



Istituto Universitario
di Studi Superiori di Pavia



Università degli Studi di
Pavia

**EUROPEAN SCHOOL OF ADVANCED STUDIES IN
REDUCTION OF SEISMIC RISK**

ROSE SCHOOL

**RECORD SELECTION FOR NONLINEAR SEISMIC
ANALYSIS OF STRUCTURES**

**A Dissertation Submitted in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Master Degree in**

EARTHQUAKE ENGINEERING

By

Iunio Iervolino

**Advisor: C. Allin Cornell
Reviewer: David M. Boore**

MAY, 2004

The dissertation entitled “Record Selection for Nonlinear Seismic Analysis of Structures”, by Iunio Iervolino, has been approved in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the Master Degree in Earthquake Engineering.

C. Allin Cornell

David M. Boore

Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Index of Figures | 4 |
| Index of Tables | 4 |
| Credits | 9 |
| Abstract | 10 |
| 1 Motivation and framework | 12 |
| 2 Classes and Records | 16 |
| 2.1 Class of target sets | 16 |
| 2.2 Class of arbitrary sets | 19 |
| 3 Design of analyses and case studies | 22 |
| 3.1 Single Degree of Freedom Systems | 22 |
| 3.2 Multiple Degree of Freedom Systems | 24 |
| 4 Analyses | 28 |
| 5 Results and Discussion | 34 |
| 6 The Scaling Issue | 52 |
| 7 Scaling Issue Results | 58 |
| 8 Summary of Conclusions | 72 |
| References | 74 |
| Appendix 1 | 77 |
| Appendix 2 | 80 |
| Appendix 3 | 82 |

Index of Figures

| | |
|---|----|
| Figure 1. Moment magnitude histograms for the T sets. | 18 |
| Figure 2. Closest distance to rupture histograms for the T sets. | 18 |
| Figure 3. Target set representation in terms of magnitude and distance. | 19 |
| Figure 4. Moment magnitude histograms for the A sets. | 20 |
| Figure 5. Closest distance to rupture histograms for the A sets. | 21 |
| Figure 6. Arbitrary and Target sets comparison in terms of magnitude and distance. | 21 |
| Figure 7. SDOF bilinear hysteresis. | 21 |
| Figure 8. SDOF strength-degrading trilinear hysteresis. | 23 |
| Figure 9. Van Nuys Holiday Inn plan and transverse elevation. | 25 |
| Figure 10. SAC LA-9 Story elevation and plan. | 26 |
| Figure 11. Cloud and striping of a target set to the median S_a . Note the similarity of the two drift medians and the smaller dispersion (proportional to horizontal bar size) in the stripe. | 29 |
| Figure 12. An arbitrary set and a target set striped to the same S_a (median of target sets). Note the similarity of the two drift medians and comparable dispersion. | 29 |
| Figure 13. Target sets elastic spectra. | 44 |
| Figure 14. Arbitrary sets elastic spectra. | 45 |
| Figure 15. Arbitrary and Target sets elastic spectra medians. | 46 |
| Figure 16. Drift medians ratio plots for $T = 1.5$ sec – ductility 2 SDOF. | 47 |
| Figure 17. Drift medians ratio plots for $T = 1.5$ sec – ductility 6 SDOF. | 47 |
| Figure 18. Drift medians ratio plots for $T = 1.5$ sec tril. - ductility 6 SDOF. | 48 |
| Figure 19. Drift medians ratio plots for $T = 1.5$ sec tril. - ductility 2 SDOF. | 48 |
| Figure 20. Drift medians ratio plots for $T = 0.1$ sec - ductility 6 SDOF. | 49 |

Figure 21. Drift medians ratio plots for $T = 0.1$ sec - ductility 2 SDOF.49

Figure 22. Drift medians ratio plots for $T = 4$ sec - ductility 6 SDOF.50

Figure 23. Drift medians ratio plots for $T = 4$ sec - ductility 2 SDOF.50

Figure 24. Drift medians ratio plots for Van Nuys MDOF.....51

Figure 25. Drift medians ratio plots for SAC LA-9 MDOF.51

Figure 26. Moment magnitude histograms for the NT1 set.....55

Figure 27. Closest distance to rupture histograms for the NT1 set.....55

Figure 28. Moment magnitude histograms for the NT2 set.....56

Figure 29. Closest distance to rupture histograms for the NT1 set.....56

Figure 30. Arbitrary set representation in terms of magnitude and distance.57

Figure 31. NT1 elastic spectra.63

Figure 32. NT2 elastic spectra.64

Figure 33. NT1, NT2 and Arbitrary sets elastic spectra medians.....65

Figure 34. Scaling drift medians ratio plots for $T = 1.5$ sec - ductility 2 SDOF.66

Figure 35. Scaling drift medians ratio plots for $T = 1.5$ sec - ductility 6. SDOF.66

Figure 36. Scaling drift medians ratio plots for $T = 1.5$ sec tril. - ductility 6 SDOF...67

Figure 37. Scaling drift medians ratio plots for $T = 1.5$ sec tril. - ductility 2 SDOF...67

Figure 38. Scaling drift medians ratio plots for $T = 0.1$ sec - ductility 6 SDOF.68

Figure 39. Scaling drift medians ratio plots for $T = 0.1$ sec - ductility 2 SDOF.68

Figure 40. Scaling drift medians ratio plots for $T = 4$ sec - ductility 6 SDOF.69

Figure 41. Scaling drift medians ratio plots for $T = 4$ sec - ductility 2 SDOF.69

Figure 42. Scaling drift medians ratio plots for $T = 0.85$ sec - ductility 6 SDOF.70

Figure 43. Scaling drift medians ratio plots for $T = 0.85$ sec - ductility 2 SDOF.70

Figure 44. Scaling drift medians ratio plots for SAC LA-9 MDOF.....71

Index of Tables

| | |
|---|----|
| Table 1. SDOF cases..... | 24 |
| Table 2. Ratio of medians drifts and standard errors in the target sets for the T = 1.5 sec Bilinear SDOF..... | 32 |
| Table 3. Ratio of medians drifts and standard errors in the target sets for the T = 1.5 sec Trilinear SDOF..... | 32 |
| Table 4. Ratio of medians drifts and standard errors in the target sets for the T = 0.1sec Bilinear SDOF..... | 32 |
| Table 5. Ratio of medians drifts and standard errors in the target sets for the T = 4 sec Bilinear SDOF. | 33 |
| Table 6. Ratio of medians drifts and standard errors for the T = 1.5 sec Bilinear SDOF. (Bold implies that the hypothesis test of equality is rejected at the 6% significance level.) | 37 |
| Table 7. Ratio of medians drifts and standard errors for the T = 1.5 sec Trilinear SDOF. | 38 |
| Table 8. Ratio of medians drifts and standard errors for the T = 0.1 sec Bilinear SDOF. | 39 |
| Table 9. Ratio of medians drifts and standard errors for the T = 4 sec Bilinear SDOF. | 39 |
| Table 10. Ratio of medians drifts and standard errors for the Van Nuys and SAC MDOF systems. | 40 |
| Table 11. SDOF systems results summary. | 41 |
| Table 12. SDOF scaling factors between the Arbitrary Sets and the original Target Sets..... | 52 |

| | |
|---|----|
| Table 13. SDOF Scaling Factors between the Arbitrary Sets and the New Target Sets. | 57 |
| Table 14. Ratio of medians drifts and standard errors for the T = 1.5 sec Bilinear SDOF. | 59 |
| Table 15. Ratio of medians drifts and standard errors for the T = 1.5 sec Trilinear SDOF. | 59 |
| Table 16. Ratio of medians drifts and standard errors for the T = 0.1 sec Bilinear SDOF. | 60 |
| Table 17. Ratio of medians drifts and standard errors for the T = 4 sec Bilinear SDOF. | 60 |
| Table 18. Ratio of medians drifts and standard errors for the T = 0.85 sec Bilinear SDOF. | 61 |
| Table 19. Ratio of medians drifts and standard errors for the SAC LA-9 MDOF. | 61 |
| Table 20. SDOF T = 1.5 sec bilinear log (z)/β results. | 77 |
| Table 21. SDOF T = 1.5 sec trilinear log (z)/β results. | 77 |
| Table 22. SDOF T = 0.1 sec bilinear log (z)/β results. | 77 |
| Table 23. SDOF T = 4 sec bilinear log (z)/β results. | 78 |
| Table 24. Van Nuys and SAC MDOF log (z)/β results. | 78 |
| Table 25. SDOF T = 1.5 sec (bilinear)..... | 80 |
| Table 26. SDOF T = 1.5 sec (trilinear)..... | 80 |
| Table 27. SDOF T = 0.1 sec..... | 80 |
| Table 28. SDOF T = 4 sec..... | 80 |
| Table 29. SDOF T = 0.85 sec..... | 81 |
| Table 30. SAC sec..... | 81 |
| Table 31. Records used in the Target sets..... | 82 |

Table 32. Record used in the Arbitrary sets.....84
Table 33. Record used in the scaling Target sets.....88

Credits

May 11, 2004 - Stanford, California

If a couple of years ago someone would ask me what I really wish to do during my M.Sc. and Ph.D. programs I could only respond that my desire was to work with Professor C. Allin Cornell “the” master of earthquake engineering, but immediately after I would resignedly add that I knew it was never going to happen. Now I’m visiting researcher at Stanford University since January 2003 and my cooperation with Allin and his team is going beyond the study presented in this thesis...frankly, I never thought it could go this far.

Then, my gratitude goes to my advisor for all he taught me and what he’s going to in the future. I also gratefully acknowledge Professor Gian Michele Calvi and the board of ROSE School for giving me the opportunity of achieving the Master degree by taking spot courses conciliating my Ph.D. program schedule at University of Naples Federico II. Nonetheless I thank David M. Boore being the referee for this thesis strongly improving the significance and accuracy of it.

However, I can’t forget that I firstly am greatly in debt with Professors Gaetano Manfredi and Edoardo Cosenza whom continue providing me incomparable and (almost) unconditioned support ever since I was a Management Engineering undergrad.

I also want to mention Alessandro, Ana, Chiara, Giorgio, Maria, Sandra and Simone each of those, for different reasons, is making me unexpectedly missing staying in Pavia.

Iunio

Abstract

This thesis presents a determinedly transparent study of the question of selection and scaling of accelerograms for predicting the non-linear dynamic response of a structure at a specific site. The preferred current practice is to select carefully records that reflect the expected magnitude, distance and other characteristics of the source of the events that are in some sense most likely to threaten the structure. The records are then typically scaled to some common representative level. Neither aspect of this process, neither selection nor scaling, has received significant research attention to ascertain their effects on the conclusions. This paper approaches these subjects inversely; it hypothesizes that neither the usual principal seismological characteristics nor scaling of records matters to the nonlinear response of structures. It then investigates under what conditions this hypothesis may not be sustainable. The study deals with *ordinary records*; softer soil site and specific near-fault effects, such as directivity-induced pulses, both of which may cause narrow-band response spectra are carefully avoided. Nonlinear analysis case studies consider different periods, backbones, ductility levels and structural types. Two classes of records sets are compared in each case: one class carefully chosen to represent a specific magnitude and distance scenario (a “target set”), and another class chosen randomly from a large catalogue (an “arbitrary set”) and scaled to match the target set in general amplitude. Results of time-history analyses are formally compared by a simple statistical hypothesis test to assess the difference, if any, between non-linear demands of the two classes of records. The effect of the degree of scaling (by first-mode spectral acceleration level) is investigated in the same way. Results here show little evidence to support the need for careful site-specific process of record selection and that

concern over scenario-to-scenario record scaling, at least within the limits tested, may not be justified. This study does not explain the role of systematic spectral shape deviations, such as those due to: soft soil, directivity, or scenarios calling for non-median ground motions.

1 Motivation and framework

The study is aimed at improving the bases for guidelines for earthquake engineering practice in terms of: (1) characteristic that should be taken into account in accelerograms selection; (2) scaling of records in order to get scenario (target) intensity; (3) sufficient size of record sets. Moreover it will also shed light on other issues such as structural period and/or backbone sensitivity.

The current state of best practice (e.g., NRC 2001) in selecting accelerograms for assessing the nonlinear demand of structures is based on first disaggregating (McGuire 1995), by causative magnitude and distance (M and R), the site's probabilistic seismic hazard analysis (PSHA) for the level of spectral acceleration (at a period near that of the first mode of the structure) at a specified probability (say a 2% chance of exceedance in 50 years). The records are then chosen to match within tolerable limits the mean or modal value of the M and R, i.e., the expected value or most likely value of these characteristics given that exceedance. The records may also be selected for the expected style of faulting type and soil type, but we shall focus on M and R. Finally the records are usually scaled to match in some average way the uniform hazard spectrum (UHS) or, it is often recommended, precisely to the UHS level at a period near that of the first period of the structure (Shome et al., 1998). Several observations can be made about this procedure. For example, it is an unstated but implicit assumption that all this care is taken about the selected records' earthquake properties (e.g., M and R) because they (may) matter to linear or nonlinear response. But little information on this effect is available by earthquake engineers to pass on the seismologist responsible for the selection. Lack of knowledge of the influence of seismological parameters on the structural response has driven the

seismologists to be prudent and assume that all features (magnitude, faulting style, etc.) matter to structural response and so they do their best to provide records accordingly.

The question of “how best to select records?” is equivalent to asking “what earthquake parameters we have to try to match when selecting the records?” The concept of parsimony in engineering practice implies that the easiest way to try to answer this question is by first assuming that “it doesn’t matter”, which is equivalent to saying that the choice of records is a non-issue. Then, whether and under what conditions this assumption cannot be sustained is evaluated by a large number of examples and cases studies. In this framework several structural types are considered belonging to both single-degree-of-freedom (SDOF) and multi-degree-of-freedom (MDOF) systems. SDOF systems are chosen to vary across a range of periods, backbones, and target ductilities. The MDOF systems belong to moderate period structures and have been chosen to represent quite different structural configurations. They include older reinforced concrete structures and steel moment resisting frames with brittle connections. In today’s practice such older structures are more likely to be subjected to nonlinear dynamic analyses than those under design.

The following procedure is used to test the importance of considering M and R when selecting records. First, a “target” group of sets is selected from a narrow magnitude-distance (M-R scenario) bin of available records. Then size-ten samples of target sets are selected, each has two sub sets representing the two horizontal components, yielding six samples of target sets of size ten. The target sets scenario is a comparatively high M small R one. To minimize potential directivity effects all values of R are greater than 15 km.

For each structure considered these records in the sample target sets are scaled to their overall median spectral acceleration at the first-mode period. This intra-bin scaling has been shown to be a good practice with respect to reducing the variance of the results of nonlinear analyses without introducing bias (Shome et al. 1998). The reduced variance increases the power of the statistical test to follow.

Second, another group of records referred to as “arbitrary sets”, is considered. As will be discussed in more detail below, these arbitrary sets are characterized by having been chosen (almost) at random with respect to the same features, M and R , which were carefully considered in the target sets. Five size ten samples are selected, the two horizontal components yielding a total of ten arbitrary samples. The arbitrary sets are also scaled to the common median first-mode period spectral acceleration of the target sets in order to mimic how any selected set of records might be scaled to the design target response spectrum.

Third, the structure in question is subjected to a nonlinear dynamic analysis under each of many records. Median responses are estimated for all six plus ten (16) record sets. The median of each of the arbitrary sets is compared with each of the target sets (six times ten or 60 comparisons). The comparison of medians is statistical and performed by a conventional hypothesis test (Benjamin and Cornell 1970). Consistently with the assumption that “record selection doesn’t matter”, the null hypothesis is that the ration of arbitrary-set median response to target-set median response is unity.

The question of the effect of scaling proposed record sets (such as one of these arbitrary sets) to the desired level (e.g., that of the median of the target sets here) was addressed next. The ten arbitrary sets did not require interesting degrees of scaling to reach the median of the six targets above. Therefore another group of stronger target

sets was constructed for this phase of the study. These were selected from records obtained within 15 km. As described below; care was taken to avoid records with significant directivity effects. In all other respects the same three steps above were repeated. The null hypothesis is, again, that such scaling “does not matter” (i.e., that median response to scale an arbitrary set is the same as that of the target sets).

2 Classes and Records

All the records used came from the Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center (PEER) database (<http://peer.berkeley.edu/smcat/>), ensuring uniform processing. However all the accelerograms in both of the groups of sets have been selected with some boundary conditions in order to better reduce the influence of those factor that are not in the objective of the study. In particular only California events have been considered, recorded on NEHRP C-D soil class and coming from free field or one-story building instrument housing. These features make the records definable as ordinary, avoiding site and housing response effects. Moreover for addressing the selection issue the records belong to the *far field* (defined here as closest distance to rupture) greater than 15 km in order to better avoid directivity pulse-type effects. Other features such as hanging/foot wall and fault mechanism are permitted vary among the record sets considered as they do not cause systematic peaks in the spectra. Next we address how the various record sets were selected from the “reduced” catalogue defined above.

2.1 CLASS OF TARGET SETS

The target sets for the record selection study are designed to be representative of a specific scenario event (M and R) that might be the realistic threat at a particular site, here a moment magnitude 7 at 20 km, defined as closest distance to fault rupture. This target event was chosen to be as large and close as feasible given the wish to have several samples of the target sets and given the limited number of large magnitude, close records in the catalogue. (The records must also respect the general selection criteria presented just above.) In order to best represent what might occur in the future

and to reduce correlation due to event commonality or “overlap”, it is desirable to have the ten records in each set come from ten different events. This requirement conflicts with the desire to have a large target magnitude and to sample events close to the target in magnitude. The compromise was to use five events and two records per event. This decision led to five events with magnitude range 6.7 to 7.4 (Fig. 1 and 3). Starting from this point six different sets of ten records each have been arranged such that almost all the records are in a distance range narrow as possible about the 20 km target (Fig. 2). The sample size of ten events in each set has been chosen because ten is the order of magnitude of size used in recommended earthquake engineering practice (which is typically as small as three to seven). (The total, or pooled, set of all records will also be considered but the breakdown into sets of a more conventional size is considered more representative and hence more instructive and transparent.) Further no two target sets have more than one record in common out of the ten; complete independence was not feasible because not all five events had the necessary twelve records within or near the distance range. These selection limitations on events and records are designed to make the sets as nearly independent as possible given the limited number of records available.

The records in the target sets are named: T1a, T1b, T2a, T2b, T3a and T3b. Sets with a common number such as T1a and T1b contain components from precisely the same ten three-component recordings. The “a” and “b” refer to the fact one horizontal component is used in “a” and the other in “b”. In Appendix 3 records in the target sets, are listed (Table 31); so that all target sets can be easily retrieved in the PEER on-line database.




Figure 1. Moment magnitude histograms for the T sets.




Figure 2. Closest distance to rupture histograms for the T sets.




Figure 3. Target set representation in terms of magnitude and distance.

2.2 CLASS OF ARBITRARY SETS

These sets were chosen effectively randomly from the catalog without regard to magnitude or distance subject only to the general constraints presented above (California, soil type and distance). The arbitrary sets are ten sets of ten records each¹. They come from California events in a comparatively wide range of moderate magnitudes ($6.4 < M < 7.4$) and distances ($15 < R < 50$ km) as shown in Fig. 4 and 5. (The single 6.3 was an anomaly.) The records in each set are chosen randomly (without replacement) first from the list of events, insuring ten different events in this case, and then from the available distances within a selected event - to the degree possible; because of limits on the number of recordings/distances in such event, it was necessary to have two records from one event in some cases in order to construct ten arbitrary sets. The upper bound is the limit of the catalogue; the lower bound of 6.4

¹ One of the A sets (A5) is actually made of 9 accelerograms since one of the chosen stations has only one recorded component; A5b is made only of 9 elements then.

was selected because it is a full magnitude unit below the upper value and because there are sufficient events and records in the catalogue that in practical application one need go no lower than this to have a large sample from which to select the relatively few records (three to ten) that are needed there.

The sets in the arbitrarily chosen group are named from A1a, A1b to A5a, A5b. The “a” and “b” apply as above. Records belonging to arbitrary sets are reported in Appendix 3 (Table 32). Comparison of Arbitrary and Target sets in terms of M and R is reported in Fig. 6.




Figure 4. Moment magnitude histograms for the A sets.




Figure 5. Closest distance to rupture histograms for the A sets.




Figure 6. Arbitrary and Target sets comparison in terms of magnitude and distance.

3 Design of analyses and case studies

To establish the validity of the (over) simply stated hypothesis that “does not matter how one selects records”, a series of structures have to be chosen. In order to make the conclusions of the study broad wide-ranging cases have been considered. The different structural features considered to be most meaningful to be investigated are: (1) first natural period; (2) force-deformation or hysteresis relationship; (3) target ductility; (4) number of degrees of freedom; (5) structural type (concrete or steel). For each of these factors a wide range has been considered in order to help establish the limits of acceptability of the hypothesis.

3.1 SINGLE DEGREE OF FREEDOM SYSTEMS

Three different periods SDOF systems have been considered, very short (0.1 sec) moderate (1.5 sec) and very long (4 sec), in order to investigate if conclusions reached to at moderate periods seem to hold at extreme periods. Most nonlinear SDOF system study is based on simple bilinear systems with a second stiffness equal to 3% of the first; see Fig.7 for a hysteresis rule example.

For each of the three periods two yield strengths are selected to give median ductility of approximately 2 and 6 under the target records. Viscous damping is always 5% of critical. For the most interesting, moderate period case ($T = 1.5$ sec case), a second trilinear backbone with a degrading strength branch (see Fig. 8) is considered, again with two strength levels. Table 1 summarizes the SDOF structural configurations analyzed under both the target and the arbitrary groups of sets.




Figure 7. SDOF bilinear hysteresis.




Figure 8. SDOF strength-degrading trilinear hysteresis.


Table 1. SDOF cases.

| Period | T = 1.5 sec | | | | T = 0.1 sec | | T = 4 sec | |
|-----------|-------------|---|-----------|---|-------------|---|-----------|---|
| | Bilinear | | Trilinear | | Bilinear | | Bilinear | |
| Ductility | 2 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 6 |

3.2 MULTIPLE DEGREE OF FREEDOM SYSTEMS

Both of the MDOF structural models are moment-resisting frames, one of reinforced concrete (RC) and one of steel. The former is an older, non-ductile RC building, in Van Nuys, California, studied as part of the PEER testbed program (Porter et al. 2002), while the other structure is the 9-story Los Angeles SAC steel building (Gupta and Krawinkler 1999) with brittle connections (Luco and Cornell 2000).

The reinforced concrete structure is modeled with strength degrading moment and shear behavior in the nonlinear range of the member-end hinges. The Van Nuys building is a 7-story, 66,000 sf (6,200 m²) hotel located in California's San Fernando Valley, northwest of downtown Los Angeles. The hotel was designed in 1965 according to the 1964 Los Angeles City Building Code, and built in 1966. In plan, the building is rectangular, 63 ft by 150 ft, 3 bays by 8 bays, 7 stories tall (see Fig. 9). The reinforcing steel lacks modern ductile detailing. Perimeter moment frames provide the primary lateral force resistance. A 2D model of the transverse frame has analyzed here by DRAIN2D software (Jalayer, 2002). Its transverse vibration has a dominant period of about 0.85 sec.



| RSB3 | RSB2 | RSB1 |
|-------|-------|-------|
| FSB3 | FSB2 | FSB1 |
| FSB3 | FSB2 | FSB1 |
| FSB3 | FSB2 | FSB1 |
| FSB3 | FSB2 | FSB1 |
| FSB3 | FSB2 | FSB1 |
| 2FSB3 | 2FSB2 | 2FSB1 |
| C7 | C8 | C9 |

Figure 9. Van Nuys Holiday Inn plan and transverse elevation.




Figure 10. SAC LA-9 Story elevation and plan.

The other analyzed MDOF is a 2D model of the SAC LA-9 frame. It is one of the structures considered as part of the SAC steel project, designed to the 1994 UBC code (Fig. 10). The nine-story benchmark structure is 45.73 m (150 ft) by 45.73 m (150 ft) in plan, and 37.19 m (122 ft) in elevation. The bays are 9.15 m (30 ft) on center, in both directions, with five bays each in the north-south (N-S) and east-west (E-W) directions. The first natural period of this building is between 1.5 and 2 sec corresponding to the moderate period SDOF already considered. The fracture of the “pre-Northridge” brittle connections is introduced into the DRAIN-2DX program using rotational spring elements at the ends of each elastic beam. The element was developed by Foutch and Shi (2002).

4 Analyses

The SDOF and MDOF cases presented have been analyzed with the groups of sets described as input. The considered response parameter is the peak-in-time drift for the single degree of freedom cases and the maximum interstory peak drift over all the stories for the MDOF cases. We shall refer to these as simply “drift” in what follows.

Each of the considered structural cases has been analyzed first by running the six different considered target sets as recorded, meaning without any scaling. For each structural model this produces a “cloud” of points (see Fig. 11) in the plane of drift, θ , versus first-mode spectral acceleration, S_a . The records belonging to the target sets have then been scaled to the median first-mode spectral acceleration of all the six target sets (estimated by the geometric mean) (Fig. 11). This second “stripe” scaling is not necessary, but it gives virtually the same median EDP (as shown by Shome, et al. 1998, and as confirmed here by these two steps). It also gives smaller dispersion and hence provides for stronger significance tests. The arbitrary sets have been analyzed in the same way. Finally, to permit the comparison of the target and the arbitrary sets, the records within the arbitrary sets have all been scaled to the median spectral acceleration of the targets sets (see Fig. 12). The medians of the response parameters (maximum drift) of the two different sets are next compared statistically for equality (or not).




Figure 11. Cloud and striping of a target set to the median Sa. Note the similarity of the two drift medians and the smaller dispersion (proportional to horizontal bar size) in the stripe.




Figure 12. An arbitrary set and a target set striped to the same Sa (median of target sets). Note the similarity of the two drift medians and comparable dispersion.

The hypothesis that it does not matter how one chooses records means that the results of the arbitrary sets scaled to the median spectral accelerations of the target should give virtually the same results in terms of the chosen response parameter. This equivalence for each structural case can be assessed by statistically testing the ratio of the estimated median of the drift results of each of the arbitrary sets A_{ij} ($i=1,2,\dots,5$; $j=a,b$) divided by the estimated to the median of the results of each of the target sets T_{ij} ($i=1,2,3$; $j=a,b$).

In the following relation the ratio of the estimated medians of the drift responses of arbitrary set, x , and target set, y , is defined as z :

$$z = \frac{\bar{\theta}_x}{\bar{\theta}_y} \quad (1)$$

In which $\bar{\theta}_x$ and $\bar{\theta}_y$ are respectively the estimated medians of set x and set y . Recall that the estimate, which is the geometric mean, is also equal to log base e raised to a power equal to the average of the natural logs of the drift.

The estimation of standard error of Z can be evaluated as:

$$\beta_z = \sqrt{\frac{\beta_x^2}{n_1} + \frac{\beta_y^2}{n_2}} \quad (2)$$

Where: n_1 and n_2 are the sample sizes of the particular arbitrary set and target set respectively; β_x and β_y are the standard deviations of the natural logarithms of the particular arbitrary set and target set respectively.

Under the assumption that the individual responses are lognormal (which has been reported by Shome et al. (1998) and others) the natural log of the ratio in (1) divided by β_z is distributed as a student-t with $(n_1 + n_2 - 2)$ degrees of freedom. This number

is typically 18 here. Statistically speaking the assumption being tested is that the medians of the probability distribution of the drift results are the same for both the target and the arbitrary sets. Or equivalently, that the means of the natural logs are equal. The Null Hypothesis, H_0 , of the test is:

$$H_0 : \text{median responses are equal}$$

To the acceptance of this hypothesis we can associate a statistical significance level, which corresponds to the risk of rejecting when it is in fact correct.

$$\text{Significance level} = P[\text{reject } H_0 / H_0 \text{ correct}] \quad (3)$$

Two significance levels have been considered in the present study; they correspond to the “1.5-sigma and 2-sigma” levels (here the “1.5- β and 2- β ” levels). For the two sided Student-t PDF with 18 degrees of freedom (DOF) these levels correspond to 0.152 and 0.0608 respectively (These values differ only slightly from those for the simple Gaussian distribution, which the t-distribution approaches for large DOF values). Therefore to test whether one can accept the hypothesis that a pair of target and arbitrary set medians are equal, he needs simply to calculate the natural log of their ratio ($\ln(z)$), to divide that by the estimated standard error, β_z , (Eq. 2) and to confirm whether that result is “close” to zero, where close means within ± 1.5 or ± 2.0 for the 15% and 6% significance levels respectively. For example, the upper left hand case in Table 2 (to follow) yields a ratio of 1.07 whose natural log is about 0.07; the standard error is about 0.14. The former divided by the latter is 0.48 (to two significant figures). This value is less than 1.5 (or 2.0), so the equality of medians hypothesis may be accepted at the 15% (and 6%) significance level. Note that if the ratio is close to unity, an approximate check is to compare simply the deviation from unity (1.07–1.0 or 0.07 in this example) with 1.5 (or 2.0) times β (0.21 or 0.28 in this

example). This is adequate in most cases here. Note that even if the hypothesis is true one would expect to reject it (incorrectly) in about 15% (or 6%) of the cases.

Finally before making the arbitrary to target set comparisons, the target sets have been compared to confirm that they are “equivalent”. This means that the target set responses have been statistically compared among themselves that the hypothesis of equality of medians has been accepted (see Tables 2 to 5).

Table 2. Ratio of medians drifts and standard errors in the target sets for the T = 1.5 sec Bilinear SDOF.

| | $\mu \approx 6$ | $\mu \approx 2$ | | $\mu \approx 6$ | $\mu \approx 2$ |
|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| T2a vs. T1a | 1.21 | 1.08 | T2b vs. T1b | 1.16 | 1.03 |
| | <i>0.18</i> | <i>0.10</i> | | <i>0.20</i> | <i>0.07</i> |
| T3a vs. T1a | 0.97 | 1.03 | T3b vs. T1b | 1.12 | 1.02 |
| | <i>0.16</i> | <i>0.11</i> | | <i>0.17</i> | <i>0.08</i> |
| T2a vs. T3a | 0.80 | 0.96 | T2b vs. T3b | 0.96 | 0.99 |
| | <i>0.19</i> | <i>0.10</i> | | <i>0.17</i> | <i>0.08</i> |

Table 3. Ratio of medians drifts and standard errors in the target sets for the T = 1.5 sec Trilinear SDOF.

| | $\mu \approx 6$ | $\mu \approx 2$ | | $\mu \approx 6$ | $\mu \approx 2$ |
|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| T2a vs. T1a | 1.25 | 1.06 | T2b vs. T1b | 0.71 | 0.88 |
| | <i>0.43</i> | <i>0.19</i> | | <i>0.39</i> | <i>0.18</i> |
| T3a vs. T1a | 0.74 | 0.97 | T3b vs. T1b | 0.93 | 0.90 |
| | <i>0.43</i> | <i>0.19</i> | | <i>0.48</i> | <i>0.18</i> |
| T2a vs. T3a | 0.59 | 0.91 | T2b vs. T3b | 1.31 | 1.03 |
| | <i>0.44</i> | <i>0.09</i> | | <i>0.41</i> | <i>0.19</i> |

Table 4. Ratio of medians drifts and standard errors in the target sets for the T = 0.1sec Bilinear SDOF.

| | $\mu \approx 6$ | $\mu \approx 2$ | | $\mu \approx 6$ | $\mu \approx 2$ |
|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| T2a vs. T1a | 1.36 | 1.04 | T2b vs. T1b | 1.13 | 1.11 |
| | <i>0.35</i> | <i>0.11</i> | | <i>0.34</i> | <i>0.21</i> |
| T3a vs. T1a | 1.42 | 1.16 | T3b vs. T1b | 1.04 | 1.06 |

| | | |
|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | <i>0.33</i> | <i>0.14</i> |
| T2a vs. T3a | 1.04 | 1.11 |
| | <i>0.31</i> | <i>0.13</i> |

| | | |
|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | <i>0.32</i> | <i>0.17</i> |
| T2b vs. T3b | 0.92 | 0.96 |
| | <i>0.31</i> | <i>0.20</i> |

Table 5. Ratio of medians drifts and standard errors in the target sets for the T = 4 sec Bilinear SDOF.

| | $\mu \approx 6$ | $\mu \approx 2$ |
|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| T2a vs. T1a | <u>1.35</u> | 1.13 |
| | <i>0.18</i> | <i>0.11</i> |
| T3a vs. T1a | 1.26 | 1.11 |
| | <i>0.17</i> | <i>0.10</i> |
| T2a vs. T3a | 0.93 | 0.98 |
| | <i>0.18</i> | <i>0.10</i> |

| | $\mu \approx 6$ | $\mu \approx 2$ |
|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| T2b vs. T1b | 1.24 | 1.09 |
| | <i>0.19</i> | <i>0.12</i> |
| T3b vs. T1b | 1.20 | 1.02 |
| | <i>0.17</i> | <i>0.08</i> |
| T2b vs. T3b | 0.96 | 0.94 |
| | <i>0.20</i> | <i>0.11</i> |

5 Results and Discussion

In the following tables, Tables 6 to 10, all the study case results are summarized. Each table shows a particular structural case; in each cell are the median ratios, z , for the correspondent sets and, below, the standard error estimation, β_z , (in italics). Those cases for which the null hypothesis is rejected at the 2- β or 6% significance level are shown in bold font. Those rejected at the 15% level are shown underlined. (For readers reference Absolute value of natural log of z divided by β_z is shown in Appendix 1 – Tables 20 to 14.)

For example, for the bilinear $T = 1.5$ sec, ductility 6 (Table 6) case with arbitrary set A5a and target set T3b, the ratio of the median of the arbitrary set responses to that of the target set is shown to be 0.69. It is statistically different from one because the log of 0.69 divided by 0.15 is -2.47 which is less than -2. Hence it is shown in bold. Note the ratio to its left is smaller (0.66) but the standard error estimation is larger (0.18) so in this test the medians are not different at the 6% level. (Although they are at 15% level.)

In the last column of each table the six target sets are pooled to create a single large target set ($n_1 = 52$ is the number of *distinct* records in the target sets) to compare to each of the arbitrary sets, while in the last row of each table the ten arbitrary sets are merged ($n_2 = 99$) and compared to each target set. Finally in the lower right hand corner of each table both the target set and the arbitrary sets are merged and compared. (Note standard errors smaller on edges).

Consider Table 6 for the moderate period bilinear SDOF system. Looking first at the pooled (large sample) results in the lower right hand corner of each half of the table, it is clear that the arbitrarily chosen records are indeed virtually

indistinguishable from those of the target scenario with respect to their impact on the nonlinear response of this oscillator. The observed ratios are virtually unity (0.99 and 1.00) with standard errors of 2 and 7% for ductility 2 and 6 respectively. The full table of 120 ratios gives, however, a better sense of what degree of confirmation one can expect from a professionally practical sample size. The observed ratios scatter either side of unity, ranging from as low as 0.66 to as high as 1.31, for the ductility 6 case. Typically they are within 20% of one for that case and within 10% for the ductility 2 case. The standard errors of estimation of the ratio are typically estimated to be about 0.1 for the ductility 2 case and 0.2 for the ductility 6 case. Note that both the numerators and the denominators of the ratios suffer from statistical variability. (It is worth noting that Eq. 2 implies that for this problem the individual (log) standard deviations, β_x and β_y , for an individual record are about $\sqrt{5}$ or 2.2 times the standard error of estimation of the small set ratios. Hence in this moderate-period case the individual record-to-record log standard deviations of the displacements are about +/- 40% for ductility 6 and +/- 20% for ductility 2.) None of the 60 ductility 2 cases and three of the 60 cases of ductility 6 have median ratios found to be statistically significantly different from one (at the 6% significance level implied by the $\pm 2\text{-}\beta$ bounds). This total of four is about 7% of the total 60 cases.

The other cases are similar. For example, the $T = 1.5$ trilinear case (with strength degradation; Table 7) and the 0.1 sec bilinear case (Table 8) both have only 2 of 60 ductility 6 sets that are statistically significant. The $T = 4$ sec case (Table 9) has 7 of 30 at ductility 6 and 4 of 30 at ductility 2. These fractions are somewhat different from the 6% fraction that might be expected if the hypothesis of unit ratio is in fact true, i.e., if the response results for the arbitrarily selected records are the same as those from the {Magnitude = 7, R = 20 km} target sets. Only the ductility 2 $T = 0.1$

sec case is statistically significant when pooled to the largest sample size. (Its test value is 2.00 based on a median ratio of 1.15 and β of 0.07.) Considering all former SDOF cases, six of the 16x4 or 64 or 9% of the pooled columns and rows suggest rejection. Study of the patterns within the tables shows that individual rows or columns (sets) tend to dominate. For example, all seven of the ductility 6 $T = 4$ sec rejected cases are associated with just two target sets T2a and T3a, suggesting that these two sets may be (randomly) “stronger” than typical. Yet three arbitrary sets, A5a, A5b, and A2b dominate the ductility 2 rejections, the latter two being “stronger”. These effects are reflected in the column and row pools. The large pooled set is not significantly different for one, however. Similar, weaker such effects are seen in the other cases. Notice, however, the “strong” or “weak” sets may not carry over from one ductility to another. In sum these patterns imply that the 60 small sample ratios are not fully independent on one another as they share common sets. Hence one unusual set in ten (or six) may cause multiple “failures” within the sixty cases.

The MDOF cases are both quite benign with only one significant case (at the 6% level), two pooled row cases, and a total sample median ratio very close to one in both cases.

Note that only one of the total of ten structural cases, the $T = 0.1$ bilinear SDOF case (Table 8), shows a large (pooled) sample ratio statistically different from one. Its ratio of 1.15 is just larger than twice its standard error of estimation of 0.07; further, for this 0.1 sec case, the small sample cases show only one arbitrary set (A3a) with a number of significant ratios in the ductility 2 case and just one target set (T1a) with several significant ratios in the ductility 6 case. Apparently arbitrary set A3a is unusually severe and target set T1a is unusually weak.

It should be noted that, relative to the moderate period bilinear case, the trilinear and 0.1 sec cases have large standard errors (caused by large record-to-record variability), while that of the 4 sec case is similar to the 1.5 sec bilinear SDOF case in respect to the size of the standard errors. The MDOF systems have standard errors similar to that of the ductility 6 1.5 sec bilinear SDOF case. While, even for the largest pooled sample sizes, the observed mean ratios of the trilinear and 0.1 second case are often quite different from unity (almost 20% in the ductility 6 cases), the important question is how different is the ratio relative to the standard error of estimation (less than 1.5 times that standard error in both examples cited). This observation demonstrates that one must keep this dispersion in mind when making judgments about such matters; the same sample size is much less informative about some systems than others.

Table 6. Ratio of medians drifts and standard errors for the T = 1.5 sec Bilinear SDOF. (Bold implies that the hypothesis test of equality is rejected at the 6% significance level.)

| $\mu \approx 6$ | T1a | T2a | T3a | T1b | T2b | T3b | T | $\mu \approx 2$ | T1a | T2a | T3a | T1b | T2b | T3b | T |
|-----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| A1a | 1.07 | 0.88 | 1.10 | 1.00 | 0.86 | 0.89 | 0.96 | A1a | 0.96 | 0.89 | 0.93 | 0.95 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 |
| | <i>0.14</i> | <i>0.17</i> | <i>0.15</i> | <i>0.17</i> | <i>0.16</i> | <i>0.13</i> | <i>0.10</i> | | <i>0.11</i> | <i>0.10</i> | <i>0.11</i> | <i>0.09</i> | <i>0.09</i> | <i>0.10</i> | <i>0.08</i> |
| A2a | 1.27 | 1.05 | 1.31 | 1.18 | 1.02 | 1.06 | 1.14 | A2a | 1.09 | 1.02 | 1.06 | 1.08 | 1.05 | 1.06 | 1.06 |
| | <i>0.18</i> | <i>0.21</i> | <i>0.19</i> | <i>0.21</i> | <i>0.20</i> | <i>0.18</i> | <i>0.16</i> | | <i>0.12</i> | <i>0.11</i> | <i>0.11</i> | <i>0.10</i> | <i>0.09</i> | <i>0.11</i> | <i>0.09</i> |
| A3a | 1.12 | 0.93 | 1.15 | 1.05 | 0.90 | 0.93 | 1.01 | A3a | 1.02 | 0.95 | 0.99 | 1.01 | 0.98 | 0.99 | 0.99 |
| | <i>0.16</i> | <i>0.18</i> | <i>0.17</i> | <i>0.18</i> | <i>0.18</i> | <i>0.15</i> | <i>0.12</i> | | <i>0.10</i> | <i>0.08</i> | <i>0.09</i> | <i>0.07</i> | <i>0.06</i> | <i>0.08</i> | <i>0.05</i> |
| A4a | 1.06 | 0.87 | 1.09 | 0.99 | 0.85 | 0.88 | 0.95 | A4a | 0.99 | 0.92 | 0.96 | 0.98 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 |
| | <i>0.15</i> | <i>0.17</i> | <i>0.16</i> | <i>0.18</i> | <i>0.17</i> | <i>0.14</i> | <i>0.11</i> | | <i>0.10</i> | <i>0.09</i> | <i>0.10</i> | <i>0.08</i> | <i>0.07</i> | <i>0.09</i> | <i>0.07</i> |
| A5a | 1.09 | 0.90 | 1.12 | 1.02 | 0.88 | 0.91 | 0.98 | A5a | 0.99 | 0.92 | 0.96 | 0.98 | 0.95 | 0.96 | 0.96 |
| | <i>0.16</i> | <i>0.18</i> | <i>0.17</i> | <i>0.18</i> | <i>0.18</i> | <i>0.15</i> | <i>0.12</i> | | <i>0.11</i> | <i>0.10</i> | <i>0.10</i> | <i>0.09</i> | <i>0.08</i> | <i>0.10</i> | <i>0.07</i> |
| A1b | 1.22 | 1.01 | 1.25 | 1.14 | 0.98 | 1.01 | 1.10 | A1b | 1.06 | 0.98 | 1.02 | 1.05 | 1.02 | 1.03 | 1.03 |
| | <i>0.15</i> | <i>0.18</i> | <i>0.17</i> | <i>0.18</i> | <i>0.18</i> | <i>0.15</i> | <i>0.12</i> | | <i>0.10</i> | <i>0.09</i> | <i>0.10</i> | <i>0.08</i> | <i>0.07</i> | <i>0.09</i> | <i>0.06</i> |
| A2b | 1.16 | 0.96 | 1.20 | 1.09 | 0.93 | 0.97 | 1.05 | A2b | 1.08 | 1.00 | 1.04 | 1.07 | 1.04 | 1.05 | 1.04 |
| | <i>0.23</i> | <i>0.25</i> | <i>0.24</i> | <i>0.25</i> | <i>0.25</i> | <i>0.23</i> | <i>0.21</i> | | <i>0.13</i> | <i>0.12</i> | <i>0.12</i> | <i>0.11</i> | <i>0.11</i> | <i>0.12</i> | <i>0.10</i> |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| A3b | 1.15 | 0.95 | 1.18 | 1.07 | 0.92 | 0.96 | 1.03 | A3b | 1.04 | 0.96 | 1.00 | 1.03 | 1.00 | 1.01 | 1.01 |
| | <i>0.17</i> | <i>0.19</i> | <i>0.18</i> | <i>0.19</i> | <i>0.19</i> | <i>0.17</i> | <i>0.14</i> | | <i>0.10</i> | <i>0.09</i> | <i>0.10</i> | <i>0.08</i> | <i>0.07</i> | <i>0.09</i> | <i>0.07</i> |
| A4b | 1.18 | 0.98 | 1.22 | 1.11 | 0.95 | 0.99 | 1.07 | A4b | 1.06 | 0.98 | 1.02 | 1.05 | 1.02 | 1.02 | 1.02 |
| | <i>0.16</i> | <i>0.18</i> | <i>0.17</i> | <i>0.18</i> | <i>0.18</i> | <i>0.15</i> | <i>0.13</i> | | <i>0.11</i> | <i>0.09</i> | <i>0.10</i> | <i>0.08</i> | <i>0.08</i> | <i>0.09</i> | <i>0.07</i> |
| A5b | 0.83 | 0.68 | 0.85 | 0.77 | 0.66 | 0.69 | 0.75 | A5b | 0.95 | 0.88 | 0.92 | 0.94 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| | <i>0.15</i> | <i>0.18</i> | <i>0.16</i> | <i>0.18</i> | <i>0.18</i> | <i>0.15</i> | <i>0.12</i> | | <i>0.10</i> | <i>0.09</i> | <i>0.10</i> | <i>0.08</i> | <i>0.08</i> | <i>0.09</i> | <i>0.07</i> |
| A | 1.11 | 0.92 | 1.14 | 1.04 | 0.89 | 0.93 | 1.00 | A | 1.02 | 0.95 | 0.99 | 1.01 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 |
| | <i>0.11</i> | <i>0.15</i> | <i>0.13</i> | <i>0.15</i> | <i>0.14</i> | <i>0.11</i> | <i>0.07</i> | | <i>0.09</i> | <i>0.07</i> | <i>0.08</i> | <i>0.06</i> | <i>0.05</i> | <i>0.07</i> | <i>0.02</i> |

Table 7. Ratio of medians drifts and standard errors for the T = 1.5 sec Trilinear SDOF.

| $\mu \approx 6$ | T1a | T2a | T3a | T1b | T2b | T3b | T | $\mu \approx 2$ | T1a | T2a | T3a | T1b | T2b | T3b | T |
|-----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| A1a | 0.72 | 0.57 | 0.97 | 0.57 | 0.80 | 0.61 | 0.69 | A1a | 1.02 | 0.96 | 1.06 | 0.93 | 1.06 | 1.03 | 1.01 |
| | <i>0.40</i> | <i>0.41</i> | <i>0.42</i> | <i>0.43</i> | <i>0.35</i> | <i>0.44</i> | <i>0.30</i> | | <i>0.21</i> | <i>0.12</i> | <i>0.12</i> | <i>0.16</i> | <i>0.17</i> | <i>0.16</i> | <i>0.11</i> |
| A2a | 1.93 | 1.54 | <u>2.60</u> | 1.53 | <u>2.16</u> | 1.65 | 1.87 | A2a | 1.26 | 1.19 | 1.30 | 1.15 | 1.31 | 1.28 | 1.25 |
| | <i>0.52</i> | <i>0.52</i> | <i>0.53</i> | <i>0.54</i> | <i>0.47</i> | <i>0.55</i> | <i>0.44</i> | | <i>0.26</i> | <i>0.19</i> | <i>0.19</i> | <i>0.22</i> | <i>0.23</i> | <i>0.22</i> | <i>0.19</i> |
| A3a | 1.21 | 0.97 | 1.63 | 0.96 | 1.35 | 1.03 | 1.17 | A3a | 1.10 | 1.04 | 1.14 | 1.00 | 1.15 | 1.12 | 1.09 |
| | <i>0.39</i> | <i>0.40</i> | <i>0.41</i> | <i>0.42</i> | <i>0.33</i> | <i>0.43</i> | <i>0.28</i> | | <i>0.23</i> | <i>0.15</i> | <i>0.15</i> | <i>0.18</i> | <i>0.19</i> | <i>0.19</i> | <i>0.14</i> |
| A4a | 1.01 | 0.80 | 1.36 | 0.80 | 1.13 | 0.86 | 0.97 | A4a | 1.02 | 0.96 | 1.05 | 0.93 | 1.06 | 1.03 | 1.01 |
| | <i>0.40</i> | <i>0.40</i> | <i>0.41</i> | <i>0.42</i> | <i>0.34</i> | <i>0.44</i> | <i>0.29</i> | | <i>0.23</i> | <i>0.15</i> | <i>0.15</i> | <i>0.18</i> | <i>0.19</i> | <i>0.19</i> | <i>0.14</i> |
| A5a | 1.32 | 1.05 | 1.78 | 1.05 | 1.47 | 1.13 | 1.27 | A5a | 1.09 | 1.02 | 1.12 | 0.99 | 1.13 | 1.10 | 1.08 |
| | <i>0.48</i> | <i>0.47</i> | <i>0.48</i> | <i>0.50</i> | <i>0.42</i> | <i>0.50</i> | <i>0.38</i> | | <i>0.21</i> | <i>0.12</i> | <i>0.12</i> | <i>0.16</i> | <i>0.17</i> | <i>0.17</i> | <i>0.12</i> |
| A1b | 0.86 | 0.69 | 1.16 | 0.68 | 0.96 | 0.73 | 0.83 | A1b | 1.05 | 0.99 | 1.09 | 0.96 | 1.09 | 1.06 | 1.04 |
| | <i>0.39</i> | <i>0.39</i> | <i>0.40</i> | <i>0.41</i> | <i>0.33</i> | <i>0.43</i> | <i>0.28</i> | | <i>0.20</i> | <i>0.10</i> | <i>0.10</i> | <i>0.15</i> | <i>0.16</i> | <i>0.15</i> | <i>0.09</i> |
| A2b | 1.35 | 1.08 | 1.83 | 1.08 | 1.52 | 1.16 | 1.31 | A2b | 1.35 | 1.28 | 1.40 | 1.23 | 1.41 | 1.37 | 1.34 |
| | <i>0.50</i> | <i>0.50</i> | <i>0.51</i> | <i>0.52</i> | <i>0.45</i> | <i>0.53</i> | <i>0.42</i> | | <i>0.32</i> | <i>0.27</i> | <i>0.27</i> | <i>0.29</i> | <i>0.30</i> | <i>0.29</i> | <i>0.27</i> |
| A3b | <u>1.99</u> | 1.59 | 2.68 | 1.58 | 2.22 | 1.70 | 1.92 | A3b | 0.95 | 0.90 | 0.98 | 0.87 | 0.99 | 0.97 | 0.94 |
| | <i>0.42</i> | <i>0.43</i> | <i>0.43</i> | <i>0.44</i> | <i>0.37</i> | <i>0.46</i> | <i>0.32</i> | | <i>0.21</i> | <i>0.12</i> | <i>0.12</i> | <i>0.16</i> | <i>0.17</i> | <i>0.16</i> | <i>0.11</i> |
| A4b | 1.51 | 1.21 | <u>2.04</u> | 1.20 | 1.69 | 1.29 | 1.46 | A4b | 1.00 | 0.94 | 1.03 | 0.91 | 1.04 | 1.01 | 0.99 |
| | <i>0.45</i> | <i>0.45</i> | <i>0.46</i> | <i>0.47</i> | <i>0.39</i> | <i>0.48</i> | <i>0.35</i> | | <i>0.22</i> | <i>0.14</i> | <i>0.14</i> | <i>0.18</i> | <i>0.19</i> | <i>0.18</i> | <i>0.14</i> |
| A5b | 1.02 | 0.81 | 1.37 | 0.81 | 1.14 | 0.87 | 0.98 | A5b | 0.92 | 0.86 | 0.95 | 0.83 | 0.95 | 0.93 | 0.91 |
| | <i>0.42</i> | <i>0.42</i> | <i>0.43</i> | <i>0.44</i> | <i>0.36</i> | <i>0.46</i> | <i>0.32</i> | | <i>0.23</i> | <i>0.16</i> | <i>0.16</i> | <i>0.19</i> | <i>0.20</i> | <i>0.19</i> | <i>0.15</i> |
| A | 1.23 | 0.98 | <u>1.66</u> | 0.98 | 1.38 | 0.76 | 1.19 | A | 1.07 | 1.01 | 1.11 | 0.98 | 1.11 | 0.87 | 1.06 |
| | <i>0.31</i> | <i>0.32</i> | <i>0.33</i> | <i>0.34</i> | <i>0.24</i> | <i>0.43</i> | <i>0.16</i> | | <i>0.19</i> | <i>0.08</i> | <i>0.07</i> | <i>0.13</i> | <i>0.15</i> | <i>0.28</i> | <i>0.07</i> |

Table 8. Ratio of medians drifts and standard errors for the T = 0.1 sec Bilinear SDOF.

| $\mu \approx 6$ | T1a | T2a | T3a | T1b | T2b | T3b | T | $\mu \approx 2$ | T1a | T2a | T3a | T1b | T2b | T3b | T |
|-----------------|-------------|------|------|------|------|------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|-------------|------|-------------|------|-------------|-------------|
| A1a | <u>2.04</u> | 1.50 | 1.44 | 1.42 | 1.26 | 1.37 | 1.49 | A1a | 1.23 | 1.18 | 1.07 | 1.20 | 1.08 | 1.13 | 1.15 |
| | 0.38 | 0.37 | 0.35 | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0.34 | 0.29 | | 0.17 | 0.16 | 0.18 | 0.19 | 0.22 | 0.18 | 0.15 |
| A2a | 1.38 | 1.02 | 0.97 | 0.96 | 0.85 | 0.93 | 1.01 | A2a | 1.14 | 1.09 | 0.98 | 1.11 | 1.00 | 1.04 | 1.06 |
| | 0.41 | 0.39 | 0.37 | 0.40 | 0.39 | 0.37 | 0.32 | | 0.13 | 0.13 | 0.15 | 0.16 | 0.20 | 0.15 | 0.11 |
| A3a | <u>2.21</u> | 1.62 | 1.55 | 1.54 | 1.36 | 1.48 | <u>1.61</u> | A3a | <u>1.62</u> | <u>1.55</u> | 1.40 | <u>1.58</u> | 1.42 | <u>1.48</u> | <u>1.51</u> |
| | 0.38 | 0.37 | 0.35 | 0.38 | 0.37 | 0.35 | 0.30 | | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.26 | 0.26 | 0.29 | 0.26 | 0.24 |
| A4a | 1.70 | 1.25 | 1.20 | 1.18 | 1.04 | 1.14 | 1.24 | A4a | <u>1.45</u> | <u>1.39</u> | 1.25 | 1.41 | 1.27 | 1.33 | 1.35 |
| | 0.43 | 0.41 | 0.40 | 0.42 | 0.41 | 0.39 | 0.35 | | 0.22 | 0.21 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 0.26 | 0.23 | 0.20 |
| A5a | 0.95 | 0.70 | 0.67 | 0.66 | 0.59 | 0.64 | 0.69 | A5a | 1.03 | 0.99 | 0.89 | 1.01 | 0.90 | 0.95 | 0.96 |
| | 0.39 | 0.38 | 0.36 | 0.38 | 0.38 | 0.35 | 0.29 | | 0.12 | 0.11 | 0.14 | 0.15 | 0.19 | 0.14 | 0.09 |
| A1b | <u>2.04</u> | 1.50 | 1.44 | 1.42 | 1.25 | 1.37 | 1.48 | A1b | <u>1.51</u> | 1.44 | 1.30 | 1.47 | 1.32 | 1.38 | 1.40 |
| | 0.42 | 0.41 | 0.39 | 0.42 | 0.41 | 0.39 | 0.35 | | 0.26 | 0.25 | 0.27 | 0.27 | 0.30 | 0.27 | 0.25 |
| A2b | 1.34 | 0.99 | 0.95 | 0.93 | 0.83 | 0.90 | 0.98 | A2b | 0.99 | 0.95 | 0.86 | 0.97 | 0.87 | 0.91 | 0.92 |
| | 0.39 | 0.38 | 0.36 | 0.38 | 0.37 | 0.35 | 0.31 | | 0.14 | 0.13 | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.20 | 0.16 | 0.12 |
| A3b | <u>2.21</u> | 1.62 | 1.56 | 1.53 | 1.35 | 1.48 | 1.60 | A3b | 1.39 | 1.34 | 1.20 | 1.36 | 1.22 | 1.28 | 1.30 |
| | 0.40 | 0.39 | 0.37 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.37 | 0.32 | | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.23 | 0.24 | 0.26 | 0.23 | 0.21 |
| A4b | <u>2.17</u> | 1.59 | 1.53 | 1.51 | 1.33 | 1.45 | <u>1.58</u> | A4b | 1.19 | 1.15 | 1.03 | 1.17 | 1.05 | 1.10 | 1.11 |
| | 0.36 | 0.34 | 0.32 | 0.35 | 0.34 | 0.31 | 0.26 | | 0.21 | 0.20 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.25 | 0.22 | 0.19 |
| A5b | 1.02 | 0.75 | 0.72 | 0.71 | 0.63 | 0.69 | 0.74 | A5b | 0.98 | 0.94 | 0.84 | 0.95 | 0.85 | 0.90 | 0.91 |
| | 0.34 | 0.31 | 0.29 | 0.33 | 0.31 | 0.29 | 0.23 | | 0.11 | 0.10 | 0.13 | 0.14 | 0.18 | 0.13 | 0.08 |
| A | <u>1.64</u> | 1.20 | 1.16 | 1.14 | 1.01 | 1.05 | 1.19 | A | <u>1.24</u> | <u>1.19</u> | 1.07 | 1.21 | 1.08 | 1.14 | <u>1.15</u> |
| | 0.28 | 0.25 | 0.22 | 0.26 | 0.25 | 0.23 | 0.14 | | 0.10 | 0.09 | 0.12 | 0.13 | 0.18 | 0.13 | 0.07 |

Table 9. Ratio of medians drifts and standard errors for the T = 4 sec Bilinear SDOF.

| $\mu \approx 6$ | T1a | T2a | T3a | T1b | T2b | T3b | T | $\mu \approx 2$ | T1a | T2a | T3a | T1b | T2b | T3b | T |
|-----------------|------|-------------|-------------|------|------|------|-------------|-----------------|------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------|-------------|------|
| A1a | 0.89 | <u>0.66</u> | <u>0.71</u> | 0.98 | 0.79 | 0.82 | <u>0.80</u> | A1a | 0.94 | <u>0.83</u> | <u>0.84</u> | 1.01 | 0.93 | 0.99 | 0.92 |
| | 0.14 | 0.15 | 0.13 | 0.13 | 0.17 | 0.14 | 0.09 | | 0.09 | 0.10 | 0.09 | 0.08 | 0.12 | 0.07 | 0.06 |
| A2a | 1.14 | 0.85 | 0.91 | 1.26 | 1.02 | 1.06 | 1.03 | A2a | 1.12 | 0.99 | 1.01 | <u>1.21</u> | 1.11 | <u>1.18</u> | 1.10 |
| | 0.17 | 0.18 | 0.17 | 0.16 | 0.20 | 0.17 | 0.13 | | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.13 | 0.09 | 0.09 |
| A3a | 1.00 | <u>0.74</u> | <u>0.79</u> | 1.10 | 0.89 | 0.92 | 0.90 | A3a | 0.96 | <u>0.84</u> | <u>0.86</u> | 1.03 | 0.94 | 1.01 | 0.94 |
| | 0.15 | 0.17 | 0.15 | 0.14 | 0.18 | 0.16 | 0.11 | | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.09 | 0.12 | 0.08 | 0.07 |
| A4a | 1.04 | 0.77 | 0.83 | 1.15 | 0.93 | 0.96 | 0.94 | A4a | 1.03 | 0.91 | 0.93 | 1.11 | 1.02 | 1.08 | 1.01 |
| | 0.16 | 0.18 | 0.16 | 0.15 | 0.19 | 0.17 | 0.12 | | 0.09 | 0.10 | 0.09 | 0.08 | 0.12 | 0.07 | 0.06 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------|------|-------------|--|------|-------------|------|-------------|------|-------------|-------------|
| | 0.17 | 0.18 | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.19 | 0.17 | 0.12 | | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.10 | 0.09 | 0.13 | 0.09 | 0.07 |
| A1b | 1.05 | <u>0.77</u> | 0.83 | 1.16 | 0.93 | 0.97 | 0.94 | | 1.10 | 0.97 | 0.99 | <u>1.19</u> | 1.09 | <u>1.16</u> | 1.08 |
| | 0.15 | 0.16 | 0.14 | 0.14 | 0.18 | 0.15 | 0.10 | | 0.10 | 0.11 | 0.10 | 0.09 | 0.12 | 0.08 | 0.07 |
| A2b | 1.19 | 0.88 | 0.95 | <u>1.32</u> | 1.06 | 1.10 | 1.07 | | 1.16 | 1.02 | 1.04 | <u>1.25</u> | 1.14 | <u>1.22</u> | <u>1.14</u> |
| | 0.16 | 0.18 | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.19 | 0.17 | 0.12 | | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.09 | 0.08 | 0.12 | 0.07 | 0.06 |
| A3b | 0.88 | <u>0.65</u> | <u>0.70</u> | 0.98 | 0.79 | 0.82 | <u>0.80</u> | | 0.98 | 0.87 | 0.88 | 1.06 | 0.97 | 1.03 | 0.96 |
| | 0.14 | 0.15 | 0.14 | 0.13 | 0.17 | 0.15 | 0.09 | | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.09 | 0.08 | 0.12 | 0.07 | 0.07 |
| A4b | 0.95 | <u>0.70</u> | <u>0.75</u> | 1.05 | 0.84 | 0.88 | 0.85 | | 0.93 | <u>0.82</u> | 0.84 | 1.00 | 0.92 | 0.98 | 0.91 |
| | 0.15 | 0.17 | 0.15 | 0.14 | 0.18 | 0.16 | 0.11 | | 0.12 | 0.13 | 0.12 | 0.11 | 0.14 | 0.11 | 0.10 |
| A5b | 0.88 | <u>0.65</u> | <u>0.70</u> | 0.97 | 0.78 | 0.81 | <u>0.79</u> | | 0.99 | 0.88 | 0.89 | 1.07 | 0.98 | 1.04 | 0.97 |
| | 0.16 | 0.17 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.19 | 0.16 | 0.11 | | 0.10 | 0.11 | 0.10 | 0.09 | 0.12 | 0.08 | 0.07 |
| A | 0.99 | <u>0.73</u> | <u>0.79</u> | 1.10 | 0.88 | 0.92 | <u>0.90</u> | | 1.01 | 0.89 | 0.91 | 1.09 | 1.00 | 1.06 | 0.99 |
| | 0.12 | 0.14 | 0.12 | 0.11 | 0.16 | 0.13 | 0.06 | | 0.08 | 0.08 | 0.07 | 0.06 | 0.11 | 0.05 | 0.04 |

Table 10. Ratio of medians drifts and standard errors for the Van Nuys and SAC MDOF systems.

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------|------|-------------|------|-------------|------|-------------|-----|------|-------------|-------------|------|------|------|-------------|
| VN | T1a | T2a | T3a | T1b | T2b | T3b | T | LA9 | T1a | T2a | T3a | T1b | T2b | T3b | T |
| A1a | 1.09 | 1.08 | 1.00 | 0.93 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.02 | A1a | 1.04 | 0.94 | 0.93 | 1.07 | 1.04 | 1.10 | 1.02 |
| | 0.11 | 0.08 | 0.11 | 0.17 | 0.10 | 0.16 | 0.08 | | 0.18 | 0.19 | 0.19 | 0.17 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.15 |
| A2a | 1.08 | 1.07 | 0.99 | 0.93 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.01 | A2a | 1.18 | 1.07 | 1.06 | 1.22 | 1.19 | 1.26 | 1.16 |
| | 0.10 | 0.08 | 0.11 | 0.17 | 0.09 | 0.16 | 0.07 | | 0.18 | 0.19 | 0.19 | 0.17 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.15 |
| A3a | 1.03 | 1.02 | 0.95 | 0.88 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | A3a | 1.04 | 0.94 | 0.93 | 1.07 | 1.04 | 1.10 | 1.02 |
| | 0.13 | 0.11 | 0.13 | 0.18 | 0.12 | 0.18 | 0.11 | | 0.17 | 0.17 | 0.17 | 0.15 | 0.18 | 0.19 | 0.12 |
| A4a | 1.10 | 1.10 | 1.02 | 0.95 | 1.03 | 1.03 | 1.03 | A4a | 0.93 | 0.84 | 0.83 | 0.95 | 0.93 | 0.98 | 0.91 |
| | 0.13 | 0.11 | 0.13 | 0.18 | 0.12 | 0.18 | 0.11 | | 0.17 | 0.18 | 0.17 | 0.15 | 0.18 | 0.19 | 0.13 |
| A5a | 0.93 | 0.92 | <u>0.85</u> | 0.80 | <u>0.86</u> | 0.86 | <u>0.87</u> | A5a | 0.96 | 0.88 | 0.86 | 0.99 | 0.97 | 1.02 | 0.95 |
| | 0.10 | 0.07 | 0.10 | 0.16 | 0.08 | 0.16 | 0.06 | | 0.17 | 0.17 | 0.16 | 0.15 | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.12 |
| A1b | 1.16 | 1.15 | 1.07 | 1.00 | 1.08 | 1.08 | 1.09 | A1b | 0.82 | <u>0.74</u> | <u>0.73</u> | 0.84 | 0.82 | 0.87 | <u>0.80</u> |
| | 0.16 | 0.15 | 0.17 | 0.21 | 0.16 | 0.21 | 0.15 | | 0.18 | 0.19 | 0.18 | 0.16 | 0.19 | 0.20 | 0.14 |
| A2b | 1.05 | 1.04 | 0.97 | 0.90 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.99 | A2b | 1.00 | 0.91 | 0.90 | 1.03 | 1.01 | 1.07 | 0.98 |
| | 0.10 | 0.08 | 0.11 | 0.16 | 0.09 | 0.16 | 0.07 | | 0.22 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 0.21 | 0.24 | 0.24 | 0.20 |
| A3b | 1.00 | 0.99 | 0.92 | 0.86 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | A3b | 1.03 | 0.93 | 0.92 | 1.06 | 1.03 | 1.09 | 1.01 |
| | 0.10 | 0.08 | 0.11 | 0.16 | 0.09 | 0.16 | 0.07 | | 0.16 | 0.17 | 0.16 | 0.14 | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.12 |
| A4b | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.86 | 0.80 | 0.87 | 0.87 | <u>0.88</u> | A4b | 0.95 | 0.86 | 0.85 | 0.98 | 0.95 | 1.01 | 0.93 |
| | 0.11 | 0.09 | 0.11 | 0.17 | 0.10 | 0.17 | 0.08 | | 0.15 | 0.16 | 0.15 | 0.13 | 0.16 | 0.17 | 0.10 |
| A5b | 1.13 | 1.12 | 1.05 | 0.97 | 1.05 | 1.05 | 1.06 | A5b | 0.78 | <u>0.71</u> | <u>0.70</u> | 0.80 | 0.79 | 0.83 | <u>0.77</u> |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | <i>0.12</i> | <i>0.10</i> | <i>0.12</i> | <i>0.18</i> | <i>0.11</i> | <i>0.17</i> | <i>0.10</i> | | | <i>0.17</i> | <i>0.18</i> | <i>0.17</i> | <i>0.15</i> | <i>0.18</i> | <i>0.19</i> | <i>0.13</i> |
| A | 1.05 | 1.04 | 0.97 | 0.90 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.98 | A | 0.97 | 0.88 | 0.87 | 1.00 | 0.97 | 1.03 | 0.95 | |
| | <i>0.09</i> | <i>0.06</i> | <i>0.09</i> | <i>0.16</i> | <i>0.07</i> | <i>0.15</i> | <i>0.05</i> | | <i>0.13</i> | <i>0.14</i> | <i>0.13</i> | <i>0.10</i> | <i>0.15</i> | <i>0.15</i> | <i>0.06</i> | |

Table 11. SDOF systems results summary.

| High μ | T = 1.5 sec | T = 0.1 sec | T = 4 sec | T = 1.5 sec (Tril.) | High μ – All T |
|--------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1.5- β | 3/60 | 5/60 | 14/60 | 6/60 | 28/240 |
| 2- β | 3/60 | 2/60 | 7/60 | 2/60 | 14/240 |
| All μ | T = 1.5 sec | T = 0.1 sec | T = 4 sec | T = 1.5 sec (Tril.) | Low μ - All T |
| 1.5- β | 0/60 | 7/60 | 13/60 | 0/60 | 20/240 |
| 2- β | 0/60 | 0/60 | 4/60 | 0/60 | 4/240 |
| All μ | T = 1.5 sec | T = 0.1 sec | T = 4 sec | T = 1.5 sec (Tril.) | All μ - All T |
| 1.5- β | 3/120 | 12/120 | 27/120 | 6/120 | 48/480 |
| 2- β | 3/120 | 2/120 | 11/120 | 2/120 | 18/480 |

Similar conclusions can be found for the 1.5 sigma (15% significance level) basis. Table 11 shows the summary of the number of small sample comparisons showing statistically significant differences for the SDOF cases for both significance levels. These percentages of significant differences should be compared with the fraction of cases (15% and 6%) that one expects to show significant differences even when the hypothesis is true. As discussed above, however, there is some correlation among these sixty ratios, which may affect these expected fractions to some degree. Those for the T = 4 sec case are generally high while the various pooled cases shown are generally lower than “expected”.

Observation of the typical ratios observed shows that the small sample results may either be above or below unity for all the cases. Looking solely at the large sample ratios, one might want to conclude that the arbitrary records produce somewhat high responses for the trilinear and 0.1 sec bilinear cases; while in the 4 sec bilinear case they may induce somewhat low responses at higher ductility. But, given the large dispersions, these conclusions cannot be supported statistically by this data.

In fact taken together, the tables and summaries give little or no support to the notion that one should expect major systematic errors in the estimated nonlinear responses if he selects the records simply at random from a catalog with a wide magnitude and distance range, rather than carefully selecting records that match the mean or modal $\{M, R\}$ scenario from a disaggregated PSHA. (It should be pointed out that that scenario is, in any case, based on a disaggregation of simply *linear* SDOF spectral accelerations, not of the nonlinear SDOF or MDOF model of the structure at the moderate to large ductility of interest in such assessments.) While the cases here are admittedly limited and focused on moderate-period systems, the tests do extend to more extreme periods and to non-ductile SDOF and MDOF systems. Further there is other evidence that supports the general conclusion that M and R play at most only minor roles in affecting nonlinear displacements of structures. Studies such as those in Bazzurro and Cornell (1994a and 1994b), Shome et al. (1998), Shome (1999), Carballo (2000), Luco (2002), Medina (2002), and Jalayer (2003) all quantify in various other ways the general insensitivity of nonlinear structural displacements to R and the light sensitivity to M. Cases that may display some sensitivity to magnitude include tall buildings with important second-mode effects and very short period systems. The case of small magnitudes (less than 6, say), which may be important in certain low seismicity regions and for which the shape of the records Fourier or

response spectra may be more strongly magnitude dependent, has not received as much study. It is apparently the magnitude-dependence of the shape of the spectrum that drives any such magnitude dependence.

In Fig. 13 and 14 the pseudo acceleration spectral shapes for the records in the target and arbitrary sets respectively are shown. In figure 15 the medians spectra are also compared. Plots in Figure 16 to 25 show the drift ratio reported in Tables 8 to 12 in respect to 1 which means same median response. One can use this plots to assess whether one arbitrary set systematically underestimate or overestimate the nonlinear demand in respect of target sets.




Figure 13. Target sets elastic spectra.




Figure 14. Arbitrary sets elastic spectra.




Figure 15. Arbitrary and Target sets elastic spectra medians.




Figure 16. Drift medians ratio plots for T = 1.5 sec – ductility 2 SDOF.




Figure 17. Drift medians ratio plots for T = 1.5 sec – ductility 6 SDOF.




Figure 18. Drift medians ratio plots for T = 1.5 sec tril. - ductility6 SDOF.




Figure 19. Drift medians ratio plots for T = 1.5 sec tril. - ductility 2 SDOF.




Figure 20. Drift medians ratio plots for T = 0.1 sec - ductility 6 SDOF.




Figure 21. Drift medians ratio plots for T = 0.1 sec - ductility 2 SDOF.




Figure 22. Drift medians ratio plots for T = 4 sec - ductility 6 SDOF.




Figure 23. Drift medians ratio plots for T = 4 sec - ductility 2 SDOF.




Figure 24. Drift medians ratio plots for Van Nuys MDOF.




Figure 25. Drift medians ratio plots for SAC LA-9 MDOF.

6 The Scaling Issue

The validity of the scaling of accelerograms by a scalar intensity measure such as PGA or first-mode spectral acceleration is also one of the objectives that the study above, as it was originally conceived by the writers, would help to address. The concern is usually stated that weaker records scaled up may produce lower responses (or at least different) responses than unscaled records. It was presumed that the arbitrary sets, coming from on average smaller magnitudes and larger distances, would have significantly lower strength records, requiring significant scaling to match the target sets. However as shown in Table 12 the scaling factors for arbitrary-to-target sets (pooled a-b component) are not much larger than one on average (The last row of Table 12 reports the median of the scaling factors overall the arbitrary sets.) Therefore the results above cannot serve as a test of this issue. The fact that the scaling factors are not large, in fact, avoids the possibility that any such effect might be confounding the record selection conclusions above.

Table 12. SDOF scaling factors between the Arbitrary Sets and the original Target Sets.

| T = 1.5 sec | Scale Factor | T = 0.85 sec | Scale Factor | T = 0.1 sec | Scale Factor | T = 4 sec | Scale Factor |
|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|--------------|-----------------|
| A1 | 1 | A1 | 1.2 | A1 | 1.4 | A1 | 1.1 |
| A2 | 1.4 | A2 | 1.4 | A2 | 1.4 | A2 | 1.4 |
| A3 | 1.2 | A3 | 1.0 | A3 | 1.4 | A3 | 1.4 |
| A4 | 0.9 | A4 | 0.8 | A4 | 1 | A4 | 0.8 |
| A5 | 1 | A5 | 1.0 | A5 | 0.9 | A5 | 1.3 |
| A | 1.1 | A | 1.1 | A | 1.2 | A | 1.2 |

There are not enough available records have been found in the far-field database to get sufficiently large scaling factors to test the manipulability of the records while still holding fixed the several features discussed above that are the bases of the previous target set choices. Therefore two new target sets (denoted NT1 and NT2) especially prepared for the scaling issue have been chosen from the PEER catalog using still only records coming from California events with the same instrument and soil characteristics as before, but now with a distance closer than 15 km. Given this short distance range the concern is whether these “nearby” records can be legitimately treated as if they were representative of non-near-to-the source or “ordinary” records. They have, however, been selected to avoid, to the degree feasible, records with an obvious pulse-like nature suggesting possible directivity effects. Although in the NT1 target set, one pulse-like record (Northridge 1994/01/17 12:31 – 77 Rinaldi Receiving Station) is present, the recording used is not the fault-normal component. Further a check was made, by holding the record out of the set, to confirm that its presence did not introduce any bias in the response results obtained. A statistical test was also made to confirm that the responses from these two new target record sets are not statistically different from those of the six target sets used above in the selection exercise.

Two of these nearby sets have been prepared. To be sure that these nearby target sets were strong enough to investigate the scaling, one set (denoted NT1) has been chosen by picking the 10 strongest records. The strongest records were defined as those with the maximum *average* spectral acceleration at the four periods (0.1, 0.85, 1.5 and 4 sec). The objective of using this average was to reduce the likelihood of selecting records that happen to be unduly strong at one period due to there being a large peak in its spectrum. Such records would be present if the selection were done

structure-by-structure seeking the strongest records based on the spectrum at a single period. Among records scaled to a common single spectral acceleration level a record with such a peak will generally cause *lower* nonlinear response for structures with that natural period; the common explanation is that as it “softens” it drifts into a regime of lower input power (e.g., Kennedy et al., 1984; Carballo, 2000). To the degree such peaks are to some degree systematically present in these records, the ratio of arbitrary-to-target medians will be increased. A proxy for the “peakiness” of a record is the normalized residual (“epsilon”) between the record Sa value and that predicted by the Abrahamson and Silva (1997) attenuation law. In NT1 they have been found to be an average about 0.5, whereas they are close to zero for the arbitrary sets and for NT2. The target set NT1 can be found in Appendix 3 (Table 33).

A second new target set has been built choosing the *randomly* among events with the strongest earthquake magnitude in the nearby field arbitrary sets. This set, called NT2, is also listed in Appendix 3 and shows two records overlapping with NT1. In Table 13 the scaling factors of the same 10 arbitrary sets to the two new target sets are shown. These tests were not conducted on the Van Nuys MDOF model. The Van Nuys MDOF has been replaced by a $T = 0.85$ sec SDOF, while the scaling factors for the SAC LA-9 factors can be considered coincident with those for the 1.5 sec SDOF. Figures 27 to 29 show the histogram distributions for M and R of the scaling target sets NT1 and NT2; while in Fig. 30 the NT sets are compared with the Arbitrary set.




Figure 26. Moment magnitude histograms for the NT1 set.




Figure 27. Closest distance to rupture histograms for the NT1 set.




Figure 28. Moment magnitude histograms for the NT2 set.




Figure 29. Closest distance to rupture histograms for the NT1 set.

Table 13. SDOF Scaling Factors between the Arbitrary Sets and the New Target Sets.

| T = 1.5 sec | NT1 | NT2 | T = 0.85 sec | NT1 | NT2 | T = 0.1 sec | NT1 | NT2 | T = 4 sec | NT1 | NT2 |
|----------------|-----|-----|-----------------|-----|-----|----------------|-----|-----|--------------|-----|-----|
| A1 | 3.6 | 1.7 | A1 | 5.2 | 2.6 | A1 | 4.3 | 2.9 | A1 | 2.3 | 2.0 |
| A2 | 5.5 | 2.2 | A2 | 6.3 | 3.1 | A2 | 4.3 | 2.9 | A2 | 2.8 | 2.4 |
| A3 | 4.3 | 2.0 | A3 | 4.3 | 2.1 | A3 | 4.2 | 2.8 | A3 | 2.8 | 2.4 |
| A4 | 3.1 | 1.5 | A4 | 3.5 | 1.7 | A4 | 3.1 | 2.0 | A4 | 1.7 | 1.5 |
| A5 | 3.6 | 1.8 | A5 | 4.6 | 2.3 | A5 | 2.8 | 1.9 | A5 | 2.6 | 2.3 |
| A | 3.9 | 1.8 | A | 4.7 | 2.3 | A | 3.7 | 2.5 | A | 2.4 | 2.1 |

The last row of Table 13 reports the median of the scaling factors over all the arbitrary sets. As expected NT2 set shows lower scaling factors than NT1. The NT2 scaling factors are nonetheless of a useful amplitude (about 2).




Figure 30. Arbitrary and Scaling Target sets representation in terms of magnitude and distance.

7 Scaling Issue Results

The results of the nonlinear analyses and ratio calculations are presented in the Tables 14 to 19. They are in the same format as the tables discussed in the selection study above, except no pooled results are provided across the two target sets because the scaling levels are different. (Absolute value of natural log of z divided by β_z is shown in Appendix 2 – Tables 25 to 30.)

The three moderate and short period bilinear SDOF systems show virtually no cases significantly different from one (at the two-sigma or 6% percent) significance level; that is, they suggest that scaling by factors up to at least 4 does not bias the nonlinear displacement results for these systems at low or high ductility levels. (The 0.85 sec SDOF system standing in for the Van Nuys MDOF case shows some high-scaling over prediction at the smaller ductility only.) The trilinear strength-degrading system suggests that at the high scaling and high ductility there may be some overestimation of nonlinear displacements by the scaled up records. But the pooled ratio of 1.66 is not significant statistically in face of the very large dispersion. (The log at the median ratio over β is 1.58, just significant at the 15% level and hence underlined). Curiously at low ductility the artificial records are an average lower than the target set NT1 and statistically significantly so.

On the same basis the long-period SDOF system also is significant under high scaling and both high and low ductility, but the scaled records now appear to underestimate the target sets. The exception is at the low ductility and lesser scaling (NT2) when the scaled up records overestimate the drift to a degree nearly significant at the 15% level. The moderate-period MDOF system shows five rather unexpected

and/or contradictory significant cases. The SAC steel frame shows a significantly low ratio, but only for the lower of the two scale-factor target sets (NT2). Recall that it gave only one significant ratio in sixty (Table 10) when the scale factor was close to unity. Therefore if this NT2 result is meaningful it implies an unlikely non-monotonic bias with scale factor. Like the other cases above such “internal inconsistencies” make generalizations difficult. In short, while the scaling results here are limited by the shortage of strong records, there is no compelling or consistent evidence in this study that scaling of (arbitrarily selected) records causes bias in the estimation of nonlinear displacements of model structures relative to a target set of stronger records.

Table 14. Ratio of medians drifts and standard errors for the T = 1.5 sec Bilinear SDOF.

Table 15. Ratio of medians drifts and standard errors for the T = 1.5 sec Trilinear SDOF..

(Bold implies that the hypothesis test of equality is rejected at the 6% significance level.)

| $\mu \approx 6$ | NT1 | NT2 | $\mu \approx 2$ | NT1 | NT2 | $\mu \approx 6$ | NT1 | NT2 | $\mu \approx 2$ | NT1 | NT2 |
|-----------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|-------------|
| A1a | 1.09 | 0.95 | A1a | 0.98 | 0.88 | A1a | 1.15 | 0.72 | A1a | 0.61 | 1.00 |
| | <i>0.17</i> | <i>0.10</i> | | <i>0.11</i> | <i>0.13</i> | | <i>0.67</i> | <i>0.42</i> | | <i>0.38</i> | <i>0.20</i> |
| A2a | 1.31 | 1.09 | A2a | 1.12 | 1.01 | A2a | 4.21 | 1.75 | A2a | 0.94 | 1.27 |
| | <i>0.21</i> | <i>0.15</i> | | <i>0.12</i> | <i>0.14</i> | | <i>0.47</i> | <i>0.53</i> | | <i>0.13</i> | <i>0.25</i> |
| A3a | 1.16 | 0.95 | A3a | 1.03 | 0.95 | A3a | <u>2.21</u> | 1.41 | A3a | 0.86 | 1.15 |
| | <i>0.19</i> | <i>0.12</i> | | <i>0.08</i> | <i>0.11</i> | | <i>0.47</i> | <i>0.43</i> | | <i>0.13</i> | <i>0.22</i> |
| A4a | 1.09 | 0.89 | A4a | 1.00 | 0.91 | A4a | 1.64 | 1.00 | A4a | 0.88 | 1.02 |
| | <i>0.18</i> | <i>0.13</i> | | <i>0.09</i> | <i>0.12</i> | | <i>0.40</i> | <i>0.41</i> | | <i>0.13</i> | <i>0.22</i> |
| A5a | 1.12 | 0.94 | A5a | 1.01 | 0.91 | A5a | 0.88 | 1.39 | A5a | <u>0.47</u> | 1.15 |
| | <i>0.19</i> | <i>0.13</i> | | <i>0.11</i> | <i>0.13</i> | | <i>0.79</i> | <i>0.49</i> | | <i>0.45</i> | <i>0.19</i> |
| A1b | 1.25 | 1.07 | A1b | 1.07 | 0.98 | A1b | 1.21 | 0.92 | A1b | 0.73 | 1.06 |
| | <i>0.18</i> | <i>0.13</i> | | <i>0.09</i> | <i>0.12</i> | | <i>0.56</i> | <i>0.41</i> | | <i>0.27</i> | <i>0.19</i> |
| A2b | 1.39 | 0.98 | A2b | 1.18 | 0.99 | A2b | <u>2.17</u> | 1.19 | A2b | 0.94 | 1.44 |
| | <i>0.29</i> | <i>0.21</i> | | <i>0.17</i> | <i>0.15</i> | | <i>0.49</i> | <i>0.51</i> | | <i>0.14</i> | <i>0.31</i> |
| A3b | 1.18 | 0.99 | A3b | 1.08 | 0.96 | A3b | <u>2.22</u> | <u>1.92</u> | A3b | 0.89 | 1.04 |
| | <i>0.20</i> | <i>0.14</i> | | <i>0.08</i> | <i>0.12</i> | | <i>0.47</i> | <i>0.40</i> | | <i>0.13</i> | <i>0.22</i> |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------------|-------------|-----|-------------|-------------|-----|-------------|-------------|-----|-------------|-------------|
| A4b | 1.21 | 1.02 | A4b | 1.10 | 0.98 | A4b | 3.09 | 1.57 | A4b | 0.89 | 1.10 |
| | <i>0.19</i> | <i>0.13</i> | | <i>0.10</i> | <i>0.12</i> | | <i>0.40</i> | <i>0.45</i> | | <i>0.13</i> | <i>0.22</i> |
| A5b | 0.85 | 0.72 | A5b | 0.94 | 0.87 | A5b | 0.50 | 0.99 | A5b | 0.39 | 1.00 |
| | <i>0.18</i> | <i>0.12</i> | | <i>0.10</i> | <i>0.12</i> | | <i>0.78</i> | <i>0.44</i> | | <i>0.52</i> | <i>0.25</i> |
| A | 1.14 | 0.96 | A | 1.04 | 0.95 | A | 1.66 | 1.23 | A | 0.74 | 1.12 |
| | <i>0.15</i> | <i>0.07</i> | | <i>0.07</i> | <i>0.11</i> | | <i>0.32</i> | <i>0.33</i> | | <i>0.14</i> | <i>0.15</i> |

Table 16. Ratio of medians drifts and standard errors for the T = 0.1 sec Bilinear SDOF.

Table 17. Ratio of medians drifts and standard errors for the T = 4 sec Bilinear SDOF.

| $\mu \approx 6$ | NT1 | NT2 | $\mu \approx 2$ | NT1 | NT2 | $\mu \approx 6$ | NT1 | NT2 | $\mu \approx 2$ | NT1 | NT2 |
|-----------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|-------------|
| A1a | 1.24 | 1.45 | A1a | 1.19 | 1.13 | A1a | 0.70 | 0.78 | A1a | 0.77 | 0.99 |
| | <i>0.37</i> | <i>0.37</i> | | <i>0.22</i> | <i>0.25</i> | | <i>0.11</i> | <i>0.09</i> | | <i>0.10</i> | <i>0.06</i> |
| A2a | 0.87 | 1.00 | A2a | 1.06 | 0.99 | A2a | 0.89 | 1.01 | A2a | 0.92 | 1.18 |
| | <i>0.36</i> | <i>0.37</i> | | <i>0.18</i> | <i>0.22</i> | | <i>0.15</i> | <i>0.14</i> | | <i>0.11</i> | <i>0.08</i> |
| A3a | 1.34 | 1.49 | A3a | 1.50 | 1.43 | A3a | 0.79 | 0.88 | A3a | 0.78 | 1.01 |
| | <i>0.39</i> | <i>0.39</i> | | <i>0.29</i> | <i>0.31</i> | | <i>0.12</i> | <i>0.12</i> | | <i>0.11</i> | <i>0.07</i> |
| A4a | 1.19 | 1.24 | A4a | 1.35 | 1.26 | A4a | 0.81 | 0.91 | A4a | 0.85 | 1.08 |
| | <i>0.40</i> | <i>0.42</i> | | <i>0.27</i> | <i>0.30</i> | | <i>0.14</i> | <i>0.13</i> | | <i>0.10</i> | <i>0.06</i> |
| A5a | 0.57 | 0.64 | A5a | 0.87 | 0.83 | A5a | 0.75 | 0.83 | A5a | 0.73 | 0.93 |
| | <i>0.36</i> | <i>0.38</i> | | <i>0.18</i> | <i>0.22</i> | | <i>0.14</i> | <i>0.13</i> | | <i>0.11</i> | <i>0.07</i> |
| A1b | 1.24 | 1.42 | A1b | 1.43 | 1.36 | A1b | 0.80 | 0.92 | A1b | 0.90 | 1.16 |
| | <i>0.42</i> | <i>0.42</i> | | <i>0.29</i> | <i>0.31</i> | | <i>0.11</i> | <i>0.10</i> | | <i>0.12</i> | <i>0.08</i> |
| A2b | 0.83 | 0.97 | A2b | 0.97 | 0.93 | A2b | 0.93 | 1.04 | A2b | 0.94 | 1.21 |
| | <i>0.36</i> | <i>0.37</i> | | <i>0.19</i> | <i>0.23</i> | | <i>0.15</i> | <i>0.14</i> | | <i>0.11</i> | <i>0.07</i> |
| A3b | 1.30 | 1.57 | A3b | 1.31 | 1.24 | A3b | 0.70 | 0.76 | A3b | 0.79 | 1.01 |
| | <i>0.39</i> | <i>0.39</i> | | <i>0.27</i> | <i>0.30</i> | | <i>0.11</i> | <i>0.09</i> | | <i>0.11</i> | <i>0.07</i> |
| A4b | 1.17 | 1.46 | A4b | 1.24 | 1.18 | A4b | 0.72 | 0.85 | A4b | 0.77 | 0.98 |
| | <i>0.37</i> | <i>0.36</i> | | <i>0.24</i> | <i>0.26</i> | | <i>0.14</i> | <i>0.12</i> | | <i>0.13</i> | <i>0.10</i> |
| A5b | 0.65 | 0.74 | A5b | 0.90 | 0.86 | A5b | 0.67 | 0.77 | A5b | 0.81 | 1.04 |
| | <i>0.29</i> | <i>0.30</i> | | <i>0.15</i> | <i>0.19</i> | | <i>0.34</i> | <i>0.13</i> | | <i>0.32</i> | <i>0.08</i> |
| A | 1.00 | 1.15 | A | 1.17 | 1.10 | A | 0.77 | 0.87 | A | 0.82 | 1.06 |
| | <i>0.28</i> | <i>0.27</i> | | <i>0.15</i> | <i>0.19</i> | | <i>0.09</i> | <i>0.07</i> | | <i>0.09</i> | <i>0.04</i> |

Table 18. Ratio of medians drifts and standard errors for the T = 0.85 sec Bilinear SDOF

| $\mu \approx 6$ | NT1 | NT2 | $\mu \approx 2$ | NT1 | NT2 |
|-----------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|-------------|
| A1a | 1.01 | 1.04 | A1a | 1.08 | 1.03 |
| | 0.17 | 0.18 | | 0.12 | 0.16 |
| A2a | 1.10 | 1.14 | A2a | <u>1.25</u> | 1.20 |
| | 0.16 | 0.18 | | 0.13 | 0.16 |
| A3a | 0.83 | 0.86 | A3a | 1.12 | 1.07 |
| | 0.18 | 0.19 | | 0.09 | 0.13 |
| A4a | 0.82 | 0.84 | A4a | <u>1.15</u> | 1.10 |
| | 0.16 | 0.18 | | 0.09 | 0.13 |
| A5a | 0.78 | 0.81 | A5a | 0.91 | 0.87 |
| | 0.19 | 0.20 | | 0.12 | 0.15 |
| A1b | 1.24 | 1.28 | A1b | <u>1.30</u> | 1.25 |
| | 0.26 | 0.27 | | 0.14 | 0.17 |
| A2b | <u>1.36</u> | <u>1.40</u> | A2b | <u>1.25</u> | 1.20 |
| | 0.20 | 0.21 | | 0.08 | 0.13 |
| A3b | 0.95 | 0.98 | A3b | 1.04 | 1.00 |
| | 0.15 | 0.17 | | 0.09 | 0.13 |
| A4b | 0.91 | 0.94 | A4b | 1.05 | 1.01 |
| | 0.18 | 0.19 | | 0.11 | 0.15 |
| A5b | 1.18 | 1.22 | A5b | <u>1.39</u> | <u>1.33</u> |
| | 0.19 | 0.20 | | 0.13 | 0.16 |
| A | 1.00 | 1.03 | A | <u>1.14</u> | 1.10 |
| | 0.15 | 0.16 | | 0.07 | 0.12 |

Table 19. Ratio of medians drifts and standard errors for the SAC LA-9 MDOF.

| | NT1 | NT2 |
|-----|------|-------------|
| A1a | 1.02 | <u>0.81</u> |
| | 0.15 | 0.12 |
| A2a | 1.28 | 0.90 |
| | 0.18 | 0.12 |
| A3a | 1.21 | <u>0.83</u> |
| | 0.15 | 0.11 |
| A4a | 1.09 | <u>0.75</u> |
| | 0.18 | 0.12 |
| A5a | 1.04 | <u>0.79</u> |
| | 0.16 | 0.11 |
| A1b | 0.94 | <u>0.67</u> |
| | 0.16 | 0.13 |
| A2b | 0.97 | 0.80 |
| | 0.18 | 0.18 |
| A3b | 1.17 | <u>0.84</u> |
| | 0.17 | 0.11 |
| A4b | 1.12 | <u>0.79</u> |
| | 0.14 | 0.10 |
| A5b | 0.88 | <u>0.72</u> |
| | 0.15 | 0.12 |
| A | 1.07 | <u>0.79</u> |
| | 0.12 | 0.08 |

In general (NT2 is the exception) here the scaling has been from one magnitude-distance bin to another with random selection of records from within that bin. This procedure insures that there are no systematic peak-valley (or epsilon) effects. Other studies in progress are beginning to show that there can be systematic bias due to scaling if the effects of peaks and valley are not avoided. As described above records

with spectral peaks at the dominant spectral period tend to give smaller nonlinear displacements. The reverse is true for record with spectral valleys. Therefore if the latter are scaled to the former overestimation is likely. These effects were minimized by the record selection and processing conducted in this study. Record selection in practice should also avoid unintentional use of record sets dominated by either kind of record.

Figures 31 and 32 show the pseudo acceleration spectral shapes for the records in the target and arbitrary sets respectively are shown. In Fig. 33 the medians spectra of scaling target set is compared to arbitrary sets median. Plots in Fig. 35 to 44 show the drift ratio reported in Tables 14 to 19.




Figure 31. NT1 elastic spectra.




Figure 32. NT2 elastic spectra.




Figure 33. NT1, NT2 and Arbitrary sets elastic spectra medians.




Figure 34. Scaling drift medians ratio plots for T = 1.5 sec - ductility 2 SDOF.




Figure 35. Scaling drift medians ratio plots for T = 1.5 sec - ductility 6 SDOF.




Figure 36. Scaling drift medians ratio plots for T = 1.5 sec tril. - ductility 6 SDOF.




Figure 37. Scaling drift medians ratio plots for T = 1.5 sec tril. - ductility 2 SDOF.




Figure 38. Scaling drift medians ratio plots for T = 0.1 sec - ductility 6 SDOF.




Figure 39. Scaling drift medians ratio plots for T = 0.1 sec - ductility 2 SDOF.




Figure 40. Scaling drift medians ratio plots for T = 4 sec - ductility 6 SDOF.




Figure 41. Scaling drift medians ratio plots for T = 4 sec - ductility 2 SDOF.




Figure 42. Scaling drift medians ratio plots for $T = 0.85$ sec - ductility 6 SDOF.




Figure 43. Scaling drift medians ratio plots for $T = 0.85$ sec - ductility 2 SDOF.




Figure 44. Scaling drift medians ratio plots for SAC LA-9 MDOF.

8 Summary of Conclusions

Based on an investigation of the nonlinear response of a suite of model structures to sets of records selected to match a specific magnitude and distance scenario and other records selected arbitrarily, this study has found no consistent evidence to suggest that it is necessary to take great care in the selection of records with respect to such factors.

The conclusion must be conditioned by the characteristics of the uniform catalog available at the time of the study and by the selected magnitude and distance limits. The magnitudes used were limited to moderate values (6.4 to 7.4) (a) because higher values (within the constraints cited above) were not available in the catalog and (b) because smaller values would in practice be unlikely to be chosen for a scenario event in the 7 range as the catalog does have an adequate number of 6.4 and larger events and records from which to chose a sample of typical size (ten or less). The mean magnitudes of the A and T sets are 6.6 and 7.1 respectively. The former number suggests, as expected, that the lower magnitudes in the range are more common than the larger. The latter number shows that the T set was indeed from the upper tail of the histogram of magnitudes in the catalog. The differential is 0.5 magnitude units. A reduction of the lower bound to, say, 6 would have somewhat facilitated meeting the authors' restrictions designed to avoid overlapping of the samples for the A sets, but it would not have helped the more challenging T set selection. This lower bound change would have reduced the overlap between records in the T sets with those in the A sets, which would have been somewhat beneficial statistically; it also would have increased the differential in mean magnitudes which would likely have been a

stronger challenge to the posed null hypothesis. As stated, the choice of a lower magnitude of 6.4 was based on argument that it was the practical choice, while being a full magnitude unit below the largest value.

With respect to distance, a larger catalogue, such as that under current development under PEER, or a larger selected maximum distance (50 kilometers was chosen for reasons analogous to those for the 6.4 lower limit on magnitude) would create a larger mean distance differential between the A and T sets, now 32 versus 25 kilometers. This would not likely cause a greater challenge to the hypothesis because distance per se is known to have little effect on nonlinear response. It would, however, create a larger differential in the mean spectral accelerations, causing a less transparent interaction between the distance and scaling issues.

Further, based on the responses of the investigated models to sets of records that are comparatively strong and records that are arbitrarily selected and then scaled up to match the strength of the stronger records, this study has found no compelling evidence that such scaling induces bias in the response estimation. This scaling conclusion reaches to scale factors as high as 4 and ductility up to 6. These general conclusions are limited to firm soil sites and to sites where directivity-induced phenomena are not an important threat. The suite of structures is limited in number but it is wide in period range and covers both ductile and strength-degrading models, and both SDOF and MDOF cases. The scaling study in particular is limited by the number of records. Few qualify as strong enough to test for large scale factors.

References

- Abrahamson, N. A., Silva, W. J., 1997. Empirical response spectral attenuation relations for shallow crustal earthquakes, *Seismological Research Letters* **68**(1), 94-127.
- Bazzurro, P., and C.A. Cornell, 1994a, Seismic Hazard Analysis of Nonlinear Structures. I: Methodology, *Journal of Structural Engineering, ASCE* **120**, 3325-3344.
- Bazzurro, P., and C.A. Cornell, 1994b, Seismic Hazard Analysis of Nonlinear Structures. II: Applications", *Journal of Structural Engineering, ASCE* **120**, 3345-33665.
- Benjamin, J. R., Cornell, C.A., 1970. *Probability, Statistics and Decision for Civil Engineers*, McGraw-Hill, London.
- Carballo Arévalo, J.E., 2003. *Probabilistic Seismic Demand Analysis: Spectrum Matching and Design*. Ph. D. Thesis, Dept. of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Stanford University, Stanford, CA,. Advisor: C. A. Cornell. [<http://www.stanford.edu/group/rms/>]
- Foutch, D.A., Shi, S., 2002. Modeling of steel moment frames for seismic loads, *Journal of Constructional Steel Research* **58**, Issues 5-8.
- Gupta, A., Krawinkler, H., 1999. *Seismic demands for performance evaluation of steel moment resisting frame structures* (SAC Task 5.4.3). Report No. 132, John A. Blume Earthquake Engineering Center, Stanford University, Stanford, California.

- Jalayer, F., 2003. *Direct Probabilistic Seismic Analysis: Implementing Non-Linear Dynamic Assessments*, Ph. D. Thesis, Dept. of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Stanford University, Stanford, CA. Advisor: C. A. Cornell. [<http://www.stanford.edu/group/rms/>]
- Kennedy, R. P., Short, S. A., Mertz k. L., Tokarz, F. J., Idriss, I. M., Power, M. S., and Sadigh, K. 1984. *Engineering Characterization of Ground Motion – Task I: Effects of Characteristics of Free-Field Motion on Structural Response*, NUREG/CR-3805 **1**, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission.
- Luco, N., 2002. *Probabilistic Seismic Demand Analysis, SMRF Connection Fractures, and Near-Source Effect*, Ph. D. Thesis, Dept. of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Stanford University, Stanford, CA. Advisor: C. A. Cornell. [<http://www.stanford.edu/group/rms/>]
- Luco, N., Cornell, C.A., 2000. Effects of Connection Fractures on SMRF Seismic Drift Demands, *Journal of Structural Engineering, ASCE* **126**, No. 1.
- McGuire, RK., 1995. Probabilistic Seismic Hazard Analysis and Design Earthquakes: Closing the Loop, *Bulletin of Seismological Society of America* **85**, No. 5.
- Medina R. A. 2002. *Seismic Demands For Nondeteriorating Frame Structures And Their Dependence On Ground Motion*. Ph. D. Thesis, Dept. of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Stanford University, Stanford, CA. Advisor: H. Krawinkler.
- NUREG/CR–6728, 2001. *Technical Basis for Revision of Regulatory Guidance on Design Ground Motions: Hazard- and Risk- Consistent Ground Motion*

Spectra Guidelines, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Government Printing Office, Washington D.C.

Porter, K.A., Beck, J.L., Shaikhutdinov, R.V., 2002. *Investigation of Sensitivity of Building Loss Estimates to Major Uncertain Variables for the Van Nuys Testbed*, PEER Report Series **2002/03**, August.

Shome N., 1999. *Probabilistic Seismic Demand Analysis of Nonlinear Structures*, Principal

Ph. D. Thesis, Dept. of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Stanford University, Stanford, CA. Advisor: C. A. Cornell.
[<http://www.stanford.edu/group/rms/>]

Shome, N., Cornell, C.A., Bazzurro, P., Carballo, J.E., 1998. Earthquakes, Records and Nonlinear Responses, *Earthquake Spectra* **14**, No. 3.

Appendix 1

Table 20. SDOF T = 1.5 sec bilinear log (z)/β results.

| $\mu \approx 6$ | T1a | T2a | T3a | T1b | T2b | T3b | T | $\mu \approx 2$ | T1a | T2a | T3a | T1b | T2b | T3b | T |
|-----------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| A1a | 0.48 | 0.75 | 0.64 | 0.00 | 0.94 | 0.90 | 0.41 | 1a | 0.37 | 1.17 | 0.66 | 0.57 | 0.81 | 0.73 | 0.91 |
| A2a | 1.33 | 0.23 | 1.42 | 0.79 | 0.10 | 0.32 | 0.82 | A2a | 0.72 | 0.18 | 0.53 | 0.77 | 0.54 | 0.53 | 0.65 |
| A3a | 0.71 | 0.40 | 0.82 | 0.27 | 0.59 | 0.48 | 0.08 | A3a | 0.20 | 0.64 | 0.11 | 0.14 | 0.34 | 0.13 | 0.20 |
| A4a | 0.39 | 0.82 | 0.54 | 0.06 | 0.96 | 0.91 | 0.47 | A4a | 0.10 | 0.93 | 0.41 | 0.25 | 0.58 | 0.45 | 0.58 |
| A5a | 0.54 | 0.59 | 0.67 | 0.11 | 0.71 | 0.63 | 0.17 | A5a | 0.09 | 0.83 | 0.41 | 0.22 | 0.64 | 0.41 | 0.58 |
| A1b | 1.33 | 0.06 | 1.31 | 0.73 | 0.11 | 0.07 | 0.79 | A1b | 0.58 | 0.22 | 0.20 | 0.61 | 0.28 | 0.33 | 0.49 |
| A2b | 0.65 | 0.16 | 0.76 | 0.34 | 0.29 | 0.13 | 0.23 | A2b | 0.59 | 0.00 | 0.33 | 0.62 | 0.36 | 0.41 | 0.39 |
| A3b | 0.82 | 0.27 | 0.92 | 0.36 | 0.44 | 0.24 | 0.21 | A3b | 0.39 | 0.45 | 0.00 | 0.37 | 0.00 | 0.11 | 0.14 |
| A4b | 1.03 | 0.11 | 1.17 | 0.58 | 0.28 | 0.07 | 0.52 | A4b | 0.53 | 0.22 | 0.20 | 0.61 | 0.25 | 0.22 | 0.28 |
| A5b | 1.24 | 2.14 | 1.02 | 1.45 | 2.31 | 2.47 | 2.40 | A5b | 0.51 | 1.42 | 0.83 | 0.77 | 1.04 | 0.93 | 1.19 |
| A | 0.95 | 0.56 | 1.01 | 0.26 | 0.83 | 0.66 | 0.00 | A | 0.22 | 0.73 | 0.13 | 0.17 | 0.20 | 0.14 | 0.50 |

Table 21. SDOF T = 1.5 sec trilinear log (z)/β results.

| $\mu \approx 6$ | T1a | T2a | T3a | T1b | T2b | T3b | T | $\mu \approx 2$ | T1a | T2a | T3a | T1b | T2b | T3b | T |
|-----------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| A1a | 0.82 | 1.37 | 0.07 | 1.31 | 0.64 | 1.12 | 1.24 | A1a | 0.09 | 0.34 | 0.49 | 0.45 | 0.34 | 0.18 | 0.09 |
| A2a | 1.26 | 0.83 | 1.80 | 0.79 | 1.64 | 0.91 | 1.42 | A2a | 0.89 | 0.92 | 1.38 | 0.64 | 1.17 | 1.12 | 1.17 |
| A3a | 0.49 | 0.08 | 1.19 | 0.10 | 0.91 | 0.07 | 0.56 | A3a | 0.41 | 0.26 | 0.87 | 0.00 | 0.74 | 0.60 | 0.62 |
| A4a | 0.02 | 0.56 | 0.75 | 0.53 | 0.36 | 0.34 | 0.11 | A4a | 0.09 | 0.27 | 0.33 | 0.40 | 0.31 | 0.16 | 0.07 |
| A5a | 0.58 | 0.10 | 1.20 | 0.10 | 0.92 | 0.24 | 0.63 | A5a | 0.41 | 0.17 | 0.94 | 0.06 | 0.72 | 0.56 | 0.64 |
| A1b | 0.39 | 0.95 | 0.37 | 0.94 | 0.12 | 0.73 | 0.67 | A1b | 0.24 | 0.10 | 0.86 | 0.27 | 0.54 | 0.39 | 0.44 |
| A2b | 0.60 | 0.15 | 1.18 | 0.15 | 0.93 | 0.28 | 0.64 | A2b | 0.94 | 0.91 | 1.25 | 0.71 | 1.15 | 1.09 | 1.08 |
| A3b | 1.64 | 1.08 | 2.29 | 1.04 | 2.16 | 1.15 | 2.04 | A3b | 0.24 | 0.88 | 0.17 | 0.87 | 0.06 | 0.19 | 0.56 |
| A4b | 0.92 | 0.42 | 1.55 | 0.39 | 1.35 | 0.53 | 1.08 | A4b | 0.00 | 0.44 | 0.21 | 0.52 | 0.21 | 0.06 | 0.07 |
| A5b | 0.05 | 0.50 | 0.73 | 0.48 | 0.36 | 0.30 | 0.06 | A5b | 0.36 | 0.94 | 0.32 | 0.98 | 0.26 | 0.38 | 0.63 |
| A | 0.67 | 0.06 | 1.54 | 0.06 | 1.34 | 0.64 | 1.09 | A | 0.36 | 0.12 | 1.49 | 0.16 | 0.70 | 0.50 | 0.83 |

Table 22. SDOF T = 0.1 sec bilinear log (z)/β results.

| $\mu \approx 6$ | T1a | T2a | T3a | T1b | T2b | T3b | T | $\mu \approx 2$ | T1a | T2a | T3a | T1b | T2b | T3b | T |
|-----------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| A1a | 1.88 | 1.10 | 1.04 | 0.95 | 0.62 | 0.93 | 1.38 | A1a | 1.22 | 1.03 | 0.38 | 0.96 | 0.35 | 0.68 | 0.93 |
| A2a | 0.79 | 0.05 | 0.08 | 0.10 | 0.42 | 0.20 | 0.03 | A2a | 1.01 | 0.66 | 0.13 | 0.65 | 0.00 | 0.26 | 0.53 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| A3a | 2.09 | 1.30 | 1.25 | 1.14 | 0.83 | 1.12 | 1.59 | A3a | 1.93 | 1.75 | 1.29 | 1.76 | 1.21 | 1.51 | 1.72 |
| A4a | 1.23 | 0.54 | 0.46 | 0.39 | 0.10 | 0.34 | 0.61 | A4a | 1.69 | 1.57 | 0.97 | 1.49 | 0.92 | 1.24 | 1.50 |
| A5a | 0.13 | 0.94 | 1.11 | 1.09 | 1.39 | 1.28 | 1.28 | A5a | 0.25 | 0.09 | 0.83 | 0.07 | 0.55 | 0.37 | 0.45 |
| A1b | 1.70 | 0.99 | 0.93 | 0.83 | 0.54 | 0.81 | 1.12 | A1b | 1.59 | 1.46 | 0.97 | 1.43 | 0.93 | 1.19 | 1.35 |
| A2b | 0.75 | 0.03 | 0.14 | 0.19 | 0.50 | 0.30 | 0.07 | A2b | 0.07 | 0.39 | 0.94 | 0.19 | 0.70 | 0.59 | 0.69 |
| A3b | 1.98 | 1.24 | 1.20 | 1.09 | 0.77 | 1.06 | 1.47 | A3b | 1.50 | 1.33 | 0.79 | 1.28 | 0.76 | 1.07 | 1.25 |
| A4b | 2.15 | 1.36 | 1.33 | 1.18 | 0.84 | 1.20 | 1.76 | A4b | 0.83 | 0.70 | 0.13 | 0.71 | 0.20 | 0.43 | 0.55 |
| A5b | 0.06 | 0.93 | 1.13 | 1.04 | 1.49 | 1.28 | 1.31 | A5b | 0.18 | 0.62 | 1.34 | 0.37 | 0.90 | 0.81 | 1.18 |
| A | 1.77 | 0.73 | 0.67 | 0.50 | 0.04 | 0.21 | 1.24 | A | 2.15 | 1.93 | 0.56 | 1.47 | 0.43 | 1.01 | 2.00 |

Table 23. SDOF T = 4 sec bilinear log (z)/β results.

| $\mu \approx 6$ | T1a | T2a | T3a | T1b | T2b | T3b | T | $\mu \approx 2$ | T1a | T2a | T3a | T1b | T2b | T3b | T |
|-----------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| A1a | 0.83 | 2.77 | 2.63 | 0.16 | 1.39 | 1.42 | 2.48 | A1a | 0.69 | 1.86 | 1.94 | 0.12 | 0.60 | 0.14 | 1.39 |
| A2a | 0.77 | 0.90 | 0.55 | 1.44 | 0.10 | 0.34 | 0.23 | A2a | 1.03 | 0.09 | 0.10 | 1.91 | 0.80 | 1.84 | 1.06 |
| A3a | 0.00 | 1.77 | 1.57 | 0.68 | 0.65 | 0.52 | 0.96 | A3a | 0.41 | 1.74 | 1.51 | 0.33 | 0.52 | 0.12 | 0.88 |
| A4a | 0.25 | 1.45 | 1.16 | 0.93 | 0.38 | 0.24 | 0.52 | A4a | 0.33 | 0.94 | 0.81 | 1.30 | 0.17 | 1.10 | 0.17 |
| A5a | 0.24 | 1.90 | 1.72 | 0.36 | 0.86 | 0.75 | 1.26 | A5a | 0.96 | 2.14 | 2.11 | 0.34 | 0.90 | 0.69 | 1.83 |
| A1b | 0.33 | 1.63 | 1.33 | 1.06 | 0.40 | 0.20 | 0.62 | A1b | 0.95 | 0.28 | 0.10 | 1.93 | 0.72 | 1.86 | 1.10 |
| A2b | 1.09 | 0.71 | 0.32 | 1.74 | 0.31 | 0.56 | 0.56 | A2b | 1.48 | 0.20 | 0.44 | 2.79 | 1.09 | 2.84 | 2.18 |
| A3b | 0.91 | 2.87 | 2.55 | 0.16 | 1.39 | 1.32 | 2.48 | A3b | 0.20 | 1.39 | 1.42 | 0.73 | 0.25 | 0.42 | 0.58 |
| A4b | 0.34 | 2.10 | 1.92 | 0.35 | 0.97 | 0.80 | 1.48 | A4b | 0.60 | 1.53 | 1.45 | 0.00 | 0.60 | 0.18 | 0.94 |
| A5b | 0.80 | 2.53 | 2.38 | 0.20 | 1.31 | 1.32 | 2.14 | A5b | 0.10 | 1.16 | 1.17 | 0.75 | 0.17 | 0.49 | 0.44 |
| A | 0.08 | 2.25 | 1.96 | 0.87 | 0.80 | 0.64 | 1.76 | A | 0.12 | 1.46 | 1.35 | 1.44 | 0.00 | 1.17 | 0.25 |

Table 24. Van Nuys and SAC MDOF log (z)/β results.

| VN | T1a | T2a | T3a | T1b | T2b | T3b | T | SAC | T1a | T2a | T3a | T1b | T2b | T3b | T |
|-----|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| A1a | 0.78 | 0.96 | 0.00 | 0.43 | 0.10 | 0.06 | 0.25 | A1a | 0.22 | 0.33 | 0.38 | 0.40 | 0.20 | 0.48 | 0.13 |
| A2a | 0.77 | 0.85 | 0.09 | 0.43 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.14 | A2a | 0.92 | 0.36 | 0.31 | 1.17 | 0.87 | 1.16 | 0.99 |
| A3a | 0.23 | 0.18 | 0.39 | 0.71 | 0.34 | 0.23 | 0.37 | A3a | 0.23 | 0.36 | 0.43 | 0.45 | 0.22 | 0.50 | 0.17 |
| A4a | 0.73 | 0.87 | 0.15 | 0.28 | 0.25 | 0.16 | 0.27 | A4a | 0.43 | 0.97 | 1.10 | 0.34 | 0.40 | 0.11 | 0.73 |
| A5a | 0.73 | 1.19 | 1.63 | 1.39 | 1.89 | 0.94 | 2.32 | A5a | 0.24 | 0.75 | 0.94 | 0.07 | 0.17 | 0.11 | 0.43 |
| A1b | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.40 | 0.00 | 0.48 | 0.37 | 0.57 | A1b | 1.10 | 1.58 | 1.75 | 1.09 | 1.04 | 0.70 | 1.59 |
| A2b | 0.49 | 0.49 | 0.28 | 0.66 | 0.22 | 0.13 | 0.14 | A2b | 0.00 | 0.41 | 0.46 | 0.14 | 0.04 | 0.28 | 0.10 |
| A3b | 0.00 | 0.13 | 0.76 | 0.94 | 0.81 | 0.45 | 1.04 | A3b | 0.18 | 0.43 | 0.52 | 0.42 | 0.16 | 0.48 | 0.08 |
| A4b | 0.66 | 0.81 | 1.37 | 1.31 | 1.39 | 0.82 | 1.60 | A4b | 0.34 | 0.94 | 1.08 | 0.16 | 0.32 | 0.06 | 0.73 |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| A5b | 1.02 | 1.13 | 0.41 | 0.17 | 0.44 | 0.29 | 0.58 |
| A | 0.54 | 0.65 | 0.34 | 0.66 | 0.44 | 0.20 | 0.40 |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| A5b | 1.46 | 1.90 | 2.10 | 1.49 | 1.31 | 0.98 | 2.01 |
| A | 0.23 | 0.91 | 1.07 | 0.00 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.85 |

Appendix 2

Table 25. SDOF T = 1.5 sec (bilinear)

log (z)/β results.

| $\mu \approx 6$ | NT1 | NT3 | $\mu \approx 2$ | NT1 | NT3 |
|-----------------|------|------|-----------------|------|------|
| A1a | 0.51 | 0.51 | A1a | 0.18 | 0.98 |
| A2a | 1.29 | 0.57 | A2a | 0.94 | 0.07 |
| A3a | 0.78 | 0.43 | A3a | 0.37 | 0.47 |
| A4a | 0.48 | 0.90 | A4a | 0.00 | 0.79 |
| A5a | 0.60 | 0.48 | A5a | 0.09 | 0.73 |
| A1b | 1.24 | 0.52 | A1b | 0.75 | 0.17 |
| A2b | 1.14 | 0.10 | A2b | 0.97 | 0.07 |
| A3b | 0.83 | 0.07 | A3b | 0.96 | 0.34 |
| A4b | 1.00 | 0.15 | A4b | 0.95 | 0.17 |
| A5b | 0.90 | 2.74 | A5b | 0.62 | 1.16 |
| A | 0.87 | 0.58 | A | 0.56 | 0.47 |

Table 26. SDOF T = 1.5 sec (trilinear)

log (z)/β results.

| $\mu \approx 6$ | NT1 | NT3 | $\mu \approx 2$ | NT1 | NT3 |
|-----------------|------|------|-----------------|------|------|
| A1a | 0.21 | 0.78 | A1a | 1.30 | 0.00 |
| A2a | 3.06 | 1.06 | A2a | 0.48 | 0.96 |
| A3a | 1.69 | 0.80 | A3a | 1.16 | 0.64 |
| A4a | 1.24 | 0.00 | A4a | 0.98 | 0.09 |
| A5a | 0.16 | 0.67 | A5a | 1.68 | 0.74 |
| A1b | 0.34 | 0.20 | A1b | 1.17 | 0.31 |
| A2b | 1.58 | 0.34 | A2b | 0.44 | 1.18 |
| A3b | 1.70 | 1.63 | A3b | 0.90 | 0.18 |
| A4b | 2.82 | 1.00 | A4b | 0.90 | 0.43 |
| A5b | 0.89 | 0.02 | A5b | 1.81 | 0.00 |
| A | 1.58 | 0.63 | A | 2.15 | 0.76 |

Table 27. SDOF T = 0.1 sec

log (z)/β results.

| $\mu \approx 6$ | NT1 | NT3 | $\mu \approx 2$ | NT1 | NT3 |
|-----------------|------|------|-----------------|------|------|
| A1a | 0.58 | 1.00 | A1a | 0.79 | 0.49 |
| A2a | 0.39 | 0.00 | A2a | 0.32 | 0.05 |
| A3a | 0.75 | 1.02 | A3a | 1.40 | 1.15 |
| A4a | 0.43 | 0.51 | A4a | 1.11 | 0.77 |
| A5a | 1.56 | 1.17 | A5a | 0.77 | 0.85 |
| A1b | 0.51 | 0.83 | A1b | 1.23 | 0.99 |
| A2b | 0.52 | 0.08 | A2b | 0.16 | 0.32 |
| A3b | 0.67 | 1.16 | A3b | 1.00 | 0.72 |
| A4b | 0.42 | 1.05 | A4b | 0.90 | 0.64 |
| A5b | 1.49 | 1.00 | A5b | 0.70 | 0.79 |
| A | 0.00 | 0.52 | A | 1.05 | 0.50 |

Table 28. SDOF T = 4 sec

log (z)/β Results.

| $\mu \approx 6$ | NT1 | NT3 | $\mu \approx 2$ | NT1 | NT3 |
|-----------------|------|------|-----------------|------|------|
| A1a | 3.24 | 2.76 | A1a | 2.61 | 0.17 |
| A2a | 0.78 | 0.07 | A2a | 0.76 | 2.07 |
| A3a | 1.96 | 1.07 | A3a | 2.26 | 0.14 |
| A4a | 1.51 | 0.73 | A4a | 1.63 | 1.28 |
| A5a | 2.05 | 1.43 | A5a | 2.86 | 1.04 |
| A1b | 2.03 | 0.83 | A1b | 0.88 | 1.86 |
| A2b | 0.48 | 0.28 | A2b | 0.56 | 2.72 |
| A3b | 3.24 | 3.05 | A3b | 2.14 | 0.14 |
| A4b | 2.35 | 1.35 | A4b | 2.01 | 0.20 |
| A5b | 1.18 | 2.01 | A5b | 0.66 | 0.49 |
| A | 2.90 | 1.99 | A | 2.21 | 1.46 |

Table 29. SDOF T = 0.85 sec

log (z)/β results.

| $\mu \approx 6$ | NT1 | NT3 | $\mu \approx 2$ | NT1 | NT3 |
|-----------------|------|------|-----------------|------|------|
| A1a | 0.06 | 0.22 | A1a | 0.64 | 0.18 |
| A2a | 0.60 | 0.73 | A2a | 1.72 | 1.14 |
| A3a | 1.04 | 0.79 | A3a | 1.26 | 0.52 |
| A4a | 1.24 | 0.97 | A4a | 1.55 | 0.73 |
| A5a | 1.31 | 1.05 | A5a | 0.79 | 0.93 |
| A1b | 0.83 | 0.91 | A1b | 1.87 | 1.31 |
| A2b | 1.54 | 1.60 | A2b | 2.79 | 1.40 |
| A3b | 0.34 | 0.12 | A3b | 0.44 | 0.00 |
| A4b | 0.52 | 0.33 | A4b | 0.44 | 0.07 |
| A5b | 0.87 | 0.99 | A5b | 2.53 | 1.78 |
| A | 0.00 | 0.18 | A | 1.87 | 0.79 |

Table 30. SAC sec

log (z)/β results.

| SAC | NT1 | NT3 |
|-----|------|------|
| A1a | 0.13 | 1.76 |
| A2a | 1.37 | 0.88 |
| A3a | 1.27 | 1.69 |
| A4a | 0.48 | 2.40 |
| A5a | 0.25 | 2.14 |
| A1b | 0.39 | 3.08 |
| A2b | 0.17 | 1.24 |
| A3b | 0.92 | 1.59 |
| A4b | 0.81 | 2.36 |
| A5b | 0.85 | 2.74 |
| A | 0.56 | 2.95 |

Appendix 3

Table 31. Records used in the Target sets.

| Set | Event | Station | Record/Component |
|-----|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|
| T1a | Cape Mendocino 1992/04/25 18:06 | 89509 Eureka - Myrtle & West | CAPEMEND/EUR000 |
| T1a | Cape Mendocino 1992/04/25 18:06 | 89486 Fortuna - Fortuna Blvd | CAPEMEND/FOR000 |
| T1a | Imperial Valley 1979/10/15 23:16 | 6622 Compuertas | IMPVALL/H-CMP015 |
| T1a | Imperial Valley 1979/10/15 23:16 | 6621 Chihuahua | IMPVALL/H-CHI012 |
| T1a | Landers 1992/06/28 11:58 | 5070 North Palm Springs | LANDERS/NPS000 |
| T1a | Landers 1992/06/28 11:58 | 12025 Palm Springs Airport | LANDERS/PSA000 |
| T1a | Loma Prieta 1989/10/18 00:05 | 57382 Gilroy Array #4 | LOMAP/G04000 |
| T1a | Loma Prieta 1989/10/18 00:05 | 14 WAHO | LOMAP/WAH000 |
| T1a | Northridge 1994/01/17 12:31 | 24389 LA - Century City CC North | NORTHR/CCN360 |
| T1a | Northridge 1994/01/17 12:31 | 24283 Moorpark - Fire Sta | NORTHR/MRP180 |
| T1b | Cape Mendocino 1992/04/25 18:06 | 89509 Eureka - Myrtle & West | CAPEMEND/EUR090 |
| T1b | Cape Mendocino 1992/04/25 18:06 | 89486 Fortuna - Fortuna Blvd | CAPEMEND/FOR090 |
| T1b | Imperial Valley 1979/10/15 23:16 | 6622 Compuertas | IMPVALL/H-CMP285 |
| T1b | Imperial Valley 1979/10/15 23:16 | 6621 Chihuahua | IMPVALL/H-CHI282 |
| T1b | Landers 1992/06/28 11:58 | 5070 North Palm Springs | LANDERS/NPS090 |
| T1b | Landers 1992/06/28 11:58 | 12025 Palm Springs Airport | LANDERS/PSA090 |
| T1b | Loma Prieta 1989/10/18 00:05 | 57382 Gilroy Array #4 | LOMAP/G04090 |
| T1b | Loma Prieta 1989/10/18 00:05 | 14 WAHO | LOMAP/WAH090 |
| T1b | Northridge 1994/01/17 12:31 | 24389 LA - Century City CC North | NORTHR/CCN090 |
| T1b | Northridge 1994/01/17 12:31 | 24283 Moorpark - Fire Sta | NORTHR/MRP090 |
| T2a | Cape Mendocino 1992/04/25 18:06 | 89486 Fortuna - Fortuna Blvd | CAPEMEND/FOR000 |
| T2a | Cape Mendocino 1992/04/25 18:06 | 89324 Rio Dell Overpass - FF | CAPEMEND/RIO360 |

| | | | |
|-----|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------|
| T2a | Imperial Valley 1979/10/15 23:16 | 931 El Centro Array #12 | IMPVALL/H-E12140 |
| T2a | Imperial Valley 1979/10/15 23:16 | 5056 El Centro Array #1 | IMPVALL/H-E01140 |
| T2a | Landers 1992/06/28 11:58 | 5071 Morongo Valley | LANDERS/MVH000 |
| T2a | Landers 1992/06/28 11:58 | 22074 Yermo Fire Station | LANDERS/YER360 |
| T2a | Loma Prieta 1989/10/18 00:05 | 1652 Anderson Dam (Downstream) | LOMAP/AND360 |
| T2a | Loma Prieta 1989/10/18 00:05 | 57066 Agnews State Hospital | LOMAP/AGW000 |
| T2a | Northridge 1994/01/17 12:31 | 24461 Alhambra - Fremont School | NORTHR/ALH360 |
| T2a | Northridge 1994/01/17 12:31 | 24055 Leona Valley #5 - Ritter | NORTHR/LV5000 |
| T2b | Cape Mendocino 1992/04/25 18:06 | 89486 Fortuna - Fortuna Blvd | CAPEMEND/FOR090 |
| T2b | Cape Mendocino 1992/04/25 18:06 | 89324 Rio Dell Overpass - FF | CAPEMEND/RIO270 |
| T2b | Imperial Valley 1979/10/15 23:16 | 931 El Centro Array #12 | IMPVALL/H-E12230 |
| T2b | Imperial Valley 1979/10/15 23:16 | 5056 El Centro Array #1 | IMPVALL/H-E01230 |
| T2b | Landers 1992/06/28 11:58 | 5071 Morongo Valley | LANDERS/MVH090 |
| T2b | Landers 1992/06/28 11:58 | 22074 Yermo Fire Station | LANDERS/YER270 |
| T2b | Loma Prieta 1989/10/18 00:05 | 1652 Anderson Dam (Downstream) | LOMAP/AND270 |
| T2b | Loma Prieta 1989/10/18 00:05 | 57066 Agnews State Hospital | LOMAP/AGW090 |
| T2b | Northridge 1994/01/17 12:31 | 24461 Alhambra - Fremont School | NORTHR/ALH090 |
| T2b | Northridge 1994/01/17 12:31 | 24055 Leona Valley #5 - Ritter | NORTHR/LV5090 |
| T3a | Cape Mendocino 1992/04/25 18:06 | 89509 Eureka - Myrtle & West | CAPEMEND/EUR000 |
| T3a | Cape Mendocino 1992/04/25 18:06 | 89324 Rio Dell Overpass - FF | CAPEMEND/RIO360 |
| T3a | Imperial Valley 1979/10/15 23:16 | 6621 Chihuahua | IMPVALL/H-CHI012 |
| T3a | Imperial Valley 1979/10/15 23:16 | 5059 El Centro Array #13 | IMPVALL/H-E13140 |
| T3a | Landers 1992/06/28 11:58 | 23559 Barstow | LANDERS/BRS000 |
| T3a | Landers 1992/06/28 11:58 | 12149 Desert Hot Springs | LANDERS/DSP000 |
| T3a | Loma Prieta 1989/10/18 00:05 | 57504 Coyote Lake Dam (Downst) | LOMAP/CLD195 |
| T3a | Loma Prieta 1989/10/18 00:05 | 1695 Sunnyvale - Colton Ave. | LOMAP/SVL360 |

| | | | |
|-----|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------|
| T3a | Northridge 1994/01/17 12:31 | 24303 LA - Hollywood Stor FF | NORTHR/HOL360 |
| T3a | Northridge 1994/01/17 12:31 | 24309 Leona Valley #6 | NORTHR/LV6360 |
| T3b | Cape Mendocino 1992/04/25 18:06 | 89509 Eureka - Myrtle & West | CAPEMEND/EUR090 |
| T3b | Cape Mendocino 1992/04/25 18:06 | 89324 Rio Dell Overpass - FF | CAPEMEND/RIO270 |
| T3b | Imperial Valley 1979/10/15 23:16 | 6621 Chihuahua | IMPVALL/H-CHI282 |
| T3b | Imperial Valley 1979/10/15 23:16 | 5059 El Centro Array #13 | IMPVALL/H-E13230 |
| T3b | Landers 1992/06/28 11:58 | 23559 Barstow | LANDERS/BRS090 |
| T3b | Landers 1992/06/28 11:58 | 12149 Desert Hot Springs | LANDERS/DSP090 |
| T3b | Loma Prieta 1989/10/18 00:05 | 57504 Coyote Lake Dam (Downst) | LOMAP/CLD285 |
| T3b | Loma Prieta 1989/10/18 00:05 | 1695 Sunnysvale - Colton Ave. | LOMAP/SVL270 |
| T3b | Northridge 1994/01/17 12:31 | 24303 LA - Hollywood Stor FF | NORTHR/HOL090 |
| T3b | Northridge 1994/01/17 12:31 | 24309 Leona Valley #6 | NORTHR/LV6090 |

Table 32. Record used in the Arbitrary sets.

| Set | Event | Station | Record/Component |
|-----|---|------------------------------------|-------------------|
| A1a | Cape Mendocino 1992/04/25 18:06 | 89509 Eureka - Myrtle & West | CAPEMEND/EUR000 |
| A1a | Coalinga 1983/05/02 23:42 | 36410 Parkfield - Cholame 3W | COALINGA/H-C03000 |
| A1a | Coalinga 1983/05/02 23:42 | 36444 Parkfield - Fault Zone 10 | COALINGA/H-Z10000 |
| A1a | Imperial Valley 1979/10/15 23:16 | 5059 El Centro Array #13 | IMPVALL/H-E13140 |
| A1a | Imperial Valley 1979/10/15 23:16 | 5052 Plaster City | IMPVALL/H-PLS045 |
| A1a | Landers 1992/06/28 11:58 | 22074 Yermo Fire Station | LANDERS/YER360 |
| A1a | Loma Prieta 1989/10/18 00:05 | 47524 Hollister - South & Pine | LOMAP/HSP000 |
| A1a | Northridge 1994/01/17 12:31 | 14368 Downey - Co Maint Bldg | NORTHR/DWN360 |
| A1a | San Fernando 1971/02/09 14:00 | 125 Lake Hughes #1 | SFERN/L01021 |
| A1a | Superstitt Hills(B) 1987/11/24 13:16 | 5210 Wildlife Liquef. Array | SUPERST/B-IVW360 |
| A1b | Cape Mendocino 1992/04/25 18:06 | 89509 Eureka - Myrtle & West | CAPEMEND/EUR090 |
| A1b | Coalinga 1983/05/02 23:42 | 36410 Parkfield - Cholame 3W | COALINGA/H-C03090 |
| A1b | Coalinga 1983/05/02 23:42 | 36444 Parkfield - Fault | COALINGA/H-Z10090 |

| | | Zone 10 | |
|-----|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| A1b | Imperial Valley 1979/10/15 23:16 | 5059 El Centro Array #13 | IMPVALL/H-E13230 |
| A1b | Imperial Valley 1979/10/15 23:16 | 5052 Plaster City | IMPVALL/H-PLS135 |
| A1b | Landers 1992/06/28 11:58 | 22074 Yermo Fire Station | LANDERS/YER270 |
| A1b | Loma Prieta 1989/10/18 00:05 | 47524 Hollister - South & Pine | LOMAP/HSP090 |
| A1b | Northridge 1994/01/17 12:31 | 14368 Downey - Co Maint Bldg | NORTHR/DWN090 |
| A1b | San Fernando 1971/02/09 14:00 | 125 Lake Hughes #1 | SFERN/L01111 |
| A1b | Superstitt Hills(B) 1987/11/24 13:16 | 5210 Wildlife Liquef. Array | SUPERST/B-IVW090 |
| A2a | Cape Mendocino 1992/04/25 18:06 | 89324 Rio Dell Overpass - FF | CAPEMEND/RIO270 |
| A2a | Coalinga 1983/05/02 23:42 | 36408 Parkfield - Fault Zone 3 | COALINGA/H- COH000 |
| A2a | Coalinga 1983/05/02 23:42 | 36439 Parkfield - Gold Hill 3E | COALINGA/H-GH3000 |
| A2a | Imperial Valley 1979/10/15 23:16 | 724 Niland Fire Station | IMPVALL/H-NIL360 |
| A2a | Imperial Valley 1979/10/15 23:16 | 5169 Westmorland Fire Sta | IMPVALL/H-WSM180 |
| A2a | Landers 1992/06/28 11:58 | 12025 Palm Springs Airport | LANDERS/PSA000 |
| A2a | Loma Prieta 1989/10/18 00:05 | 47179 Salinas - John & Work | LOMAP/SJW160 |
| A2a | Northridge 1994/01/17 12:31 | 24271 Lake Hughes #1 | NORTHR/LH1000 |
| A2a | San Fernando 1971/02/09 14:00 | 262 Palmdale Fire Station | SFERN/PDL120 |
| A2a | Superstitt Hills(A) 1987/11/24 05:14 | 5210 Wildlife Liquef. Array | SUPERST/A-IVW360 |
| A2b | Cape Mendocino 1992/04/25 18:06 | 89324 Rio Dell Overpass - FF | CAPEMEND/RIO360 |
| A2b | Coalinga 1983/05/02 23:42 | 36408 Parkfield - Fault Zone 3 | COALINGA/H- COH090 |
| A2b | Coalinga 1983/05/02 23:42 | 36439 Parkfield - Gold Hill 3E | COALINGA/H-GH3090 |
| A2b | Imperial Valley 1979/10/15 23:16 | 724 Niland Fire Station | IMPVALL/H-NIL090 |
| A2b | Imperial Valley 1979/10/15 23:16 | 5169 Westmorland Fire Sta | IMPVALL/H-WSM090 |
| A2b | Landers 1992/06/28 11:58 | 12025 Palm Springs Airport | LANDERS/PSA090 |
| A2b | Loma Prieta 1989/10/18 00:05 | 47179 Salinas - John & Work | LOMAP/SJW250 |
| A2b | Northridge 1994/01/17 12:31 | 24271 Lake Hughes #1 | NORTHR/LH1090 |
| A2b | San Fernando 1971/02/09 14:00 | 262 Palmdale Fire Station | SFERN/PDL210 |
| A2b | Superstitt Hills(A) 1987/11/24 05:14 | 5210 Wildlife Liquef. Array | SUPERST/A-IVW090 |

| | | | |
|-----|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| A3a | Cape Mendocino 1992/04/25 18:06 | 89486 Fortuna - Fortuna Blvd | CAPEMEND/FOR000 |
| A3a | Coalinga 1983/05/02 23:42 | 36455 Parkfield - Vineyard Cany 1E | COALINGA/H-PV1000 |
| A3a | Coalinga 1983/05/02 23:42 | 36447 Parkfield - Vineyard Cany 2W | COALINGA/H-VC2000 |
| A3a | Imperial Valley 1979/10/15 23:16 | 5066 Coachella Canal #4 | IMPVALL/H-CC4045 |
| A3a | Imperial Valley 1979/10/15 23:16 | 6605 Delta | IMPVALL/H-DLT262 |
| A3a | Landers 1992/06/28 11:58 | 12149 Desert Hot Springs | LANDERS/DSP000 |
| A3a | Loma Prieta 1989/10/18 00:05 | 1002 APEEL 2 - Redwood City | LOMAP/A02043 |
| A3a | Loma Prieta 1989/10/18 00:05 | 57191 Halls Valley | LOMAP/HVR000 |
| A3a | Northridge 1994/01/17 12:31 | 14403 LA - 116th St School | NORTHR/116360 |
| A3a | San Fernando 1971/02/09 14:00 | 289 Whittier Narrows Dam | SFERN/WND143 |
| A3b | Cape Mendocino 1992/04/25 18:06 | 89486 Fortuna - Fortuna Blvd | CAPEMEND/FOR090 |
| A3b | Coalinga 1983/05/02 23:42 | 36455 Parkfield - Vineyard Cany 1E | COALINGA/H-PV1090 |
| A3b | Coalinga 1983/05/02 23:42 | 36447 Parkfield - Vineyard Cany 2W | COALINGA/H-VC2090 |
| A3b | Imperial Valley 1979/10/15 23:16 | 5066 Coachella Canal #4 | IMPVALL/H-CC4135 |
| A3b | Imperial Valley 1979/10/15 23:16 | 6605 Delta | IMPVALL/H-DLT352 |
| A3b | Landers 1992/06/28 11:58 | 12149 Desert Hot Springs | LANDERS/DSP090 |
| A3b | Loma Prieta 1989/10/18 00:05 | 1002 APEEL 2 - Redwood City | LOMAP/A02133 |
| A3b | Loma Prieta 1989/10/18 00:05 | 57191 Halls Valley | LOMAP/HVR090 |
| A3b | Northridge 1994/01/17 12:31 | 14403 LA - 116th St School | NORTHR/116090 |
| A3b | San Fernando 1971/02/09 14:00 | 289 Whittier Narrows Dam | SFERN/WND233 |
| A4a | Coalinga 1983/05/02 23:42 | 36407 Parkfield - Fault Zone 1 | COALINGA/H- COW000 |
| A4a | Coalinga 1983/05/02 23:42 | 36456 Parkfield - Fault Zone 14 | COALINGA/H-Z14000 |
| A4a | Imperial Valley 1979/10/15 23:16 | 6621 Chihuahua | IMPVALL/H-CHI012 |
| A4a | Imperial Valley 1979/10/15 23:16 | 931 El Centro Array #12 | IMPVALL/H-E12140 |
| A4a | Landers 1992/06/28 11:58 | 23559 Barstow | LANDERS/BRS000 |
| A4a | Loma Prieta 1989/10/18 00:05 | 1652 Anderson Dam (Downstream) | LOMAP/AND360 |
| A4a | Loma Prieta 1989/10/18 00:05 | 1656 Hollister Diff. Array | LOMAP/HDA165 |
| A4a | Northridge 1994/01/17 12:31 | 14196 Inglewood - Union | NORTHR/ING000 |

| | | Oil | |
|-----|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| A4a | Northridge 1994/01/17 12:31 | 24283 Moorpark - Fire Sta | NORTHR/MRP180 |
| A4a | San Fernando 1971/02/09 14:00 | 135 LA - Hollywood Stor Lot | SFERN/PEL180 |
| A4b | Coalinga 1983/05/02 23:42 | 36407 Parkfield - Fault Zone 1 | COALINGA/H- COW090 |
| A4b | Coalinga 1983/05/02 23:42 | 36456 Parkfield - Fault Zone 14 | COALINGA/H-Z14090 |
| A4b | Imperial Valley 1979/10/15 23:16 | 6621 Chihuahua | IMPVALL/H-CHI282 |
| A4b | Imperial Valley 1979/10/15 23:16 | 931 El Centro Array #12 | IMPVALL/H-E12230 |
| A4b | Landers 1992/06/28 11:58 | 23559 Barstow | LANDERS/BRS090 |
| A4b | Loma Prieta 1989/10/18 00:05 | 1652 Anderson Dam (Downstream) | LOMAP/AND270 |
| A4b | Loma Prieta 1989/10/18 00:05 | 1656 Hollister Diff. Array | LOMAP/HDA255 |
| A4b | Northridge 1994/01/17 12:31 | 14196 Inglewood - Union Oil | NORTHR/ING090 |
| A4b | Northridge 1994/01/17 12:31 | 24283 Moorpark - Fire Sta | NORTHR/MRP090 |
| A4b | San Fernando 1971/02/09 14:00 | 135 LA - Hollywood Stor Lot | SFERN/PEL090 |
| A5a | Coalinga 1983/05/02 23:42 | 36227 Parkfield - Cholame 5W | COALINGA/H-C05360 |
| A5a | Coalinga 1983/05/02 23:42 | 36441 Parkfield - Vineyard Cany 6W | COALINGA/H-VC6000 |
| A5a | Imperial Valley 1979/10/15 23:16 | 5056 El Centro Array #1 | IMPVALL/H-E01140 |
| A5a | Imperial Valley 1979/10/15 23:16 | 6617 Cucapah | IMPVALL/H-QKP085 |
| A5a | Landers 1992/06/28 11:58 | 5071 Morongo Valley | LANDERS/MVH000 |
| A5a | Landers 1992/06/28 11:58 | 5070 North Palm Springs | LANDERS/NPS000 |
| A5a | Loma Prieta 1989/10/18 00:05 | 57504 Coyote Lake Dam (Downst) | LOMAP/CLD195 |
| A5a | Loma Prieta 1989/10/18 00:05 | 57382 Gilroy Array #4 | LOMAP/G04000 |
| A5a | Northridge 1994/01/17 12:31 | 24157 LA - Baldwin Hills | NORTHR/BLD360 |
| A5a | Northridge 1994/01/17 12:31 | 24303 LA - Hollywood Stor FF | NORTHR/HOL360 |
| A5b | Coalinga 1983/05/02 23:42 | 36227 Parkfield - Cholame 5W | COALINGA/H-C05270 |
| A5b | Coalinga 1983/05/02 23:42 | 36441 Parkfield - Vineyard Cany 6W | COALINGA/H-VC6090 |
| A5b | Imperial Valley 1979/10/15 23:16 | 5056 El Centro Array #1 | IMPVALL/H-E01230 |
| A5b | Landers 1992/06/28 11:58 | 5071 Morongo Valley | LANDERS/MVH090 |
| A5b | Landers 1992/06/28 11:58 | 5070 North Palm Springs | LANDERS/NPS090 |
| A5b | Loma Prieta 1989/10/18 00:05 | 57504 Coyote Lake Dam (Downst) | LOMAP/CLD285 |
| A5b | Loma Prieta 1989/10/18 00:05 | 57382 Gilroy Array #4 | LOMAP/G04090 |
| A5b | Northridge 1994/01/17 12:31 | 24157 LA - Baldwin Hills | NORTHR/BLD090 |

| | | | |
|-----|-----------------------------|------------------------------|---------------|
| A5b | Northridge 1994/01/17 12:31 | 24303 LA - Hollywood Stor FF | NORTHR/HOL090 |
|-----|-----------------------------|------------------------------|---------------|

Table 33. Record used in the scaling Target sets.

| Set | Event | Station | Record/Component |
|-----|--|------------------------------------|-------------------|
| NT1 | Coalinga 1983/05/02 23:42 | 1162 Pleasant Valley P.P. - yard | COALINGA/H-PVY045 |
| NT1 | Coalinga 1983/05/02 23:42 | 1162 Pleasant Valley P.P. - yard | COALINGA/H-PVY135 |
| NT1 | Imperial Valley 1979/10/15 23:16 | 5054 Bonds Corner | IMPVALL/H-BCR230 |
| NT1 | Imperial Valley 1979/10/15 23:16 | 5028 El Centro Array #7 | IMPVALL/H-E07230 |
| NT1 | Loma Prieta 1989/10/18 00:05 | 47125 Capitola | LOMAP/CAP000 |
| NT1 | Loma Prieta 1989/10/18 00:05 | 57007 Corralitos | LOMAP/CLS090 |
| NT1 | Northridge 1994/01/17 12:31 | 77 Rinaldi Receiving Sta | NORTHR/RRS228 |
| NT1 | Northridge 1994/01/17 12:31 | 74 Sylmar - Converter Sta | NORTHR/SCS142 |
| NT1 | N. Palm Springs 1986/07/08 09:20 | 5070 North Palm Springs | PALMSPR/NPS210 |
| NT1 | Superstitn Hills(B) 1987/11/24 13:16 | 5051 Parachute Test Site | SUPERST/B-PTS225 |
| NT3 | Imperial Valley 1979/10/15 23:16 | 5054 Bonds Corner | IMPVALL/H-BCR140 |
| NT3 | Imperial Valley 1979/10/15 23:16 | 5060 Brawley Airport | IMPVALL/H-BRA315 |
| NT3 | Imperial Valley 1940/05/19 04:37 | 117 El Centro Array #9 | IMPVALL/I-ELC180 |
| NT3 | Landers 1992/06/28 11:58 | 22170 Joshua Tree | LANDERS/JOS000 |
| NT3 | Loma Prieta 1989/10/18 00:05 | 47381 Gilroy Array #3 | LOMAP/G03000 |
| NT3 | Loma Prieta 1989/10/18 00:05 | 47006 Gilroy - Gavilan Coll. | LOMAP/GIL337 |
| NT3 | Northridge 1994/01/17 12:31 | 90053 Canoga Park - Topanga Can | NORTHR/CNP196 |
| NT3 | Northridge 1994/01/17 12:31 | 90009 N. Hollywood - Coldwater Can | NORTHR/CWC180 |
| NT3 | Superstition Hills(B) 1987/11/24 13:16 | 01335 El Centro Imp. Co. Cent | SUPERST/B-ICC000 |
| NT3 | Superstition Hills(B) 1987/11/24 13:16 | 5051 Parachute Test Site | SUPERST/B-PTS225 |