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ABSTRACT

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

by

Xiao Liang

Doctor of Philosophy in Engineering – Civil and Environmental Engineering

University of California, Berkeley

Professor Khalid M. Mosalam, Chair

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

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

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

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

1.1 MOTIVATION AND OBJECTIVE

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

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

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

Another key challenge in the PBEE approach is the selection and modification of ground motions (GMs) to serve as input excitations for the simulations using NTHA of structures. The intricate nonlinear response of structures is highly sensitive to the ground motion selection and modification (GMSM) of the input records. Therefore, the GMSM of the input records are vital prerequisites for accurate seismic analysis. Numerous research efforts focused on developing different GMSM procedures, which are generally categorized into two approaches: (1) amplitude scaling and (2) spectrum shape matching procedures. The first approach selects and modifies the GM records based on scalar intensity measures (IMs). The second approach that takes the spectrum shape into account selects and scales a suite of GM records that has close matching to a target spectrum. Although many GMSM procedures are available, there is no consensus regarding a single accurate method and many studies focused on evaluating these procedures. The existing evaluation studies in the literature are primarily for building structures and considered unidirectional input ground motion. In general, bidirectional GM studies should be conducted, especially for the structures with very different behaviors in two directions, e.g., bridge structures. To fill in this knowledge gap, a framework based on the PBEE approach is proposed to evaluate different GMSM procedures conducting NTHA simulations under bidirectional GM excitations.

In urban societies, reinforced concrete (RC) highway bridges, key components of infrastructure systems, play a significant role in transportation and distribution of goods and commuting people. Therefore, they are expected to sustain minor damage and maintain their functionality in the aftermath of earthquakes, which commonly occur in California due to many active faults. In the last two decades, however, even bridges designed according to modern design codes were observed to experience poor performance or even collapse during earthquakes caused by inherent vulnerability of the bridge structural systems. Thus, accurate seismic structural analysis of existing and newly designed RC highway bridges is fundamental to estimate their seismic demands. As such important lifeline structures, RC highway bridge systems are investigated as an application of the previously discussed theoretical developments proposed in this dissertation to address the two key challenges in the PBEE approach.

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

1. Development of a nonlinear equation solver that attempts to overcome the drawbacks of the NR algorithms.
4. Recommendations of accurate and robust NTHA simulations for RC highway bridge systems.
5. Development of a framework to probabilistically evaluate GMSM procedures with application to RC highway bridge systems.

1.2 ORGANIZATION OF THE DISSERTATION

This dissertation is organized into 10 chapters as schematically illustrated in Figure 1.1 and discussed in this section. After this introductory chapter, Chapter 2 reviews the direct integration algorithms and the nonlinear equation solvers investigated in this study. The theoretical developments are presented in Chapters 3 through 6. Chapter 3 starts with the introduction of continuous-time and discrete-time systems and the definitions of stability. It then introduces the Lyapunov stability theory for these two systems. Based on such theory for continuous-time systems, a new nonlinear equation solver is developed to overcome the drawbacks of the NR algorithms and its convergence performance is demonstrated by several numerical examples. Chapters 4 and 5 utilize the Lyapunov stability theory for discrete-time systems to investigate the stability of direct integration algorithms for nonlinear structural systems. Chapter 4 proposes a numerical approach to transform the problem of seeking a Lyapunov function to a convex optimization problem, i.e., an approach that enables performing the stability analysis numerically. In addition, the accuracy of the integration algorithms is examined using a geometrically nonlinear problem, which has a closed-form exact solution. Chapter 5 proposes another Lyapunov-based approach to investigate the stability of explicit direct integration algorithms for nonlinear MDOF systems by means of the strictly positive real lemma. This approach transforms the stability analysis to pursuing the strictly positive realness of the transfer function matrix for the formulated MDOF system. Several examples, including a bridge structure and a generic multi-story shear building, are presented in this chapter to demonstrate this proposed approach. Chapter 6 starts with the well-known PEER PBEE approach. By taking advantage of this approach, it presents a framework for probabilistic evaluation of GMSM procedures.

The application of the theoretical developments in Chapters 3 through 6 is presented in Chapters 7 to 9. Chapter 7 provides a brief introduction of RC highway bridge structures selected in this study and reviews the computational models of these bridges. Chapter 8 investigates solutions to the numerical problems of convergence experienced in the NTHA simulations of these RC highway bridge systems. Recommendations are given in Chapters 8 for the accurate and robust NTHA simulations. Chapter 9 probabilistically evaluates several GMSM procedures considering the distinct structural behaviors in the longitudinal and transverse directions of RC highway bridges under bidirectional GM excitations. A brief summary, the main conclusions and future extension based on this study are presented in Chapter 10. This dissertation also includes six appendices. Appendices A to E give some derivations and details used for the proposed two Lyapunov-based approaches of stability analysis. Appendices E and F document all the utilized GMs in this dissertation.
Figure 1.1 Classification of dissertation chapters.
2 Direct Integration Algorithms and Nonlinear Solvers

2.1 INTRODUCTION

The response of a structure to earthquake excitation and the consequences of this response involve various uncertainties at different stages including the definition of hazard, structural response, damage, and the corresponding loss determination. Performance-based Earthquake Engineering (PBEE) approach aims to consider all these uncertainties in order to determine the most efficient decision about the seismic risk mitigation actions [Günay and Mosalam 2013]. In order to achieve this goal of the PBEE approach, considerable amount of structural analytical simulations are required. Attributed to continuous improvement of computational power [Mosalam et al. 2013], nonlinear time history analysis (NTHA) method as the most suitable approach is becoming increasingly prevalent for analyzing large and complex structures.

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

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

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

2.2 DIRECT INTEGRATION ALGORITHMS

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

\[ m \ddot{u} + c \dot{u} + f = p \]  

(2.1)

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

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

\[ u_{i+1} = u_i + (\Delta t)\dot{u}_i + \frac{(\Delta t)^2}{2}[(1-2\beta)\ddot{u}_i + 2\beta \dddot{u}_{i+1}] \]  

(2.2)

\[ \dot{u}_{i+1} = \dot{u}_i + (\Delta t)[(1-\gamma)\dddot{u}_i + \gamma \dddot{u}_{i+1}] \]  

(2.3)

\[ m\dddot{u}_{i+1} + c\ddot{u}_{i+1} + f_{i+1} = p_{i+1} \]  

(2.4)

In the above equations, \( \gamma \) and \( \beta \) parameters define the variation of accelerations over a time step, \( \Delta t \). For example, \( \gamma = 1/2 \) and \( \beta = 1/4 \) represent constant average acceleration over the time step, while \( \gamma = 1/2 \) and \( \beta = 1/6 \) define linear variation of acceleration during the time step.

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

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

$$u_{i+1} = u_i + (\Delta t) \dot{u}_i + \frac{(\Delta t)^2}{2} \ddot{u}_i$$

(2.5)

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

$$m_{eff} \ddot{u}_{i+1} = p_{eff}$$

$$m_{eff} = m + (\Delta t)\gamma c$$

$$p_{eff} = p_{i+1} - f_{i+1} - c \left[ \dot{u}_i + (\Delta t)(1 - \gamma) \ddot{u}_i \right]$$

(2.6)

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

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

2.2.2 Operator-Splitting Algorithm

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

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

(2.7)

After the prediction of the displacement, the method is defined by setting the restoring force of the integration time step as the sum of the restoring force corresponding to the predicted displacement, $\tilde{f}_{i+1}$, and the difference between the corrected and predicted displacements multiplied by the tangential stiffness matrix, $k$, i.e.,
\[ f_{r+1} = \tilde{f}_{r+1} + k_r (u_{r+1} - \ddot{u}_{r+1}) \]  

(2.8)

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

\[ \Delta u_{r+1} = u_{r+1} - \ddot{u}_{r+1} \]  

(2.9)

Substituting Eq. (2.9) in Eq. (2.8) gives,

\[ f_{r+1} = \tilde{f}_{r+1} + k_r (\Delta u_{r+1}) \]  

(2.10)

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

\[ \ddot{u}_{r+1} = \frac{\Delta u_{r+1}}{(\Delta t)^2 \beta} \]  

(2.11)

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

\[ \ddot{u}_{r+1} = \dot{u}_i + (\Delta t)(1-\gamma)\ddot{u}_i + \frac{\gamma}{(\Delta t)^2 \beta} (\Delta u_{r+1}) \]  

(2.12)

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

\[ k_{eff} \Delta u_{r+1} = p_{eff} \]  

(2.13)

\[ k_{eff} = \frac{1}{(\Delta t)^2 \beta} m + \frac{\gamma}{\Delta t \beta} c + k_r \]

\[ p_{eff} = p_{r+1} - \tilde{f}_{r+1} - c[\dot{u}_i + \Delta t(1-\gamma)\ddot{u}_i] \]

\[ u_{r+1} = \ddot{u}_{r+1} + \Delta u_{r+1} \]  

(2.14)
The algorithm for an integration time step of the OS method is summarized as follows:

1. Compute the predicted displacement using Eq. (2.7);
2. Obtain the restoring force, $\tilde{f}$, corresponding to the predicted displacement from the constitutive relationships of the defined materials and elements using a state determination method [Spacone et al. 1996];
3. Determine the difference between the corrected and the predicted displacements by solving the linear system of equations defined by Eqs. (2.13);
4. Determine the acceleration using Eq. (2.11);
5. Calculate the corrected displacement using Eq. (2.14);
6. Obtain the restoring force corresponding to the corrected displacement following the procedure outlined in step 2 above;
7. Determine the velocity using Eq. (2.12);
8. Increment $i$ and proceed with the next integration time step.

It is noted that the initial stiffness matrix, $k_i$, was used instead of $k_T$ in some of the studies in literature. For example, [Combescure and Pegon 1997] used $k_i$ in hybrid simulations involving physical and computational substructures due to the difficulties in obtaining the tangent stiffness matrices of the test specimens.

2.2.3 Implicit Newmark Algorithm

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

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

(2.15)

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

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

In order to solve for the displacement increments, the difference Eqs. (2.2) and (2.3) are redefined such that the velocities and accelerations are expressed in terms of displacements as follows:
\[ \ddot{u}_{i+1} = \frac{\delta u_{i+1}}{(\Delta t)^2} - \frac{1}{(\Delta t)\beta} \dot{u}_{i} - \left( \frac{1}{2\beta} - 1 \right) \ddot{u}_{i} \]  
\tag{2.16}

\[ \delta u_{i+1} = u_{i+1} - u_{i} \]  
\tag{2.17}

\[ \dot{u}_{i+1} = -\frac{\gamma}{(\Delta t)\beta} \delta u_{i+1} - \left( \frac{\gamma}{\beta} - 1 \right) \dot{u}_{i} - (\Delta t) \left( \frac{\gamma}{2\beta} - 1 \right) \ddot{u}_{i} \]  
\tag{2.18}

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

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

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

\[ g'(u_{i+1}^k) \delta u_{i+1}^k = -g(u_{i+1}^k) \]  
\tag{2.20}

\[ g(\dot{u}_{i+1}^k) = \dddot{u}_{i+1}^k + \dot{c}u_{i+1}^k + f_{i+1}^k - p_{i+1} \]  
\tag{2.21}

\[ g'(u_{i+1}^k) = \frac{1}{(\Delta t)^2} \mathbf{m} + \frac{\gamma}{(\Delta t)\beta} \mathbf{c} + \mathbf{k}_f \]  
\tag{2.22}

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

\[ \mathbf{k}_{\text{eff}} \delta \mathbf{u}_{i+1}^k = \mathbf{p}_{\text{eff}} \]  
\tag{2.23}

\[ \mathbf{k}_{\text{eff}} = \frac{1}{(\Delta t)^2} \mathbf{m} + \frac{\gamma}{(\Delta t)\beta} \mathbf{c} + \mathbf{k}_f \]

\[ \mathbf{p}_{\text{eff}} = \mathbf{p}_{i+1} - \dddot{u}_{i+1}^k - \dot{c}u_{i+1}^k - f_{i+1}^k \]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

\[
\ddot{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1}^{k=1} = - \frac{1}{(\Delta t)^2 \beta} \ddot{\mathbf{u}}_i - \left( \frac{1}{2 \beta} - 1 \right) \ddot{\mathbf{u}}_i \tag{2.29}
\]
The algorithm for an integration time step of the IN method is summarized as follows:

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

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

2. Obtain the restoring force, \( f \), corresponding to the computed displacement from the constitutive relationships of the defined materials and elements using a state determination method [Spacone et al. 1996];

3. Determine the displacement increment by solving the linear system of equations defined by Eqs. (2.23).

4. Compute the displacement, velocity and acceleration using Eqs. (2.24)-(2.26);

5. Check convergence by comparing a calculated norm with a defined tolerance value. If the norm is smaller than the tolerance, set \( N = k \), increment \( i \) and proceed to the next time integration step; otherwise, increment \( k \) and go to step 2.

Regarding the above algorithm, two remarks are stated as follows:

- The presence of the convergence check requires at least two iterations. Therefore, unless a solution is separately coded for a linear case, a general nonlinear analysis software requires at least two iterations for the IN integration, even for the case of a linear problem.

- Different norms can be used for the convergence check in step 5. Examples of these norms are the displacement increment, unbalanced force and energy norms.

2.2.4 TRBDF2 Algorithm

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

\[
\ddot{u}_{i+1} = \frac{u_{i+1} - 4u_i + 3u_{i-1}}{\Delta t} \tag{2.30}
\]

\[
\ddot{u}_{i+1} = \frac{\ddot{u}_{i+1} - 4\ddot{u}_i + 3\ddot{u}_{i-1}}{\Delta t} \tag{2.31}
\]

Following the regular NR method as demonstrated for IN, the following linear system of Eqs. (2.32) is obtained:
After the determination of the displacement increment for iteration \( k \) from Eqs. (2.32), the method continues by the calculation of the displacement, velocity and acceleration for iteration \( k + 1 \) using Eqs. (2.33)-(2.35), respectively.

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

(2.32)

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

### 2.3 NONLINEAR EQUATION SOLVERS

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

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

(2.36)

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

\[
\mathbf{r}(\mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{0}
\]

(2.37)

The following sub-sections describe how each of the discussed nonlinear solvers attempt to satisfy Eq. (2.37). It is noted that the subscript \( i \) representing the number of the integration time step is dropped to simplify the expressions in the following sub-sections.
2.3.1 Regular Newton-Raphson Algorithm

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

\[ r(u^k + \Delta u^{k+1}) \approx r(u^k) + \frac{\partial r(u^k)}{\partial u} (\Delta u^{k+1}) \]  

(2.38)

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

\[ J_k = \frac{\partial r(u^k)}{\partial u} = -k_T \]  

(2.39)

where \( k_T \) is the tangential stiffness matrix. The algorithm starts with an initial guess and iterates with the following equations until a certain convergence criterion is met.

\[ \Delta u^{k+1} = -J_k^{-1} r(u^k) = k_T^{-1} r(u^k) \]  

(2.40)

\[ u^{k+1} = u^k + \Delta u^{k+1} \]

2.3.2 Broyden Algorithm

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

\[ J_k = J_{k:1} + \Delta r^k - J_{k:1} \Delta u_k \left( \Delta u^k \right)^T \]  

(2.41)

where \( \| \cdot \| \) indicates the discrete \( L_2 \)-norm\(^1\) and superscript \( T \) indicates transpose.

\[ \Delta u_k = u^k - u^{k:1} \]

\[ \Delta r^k = r^k - r^{k:1} \]  

(2.42)

Subsequently, the algorithm proceeds with Eqs. (2.40) as in the regular NR algorithm. It is to be noted that the modified NR is a special case where the rank-one update is ignored.

\(^{1}\| u \| = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n} u_i^2} \) where \( n \) in the number of components of the vector \( u \)
2.3.3 Newton-Raphson with Line Search Algorithm

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

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

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

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

(2.43)

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

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

(2.44)

with the following initial guess

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

(2.45)

2.3.4 Broyden–Fletcher–Goldfarb–Shanno Algorithm

From an initial guess $\mathbf{u}_0$ and an approximate Hessian matrix$^2 \mathbf{B}_0$, the following steps in the Broyden–Fletcher–Goldfarb–Shanno (BFGS) algorithm are repeated until convergence [Bathe and Cimento 1980]:

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

$$
\mathbf{B}_k \left( \Delta \mathbf{u}^k \right) = -\nabla \mathbf{r} \left( \mathbf{u}^k \right)
$$

(2.46)

where $\mathbf{B}_k$ is an approximation of the Hessian matrix, which is updated at each iteration, and $\nabla \mathbf{r} \left( \mathbf{u}^k \right)$ is the gradient$^3$ of the function evaluated at $\mathbf{u}^k$.

2) A line search is performed to find the step size $\eta^k$ for the $k$-th iteration and update the displacement as follows:

$^2$Hessian matrix is a square matrix of second-order partial derivatives of a function.

$^3$ $\nabla f = \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \mathbf{i} + \frac{\partial f}{\partial y} \mathbf{j} + \frac{\partial f}{\partial z} \mathbf{k}$ where $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}$ and $\mathbf{k}$ are unit vectors in the directions $x, y$ and $z$, respectively.
\[ \mathbf{u}^{k+1} = \mathbf{u}^k + \eta^k \Delta \mathbf{u}^k \]  

(2.47)

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

\[ \mathbf{B}_{k+1} = \mathbf{B}_k + \frac{\mathbf{y}^k (\mathbf{y}^k)^T}{\mathbf{s}^k (\mathbf{s}^k)^T} \mathbf{B}_k \frac{(\mathbf{s}^k)^T \mathbf{B}_k}{\mathbf{y}^k} \]  

(2.48)

where

\[ \mathbf{s}^k = \eta^k \Delta \mathbf{u}^k \]  

(2.49)

\[ \mathbf{y}^k = \nabla \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{u}^{k+1}) - \nabla \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{u}^k) \]  

(2.50)

### 2.3.5 Krylov-Newton Algorithm

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

\[ \mathbf{R}(\mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{k}_0^1 \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{0} \]  

(2.51)

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

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

(2.52)

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

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

\[ \Delta \mathbf{u}^{k+1} = \mathbf{w}^{k+1} + \mathbf{q}^{k+1} \]  

(2.53)

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

\[ \mathbf{w}^{k+1} = c_1 \Delta \mathbf{u}^1 + \cdots + c_m \Delta \mathbf{u}^m \]  

(2.54)

To satisfy Eq. (2.52), the first step is to minimize the norm of vector \( \mathbf{R}(\mathbf{u}^k) - \mathbf{A} \mathbf{w}^{k+1} \), which represents an over-determined system of equations for the unknown coefficients \( c_1, \ldots, c_m \) in Eq. (2.54), by least-squares analysis [Golub and Van Loan 1996]. The second step for satisfying Eq. (2.52) is to solve the following equations:
\[ \mathbf{R}(\mathbf{u}^{k+1}) = g_k - Aq^{k+1} = 0 \] (2.55)

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

\[ q^{k+1} = g_k \] (2.56)

The displacement increment is then calculated by summing the two components determined from Eqs. (2.54) and (2.56).
3 Development of Lyapunov-Based Nonlinear Equation Solver

3.1 INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

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

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

3.2.1 Continuous-Time Systems

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

$$\dot{x} = g(x)$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.1)

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

$$\tilde{x} = x - x^*$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.2)

and therefore

$$\dot{\tilde{x}} = g(x) = g(\tilde{x} + x^*) = \tilde{g}(\tilde{x})$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.3)

which leads to

$$\tilde{g}(0) = 0$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.4)

3.2.2 Discrete-Time Systems

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

$$x_{k+1} = g(x_k)$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.5)

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

$$\tilde{x}_k = x_k - x^*$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.6)

and therefore

$$\tilde{x}_{k+1} + x^* = g(x_k) = g(\tilde{x}_k + x^*)$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.7)

$$\tilde{x}_{k+1} = g(\tilde{x}_k + x^*) - x^* = \tilde{g}(\tilde{x}_k)$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.8)

which also leads to Eq. (3.4).
3.2.3 Stability Definitions

**Stability**: The equilibrium \( x = 0 \) is stable if for each \( \varepsilon > 0 \), there exists \( \delta > 0 \) such that:

\[
|x(0)| \leq \delta \quad \Rightarrow \quad |x(t)| \leq \varepsilon
\]  

(3.9)

for all \( t \geq 0 \) [Khalil 2002]. The equilibrium point is unstable if it is not stable.

**Asymptotic stability**: The equilibrium \( x = 0 \) is asymptotically stable if it is stable and \( x(0) \to 0 \) for all \( x(0) \) in a neighborhood of \( x = 0 \).

**Global asymptotic stability**: The equilibrium \( x = 0 \) is globally asymptotically stable if it is stable and \( x(0) \to 0 \) for all \( x(0) \). It is noted that \( x(0) \to 0 \) does not necessarily guarantee stability. For example, trajectories may converge to the origin only after a large detour that violates the stability definition in Eq. (3.9).

3.3 LYAPUNOV STABILITY THEORY

The Lyapunov stability theory is discussed in this section. This discussion focus on the previously discussed continuous-time and discrete-time nonlinear systems.

3.3.1 Continuous-Time Systems

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

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

(3.10)

and

\[
\dot{v}(x) = \frac{d}{dt} v(x) = \nabla v(x) \cdot g(x) \leq 0 \quad \forall x \in D
\]

(3.11)

Moreover, \( x = 0 \) is asymptotically stable if

\[
\dot{v}(x) < 0 \quad \forall x \in D - \{0\}
\]

(3.12)

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

\[
|x| \to \infty \quad \Rightarrow \quad v(x) \to \infty
\]

(3.13)

then \( x = 0 \) is globally asymptotically stable.
3.3.2 Discrete-Time Systems

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

\[
\Delta v_{k+1} = v(x_{k+1}) - v(x_k) \leq 0 \quad \forall x \in D
\]  

(3.14)

Moreover, \( x = 0 \) is asymptotically stable if

\[
\Delta v(x_{k+1}) < 0 \quad \forall x \in D - \{0\}
\]  

(3.15)

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

For continuous time systems, it is required that the derivative of the Lyapunov function is negative along the trajectories. For discrete-time systems, it is required that the difference in the Lyapunov function is negative along the trajectories. Also, quite importantly we do not require that \( v \) is continuously differentiable, but to be only continuous.

3.4 Lyapunov-Based Nonlinear Equation Solver

As stated in Eq. (2.37), the general formulation of nonlinear set of equation is as follows:

\[
g(x) = 0
\]  

(3.16)

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

\[
\dot{x} = -K \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial x} g(x) \right]^T g(x) = -KJ(x)^T g(x)
\]  

(3.17)

where \( K \) is positive definite, i.e., \( K = K^T > 0 \) and the Jacobian matrix

\[
J(x) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} g(x)
\]  

(3.18)

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

\[
v(x) = \frac{1}{2} g(x)^T g(x)
\]  

(3.19)

A sufficient condition for the system, and thus the direct integration algorithm, to be stable is as follows:
\[ \dot{v}(x) = \frac{1}{2} \left[ \frac{\partial g(x)}{\partial x} \right]^T g(x) + \frac{1}{2} g(x)^T \left[ \frac{\partial g(x)}{\partial x} \right] = -\frac{1}{2} [J(x)KJ(x)^T g(x)]^T g(x) - \frac{1}{2} g(x)^T [J(x)KJ(x)^T g(x)] = -g(x)^T J(x)KJ(x)^T g(x) \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.20)

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

### 3.4.1 Static Problems

For static structural problems, Eqs. (3.16) and (3.17) become

\[ g = f(u) = 0 \] \hspace{1cm} (3.21)

\[ \dot{u} = -K \left[ \frac{\partial f(u)}{\partial u} \right]^T f(u) = -KJ(u)^T f(u) = -Kk_T f(u) \] \hspace{1cm} (3.22)

and the corresponding Jacobian matrix is

\[ J(u) = \frac{\partial f(u)}{\partial u} = k_T \] \hspace{1cm} (3.23)

where \( k_T \) is the tangent stiffness of the structural system. The Lyapunov function corresponding to Eq. (3.19) becomes

\[ v(u) = \frac{1}{2} f(u)^T f(u) \] \hspace{1cm} (3.24)

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

\[ |u| \to \infty \Rightarrow f(u) \to \infty \Rightarrow v(u) \to \infty \] \hspace{1cm} (3.25)

Then, the hypothetical system in Eq. (3.22) is globally asymptotically stable and converges to the equilibrium corresponding to \( v(u) = 0 \) and thus \( f(u) = 0 \). It is to be noted that the tangent stiffness matrix \( k_T \) can be replaced by the constant stiffness matrix at the initial guess at \( u^0 \).
3.4.2 Dynamic Problems

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

$$g(u_{i+1}) = m \ddot{u}_{i+1} + cu_{i+1} + f_{i+1} - p_{i+1}$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.26)

Consider using the implicit Newmark integration algorithm and reorder the Newmark difference equations Eqs. (2.2) and (2.3) as follows:

$$\ddot{u}_{i+1} = \frac{\gamma}{(\Delta t)^2} (u_{i+1} - u_i) - \frac{1}{(\Delta t)^2} c \dot{u}_i - \frac{1}{(\Delta t)^2} m \ddot{u}_i$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.27)

$$\dddot{u}_{i+1} = \frac{1}{(\Delta t)^2} (u_{i+1} - u_i) - \frac{1}{(\Delta t)^2} c \ddot{u}_i - \frac{1}{(\Delta t)^2} m \dddot{u}_i$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.28)

Substituting Eqs. (3.27) and (3.28) into Eq. (3.26) leads to the following

$$g(u_{i+1}) = m \ddot{u}_{i+1} + cu_{i+1} + f_{i+1} - p_{i+1}$$

$$= m \left[ \frac{1}{(\Delta t)^2} (u_{i+1} - u_i) - \frac{1}{(\Delta t)^2} c \dot{u}_i - \frac{1}{(\Delta t)^2} m \ddot{u}_i \right]$$

$$+ c \left[ \frac{\gamma}{(\Delta t)^2} (u_{i+1} - u_i) - \frac{1}{(\Delta t)^2} c \ddot{u}_i - \frac{1}{(\Delta t)^2} m \dddot{u}_i \right] + f_{i+1} - p_{i+1}$$

(3.29)

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

$$g(u_{i+1}) = \left[ \frac{m}{(\Delta t)^2} + \frac{c\gamma}{(\Delta t)^2} \right] u_{i+1} + f(u_{i+1}) + \text{constants}$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.30)

and the corresponding Jacobian matrix is as follows:

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

$$= \frac{1}{(\Delta t)^2} m + \frac{\gamma}{(\Delta t)^2} c + k_{f_{i+1}}$$

(3.31)

where \( k_{f_{i+1}} \) is the tangent stiffness matrix at the \( i+1 \) step. Therefore, according to Eq. (3.17), the hypothetical dynamical system and corresponding Lyapunov function are as follows:
\[
\dot{u}_{i+1} = -K \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial u_{i+1}} g(u_{i+1}) \right]^T g(u_{i+1}) = -KJ(u_{i+1})^T g(u_{i+1}) \\
= -K \left( \frac{1}{(\Delta t)^2} m + \frac{\gamma}{(\Delta t)^2} c + k_{r,i} \right)^T g(u_{i+1}) \\
v(u_{i+1}) = \frac{1}{2} g(u_{i+1})^T g(u_{i+1})
\] (3.32) (3.33)

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

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

1. Compute the Jacobian matrix using Eq. (3.23) and (3.31) for static and dynamical systems, respectively;
2. Form the hypothetical dynamical system represented by Eq. (3.22) and (3.32) for static and dynamical systems, respectively;
3. Solve the set of equation for the hypothetical dynamical system using numerical integration scheme starting from the initial condition (or guess).

### 3.5 NUMERICAL EXAMPLES

Several numerical examples are presented in this section to compare the convergence behaviors of the regular NR algorithm and that of the proposed algorithm. The first example is a single-degree of freedom (SDOF) nonlinear static system characterized by a single parameter. The second example is a two-DOF static system with bilinear force-deformation relationships. The third example is a two-DOF dynamical system used to compare the convergence behavior of these two nonlinear equation solvers with a single time step integrator. The second and third examples are performed using the inconsistent Jacobian matrix as discussed below. In this section, the hypothetical dynamical system of all the numerical examples is solved by the Dormand–Prince method [Dormand and Prince 1980] that is implemented as the differential equation solver \textit{ode45} in MATLAB [Mathworks Inc. 2015]. For convenience, all units are omitted in this section, where use of consistent units is taken into account.

#### 3.5.1 SDOF Nonlinear Static System

Consider the restoring force of the nonlinear SDOF system, as shown in Figure. 3.1, has the following form
\[ f(u) = \text{sign}(u)|u|^{r} \]  

(3.35)

where \( \text{sign}(u) = 1 \) if \( u \geq 1 \), otherwise \( \text{sign}(u) = -1 \).

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

(3.36)

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

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

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

(3.37)

\[ v(u) = \frac{1}{2}|u|^{2r} \]

(3.38)

Figure 3.3 presents the traces of equilibrium search for the same SDOF examples with different values of \( r \) using the proposed nonlinear equation solver. It is clear that the proposed algorithm is
globally asymptotically stable for this example. Figure 3.3 is obtained by solving the hypothetical dynamical system is Eq. (3.37), therefore the x-axis of Figure 3.3 is labeled as the number of time steps.

Figure 3.2 Traces of equilibrium search for the SDOF example using the regular NR algorithm.
Figure 3.3 Traces of equilibrium search for the SDOF example using the proposed Lyapunov-based algorithm.

3.5.2 Two-DOF Nonlinear Static System

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

\[
\mathbf{b} = \begin{bmatrix} k_1 & 0 \\ 0 & k_2 \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \mathbf{J} = \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{b} \mathbf{A} = \begin{bmatrix} k_1 + k_2 & -k_2 \\ -k_2 & k_2 \end{bmatrix}
\]

(3.39)

The restoring vector \( \mathbf{f} \), that is radially unbounded, is as follows (\( q \)'s are defined in Figure 3.5):
\[
f = \begin{bmatrix} f_1 \\ f_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} q_1 - q_2 \\ q_2 \end{bmatrix}
\]  

\[
m = \begin{bmatrix} 1/2500 & 0 \\ 0 & 1/2500 \end{bmatrix}, \quad A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}
\]

Figure 3.4 Two-DOF nonlinear system.

Figure 3.5 Force-deformation relationships of the two springs.

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

\[
k_n = \begin{bmatrix} k_1 & 0.5 \\ 0.5 & k_2 \end{bmatrix} \quad \rightarrow \quad J = A^T k_n A = \begin{bmatrix} k_1 + k_2 - 1 & -k_2 + 0.5 \\ -k_2 + 0.5 & k_2 \end{bmatrix}
\]  

(3.41)
The equilibrium point of this system is predetermined as $\mathbf{u} = [39 \ 21]^T$. Figures 3.6 and 3.7 show respectively the convergence behavior of the regular NR and that of the proposed Lyapunov-based algorithms with different initial guesses. As shown in Figure 3.6, the regular NR algorithm either diverges or oscillates around the true solution. It is noted from Figure 3.6d that even though the initial guess is just around the equilibrium point, the regular NR algorithm fails to converge to the true solution. In contrast, the proposed Lyapunov-based algorithm converges for all the initial guesses. This is expected as this proposed algorithm is globally asymptotically stable for this system with the property of radially unboundedness shown in Eq. (3.40).
3.5.3 Two-DOF Nonlinear Dynamical System

The same two-DOF system as in the previous example is simulated to demonstrate the convergence behavior of the two nonlinear equation solvers in the $i+1$ time step after time discretizing the governing equations by the implicit Newmark algorithm with constant acceleration, i.e., $\gamma = 1/2$ and $\beta = 1/4$. The simulations are based on the following numerical conditions:

\[
\Delta t = 0.1, \quad \hat{u}_i = [200 \ 100]^T, \quad \hat{u}_i = [-100 \ 50]^T, \quad \mathbf{p}_{i+1} = [1 \ 2]^T
\]  

(3.42)

The initial guess of the displacement vector at the time step $i+1$ is set to equal the obtained one at the time step $i$, i.e., $\mathbf{u}_{i+1}^0 = \mathbf{u}_i$, and the same inconsistent Jacobian matrix as in Eq. (3.41) is used.

Figure 3.7 Traces of equilibrium search for the two-DOF static example using the proposed Lyapunov-based algorithm.
Figure 3.8 presents the traces of the displacement vector by the regular NR algorithm where $u_i$ ends with oscillation indefinitely for all four displacement vectors at the time step $i$, leading to the commonly experienced convergence problems. In contrast, as shown in Figure 3.9, the proposed algorithm is able to accurately find the solution for all four situations.

![Figure 3.8 Traces of equilibrium search for the two-DOF dynamic example using the regular NR algorithm.](image-url)
Figure 3.9 Traces of equilibrium search for the two-DOF dynamic example using the proposed Lyapunov-based algorithm.
4 Numerical Lyapunov Stability Analysis

4.1 INTRODUCTION

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

![Figure 4.1 Definition of stiffening and softening systems.](image)

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

Lyapunov stability theory that introduced in Chapter 3 is taken advantage of to study the stability of nonlinear systems. Generally speaking, constructing the previously mentioned energy function for the nonlinear system, which is the basis of Lyapunov stability theory, is not readily available. To handle this difficulty, this chapter proposes a numerical approach to transform the problem of seeking a Lyapunov function to a convex optimization problem, which can solve the problem in a simpler and clearer way. However, this proposed approach may involve extensive computations. Accordingly, this chapter proposes an approach that enables performing the stability analysis numerically. Convex optimization considers the problem of minimizing convex functions over convex sets where a wide range of problems can be formulated in this way. In this optimization, any local minimum must be a global minimum, which is an important property leading to reliable and efficient solutions using, e.g. interior-point methods, which are suitable for computer-aided design or analysis tools [Boyd and Vandenberge 2004]. It is shown that the proposed approach is generally applicable to direct integration algorithms for various nonlinear behaviors. Moreover, based on Lyapunov stability theory, some arguments of stability regarding these direct integration algorithms from past studies are found to be groundless and these findings are discussed in this chapter. The chapter also investigates the OS algorithm that uses tangent stiffness in the formulation, which has not been previously studied. It is shown that this algorithm possesses similar stability properties to those of the implicit Newmark integration. Finally, the accuracy of the integration methods is examined using a geometrically nonlinear problem, which has a closed-form exact solution.

4.2 DIRECT INTEGRATION ALGORITHMS

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

\[ m\ddot{u}_{i+1} + c\dot{u}_{i+1} + f_{i+1} = p_{i+1} \]  \hspace{1cm} (4.1)

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

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

\[ u_{i+1} = u_i + \eta_0(\Delta t)\dot{u}_i + \eta_1(\Delta t)^2\ddot{u}_i + \eta_2(\Delta t)^3\dddot{u}_{i+1} + \eta_3 \]  \hspace{1cm} (4.2)

\[ \dot{u}_{i+1} = \eta_4\dot{u}_i + \eta_5(\Delta t)\ddot{u}_i + \eta_6(\Delta t)\dot{u}_{i+1} + \eta_7 \]  \hspace{1cm} (4.3)
In general, Eqs. (4.1)-(4.3) require an iterative solution, which forms the basis of implicit algorithms. On the other hand, these algorithms become explicit when $\eta_i = 0$. Coefficients of the Newmark integration family (Newmark 1959) and the explicit OS algorithms (Hughes et al. 1979) are summarized in Table 1 where $\kappa = m/(\beta(\Delta t)^2) \gamma / (\beta(\Delta t)) + k_i$ and $k_i$ is defined below.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Newmark</th>
<th>OS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\kappa_0$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1 - c/(\kappa(\Delta t))$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\kappa_1$</td>
<td>$(1 - 2\beta)/2$</td>
<td>$(1 - 2\beta)/2 - c(1 - \gamma)/(\kappa(\Delta t))$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\kappa_2$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\kappa_3$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$(p_{i+1} - \tilde{f}_{i+1})/\kappa$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\kappa_4$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1 - c\gamma/(\beta\kappa(\Delta t))$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\kappa_5$</td>
<td>$1 - \gamma$</td>
<td>$1 - \gamma - c\gamma(1 - \gamma)/(\beta\kappa(\Delta t))$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\kappa_6$</td>
<td>$\gamma$</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\kappa_7$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$\gamma(p_{i+1} - \tilde{f}_{i+1})/(\beta\kappa(\Delta t))$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.3 Lyapunov Stability Analysis

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

$$ x_{i+1} = A_ix_i + L_i $$(4.4)

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

$$ x_{i+1} = \left(\prod_{j=i}^1 A_j\right)x_1 + \sum_{l=1}^{i-1}\left(\prod_{k=l}^{i-1} A_k\right)L_t + L_i $$(4.5)

where $\prod_{j=i}^1 A_j = A_i A_{i-1} \cdots A_2 A_1$. In order to investigate the stability of the system in Eq. (4.4), a Lyapunov artificial energy function $v_{i+1}$ [Franklin et al. 2015] at the time step $i+1$, can be chosen as:

$$ v_{i+1} = x_{i+1}^TMx_{i+1} $$ (4.6)
where $M$ is positive definite, i.e. $M = M^T > 0$ and $\theta$ is the null matrix of the same dimension as $M$. The system in Eq. (4.4) is stable if the Lyapunov function in Eq. (4.6) is bounded for $i \to \infty$. Substituting Eq. (4.5) into Eq. (4.6) with some manipulations leads to the following:

$$v_{i+1} = x_i^T \left( \prod_{k=i}^{i+1} A_k \right) M \left( \prod_{j=i}^{i+1} A_j \right) x_i + \sum_{i=1}^{i-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^{i-1} \left( L_{i}^T \left( \prod_{k=\ell}^{i+1} A_k \right) M \left( \prod_{\ell=n}^{i+1} A_n \right) L_m \right) + L_i^T M L_i + 2x_i^T \left( \prod_{k=i}^{i+1} A_k \right) M L_i + 2x_i^T \left( \prod_{k=i}^{i+1} A_k \right) M \left( \sum_{\ell=1}^{i-1} \prod_{m=\ell}^{i+1} A_m \right) L_m$$  

(4.7)

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

$$A^i = V D V^{-1}$$  

(4.8)

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

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

$$f_{i+1}^* - f_i = k_{T,i+1}^* (u_{i+1}^* - u_i)$$  

(4.9)

where $(f_{i+1}^*, k_{T,i+1}^*, u_{i+1}^*) = (f_i, k_{T,i}, u_i)$ for the Newmark family of algorithms and $(f_{i+1}^*, k_{T,i+1}^*, u_{i+1}^*) = (f_i, k_{T,i}, u_i)$ for the OS algorithms. It should be noted that $k_{T,i}$ is the tangent stiffness at the time step $i+1$, and other parameters are defined before. The tangent stiffness is generally a function of the displacement, thus Eq. (4.4) represents a nonlinear system of equations. With the approximation in Eq. (4.9), the approximation operator $A_i$ for the Newmark and the OS algorithms is derived as follows:
\[
A_i = \begin{bmatrix}
1 - \frac{1 - 2\beta}{2} \omega_i^2 (\Delta t)^2 - 2\zeta \omega_i (1 - \gamma)(\Delta t) \\
\frac{1 + 2\zeta \omega_i \gamma (\Delta t) + \beta \omega_i^2 (\Delta t)^2}{1 + 2\zeta \omega_i \gamma (\Delta t) + \beta \omega_i^2 (\Delta t)^2} \gamma (1 - \frac{1 - 2\beta}{2} \omega_i^2 (\Delta t)^2 - 2\zeta \omega_i (1 - \gamma)(\Delta t)) + (1 - \gamma) \\
\beta (1 - \frac{1 - 2\beta}{2} \omega_i^2 (\Delta t)^2 - 2\zeta \omega_i (1 - \gamma)(\Delta t)) + 1 - 2\beta \\
\frac{1 + 2\zeta \omega_i \gamma (\Delta t) + \beta \omega_i^2 (\Delta t)^2}{1 + 2\zeta \omega_i \gamma (\Delta t) + \beta \omega_i^2 (\Delta t)^2} \frac{-2\omega_i^2 (\Delta t)^2}{1 + 2\zeta \omega_i \gamma (\Delta t) + \beta \omega_i^2 (\Delta t)^2}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

where \( \zeta = c/(2m\omega_i) \), \( \omega_i^2 = k_i/m \). Coefficients \( \omega_0 \) and \( \omega_1 \) for the Newmark integration family and the OS algorithms are listed in Table 4.2.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Newmark</th>
<th>OSinitial</th>
<th>OS\text{tangent}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \omega_0 )</td>
<td>( \omega_{r_{i1}} )</td>
<td>( \bar{\omega}<em>{r</em>{i1}} )</td>
<td>( \bar{\omega}<em>{r</em>{i1}} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \omega_1 )</td>
<td>( \omega_{r_{i1}} )</td>
<td>( \omega_{n} )</td>
<td>( \tilde{\omega}<em>{r</em>{i1}} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

where \( \omega_{r_{i1}}^2 = k_{r_{i1}}/m, \tilde{\omega}_{r_{i1}}^2 = \tilde{k}_{r_{i1}}/m \). It is obvious that one of the eigenvalues of \( A_i \) in Eq. (4.10) is 1. For the Newmark and OS algorithms with \((\beta, \gamma) = (1/4, 1/2)\), the other two eigenvalues are obtained as:

\[
\lambda_{1,2} = 1 - \frac{3}{8} \omega_0^2 (\Delta t)^2 + \frac{1}{8} \omega_i^2 (\Delta t)^2 \pm \Delta t \sqrt{\frac{3}{8} \omega_0^2 \zeta^2 + \frac{1}{8} \omega_i^2 \zeta \Delta t (\omega_i^2 - \omega_0^2)} + (\Delta t)^2 \left(9\omega_0^4 - 10\omega_0^2 \omega_i^2 + \omega_i^4 - \omega_r^2\right)
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{1 + \omega_i \zeta \Delta t + \frac{1}{8} \omega_i^2 (\Delta t)^2}
\]

(4.11)

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

\[
\lambda_{1,2} = \frac{1 - \frac{1}{2} \omega_{r_{i1}}^2 (\Delta t)^2 \pm \Delta t \sqrt{\omega_{r_{i1}}^2 \zeta^2 + \frac{1}{4} \omega_{r_{i1}}^2 (\Delta t)^2 - \omega_{r_{i1}}^2}}{1 + \omega_{r_{i1}} \zeta \Delta t}
\]

(4.12)

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

\[
k_{r_{i1}} = (f_{i+1} - f_{i+0.5})/(u_{i+1} - u_{i+0.5}) = (f_{i+0.5} - f_i)/(u_{i+0.5} - u_i)
\]

(4.13)
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A noteworthy observation, which is the most critical case for the stability analysis of direct integration algorithms, is that the approximation operator of the explicit OS\textsuperscript{initial} algorithm is the same as that of the implicit Newmark algorithm with \(\omega_{r,i}^2\) replaced by \(\tilde{\omega}_{r,i}^2\) (refer to Table 4.2). This indicates that they possess similar stability properties, as indicated in Table 4.3.

### Table 4.3 Conditions for \(\rho(A_i) \leq 1\).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Integration Algorithms</th>
<th>Limits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implicit Newmark</td>
<td>(k_{r,i} \geq 0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit Newmark</td>
<td>(\Delta t/T_{r,i} \leq 1/\pi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(OS_{\text{initial}})</td>
<td>(0 \leq \tilde{k}_{r,i} \leq k)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(OS_{\text{tangent}})</td>
<td>(\tilde{k}_{r,i} \geq 0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRBDF2</td>
<td>(k_{r,i} \geq 0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The conditions in Table 4.3 are not stability criteria of the listed direct integration algorithms used in nonlinear systems. They are only the conditions for \(\rho(A_i) \leq 1\). Some past studies, however, determined the stability of direct integration algorithms based solely on the spectral radius. Combescure and Pegon (1997) claimed that the \(OS_{\text{initial}}\) algorithm is unconditionally stable as long as the tangent stiffness is smaller than or equal to the initial stiffness; otherwise, the algorithm is unstable. They directly applied the stability criterion that only works for linear structures, i.e. \(\rho(A) \leq 1\), to nonlinear ones. As previously discussed, the boundedness of

\[
A_i = \frac{1}{B} \begin{bmatrix}
9 - \frac{47}{16} \omega_{r,i}^2 (\Delta t)^2 & \frac{5}{16} \omega_{r,i}^4 (\Delta t)^4 - 9 \omega_{r,i}^2 (\Delta t)^2 & 0 \\
9 - \frac{5}{16} \omega_{r,i}^2 (\Delta t)^2 & \frac{5}{16} \omega_{r,i}^4 (\Delta t)^4 & 0 \\
\frac{9}{2} + \frac{1}{16} \omega_{r,i}^2 (\Delta t)^2 & 9 - \frac{47}{16} \omega_{r,i}^2 (\Delta t)^2 & \frac{1}{16} \omega_{r,i}^2 (\Delta t)^2 + 9 \end{bmatrix}
\]

(4.14)

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

\[
\lambda_{1,2} = \frac{9 - \frac{47}{16} \omega_{r,i}^2 (\Delta t)^2 \pm \sqrt{(9 - \frac{5}{16} \omega_{r,i}^2 (\Delta t)^2)^2 - \frac{1}{16} \omega_{r,i}^2 (\Delta t)^4 + \frac{25}{16} \omega_{r,i}^2 (\Delta t)^2 + 9}}{16}
\]

(4.15)

It can be shown that for \(k_{r,i} \geq 0\), magnitudes of the eigenvalues in Eq. (4.15) are always less than 1 because of introduced numerical damping.
\[ \prod_{j=i}^{1} A_j \] for \( i \to \infty \) is the stability criterion for both linear and nonlinear structures. For a nonlinear structure, with the continuous variation of the approximation operator, it is obvious that the boundedness of \( \prod_{j=i}^{1} A_j \) for \( i \to \infty \) cannot be guaranteed by \( \rho(A_i) \leq 1 \). Moreover, the unboundedness of \( \prod_{j=i}^{1} A_j \) for \( i \to \infty \) cannot be simply equivalent to \( \rho(A_i) > 1 \).

The example below is presented to illustrate that the system can still go unstable with \( \rho(A_i) \leq 1 \) for every time step, i.e., the stability cannot be strictly guaranteed by \( \rho(A_i) \leq 1 \) only.

The implicit Newmark method with constant average acceleration is used in this example considering the following numerical conditions where all units are assumed consistent and omitted for convenience:

\[ \zeta = 0.01 \quad \Delta t = 0.01T_n = 0.01(2\pi/\omega_n) \quad k_i = 100 \quad m = 1 \quad (4.16) \]

The response of the \( i \)-th time step, \( x_i \), with the loading vector \( L = 0 \), is as follows:

\[ x_i = \begin{bmatrix} \Delta t \hat{u}_i \ (\Delta t)\dot{u}_i \ u_i \end{bmatrix} = \left( \prod_{j=i}^{1} A_j \right) x_0 \quad (4.17) \]

The total number of simulated time steps is 10,000 with initial conditions \( x_0 = \begin{bmatrix} \Delta t^2 \hat{u}_0 \ (\Delta t)\dot{u}_0 \ u_0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}^T \). In this example, 10,000 values of tangent stiffness are selected randomly under the condition that all of them are larger than the value of initial stiffness \( k_i = 100 \), i.e. \( k_{T_i} > k_i \), \( i : 1 \to 10,000 \), i.e. assuming a stiffening behavior. Therefore, according to Table 4.3, \( \rho(A_i) = 1, \ i : 1 \to 10,000 \).

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

4.4 NUMERICAL LYAPUNOV ANALYSIS

In this section, a numerical approach is presented to enable investigating the stability discussed in the previous sections. This approach is based on transforming the stability analysis to a problem of convex optimization, which is applicable to direct integration algorithms applied to nonlinear problems.

As previously discussed, a system is stable if its $\prod_{j=1}^{i} A_j$ is bounded for $i \rightarrow \infty$. This is equivalent to investigating the system in Eq. (7) with the loading vector $L = 0$, i.e.,

$$x_{i+1} = A_i x_i$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.18)

$A_i$ can be rewritten non-dimensionally, e.g., in the implicit Newmark algorithm:

$$A_i = \begin{bmatrix}
1 & -\frac{\omega_n^2 \Delta t}{1 + 2\pi \mu} & 0 \\
\frac{1}{1 + 2\pi \mu} & \frac{1}{1 + 2\pi \mu} & 0 \\
\frac{1}{1 + 2\pi \mu} & \frac{1}{1 + 2\pi \mu} & 1
\end{bmatrix}$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.19)

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

$$v_{i+1} = x_{i+1}^T M_{i+1} x_{i+1}$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.20)
where the positive definite matrix $\mathbf{M}_{i+1} = \mathbf{M}_{i+1}^T$ is a function of $\delta_{i+1}$. A sufficient condition for the system and thus the direct integration algorithm to be stable is as follows:

$$\Delta v_{i+1} = v_{i+1} - r_i v_i = x_{i+1}^T \mathbf{M}_{i+1} x_{i+1} - r_i x_i^T \mathbf{M}_i x_i = x_i^T \left( \mathbf{A}_i^T \mathbf{M}_{i+1} \mathbf{A}_i - r_i \mathbf{M}_i \right) x_i = x_i^T \mathbf{P}_{i+1} x_i \leq 0$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.21)

where $0 < r_i \leq 1$ controls the rate of convergence, i.e. the smaller the $r_i$, the faster the convergence.

Eq. (4.21) leads to the negative semi-definiteness of $\mathbf{P}_{i+1}$, i.e. $\mathbf{P}_{i+1} \preceq 0$. For a direct integration algorithm, $\mathbf{M}_{i+1}$ can be expressed as:

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

where $\alpha_j$ and $\Phi(\delta_{i+1})_j$ are the $j$–th constant coefficient and base function, respectively, and $N$ is the total number of base functions. One example set of base functions is given in the Appendix. The set of base functions of only $\Phi_1$ to $\Phi_6$ represent constant $\mathbf{M}_{i+1}$, $\Phi_7$ to $\Phi_{12}$ constitute the set of base functions that treats $\mathbf{M}_{i+1}$ as a linear function of $\delta_{i+1}$. Nonlinear relationship between $\mathbf{M}_{i+1}$ and $\delta_{i+1}$ can be considered by additional base functions $\Phi_{13}$ to $\Phi_{18}$.

![Diagram](image)

**Figure 4.3** Schematic illustration of discretization process.

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

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

\[
A_i^T A_{i+1} - r_i M_i = A_i (\delta_{i+1})^T \left( \sum_{j=1}^{N} \alpha_j \Phi(\delta_{i+1})_j \right) A_i (\delta_{i+1}) - r_i \sum_{j=1}^{N} \alpha_j \Phi(\delta_{i+1})_j = 0 \tag{4.23}
\]

\[
M_i = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \alpha_j \Phi(\delta_{i+1})_j - 0, \quad M_{i+1} = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \alpha_j \Phi(\delta_{i+1})_j - 0
\]

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

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

\[
\zeta = 0.05, \quad \mu = 0.05/(2\pi), \quad n = 20, \quad \varepsilon = 0.05, \quad r_i = 1.0 \tag{4.24}
\]

The set of base functions \(\Phi_1\) to \(\Phi_{12}\) in the Appendix is used.

### 4.4.1 Softening Example

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

\[
\alpha_1 = 1.90 \times 10^{-8}, \quad \alpha_2 = 2.46 \times 10^{-9}, \quad \alpha_3 = 1.70 \times 10^{-10}, \quad \alpha_4 = -2.25 \times 10^{-9},
\]

\[
\alpha_5 = -2.70 \times 10^{-10}, \quad \alpha_6 = -4.60 \times 10^{-10}, \quad \alpha_7 = 1.76 \times 10^{-8}, \quad \alpha_8 = 1.05 \times 10^{-9},
\]

\[
\alpha_9 = 6.00 \times 10^{-11}, \quad \alpha_{10} = -3.35 \times 10^{-9}, \quad \alpha_{11} = 4.30 \times 10^{-10}, \quad \alpha_{12} = -2.00 \times 10^{-10}\tag{4.25}
\]
The existence of such set of $\alpha_j$ implies the existence of $M_{i+1}$ in Eq. (4.22) that satisfies the inequality in Eq. (4.21), which indicates that the implicit Newmark algorithm is stable for the conditions in Eq. (4.24) in the range of $\delta_j, \delta_{i+1} \in [0.9, 1.0]$.

### 4.4.2 Stiffening Example

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

$$
\begin{align*}
\alpha_1 &= 9.81 \times 10^{-7}, \quad \alpha_2 = 2.28 \times 10^{-10}, \quad \alpha_3 = 1.93 \times 10^{-8}, \quad \alpha_4 = -2.25 \times 10^{-8}, \\
\alpha_5 &= -2.30 \times 10^{-9}, \quad \alpha_6 = -1.53 \times 10^{-9}, \quad \alpha_7 = 1.01 \times 10^{-6}, \quad \alpha_8 = 3.39 \times 10^{-11}, \\
\alpha_9 &= 7.03 \times 10^{-9}, \quad \alpha_{10} = -8.94 \times 10^{-9}, \quad \alpha_{11} = 7.20 \times 10^{-9}, \quad \alpha_{12} = -5.01 \times 10^{-10}
\end{align*}
$$

The set of $\alpha_j$ in Eqs. (4.25) and (26) from many determined sets has the minimum 2-norm explaining the listed small values of $\alpha_j$. The existence of such set of $\alpha_j$ implies that the implicit Newmark algorithm is stable for the conditions in Eq. (4.24) in the range of $\delta_j, \delta_{i+1} \in [1.0, 1.1]$. The accuracy of the proposed numerical stability analysis approach depends on the selection of the interval $\Delta \delta$. Similar to the time step $\Delta t$ used in nonlinear time history analysis, smaller $\Delta \delta$, that requires higher computational effort, leads to more accurate and reliable stability analysis. For example, if $n+1=41$ points (denoted as set A) are sampled ($\Delta \delta = 0.0025$) for the softening example, $41^2 - 21^2 = 1240$ additional pairs of $(\delta_j, \delta_{i+1})$, which require more computational effort, need to be considered than that for the case with $n+1=21$ sampled points (denoted as set B). The stability analysis based on set A is closer to that of the continuous interval of $[0.9, 1.0]$ than that based on set B. Furthermore, it is to be noted that the set of coefficients $\alpha$ that satisfies the inequality of Eq. (4.21) for set A, also fulfills the same inequality for set B because the set of the possible pairs of $(\delta_j, \delta_{i+1})$ for set B is a subset of that for set A. Therefore, the stability of the set of larger number of sampled points implies the stability of smaller number of sampled points. It should be emphasized that Eq. (4.21) is a sufficient condition for the direct integration algorithm to be stable. Therefore, the existence of the coefficients corresponding to the selected base functions obtained by the numerical approach proposed in this chapter that satisfies Eq. (4.21) implies that the range of interest for $\delta_{i+1}$ is a sufficient range for the direct integration algorithm to be stable. However, inexistence of such coefficients does not indicate the instability of the direct integration algorithm within the range of interest for $\delta_{i+1}$.

The proposed approach in this section can be applied to investigating the stability of other direct integration algorithms, including the other four methods considered in this chapter. Also, various nonlinear problems, including stiffening $(\delta_{i+1} > 1)$ and softening $(\delta_{i+1} < 1)$ behaviors in Fig. 1, can be taken into account. Accordingly, the proposed approach is generally applicable to direct integration algorithms as long as they can be expressed as given by Eq. (4.18). Moreover, this approach can potentially be extended to MDOF systems. For $m$-DOF systems, the $3m \times 3m$ approximation operator is a function of $\delta_{i+1}^j$, where $j: 1 \rightarrow m$ denotes the $j$-th DOF, and thus
selected base functions and corresponding coefficients are needed if $M_{i+1}$ is expressed as an affine function of $\delta_{i+1}^j$, $j:1 \rightarrow m$. For example, for each possible pair of $(\delta_1^i, \delta_2^i, \ldots, \delta_m^i, \delta_{i+1}^i)$, the computational effort for 10-DOF systems is $[(10+1)(9\times10^2 + 3\times10)/2]/[(1+1)(9\times1^2 + 3\times1)/2] = 426.25$ times that for SDOF systems. Therefore, the proposed approach may involve extensive computations for MDOF systems.

### 4.5 ACCURACY ANALYSIS

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

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

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

**Table 4.4 Nonlinear pendulum.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Expression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governing equation</td>
<td>$\ddot{\theta} + (g/l)\sin \theta = 0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial conditions</td>
<td>$\theta(0) = \theta_0, \dot{\theta}(0) = 0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exact solution (Beléndez et al. 2007)</td>
<td>$\theta(t) = 2 \arcsin \left( \sin \left( \theta_0 / 2 \right) \sin(\bar{n};r) \right)$, $r = \sin^2 \left( \theta_0 / 2 \right)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period</td>
<td>$T = 4K(r)/\kappa_0$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

The nonlinear pendulum problem is also used to demonstrate the incorrectness of the stability criterion of the OS\textsubscript{initial} algorithm from past studies and the suitability of the proposed numerical stability analysis approach in this chapter. The tangent stiffness of this nonlinear pendulum is obtained as:

\[
k_T = (g/l) \cos \theta
\]  
(4.27)

This tangent stiffness \( k_T \) is always positive if \( \theta \in (-\pi/2, \pi/2) \). The OS\textsubscript{initial} algorithm with initial condition \( \theta_0 = 0.10\pi \) results in the fact that all the values of tangent stiffness are larger than that of the initial stiffness, which is \( (g/l) \cos(0.10\pi) \). Recall that the stability criterion by Combescure and Pegon (1997), refer to Table 3, implies that the OS\textsubscript{initial} algorithm should be unstable for \( \theta_0 = 0.10\pi \). The numerical problem is analyzed using the proposed numerical stability analysis approach for the following conditions:

\[
\zeta = 0 \quad \mu = 0.05/(2\pi) \quad n = 20 \quad r_i = 1.0
\]  
(4.28)

The set of base functions \( \Phi_1 \) to \( \Phi_6 \) as in the Appendix is used, which represents constant \( M_{i+1} \). Same procedure as in section “Numerical Stability Analysis” is performed for \( \theta_0 = 0.10\pi \) in this example. Therefore, for the range of interest \( \delta_i, \delta_{i+1} \in [1.0, 0.1/\cos \theta_0] \), the coefficients \( \alpha_j, \ j: 1 \rightarrow 6 \) obtained by minimizing the 2-norm of \( \alpha \), i.e. \( \min \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{6} |\alpha_j|^2} \), are as follows:

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

The existence of such set of \( \alpha_j \) implies that the OS\textsubscript{initial} algorithm is stable for \( \theta_0 = 0.10\pi \). The results by the proposed approach is consistent with the fact that the OS\textsubscript{initial} algorithm is stable as reflected in Figure 4.5, which demonstrates the incorrectness of the stability criterion by Combescure and Pegon (1997).
Figure 4.5 Period elongation and amplitude decay for the pendulum problem with $\theta_0 = 0.10\pi$. 

\[ \theta_0 = 0.10\pi \]
Figure 4.6 Period elongation and amplitude decay for the pendulum problem with $\theta_0 = 0.50\pi$. 
5 Lyapunov Stability Considering Strictly Positive Real Lemma

5.1 INTRODUCTION

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

In this chapter, another Lyapunov-based approach is proposed to investigate Lyapunov stability of explicit direct integration algorithms for MDOF nonlinear systems [Liang and Mosalam 2015, 2016b-d]. Two general classes of MDOF nonlinear responses of structural systems are considered. They are stiffening systems, e.g., in situations where gaps between components of the system are closed, and softening systems, e.g., due to initiation and propagation of damage which is common in modeling reinforced concrete structures when subjected to extreme loads. The idealized backbone curves (force-displacement relationships) of these two systems are discussed later in the chapter. In this study, the explicit algorithm is formulated for a generic MDOF nonlinear system that has responses governed by nonlinear functions of the restoring forces. Based on this formulation, a systematic approach is proposed to investigate the Lyapunov stability of explicit algorithms for MDOF nonlinear systems by means of the strictly positive real lemma [Cains 1989]. This approach transforms the stability analysis to pursuing the strictly positive realness of the transfer function matrix for the formulated MDOF system. Furthermore, this is equivalent to a problem of convex optimization that can be solved graphically for SDOF systems, e.g., by Nyquist plot [Franklin et al. 2015], or numerically for MDOF systems, e.g., by CVX [CVX Research Inc. 2011]. Using the proposed approach, a sufficient condition in terms of bounds for each basic resisting force in this study, where the explicit algorithm is stable in the sense of Lyapunov, can be obtained. Specifically, the maximum and minimum bounds for each basic...
resisting force for stable (in the sense of Lyapunov) MDOF stiffening and softening systems, respectively, are determined. Finally, this proposed Lyapunov stability analysis is demonstrated by a SDOF system, a bridge structure, and a generic multi-story shear building with nonlinear stiffening or softening behavior to study the stability performance of two types of commonly used explicit direct integration algorithms.

5.2 MATHEMATICAL PRELIMINARIES

In this section, definitions, notations, the generalized strictly positive real lemma and the corresponding corollary are introduced. Here, $(\bullet)^T$ and $(\bullet)^*$ denote transpose and complex conjugate transpose, respectively; $(\bullet)\succ0$ and $(\bullet)\prec0$ denote positive and negative definiteness, respectively. Denote

$$G(z) = \begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{bmatrix}$$

(5.1)

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

$$G(z) = \bar{D} + \bar{C}(iz - \bar{A})^{-1}\bar{B}$$

(5.2)

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

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

$$Z = [\bar{B} \hspace{1cm} \bar{A}\bar{B} \hspace{1cm} \bar{A}^2\bar{B} \hspace{1cm} \cdots \hspace{1cm} \bar{A}^{n-1}\bar{B}]$$

(5.3)

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

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

$$\bar{M} = \bar{A}'\bar{M}\bar{A} + \bar{L}'\bar{L}$$

(5.4a)

$$\bar{0} = \bar{B}'\bar{M}\bar{A} - \bar{C} + \bar{W}'\bar{L}$$

(5.4b)
\[ 0 = \bar{D} + \bar{D}^T - \bar{B}^T \bar{M} \bar{B} - W^T W \]  

(5.4c)

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

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\bar{A}^T P \bar{A} - P \\
(\bar{A}^T P \bar{B} - \bar{C}^T)^T - (\bar{D}^T + \bar{D}) + \bar{B}^T P \bar{B}
\end{bmatrix} < 0
\]  

(5.5)

### 5.3 Explicit Integration Algorithms

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

\[ m \ddot{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1} + c \dot{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1} + \mathbf{f}_{i+1} = \mathbf{p}_{i+1} \]  

(5.6)

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

#### 5.3.1 Standard Single-step Explicit Algorithms

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

\[
\mathbf{u}_{i+1} = \mathbf{u}_i + \eta_0 (\Delta t) \dot{\mathbf{u}}_i + \eta_1 (\Delta t)^2 \ddot{\mathbf{u}}_i 
\]  

(5.7a)

\[
\mathbf{u}_{i+1} = \dot{\mathbf{u}}_i + \eta_2 (\Delta t) \ddot{\mathbf{u}}_i + \eta_3 (\Delta t)^2 \mathbf{u}_{i+1} 
\]  

(5.7b)

For example, \( \eta = [\eta_0, \eta_1, \eta_2, \eta_3] = [1, 1/2, 1/2, 1/2] \) leads to the explicit Newmark algorithm [Newmark 1959]. Substituting Eq. (5.7b) in Eq. (5.6), the following linear system of equations is readily obtained.

\[ m_{\text{eff}} \ddot{\mathbf{u}}_{i+1} = \mathbf{p}_{\text{eff}} \]  

(5.8a)

\[ m_{\text{eff}} = m + \eta_3 (\Delta t) c \]  

(5.8b)

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

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

5.3.2 Predictor-corrector Explicit Algorithms

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

\[
\ddot{u}_{i+1} = u_i + (\Delta t)(1 - \gamma)\dot{u}_i + (0.5 - \beta)(\Delta t)^2\ddot{u}_i
\]  

\[
\dddot{u}_{i+1} = \dddot{u}_i + (1 - \gamma)(\Delta t)\dddot{u}_i
\]  

(5.9a)  

(5.9b)

where parameters \(\gamma\) and \(\beta\) are defined in Eq. (5.12). The balance equation of this method is:

\[
m\ddot{u}_{i+1-\alpha_m} + c\ddot{\dot{u}}_{i+1-\alpha_f} + \dddot{f}_{i+1-\alpha_f} = p_{i+1-\alpha_f}
\]  

(5.10)

where \(\dddot{f}_{i+1-\alpha_f}\) is the restoring force vector corresponding to \(\dddot{u}_{i+1-\alpha_f}\) and \(p_{i+1-\alpha_f}\) is the external force vector at time step \(i + 1 - \alpha_f\) with other parameters defined as follows:

\[
\dddot{u}_{i+1-\alpha_m} = (1 - \alpha_m)\dddot{u}_{i+1} + \alpha_m\dddot{u}_i
\]  

(5.11a)

\[
\dddot{u}_{i+1-\alpha_f} = (1 - \alpha_f)\dddot{u}_{i+1} + \alpha_f\dddot{u}_i
\]  

(5.11b)

\[
\dddot{u}_{i+1-\alpha_f} = (1 - \alpha_f)\dddot{u}_{i+1} + \alpha_f\dddot{u}_i
\]  

(5.11c)

\[
t_{i+1-\alpha_f} = (1 - \alpha_f)t_{i+1} + \alpha_f t_i
\]  

(5.11d)

The algorithmic parameters are given by

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

(5.12)

where \(\rho_\infty\) is the desired high-frequency dissipation. The acceleration at time step \(i + 1\), \(\dddot{u}_{i+1}\), can be calculated using Eqs. (5.10) and (5.11a). Subsequently, the displacement and velocity at time step \(i + 1\) can be determined by the following correctors:

\[
u_{i+1} = \dddot{u}_{i+1} + \beta(\Delta t)^2\dddot{u}_{i+1}
\]  

(5.13a)

\[
\dot{u}_{i+1} = \dddot{u}_{i+1} + \gamma(\Delta t)\dddot{u}_{i+1}
\]  

(5.13b)
5.4 MDOF NONLINEAR SYSTEMS

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

\[
f^j = \sum_{l=1}^{N} \alpha^l q^l = \alpha^j q
\]

(5.14)

where \( q^T = [q^1, q^2, \ldots, q^N] \) and \( \alpha^j = [\alpha^j_1, \alpha^j_2, \ldots, \alpha^j_N] \). Therefore,

\[
f = [f^1, f^2, \ldots, f^n]^T = \alpha q
\]

(5.15)

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

\[
\bar{u}^l = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \beta^l_j u^j = \beta^l u
\]

(5.16)

where \( u = [u^1, u^2, \ldots, u^n] \) and \( \beta^l = [\beta^l_1, \beta^l_2, \ldots, \beta^l_n] \). Therefore,

\[
\bar{u} = [\bar{u}^1, \bar{u}^2, \ldots, \bar{u}^N]^T = \beta u
\]

(5.17)

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

\[
\bar{k}_{\text{Min}}^l (\bar{u}^l)^2 \leq q^l \bar{u}^l \leq \bar{k}_{\text{Max}}^l (\bar{u}^l)^2
\]

(5.18)

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

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

(5.19)

Eq. (5.19) is equivalent to the following:
\begin{equation}
\mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{k}_{\text{Min}} \mathbf{u} \leq \mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{q} \leq \mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{k}_{\text{Max}} \mathbf{u}
\end{equation}

(5.20)

where

\begin{equation}
\mathbf{k}_{\text{Min}} = \text{diag}[\bar{k}_{\text{Min}}^1, \bar{k}_{\text{Min}}^2, \ldots, \bar{k}_{\text{Min}}^N]
\end{equation}

(5.21a)

\begin{equation}
\mathbf{k}_{\text{Max}} = \text{diag}[\bar{k}_{\text{Max}}^1, \bar{k}_{\text{Max}}^2, \ldots, \bar{k}_{\text{Max}}^N]
\end{equation}

(5.21b)

Defining \( \bar{k}^l_i \) as the initial bound of \( q^l \), Fig. 1 shows the schematic illustrations of the \( l \)-th resisting force bounded in the sector between \( \bar{k}^l_i \left( \mathbf{u}^l \right) \) and \( \bar{k}_i \left( \mathbf{u}^l \right) \) for stiffening (Figure 5.1a) and softening (Figure 5.1b) systems. As mentioned before, the maximum, \( \bar{k}_{\text{Max}}^l \) and minimum, \( \bar{k}_{\text{Min}}^l \), bounds of \( q^l \), where \( l : 1 \rightarrow N \), for stable (in the sense of Lyapunov) stiffening and softening MDOF systems, respectively, are to be determined in this chapter. In the next two subsections, the explicit integration algorithms introduced in the previous section are formulated for MDOF (\( n \) DOFs) nonlinear systems with stiffening and softening behavior (Figure 5.1).

![Figure 5.1 Schematic illustrations of two nonlinear systems with sector-bounded basic resisting forces.](image)

5.4.1 MDOF Stiffening Systems

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

\begin{equation}
x_{i+1} = \mathbf{A}x_i - \mathbf{B}_1 \bar{f}_{i+1} + \mathbf{D} \bar{p}_{i+1} = \mathbf{A}x_i - \mathbf{B}_1 \mathbf{a} \bar{q}_{i+1} + \mathbf{D} \bar{p}_{i+1}
\end{equation}

(5.22)

where \( x_i = \left[ (\Delta t)^2 \mathbf{u}^T_i (\Delta t) \mathbf{u}^T_i \right]^T \). For the SSE algorithms, \( \mathbf{A} \), \( \mathbf{B}_1 \) and \( \mathbf{D} \) are as follows with \( \bar{f}_{i+1} = f_{i+1} \), \( \bar{p}_{i+1} = p_{i+1} \) and \( \bar{q}_{i+1} = q_{i+1} \):
where $0$ and $I$ are $n \times n$ null and identity matrices, respectively. The external force vector, $p$, is generally independent of the kinematic quantities, $x$, and does not affect the Lyapunov stability of the direct integration algorithms (Liang and Mosalam 2015, 2016a). Therefore, $\bar{p}_{i+1}$ in Eq. (5.22) is set to zero in the subsequent parts of this chapter. For the PCE algorithms, $A$ is listed in Table 5.1 and considering $\bar{f}_{i+1} = \bar{f}_{i+1-\alpha}r$, $\bar{p}_{i+1} = p_{i+1-\alpha}$, and $\bar{q}_{i+1} = \bar{q}_{i+1-\alpha}$, we have:

\[
B_i = D = \begin{bmatrix}
(\Delta t)^2 m_{eff}^{-1} & \eta_3(\Delta t)^2 m_{eff}^{-1} & 0
\end{bmatrix}^T
\]

\[
(5.23b)
\]

**Table 5.1 Elements of $A$ matrix for PCE algorithms.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Expression</th>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Expression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$A_{11}$</td>
<td>$-m^2c(1-\alpha_r)(1-\gamma(\Delta t) - \alpha_m)I/(1-\alpha_m)$</td>
<td>$A_{22}$</td>
<td>$I + \gamma A_{12}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_{21}$</td>
<td>$(1-\gamma)I + \gamma A_{11}$</td>
<td>$A_{22}$</td>
<td>$I + \beta A_{12}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_{11}$</td>
<td>$(0.5 - \beta)I + \beta(\Delta t)^2 A_{11}$</td>
<td>$A_{13} = A_{23}$</td>
<td>$0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_{12}$</td>
<td>$-m^2c(\Delta t)(1-\alpha_m)$</td>
<td>$A_{33}$</td>
<td>$I$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

\[
x_{i+1} = Ax_i - B_1a\bar{K}_{Min}Cx_i + B_1a\bar{K}_{Min}C\bar{x}_i - B_1a\bar{q}_{i+1}
= \left(A - B_1a\bar{K}_{Min}C \right)x_i - B_1a\left(\bar{q}_{i+1} - \bar{K}_{Min}\bar{C}x_i \right)
= \left(A - B_1a\bar{K}_{Min}C \right)x_i - B_1a\left(\bar{q}_{i+1} - \bar{K}_{Min}\bar{C}\bar{x}_i \right)
= A_{c1}x_i - B_1aq_{c1}
\]

where

\[
C = \beta\bar{C}
\]

\[
(5.26a)
\]
\[ \tilde{C} = \begin{bmatrix} \eta_I & \eta_I & \mathbf{1} \\ [1 - \alpha_f](0.5 - \beta) & (1 - \alpha_f) & \mathbf{1} \end{bmatrix} \]

SSE algorithms

(5.26b)

\[ \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{1} - \mathcal{A} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{1} \end{bmatrix} \]

PCE algorithms

\[ \mathbf{u}_{r+1} = \mathbf{C}\tilde{f}_r \]

(5.26c)

\[ \mathbf{A}_{r1} = \mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B}_r \alpha \mathbf{K}_{\text{Max}} \mathbf{C} \]

(5.26d)

\[ \mathbf{q}_{r1} = \mathbf{q}_{r+1} - \mathbf{K}_{\text{Min}} \mathbf{u}_{r+1} \]

(5.26e)

### 5.4.2 MDOF Softening Systems

For softening systems, similar to Eq. (5.22), with \( \mathbf{B}_2 = -\mathbf{B}_1 \) and also setting \( \mathbf{p}_{r+1} = \mathbf{0} \), as mentioned above:

\[ x_{r+1} = \mathbf{A}x_r + \mathbf{B}_2\alpha \tilde{q}_{r+1} \]

\[ = \mathbf{A}x_r + \mathbf{B}_2\alpha \mathbf{K}_{\text{Max}} \mathbf{C} x_r - \mathbf{B}_2\alpha \mathbf{K}_{\text{Max}} \mathbf{C} x_r + \mathbf{B}_2\alpha \tilde{q}_{r+1} \]

\[ = \left( \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B}_2\alpha \mathbf{K}_{\text{Max}} \mathbf{C} \right)x_r - \mathbf{B}_2\alpha \left( \mathbf{K}_{\text{Max}} \mathbf{C} x_r - \tilde{q}_{r+1} \right) \]

\[ = \left( \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B}_2\alpha \mathbf{K}_{\text{Max}} \mathbf{C} \right)x_r - \mathbf{B}_2\alpha \left( \mathbf{K}_{\text{Max}} \mathbf{u}_{r+1} - \tilde{q}_{r+1} \right) \]

\[ = \mathbf{A}_{r2} x_r - \mathbf{B}_2\alpha \mathbf{q}_{r2} \]

(5.27)

where

\[ \mathbf{A}_{r2} = \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B}_2\alpha \mathbf{K}_{\text{Max}} \mathbf{C} \]

(5.28a)

\[ \mathbf{q}_{r2} = \mathbf{K}_{\text{Max}} \mathbf{u}_{r+1} - \tilde{q}_{r+1} \]

(5.28b)

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

\[ x_{r+1} = \mathbf{A}_e x_r - \mathbf{B}_e \mathbf{q}_e \]

(5.29)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.2 Coefficients of MDOF stiffening and softening systems.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Matrix</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \mathbf{A}_e )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \mathbf{B}_e )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \mathbf{q}_e )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.5 LYAPUNOV STABILITY ANALYSIS AS A PROBLEM OF CONVEX OPTIMIZATION

Based on Eq. (5.18) and Table 5.2, the \( l \)-th effective basic resisting force, \( q^l \), expressed as a function of \( \bar{u}_{i+1} \), has the following range:

\[
0 \leq q^l \bar{u}_{i+1} \leq \tilde{k}^l (\bar{u}_{i+1}^l)^2
\]

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

\[
0 \leq \sum_{i=1}^{N} (q_e^l \bar{u}_{i+1}^l) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left[ \tilde{k}^l (\bar{u}_{i+1}^l)^2 \right]
\]

Therefore, \( q_e \), expressed as a function of \( \bar{u} \), has the following range:

\[
0 \leq \bar{u}_{i+1}^T q_e \leq \bar{u}_{i+1}^T \tilde{k} \bar{u}_{i+1}
\]

where

\[
\tilde{k} = \tilde{k}_{Max} - \tilde{k}_{Min} = \text{diag} [\tilde{k}^1, \tilde{k}^2, \ldots, \tilde{k}^N]
\]

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

\[
v_{i+1} = x_{i+1}^T M x_{i+1}
\]

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

\[
\Delta v_{i+1} = v_{i+1} - v_i = x_{i+1}^T M x_{i+1} - x_i^T M x_i
\]

\[
= (A_e x_i - B_e q_e)^T M (A_e x_i - B_e q_e) - x_i^T M x_i
\]

\[
= x_i^T (A_e^T M A_e - M) x_i - 2q_e^T B_e^T M A_e x_i + q_e^T B_e^T M B_e q_e \leq 0
\]

Defining the weight coefficient of the constraint in Eq. (5.30) as \( \lambda_i > 0 \) with \( \sum_{i=1}^{N} \lambda_i = 1 \), multiplying Eq. (5.30) by \( \lambda_i q^l / \bar{u}_{i+1}^l, |\bar{u}_{i+1}^l| > 0 \), which is always positive, and rearranging, one obtains:

\[
\lambda_i q^l (q_e^l - \tilde{k}^l \bar{u}_{i+1}^l) \leq 0
\]

Summing up all effective basic resisting forces from 1 to \( N \) gives the following:
where the coefficient matrix \( \lambda = \text{diag}\{ \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \ldots, \lambda_N \} \). Defining \( \Delta \bar{v}_{i+1} \) as an upper bound of \( \Delta v_{i+1} \) that incorporates the constraints in Eq. (5.37), Eq. (5.35) becomes

\[
\Delta v_{i+1} \leq \Delta \bar{v}_{i+1} = x_i^T (A^T eM e - M) x_i - 2q_i^T B^T eM e x_i + q_i^T B^T eM e q_i - 2q_i^T \lambda (q_e - \bar{k} C x_i)
\]

\[
= x_i^T (A^T eM e - M) x_i + q_i^T (B^T eM e - 2\lambda) q_e - 2q_i^T (B^T eM e - \bar{k} C) x_i
\]

(5.38)

where \( \Delta \bar{v}_{i+1} \) can be further transformed as follows:

\[
\Delta \bar{v}_{i+1} = \Delta \bar{v}_{i+1} + x_i^T L^T L x_i - x_i^T L^T L x_i
\]

\[
= x_i^T (A^T eM e - M + L^T L) x_i - \left[ q_i^T (2\lambda - B^T eM e) q_e - 2q_i^T (\bar{k} C - B^T eM e) x_i + x_i^T L^T L x_i \right]
\]

(5.39)

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

\[
M = A^T eM e + L^T L
\]

(5.40a)

\[
0 = B^T eM e - \bar{k} C + W^T L
\]

(5.40b)

\[
0 = \lambda + \lambda^T - B^T eM e - W^T W
\]

(5.40c)

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

\[
\Delta v_{i+1} \leq \Delta \bar{v}_{i+1} = x_i^T 0 x_i - \left[ q_i^T W^T W q_e - 2q_i^T W^T L x_i + x_i^T L^T L x_i \right]
\]

\[
= -(W q_e - L x_i)^T (W q_e - L x_i) \leq 0
\]

(5.41)

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

\[
\bar{A} = A_e, \quad \bar{B} = B_e, \quad \bar{C} = \bar{k} C, \quad \bar{D} = \lambda, \quad M = M, \quad L = L, \quad W = W
\]

(5.42)

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

\[
G(z) = \lambda + \bar{k} C (I - A_e)^{-1} B_e
\]

(5.43)

For SDOF systems, the matrices \( \alpha, \beta, \) and \( \lambda \) become 1, Eq. (5.43) reduces to
\[ G(z) = 1 + \bar{k}C(Iz - A_e)^{-1}B_e \quad (5.44) \]

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

\[ \text{Re}[G(z)] > 0 \quad (5.45) \]

which leads to

\[ \text{Re}[H(z)] > -1/\bar{k} \quad (5.46) \]

where

\[ H(z) = C(Iz - A_e)^{-1}B_e \quad (5.47) \]

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

For MDOF systems, recall the corollary in Eq. (5.5), the strictly positive realness of \( G(z) \) in Eq. (5.43) becomes equivalent to Eq. (5.48) with \( P = P^T > 0 \):

\[ \begin{bmatrix} A_e^TPA_e - P & A_e^TPB_e - (\bar{k}C)^T \\ A_e^TPB_e - (\bar{k}C)^T & - (\lambda^T + \lambda) + B_e^TPB_e \end{bmatrix} < 0 \quad (5.48) \]

Eq. (5.48) is a linear matrix inequality (LMI) over variables \( P \) and \( \bar{k} \) [Boyd et al. 1994]. Accordingly, the stability analysis becomes a problem of convex optimization, which addresses the problem of minimizing convex functions over convex sets, by which a wide range of problems can be formulated. In convex optimization, any local minimum must be a global minimum. This important property leads to reliable and efficient solutions, e.g. interior-point methods, which are suitable for computer-aided design or analysis tools [Boyd and Vandenberge 2004]. This problem of convex optimization in Eq. (5.48), which seeks \( \bar{k} \) and the corresponding \( P \) by minimizing certain convex cost function, e.g. \( \min(\sum_{i=1}^{N} \bar{k}_i) \), subjected to the constraints of \( P = P^T > 0 \) and \( \bar{k} > 0 \), can be solved numerically by CVX, a package for specifying and solving convex problems [CVX Research Inc. 2011]. It should be noted that a poorly chosen cost function or coefficient matrix may lead to reduced sufficient condition, i.e., the difference between the upper and lower bounds of the basic resisting force of the system (\( \bar{k} \)). In general, a smaller value of the weight coefficient for the constraint \( \lambda_i \) leads to a larger value of \( \bar{k}_i \). For example, in a two-DOF system, \( \min(-\bar{k}^2) \) and \( \lambda_2 = 0.1 \) (5. \( \lambda_1 = 1 - \lambda_2 = 0.9 \) ) may not be a good cost function and weight coefficient if the basic force \( q^1 \) is of primary interest since this cost function may result in small \( \bar{k}^1 \). In this case, \( \min(-\bar{k}^1) \) and \( \lambda_1 = 0.1 \) would be an appropriate selection. Therefore, the selection of the cost function and coefficient matrix is important and should take all the basic resisting forces of interest into account.
It is noteworthy that if \( \mathbf{q} \) in Eq. (5.20) is strictly within the following range:

\[
\mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{K}_{\text{Min}} \mathbf{u} < \mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{q} < \mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{K}_{\text{Max}} \mathbf{u}
\]  

(5.49)

Therefore, Eqs. (5.32), (5.37) and (5.41) become

\[
0 < \mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{q}_e < \mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{K} \mathbf{u}_{i+1} \quad \text{(5.50a)}
\]

\[
\mathbf{q}_e \lambda (\mathbf{q}_e - \mathbf{K} \mathbf{u}_{i+1}) = \mathbf{q}_e \lambda (\mathbf{q}_e - \mathbf{K} \mathbf{C} \mathbf{x}_i) < 0 \quad \text{(5.50b)}
\]

\[
\Delta \mathbf{v}_{i+1} < \Delta \mathbf{v}_{i+1} \leq 0 \quad \text{(5.50c)}
\]

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

### 5.6 NUMERICAL EXAMPLES FOR SDOF SYSTEMS

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

\[
m = 1, \quad k_i = 1, \quad \omega_n = 2\pi T_n = \sqrt{k_i/m}, \quad \zeta = c/(2m\omega_n) = 0.05, \quad \mu = (\Delta t)/T_n = 0.01
\]  

(5.51)

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

Based on Eq. (5.51), \( \mathbf{A}_e \), \( \mathbf{C} \) and \( \rho(\mathbf{A}_e) \) for the explicit Newmark algorithm, i.e., \( \eta = [1 \quad 1/2 \quad 1/2 \quad 1/2] \), are as follows:

\[
\mathbf{A}_e = \begin{bmatrix}
-0.0051 & -0.0102 & -0.0039 \\
0.4975 & 0.9949 & -0.0020 \\
0.5000 & 1.0000 & 1.0000
\end{bmatrix}
\]  

(5.52a)

\[
\mathbf{C} = \begin{bmatrix}
0.5000 & 1.0000 & 1.0000
\end{bmatrix}
\]  

(5.52b)

\[
\rho(\mathbf{A}_e) = 0.9969
\]  

(5.52c)
\( \rho(A_e) < 1 \) implies that \( A_e \) is asymptotically stable and thus the first condition of the strictly positive realness of \( G(z) \) in Eq. (5.44) is satisfied.

### 5.6.1 Stiffening Systems

For stiffening systems, \( B_e = B_i \) is as follows:

\[
B_e = \begin{bmatrix} 0.0039 & 0.0020 & 0 \end{bmatrix}^T
\]

(5.53)

The row ranks of the Kalman’s controllability matrix:

\[
Z = [B_e \quad A_e B_e \quad A_e^2 B_e \quad A_e^3 B_e]
\]

(5.54)

is equal to 3, i.e., \( \text{rank}(Z) = 3 \). Therefore, \( (A_e, B_e) \) is controllable.

The Nyquist plot of \( H(z) \) in Eq. (5.46) corresponding to \( A_e \), \( C \) and \( B_e \) in Eqs. (5.52) and (5.53) is shown in Figure 5.2, where \( \min \{\text{Re}[H(z)]\} = -4.7642 \) is obtained. Based on Eq. (5.45), one obtains:

\[
-1/k < \min \{\text{Re}[H(z)]\}
\]

(5.55a)

\[
k < -1/\min \{\text{Re}[H(z)]\} = 0.2099
\]

(5.55b)

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

![Figure 5.2 Nyquist plot of \( H(z) \) for a stiffening system of the explicit Newmark algorithm.](image)
5.6.2 Softening Systems

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

\[
\mathbf{B}_e = \begin{bmatrix} 0.0039 & 0.0020 & 0 \end{bmatrix}^T
\]  

(5.56)

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

\[
k < -1/\min \{\text{Re}[H(z)]\} = 0.1902
\]  

(5.57)

Therefore, for softening systems, the explicit Newmark algorithm is stable in the sense of Lyapunov in the range that \( f/u \in (k_f - k, k_f) = (0.8098, 1) \) \(|u| > 0 \) for the numerical conditions in Eq. (5.51).

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( \eta )</th>
<th>( \rho(A_e) )</th>
<th>Stiffening Systems</th>
<th>Softening Systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1 1/2 1/4 3/4]</td>
<td>0.9964</td>
<td>0.3333</td>
<td>0.2853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1 1/2 3/4 1/4]</td>
<td>0.9974</td>
<td>0.1387</td>
<td>0.1308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1 1/4 1/2 1/2]</td>
<td>0.9974</td>
<td>0.1727</td>
<td>0.1639</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.4 The \( k \) values of different generalized-\( \alpha \) PCE algorithms for stiffening and softening systems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( \rho_\alpha )</th>
<th>( \rho(A,\alpha) )</th>
<th>Stiffening systems</th>
<th>Softening systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.9969</td>
<td>0.2096</td>
<td>0.1901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.9969</td>
<td>0.2101</td>
<td>0.1904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.9969</td>
<td>0.2103</td>
<td>0.1905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.9969</td>
<td>0.2103</td>
<td>0.1905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9969</td>
<td>0.2103</td>
<td>0.1905</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed approach can be applied to investigate the stability of other explicit direct integration algorithms. The results of other SSE algorithms defined by the vector \( \eta \) and the generalized-\( \alpha \) PCE algorithms defined by \( \rho_\alpha \) are listed in Tables 5.3 and 5.4, respectively.

### 5.7 NUMERICAL EXAMPLES FOR MDOF SYSTEMS

Several numerical examples for MDOF systems are presented in this section.

#### 5.7.1 MDOF Bridge Structures

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

![Figure 5.4 A MDOF bridge structure.](image)

The derivation of the \( N \) basic resisting forces (\( \mathbf{q} \) in terms of \( \mathbf{u} \)) and the corresponding matrices \( \mathbf{a} \) and \( \mathbf{b} \) for this bridge structure is given in Appendix I. The row rank of the controllability matrix:
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\[ Z = [B_e \quad A_e B_e \quad A^2_e B_e \quad \cdots \quad A^{N_e}_e B_e] \]  

(5.58)

is such that \( \text{rank}(Z) = 18 \). Therefore, \((A_e, B_e)\) is controllable and \( \rho(A_e) = 0.9999 < 1 \).

In this section, the generalized- \( \alpha \) PCE algorithm with \( \rho(\alpha) = 0.6 \) is used to demonstrate the approach proposed in the previous sections on MDOF structural systems with nonlinear stiffening or softening behavior. The Lyapunov stability analysis is conducted for the bridge in Figure 5.4 assuming the following numerical values:

\[ m_b = m_e = 1.0, \quad L_i = 100.0, \quad i = 1, 2, \cdots, 5, \quad E_p I_p = E_z I_z = 1.0 \times 10^8 \]  

(5.59a)

\[ \lambda_i = 1/\sum_{l=1}^{N} l, \quad \mu = (\Delta T)/T_n = 0.01 \]  

(5.59b)

where \( \lambda_i \) is the weight coefficient of the \( l \)-th constraint, refer to Eq. (5.36), \( l:1 \rightarrow N \), \( T_n \) is the period of the \( n \)-th mode of vibration, which is \( T_n = T_0 = 0.19 \text{ sec} \) for the analyzed bridge. Rayleigh damping is assigned to the bridge [Chopra 2006], i.e.,

\[ c = a_0 m + a_1 k \]  

(5.60)

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

\[ a_0 = \frac{2 \omega_i \omega_j \zeta}{\omega_i + \omega_j}, \quad a_1 = \frac{2 \zeta}{\omega_i + \omega_j} \]  

(5.61)

where \( \omega_i \) and \( \omega_j \) are the natural frequencies of the \( i \)-th and \( j \)-th modes. Therefore, the damping ratio for the \( k \)-th mode is [Chopra 2006]:

\[ \zeta_k = \frac{a_0 + a_1 \omega_k}{2 \omega_k} \]  

(5.62)

In this example, \( i = 1 \) and \( j = 4 \) are selected such that the mean value of the damping ratio of all modes, i.e. \( \text{mean}(\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \cdots, \zeta_6) \), has the closest value to the assigned damping ratio \( \zeta = 0.05 \). The determination of the damping matrices for the other examples in this chapter follows the same procedure presented above.
Table 5.5 The $\bar{k}$ of each basic resisting force for the bridge structure.

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

Table 5.6 The $\bar{k}$ of each basic resisting force for the bridge structure for different $\lambda$ and cost function.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resisting force Number</th>
<th>Stiffening systems</th>
<th>Softening systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5791.6</td>
<td>5680.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>430.0</td>
<td>419.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>897.9</td>
<td>890.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>897.9</td>
<td>890.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>802.7</td>
<td>753.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1144.5</td>
<td>1086.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>834.4</td>
<td>824.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>575.9</td>
<td>564.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1144.5</td>
<td>1086.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>802.7</td>
<td>753.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>575.9</td>
<td>564.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>834.4</td>
<td>824.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Under earthquake excitation, nonlinearity usually occurs in the columns of bridge structure only where the bridge deck can be modeled using linear elastic elements. Therefore, the basic resisting forces associated with the column are of primary interest. Based on Appendix B, only the first two basic resisting forces are associated with the horizontal translation DOF of the column, $u^1$. Hence, the weight coefficients in Eq. (5.59b) are chosen such that the two smallest weight coefficients are assigned to the constraints corresponding to the first two basic resisting forces. Moreover, the cost function for this bridge structure is selected as $\min\{-(\bar{k}^1 + \bar{k}^2)\}$, which is equivalent to maximizing $-(\bar{k}^1 + \bar{k}^2)$. Accordingly, we perform convex optimization over all possible $\bar{K}$ that has the largest value of $-(\bar{k}^1 + \bar{k}^2)$ and the obtained result is the $\bar{K}$ for all the basic resisting forces. In this cost function, $\bar{k}^1 = \bar{k}_{Max}^1 - \bar{k}_{Min}^1$ and $\bar{k}^2 = \bar{k}_{Max}^2 - \bar{k}_{Min}^2$ are the differences of the upper and lower bounds of the basic resisting forces $q^1$ and $q^2$ associated with the column element. With the initial bounds and corresponding matrix $\bar{k}_i$, presented in Appendix I, the difference of the upper and lower bounds, $\bar{k} = \bar{k}_{Max}^i - \bar{k}_{Min}^i$, of each resisting force are listed in Table 5.5 for both stiffening, $\bar{u}^T \bar{q} \in [\bar{u}^T \bar{k}_i \bar{u}, \bar{u}^T (\bar{k}_i + \bar{k}) \bar{u}]$, and softening systems,
It is to be noted that the obtained $\mathbf{K}$ depends on the selection of the coefficient matrix $\lambda$ and the cost function. For example, different coefficient matrix $\lambda$, e.g., $\lambda_i = 1/N$, or alternative cost function chosen to be minimized, e.g. $\min(-\mathbf{K}^i)$, will yield different $\mathbf{K}$ as shown in Table 5.6.

## 5.7 MULTI-STORY SHEAR BUILDING STRUCTURES

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

![Figure 5.5 General multi-story shear building structure.](image)

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

$$m_j = 0.5, \quad \zeta_j = 0.05, \quad k_j = 1000.0$$

(5.63a)
\[ \lambda_j = \omega_j^2 \left( \sum_{j=1}^{n} \omega_j^2 \right), \quad \omega_j = 2\pi / T_j, \quad \mu = (\Delta t) / T_n = 0.01 \] (5.63b)

where \( j: 1 \rightarrow n \), \( T_j \) is the period of the \( j \)-th mode of vibration of the analyzed structure, and \( T_n \) is the period of the \( n \)-th mode of vibration, which depends on the number of stories, \( n \), of the analyzed shear building. As in the previous example, the initial bound matrix \( \bar{K}_n = \text{diag} [\bar{k}_1^1, \bar{k}_2^2, \ldots, \bar{k}_n^n] \).

### 5.7.1 A Two-Story Shear Building

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

#### 5.7.1.1 Stiffening Systems

For stiffening systems, \( \bar{K}_{\text{Min}} = \bar{K}_1 \), \( B_e = B_1 \alpha \) is given in Appendix III. The row rank of the controllability matrix:

\[ Z = [B_e \quad A_e B_e \quad A_e^2 B_e \cdots A_e^5 B_e] \] (5.64)

is such that \( \text{rank}(Z) = 6 \). Therefore, \( (A_e, B_e) \) is controllable and the following \( \bar{K} = \bar{K}_{\text{Max}} - \bar{K}_1 \):

\[ \bar{K} = \begin{bmatrix} 205 & 0 \\ 0 & 174 \end{bmatrix} \] (5.65)

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

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Minimize} & \quad - (\bar{k}^1 + \bar{k}^2) \\
\text{subjected to} & \quad \\
& \quad A_e^T P A_e - P + A_e^T P B_e - (\bar{K} C)^T (I + 1) B_e^T P B_e \\
& \quad < 0, \quad P = P^T > 0, \quad \bar{K} > 0
\end{align*}
\] (5.66)

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

\[ \bar{u}^T \bar{K}_{\text{Min}} \bar{u} \leq \bar{u}^T q \leq \bar{u}^T \bar{K}_{\text{Max}} \bar{u} \] (5.68)
where

\[
\bar{k}_{\text{Min}} = \bar{k}_I = \begin{bmatrix} 1000 & 0 \\ 0 & 1000 \end{bmatrix}
\]  
(5.69a)

\[
\bar{k}_{\text{Max}} = \bar{k}_{\text{Min}} + \bar{k} = \begin{bmatrix} 1205 & 0 \\ 0 & 1174 \end{bmatrix}
\]  
(5.69b)

### 5.7.1.2 Softening Systems

For softening systems, \( \bar{k}_{\text{Max}} = \bar{k}_I \), \( \bar{B}_e = \bar{B}_2 \bar{a} = -\bar{B}_1 \bar{a} \) as given in Appendix III, and the following \( \bar{k} = \bar{k}_I - \bar{k}_{\text{Min}} \):

\[
\bar{k} = \begin{bmatrix} 184 & 0 \\ 0 & 159 \end{bmatrix}
\]  
(5.70)

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

\[
\bar{k}_{\text{Max}} = \bar{k}_I = \begin{bmatrix} 1000 & 0 \\ 0 & 1000 \end{bmatrix}
\]  
(5.71a)

\[
\bar{k}_{\text{Min}} = \bar{k}_{\text{Max}} - \bar{k} = \begin{bmatrix} 816 & 0 \\ 0 & 841 \end{bmatrix}
\]  
(5.71b)

### 5.7.2 A 20-Story Shear Building

A 20-story (Figure 5.5 with \( n = 20 \)) shear building is used to investigate the Lyapunov stability analysis of the explicit Newmark algorithm. The fundamental and 20\textsuperscript{th} periods of this building are \( T_1 = 1.83 \) sec and \( T_{20} = 0.07 \) sec, which are within the practical range for the 20-story shear building.

Same Lyapunov stability analysis as in previous sections is conducted for the analyzed 20-story shear building with stiffening or softening behavior. The cost function for this bridge structure is selected as \( \min \left( -\sum_{j=1}^{20} \bar{k}_j \right) \), which is equivalent to maximizing \( \sum_{j=1}^{20} \bar{k}_j \). In this cost function, \( \bar{k}_j = \bar{k}_{\text{Max}}^j - \bar{k}_{\text{Min}}^j \) is the difference of the upper and lower bounds of the basic resisting force \( q^j \) associated with the \( j \)-th story, where \( j:1 \rightarrow n \). Table 4 shows that the difference of the upper and lower bounds, \( \bar{k} = \bar{k}_{\text{Max}} - \bar{k}_{\text{Min}} \), of each resisting force for the explicit Newmark algorithm to be stable (5.in the sense of Lyapunov) for both stiffening, \( \bar{u}^T \bar{q} \in [\bar{u}^T \bar{k}_I \bar{u}, \bar{u}^T (\bar{k}_I + \bar{k}) \bar{u}] \), and softening, \( \bar{u}^T \bar{q} \in [\bar{u}^T (\bar{k}_I - \bar{k}) \bar{u}, \bar{u}^T (\bar{k}_I - \bar{k}) \bar{u}] \), systems.
Table 5.7 The $\bar{k}$ of each basic resisting force for the 20-story shear building.

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

From Table 5.7, it is observed that the largest difference of upper and lower bounds is obtained for the first story for both stiffening and softening systems. Define $\delta^j$ as the difference between the upper and lower bounds of the stiffness of the $j$–th story normalized by the corresponding initial stiffness, i.e.,

$$\delta^j = \bar{k}^j / k_i^j$$  \hspace{1cm} (5.72)

For shear buildings, usually the first story is the most critical one where high levels of nonlinearity may occur. Fig. 4 presents the effects of the total number of stories and damping values (2%, 5% and 10%) on $\delta^1$ for stiffening (Figure 5.6a) and softening (Figure 5.6b) systems. The number of stories is investigated up to 25, i.e. $n:1 \rightarrow 25$. It can be observed from Fig. 4 that $\delta^1$ increases with the increase of the damping values. For the stiffening system (Figure 5.6a), $\delta^1$ also increases in general with the increase of the number of stories; while for the softening system (Figure 5.6b), $\delta^1$ increases or decreases with the increase of the number of stories for low (2%) or high (10%) damping ratios, respectively, while no change is observed for moderate (5%) damping ratio.

5.7.3 Discussion of Broader Scope

The proposed approach can be applied to investigate the stability of other explicit direct integration algorithms defined by the vector $\eta$ or $\rho_e$ for any MDOF nonlinear system defined by the matrices $\alpha$ and $\beta$. Moreover, it is also noted that neither $\bar{k}^l_{\min}$ nor $\bar{k}^l_{\max}$ is necessarily equal to $k^l_i$, where $l:1 \rightarrow N$, for the stiffening or the softening systems, respectively. These bounds values can take any other value along the loading path. Furthermore, besides strictly stiffening and softening systems as in Fig. 1, other nonlinear problems can be treated using the proposed stability analysis approach. This is true as long as Eq. (5.18) is satisfied and thus the nonlinear force is sector-bounded, e.g., those shown in Figure 5.7 with both stiffening and softening behavior including occasionally tangent negative stiffness values. Thus, the proposed approach is generally applicable to explicit direct integration algorithms for various MDOF nonlinear systems.
Figure 5.6 $\delta^1$ of different number of stories and damping values.
Figure 5.7 Schematic illustrations of sector-bounded basic resisting forces not strictly stiffening or softening.
6 Development of the Benchmark Probability Distribution of Seismic Demands

6.1 INTRODUCTION

Besides accurate seismic structural analysis of structures that is fundamental to estimate their seismic demands [Liang et al. 2016b], another key challenge in the PBEE approach is the selection and modification of ground motions (GMs) to serve as input excitations for NTHA simulations of structures. The intricate nonlinear response of structures is highly sensitive to the ground motion selection and modification (GMSM) of the input records. Therefore, the GMSM of the input records is a vital prerequisite for accurate seismic analysis.

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

Although many GMSM procedures are available, there is no consensus regarding a single accurate method and many studies focused on evaluating these procedures. Hancock et al. (2008), Haselton et al. (2009), and Heo et al. (2010) compared different GMSM procedures in predicting median responses of seismic demands against developed reference benchmarks. Recently, Kwong et al. (2015) developed a framework for the evaluation of GMSM procedures by determining a benchmark seismic demand hazard curve. Later, Kwong and Chopra (2016) applied this framework to evaluate two GMSM procedures: (1) exact conditional spectrum [Lin et al. 2013] and (2) generalized conditional intensity measures [Bradley 2010]. These evaluation studies were primarily focused on building structures and considered unidirectional input ground motion. In
general, bridge structures exhibit distinct behaviors in the longitudinal and transverse directions. Hence, bidirectional GM studies focused on highway bridges are needed as conducted in this study.

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

### 6.2 BENCHMARK PROBABILITY DISTRIBUTION OF SEISMIC DEMANDS

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

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

(6.1)

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

In this study, a reference benchmark PDSD is developed based on the PEER PBEE framework considering the first two sources of uncertainties, i.e., the earthquake intensity measure and the structural response. In addition, this study is extended to account for structural collapse of a certain damage group corresponding to a group of structural components affected by the same EDP (e.g., Cornell 1999, Baker and Cornell 2005, Lin et al. 2013). This study makes use of Eq. (6.2), which presents the general formula for the PDSD.

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

(6.2)

where \(im = (im_1, im_2, \ldots, im_{n_{im}})\) are values of the intensity measures represented as random variables \(IM = (IM_1, IM_2, \ldots, IM_{n_{im}}),\) \(n_{im}\) is the number of intensity measures considered, \(\int_{im} \cdot \) \(dim\) is an abbreviated form of \(\int_{im_1} \int_{im_2} \cdots \int_{im_{n_{im}}} \cdot \) \(dim_1 \cdot dim_2 \cdots dim_{n_{im}}\) and will be used thereafter.
in this chapter, \( G(edp | im) = \Pr(EDP > edp | IM = im) \) is the conditional probability of \( EDP \) exceeding the demand level \( edp \) given the vector of intensity measures \( im \), and \( f_{IM}(im) \) is the joint probability density function (PDF) of the intensity measures, i.e., \( IM \).

### 6.2.1 Intensity Measures

A non-parametric statistical inference, multivariate kernel density estimation (Härdle et al. 2004) is used to estimate \( f_{IM}(im) \). For this purpose, we consider an \( m \)-dimensional random vector \( X = (X_1, \ldots, X_m)^T \), where \( X_1, \ldots, X_m \) are one-dimensional random variables. Drawing a random sample of size \( n \) in this setting means that we have \( n \) observations for each of the \( m \) random variables, \( X_1, \ldots, X_m \). In this case, our goal is to estimate the probability density of \( X = (X_1, \ldots, X_m)^T \), which is the joint PDF of the random variables \( X_1, \ldots, X_m \) as follows:

\[
 f_X(x) = f_{X_1, \ldots, X_m}(x_1, \ldots, x_m) \tag{6.3}
\]

Considering adapting the kernel density estimator to \( m \)-dimensional cases, we have

\[
 \hat{f}_X(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{h_1 \cdots h_m} K \left( \frac{x_1 - X_{i1}}{h_1}, \ldots, \frac{x_m - X_{im}}{h_m} \right) \tag{6.4}
\]

where \( h_j, j = 1, 2, \ldots, m \), is the bandwidth for \( X_j \), \( K \) is a multivariate kernel function with \( m \) arguments, \( X_{ij} \) is the \( i \)-th observation of the random variable \( X_j \). The symbol “\(^{\wedge}\)” in Eq. (6.4) denotes the estimation, i.e., \( \hat{g}(x) \) is an estimate of \( g(x) \). In this study, Eq. (6.4) becomes

\[
 \hat{f}_{IM}(im) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{h_1 \cdots h_m} K \left( \frac{im_1 - IM_{i1}}{h_1}, \ldots, \frac{im_m - IM_{im}}{h_m} \right) \tag{6.5}
\]

In order for this joint PDF estimate to equally weight each intensity measure, a whitening transformation [Krizhevsky and Hinton 2009] can be applied to the \( n \) groups of \( m \) intensity measures, i.e., \( m \times n \) matrix \( IM_0 \), as follows:

\[
 IM_\mu = IM_0 - \mu \\
 IM_{white} = IM_\mu \Sigma^{-1/2} \tag{6.6}
\]

where \( \mu \) is a \( m \times n \) matrix with all entries of the \( j \)-th column are equal to the mean of the \( j \)-th intensity measure, \( j = 1, 2, \ldots, m \), respectively, and \( \Sigma \) is the \( m \times m \) covariance matrix of the \( m \) columns of \( IM_\mu \). After this whitening transformation, each column of \( IM_{white} \) has zero mean and identity covariance matrix. A kernel density estimator for \( K \) and a bandwidth selection method for \( h_j, j = 1, 2, \ldots, m \), proposed by Botev et al. (2010), are adopted to estimate the joint PDF \( f_{IM}(im) \). After such estimation, \( IM_{white} \) is transformed back to \( IM_0 \), i.e.,
The procedures of density estimation discussed above can be readily applied to the investigated structures.

6.2.2 Collapse Consideration

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

\[
G(edp \mid im) = G(edp \mid im, C) \times \Pr(C \mid im) + G(edp \mid im, NC) \times \Pr(NC \mid im) \tag{6.8}
\]

Intuitively, we can set \(G(edp \mid im, C) = 1.0\). Thus, Eq. (9) leads to the following:

\[
G(edp \mid im) = \Pr(C \mid im) + G(edp \mid im, NC) \times [1 - \Pr(C \mid im)] \tag{6.9}
\]

From the prescribed collapse criteria, Eq. (6.9) is further manipulated as follows:

\[
G(edp \mid im) = \int_{fc} \{\Pr(C \mid im) + G(edp \mid im, NC) \times [1 - \Pr(C \mid im)]\} f_{fc}(fc) dfc \tag{6.10}
\]

where \(fc = (fc_1, fc_2, \ldots, fc_{n_{fc}})\) are values of the failure criteria represented as random variables \(FC = (FC_1, FC_2, \ldots, FC_{n_{fc}})\), \(n_{fc}\) is the number of failure criteria considered, \(\int_{fc} (\cdot) dfc\) is an abbreviated form of \(\int_{fc_1} \int_{fc_2} \cdots \int_{fc_{n_{fc}}}(\cdot) dfc_1 dfc_2 \cdots dfc_{n_{fc}}\), and \(f_{fc}(fc)\) is the joint PDF of failure criteria, i.e., \(FC\). The fragility surface or conditional probability of collapse, i.e., \(\Pr(C \mid im)\), is evaluated using multivariate binary logistic regression [Wasserman 2010] by fitting a binomial distribution to the observed collapsed (1: C; 0: NC) versus \textbf{IM}, i.e.,

\[
\hat{\Pr}(C \mid im) = \frac{\exp \left(\hat{\alpha}_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \hat{\alpha}_i im_i\right)}{1 + \exp \left(\hat{\alpha}_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \hat{\alpha}_i im_i\right)} \tag{6.11}
\]

where the coefficients \(\hat{\alpha}_0 \ldots \hat{\alpha}_m\) can be obtained by the reweighted least squares algorithm [Wasserman 2010].
6.2.3 Non-Collapse Structural Responses

In Eq. (6.10), the only term that has not been determined is the probability of \( EDP \) exceeding the demand level \( edp \) given the intensity measures for the non-collapse scenario, i.e., \( G(edp \mid im, NC) \). In this study, the distribution of \( EDPs \) conditioned on the intensity measures is assumed to be lognormal (e.g., Kunnath 2006 and Kunnath et al. 2006). Multivariate linear regression (Wasserman 2010) can be used to estimate this distribution. From regression, for a given set of \( im_i, i = 1,2,\cdots,m \), under non-collapse scenario, the mean value of \( \ln(EDP) \) is as follows:

\[
\hat{\mu}_{\ln(EDP) \mid im} = \hat{\beta}_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \hat{\beta}_i im_i \tag{6.12}
\]

where coefficients \( \hat{\beta}_i, i = 1,2,\cdots,m \), are determined from the least square estimate [Wasserman 2010]. An unbiased estimate of the variance of the distribution is given as follows:

\[
\hat{\sigma}_{\ln(EDP) \mid im}^2 = \frac{1}{N-k}\sum_{i=1}^{N} \hat{e}_i^2 \tag{6.13}
\]

\[
\hat{e}_i = \hat{\beta}_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{m} \hat{\beta}_j IM_j - \ln(EDP_i) \tag{6.14}
\]

where \( IM_j \) and \( EDP_i \) are the \( i \)-th sampling point of \( IM^j, j = 1,2,\cdots,m \), and \( EDP \), respectively. \( N \) is the total number of sampling points that correspond to the NC and \( k \) is the number of the free parameters, i.e., \( k = m+1 \) for this case. The probability that the \( EDP \) exceeds the demand level of \( edp \) given \( im \) and for the NC scenario can now be calculated using the normal CCDF:

\[
\hat{G}(edp \mid im, NC) = 1 - \Phi\left\{ \ln(EDP) - \hat{\mu}_{\ln(EDP) \mid im} \bigg/ \hat{\sigma}_{\ln(EDP) \mid im} \right\} \tag{6.15}
\]

where \( \Phi(\cdot) \) denotes the standard normal CDF.

6.2.4 Integration of Intensity Measures and Structural Responses

Combination of the intensity measures from the kernel density estimator and the structural responses, including C and NC cases, i.e., substituting Eq. (6.10) and required estimates of its different terms, as discussed above, into Eq. (6.2), leads to the following

\[
\hat{G}(edp) = \int_{im} \int_{fc} \left[ \hat{P}(C \mid im) + \hat{G}(edp \mid im, NC) \times \left[ 1 - \hat{P}(C \mid im) \right] \right] dDr(fc) \hat{f}_{im}(im) dfcdim \tag{6.16}
\]

The procedures of the benchmark \( PDS\) development is readily extended to the case of multiple earthquake scenarios as follows:
\[
\hat{G}_m(edp) \equiv \sum_{l=1}^{N_{eqs}} V_l \cdot \left\{ \int_{im} \int_{fc} \left[ \hat{\text{Pr}}(C \mid im) + \hat{G}(edp \mid im, NC) \times \left[ 1 - \hat{\text{Pr}}(C \mid im) \right] \right] \hat{f}_{Dr}(fc) \hat{f}_{im}(im) dfc dim \right\}
\]

(6.17)

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

### 6.3 EVALUATION OF THE GMSM PROCEDURES

Similar to the development of the reference benchmark PDSD, the PDSD estimates by the GM records selected from each GMSM procedure are developed. Analogous to Eqs. (6.8) and (6.9), \( G(edp) \) is divided into two mutually exclusive categories of C and NC, i.e.,

\[
\begin{align*}
G(edp) &= G(edp \mid C) \times \text{Pr}(C) + G(edp \mid NC) \times \text{Pr}(NC) \\
&= \text{Pr}(C) + G(edp \mid NC) \times \left[ 1 - \text{Pr}(C) \right]
\end{align*}
\]

(6.18)

where it is assumed that \( G(edp \mid C) = 1.0 \) and \( \text{Pr}(C) \) is the probability of collapse estimated as follows:

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

(6.19)

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

\[
\hat{G}(edp \mid NC) = \frac{1}{\bar{m}} \sum_{l=1}^{\bar{m}} I(EDP_l > edp)
\]

(6.20)

where \( \bar{m} \) is the number of GM records that produce NC, \( EDP_l \) is the value of \( EDP \) for the \( l \)-th record, and \( I(\cdot) \) represents the indicator function, i.e., \( I(EDP_l > edp) = 1.0 \) if \( EDP_l > edp \); otherwise, \( I(EDP_l > edp) = 0.0 \). Recall the previously discussed collapse criteria, along with the estimates in Eqs. (6.19) and (6.20), the PDSD estimate, i.e., \( \hat{G}(edp) \), is obtained as follows:

\[
\hat{G}(edp) = \int_{fc} \left\{ \hat{\text{Pr}}(C) + \hat{G}(edp \mid NC) \times \left[ 1 - \hat{\text{Pr}}(C) \right] \right\} \hat{f}_{im}(im) dfc
\]

(6.21)
7 Computational Bridge Structure Models

7.1 INTRODUCTION

In any urban transportation system, ordinary standard reinforced concrete (RC) highway bridges are essential lifeline structures for transporting goods and people around natural terrains. In California where numerous active faults exist, earthquakes occur frequently and therefore bridges should sustain minimal damage and remain operational in the aftermath of an earthquake. This requirement is essential for recovery and emergency management purposes. RC highway bridges were observed to have substandard performance during earthquakes due to the inherent lack of high redundancy of the structural system [Benzoti et al. 1996]. Even bridges designed according to modern codes were severely damaged or collapsed in different parts of the world during earthquakes in the last two decades. Accordingly, determination of the seismic response of existing and newly designed RC highway bridges, using techniques of structural analysis, is essential to ensure their seismic safety.

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

7.2 BRIDGE STRUCTURES

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bridge</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Jack Tone Road Overcrossing</td>
<td>La Veta Avenue Overcrossing</td>
<td>Jack Tone Road Overhead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of spans</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column bent</td>
<td>Single-column</td>
<td>Two-column</td>
<td>Three-column</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column radius</td>
<td>33.1 in.</td>
<td>33.5 in.</td>
<td>33.1 in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column height</td>
<td>22.0 ft.</td>
<td>22.0 ft.</td>
<td>24.6 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abutment</td>
<td>Seat type</td>
<td>Seat type</td>
<td>Seat type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seat length</td>
<td>33.85 in.</td>
<td>33.85 in.</td>
<td>33.85 in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superstructure concrete</td>
<td>$f'_c = 5, ksi, E_c = 4030.5, ksi$</td>
<td>$f'_c = 5, ksi, E_c = 4030.5, ksi$</td>
<td>$f'_c = 5, ksi, E_c = 4030.5, ksi$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column bent concrete and reinforcing materials</td>
<td>Concrete: 5 ksi, Steel: ASTM A706</td>
<td>Concrete: 5 ksi, Steel: ASTM A706</td>
<td>Concrete: 5 ksi, Steel: ASTM A706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long: 44#11 (bundles of 2)</td>
<td>$\rho_l = 2.00%$</td>
<td>Long: 44#11 (bundles of 2)</td>
<td>Long: 44#11 (bundles of 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trans.: Spiral, #6 @ 3.34 in.</td>
<td>Trans.: Spiral, #6 @ 3.34 in.</td>
<td>Trans.: Spiral, #4 @ 6.00 in.</td>
<td>Trans.: Spiral, #6 @ 3.34 in.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 7.1** Configurations of the selected bridges.

(a) Bridge A  
(b) Bridge B  
(c) Bridge C
7.3 COMPUTATIONAL MODELS

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

![Figure 7.2 Modeling of Bridge B [Kaviani et al. 2014].](image)

7.3.1 Material Properties

Material properties assigned to the models were on the basis of Caltrans SDC [2010]. The model developed by Mander et al. [1988] was used for the RC column of the selected bridges. It is recommended by Caltrans SDC [2010] that confined as well as unconfined concrete should be taken into account to determine the local capacity of ductile concrete member.
In this study, for the unconfined concrete, the compressive strain at the maximum compressive stress, $\varepsilon_{c0} = 5$ ksi, and the ultimate compression (spalling) strain were chosen as $\varepsilon_{cp} = 0.0028$. For the confined concrete, the compressive strain at the maximum compressive stress, $f_{ce} = 6.6$ ksi, and the ultimate compression strain were employed as $\varepsilon_{ce} = 0.008$ and $\varepsilon_{cu} = 0.025$, respectively. The modulus of elasticity specified by Caltrans SDC [2010] is

$$E_c = 33 \times w^{1.5} \times \sqrt{f'_c} \text{ (psi)}$$

(7.1)

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

7.3.2 Superstructure Modeling

Caltrans SDC [2010] requires the superstructure of a bridge to be capacity protected and accordingly to remain elastic. Considering that the bridge is designed according to the code regulations, the bridge deck and the cap-beam that form the bridge superstructure are modeled with elastic beam-column elements using uncracked section properties (typical for prestressed concrete). The three-dimensional spine-line models for the bridge superstructures, with a series of elastic beam-column line elements located at the centroids of the cross-sections following the bridge alignment, were used to strike a good balance between computational efficiency and accuracy. The width of the deck is incorporated in the model at the two extreme nodes of the spine model, and by including a transverse rigid bar whose lengths is the same as the width of the deck. This approach allows accounting for the passive resistance of backfill soil distributed along the width of the deck. The orientation of the rigid bars and their widths are decided according to the abutment skew angle. Zero-length elements with uniaxial behavior—whose properties are discussed later below—are distributed along the width of the rigid boundary elements to model the passive backfill reaction normal to the backwall as well as the transverse reactions by the shear-keys. At each abutment, the deck is resting on several elastomeric (polytetrafluoroethylene) bearings through which the vertical loads from the superstructure are transferred to the stem wall. The two-phase (compressible and incompressible) vertical response of the bearing pads and the stem wall is represented with a bilinear force-deformation backbone curve [Kaviani et. al. 2012]. Horizontal resistance due to sliding friction between deck and bearing pads has been neglected, considering the relatively small value of the friction coefficient between the pads and their mating surface [Caltrans SDC 2010]. The integral cap beam is modeled with elastic beam-column elements—with very large torsional and bending (out-of-plane of bent) rigidities—and is rigidly connected at its central node to the deck spine model.

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

$$M_{xx} = \frac{M d_w^2}{12} = \frac{(m/L) L_{trib} d_w}{12}$$  \hspace{1cm} (7.2)

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

$$M_{zz} = \frac{M_c R_{col}^2}{2} = \frac{(m_c/L_c) L_{trib} D_{col}^2}{8}$$  \hspace{1cm} (7.3)

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

### 7.3.3 Column-bent Modeling

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

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

The study focused on seat-type abutment modeling. A representative seat-type abutment is illustrated in Figure 7.4. Two modeling approaches, namely Type I and Type II, were considered for the abutment (Figure 7.5). In both approaches, the longitudinal responses of the backfill and the expansion joint, the transverse responses of the shear keys, and the vertical responses of the bearing pads and the stemwall were all explicitly considered. In the Type I modeling approach (Figure 7.5a), two nonlinear springs, one at each end, connected in series to gap elements, were used to model the passive backfill response and the expansion joint [Aviram et al. 2008], respectively. The shear key response was modeled using an elastic-perfectly-plastic backbone relationship. The vertical response of the bearing pads and stemwall was modeled by two parallel springs, one at each end (note that only one side is labelled in Figure 1), to represent the stiffness values. The backfill passive pressure was produced by the abutment backwall. The strength and initial stiffness of the soil springs were determined according to Caltrans SDC [Caltrans 2010]. In the Type II modeling approach, the number of nonlinear springs connected in series to the gap elements was increased to five as shown in Figure 7.5b, and the shear key response was modeled using a nonlinear spring with a tri-linear backbone relationship (Figure 7.6).
a) Type I abutment modeling

b) Type II abutment modeling

Figure 7.5 Abutment modeling with springs and gap elements.
Figure 7.6 Shear key force-deformation backbone curves [Kaviani et al. 2014].
8 Application of Robust Integration and Solution Algorithms Selection

8.1 INTRODUCTION

As stated in Chapter 7, determination of the seismic response of existing and newly designed RC highway bridges is essential to ensure their seismic safety. The most suitable analysis method that can be used for this purpose is nonlinear time history analysis (NTHA). However, one of the factors that introduce a challenge to conduct NTHA is the problems of convergence. In general, these problems are attributed to three reasons: (1) various forms of nonlinear modeling required for accurate representation of the major bridge components (e.g., distributed plasticity models with discretized fiber sections for columns, stiffening gap elements used for the abutments, and combination of various nonlinear springs required for modeling shear keys); (2) complexity introduced by the interaction of the responses in longitudinal, transverse, and sometimes vertical directions; (3) dynamic complexity due to the mass distribution along the deck.

This chapter investigates solutions to the numerical problems of convergence through the use of efficient direct integration algorithms. Two of the explicit integration algorithms are the Explicit Newmark (EN) and the Operator-Splitting (OS) algorithms, which do not require iterations nor convergence checks. The TRBDF2 is an implicit integration algorithm developed to rectify potential stability problems of the Implicit Newmark (IN) for problems involving large deformations. The formulations of these algorithms are already introduced in Chapter 2. Applicability of these integration algorithms to NTHA of RC highway bridges is explored herein by using three representative RC highway bridges described in Chapter 7 where modeling of these three bridges includes the above-mentioned three sources of possible NTHA convergence issues.

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

The applicability of the discussed explicit and implicit integration algorithms introduced in Chapter 2 for NTHA is discussed in this section. This discussion focuses on the three described RC highway bridges. Table 8.1 presents coefficients for the Newmark and the OS integration algorithms, i.e., the MDOF version of Table 4.1, where

\[ \eta = m/(\Delta t^2 \beta) + k_{i+1} + c \gamma/(\Delta t \beta). \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Newmark</th>
<th>OS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \eta_1 )</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>( 1 - [1/\Delta t] \eta \cdot c )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \eta_i )</td>
<td>( (1-2\beta)/2 )I</td>
<td>( [(1-2\beta)/2] - [(1-\gamma)/\Delta t] \eta \cdot c )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \eta_i )</td>
<td>( \beta )I</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \eta_i )</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>( \eta^\top (p_{i-1} - \bar{r}_{i-1}) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \eta_i )</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>( 1 - [\gamma/(\beta \Delta t)] \eta \cdot c )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \eta_i )</td>
<td>( (1-\gamma) )I</td>
<td>( (1-\gamma)I - [\gamma/(\beta \Delta t)] \eta \cdot c )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \eta_i )</td>
<td>( \gamma )I</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \eta_i )</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>( [\gamma/(\beta \Delta t)] \eta^\top (p_{i-1} - \bar{r}_{i-1}) )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.2.1 Explicit Newmark (EN) Algorithm

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

\[ \frac{\Delta t}{T_n} \leq \frac{1}{\pi} \]  

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

8.2.2 Operator-Splitting (OS) Algorithm

As mentioned in Chapter 4, the version of the OS algorithm considered herein (i.e., the one using the tangential stiffness matrix), possesses similar stability properties and accuracies to those of the
IN integration [Liang and Mosalam 2015, 2016a]. Moreover, the TRBDF2 algorithm is considered because of its superior stability and better convergence behavior due to numerical damping.

The NTHA is conducted for both abutment modeling approaches I and II of Bridges A, B, and C using the IN, OS, and TRBDF2 algorithms under 40 pulse-like three-component ground motions described in [Jayaram et al. 2010] and documented in the Appendix E. The pulse-like ground motions tend to introduce highly nonlinear responses. Therefore, they are selected in this study to assess the validity of the discussed integration algorithms for NTHA of bridges. The results from the IN algorithm, which is considered as the common algorithm used for NTHA, are considered as the reference results. It is to be noted that the use of a numerical solution as the reference is attributed to the lack of an available closed-form exact solution or reliable experimental data for the analyzed bridges under the selected earthquake excitations.

For comparison of the results, three EDPs are selected, namely the peak response value of abutment unseating displacement, column drift ratio, and column base shear. As identified in Figure 8.1 for Bridge B, these three EDPs correspond to the longitudinal displacement of Node 100, column drift ratio of Node 12, and column base shear of Node 11. Similar nodes are also utilized for Bridges A and C to investigate the NTHA results. The comparison is conducted quantitatively by using the error measure $Max_{error}$, defined as follows:
where $Max_{ref}$ and $Max_{alt}$ are the maximum absolute response of the considered EDPs provided by the IN and by the other algorithms, respectively. The NTHA is conducted for all three bridges with detailed results presented for Bridge B and brief ones given for Bridges A and C. Figure 8.2 and 8.4 show the $Max_{error}$ of the OS and TRBDF2 algorithms for the three selected EDPs of Bridge B, which were analyzed with both abutment modeling approaches I and II (Figure 7.5), from all 40 ground motions.

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

The good match of the time history responses for the highly nonlinear case in Fig. 8.3a and the small values of the error measure in Figure 8.2 indicate that the explicit OS algorithm is suitable for the intended objective of overcoming problems of convergence in the NTHA of RC highway bridges, while maintaining the accuracy of the results provided by the IN method. Similar good match and small error levels are also obtained for Bridges A and C as discussed in the section 8.4.

8.2.3 TRBDF2 Algorithm

Figure 8.4 shows the $Max_{error}$ of the TRBDF2 algorithm for the three selected EDPs of Bridge B, analyzed with both abutment modeling approaches I and II (Figure 7.5), from all 40 ground motions. Analogous to the OS results in Figure 8.2, small errors in Figure 8.4 imply that the accuracy of the implicit TRBDF2 and IN algorithms are comparable. Furthermore, the TRBDF2 algorithm exhibits superior convergence features as discussed in the section 8.4.
Figure 8.2 $Max_{error}$ of the OS algorithm for the three selected EDPs of Bridge B.
a) Abutment unseating displacement

b) Moment-curvature response

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

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

The following sections investigate the effect of different parameters in improving the convergence properties of the IN method while preserving its accuracy for the bridge models described in Chapter 7. It is noted that this investigation is based on the displacement formulation of the method, which is observed to result in an improved convergence performance compared to the acceleration formulation. The considered parameters are categorized in five groups as follows:

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

8.3.1 Type and Sequence of Nonlinear Equation Solvers

In order to achieve convergence, OpenSees [McKenna et al. 2010] allows trying various nonlinear solvers consecutively for any iteration of an integration time step. Therefore, one of the potential items that can be considered to improve convergence is the type and sequence of the nonlinear equation solvers. This investigation is further divided into two sub-groups, namely, (a) determination of the most suitable initial solver and (b) sequence of other solvers after the initial one. Nonlinear equation solvers considered are the ones introduced in Chapter 2, i.e., the regular Newton Raphson (NR), Broyden, Newton-Raphson with line search (NRLS), Broyden–Fletcher–Goldfarb–Shanno (BFGS), and Krylov-Newton algorithms.

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

Using the NRLS as the initial solver, no difference was found when different subsequent orders of other solvers (NR, Broyden, BFGS, and Krylov-Newton) were investigated. It may be concluded that as long as a suitable initial solver is determined, the order of subsequent other solvers do not have significant impact on the convergence. It is beneficial to note that this finding may be specific to the investigated structure since this investigation is not repeated for other structures. However, it is still a useful conclusion because of two reasons. First, this finding sets the NLS to be a suitable initial solver as the first simulation trial of future nonlinear models. Second,
it shows to the analyst the importance of proper selection of the initial solver compared to trying a variety of solver combinations afterwards. The same observations were found for the two other Bridges B and C.

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

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

8.3.2 Convergence Test Type

The following five convergence tests: Energy Increment, Norm Displacement Increment, Relative Norm Displacement Increment, Total Relative Displacement Increment, and Relative Energy Increment, are compared for the 4 ground motions (GM18, GM19, GM28 and GM31) with scale factors ranging from 1.0 to 2.0. The comparisons are based on counting the total number of iterations for each simulation, see Table 8.3 for Bridge A with Type II abutment modeling. It is observed that the Energy Increment test leads to significantly less number of iterations compared to the other test types. It is to be noted that very small response differences are obtained from the simulations with different convergence tests, as indicated by \( \text{error}_{\text{Max}} \) for the longitudinal direction displacements of one of the nodes of the abutment, i.e., node 100 (Figure 8.1) in Table 8.4. Here, \( \text{error}_{\text{Max}} \) is calculated for the simulations with different convergence tests considering the simulations with the Energy Increment test as the reference.

It is beneficial to note that the same tolerance value of \( 10^{-8} \) is used for all the convergence tests, which is the main factor that makes the Energy Increment test to have the least amount of iterations. Multiplication of the displacement increment with the unbalanced force, both less than 1.0, results in a norm value smaller than the other norms. However, aside from this explanation, observing that the simulations with the less stringent Energy Increment leads to practically the same results with significantly less number of iterations compared to the other tests, it is concluded that the Energy Increment test is the most suitable convergence test for the analyzed model. Similar to the investigation in previous sections, this finding may be specific to the investigated model. However, for similar reasons as those mentioned above, it is still a useful conclusion by providing an initial trial suggestion for other models and simulations.
Table 8.3 Total number of iterations for simulations with different convergence tests under GM31 for Bridge A with Type II abutment modeling.

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

Table 8.4 Max\text{error} in long. deformation of node 100 for GM31 (different convergence tests) for Bridge A with Type II abutment modeling.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Factor</th>
<th>NormDisIncr</th>
<th>RelativeNormDispIncr</th>
<th>RelativeTotalNormDisIncr</th>
<th>RelativeEnergyIncr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.82×10^{-6}</td>
<td>1.82×10^{-6}</td>
<td>1.82×10^{-6}</td>
<td>1.82×10^{-6}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.30×10^{-4}</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>7.67×10^{-6}</td>
<td>7.67×10^{-6}</td>
<td>7.67×10^{-6}</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.21×10^{-6}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Failed</td>
<td>1.91×10^{-4}</td>
<td>2.38×10^{-3}</td>
<td>2.70×10^{-6}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.3.3 Convergence Tolerance

For Bridge B with Type II abutment modeling, the effect of different tolerances of 1.0, 0.1, $10^{-3}$, and $10^{-5}$ on the convergence and accuracy of the obtained results is investigated using the Energy Increment test. Analyses are conducted for all 40 GMs with 5 different tolerances, including the ones with $10^{-8}$, with scaling factors presented in Figure 8.5, i.e., the maximum scaling factors without convergence issues. In order for the comparison, the longitudinal direction deformation of one of the nodes of the abutment, corresponding to node 100 (refer to Figure 8.1), and the longitudinal displacement of a column node, node12, are selected. Figure 8.6 presents the largest Max\text{error} of 40 GMs of these selected two nodes for the simulations with 4 different tolerances. In the calculation of these error quantities, simulations with the tolerance of $10^{-8}$ are considered as the reference.
Selected tolerances may have considerable effect on the nonlinear response. A large tolerance may result in a premature convergence and corresponding deviation from the true response. The small errors between the simulations with tolerances of $10^{-5}$ and $10^{-8}$ under the effect of the considered ground motions resulting in highly nonlinear response indicate that the increase of the tolerance can be used as a reasonable option to overcome convergence issues, while
preserving accuracy. It is to be noted that the above tolerance values are used for all the integration time steps of a particular simulation. Considering that a common application is the increase of the convergence tolerance only at the integration time steps with convergence problems, the errors in the obtained results in such cases of selective adoption of tolerance values will be even less than the errors plotted in Figure 8.6.

8.3.4 Integration Time Step

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

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

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

8.3.5 Adaptive Switching of Integration Algorithms

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

NTHA results in Table 8.6 are selected examples from simulations for the seismic response of bridges investigated in more detail in the next section. It is observed from Table 8.6 that the IN algorithm fails to converge at the indicated times in the 4th column, where the responses are at high levels of nonlinearity. It is noted that the ground motions in this table are identified by its sequence number in [NGA database 2011]. On the other hand, the simulations with the same ground motions are completed using adaptive switching between integration algorithms, i.e. from IN to OS, at the time steps when IN fails to converge. Therefore, the adaptive switching of algorithms is considered to be a viable and readily available option, e.g., in OpenSees (2010), to overcome the problems of convergence. Moreover, this statement is supported by the previously conducted theoretical investigation [Liang and Mosalam 2015, 2016a] and successful completion of the simulations discussed in the next chapter.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NGA Sequence Number</th>
<th>Bridge</th>
<th>Scale factor</th>
<th>Implicit Newmark</th>
<th>Switching Integration algorithms</th>
<th>TRBDF2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>6.160</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1271</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>13.720</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>964</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>2.690</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1263</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>17.420</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>1.310</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1541</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>31.120</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>755</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>0.495</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1542</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>25.040</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 8.6, it is also observed that simulations that experienced problems of convergence are all completed with the use of TRBDF2. This superior convergence performance of TRBDF2 is attributed to the numerical damping introduced by the three point backward Euler scheme. It is noted that several simulations in Table 8.6 fails to converge at as early as 0.495 sec when IN is used. This early stage convergence issues can be attributed to several possible reasons, such as near fault ground motions that cause nonlinear responses very early or the abrupt stiffness change due to the opening and closing of the gap elements used in the modeling of abutments.
8.4 SEISMIC RESPONSE OF BRIDGES

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

This investigation requires a large number of NTHA that produce highly nonlinear response and may face problems of convergence. Therefore, the solutions for overcoming such problems discussed in the previous sections are used in the conducted NTHA simulations.

The maximum column drift ratio, column base shear, and deck total acceleration are selected as the investigated EDPs. With reference to Figure 8.1, these three EDPs correspond to the column drift ratio of Node 12, column base shear of Node 11, and deck total acceleration of Node 110 in Bridge B. Two groups of ground motions are selected from the NGA Database [2011] for the purpose of this investigation. The first group, expected to result primarily in the first-mode response, is selected using the conditional mean spectrum, namely the CMS method [Baker 2011]. The second group, which serves as the reference for comparison, is selected to match a chosen scenario response spectrum, the shape of which allows higher mode response. Therefore, the ground motions in the second group are considered as the ones with higher mode effects. Both groups of ground motions are selected using a method that seeks to match the mean and variance of the target spectrum [Jayaram et al. 2011].

For each bridge, three earthquake scenarios are considered, namely those with 2%, 10% and 50% probability of exceedance (POE) in 50 years. The attenuation model by Campbell and Bozorgnia (2008) is used to generate these three hazard levels. The CMS (Baker 2011), which is a response spectrum associated with a target value of the spectral acceleration $S_a$ at a single period, is the target spectrum for the first group of ground motions. In this study, this single period is the fundamental one of the bridge. The second “reference” group is selected to match the spectrum predicted by the attenuation model of Campbell and Bozorgnia (2008).

Fig. 8.7a shows the response spectrum by the attenuation model from Campbell and Bozorgnia (2008) at hazard level of 10% POE in 50 years for Bridge B site, i.e., the target spectrum for the second “reference” group. Also shown in Fig. 8.7a is the CMS [Baker 2011] anchored at the Bridge B fundamental period of 1.1 sec, which is the target spectrum for the first group. As mentioned before, both groups of ground motions are selected using a method proposed by Jayaram et al. (2011) that seeks to match the mean and variance of the target spectrum (Fig. 8.7b). A detailed explanation of this method can be found in [Jayaram et al. 2011].
Figure 8.7 Campbell and Bozorgnia (CB) 2008 spectrum and CMS for 10% POE in 50 years for Bridge B site.
As discussed before, two approaches for abutment modeling, namely Type I and Type II (Figure 7.5), are considered. For each abutment modeling (2) of each scenario (3), 40 GM records are selected for each ground motion group (2). These GM records are documented in Appendix E. Therefore, $40 \times 2 \times 3 \times 2 \times 3 = 1440$ NTHA simulations in total are conducted for the considered bridge systems (3). A large number of problems related to convergence, e.g., those indicated in Table 8.6, are encountered. Most of these problems are overcome by the proposed solutions, i.e., OS, TRBDF2, and approaches to improve convergence properties of IN presented in Section 8.3. The NTHA simulations that still fail to converge are primarily due to the large ground motions, e.g., several ones in the “reference” group at hazard level of 2% POE in 50 years, which lead to significantly large nonlinear responses in the range of collapse limit state and probably correspond to physical partial or complete bridge collapse.

Figures 8.8-8.10 present the ratios of the median EDPs obtained from the ground motions of the first group (CMS), i.e., first-mode dominant, to those obtained from the ground motions of the second “reference” group, i.e., higher mode response. Therefore, the smaller the ratio, the more the considered EDP is affected by the higher modes. It is observed that the ratio for the column base shear is close to 1.0 and almost invariant for both modeling cases and all three scenarios. On the other hand, the ratios for the column drift and deck acceleration are always less than 1.0 and generally reduce as the hazard level and the corresponding nonlinearity level increase. Accordingly, it is concluded that the higher mode effects are more pronounced on column displacements and deck accelerations than on column shear forces. Moreover, the effects of higher modes on the column drift and deck acceleration increase with increasing hazard level and nonlinearity. The column base shear is likely to be a first-mode dominant EDP, irrespective of the hazard level. Accordingly, an investigation that uses the base shear as the EDP of interest may make use of computationally less demanding single mode nonlinear static analyses in PBEE computations. On the contrary, NTHA must be used if the column drift and deck acceleration are the important EDPs.

The results in Figures 8.8-8.10 are in agreement with the statement that the higher modes affect the response of bridges to a greater extent than that of buildings in [Kappos et al. 2013]. To evaluate the accuracy of the two methods of ground motion selection, an estimate of the true response can be obtained using the concept of high-end prediction (HEP) [Haselton et al. 2009], which is discussed in the next chapter.
Figure 8.8 Ratios of median EDPs for the two abutment modeling cases of Bridge A.
Figure 8.9 Ratios of median EDPs for the two abutment modeling cases of Bridge B.
Figure 8.10 Ratios of median EDPs for the two abutment modeling cases of Bridge C.
9 Probabilistic Evaluation of Ground Motion Selection and Modification Procedures

9.1 INTRODUCTION

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

Figure 9.1 GM intercept angle scheme for the strike-normal component.
9.2 EARTHQUAKE SCENARIO

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

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

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

![Figure 9.2 Response spectra for the selected earthquake scenario of Bridge B site.](image)

9.3 BENCHMARK PROBABILITY DISTRIBUTION OF SEISMIC DEMANDS

In this chapter, a reference benchmark $P_DSD$ is developed based on the framework proposed in Chapter 6. The following sub-sections present detailed procedures of developing the benchmark $P_DSD$ for the RC highway bridge systems.
9.3.1 Ground Motion Selection for the Benchmark PDSD

The reference benchmark PDSD is developed from a large amount of NTHA simulations. The GM records for these simulations are selected based on the following procedure:

1. Select bidirectional GM records from an expanded range of the given earthquake scenario. In this study, the selection criteria are as follows:
   
   c) \( 6.5 \leq M \leq 7.5 \);
   
   d) \( 0.0 \text{ km} < R \leq 20.0 \text{ km} \);
   
   e) \( V_{s30} \geq 183 \text{ m/s} \);
   
   f) Lowest usable frequency = 0.25 Hz;
   
   g) Faulting: Not constrained.

Thus, 99 pairs of bidirectional horizontal GM records are selected from the PEER Next Generation Attenuation (NGA) Project GM database [PEER 2011].

2. Scale the selected 99 pairs of GM records based on peak ground velocities (PGVs) of one standard deviation above (+ \( \varepsilon \)) and one standard deviation below (− \( \varepsilon \)) the PGV of the target earthquake scenario, i.e.,

\[
SF_{max/min}^i = \frac{PGV_{Target \pm \varepsilon}}{\sqrt{PGV_1^i \cdot PGV_2^i}}
\]

where \( SF_{max}^i \) and \( SF_{min}^i \) are the maximum and minimum scaling factors for the \( i \)-th GM pair of components defined by subscripts 1 and 2 and scaled by the same scaling factor. Two rules are applied simultaneously to exclude the GM pairs that are over modified or unrealistic:

i. Exclude the GM pair of components whose maximum scaling factor is larger than 5 to avoid excessive modification;

ii. Exclude the GM pair of components if any peak ground acceleration (PGA) of its components after scaling is larger than 1.6g to avoid unrealistic large PGA.

60 pairs of bidirectional horizontal GMs (documented in Appendix F) are left after the application of these two rules.

3. Interpolate between \( SF_{max}^i \) and \( SF_{min}^i \) to obtain 10 scale factors in total for each GM pair yielding a total of 600 pairs of bidirectional horizontal GMs.

For evaluating the PDSD estimates from different GMSM procedures, four EDPs are selected, namely the peak abutment unseating displacement, the column drift ratio, the column base shear, and the column top curvature. Moreover, different intercept angles, varying from 0° to 150° with an increment of 30°, are investigated. Therefore, considering the three selected RC highway bridges, two abutment analytical modeling types I and II, and the above-mentioned six intercept angles for all 600 scaled GMs, \( 600 \times 3 \times 2 \times 6 = 21,600 \) NTHA simulations are performed in total for the determination of the reference benchmark PDSD.
9.3.2 Intensity Measures

Many research efforts were devoted to the intensity measures, e.g., Bradley 2013. Various studies have shown that *PGV* can be considered as a reasonable GM intensity measure that correlates well with the peak nonlinear oscillator response, e.g., Riddell 2007, Akkar and Özen 2005, Kurama and Farrow 2003, and Akkar and Küçükdoğan 2008. Küçükdoğan (2007) also demonstrated that *PGV* reveals a good correlation with the global nonlinear seismic demands. In this study, the natural logarithm of *PGVs* of two directions of GM records are selected as the intensity measures, i.e.,

\[
\text{IM} = [\ln(PGV_1) \, \ln(PGV_2)]
\]

to account for the distinct behaviors in the longitudinal and transverse directions of the considered bridge structures. Therefore, \( f_{\text{IM}}(im) \) in Eq. (6.2) becomes the joint PDF of \( \ln(PGV_1) \) and \( \ln(PGV_2) \). In this study, on the basis of 600 pairs of \( PGV_1 \) and \( PGV_2 \) for each investigated RC highway bridge, Eq. (6.5) becomes

\[
\hat{f}_{\text{IM}}(im) = \frac{1}{600} \sum_{i=1}^{600} \frac{1}{h_1 h_2} K \left[ \frac{\ln(pgv_1) - \ln(pgv_{1,i})}{h_1}, \frac{\ln(pgv_2) - \ln(pgv_{2,i})}{h_2} \right]
\]

(9.2)

where \( h_1 \) and \( h_2 \) are the bandwidths for \( \ln(PGV_1) \) and \( \ln(PGV_2) \), respectively. In addition, the whitening transformation in Eq. (6.6) is applied to the 600 pairs of \( \ln(PGV_1) \) and \( \ln(PGV_2) \), i.e., 600×2 matrix \( \ln(PGV_0) \), as follows:

\[
\ln(PGV_\mu) = \ln(PGV_0) - \mu \\
\ln(PGV_{\text{white}}) = \ln(PGV_\mu) \Sigma^{-1/2}
\]

(9.3)

where \( \mu \) is a 600×2 matrix with all entries of the first and second columns are equal to the means of \( \ln(PGV_1) \) and \( \ln(PGV_2) \), respectively, and \( \Sigma \) is the 2×2 covariance matrix of the two columns of \( \ln(PGV_\mu) \). After this whitening transformation, each column of \( \ln(PGV_{\text{white}}) \) has zero mean and identity covariance matrix. The kernel density estimator for \( K \) and a bandwidth selection method for \( h_1 \) and \( h_2 \) introduced in Chapter 6 [Botev et al. 2010], are adopted to estimate the joint PDF \( f_{\text{IM}}(im) \). After such estimation, similar to Eq. (6.7), \( \ln(PGV_{\text{white}}) \) is transformed back to \( \ln(PGV_0) \), i.e.,

\[
\ln(PGV) = \ln(PGV_{\text{white}}) \Sigma^{1/2} + \mu
\]

(9.4)

The procedures of density estimation discussed above are applied to the investigated three RC highway bridges. As an example, the joint PDF for Bridge B is illustrated in Figure 9.3. It is noted that the results of this process depend on the selected 600 pairs of GM records, which are based on the selected earthquake scenario and \( V_{30s} \) of the bridge site [Omrani et al. 2015]. Therefore, the 600 GM records are different for the three considered bridges as their sites have different \( V_{30s} \).
9.3.3 Collapse Consideration

In this study, two failure criteria are defined: (1) deck unseating and (2) column excessive rotation; whichever takes place first will imply the occurrence of collapse. Deck unseating is assumed to occur when the relative displacement between the bridge deck and the abutment is larger than the length of the abutment seat, which is taken as 33.85 inches (Table 6.1). The limit state corresponding to column excessive rotation is defined as exceeding certain threshold value of the column drift ratio, $\bar{DR}$. Hutchinson et al. (2004) demonstrated that, on the basis of the mean trend from their experimental data, if the maximum drift ratios are less than about 8%, the residual drift ratios are generally less than 1%, which is the allowable residual drift ratio suggested in [MacRae and Kawashima 1997]. The maximum drift ratios of about 6% were recommended in [Hutchinson et al. 2004] if a higher degree of confidence is required. In this study, $\bar{DR}$ is assumed to have a gamma distribution (Figure 9.4) with mean and mode equal to 8% and 6%, respectively.

![Figure 9.4 Assumed gamma distribution of $\bar{DR}$](image)

Figure 9.3 Joint PDF of $\ln(PGV_1)$ and $\ln(PGV_2)$ of Bridge B by kernel density estimation.
From the prescribed collapse criteria above, Eq. (6.10) is further manipulated as follows:

\[
G(edp \mid im) = \int_{dr} \left[ \Pr(C \mid im) + G(edp \mid im, NC) \times [1 - \Pr(C \mid im)] \right] f_{\overline{DR}}(dr) d\overline{dr} 
\]  
(9.5)

where \( f_{\overline{DR}}(dr) \) is the PDF of the \( \overline{DR} \) defined in Figure 9.4. Based on Eq. (6.11), the fragility surface or conditional probability of collapse, i.e., \( \Pr(C \mid im) \), is estimated using multivariate binary logistic regression [Wasserman 2010] as follows

\[
\hat{\Pr}(C \mid im) = \frac{\exp[\hat{\alpha}_0 + \hat{\alpha}_1 \ln(pgv_1) + \hat{\alpha}_2 \ln(pgv_2)]}{1 + \exp[\hat{\alpha}_0 + \hat{\alpha}_1 \ln(pgv_1) + \hat{\alpha}_2 \ln(pgv_2)]} 
\]  
(9.6)

where the coefficients \( \hat{\alpha}_0 \), \( \hat{\alpha}_1 \) and \( \hat{\alpha}_2 \) are obtained by the reweighted least squares algorithm [Wasserman 2010]. For illustration, Figure 9.5 presents \( \hat{\Pr}(C \mid im) \) for Bridge B with Type I abutment model when \( \overline{DR} \) equals 8%, i.e., the mean of the gamma distribution in Figure 9.4.

![Figure 9.5 The fragility surface for Bridge B (Type I abutment model) with \( \overline{DR} = 8\% \).](image)

### 9.3.4 Non-collapse Structural Responses

Based on Eq. (6.12), for a given pair of \( \ln(pgv_1) \) and \( \ln(pgv_2) \) under non-collapse scenario, the mean value of \( \ln(EDP) \) is as follows:

\[
\hat{\mu}_{\ln(edp)\mid im} = \hat{\beta}_0 + \hat{\beta}_1 \ln(pgv_1) + \hat{\beta}_2 \ln(pgv_2) 
\]  
(9.7)

where coefficients \( \hat{\beta}_0 \), \( \hat{\beta}_1 \) and \( \hat{\beta}_2 \) are determined from the least square estimate [Wasserman 2010]. An unbiased estimate of the variance of the distribution, i.e., Eqs. (6.13) and (6.14) become
\[
\hat{\sigma}_{\text{ln}(edp)im}^2 = \left[ \frac{1}{N-3} \right] \sum_{i=1}^{N} \hat{\varepsilon}_i^2 \quad (9.8)
\]

\[
\hat{\varepsilon}_i = \hat{\beta}_0 + \hat{\beta}_1 \ln(PGV_i^1) + \hat{\beta}_2 \ln(PGV_i^2) - \ln(EDP_i)
\quad (9.9)
\]

where \(PGV_i^1\), \(PGV_i^2\) and \(EDP_i\) are the \(i\)-th sampling point of \(PGV_i\), \(PGV_2\) and \(EDP\), respectively. \(N\) is the total number of sampling points that produce NC. The probability that the \(EDP\) exceeds the demand level of \(edp\) given \(im\) and for the NC scenario can now be calculated using the normal CCDF in Eq. (6.15). Figure 9.6 illustrates the linear regression surface of the column drift for Bridge B with Type I abutment model when \(\overline{DR}\) equals 8%.

![Figure 9.6 Linear regression surface of column drift for Bridge B (Type I abutment model) with \(\overline{DR} = 8\%\).](image)

### 9.3.5 Integration of Intensity Measures and Structural Responses

Combination of the intensity measures from the kernel density estimator and the structural responses, including C and NC cases, i.e., substituting Eq. (9.5) and the required estimates of its different terms, as discussed above, into Eq. (6.2), leads to the following:

\[
\hat{G}(edp) = \int_{im} \int_{dr} \left\{ \hat{\Pr}(C | im) + \hat{G}(edp | im, NC) \times \left[ 1 - \hat{\Pr}(C | im) \right] \right\} \hat{f}_{\text{IM}}(dr) \hat{f}_{im}(im) \, d\overline{dr} \, dim \quad (9.10)
\]

In general, it is impossible to determine the exact solution of the integrations in Eq. (9.10). Instead, in practice, \(\hat{G}(edp)\) in Eq. (9.10) is computed from the following discretized form:

\[
\hat{G}(edp) \equiv \sum_k \sum_j \sum_i \left\{ \hat{\Pr}(C_i | im_{jk}) + \hat{G}(edp | im_{jk}, NC_i) \times \left[ 1 - \hat{\Pr}(C_i | im_{jk}) \right] \right\} \hat{\Pr}(\overline{dr}) \hat{\Pr}(im_{jk})
\quad (9.11)
\]
where $\hat{\Pr}(C_i | im_{jk})$ and $\hat{G}(edp | im_{jk}, NC_i)$ are respectively the estimated probabilities of collapse and exceedance in the context of NC, when $dr = \overline{dr}_i$, conditioning on $IM = im_{jk}$, i.e., $\ln(PGV_i) = \ln(pgv_i^j)$ and $\ln(PGV_j) = \ln(pgv_i^k)$. $\hat{\Pr}(dr_i)$ and $\hat{\Pr}(im_{jk})$ are estimated from:

$$\hat{\Pr}(dr_i) = \hat{f}_{DR}(dr_i)/\sum_{j=1}^{N_{im}} \hat{f}_{DR}(dr_j) \quad (9.12a)$$

$$\hat{\Pr}(im_{jk}) = \hat{f}_{IM}(im_{jk})/\sum_{p=1}^{N_{im1}} \sum_{q=1}^{N_{im2}} \hat{f}_{IM}(im_{pq}) \quad (9.12b)$$

where $N_{dr}$, $N_{im1}$, and $N_{im2}$ are the numbers of points considered for $\overline{DR}$, $\ln(PGV_i)$ and $\ln(PGV_j)$, respectively. Thus, as expected, $\sum_{i=1}^{N_{dr}} \hat{\Pr}(dr_i) = 1$ and $\sum_{j=1}^{N_{im1}} \sum_{k=1}^{N_{im2}} \hat{\Pr}(im_{jk}) = 1$. In this study, $N_{dr} = 100$ and $N_{im1} = N_{im2} = 64$. Comparing Eq. (9.11) with Eq. (9.10), the integrals, the PDF and the joint PDF are replaced with the summations, the probability mass function (PMF) and the joint PMF, respectively. In Eq. (9.11), the symbol “$\equiv$” signifies the approximation due to the discretization of the continuous integral of the seismic hazard and structural demand.

### 9.3.6 Effects of Intercept Angles on PDSD Estimates

The reference benchmark PDSD is developed on the basis of the implicit assumption that the earthquake is likely to occur at the previously mentioned six different intercept angles with equal probability. In this section, PDSD estimates from each intercept angle are compared against the benchmark to investigate the effects of intercept angles. Figures 9.7-9.9 present such comparisons for several EDPs of samples of the studied three bridges where the percentage error is defined as follows:

$$error_i = \frac{PDSD_i^i - PDSD_{Ref}^i}{PDSD_{Ref}^i} \times 100 \quad (9.13)$$

where $PDSD_{Ref}^i$ and $PDSD_i^i$ are the $i$-th EDP point from the benchmark PDSD and the PDSD estimate from each of the six intercept angles, respectively. Therefore, the positive or negative $error_i$ signifies the overestimation or underestimation of the $i$-th EDP point, respectively.

Figures 9.10-9.12 present the maximum errors, defined as $\max_i |error_i|$, of different intercept angles for all four investigated EDPs of the three bridges with both Types I and II abutment modeling. It can be observed that the maximum errors are generally below 10%, with few exceptions, but clearly not negligible. As shown in Figures 9.7b and 9.10b, the maximum error can be as large as about 20%. Therefore, the intercept angle causes certain differences in estimating the PDSD. This is expected as bridge structures clearly possess different geometric properties in the longitudinal and transverse directions. It is to be noted that the results presented in Figures 9.10-9.12 are based on NTHA simulations of 600 GM records for each intercept angle. Larger differences are expected if the number of GM records for NTHA simulations is much less than
600 as will be shown in a latter section in which only 40 GM records are selected from each investigated GMSM procedure.

Figure 9.7 PDSD and error for column shear force of Bridge A with Type II abutment model.
a) **PDSD comparison**

b) **Error comparison**

Figure 9.8 *PDSD and error for column drift ratio of Bridge B with Type I abutment model.*
Figure 9.9 *PDSD* and error for abutment unseating displacement of Bridge C with Type I abutment model.
Figure 9.10 Maximum errors of different intercept angles for Bridge A.
Figure 9.11 Maximum errors of different intercept angles for Bridge B.
9.4 GMSM PROCEDURES

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

### 9.4.1 \( S_a(T_i) \) Selection and Scaling Method

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

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

1. Select the GM based on an \( M-R-S-F \) (magnitude, source-to-site distance, site classification and type of faulting) bin that is consistent with the given earthquake scenario. The criteria utilized in this GMSM procedure are:
   i. \( 6.6 \leq M \leq 7.4 \);
   ii. \( 5.0 \ km < R \leq 15.0 \ km \);
   iii. \( V_s \geq 183 \ m/s \);
   iv. Lowest usable frequency = 0.25 Hz;
   v. Faulting: Not constrained.
2. Scale each component of record to the target GM level based on their geometric mean as given by Eq. (9.14). The target \( S_a(T_i) \) is the median + 1.5\( \varepsilon \) predicted by the attenuation model from [Campbell and Bozorgnia 2008] for the given \( M, R, S \) and \( F \) scenario.

\[
SF_i = \frac{S_a(T_i)_{\text{Target}}}{\sqrt{|S_a(T_i)|_2 \cdot [S_a(T_i)_2]}} \tag{9.14}
\]

where \( SF_i \) is the scaling factor of the \( i \)-th GM pair of components with subscripts 1 and 2 and having the same scaling factor.
3. Select desired number of records from the bin. In this study, 40 records are selected, which are determined by the following two algorithms:
   i. Based on the equation for the proportion of pulse-like records [Hayden et al. 2012],
Proportion of pulse motions: 

$$\text{Proportion of pulse motions} = \frac{\exp(0.891 - 0.188R + 1.230\varepsilon)}{1 + \exp(0.891 - 0.188R + 1.230\varepsilon)}$$  \hspace{1cm} (9.15)$$

substitution of \( R = 10 \) km and \( \varepsilon = 1.5 \) in Eq. (9.15) results in the value of proportion = 0.7. Thus, 28 of the 40 motions should be pulse-type. Select 28 records from the pulse-type bin and 12 records from the no pulse-type bin with smallest scaling factors from step 2. This procedure is denoted as \( S_a(T_i)_p \) method in this dissertation.

ii. Another algorithm is to select 40 records solely based on the scaling factors. Thus, 40 records with smallest scaling factors are selected from the bin with both pulse-type and no pulse-type GMs. This procedure is called \( S_a(T_i) \) method in this dissertation.

### 9.4.2 Conditional Mean Spectrum (CMS) Method

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

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

$$\varepsilon(T) = \left[ \ln(S_a(T)) - \mu_{\ln(S_a)}(M, R, T) \right]/\sigma_{\ln(S_a)}(M, R, T)$$ \hspace{1cm} (9.16)$$

where \( \mu_{\ln(S_a)}(M, R, T) \) and \( \sigma_{\ln(S_a)}(M, R, T) \) are the predicted mean and standard deviation of \( \ln(S_a(T)) \), respectively, computed from [Campbell and Bozorgnia 2008]. From Eq. (9.16), the target \( \ln(S_a(T_i)) \) can be expressed as follows:

$$\ln(S_a(T_i)) = \varepsilon(T_i)\sigma_{\ln(S_a)}(M, R, T_i) + \mu_{\ln(S_a)}(M, R, T_i)$$ \hspace{1cm} (9.17)$$

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

$$\mu_{\varepsilon(T_i)|\varepsilon(T_1)} = \rho(T_i,T_1)\varepsilon(T_1) \quad (9.17)$$

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

$$\rho(T_{\min},T_{\max}) = 1 - \cos\left[\frac{\pi}{2} - \left(0.359 + 0.163I_{(T_{\min} < 0.189)}\ln\left(\frac{T_{\min}}{0.189}\right)\right)\ln\left(\frac{T_{\max}}{T_{\min}}\right)\right] \quad (9.18)$$

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

4. Compute CMS. At each period of interest, $T_i$, the corresponding spectral accelerations that define the CMS can be computed by substituting Eq. (9.17) in place of $\varepsilon(T_i)$ in Eq. (9.16) after replacing $T_1$ with $T_i$ of both sides, i.e.,

$$\mu_{\ln(S_a(T_i))|\ln(S_a(T_1))} = \mu_{\ln(S_a)}(M,R,T_i) + \rho(T_i,T_1)\varepsilon(T_1)\sigma_{\ln(S_a)}(M,R,T_i) \quad (9.19)$$

where $\mu_{\ln(S_a)}(M,R,T_i)$ and $\sigma_{\ln(S_a)}(M,R,T_i)$ are derived from [Campbell and Bozorgnia 2008], $\rho(T_i,T_1)$ is computed from Eq. (27), and values of $M$, $R$ and $\varepsilon(T_1)$ are those indicated in Step 1.

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

### 9.4.3 Unconditional Selection (US) Method

This method uses exactly the same algorithm for matching both the mean and variance of the target spectrum mentioned in the previous section. However, instead of the CMS used in the CMS method, the median + 1.5$\varepsilon$ spectrum associated with the selected earthquake scenario defined with the attenuation model by [Campbell and Bozorgnia 2008] is used as the target spectrum. Similar to the first two methods, 40 GM records are selected herein. All the GMs selected from these investigated GMSM procedures for the three selected bridges are documented in Appendix F.
For each bridge with each abutment modeling, 40 GM records are selected for each investigated GMSM procedure, including two versions of $S_a(T_s)$ scaling and selection method, i.e. a total of four GMSM procedures. Similar to the development of the reference benchmark PDSD, these GMs are applied to each bridge with six different intercept angles. Thus, besides the 21,600 NTHA simulations for the development of the benchmark PDSD, 40×4×3×2×6=5,760 more NTHA analyses are performed for all the four GMSM procedures.

The PDSD estimates by the 40 GM records from each GMSM investigated procedures are compared against the benchmark PDSD to evaluate their accuracy and reliability. Based on Eq. (6.19), $Pr(C)$ in Eq. (6.18) is the probability of collapse estimated as:

$$\hat{Pr}(C) = \frac{\text{# of records causing collapse}}{40} \tag{9.20}$$

The probability of exceedance for the NC cases, i.e., $G(edp | NC)$ in Eq. (6.18), can be estimated by Eq. (6.20). Recall the previously discussed collapse criterion, along with the estimates in Eqs. (6.20) and (9.20), the PDSD estimate, i.e., $\hat{G}(edp)$, is obtained as follows:

$$\hat{G}(edp) = \int_{\Delta r} \left[ \hat{Pr}(C) + \hat{G}(edp | NC) \times [1 - \hat{Pr}(C)] \right] \hat{f}_d(d\Delta r) d\Delta r \tag{9.21}$$

Following similar procedure from Eqs. (9.10) and (9.11), $\hat{G}(edp)$ in Eq. (9.21) is computed from the following discretized form:

$$\hat{G}(edp) \approx \sum_i [\hat{Pr}(C_i) + \hat{G}(edp | NC_i) \times [1 - \hat{Pr}(C_i)]] \hat{Pr}(d\Delta r_i) \tag{9.22}$$

where $\hat{Pr}(C_i)$ and $\hat{G}(edp | NC_i)$ are respectively the estimated probabilities of collapse and exceedance in the NC cases when $dr = \Delta r_i$, and $\hat{Pr}(d\Delta r_i)$ is estimated by Eq. (9.12a). Figures 9.13-9.44 present the comparison of the PDSD estimates from the four investigated GMSM procedures and the benchmark PDSD. Such comparisons are given for all four selected EDPs of the six different intercept angles on Bridges A and B with both Types I and II abutment modeling. Figures 9.45-9.48 show the PDSD estimates of the peak column drift ratio from the four GMSM procedures on Bridge C with Types I and II abutment modeling. As mentioned previously, comparing to the difference of the PDSD estimated by the 600 GMs, larger differences, e.g., from Figures 9.21-9.28, are observed in the PDSD estimates from the different intercept angles.

It is observed from Figures 9.13-9.20 that the PDSD estimates from the $S_a(T_s)$ and $S_a(T_s)_p$ procedures generally underestimate the seismic demands from the benchmark PDSD for Bridge A with both abutment modeling. However, the $S_a(T_s)_p$ method gives reasonably accurate PDSD estimates of the three global EDPs, i.e., peak column shear force (Figure 9.17a), drift ratio (9.18a), and abutment unseating displacement (9.19a), for Bridge A with Type I abutment modeling. In general, e.g., from the comparison of Figures 9.29-9.32 and 9.33-9.36, the PDSD estimates from
the \( S_a(T_1) \) procedure are larger and more accurate than the ones estimated from the \( S_a(T_1) \)
procedure. Such observations are attributed to the fact that more pulse motions that result in large
responses are selected in the \( S_a(T_1) \) procedure. From Figures 9.21-9.24 and 9.37-9.40, the PDSD
estimates from the CMS method almost always underestimate the seismic demands of all four EDPs, especially on the large values of EDPs (the tail of the PDSD curve), for Bridges A and B with both abutment modeling. In contrast, as shown in Figures 9.25-9.28 and 9.41-9.44, the PDSD estimates by the US method are almost always on the conservative side with approximately 10-20% overestimation of the probability of exceedance over the benchmark PDSD. For bridge C, all four GMSM procedures overestimates the seismic demands of all four investigated EDPs (only the peak column drift ratio is shown in Figures 9.45-9.48 for brevity) for both Type I (Figures 9.45 and 9.46) and Type II (Figures 9.47 and 9.48) abutment modeling. It is observed from Figures 9.13-9.48 that the PDSD estimates by the first mode GMSM procedures, i.e., CMS, \( S_a(T_1) \) and \( S_a(T_1)_p \) methods, generally underestimate the benchmark PDSD for Bridges A and B, and overestimate the benchmark PDSD for bridges C. Also, the overestimations of PDSD by US method for bridges A, B and C are about 10%, 20% and 25%, respectively. Among these three investigated RC highway bridges, it can be concluded that the effects of higher modes are most pronounced on Bridge A, a bridge with two spans supported on a single-column bent, and are the least on Bridge C, a bridge with three spans and two three-column bents.

Based on the simulation results, the estimates by the US procedure are almost always on
the conservative side and are usually the most conservative of all GMSM procedures for all three
bridges. The \( S_a(T_1) \) and \( S_a(T_1)_p \) procedures show some superiority over the CMS method (e.g., in
predicting the PDSD for bridges A and B); while they sometimes underestimate the responses, e.g.,
in bridge A. As discussed previously, RC highway bridges play a crucial role in transportation and
thus require short downtime after severe earthquakes from an emergency response and, more
generally, community resiliency points of view. Therefore, among these four investigated GMSM
procedures, it is suggested to use the US method for the selection and modification of GMs.
Figure 9.13 *PDSO* estimates of column shear force of different intercept angles from $S_x(T)$ procedure for Bridge A.
Figure 9.14 \textit{PDSD} estimates of column drift ratio of different intercept angles from $S_s(T_e)$ procedure for Bridge A.
Figure 9.15 PDSD estimates of abutment unseating displacement of different intercept angles from $S_z(T)$ procedure of for Bridge A.
Figure 9.16 PDSD estimates of column top curvature of different intercept angles from $S_i(T_i)$ procedure for Bridge A.
Figure 9.17 *PDS D* estimates of column shear force of different intercept angles from $S_z(T)_p$ procedure for Bridge A.
Figure 9.18 PDSD estimates of column drift ratio of different intercept angles from $S_\xi(T)_p$ procedure for Bridge A.
Figure 9.19 PDSD estimates of abutment unseating displacement of different intercept angles from $S_x(T_p)$ procedure for Bridge A.
a) Type I abutment modeling

b) Type II abutment modeling

Figure 9.20 PDSD estimates of column top curvature of different intercept angles from $S_x(T_{\rho})$ procedure for Bridge A.
Figure 9.21 PDSD estimates of column shear force of different intercept angles from CMS procedure for Bridge A.
Figure 9.22 PDSD estimates of column drift ratio of different intercept angles from CMS procedure for Bridge A.
Figure 9.23 PDSD estimates of abutment unseating displacement of different intercept angles from CMS procedure for Bridge A.
Figure 9.24 *PDS*D estimates of column top curvature of different intercept angles from *CMS* procedure for Bridge A.
Figure 9.25 *PDSD* estimates of column shear force of different intercept angles from *US* procedure for Bridge A.
Figure 9.26  *PDSD* estimates of column drift ratio of different intercept angles from *US* procedure for Bridge A.
Figure 9.27 *PDSD* estimates of abutment unseating displacement of different intercept angles from *US* procedure for Bridge A.
Figure 9.28 PDSD estimates of column top curvature of different intercept angles from US procedure for Bridge A.
Figure 9.29 *PDSD* estimates of column shear force of different intercept angles from $S_z(T)$ procedure for Bridge B.
Figure 9.30 *PDSD* estimates of column drift ratio of different intercept angles from $S_i(T)$ procedure for Bridge B.
Figure 9.31 *PDSD* estimates of abutment unseating displacement of different intercept angles from $S_i(T_r)$ procedure for Bridge B.
a) Type I abutment modeling

b) Type II abutment modeling

Figure 9.32 *PDSD* estimates of column top curvature of different intercept angles from $S(T)$ procedure for Bridge B.
a) Type I abutment modeling

b) Type II abutment modeling

Figure 9.33 PDSD estimates of column shear force of different intercept angles from $S_2(T)_p$ procedure for Bridge B.
Figure 9.34 *PDSD* estimates of column drift ratio of different intercept angles from $S_{x}(T_p)$ procedure for Bridge B.
Figure 9.35 *PDS D* estimates of abutment unseating displacement of different intercept angles from $S_2(T, p)$ procedure for Bridge B.
Figure 9.36 PDSD estimates of column top curvature of different intercept angles from $S_{z}(T_{r})_{P}$ procedure for Bridge B.
a) Type I abutment modeling

b) Type II abutment modeling

Figure 9.37 PDSD estimates of column shear force of different intercept angles from CMS procedure for Bridge B.
Figure 9.38 *PDSD* estimates of column drift ratio of different intercept angles from *CMS* procedure for Bridge B.
Figure 9.39 *PDSD* estimates of abutment unseating displacement of different intercept angles from *CMS* procedure for Bridge B.
a) Type I abutment modeling

b) Type II abutment modeling

Figure 9.40 *PDSO* estimates of column top curvature of different intercept angles from *CMS* procedure for Bridge B.
Figure 9.41 PDSD estimates of column shear force of different intercept angles from US procedure for Bridge B.
Figure 9.42  *PDSD* estimates of column drift ratio of different intercept angles from *US* procedure for Bridge B.
Figure 9.43 *PDSD* estimates of abutment unseating displacement of different intercept angles from *US* procedure for Bridge B.
Figure 9.44 PDSD estimates of column top curvature of different intercept angles from US procedure for Bridge B.
Figure 9.45 *PDSD* estimates of column drift ratio of different intercept angles from $S_a(T_r)$ and $S_z(T_r)_p$ procedures for Bridge C with Type I abutment modeling.
Figure 9.46 PDSD estimates of column drift ratio of different intercept angles from $S_a(T_r)$ and $S'_a(T_{r,p})$ procedures for Bridge C with Type II abutment modeling.
Figure 9.47 PDSD estimates of column drift ratio of different intercept angles from CMS and US procedures for Bridge C with Type I abutment modeling.
Figure 9.48 *PDSD* estimates of column drift ratio of different intercept angles from CMS and US procedures for Bridge C with Type II abutment modeling.
10 Summary, Conclusions and Future Extensions

10.1 SUMMARY

The study completed in this dissertation investigated two key challenges related to the application of the performance-based earthquake engineering (PBEE) approach such as the methodology developed with the Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research (PEER) Center. Accurate and robust nonlinear time history analysis (NTHA) that is fundamental to estimate the seismic demands of structures is the first challenge investigated in this study. It involved the use of different types of direct integration algorithms and nonlinear equation solvers where their stability performance and convergence behavior are of great significance to ensure accurate and robust NTHA simulations, especially for nonlinear multi-degree of freedom (MDOF) structural systems. Lyapunov stability theory, the most complete framework for stability analysis of dynamical systems, was introduced in this study. Based on this theory, a new nonlinear equation solver was developed and its convergence performance was theoretically formulated and verified by several examples. In addition, two Lyapunov-based approaches were proposed to perform stability analysis of nonlinear structural systems. The first approach transformed the stability analysis to a problem of existence that can be solved via convex optimization, over the discretized domain of interest of the restoring force. The second approach was specifically applicable to explicit algorithms for nonlinear single-degree of freedom (SDOF) and MDOF systems considering strictly positive real lemma. In this approach, a generic explicit algorithm was formulated for a system governed by a nonlinear function of the basic force without adopting any approximations. Starting from this formulation and based on the Lyapunov stability theory, the stability analysis of the formulated nonlinear system was transformed to investigating the strictly positive realness of its corresponding transfer function matrix. The two Lyapunov-based approaches of stability analysis were demonstrated by several SDOF and MDOF numerical examples.

The second challenge experienced in the PBEE approach is the selection of the ground motion selection and modification (GMSM) procedure that determine the input GM records for the NTHA simulations. Therefore, proper selection of GMSM approach is vital and represents an important prerequisite for the accurate and robust NTHA simulation and thus for the entire PBEE approach. In this dissertation, a framework for probabilistic evaluation of GMSM procedures was developed in the context of a selected large earthquake scenario with bidirectional GM excitations.

As an important application, the aforementioned theoretical developments were investigated for reinforced concrete (RC) highway bridge systems, which are key components of the infrastructure in urban cities. Solutions for overcoming the problems of convergence
encountered in NTHA of RC highway bridges were presented and recommendations were given. In addition, this dissertation evaluated several GMSM procedures in predicting the probability distribution of the seismic demands (PDSD) of RC highway bridges subjected to large earthquakes that result in highly nonlinear responses. The accuracy and reliability of all the PDSD estimates from the investigated GMSM procedures were evaluated against the reference benchmark PDSD developed by the PEER PBEE framework. Such evaluations were conducted considering four selected engineering demand parameters (EDPs) of three representative RC highway bridges in California accounting for two types of abutment modeling. In total, 27,360 NTHA simulations, where 21,600 ones for the development of the benchmark PDSD and 5,760 ones for the PDSD estimates by the GMSM procedures, were performed for this evaluation.

10.2 CONCLUSIONS
The major developments and findings of this study are summarized as follows:

• A new nonlinear equation solver is developed on the basis of reformulation of the equations of motion into a hypothetical dynamical system characterized by a set of ordinary differential equations. The equilibrium points of this hypothetical system are the solutions of the nonlinear structural problems. Starting from the Lyapunov stability theory, it is demonstrated that this hypothetical dynamical system is characterized by a globally asymptotic stability, i.e., convergence, to equilibrium points for structural dynamics. This feature overcomes the inherent limitations of the traditional iterative minimization algorithms and has no restriction on the selection of the initial guess for various structural nonlinear behaviors.

• Another important feature of the proposed Lyapunov-based nonlinear equation solver, as shown in the several numerical examples, is its ability to solve the equilibrium equations for models where a numerically consistent tangent may be difficult to determine.

• An integration algorithm is stable if its Lyapunov artificial energy function is bounded. The general condition that the boundedness of $\sum_{j=i}^{l} A_j A_{j+1} \cdots A_{l-1} A_l$ for $i \to \infty$ is derived from the boundedness of the Lyapunov function. For linear structures, the stability criterion is that the spectral radius of the approximation operator is less than or equal to 1.0, which is applied to nonlinear structures by some researchers. It should be emphasized that the stability limit for linear structures, however, does not automatically hold for nonlinear structures. Therefore, basic methodologies used in some well-known stability limits of direct integration algorithms, e.g., the Operator-Splitting (OS) algorithm with initial stiffness ($\text{OS}_{\text{initial}}$), are not applicable to nonlinear problems.

• The study also investigates the OS algorithm that uses tangent stiffness in the formulation ($\text{OS}_{\text{tangent}}$), which has not been previously studied. It is shown that this explicit algorithm possesses similar stability properties to those of the implicit Newmark (IN) integration.

• An approach is proposed to perform the stability analysis numerically. This approach transforms the stability analysis to the solution of a convex optimization problem over the discretized domain of interest of the restoring force. The proposed approach is shown to be generally applicable to direct integration algorithms for nonlinear problems and can potentially be extended to MDOF systems.
• A geometrically nonlinear pendulum problem with a closed-form exact solution is used to investigate the accuracy of the investigated integration algorithms. The period is shortened by explicit Newmark and elongated by the other algorithms. The OS tangent and IN algorithms present similar period elongations. The more computationally expensive TRBDF2 has the smallest period change. All algorithms present no amplitude decay except the TRBDF2 method undergoes some amplitude decay due to the introduced numerical damping. Observed period elongation (< ±3%) and amplitude decay (< 1%) values are practically acceptable. Moreover, the incorrectness of the stability criterion of the OS initial algorithm from past studies and the suitability of the proposed numerical stability analysis approach herein have been demonstrated by the same nonlinear pendulum example.

• The systematic approach to investigate the Lyapunov stability of explicit direct integration algorithms for MDOF systems considering strictly positive real lemma is presented. The stability analysis of two types of MDOF nonlinear systems (stiffening and softening) has been presented using the proposed approach. The explicit algorithm is formulated for a generic nonlinear MDOF system represented by a general nonlinear restoring force vector. In this study, the $l$–th basic resisting force of the system is a nonlinear function bounded in the sector between $k_{Min}^{l}u^{l}$ and $k_{Max}^{l}u^{l}$, where $k_{Min}^{l}$ and $k_{Max}^{l}$ are lower and upper bounds for the $l$–th basic resisting force of the system and $u^{l}$ is a linear combination of the DOFs. Based on this formulation, the approach transforms the stability analysis to investigating the strictly positive realness of the transfer function matrix for the formulated system. Furthermore, this is equivalent to a problem of convex optimization that can be solved numerically. A sufficient condition, in terms of the difference between the upper and lower bounds of each basic resisting force of the system, where the explicit algorithm is stable in the sense of Lyapunov can be obtained numerically. Moreover, the explicit algorithm is asymptotically stable if the basic resisting force vector is strictly within a specific range defined in Eq. (5.49).

• The proposed approach to investigate the Lyapunov stability of the explicit Newmark and the generalized- $\alpha$ predictor-corrector explicit algorithms is demonstrated by several numerical examples of nonlinear SDOF and MDOF systems with stiffening or softening structural behavior. The structural systems investigated in these numerical examples include a bridge system and multi-story (number of stories ranging from 1 to 25) shear building systems. Detailed results from these examples have been presented. Moreover, detailed Lyapunov stability analysis has been demonstrated by an example of a nonlinear 2-story shear building. For the multi-story shear building, the difference between the upper and lower bounds of the stiffness of the first story ($\delta^{1}$), where high levels of nonlinearity may occur, is observed to increase with the increase of the damping values. It was also observed that $\delta^{1}$ increases with the increase of the number of stories for the stiffening system or softening system with low damping. On the other hand, $\delta^{1}$ decreases with the increase of the number of stories for the softening system with high damping. It is noted that the matrix $\bar{K}$, representing the difference between the upper and lower bounds of the basic resisting force of the system, depends on the selection of the coefficient matrix and the cost function. In conclusion, the proposed approach is shown to be applicable for investigating the Lyapunov stability of explicit direct integration algorithms used to determine the dynamic response of nonlinear MDOF structural systems.

• Solutions for overcoming the problems of convergence associated with the NTHA of RC highway bridges is presented in terms of efficient direct integration algorithms. For this
purpose, the applicability of the explicit OS and implicit TRBDF2 has been investigated for three RC highway bridges in California. The simulations of the investigated three bridges show that the OS and TRBDF2 algorithms provide very close results to those of the IN algorithm. Moreover, the TRBDF2 algorithm shows improved convergence performance as compared to the IN algorithm. Accordingly, the OS and TRBDF2 are suitable alternatives to the IN for NTHA of RC highway bridges.

- For the implicit integration methods, Newton-Raphson with Line Search is observed to be the most suitable initial nonlinear solver in terms of convergence. Accordingly, an analyst can start with this method as the initial solver in the first simulation trial of an analytical model.

- The sequence of the nonlinear solvers after a proper selection of the initial solver is observed to be insignificant. Accordingly, an analyst should pay more attention to the determination of the initial solver than the determination of the sequence of the subsequent solvers in the NTHA.

- Simulations with the convergence test based on the Energy Increment lead to the same solution with significantly less number of iterations compared to other convergence tests. Accordingly, an analyst can consider the Energy Increment test in the first simulation trial of an analytical model subjected to NTHA.

- Simulations conducted with tolerances of $10^{-5}$ and $10^{-8}$ selected for the Energy Increment test for all the integration time steps (of the simulation) are observed to result in very similar response calculations. Accordingly, the increase of the convergence tolerance for the integration time steps with convergence problems is a valid option to achieve convergence improvement.

- Use of a smaller integration time step during the simulation does not necessarily improve the convergence behavior. However, selective reduction of the integration time step, i.e., only when needed, is useful to overcome the convergence problems, as long as the integration time step is reset to its original value after completion of the reduced time steps representing the original size of a time step. This resetting process is essential to prevent the simulation from being completed before the duration of the ground motion input.

- Adaptive switching of integration algorithms shows improved convergence performance as compared to the use of IN algorithm only. Therefore, use of explicit integrators, e.g., OS algorithm, only at the numerically problematic steps is a viable and effective option to overcome the problems of convergence.

- The efficacy of the proposed solutions is presented for a challenging subject in the context of PBEE that requires a large number of NTHA. This subject is the identification of predominantly first-mode EDPs under earthquake excitation by making use of different GMSM methods. In that regard, 1,440 NTHA were conducted where a significant number of problems related to convergence were encountered and overcome using the proposed solutions. The results obtained from these NTHA indicate that the higher mode effects are more pronounced on column displacements and deck accelerations than on column shear forces. Therefore, the column base shear is likely to be a first-mode dominant EDP, irrespective of the hazard level. Moreover, the effect of higher modes is observed to increase with increasing the hazard level and the nonlinearity.
• Taking advantage of the PBEE approach, a framework for probabilistic evaluation of the GMSM procedures is developed in the context of a selected large earthquake scenario with bidirectional GM excitations.

• Two intensity measures are selected to account for the distinct behaviors in the longitudinal and the transverse directions of the bridge structures. A non-parametric inference, multivariate kernel density estimation, is utilized to estimate the joint probability density function (PDF) of the two intensity measures.

• The structural collapse scenario, including the uncertainty of the collapse criteria, is considered and incorporated into the PDSD estimate. The conditional probability of collapse and that of EDPs are respectively estimated by multivariate binary logistic and linear regressions.

• The reference benchmark PDSD is developed on the basis of equally treating the probability of earthquake occurrence at six different intercept angles between the direction of the earthquake and that of the longitudinal axis of the bridge. The difference of the PDSD estimate from each intercept angle and the benchmark is generally below 10% but can be up to 20% in few cases. Thus, the effect of the intercept angle on PDSD estimates is considerable.

• The procedures of the benchmark PDSD development in the context of a given large earthquake scenario can be readily extended to the case of multiple earthquake scenarios. Future investigation will focus on simulations considering such multiple scenarios.

• In general, the PDSD estimates from the amplitude scaling procedure using the spectral acceleration at the fundamental period ($T_1$) with special attention to the pulse-like GMs, $S_a(T_1)_{p}$, are larger and more accurate than the ones estimated from the $S_a(T_1)$ procedure without special consideration of the pulse-like GMs. The $S_a(T_1)$ and $S_a(T_1)_{p}$ procedures present certain superiority over the spectrum shape matching procedure using the conditional mean spectrum (CMS) while all three procedures underestimate the seismic demands for some bridges.

• The PDSD estimates by the spectrum shape matching procedure using the unconditional selection (US) are almost always on the conservative side and accordingly the most conservative of all investigated GMSM procedures. The RC highway bridges are essential lifelines of the transportation infrastructure and thus their possible long downtime after severe earthquakes is not affordable for both the emergency response and community resiliency. Thus, among all four investigated GMSM procedures, it is recommended to use the US for selection and modification of GMs.

### 10.3 FUTURE EXTENSIONS

Several research topics that are appropriate for future investigations can be extended from this study. A list of such topics is given below:
1. Implement the proposed Lyapunov-based nonlinear equation solver in some software framework, e.g., OpenSees, and apply it to more complex structural systems, e.g., RC highway bridge systems utilized in this dissertation.

2. Develop a new parameterized direct integration algorithm on the basis of Lyapunov stability theory and considering its applicability for nonlinear problems to investigate the stability performance.

3. In this study, the distributions of the intercept angle for input GMs, the threshold drift ratio for failure criterion, and the EDPs conditioning on the intensity measures are respectively assumed to be of uniform, gamma, and lognormal distributions. These three assumptions can be revisited considering, e.g., the Kernel Density Maximum Entropy Method (KDMEM), refer to [Alibrandi and Mosalam, 2016], which is a method that determines the least biased distribution of a random variable from a sample data, which is very useful for good approximations of the tails (corresponding to low probability as in collapse) of the distribution.

4. Stochastic GM simulated procedure can be included in the evaluation process.

5. The GMSM selection and evaluation can be extended to the case of multiple earthquake scenarios.
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Appendix A: Base Functions Used for Numerical Stability Analysis

This Appendix gives an example set of base functions used for numerical stability analysis presented in Chapter 4. This example set includes constant (Φ₁ to Φ₆), linear (Φ₇ to Φ₁₂) and nonlinear (Φ₁₃ to Φ₁₈) base functions.

\[
\Phi_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \Phi_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \Phi_3 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \Phi_4 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix},
\]

\[
\Phi_5 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \Phi_6 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \Phi_7 = \begin{bmatrix} \delta_{i+1} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \Phi_8 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \delta_{i+1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix},
\]

\[
\Phi_9 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \delta_{i+1} \\ 0 & \delta_{i+1} & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \Phi_{10} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \delta_{i+1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \Phi_{11} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & \delta_{i+1} \\ 0 & \delta_{i+1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \Phi_{12} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \delta_{i+1} \\ 0 & \delta_{i+1} & 0 \end{bmatrix},
\]

\[
\Phi_{13} = \begin{bmatrix} \delta_{i+1}^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \delta_{i+1}^2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \Phi_{14} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \delta_{i+1}^2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \delta_{i+1}^2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \Phi_{15} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \delta_{i+1}^2 \\ 0 & \delta_{i+1}^2 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \Phi_{16} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \delta_{i+1}^2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix},
\]

\[
\Phi_{17} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & \delta_{i+1}^2 \\ 0 & \delta_{i+1}^2 & 0 \\ \delta_{i+1}^2 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \Phi_{18} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \delta_{i+1}^2 \\ 0 & \delta_{i+1}^2 & 0 \end{bmatrix}
\]
Appendix B: Derivation of $\alpha$ and $\beta$ for the Bridge Structure

This appendix presents the derivation of $\alpha$ and $\beta$ for the MDOF bridge structure depicted in Figure 5.4 to illustrate the Lyapunov-based approach of stability analysis proposed in Chapter 5. In the linear range of the investigated bridge structure, shown in Figure B.1 with identified DOFs and circled element numbers, the restoring forces are as follows:

\[
f^1 = \frac{12E_J}{L_1} u^1 + \frac{6E_J}{L_1} u^2 = \frac{6E_J}{L_1} \left( \frac{2}{L_1} u^1 + u^2 \right)
\]

\[
f^2 = \frac{6E_J}{L_1} u^1 + \frac{4E_J}{L_3} u^2 + \frac{4E_J}{L_4} u^2 + \frac{6E_J}{L_2} u^3 + \frac{2E_J}{L_3} u^4 - \frac{6E_J}{L_4} u^5 + \frac{2E_J}{L_5} u^6
\]

\[
= \frac{2E_J}{L_1} \left( \frac{3}{L_1} u^1 + 2u^2 \right) + \frac{2E_J}{L_3} \left( 2u^2 + \frac{3}{L_3} u^3 + u^4 \right) + \frac{2E_J}{L_4} \left( 2u^2 - \frac{3}{L_4} u^5 + u^6 \right)
\]

\[
f^3 = \frac{6E_J}{L_3} u^2 + \frac{12E_J}{L_2} u^3 + \frac{3E_J}{L_2} u^4 + \frac{6E_J}{L_3} u^4 - \frac{3E_J}{L_2} u^4
\]

\[
= \frac{3E_J}{L_2} \left( \frac{1}{L_2} u^3 - u^4 \right) + \frac{6E_J}{L_3} \left( u^2 + \frac{2}{L_3} u^3 + u^4 \right)
\]

\[
f^4 = \frac{2E_J}{L_3} u^3 + \frac{6E_J}{L_2} u^3 - \frac{3E_J}{L_3} u^3 + \frac{4E_J}{L_5} u^4 + \frac{3E_J}{L_2} u^4
\]

\[
= \frac{3E_J}{L_3} \left( -\frac{1}{L_3} u^3 + u^4 \right) + \frac{2E_J}{L_3} \left( u^2 + \frac{3}{L_3} u^3 + 2u^4 \right)
\]

\[
f^5 = -\frac{6E_J}{L_4} u^5 + \frac{12E_J}{L_4} u^5 + \frac{3E_J}{L_3} u^5 - \frac{6E_J}{L_4} u^5 + \frac{3E_J}{L_5} u^6
\]

\[
= \frac{6E_J}{L_4} \left( -u^2 + \frac{2}{L_4} u^5 - u^6 \right) + \frac{3E_J}{L_3} \left( \frac{1}{L_5} u^5 + u^6 \right)
\]
\[
\begin{align*}
f^6 &= \frac{2E_b I_b}{L_4} u^2 - \frac{6E_b I_b}{L_4} u^5 + \frac{3E_b I_b}{L_4} u^5 + \frac{4E_b I_b}{L_4} u^6 + \frac{3E_b I_b}{L_4} u^6 \\
&= \frac{2E_b I_b}{L_4} \left( u^2 - \frac{3}{L_4} u^5 + 2u^6 \right) + \frac{3E_b I_b}{L_4} \left( \frac{1}{L_4} u^5 + u^6 \right)
\end{align*}
\]

Table B.1 List of elements contributing to the restoring force associated with each DOF.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOF Number</th>
<th>Number of Elements</th>
<th>Associated Elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1, 3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4, 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B.1 shows the list of basic resisting forces that contribute to the restoring force associated with each DOF. For example, only one basic resisting force, which is from the column element (element 1), contributes to the restoring force associated with \(u^1\). Therefore, the total number of the basic resisting forces is \(N = 1 + 3 + 2 + 2 + 2 + 2 = 12\). Based on the restoring forces in the linear range, redefine the DOFs \(\vec{\mathbf{u}}^T = [u^1, u^2, \ldots, u^6]\) using linear transformation to \(\vec{\mathbf{u}}^T = [\vec{\mathbf{u}}^1, \vec{\mathbf{u}}^2, \ldots, \vec{\mathbf{u}}^{12}]\), i.e. \(\vec{\mathbf{u}} = \beta \mathbf{u}\), as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\vec{\mathbf{u}}^1 &= \frac{2}{L_1} u^1 + u^2, \quad \vec{\mathbf{u}}^2 = \frac{3}{L_1} u^1 + 2u^2, \quad \vec{\mathbf{u}}^3 = 2u^2 + \frac{3}{L_4} u^3 + u^4, \quad \vec{\mathbf{u}}^4 = 2u^2 - \frac{3}{L_4} u^5 + u^6 \\
\vec{\mathbf{u}}^5 &= \frac{1}{L_2} u^3 - u^4, \quad \vec{\mathbf{u}}^6 = u^2 + \frac{2}{L_3} u^3 + u^4, \quad \vec{\mathbf{u}}^7 = -\frac{1}{L_2} u^3 + u^4, \quad \vec{\mathbf{u}}^8 = u^2 + \frac{3}{L_3} u^3 + 2u^4 \\
\vec{\mathbf{u}}^9 &= -u^2 + \frac{2}{L_4} u^5 - u^6, \quad \vec{\mathbf{u}}^{10} = \frac{1}{L_5} u^5 + u^6, \quad \vec{\mathbf{u}}^{11} = u^2 - \frac{3}{L_4} u^5 + 2u^6, \quad \vec{\mathbf{u}}^{12} = \frac{1}{L_5} u^5 + u^6
\end{align*}
\]
Accordingly, the 12×6 matrix $\beta$ can be written as follows:

$$
\beta^T = \begin{bmatrix}
2/L_1 & 3/L_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 0 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 3/L_3 & 0 & 1/L_2 & 2/L_3 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & -3/L_4 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2/L_4 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1/L_5 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -3/L_5 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1
\end{bmatrix}
$$

Defining the $l$–th basic resisting force $q^l$ as a function of $\bar{u}^l$ where $l \in [1, N]$, the restoring forces in the nonlinear range, i.e. $f = \alpha q$, can be written as follows:

$$
f^1 = q^1, \quad f^2 = q^2 + q^3 + q^4, \quad f^3 = q^5 + q^6, \quad f^4 = q^7 + q^8, \quad f^5 = q^9 + q^{10}, \quad f^6 = q^{11} + q^{12}
$$

Accordingly, the 6×12 matrix $\alpha$ can be written as follows:

$$
\alpha = \begin{bmatrix}
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1
\end{bmatrix}
$$

The initial bounds, i.e. lower and upper bounds for stiffening and softening systems, respectively, for the basic resisting forces based on the numerical values in Eqs. (42), are as follows:

$$
\overline{k}_i^1 = \frac{6E_b l^1}{L_1^2} = 6 \times 10^4, \quad \overline{k}_i^2 = \frac{2E_b l^2}{L_1} = 2 \times 10^6, \quad \overline{k}_i^3 = \frac{2E_b l^3}{L_3} = 2 \times 10^6, \quad \overline{k}_i^4 = \frac{2E_b l^4}{L_4} = 2 \times 10^6
$$

$$
\overline{k}_i^5 = \frac{3E_b l^5}{L_2^2} = 3 \times 10^4, \quad \overline{k}_i^6 = \frac{6E_b l^6}{L_2} = 6 \times 10^4, \quad \overline{k}_i^7 = \frac{3E_b l^7}{L_2} = 3 \times 10^6, \quad \overline{k}_i^8 = \frac{2E_b l^8}{L_3} = 2 \times 10^6
$$

$$
\overline{k}_i^9 = \frac{6E_b l^9}{L_4} = 6 \times 10^4, \quad \overline{k}_i^{10} = \frac{3E_b l^{10}}{L_5^2} = 3 \times 10^4, \quad \overline{k}_i^{11} = \frac{2E_b l^{11}}{L_4} = 2 \times 10^6, \quad \overline{k}_i^{12} = \frac{3E_b l^{12}}{L_5} = 3 \times 10^6.
$$

Therefore, the initial bound matrix $\overline{K}_i$ is defined as $\overline{K}_i = \text{diag} \{\overline{k}_i^1, \overline{k}_i^2, \ldots, \overline{k}_i^{12}\}.  
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Appendix C: Derivation of $\alpha$ and $\beta$ for the Multi-Story Shear Building

This appendix presents the derivation of $\alpha$ and $\beta$ for the MDOF shear building depicted in Figure 5.5. Due to its assumed shear mode behavior, the number of the basic resisting forces, $N$, is equal to the number of DOFs, $n$. In the linear range of this shear building, the $j$–th restoring force is as follows:

$$f^j = -\bar{k}_i^j u^{i-1} + (\bar{k}_i^j + \bar{k}_i^{j+1})u^j - \bar{k}_i^{j+1}u^{j+1} = \bar{k}_i^j(u^j - u^{i-1}) - \bar{k}_i^{j+1}(u^{j+1} - u^j)$$

where $j = l:1 \rightarrow n$ with $\bar{k}_i^{n+1} = 0$, $u^0 = 0$ and $\bar{k}_i^j$ is the initial stiffness of the $j$–th story. For such a building, the elements of the $n \times n$ ($N = n$) matrices $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are as follows:

$$\begin{align*}
\alpha_{jl} &= \begin{cases} 1 & j = l, j:1 \rightarrow n \\ -1 & j = l-1, j:1 \rightarrow n-1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\
\beta_{lj} &= \begin{cases} 1 & l = j, l:1 \rightarrow n \\ -1 & l = j+1, j:1 \rightarrow n-1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}
\end{align*}$$

Thus, the elements of the row vectors $\alpha^j$ and $\beta^j$, based on Eqs. (10) and (12), are as follows:

$$\begin{align*}
\alpha^j &= \begin{cases} 1 & l = j, j:1 \rightarrow n \\ -1 & l = j+1, j:1 \rightarrow n-1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\
\beta^j &= \begin{cases} 1 & j = l, l:1 \rightarrow n \\ -1 & j = l-1, l:1 \rightarrow n \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}
\end{align*}$$

Based on Eqs. (9) and (11), we have

$$f^j = \alpha'q = q^j - q^{j+1}$$

$$\bar{u}' = \beta'u = u^j - u^{j+1} = \Delta u^j$$

where $j = l:1 \rightarrow n$ with $q^{n+1} = 0$, $u^0 = 0$ and $q^j$ is the resisting force of the $j$–th story. Therefore, the resisting force of the $j$–th story, $q^j$, is a function of the relative displacement of the $j$–th story, $\Delta u^j$. 
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Appendix D: Numerical Results for the 2-Story Shear Building

This appendix documents all the numerical results for the 2-story shear building (Figure 5.5 with \( n = 2 \)) with stiffening and softening systems using the Lyapunov-based approach of stability analysis proposed in Chapter 5.

\[
A_e = \begin{bmatrix}
-0.0041 & 0.0016 & -0.0082 & 0.0032 & -0.0030 & 0.0015 \\
0.0016 & -0.0025 & 0.0032 & -0.0050 & 0.0015 & -0.0015 \\
0.4979 & 0.0008 & 0.9959 & 0.0016 & -0.0015 & 0.0008 \\
0.0008 & 0.4988 & 0.0016 & 0.9975 & 0.0008 & -0.0008 \\
0.5000 & 0.0000 & 1.0000 & 0.0000 & 1.0000 & 0.0000 \\
0.0000 & 0.5000 & 0.0000 & 1.0000 & 0.0000 & 1.0000 \\
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
C = \begin{bmatrix}
0.5000 & 0.0000 & 1.0000 & 0.0000 & 1.0000 & 0.0000 \\
-0.5000 & 0.5000 & -1.0000 & 1.0000 & -1.0000 & 1.0000 \\
\end{bmatrix}
\]

**Stiffening Systems**

\[
P = P^T = 10^9 \times \begin{bmatrix}
0.6215 & 0.0978 & 0.5915 & 0.1951 & 0.0029 & -0.0009 \\
0.7211 & 0.1954 & 0.7910 & -0.0016 & 0.0027 \\
1.1845 & 0.3906 & 0.0036 & -0.0008 \\
1.5814 & -0.0022 & 0.0043 \\
(sym) & 0.0033 & -0.0013 \\
& & & & 0.0020 \\
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
B_e = B_e \alpha = 10^{-5} \times \begin{bmatrix}
0.1504 & 0.0001 & 0.0752 & 0.0001 & 0.0000 & 0.0000 \\
-0.1503 & 0.1504 & -0.0751 & 0.0752 & 0.0000 & 0.0000 \\
\end{bmatrix}^T
\]
Softening Systems

\[
P = P^T = 10^9 \begin{bmatrix}
0.6154 & 0.0890 & 0.5773 & 0.1776 & 0.0026 & -0.0008 \\
0.7033 & 0.1779 & 0.7357 & -0.0014 & 0.0025 \\
1.1561 & 0.3556 & 0.0034 & -0.0008 \\
1.5068 & -0.0019 & 0.0040 \\
(sym) & 0.0027 & -0.0011 \\
& & & & & 0.0016
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\( B_z = B_z \alpha = -B_1 \alpha \)
Appendix E: Documentation of the Utilized Ground Motions in Chapter 8

This appendix documents all the 40 pulse-like GMs utilized to demonstrate the applicability of investigated integration algorithms and nonlinear solvers. Moreover, the GMs utilized for the identification of predominantly first-mode EDPs under earthquake excitation are documented in this appendix.

Table E.1 Documentation of 40 pulse-like GMs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Record Number</th>
<th>NGA Record Sequence Number</th>
<th>Earthquake Name</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Magnitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>EC County Center FF</td>
<td>6.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>EC Meloland Overpass FF</td>
<td>6.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Array #4</td>
<td>6.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Array #5</td>
<td>6.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Array #6</td>
<td>6.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Array #7</td>
<td>6.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Array #8</td>
<td>6.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Differential Array</td>
<td>6.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>Morgan Hill</td>
<td>Coyote Lake Dam (SW Abut)</td>
<td>6.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Gilroy-Gavilan Coll.</td>
<td>6.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>LGPC</td>
<td>6.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Lucerne</td>
<td>7.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Yermo Fire Station</td>
<td>7.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Jensen Filter Plant</td>
<td>6.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Jensen Filter Plant Generator</td>
<td>6.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1044</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Newhall-Fire Sta</td>
<td>6.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1045</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Newhall - W Pico Canyon Rd.</td>
<td>6.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1063</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Rinaldi Receiving Sta</td>
<td>6.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1084</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Sylmar-Converter Sta</td>
<td>6.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1085</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Sylmar-Converter Sta East</td>
<td>6.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1086</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Sylmar-Olive View Med FF</td>
<td>6.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1106</td>
<td>Kobe, Japan</td>
<td>KIMA</td>
<td>6.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1119</td>
<td>Kobe, Japan</td>
<td>Takarazuka</td>
<td>6.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1161</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>Gebze</td>
<td>7.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1197</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY028</td>
<td>7.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1244</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY101</td>
<td>7.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1489</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU049</td>
<td>7.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1492</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU052</td>
<td>7.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1493</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU053</td>
<td>7.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU054</td>
<td>7.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table E.1 (Cont.) Documentation of 40 pulse-like GMs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Record Number</th>
<th>NGA Record Sequence Number</th>
<th>Earthquake Name</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Magnitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1505</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU068</td>
<td>7.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1510</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU075</td>
<td>7.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1511</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU076</td>
<td>7.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1515</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU082</td>
<td>7.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1519</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU087</td>
<td>7.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1528</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU101</td>
<td>7.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1529</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU102</td>
<td>7.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1530</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU103</td>
<td>7.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1546</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU122</td>
<td>7.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1595</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>WGK</td>
<td>7.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table E.2 Documentation of 40 GMs of CMS group of Bridge A with Type I abutment modeling for 50% POE in 50 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Record Number</th>
<th>NGA Record Sequence Number</th>
<th>Earthquake Name</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>Scaling Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Glendale-Las Palmas</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1454</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TAP090</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2116</td>
<td>Denali, Alaska</td>
<td>TAPS Pump Station #12</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1427</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TAP035</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>Coalinga-01</td>
<td>Parkfield-Cholame 12W</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1211</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY052</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Dublin-Fire Station</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>Morgan Hill</td>
<td>Hollister Diff Array #3</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1293</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>HWA046</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1275</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>HWA026</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1797</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>LA-City Terrace</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1206</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY042</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2472</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03</td>
<td>CHY046</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Differential Array</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1256</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>HWA002</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>LA-Fletcher Dr</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1574</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TTN022</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1277</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>HWA028</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>881</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Morongo Valley</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1094</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>West Covina-S Orange Ave</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1541</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU116</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1349</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>ILA066</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1318</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>ILA014</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>LGPC</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1068</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>San Bernardino-Co Service</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1247</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>HWA025</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1795</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>Joshua Tree N.M.-Keys View</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Foster City-Menhaden Court</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>2743</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-04</td>
<td>CHY087</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1433</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TAP047</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>3342</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-06</td>
<td>HWA029</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1547</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU123</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1452</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TAP086</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1295</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>HWA049</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Gazli, USSR</td>
<td>Karakyr</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>Victoria, Mexico</td>
<td>Chihuahu</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>Chalfant Valley-02</td>
<td>Bishop-LADWP South St</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Berkeley-Strawberry Canyon</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1019</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Lake Hughes #1</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1789</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>Hesperia-4th &amp; Palm</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table E.3 Documentation of 40 GMs of CMS group of Bridge A with Type II abutment modeling for 50% POE in 50 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Record Number</th>
<th>NGA Record Sequence Number</th>
<th>Earthquake Name</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>Scaling Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Glendale-Las Palmas</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1221</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY052</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Hemet Fire Station</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2490</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03</td>
<td>CHY074</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1242</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY099</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1427</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TAP035</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1587</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TTN042</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1271</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>HWA022</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1256</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>HWA002</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1155</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>Bursa Tofas</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2699</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-04</td>
<td>CHY024</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2694</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-04</td>
<td>CHY015</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1291</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>HWA044</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>851</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Downey-Co Maint Bldg</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1177</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>Zeytiburnu</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Corralitos</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3313</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-06</td>
<td>CHY094</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1452</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TAP086</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1791</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>Indio-Coachella Canal</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1120</td>
<td>Kobe, Japan</td>
<td>Takatori</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1211</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY052</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>APEEL 3E Hayward CSUH</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>LA-City Terrace</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1318</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>ILA014</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1019</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Lake Hughes #1</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1541</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU116</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1775</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>Castaic-Old Ridge Route</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>3503</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-06</td>
<td>TCU122</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1426</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TAP034</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1279</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>HWA030</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>SF-Presidio</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Compton-Castlegate St</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1198</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY029</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Desert Hot Springs</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1445</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TAP075</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>LA-Fletcher Dr</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1210</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY050</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>2465</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03</td>
<td>CHY034</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1345</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>ILA061</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1528</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU101</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table E.4 Documentation of 40 GMs of CMS group of Bridge A with Type I abutment modeling for 10% POE in 50 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Record Number</th>
<th>NGA Record Sequence Number</th>
<th>Earthquake Name</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>Scaling Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1238</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY092</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>ILA067</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>Chalfant Valley-01</td>
<td>Zack Brothers Ranch</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1176</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>Yarimca</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Barstow</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Yermo Fire Station</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Hollister Diff. Array</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1243</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY100</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Hayward-BART Sta</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1317</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>ILA013</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1329</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>ILA037</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1605</td>
<td>Duze, Turkey</td>
<td>Duze</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>Calexico Fire Station</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1268</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>HWA017</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Dublin-Fire Station</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Fremont-Mission San Jose</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>LGPC</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1206</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY042</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>Tabas, Iran</td>
<td>Dayhook</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3271</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-06</td>
<td>CHY032</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1303</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>HWA058</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1234</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY086</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1349</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>ILA066</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>EC County Center FF</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>Morgan Hill</td>
<td>Hollister Diff. Array</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1784</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>Frink</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1490</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU050</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1263</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>HWA012</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Fremont-Emerson Court</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Halls Valley</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1149</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>Atakoy</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1810</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>Mecca-CVWD Yard</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>2715</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-04</td>
<td>CHY047</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>3276</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-06</td>
<td>CHY037</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1187</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY015</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>2714</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-04</td>
<td>CHY046</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1489</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU049</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1048</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Northridge-17645 Saticoy St</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Desert Hot Springs</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1536</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU110</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table E.5 Documentation of 40 GMs of CMS group of Bridge A with Type II abutment modeling for 10% POE in 50 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Record Number</th>
<th>NGA Record Sequence Number</th>
<th>Earthquake Name</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>Scaling Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1336</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>ILA048</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3312</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-06</td>
<td>CHY093</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2110</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-02</td>
<td>CHY111</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1332</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>ILA042</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1481</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU038</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>ILA067</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Array #8</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1528</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU101</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1810</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>Mecca-CVWD Yard</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Gazli, USSR</td>
<td>Karakyr</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1211</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY052</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1074</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Sandberg - Bald Mtn</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1508</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU072</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1293</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>HWA046</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1187</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY015</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3503</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-06</td>
<td>TCU122</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1478</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU033</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1206</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY042</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3473</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-06</td>
<td>TCU078</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>San Jose-Santa Teresa Hills</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3271</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-06</td>
<td>CHY032</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1555</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU147</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>Morgan Hill</td>
<td>Hollister Diff Array #4</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2461</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03</td>
<td>CHY028</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2458</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03</td>
<td>CHY025</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>3510</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-06</td>
<td>TCU139</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Jensen Filter Plant Generator</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1295</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>HWA049</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1509</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU074</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Coyote Lake Dam (Downst)</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1049</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Pacific Palisades-Sunset</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Irpinia, Italy-02</td>
<td>Calitri</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1177</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>Zeytinburnu</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>2715</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-04</td>
<td>CHY047</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1791</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>Indio-Coachella Canal</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1263</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>HWA012</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1427</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TAP035</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Amboy</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1087</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Tarzana-Cedar Hill A</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1546</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU122</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table E.6 Documentation of 40 GMs of CMS group of Bridge A with Type I abutment modeling for 2% POE in 50 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Record Number</th>
<th>NGA Record Sequence Number</th>
<th>Earthquake Name</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>Scaling Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1520</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU088</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1186</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY014</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Array #7</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1045</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Newhall-W Pico Canyon Rd.</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1155</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>Bursa Tofas</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1234</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY086</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1794</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>Joshua Tree</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1282</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>HWA033</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2632</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03</td>
<td>TCU084</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Hollister-South &amp; Pine</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>LGPC</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>Erzican, Turkey</td>
<td>Erzincan</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Yermo Fire Station</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1489</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU049</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1454</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TAP090</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1297</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>HWA051</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1204</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY039</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1120</td>
<td>Kobe, Japan</td>
<td>Takatori</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1509</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU074</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1493</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU053</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1495</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU055</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Fremont-Emerson Court</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1158</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>Duzee</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>Superstition Hills-02</td>
<td>Parachute Test Site</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Saratoga-W Valley Coll.</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1198</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY029</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1201</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY034</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>Westmorland</td>
<td>Parachute Test Site</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1521</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU089</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1044</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Newhall-Fire Sta</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Halls Valley</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1187</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY015</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>881</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Morongo Valley</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>SF-Presidio</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>Chalfant Valley-02</td>
<td>Zack Brothers Ranch</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>HWA055</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1529</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU102</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1481</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU038</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1490</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU050</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Coyote Lake Dam (SW Abut)</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table E.7 Documentation of 40 GMs of CMS group of Bridge A with Type II abutment modeling for 2% POE in 50 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Record Number</th>
<th>NGA Record Sequence Number</th>
<th>Earthquake Name</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>Scaling Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1205</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY041</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1088</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Terminal Island-S Seaside</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>Coalinga-05</td>
<td>Pleasant Valley P.P.-yard</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>ILA067</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1201</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY034</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1116</td>
<td>Kobe, Japan</td>
<td>Shin-Osaka</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1481</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU038</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Differential Array</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Coyote Lake Dam (SW Abut)</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1509</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU074</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>San Jose-Santa Teresa Hills</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>LGPC</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1456</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TAP095</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Yermo Fire Station</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1434</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TAP049</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1810</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>Mecca-CVWD Yard</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>Spitak, Armenia</td>
<td>Gukasian</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1155</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>Bursa Tofas</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1317</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>ILA013</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1234</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY086</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1165</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>Izmit</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>LA-Brentwood VA Hospital</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1519</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU087</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1292</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>HWA045</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1508</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU072</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1009</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>LA-Wadsworth VA Hospital</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1529</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU102</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1187</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY015</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1493</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU053</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2461</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03</td>
<td>CHY028</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1282</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>HWA033</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1495</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU055</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>APEEL 10-Skyline</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Hollister-South &amp; Pine</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Hollister Diff. Array</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1158</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>Duzce</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1515</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU082</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1048</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Northridge-17645 Saticoy St</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1227</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY074</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>2467</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03</td>
<td>CHY036</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table E.8 Documentation of 40 GMs of reference group of Bridge A for 50% POE in 50 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Record Number</th>
<th>NGA Record Sequence Number</th>
<th>Earthquake Name</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>Scaling Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2650</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03</td>
<td>TCU116</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2899</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-04</td>
<td>TCU141</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1177</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>Zeytinburnu</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Yermo Fire Station</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1164</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>Istanbul</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1315</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>ILA010</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1799</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>LA-Obregon Park</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1531</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU104</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1148</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>Arcelik</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2756</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-04</td>
<td>CHY114</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2695</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-04</td>
<td>CHY016</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>ILA067</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Fremont-Emerson Court</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>Borah Peak, ID-01</td>
<td>TAN-719</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Saratoga-W Valley Coll.</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2655</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03</td>
<td>TCU122</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1577</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TTN025</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Anaheim-W Ball Rd</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Hollister-South &amp; Pine</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Antelope Buttes</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1049</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Pacific Palisades-Sunset</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1783</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>Fort Irwin</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2706</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-04</td>
<td>CHY032</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1762</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>Amboy</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Larkspur Ferry Terminal (FF)</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1358</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>KAU012</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Calaveras Reservoir</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1206</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY042</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>NCU</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Parkfield</td>
<td>Cholame-Shandon Array #12</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>Coalinga-01</td>
<td>Parkfield-Cholame 8W</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>2994</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-05</td>
<td>CHY116</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1503</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU065</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>2646</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03</td>
<td>TCU109</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>SF-1295 Shafter</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>Mammoth Lakes-06</td>
<td>Bishop-Paradise Lodge</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>2639</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03</td>
<td>TCU100</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Fort Irwin</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1551</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU138</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1434</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TAP049</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record Number</td>
<td>NGA Record Sequence Number</td>
<td>Earthquake Name</td>
<td>Station</td>
<td>Magnitude</td>
<td>Scaling Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1310</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>ILA004</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1201</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY034</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1472</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU017</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1488</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU048</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1147</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>Ambarli</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1244</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY101</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1476</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU029</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1794</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>Joshua Tree</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>EC Meloland Overpass FF</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1234</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY086</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>Tabas, Iran</td>
<td>Tabas</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>ILA067</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>San Bernardino-E Hospitality</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>Duzce, Turkey</td>
<td>Lamont 1061</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Gazli, USSR</td>
<td>Karakyr</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Mission Creek Fault</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>Irpinia, Italy-01</td>
<td>Bagnoli Irpinio</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3509</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-06</td>
<td>TCU138</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1193</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY024</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>Cape Mendocino</td>
<td>Cape Mendocino</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Gilroy Array #3</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1493</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU053</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>3266</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-06</td>
<td>CHY026</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2458</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03</td>
<td>CHY025</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Differential Array</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1148</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>Arcelik</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1116</td>
<td>Kobe, Japan</td>
<td>Shin-Osaka</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1507</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU071</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>Spitak, Armenia</td>
<td>Gukasian</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Yermo Fire Station</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>2655</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03</td>
<td>TCU122</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Coyote Lake Dam (SW Abut)</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1547</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU123</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>Holtville Post Office</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Lucerne</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1503</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU065</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1521</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU098</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>2473</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03</td>
<td>CHY047</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1495</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU055</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1491</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU051</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table E.10 Documentation of 40 GMs of reference group of Bridge A for 2% POE in 50 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Record Number</th>
<th>NGA Record Sequence Number</th>
<th>Earthquake Name</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>Scaling Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>Superstition Mtn Camera</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1476</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU029</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1486</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU046</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Yermo Fire Station</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1505</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU068</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1147</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>Ambarli</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1521</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU089</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1503</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU065</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1478</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU033</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1176</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>Yarimca</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>EC County Center FF</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1511</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU076</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>Irpinia, Italy-01</td>
<td>Bagnoli Irpinio</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1541</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU116</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1488</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU048</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1244</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY101</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>Superstition Hills-02</td>
<td>Parachute Test Site</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Lucerne</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>Superstition Hills-02</td>
<td>Westmorland Fire Sta</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Array #7</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>LGPC</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1149</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>Atakoy</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1048</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Northridge-17645 Saticoy St</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1529</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU102</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1525</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU096</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Gazli, USSR</td>
<td>Karakyr</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Saratoga-W Valley Coll.</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Differential Array</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>Superstition Hills-02</td>
<td>El Centro Imp. Co. Cent</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1534</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU107</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1762</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>Amboy</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1297</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>HWA051</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Array #12</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1158</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>Duzce</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1198</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY029</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1546</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU122</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1111</td>
<td>Kobe, Japan</td>
<td>Nishi-Akashi</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>3472</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-06</td>
<td>TCU076</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1527</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU100</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Hollister-South &amp; Pine</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table E.11 Documentation of 40 GMs of CMS group of Bridge B for 50% POE in 50 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Record Number</th>
<th>NGA Record Sequence Number</th>
<th>Earthquake Name</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>Scaling Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2709</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-04</td>
<td>CHY035</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>Coalinga-01</td>
<td>Parkfield-Gold Hill 5W</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Yermo Fire Station</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Kern County</td>
<td>LA-Hollywood Stor FF</td>
<td>7.36</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1551</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU138</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1267</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>HWA016</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Barstow</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Gazli, USSR</td>
<td>Karakyr</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1297</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>HWA051</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>LA-Fletcher Dr</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1092</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Ventura-Harbor &amp; California</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2490</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03</td>
<td>CHY074</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Fremont-Mission San Jose</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1262</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>HWA011</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Pomona-4th &amp; Locust FF</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1791</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>Indio-Coachella Canal</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1177</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>Zeytinburnu</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Sun Valley-Roscoe Blvd</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1206</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY042</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>Superstition Hills-02</td>
<td>El Centro Imp. Co. Cent</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1817</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>North Shore - Durham</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>Superstition Hills-02</td>
<td>El Centro Imp. Co. Cent</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>North Palm Springs</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Saratoga-W Valley Coll.</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1349</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>IALA066</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1155</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>Bursa Tofas</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1511</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU076</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1459</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TAP100</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>2459</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03</td>
<td>CHY026</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1275</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>HWA026</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Foster City-APEEL 1</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1243</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY100</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1337</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>IALA049</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1454</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TAP090</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1489</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU049</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>Spikat, Armenia</td>
<td>Gukasian</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>2467</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03</td>
<td>CHY036</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1334</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>IALA044</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1476</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU029</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>2461</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03</td>
<td>CHY028</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table E.12 Documentation of 40 GMs of CMS group of Bridge B for 10% POE in 50 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Record Number</th>
<th>NGA Record Sequence Number</th>
<th>Earthquake Name</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>Scaling Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1080</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Simi Valley-Katherine Rd</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1297</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>HWA051</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1113</td>
<td>Kobe, Japan</td>
<td>OSAJ</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Yermo Fire Station</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>Cape Mendocino</td>
<td>Fortuna-Fortuna Blvd</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1550</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU136</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1155</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>Bursa Tofas</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1492</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU052</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1530</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU103</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1529</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU102</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1534</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU107</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1472</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU017</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Array #7</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1414</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TAP008</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1204</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY039</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>Landsers</td>
<td>Fountain Valley-Euclid</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Hollister-South &amp; Pine</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1295</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>HWA049</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1149</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>Atakoy</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1264</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>HWA013</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1787</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>Hector</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Saratoga-W Valley Coll.</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1459</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TAP100</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Gazli, USSR</td>
<td>Karakyr</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1044</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Newhall-Fire Sta</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1489</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU049</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>EC County Center FF</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1329</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>ILA037</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>3265</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-06</td>
<td>CHY025</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Joshua Tree</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1262</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>HWA011</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1234</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY086</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1536</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU110</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1147</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>Ambarli</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1509</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU074</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1039</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Moorpark-Fire Sta</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>Irpinia, Italy-01</td>
<td>Bagnoli Irpinio</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1541</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU116</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1334</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>ILA044</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table E.13 Documentation of 40 GMs of CMS group of Bridge B for 2% POE in 50 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Record Number</th>
<th>NGA Record Sequence Number</th>
<th>Earthquake Name</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>Scaling Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1419</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TAP017</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>APEEL 2-Redwood City</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1264</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>HWA013</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1410</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TAP003</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1492</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU052</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Hollister-South &amp; Pine</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1044</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Newhall-Fire Sta</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1201</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY034</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>Coalinga-01</td>
<td>Parkfield-Fault Zone 2</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1084</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Sylmar - Converter Sta</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Foster City-APEEL 1</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1045</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Newhall-W Pico Canyon Rd.</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Irpinia, Italy-02</td>
<td>Calitri</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1411</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TAP005</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1504</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU067</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Larkspur Ferry Terminal (FF)</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1547</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU123</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Bear Valley #12</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1517</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU084</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1529</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU102</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1147</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>Ambarli</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1182</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY006</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1509</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU074</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1116</td>
<td>Kobe, Japan</td>
<td>Shin-Osaka</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Yermo Fire Station</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1498</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU059</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Array #7</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Golden Gate Bridge</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Saratoga-W Valley Coll.</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Gazli, USSR</td>
<td>Karakyr</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1536</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU110</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Joshua Tree</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1292</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>HWA045</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>N. Palm Springs</td>
<td>Morongo Valley</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1550</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU136</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1457</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TAP097</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1120</td>
<td>Kobe, Japan</td>
<td>Takatori</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1503</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU065</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>Superstition Hills-02</td>
<td>Parachute Test Site</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1541</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU116</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table E.14 Documentation of 40 GMs of reference group of Bridge B for 50% POE in 50 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Record Number</th>
<th>NGA Record Number</th>
<th>Earthquake Name</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>Scaling Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2497</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03</td>
<td>CHY082</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1536</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU110</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Yermo Fire Station</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1397</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>KAU086</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>Niland Fire Station</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2700</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-04</td>
<td>CHY025</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Lucerne</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Mission Creek Fault</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1011</td>
<td>Northbridge-01</td>
<td>LA-Wonderland Ave</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1147</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>Ambarli</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1553</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU141</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1505</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU068</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Gazli, USSR</td>
<td>Karakyr</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>Superstition Hills-02</td>
<td>Westmorland Fire Sta</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1791</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>Indio-Coachella Canal</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Fremont-Mission San Jose</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1148</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>Arcelik</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1267</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU122</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2893</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-04</td>
<td>TCU122</td>
<td>6.49</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>Chalfant Valley-02</td>
<td>Bishop-LADWP South St</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Indio-Coachella Canal</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2115</td>
<td>Denali, Alaska</td>
<td>TAPS Pump Station #11</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1057</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Playa Del Rey-Saran</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Anderson Dam (Downstream)</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>Irpinia, Italy-01</td>
<td>Torre Del Greco</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Gilroy Array #3</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1193</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY024</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1297</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>HWA051</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1171</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>EC Meloland Overpass FF</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1074</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Sandberg - Bald Mtn</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Hollister Diff. Array</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>2715</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-04</td>
<td>CHY047</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1762</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>Amboy</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1113</td>
<td>Kobe, Japan</td>
<td>OSAJ</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1324</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>ILA030</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1158</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>Duzce</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1552</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU140</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1287</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>HWA038</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1776</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>Desert Hot Springs</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Fremont-Emerson Court</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table E.15 Documentation of 40 GMs of reference group of Bridge B for 10% POE in 50 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Record Number</th>
<th>NGA Record Sequence Number</th>
<th>Earthquake Name</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>Scaling Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>New Zealand-02</td>
<td>Matahina Dam (SW Abut)</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Coyote Lake Dam (SW Abut)</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1528</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU101</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1762</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>Amboy</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>Brawley Airport</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1488</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU048</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Array #8</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2115</td>
<td>Denali, Alaska</td>
<td>TAPS Pump Station #11</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1481</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU038</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1147</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>Ambarli</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>Tabas, Iran</td>
<td>Tabas</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1492</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU052</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1509</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU074</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2752</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-04</td>
<td>CHY101</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Yermo Fire Station</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1531</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU104</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>LA-Baldwin Hills</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1505</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU068</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1483</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU040</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1547</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU123</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>Cape Mendocino</td>
<td>Fortuna-Fortuna Blvd</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Fort Irwin</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1501</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU063</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1201</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY034</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1198</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY029</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1503</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU065</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1263</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>HWA012</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>Superstition Hills-02</td>
<td>Parachute Test Site</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1471</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU015</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Saratoga-W Valley Coll.</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Array #4</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1553</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU141</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>Victoria, Mexico</td>
<td>Chihuahua</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>Spitak, Armenia</td>
<td>Gukasian</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>Superstition Hills-02</td>
<td>Brawley Airport</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1545</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU120</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>EC Meloland Overpass FF</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1476</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU029</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>2710</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-04</td>
<td>CHY036</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1045</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Newhall-W Pico Canyon Rd.</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table E.16 Documentation of 40 GMs of reference group of Bridge B for 2% POE in 50 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Record Number</th>
<th>NGA Record Sequence Number</th>
<th>Earthquake Name</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>Scaling Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1468</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU010</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1477</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU031</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Yermo Fire Station</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1550</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU136</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>Superstition Hills-02</td>
<td>Westmorland Fire Sta</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1488</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU048</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Hollister-South &amp; Pine</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1503</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU065</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1148</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>Arcelik</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1491</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU051</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1198</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY029</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1476</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU029</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1149</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>Atakoy</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1528</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU101</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1492</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU052</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>Tabas, Iran</td>
<td>Tabas</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1084</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Sylmar-Converter Sta</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1505</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU068</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1509</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU074</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1078</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Santa Susana Ground</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>Superstition Hills-02</td>
<td>Brawley Airport</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1787</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>Hector</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1548</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU128</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1478</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU033</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1106</td>
<td>Kobe, Japan</td>
<td>KJMA</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Saratoga-W Valley Coll.</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1486</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU046</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1529</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU102</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1176</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>Yarimca</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Differential Array</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>Superstition Hills-02</td>
<td>Parachute Test Site</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Saratoga-Aloha Ave</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1498</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU059</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1244</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY101</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1510</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU075</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1542</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU117</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>Superstition Hills-02</td>
<td>El Centro Imp. Co. Cent</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>EC County Center FF</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>LGPC</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1501</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU063</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record Number</td>
<td>NGA Record Sequence Number</td>
<td>Earthquake Name</td>
<td>Station</td>
<td>Magnitude</td>
<td>Scaling Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2463</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03</td>
<td>CHY032</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1538</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU112</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1234</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY086</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1817</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>North Shore-Durmid</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1304</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>HWA059</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3297</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-06</td>
<td>CHY069</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Yermo Fire Station</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Oakland-Title &amp; Trust</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Jensen Filter Plant Generator</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1154</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>Bursa Sivil</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1783</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>Fort Irwin</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2598</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03</td>
<td>TCU039</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1359</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>KAU015</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1491</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU051</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>Morgan Hill</td>
<td>Hollister Diff Array #3</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1383</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>KAU062</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1791</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>Indio-Coachella Canal</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1259</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>HWA006</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Saratoga-W Valley Coll.</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1426</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TAP034</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1587</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TTN042</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1834</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>Sylmar-County Hospital</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1185</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY012</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1232</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY081</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1504</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU067</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Inglewood-Union Oil</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1574</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TTN022</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1314</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>ILA008</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Array #13</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1495</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU055</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Salinas-John &amp; Work</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1794</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>Joshua Tree</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1611</td>
<td>Duzce, Turkey</td>
<td>Lamont 1058</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1503</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU065</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1521</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU089</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1287</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>HWA038</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Olema-Point Reyes Station</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1317</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>ILA013</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>2654</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03</td>
<td>TCU120</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>2711</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-04</td>
<td>CHY039</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record Number</td>
<td>NGA Record Sequence Number</td>
<td>Earthquake Name</td>
<td>Station</td>
<td>Magnitude</td>
<td>Scaling Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2459</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03</td>
<td>CHY026</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1361</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>KAU020</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1542</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU117</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2649</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03</td>
<td>TCU115</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2718</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-04</td>
<td>CHY054</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Northridge-17645 Saticoy St</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1295</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>HWA049</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Anderson Dam (L Abut)</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1418</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TAP014</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1457</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TAP097</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1232</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY081</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1574</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TTN022</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1509</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU074</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2650</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03</td>
<td>TCU116</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1412</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TAP006</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU054</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1541</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU116</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1787</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>Hector</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1297</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>HWA051</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1791</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>Indio-Coachella Canal</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2744</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-04</td>
<td>CHY088</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1263</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>HWA012</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1147</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>Ambarli</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1536</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU110</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Yermo Fire Station</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1165</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>Izmit</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1508</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU072</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1193</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY024</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2458</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03</td>
<td>CHY025</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1317</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>ILA013</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Coyote Lake Dam (SW Abut)</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>2710</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-04</td>
<td>CHY036</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>Coalinga-01</td>
<td>Parkfield-Cholame 2WA</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1158</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>Duzce</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>3265</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-06</td>
<td>CHY025</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>2708</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-04</td>
<td>CHY034</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>Westmorland</td>
<td>Westmorland Fire Sta</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Dublin-Fire Station</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Baker Fire Station</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table E.19 Documentation of 40 GMs of CMS group of Bridge C for 2% POE in 50 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Record Number</th>
<th>NGA Record Sequence Number</th>
<th>Earthquake Name</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>Scaling Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>Coalinga-01</td>
<td>Parkfield-Fault Zone 2</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1575</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TTN023</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>APEEL 2-Redwood City</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1316</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>ILA012</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2509</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03</td>
<td>CHY104</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1295</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>HWA049</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1418</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TAP014</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1509</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU074</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1527</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU100</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Fort Irwin</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1328</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>ILA036</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2650</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03</td>
<td>TCU116</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1492</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU052</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1320</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>ILA016</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1263</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>HWA012</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU054</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1044</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Newhall-Fire Sta</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1455</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TAP094</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1311</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>ILA005</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1292</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>HWA045</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1204</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY039</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2507</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03</td>
<td>CHY101</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1194</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY025</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2458</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03</td>
<td>CHY025</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2752</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-04</td>
<td>CHY101</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1534</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU107</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Hollister-South &amp; Pine</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>2663</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03</td>
<td>TCU141</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>San Fernando</td>
<td>Pacoima Dam (upper left abut)</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1187</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY015</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Joshua Tree</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1536</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU110</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1116</td>
<td>Kobe, Japan</td>
<td>Shin-Osaka</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1262</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>HWA011</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Yermo Fire Station</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Saratoga-W Valley Coll.</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1542</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU117</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1317</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>ILA013</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1361</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>KA0020</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>EC County Center FF</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table E.20 Documentation of 40 GMs of reference group of Bridge C for 50% POE in 50 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Record Number</th>
<th>NGA Record Sequence Number</th>
<th>Earthquake Name</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>Scaling Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1498</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU059</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1424</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TAP028</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1117</td>
<td>Kobe, Japan</td>
<td>TOT</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1476</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU029</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2893</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-04</td>
<td>TCU122</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1377</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>KAU050</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2714</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-04</td>
<td>CHY046</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2756</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-04</td>
<td>CHY114</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1618</td>
<td>Duzce, Turkey</td>
<td>Lamont 531</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1817</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>North Shore-Durmid</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1223</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY067</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>Victoria, Mexico</td>
<td>Cerro Prieto</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1301</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>HWA056</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2115</td>
<td>Denali, Alaska</td>
<td>TAPS Pump Station #11</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1214</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY057</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1308</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>ILA002</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1190</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY019</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1450</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TAP083</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1148</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>Arcelik</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1182</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY006</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Silent Valley-Poppet Flat</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1489</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU049</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>Victoria, Mexico</td>
<td>Chihuahua</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1261</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>HWA009</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1465</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU007</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1512</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU078</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>Coalinga-01</td>
<td>Parkfield-Cholame 2WA</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1149</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>Atakoy</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1164</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>Istanbul</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2948</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-05</td>
<td>CHY032</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU026</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Array #3</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>3267</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-06</td>
<td>CHY027</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>San Fernando</td>
<td>LA-Hollywood Stor FF</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Indio-Coachella Canal</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Array #5</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>2951</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-05</td>
<td>CHY039</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Treasure Island</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Barstow</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>2711</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-04</td>
<td>CHY039</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table E.21 Documentation of 40 GMs of reference group of Bridge C for 10% POE in 50 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Record Number</th>
<th>NGA Record Sequence Number</th>
<th>Earthquake Name</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>Scaling Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2492</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03</td>
<td>CHY076</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1410</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TAP003</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1147</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>Ambarli</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1611</td>
<td>Duzce, Turkey</td>
<td>Lamont 1058</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Yermo Fire Station</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2115</td>
<td>Denali, Alaska</td>
<td>TAPS Pump Station #11</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Bear Valley #12</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1184</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY010</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Fremont-Mission San Jose</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1489</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU049</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1762</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>Amboy</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1541</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU116</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1615</td>
<td>Duzce, Turkey</td>
<td>Lamont 1062</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>San Jose-Santa Teresa Hills</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1223</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY067</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>Spitak, Armenia</td>
<td>Gukasian</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1476</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU029</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1553</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU141</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1013</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>LA Dam</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1149</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>Atakoy</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1498</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU059</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1554</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU145</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1198</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY029</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2700</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-04</td>
<td>CHY025</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>LGPC</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>ILA067</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2457</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03</td>
<td>CHY024</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1492</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU052</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Mission Creek Fault</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1318</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>ILA014</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Lucerne</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>2893</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-04</td>
<td>TCU122</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1513</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU079</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>SF-Presidio</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Differential Array</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>Tabas, Iran</td>
<td>Tabas</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Barstow</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>Chalfant Valley-02</td>
<td>Bishop-LADWP South St</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Gilroy Array #3</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record Number</td>
<td>NGA Record Sequence Number</td>
<td>Earthquake Name</td>
<td>Station</td>
<td>Magnitude</td>
<td>Scaling Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1605</td>
<td>Duzce, Turkey</td>
<td>Duzce</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1176</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>Yarimca</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1492</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU052</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1509</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU074</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>Cape Mendocino</td>
<td>Cape Mendocino</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1147</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>Ambarli</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1149</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>Atakoy</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2115</td>
<td>Denali, Alaska</td>
<td>TAPS Pump Station #11</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1234</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY086</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Yermo Fire Station</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1528</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU101</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Saratoga-W Valley Coll.</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>LGPC</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Bear Valley #12</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1201</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY034</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1505</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU068</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>Superstition Hills-02</td>
<td>El Centro Imp. Co. Cent</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>Tabas, Iran</td>
<td>Tabas</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1148</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>Arcelik</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1472</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU017</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1158</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>Duzce</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Array #12</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Hollister-South &amp; Pine</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1792</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>Indio-Riverside Co Fair Grnds</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1042</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>N Hollywood-Coldwater Can</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>Chalfant Valley-02</td>
<td>Bishop-LADWP South St</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Gilroy Array #3</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Array #8</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Lucerne</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>Niland Fire Station</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1491</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU051</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1510</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU075</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1497</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU057</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>Superstition Hills-02</td>
<td>Wildlife Liquef. Array</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Differential Array</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1488</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU048</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1504</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU067</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1533</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU106</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1476</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU029</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F: Documentation of the Utilized Ground Motions in Chapter 9

This appendix documents all the GMs utilized to develop reference benchmark *PDSD* for the investigated RC highway bridge systems. The GMs selected by the investigated four GMSM procedures are also documented in this appendix.

**Table F.1 Documentation of 60 GMs used for the development of benchmark *PDSD*.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Record Number</th>
<th>NGA Record Sequence Number</th>
<th>Earthquake Name</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Magnitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Friuli, Italy-01</td>
<td>Tolmezzo</td>
<td>6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Gazli, USSR</td>
<td>Karakyr</td>
<td>6.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>Tabas, Iran</td>
<td>Tabas</td>
<td>7.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>Aeropuerto Mexicali</td>
<td>6.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>Agrarias</td>
<td>6.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>Brawley Airport</td>
<td>6.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>Chihuahua</td>
<td>6.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>EC County Center FF</td>
<td>6.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>EC Meloland Overpass FF</td>
<td>6.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Array #10</td>
<td>6.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Array #11</td>
<td>6.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Array #4</td>
<td>6.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Array #5</td>
<td>6.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Array #6</td>
<td>6.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Array #7</td>
<td>6.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Array #8</td>
<td>6.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Differential Array</td>
<td>6.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>Holtville Post Office</td>
<td>6.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>Irpinia, Italy-01</td>
<td>Bagnoli Irpinio</td>
<td>6.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>Irpinia, Italy-01</td>
<td>Sturno</td>
<td>6.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>Superstition Hills-02</td>
<td>El Centro Imp. Co. Cent</td>
<td>6.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>Superstition Hills-02</td>
<td>Kornbloom Road (temp)</td>
<td>6.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>Superstition Hills-02</td>
<td>Parachute Test Site</td>
<td>6.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>Superstition Hills-02</td>
<td>Poe Road (temp)</td>
<td>6.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>Superstition Hills-02</td>
<td>Westmorland Fire Sta</td>
<td>6.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>BRAN</td>
<td>6.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Corralitos</td>
<td>6.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Gilroy-Historic Bldg.</td>
<td>6.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Gilroy Array #2</td>
<td>6.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Gilroy Array #4</td>
<td>6.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table F.1 (Cont.) Documentation of 60 GMs used for the development of benchmark *PDSD*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Record Number</th>
<th>NGA Record Sequence Number</th>
<th>Earthquake Name</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Magnitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>LGPC</td>
<td>6.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>San Jose-Santa Teresa Hills</td>
<td>6.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Saratoga-Aloha Ave</td>
<td>6.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Saratoga-W Valley Coll.</td>
<td>6.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>Erzican, Turkey</td>
<td>Erzincan</td>
<td>6.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>Cape Mendocino</td>
<td>Fortuna-Fortuna Blvd</td>
<td>7.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>Cape Mendocino</td>
<td>Petrolia</td>
<td>7.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>Cape Mendocino</td>
<td>Rio Dell Overpass-FF</td>
<td>7.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Joshua Tree</td>
<td>7.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Lucerne</td>
<td>7.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Arleta-Nordhoff Fire Sta</td>
<td>6.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Beverly Hills-14145 Mulhol</td>
<td>6.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Canoga Park-Topanga Can</td>
<td>6.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Canyon Country-W Lost Cany</td>
<td>6.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>1004</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>LA-Sepulveda VA Hospital</td>
<td>6.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>1013</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>LA Dam</td>
<td>6.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>1042</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>N Hollywood-Coldwater Can</td>
<td>6.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>1044</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Newhall-Fire Sta</td>
<td>6.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>1045</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Newhall-W Pico Canyon Rd.</td>
<td>6.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1048</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Northridge-17645 Saticoy St</td>
<td>6.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Pacoima Dam (downstr)</td>
<td>6.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>1052</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Pacoima Kagel Canyon</td>
<td>6.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>1063</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Rinaldi Receiving Sta</td>
<td>6.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>1086</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Sylmar-Olive View Med FF</td>
<td>6.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>1106</td>
<td>Kobe, Japan</td>
<td>KJMA</td>
<td>6.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>1111</td>
<td>Kobe, Japan</td>
<td>Nishi-Akashi</td>
<td>6.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>1116</td>
<td>Kobe, Japan</td>
<td>Shin-Osaka</td>
<td>6.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>1602</td>
<td>Duzce, Turkey</td>
<td>Bolu</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>1605</td>
<td>Duzce, Turkey</td>
<td>Duzce</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1787</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>Hector</td>
<td>7.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table F.2 Documentation of 40 GMs of $S_a(T_s)$ procedure for Bridge A with Type I abutment modeling.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Record Number</th>
<th>NGA Record Sequence Number</th>
<th>Earthquake Name</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>Scaling Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Array #4</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>Irpinia, Italy-01</td>
<td>Sturno</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>Cape Mendocino</td>
<td>Rio Dell Overpass-FF</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>SAHOP Casa Flores</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>Nahanni, Canada</td>
<td>Site 1</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>Superstition Hills-02</td>
<td>Poe Road (temp)</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Arleta-Nordhoff Fire Sta</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1082</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Sun Valley-Roscoe Blvd</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>EC County Center FF</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Differential Array</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Gilroy Array #2</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Gilroy Array #3</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Saratoga-Aloha Ave</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Saratoga-W Valley Coll.</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>Cape Mendocino</td>
<td>Cape Mendocino</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>Cape Mendocino</td>
<td>Petrolia</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Jensen Filter Plant Generator</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1013</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>LA Dam</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1044</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Newhall-Fire Sta</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1045</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Newhall-W Pico Canyon Rd.</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Pacoima Dam (downstr)</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1051</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Pacoima Dam (upper left)</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1063</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Rinaldi Receiving Sta</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1084</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Sylmar-Converter Sta</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1085</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Sylmar-Converter Sta East</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1086</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Sylmar-Olive View Med FF</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1602</td>
<td>Duzce, Turkey</td>
<td>Bolu</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1605</td>
<td>Duzce, Turkey</td>
<td>Duzce</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Gazli, USSR</td>
<td>Karakyr</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>Chihuahua</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>Superstition Hills-02</td>
<td>Superstition Mtn Camera</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>BRAN</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>Landsers</td>
<td>Joshua Tree</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Canoga Park-Topanga Can</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Canyon Country-W Lost Cany</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1004</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>LA-Sepulveda VA Hospital</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1048</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Northridge-17645 Saticoy St</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1052</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Pacoima Kagel Canyon</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1080</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Simi Valley-Katherine Rd</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1111</td>
<td>Kobe, Japan</td>
<td>Nishi-Akashi</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table F.3 Documentation of 40 GMs of $S_\tau(\tau)$ procedure for Bridge A with Type I abutment modeling.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Record Number</th>
<th>NGA Record Sequence Number</th>
<th>Earthquake Name</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>Scaling Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Array #10</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>4.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Array #11</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Array #4</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>Holtville Post Office</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>Irpinia, Italy-01</td>
<td>Sturno</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Gilroy - Gavilan Coll.</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Gilroy - Historic Bldg.</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Gilroy Array #1</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>EC County Center FF</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Differential Array</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Gilroy Array #2</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Gilroy Array #3</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Saratoga-Aloha Ave</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Saratoga-W Valley Coll.</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>Cape Mendocino</td>
<td>Cape Mendocino</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>Cape Mendocino</td>
<td>Petrolia</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Jensen Filter Plant Generator</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1013</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>LA Dam</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1044</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Newhall-Fire Sta</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1045</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Newhall-W Pico Canyon Rd.</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Pico Dam (downstr)</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1051</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Pico Dam (upper left)</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1063</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Rinaldi Receiving Sta</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1084</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Sylmar-Converter Sta</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1085</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Sylmar-Converter Sta East</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1086</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Sylmar-Olive View Med FF</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1602</td>
<td>Duzce, Turkey</td>
<td>Bolu</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1605</td>
<td>Duzce, Turkey</td>
<td>Duzce</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Gazli, USSR</td>
<td>Karakyr</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>Chihuahua</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>Superstition Hills-02</td>
<td>Superstition Mtn Camera</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>BRAN</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Joshua Tree</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Canoga Park-Topanga Can</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Canyon Country-W Lost Cany</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1004</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>LA-Sepulveda VA Hospital</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1048</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Northridge-17645 Saticoy St</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1052</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Picoima Kagel Canyon</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1080</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Simi Valley-Katherine Rd</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1111</td>
<td>Kobe, Japan</td>
<td>Nishi-Akashi</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record Number</td>
<td>NGA Record Number</td>
<td>Earthquake Name</td>
<td>Station</td>
<td>Magnitude</td>
<td>Scaling Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>Tabas, Iran</td>
<td>Dayhook</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Gilroy Array #4</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>Cape Mendocino</td>
<td>Rio Dell Overpass-FF</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>SAHOP Casa Flores</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>Nahanni, Canada</td>
<td>Site 1</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>Superstition Hills-02</td>
<td>Poe Road (temp)</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Gilroy Array #2</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Gilroy Array #3</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Saratoga-Aloha Ave</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Saratoga-W Valley Coll.</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>Cape Mendocino</td>
<td>Cape Mendocino</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>Cape Mendocino</td>
<td>Petrolia</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Jensen Filter Plant Generator</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1013</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>LA Dam</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1044</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Newhall-Fire Sta</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1045</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Newhall-W Pico Canyon Rd.</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Pacoima Dam (downstr)</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1051</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Pacoima Dam (upper left)</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1063</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Rinaldi Receiving Sta</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1084</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Sylmar-Converter Sta</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1085</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Sylmar-Converter Sta East</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1086</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Sylmar-Olive View Med FF</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1602</td>
<td>Duzce, Turkey</td>
<td>Bolu</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1605</td>
<td>Duzce, Turkey</td>
<td>Duzce</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Gazli, USSR</td>
<td>Karakyr</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>Chihuahua</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>Superstition Hills-02</td>
<td>Superstition Mtn Camera</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>BRAN</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Joshua Tree</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Canoga Park-Topanga Can</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Canyon Country-W Lost Cany</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1004</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>LA-Sepulveda VA Hospital</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1048</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Northridge-17645 Saticoy St</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1052</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Pacoima Kagel Canyon</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1080</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Simi Valley-Katherine Rd</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1111</td>
<td>Kobe, Japan</td>
<td>Nishi-Akashi</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record Number</td>
<td>NGA Record Sequence Number</td>
<td>Earthquake Name</td>
<td>Station</td>
<td>Magnitude</td>
<td>Scaling Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Array #10</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Array #11</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Array #4</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>Holtville Post Office</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>Irpinia, Italy-01</td>
<td>Sturno</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Gilroy-Gavilan Coll.</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Gilroy-Historic Bldg.</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Gilroy Array #1</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>EC County Center FF</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Differential FF</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Gilroy Array #2</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Gilroy Array #3</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Saratoga-Aloha Ave</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Saratoga-W Valley Coll.</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>Cape Mendocino</td>
<td>Cape Mendocino</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>Cape Mendocino</td>
<td>Petrolia</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Jensen Filter Plant Generator</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1013</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>LA Dam</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1044</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Newhall-Fire Sta</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1045</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Newhall-W Pico Canyon Rd.</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Pacoima Dam (downstr)</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1051</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Pacoima Dam (upper left)</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1063</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Rinaldi Receiving Sta</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1084</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Sylmar-Converter Sta</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1085</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Sylmar-Converter Sta East</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1086</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Sylmar-Olive View Med FF</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1602</td>
<td>Duzce, Turkey</td>
<td>Bolu</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1605</td>
<td>Duzce, Turkey</td>
<td>Duzce</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Gazli, USSR</td>
<td>Karakyr</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>Chihuahua</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>Superstition Hills-02</td>
<td>Superstition Mtn Camera</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>BRAN</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Joshua Tree</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Canoga Park-Topanga Can</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Canyon Country-W Lost Cany</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1004</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>LA-Sepulveda VA Hospital</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1048</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Northridge-17645 Saticoy St</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1052</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Pacoima Kagel Canyon</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1080</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Simi Valley-Katherine Rd</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1111</td>
<td>Kobe, Japan</td>
<td>Nishi-Akashi</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table F.6 Documentation of 40 GMs of CMS procedure for Bridge A with Type I abutment modeling.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Record Number</th>
<th>NGA Record Sequence Number</th>
<th>Earthquake Name</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>Scaling Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1111</td>
<td>Kobe, Japan</td>
<td>Nishi-Akashi</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>ILA067</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1425</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TAP032</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Anderson Dam (Downstream)</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1317</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>ILA013</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Dumbarton Bridge West End</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Hollister-South &amp; Pine</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>Cape Mendocino</td>
<td>Rio Dell Overpass-FF</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>Superstition Hills-02</td>
<td>El Centro Imp. Co. Cent</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Yermo Fire Station</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>881</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Morongo Valley</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1084</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Sylmar-Converter Sta</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1508</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU072</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Hollister Diff. Array</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>N. Palm Springs</td>
<td>Morongo Valley</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1490</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU050</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1521</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU089</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1155</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>Bursa Tofas</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1202</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY035</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1504</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU067</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1529</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU102</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1234</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY086</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1187</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY015</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1198</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY029</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1506</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU070</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1493</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU053</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>Coalinga-01</td>
<td>Parkfield-Fault Zone 4</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1227</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY074</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>EC Meloland Overpass FF</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Jensen Filter Plant Generator</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>Superstition Hills-02</td>
<td>Wildlife Liquef. Array</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Treasure Island</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1550</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU136</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1203</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY036</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1045</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Newhall-W Pico Canyon Rd.</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>EC County Center FF</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU061</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>Agrarias</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1456</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TAP095</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table F.7 Documentation of 40 GMs of CMS procedure for Bridge A with Type II abutment modeling.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Record Number</th>
<th>NGA Record Sequence Number</th>
<th>Earthquake Name</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>Scaling Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>Coalinga-01</td>
<td>Parkfield-Fault Zone 12</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1087</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Tarzana-Cedar Hill A</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1184</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY010</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1317</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>ILA013</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1221</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY065</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1234</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY086</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Joshua Tree</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>Superstition Hills-02</td>
<td>El Centro Imp. Co. Cent</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Treasure Island</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Hollister-South &amp; Pine</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1787</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>Hector</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Hollister Diff. Array</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Differential Array</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1227</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY074</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1456</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TAP095</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>Coalinga-01</td>
<td>Parkfield-Fault Zone 3</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1515</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU082</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1509</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU074</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1160</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>Fatih</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>Westmorland</td>
<td>Parachute Test Site</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1493</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU053</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>LGPC</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1063</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Rinaldi Receiving Sta</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1519</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU087</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1158</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>Duzce</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1491</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU051</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1506</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU070</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1187</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY015</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1536</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU110</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1198</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY029</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1202</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY035</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1504</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU067</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1770</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>Big Bear Lake-Fire Station</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1508</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU072</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Array #8</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>N. Palm Springs</td>
<td>Morongo Valley</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1484</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU042</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>EC County Center FF</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1541</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU116</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table F.8 Documentation of 40 GMs of US procedure for Bridge A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Record Number</th>
<th>NGA Record Sequence Number</th>
<th>Earthquake Name</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>Scaling Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1518</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU085</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1515</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU082</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1491</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU051</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1537</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU111</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1502</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU064</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1529</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU102</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>Parachute Test Site</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU054</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1476</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU029</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Array #5</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1496</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU056</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1492</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU052</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1086</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Sylmar-Olive View Med FF</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1148</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>Arcelik</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1508</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU072</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1493</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU053</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1489</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU049</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1488</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU048</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>Superstition Hills-02</td>
<td>Wildlife Liquef. Array</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1504</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU067</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>Superstition Hills-02</td>
<td>El Centro Imp. Co. Cent</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1490</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU050</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1787</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>Hector</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>Superstition Hills-02</td>
<td>Westmorland Fire Sta</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Array #1</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>Irpinia, Italy-01</td>
<td>Bagnoli Irpinio</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Yermo Fire Station</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1505</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU068</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1472</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU017</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1526</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU098</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1546</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU122</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1527</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU100</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Array #7</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Amboy</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1528</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU101</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Array #4</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1202</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY035</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1231</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY080</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1521</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU089</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table F.9 Documentation of 40 GMs of $S(T)$ procedure for Bridge B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Record Number</th>
<th>NGA Record Sequence Number</th>
<th>Earthquake Name</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>Scaling Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1084</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Sylmar-Converter Sta</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1063</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Rinaldi Receiving Sta</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1085</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Sylmar-Converter Sta East</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1044</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Newhall-Fire Sta</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Jensen Filter Plant Generator</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1602</td>
<td>Duzce, Turkey</td>
<td>Bolu</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1051</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Pacoima Dam (upper left)</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1045</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Newhall-W Pico Canyon Rd.</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Saratoga-W Valley Coll.</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1086</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Sylmar-Olive View Med FF</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>Cape Mendocino</td>
<td>Petrolia</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1013</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>LA Dam</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Array #4</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1605</td>
<td>Duzce, Turkey</td>
<td>Duzce</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>Cape Mendocino</td>
<td>Cape Mendocino</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Gilroy Array #2</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Saratoga-Aloha Ave</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Gilroy-Historic Bldg.</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Differential Array</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>EC County Center FF</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>Holtville Post Office</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>Irpinia, Italy-01</td>
<td>Surno</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1004</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>LA-Sepulveda VA Hospital</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Gazli, USSR</td>
<td>Karakyr</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Joshua Tree</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1080</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Simi Valley-Katherine Rd</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1048</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Northridge-17645 Saticoy St</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1787</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>Hector</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1082</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Sun Valley-Roscoe Blvd</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>Cape Mendocino</td>
<td>Rio Dell Overpass-FF</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>BRAN</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>Superstition Hills-02</td>
<td>Superstition Mtn Camera</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Canyon Country-W Lost Cany</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>Superstition Hills-02</td>
<td>Westmorland Fire Sta</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1052</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Pacoima Kagel Canyon</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>Superstition Hills-02</td>
<td>Poe Road (temp)</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Gilroy Array #4</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Arleta-Nordhoff Fire Sta</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1042</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>N Hollywood-Coldwater Can</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>Nahanni, Canada</td>
<td>Site 1</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table F.10 Documentation of 40 GMs of \( S_a(T_p) \) procedure for Bridge B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Record Number</th>
<th>NGA Record Sequence Number</th>
<th>Earthquake Name</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>Scaling Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1084</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Sylmar-Converter Sta</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1063</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Rinaldi Receiving Sta</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1085</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Sylmar-Converter Sta East</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1044</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Newhall-Fire Sta</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Jensen Filter Plant Generator</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1602</td>
<td>Duzce, Turkey</td>
<td>Bolu</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1051</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Pacoima Dam (upper left)</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1045</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Newhall-W Pico Canyon Rd.</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Saratoga-W Valley Coll.</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1086</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Sylmar-Olive View Med FF</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>Cape Mendocino</td>
<td>Petrolia</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1013</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>LA Dam</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Array #4</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1605</td>
<td>Duzce, Turkey</td>
<td>Duzce</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>Cape Mendocino</td>
<td>Cape Mendocino</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Gilroy Array #2</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Saratoga-Aloha Ave</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Gilroy-Historic Bldg.</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Differential Array</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>EC County Center FF</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>Holtville Post Office</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>Irpinia, Italy-01</td>
<td>Sturno</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1004</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>LA-Sepulveda VA Hospital</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Gazli, USSR</td>
<td>Karakyr</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Joshua Tree</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1080</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Simi Valley-Katherine Rd</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1048</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Northridge-17645 Saticoy St</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1787</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>Hector</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1082</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Sun Valley-Roscoe Blvd</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>Cape Mendocino</td>
<td>Rio Dell Overpass-FF</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>BRAN</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>Superstition Hills-02</td>
<td>Superstition Mtn Camera</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Canyon Country-W Lost Cany</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>Superstition Hills-02</td>
<td>Westmorland Fire Sta</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Array #10</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Gilroy Array #3</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Pacoima Dam (downstr)</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Array #11</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>Brawley Airport</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Gilroy Array #1</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>4.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table F.11 Documentation of 40 GMs of CMS procedure for Bridge B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Record Number</th>
<th>NGA Record Sequence Number</th>
<th>Earthquake Name</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>Scaling Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Canoga Park-Topanga Can</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1457</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TAP097</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>Superstition Hills-02</td>
<td>Wildlife Liquef. Array</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1410</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TAP003</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1045</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Newhall-W Pico Canyon Rd.</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Hollister-South &amp; Pine</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1454</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TAP090</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1198</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY029</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1555</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU147</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>Irpinia, Italy-01</td>
<td>Bagnoli Irpinio</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1425</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TAP032</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1334</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>ILA044</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Array #7</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>Superstition Hills-02</td>
<td>Parachute Test Site</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1418</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TAP014</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Golden Gate Bridge</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1515</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU082</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1530</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU103</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1286</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>HWA037</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1541</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU116</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU054</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1504</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU067</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1264</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>HWA013</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1529</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU102</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1503</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU065</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1537</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU111</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1547</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU123</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1492</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU052</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1536</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU110</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1147</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>Ambarli</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>N. Palm Springs</td>
<td>Morongo Valley</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Yermo Fire Station</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1550</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU136</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Joshua Tree</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1456</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TAP095</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>Superstition Hills-02</td>
<td>El Centro Imp. Co. Cent</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>2461</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03</td>
<td>CHY028</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1551</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU138</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1534</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU107</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1265</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>HWA014</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table F.12 Documentation of 40 GMs of US procedure for Bridge B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Record Number</th>
<th>NGA Record Sequence Number</th>
<th>Earthquake Name</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>Scaling Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2492</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03</td>
<td>CHY076</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1534</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU107</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1498</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU059</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1537</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU111</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1506</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU070</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1515</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU082</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1538</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU112</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1491</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU051</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1492</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU052</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU026</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1504</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU067</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1496</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU056</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1489</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU049</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1529</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU102</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>Superstition Hills-02</td>
<td>El Centro Imp. Co. Cent</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1490</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU050</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1546</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU122</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>Superstition Hills-02</td>
<td>Wildlife Liquef. Array</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU054</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1527</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU100</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Amboy</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1158</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>Duzce</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1202</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY035</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1508</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU072</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1501</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU063</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1493</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU053</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1482</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU039</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1505</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU068</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1528</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU101</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1176</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>Yarimca</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1148</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>Arcelik</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1084</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Sylmar-Converter Sta</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Array #4</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1555</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU147</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>Irpinia, Italy-01</td>
<td>Bagnoli Irpinio</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1436</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TAP052</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>WAHO</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1536</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU110</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1488</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU048</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table F.13 Documentation of 40 GMs of $S_T$ procedure for Bridge C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Record Number</th>
<th>NGA Record Sequence Number</th>
<th>Earthquake Name</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>Scaling Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1084</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Sylmar-Converter Sta</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1063</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Rinaldi Receiving Sta</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1085</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Sylmar-Converter Sta East</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1045</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Newhall-W Pico Canyon Rd.</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1086</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Sylmar-Olive View Med FF</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1044</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Newhall-Fire Sta</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Jensen Filter Plant Generator</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1605</td>
<td>Duzce, Turkey</td>
<td>Duzce</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Saratoga-W Valley Coll.</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1013</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>LA Dam</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Gilroy Array #2</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Array #4</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Saratoga-Aloha Ave</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>EC County Center FF</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>Cape Mendocino</td>
<td>Cape Mendocino</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Differential Array</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>Cape Mendocino</td>
<td>Petrolia</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1602</td>
<td>Duzce, Turkey</td>
<td>Bolu</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>Irpinia, Italy-01</td>
<td>Sturno</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1051</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Pacoima Dam (upper left)</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>EC Meloland Overpass FF</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Gilroy Array #3</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Gilroy-Historic Bldg.</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Array #11</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>Brawley Airport</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Gazli, USSR</td>
<td>Karakyr</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1048</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Northridge-17645 Saticoy St</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1004</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>LA-Sepulveda VA Hospital</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Canyon Country-W Lost Cany</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Gilroy Array #4</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1787</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>Hector</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Canoga Park-Topanga Can</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Joshua Tree</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1111</td>
<td>Kobe, Japan</td>
<td>Nishi-Akashi</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1080</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Simi Valley-Katherine Rd</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>Irpinia, Italy-01</td>
<td>Bagnoli Irpinio</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1052</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Pacoima Kagel Canyon</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>Superstition Hills-02</td>
<td>Westmorland Fire Sta</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>Cape Mendocino</td>
<td>Rio Dell Overpass-FF</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1082</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Sun Valley-Roscoe Blvd</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table F.14 Documentation of 40 GMs of $S_a(T_r)$ procedure for Bridge C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Record Number</th>
<th>NGA Record Sequence Number</th>
<th>Earthquake Name</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>Scaling Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1084</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Sylmar-Converter Sta</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1063</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Rinaldi Receiving Sta</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1085</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Sylmar-Converter Sta East</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1045</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Newhall-W Pico Canyon Rd.</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1086</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Sylmar-Olive View Med FF</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1044</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Newhall-Fire Sta</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Jensen Filter Plant Generator</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1605</td>
<td>Duzce, Turkey</td>
<td>Duzce</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Saratoga-W Valley Coll.</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1013</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>LA Dam</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Gilroy Array #2</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Array #4</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Saratoga-Aloha Ave</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>EC County Center FF</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>Cape Mendocino</td>
<td>Cape Mendocino</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Differential Array</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>Cape Mendocino</td>
<td>Petrolia</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1602</td>
<td>Duzce, Turkey</td>
<td>Bolu</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>Irpinia, Italy-01</td>
<td>Sturno</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1051</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Pacoima Dam (upper left)</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>EC Meloland Overpass FF</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Gilroy Array #3</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Gilroy-Historic Bldg.</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Array #11</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>Brawley Airport</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Gazli, USSR</td>
<td>Karakyr</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1048</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Northridge-17645 Saticoy St</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1004</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>LA-Sepulveda VA Hospital</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Canyon Country-W Lost Cany</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Gilroy Array #4</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1787</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>Hector</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Canoga Park-Topanga Can</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Joshua Tree</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1111</td>
<td>Kobe, Japan</td>
<td>Nishi-Akashi</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1080</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Simi Valley-Katherine Rd</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>Irpinia, Italy-01</td>
<td>Bagnoli Irpinio</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1052</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Pacoima Kagel Canyon</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>Holtville Post Office</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Pacoima Dam (downstr)</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Gilroy Array #1</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>4.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table F.15 Documentation of 40 GMs of CMS procedure for Bridge C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Record Number</th>
<th>NGA Record Sequence Number</th>
<th>Earthquake Name</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>Scaling Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1537</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU111</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1547</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU123</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1147</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>Ambarli</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1329</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>ILA037</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1262</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>HWA011</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1492</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU052</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1203</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY036</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1553</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU141</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1536</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU110</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1472</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU017</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>Westmorland</td>
<td>Parachute Test Site</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1182</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY006</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>Superstition Hills-02</td>
<td>El Centro Imp. Co. Cent</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1317</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>ILA013</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Array #10</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1187</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>CHY015</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1503</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU065</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1166</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>Iznik</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1264</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>HWA013</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2509</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-03</td>
<td>CHY104</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>Irpinia, Italy-01</td>
<td>Bagnoli Irpinio</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1504</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU067</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1534</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU107</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1509</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU074</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1084</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Sylmar-Converter Sta</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU054</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1419</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TAP017</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1529</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU102</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1515</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU082</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Yermo Fire Station</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1045</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Newhall-W Pico Canyon Rd.</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1787</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>Hector</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1410</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TAP003</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1316</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>ILA012</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>Treasure Island</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>Irpinia, Italy-01</td>
<td>Caliri</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1491</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU051</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>3317</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan-06</td>
<td>CHY101</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Joshua Tree</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table F.16 Documentation of 40 GMs of US procedure for Bridge C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Record Number</th>
<th>NGA Record Sequence Number</th>
<th>Earthquake Name</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Magnitude</th>
<th>Scaling Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2115</td>
<td>Denali, Alaska</td>
<td>TAPS Pump Station #11</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1436</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TAP052</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>Superstition Hills-02</td>
<td>Wildlife Liquef. Array</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1489</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU049</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1505</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU068</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>APEEL 2-Redwood City</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1491</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU051</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1490</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU050</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>Irpinia, Italy-01</td>
<td>Bagnoli Irpinio</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1787</td>
<td>Hector Mine</td>
<td>Hector</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU054</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1492</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU052</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1504</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU067</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1527</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU100</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1526</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU098</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1488</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU048</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1048</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Northridge-17645 Saticoy St</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>Loma Prieta</td>
<td>San Jose-Santa Teresa Hills</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU026</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1478</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU033</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1496</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU056</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>Landers</td>
<td>Amboy</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1472</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU017</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1515</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU082</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1503</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU065</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1546</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU122</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1482</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU039</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1529</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU102</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1045</td>
<td>Northridge-01</td>
<td>Newhall-W Pico Canyon Rd.</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1176</td>
<td>Kocaeli, Turkey</td>
<td>Yarimca</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1508</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU072</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1493</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU053</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1476</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU029</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1528</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU101</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Array #5</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>Cape Mendocino</td>
<td>Rio Dell Overpass-FF</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1499</td>
<td>Chi-Chi, Taiwan</td>
<td>TCU060</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>Imperial Valley-06</td>
<td>El Centro Array #4</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>Tabas, Iran</td>
<td>Dayhook</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>