

ATC-35-2

**Proceedings of
National Earthquake Ground Motion Mapping
Workshop**

**September 22-23, 1995
Los Angeles, California**

by

APPLIED TECHNOLOGY COUNCIL
555 Twin Dolphin Drive, Suite 550
Redwood City, California 94065

Funded by

U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY
Menlo Park, California
Cooperative Agreement 1434-A-1046

Cosponsored by

BUILDING SEISMIC SAFETY COUNCIL
Washington, DC
NATIONAL CENTER FOR EARTHQUAKE ENGINEERING RESEARCH
Buffalo, New York
STRUCTURAL ENGINEERS ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA
Sacramento, California

ORGANIZING COMMITTEE

Maurice Power, Co-Chairman
E. V. Leyendecker, Co-Chairman
James Beavers
Robert Backman
Roger Borchardt
Ian Buckle

Arthur Frankel
Thomas Holzer
Chris Poland
Allan Porush
Christopher Rojahn
Charles Thiel, Jr.

Preface

The National Earthquake Ground Motion Mapping Workshop, held in Los Angeles on September 22-23, 1995 was sponsored by the U.S. Geological Survey and conducted under the auspices of the ATC-35 Program to "Transfer U.S. Geological Survey Research Results into Engineering Design Practice." Co-sponsors were the Building Seismic Safety Council, the National Center for Earthquake Engineering Research, and the Structural Engineers Association of California.

The purpose of the Workshop was to provide input from the structural engineering design profession and the geosciences/geotechnical engineering professions to the U.S. Geological Survey on several key broad issues that affect the preparation and use of national earthquake ground motion maps. The input provided will help in the preparation of national ground motion maps that have a high degree of acceptance, thereby facilitating the use of the maps as a basis for seismic codes and other seismic engineering uses.

The Workshop provided the opportunity for introducing the ATC-35 Ground Motion Initiative, a longer-term effort to examine ground motion needs for a new generation of seismic design regulations and seismic design practice.

The following four key issues were the focus of the workshop:

- *Issue A: Parameters.* What ground motion parameter should be mapped?
- *Issue B: Reference site conditions.* What reference site conditions should be used as a basis for mapping?
- *Issue C: Risk Presentation.* Should maps be based on a probabilistic approach, a deterministic approach, or both?
- *Issue D: Modeling.* How should uncertainty in seismic source characterization and ground motion attenuation be incorporated in the mapping process and in the interpretation of results?

Four Working Groups were formed and met to consider these issues. In each Working Group, Advocacy papers were prepared on two sides of the issue. Using these Advocacy papers as a starting point, the Working Groups developed a position on their respective issues. At the Workshop itself, the Advocacy papers were presented by the authors, followed by a summary of the Working Group's findings, presented by the Chairman of that Group or his representative. The Workshop participants had an opportunity to discuss the issue and to accept, reject, or modify the Working Group's recommendations. Voting by written ballot was the mechanism for determining the Workshop's recommendations on each issue. There was also an opportunity for Workshop participants to provide input on other issues involved in preparing and documenting national ground-motion maps.

The Applied Technology Council gratefully acknowledges the many individuals who have contributed to the success of the Working Group meetings and the Workshop. The Workshop Organizing Committee provided overall guidance and direction for the 2-day Working Group meetings and the Workshop. These individuals are: Maurice Power (Project Director and Co-Chairman), E.V. Leyendecker (Co-Chair), Robert Bachman, James Beavers, Roger Borchardt, Ian Buckle Arthur Frankel, Thomas Holzer, Chris Poland, Allan Porush, Christopher Rojahn, and Charles Thiel. The affiliations of these individuals are provided in Appendix A. Members of the Working Groups and their affiliations are provided in Appendix B. Workshop participants and their affiliations are provided in Appendix C.

ATC also gratefully acknowledges the input, support, and cooperation provided by USGS Project Officer, Thomas Holzer.

Christopher Rojahn
Executive Director

Contents

: Preface	iii
: Contents	v
: List of Figures	ix
: List of Tables	xv
: Executive Summary	xvii
: Introduction	1
: Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations	5
Advocacy Paper No. 1: Linear-Elastic Response Spectral Values, <i>Charles Kircher</i>	9
1.1 Introduction	9
1.2 Background: USGS and BSSC Mapping Efforts	9
1.3 Maps of Other Ground- Motion Parameters.	9
1.3.1 Maps of the Probability of Exceeding a Specified Shaking Level	10
1.3.2 Maps of Earthquake Magnitude that Control Ground Shaking Hazard	10
1.3.3 Maps of Ground Shaking at Very Long Periods	10
1.3.4 Maps of GIS Data on CD ROMs - Internet Sites	10
1.4 Linear-Elastic (vs Nonlinear and/or Inelastic) Response Spectra - Pros and Cons	10
1.5 References	11
Advocacy Paper No. 2: The Need for Ground Motion Representations Beyond Elastic Response Spectral Values, <i>Helmut Krawinkler</i>	13
2.1 Introduction	13
2.2 The Design Process	14
2.3 Shortcomings of Elastic Response Spectra	15
2.4 Inelastic Spectra	15
2.4.1 Why are inelastic spectra needed?	15
2.4.2 How can inelastic spectra be obtained?	18
2.5 The Soft Soil Problem	18
2.5.1 What is the problem?	18
2.5.2 What can be done about the problem?	20
2.6 The Energy and Cumulative Damage Issue	21
2.7 Documentation of Representative Time History Records	23
2.8 Summary	25
2.9 References	25
Advocacy Paper No. 3: Rock Should be the Reference Condition, <i>Norman Abrahamson</i>	27
3.1 Introduction	27
3.2 Bandwidth	27
3.3 Site-Specific Response Studies	27

3.4	Current Practice and Regulations	28
3.5	Definition of Rock	28
3.6	Data Set Size	28
3.7	Building Stock	28
3.8	Conclusion	28
3.9	References	29
	Advocacy Paper No. 4: Soil is the Most Appropriate Reference Site Condition, <i>William Joyner</i>	33
4.1	Introduction	33
4.2	The Rock and Soil Data Sets	34
4.3	Variation of Velocity with Depth for Rock and Soil	35
4.4	Further Discussion	35
4.5	References	44
	Advocacy Paper No. 5: In Favor of “Scenario Ground Motions” Maps, <i>John Anderson</i>	45
5.1	Abstract	45
5.2	Introduction	45
5.3	Rules for Including Earthquakes on a “Scenario Ground Motion” Map	47
5.4	Map Development for Different Parts of the United States	47
5.4.1	Southwestern United States	49
5.4.2	Pacific Northwest	49
5.4.3	Eastern North America	49
5.5	Discussion	49
5.6	Summary	60
5.7	Acknowledgements	60
5.8	References	60
	Advocacy Paper No. 6: Map Probabilistically Derived Quantities, <i>Allen Cornell</i>	63
6.1	What is a Probabilistic Ground Motion Map?	63
6.2	What Information is a Probabilistically Defined Ground Motion based on?	64
6.3	Some Reasons to use Probabilistically Defined Design Ground Motions (and Hence to Map Them)	65
6.4	What is the Deterministic Method, Anyway?	66
6.5	Combined Methods	69
6.6	References	69
	Advocacy Paper No. 7: The Need for Detailed Uncertainty Treatment in Probabilistic Seismic Hazard Mapping, <i>Robert Youngs</i>	71
7.1	Summary	71
7.2	Introduction	71
7.3	Why Incorporate Uncertainty?	72
7.3.1	Scientific Acceptance	72
7.3.2	Engineering Design Practice	72
7.3.3	Identification of Significant Issues	72
7.3.4	Identification of Conservatism	72
7.3.5	Evaluations of Risk, Performance, and Loss	73
7.4	Necessary Extent of Uncertainty Modeling	73
7.5	References	76
7.6	Supplement to Advocacy Paper No. 7	77
7.7	Abstract	77
7.8	Introduction	78
7.9	Mathematical Formulation	78

7.10	Example Application	79
7.10.1	Seismic Hazard Model	80
7.10.2	Hazard Analysis	80
7.11	Conclusion	80
7.12	Acknowledgments	82
7.13	References	82
Advocacy Paper No. 8: Simplified Approach to Incorporating Uncertainty in the Ground		
	Motion Computation and Mapping Process, <i>Arthur Frankel</i>	85
8.1	Abstract	85
8.2	Introduction	85
8.3	Central and Eastern U.S.	86
8.3.1	Logic Tree	86
8.3.2	Overall Methodology	88
8.3.3	Hazard Calculation	90
8.3.4	Maps for Different Models	91
8.3.5	Comparison with EPRI Study	95
8.4	Western U.S.	97
8.4.1	Methodology and Logic Tree	97
8.4.2	Comparison with Geomatrix Study for S.F. Bay Bridge	101
8.5	Conclusions	102
8.6	Acknowledgments	104
8.7	References	104
:	Issues for Design Values for Buildings and Similar Structures and Lessons Learned from	
	BSSC Design Values Panel I, <i>Robert Bachman</i>	109
9.1	Introduction	109
9.2	Design Value Panel I	109
9.3	Seismic Hazard Mapping Engineering Issues	110
9.4	Conclusion	111
:	Building Seismic Safety Council Project 97, <i>Joe Hunt</i>	113
10.1	Introduction	113
10.2	Background of BSSC Project 97	113
10.3	Seismic Design Procedure Group	115
10.4	Structural Issues	116
10.5	Recommendations for Mapping Parameters	118
10.6	Development of Design Spectra	118
10.7	Development of Seismic Design Procedure	120
10.8	Conclusions	120
:	Ground Motion Issues and Design Values for Bridges, <i>Ian Buckle</i>	121
11.1	Background	121
11.2	AASHTO Seismic Design Specifications	121
11.3	Issues Related to Design values	122
11.3.1	Long-period spectral accelerations	122
11.3.2	Short-period spectral accelerations	122
11.3.3	Duration of shaking	123
11.3.4	Vertical ground motion	123
11.3.5	Near-field effects	123
11.3.6	Spatial variations in ground motions	124
11.3.7	Soil amplification factors	124

11.3.8	Return period for ground motions and dual-level performance considerations	124
11.3.9	Representation of orthogonal components of ground motion and directivity effects	125
11.4	Acknowledgments	125
11.5	References	125
Appendix A:	Workshop Organizing Committee	127
Appendix B:	Working Group Members	129
Appendix C:	Workshop Participants List	133
Appendix D:	Applied Technology Council Projects And Report Information	143