 2009/104 Advanced Implementation of Hybrid Simulation. Andreas H. Schellenberg, Stephen A. Mahin, Gregory L. Fenves. November 2009.
- PEER 2009/103 Performance Evaluation of Innovative Steel Braced Frames. T. Y. Yang, Jack P. Moehle, and Božidar Stojadinovic. August 2009.
- **PEER 2009/102** Reinvestigation of Liquefaction and Nonliquefaction Case Histories from the 1976 Tangshan Earthquake. Robb Eric Moss, Robert E. Kayen, Liyuan Tong, Songyu Liu, Guojun Cai, and Jiaer Wu. August 2009.
- PEER 2009/101 Report of the First Joint Planning Meeting for the Second Phase of NEES/E-Defense Collaborative Research on Earthquake Engineering. Stephen A. Mahin et al. July 2009.
- PEER 2008/104 Experimental and Analytical Study of the Seismic Performance of Retaining Structures. Linda Al Atik and Nicholas Sitar. January 2009.
- PEER 2008/103 Experimental and Computational Evaluation of Current and Innovative In-Span Hinge Details in Reinforced Concrete Box-Girder Bridges. Part 1: Experimental Findings and Pre-Test Analysis. Matias A. Hube and Khalid M. Mosalam. January 2009.
- PEER 2008/102 Modeling of Unreinforced Masonry Infill Walls Considering In-Plane and Out-of-Plane Interaction. Stephen Kadysiewski and Khalid M. Mosalam. January 2009.
- PEER 2008/101 Seismic Performance Objectives for Tall Buildings. William T. Holmes, Charles Kircher, William Petak, and Nabih Youssef. August 2008.
- PEER 2007/101 Generalized Hybrid Simulation Framework for Structural Systems Subjected to Seismic Loading. Tarek Elkhoraibi and Khalid M. Mosalam. July 2007.
- PEER 2007/100 Seismic Evaluation of Reinforced Concrete Buildings Including Effects of Masonry Infill Walls. Alidad Hashemi and Khalid M. Mosalam. July 2007.

The Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center (PEER) is a multi-institutional research and education center with headquarters at the University of California, Berkeley. Investigators from over 20 universities, several consulting companies, and researchers at various state and federal government agencies contribute to research programs focused on performance-based earthquake engineering.

These research programs aim to identify and reduce the risks from major earthquakes to life safety and to the economy by including research in a wide variety of disciplines including structural and geotechnical engineering, geology/seismology, lifelines, transportation, architecture, economics, risk management, and public policy.

PEER is supported by federal, state, local, and regional agencies, together with industry partners.



PEER Core Institutions: University of California, Berkeley (Lead Institution) California Institute of Technology Oregon State University Stanford University University of California, Davis University of California, Irvine University of California, Irvine University of California, Los Angeles University of California, San Diego University of Southern California University of Washington

PEER reports can be ordered at http://peer.berkeley.edu/publications/peer_reports.html or by contacting

Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center University of California, Berkeley 325 Davis Hall, mail code 1792 Berkeley, CA 94720-1792 Tel: 510-642-3437 Fax: 510-642-1655 Email: peer_editor@berkeley.edu

ISSN 1547-0587X