Thesis outline: Validation of ground motion simulations via response history analysis of complex seismic systems

PhD Candidate:

Vahid Loghman

Supervisors:

Professor Brendon Bradley Dr. Reagan Chandramohan Dr. Chris McGann

Background: Applications Of Ground Motions

Seismic Sources



Structural Performance

1

Ground Motions in Response History Analysis

Challenges:

- ✓ Scarcity of ground motion representing the specific-site hazard
 - Using scaled historical ground motions?!
- ✓ Restrictions:
 - Incompatibility of selected ground motions
 - Large variability in selected ground motions from empirical databases

Utilizing simulated ground motions:

Necessity of validation



Bozorgnia and Bertero (2004)



Graves and Pitarka (2010)

Validation Matrix:



- ✓ **Objective 1:** Code-based validation of ground motion simulation
- ✓ **Objective 2:** Validation of simulated GM by comprehensive analysis of archetypical buildings
- ✓ **Objective 3:** Develop "Automated" workflow for validation using MDoF systems
- ✓ **Objective 4:** Seismic performance assessment using simulated ground motions

- ✓ **Objective 1:** Code-based validation of ground motion simulation
 - Validation in the context of industry application
 - Similar procedures in analysis and design common in practice
 - NZ-1170.5 standard (structural design actions)
 - Finite elements models commonly used by engineers
 - Typical seismic responses by designers (e.g. Drift...)

Case Study:

- Two real buildings
- Located in Christchurch
- Building A:
 - \checkmark 7-story, Tn= 0.5 sec
 - ✓ RC Frame + Shear Wall
- Building B:
 - ✓ 13-story, Tn= 2 sec
 - ✓ Steel Frame + Shear Wall
- Responses:
 - ✓ Inter-story drift ratio (IDR)
 - ✓ Peak floor acceleration (PFA)



Building A

Building B

Acknowledgment: Holmes Consulting Engineering Company

Ground Motions:

- 22 Feb. 2011 Christchurch Eq.
- 40 Stations (Observed and Simulated)
- Scaled based on NZ-1170.5





Comparison between the EDPs for scaled Sim/Obs GMs:



Comparison between the EDPs for scaled Sim/Obs GMs:



Comparing EDPs variability due to the record-to-record variability:

- Bootstrap sampling
- T-test for comparison



Result:

- Comparable PFA for Building A
- Statistically Significant difference in IDR Building A

Comparing EDPs variability due to the record-to-record variability:

- Bootstrap sampling
- T-test for comparison



Result:

 Comparable responses for Building B

- ✓ **Objective 2:** Validation of simulated GM by comprehensive analysis of archetypical buildings
 - Different types of structures in terms of material, load carrying system
 - Rigorous models (Nonlinearity, degradation...)
 - Different types of Engineering Demands Parameter (EDPs)
 - Different types of Intensity Measures (IMs)
 - Pre-collapse and collapse levels
 - Covering 4th columns of validation matrix (Complex Systems)

- ✓ **Objective 3:** Develop "Automated" workflow for validation using MDoF systems
 - Make it a routine process
 - Comparing different methods of ground motion simulation

- ✓ **Objective 4:** Seismic performance assessment using simulated ground motions
 - Validation at different hazard levels by selecting simulated ground motions