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Typical Approach for Design Time Histories

• Specified Design Event
  – M, R, Site, Spectrum

• Engineers Request: Provide small set of representative ground motions time series
  – e.g. 1-7 sets of time series

• Ground Motion Analyst
  – Select ground motions with similar M, R, site, directivity condition
  – Modify the ground motion to be consistent with the design spectrum
  – Preference for less scaling
What is Unsaid in Engineer’s Request

• Use of small number of time histories
  – Implies engineer is after average response
  – Too few records to define variability

• Non-linear engineering analysis
  – Ground motion analyst should find recordings that give an average response when put into a non-linear system
    • Non-linear soil
    • Non-linear structure
Summary from the 2004 Meeting

• Large variability of non-linear response of structures from recordings with similar M,R
  – For small number of time series (e.g. 3-7), results sensitive to the selection of the time series

• No well founded objective criteria for selecting time series
  – Left to judgment
  – Problem is getting worse as the number of recordings grows

• Can’t develop an objective selection criteria until the intended use of the time series is specified.
  – Need more interaction between ground motion analyst and engineer evaluating the structure
Summary from the 2004 Meeting

- Need to decide if we are after average response or variability of response
  - Most participants agreed we are after the average response given the design spectrum, not the variability of the response
  - The design spectrum already has the return period of the ground motion in it

- If we are after average response, we can do better than just randomly selecting records from similar magnitude-Distance bin
  - Epsilon value (Cornell’s approach)
  - Simplified non-linear system

- PEER DGML
  - Records selected to capture variability of the response
Summary from the 2004 Meeting

• Modification of time series
  – Scaling by a constant factor
    • Large scale factors can lead to a bias in the response if random records in M-R bin are used
    • Large scale factors can lead to unbiased results for some time series
      – Need to consider additional parameters to be able to identify records that can be scaled by large factors
  – Spectrum compatible
    • Not considered in 2004 meeting
    • To be addressed in 2005 meeting
Recommendations for Selection and Scaling of Ground Motion Records to Satisfy Code Requirements Including Spectrum Compatible Scaling
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Scaling vs Spectrum Compatible

• Spectrum compatible reduces variability of response
  – Requires fewer sets of time histories to get same accuracy in mean response of structure
    • Spectrum compatible reduces the standard deviation of the non-linear response by about a factor of 2
    • One spectrum compatible = about 4 scaled records for determining the mean values
  – Does not capture variability of response

• Scaling preserves variability of response
  – Need to consider effect of “epsilon” in selecting records
  – Bias if scaling up spectral troughs to UHS level
Objections to Spectrum Compatible Ground Motions

- Spectrum compatible leads to a smooth spectrum. Since earthquakes don’t have smooth spectra, then spectrum compatible time series are unrealistic by definition
  - Objective is to reduce the variability in response from realistic ground motions, but preserving the median response
Objections to Spectrum Compatible Ground Motions

- Spectrum compatible excites all periods in one earthquake (e.g. broadband) which will lead to significant over-estimation of the response.
  - This is not the case for modern spectrum compatible methods
Objections to Spectrum Compatible Ground Motions

- Spectrum compatible time series aren’t realistic (e.g. white noise)
  - White noise methods are obsolete and should not be used
  - Two approaches work well preserving the general non-stationary characteristics of the reference time series
    - Time domain method (wavelets)
      - e.g. RSPMATCH
    - RVT methods (if the change in response spectral shape is not too large)
      - e.g. RASCAL
    - Still somewhat of an art. Ongoing work to make the process more automated
Example Spectral Matching
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Example Using Inelastic Oscillators

• $T = 1$ sec
• 6 Cases
  – Yield displacement ratios: 4 and 10
  – Post yield stiffness ratio: 0.05, 0.10, 0.20
Example Design Spectrum
M=6.75, R=10 km
Scaled Records
Scaled Records
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Spectrum Compatible

![Graph showing the spectrum compatibility with different cases.]
Recommendations

- For estimating median response given a design spectrum using spectrum compatible ground motions:
  - Select candidate records based on seismological properties
    - ± 0.5 magnitude (can be extended to ±1)
    - Wide distance range (e.g. 0-30 km)
    - All styles of faulting (crustal eqk)
    - Directivity condition
      - Forward, average, backward
    - Wide range of site classes
      - For hard-rock (Vs=2000 m/s), best to select hard-rock site for high frequency (> 10 hz)
  - No limits on the amount of scaling
Example: Caldecott Tunnel
T=2 sec
Recommendations (cont)

– From the suite of candidate recordings:
  • Use a simple non-linear system as proxy for the more complicated full model of the structure
  • Select records that give closest to the average response of the simple non-linear system (e.g. non-linear oscillator)

– Modify records to be spectrum compatible
  • Prefer time domain approach
  • Simple to meet code requirements on spectral content without adding conservatism

– Results only good for the median response
– Use generic (university) studies to estimate the variability
– Check that spectrum compatible records lead to near median results for the simple non-linear system
Near Fault Effects

• Directivity
  – Related to the direction of the rupture front
    • Forward directivity: rupture toward the site (site away from the epicenter)
    • Backward directivity: rupture away from the site (site near the epicenter)

• Fling
  – Related to the permanent tectonic deformation at the site
Velocity Pulses

• Forward Directivity
  – Two-sided velocity pulse due to constructive interference of SH waves from generated from parts of the rupture located between the site and epicenter
    • Constructive interference occurs if slip direction is aligned with the rupture direction
    • Occurs at sites located close to the fault but away from the epicenter for strike-slip

• Fling
  – One-sided velocity pulse due to tectonic deformation
  – Occurs at sites located near the fault rupture independent of the epicenter location
# Observations of Directivity and Fling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sense of Slip</th>
<th>Directivity</th>
<th>Fling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strike-Slip</td>
<td>Fault Normal</td>
<td>Fault Parallel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dip-Slip</td>
<td>Fault Normal</td>
<td>Fault Normal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example Code Application
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