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Abstract

An important aspect of earthquake loads exerted on extended structures, or structures founded on several foundations, is the spatial variability of the seismic motion. Hence, a rigorous earthquake resistant design of lifeline structures should account for the spatial character of the seismic input, at least in an approximate way.

A procedure for the modification of the design response spectrum is proposed. It enables addressing the problem of multiply-supported structures subjected to imperfectly correlated seismic excitations by means of an extension to the response spectrum method. A modified response spectrum model is developed for the design of extended facilities subjected to single and multicomponent ground motion, and a modal combination rule is proposed for each case. The modification procedure is based on adjusting each spectral value of the given design response spectrum by means of a correction factor which depends on the structural properties and on the characteristics of the wave propagation phenomenon. The theoretical model is validated through digital simulation of seismic ground motion, whereby model predictions are found to be in satisfactory agreement with exact results. Finally, some practical considerations on the theoretical response spectrum model are addressed. They aim at suggesting reasonable simplifications which render the model more appealing in practical situations.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Objectives and Scope

The safety incorporated in the design of large or extended structures, such as nuclear power plants, industrial buildings, bridges, or lifelines can significantly be enhanced by improvements in the understanding and the representation of the earthquake loads exerted on these facilities. An important aspect of the earthquake loads for extended structures, or structures founded on several foundations, is the spatial variability of the seismic motion, whose study is now possible as a result of the deployment of strong motion instrument arrays, started at the end of last decade. Therefore, a rigorous seismic analysis of lifeline structures should account for the spatial variability of the ground motion, at least in an approximate way. This situation has motivated the present work, whose main objective is to provide a practical means for the seismic analysis and design of spatially extended facilities accounting for partially correlated seismic excitations. In order to succeed in including such an aspect into seismic design practice, it is essential to provide the engineering community with an attractive means that takes the form of an extension to a commonly used tool. In other words, while a full Random Fields analysis to address this problem would be fastidious and not practical, an attractive alternative for engineering design situations would consist in modifying the design response spectrum, so as to account for the spatial extent of
the structure to be analyzed (or designed) and for the spatial character of the input motion. Therefore, a procedure for the modification of the design response spectrum is proposed in this thesis, which enables addressing the problem of multiply-supported structures subjected to imperfectly correlated seismic excitations. The technique is an extension to the mode superposition method combined with the response spectrum method, thereby allowing the inclusion of this potentially important problem into seismic design practice.

1.2 Organization

In Chapter 2, a review of past work on the subject of strong motion arrays and spatial variability of ground motion is made, and the relevance of the present thesis work is put into evidence.

In Chapter 3, the general derivation of the modified response spectrum model is presented. It addresses the cases of discrete systems subjected to both single and multicomponent ground motion, and the case of bridges subjected to a single ground motion component.

In Chapter 4, modal combination rules are developed for the cases of single and multicomponent ground motion, accounting for the spatial variability of the seismic excitation.

In Chapter 5, the theoretical response spectrum model is validated through digital simulation of seismic ground motion.

Finally, Chapter 6 summarizes the results and provides suggestions for further
research.
Chapter 2

Background

2.1 Introduction

Earthquakes are complex and heavily damaging phenomena that must be accounted for in estimating the safety of structures. Earthquake ground motions exhibit a high variability in both time and space, and may be probabilistically modeled based upon the theory of Random Fields. While the temporal variability has been the object of extensive research and sophisticated modeling because of its relatively easy quantification from seismograms, the spatial variability, whose investigation requires the deployment of dense networks of strong motion accelerographs, is not yet well understood.

During an earthquake, a structure is subjected to forces not only caused by the inertial loading, but also by the spatially varying nature of the ground motion. This effect, usually referred to as wave passage, is the result of a number of factors, such as site geology and stratigraphy, wave content, dispersion, scattering, etc. The problem of wave passage is of essential importance in the seismic analysis and design of of extended facilities such as dams, nuclear power plants, and bridges, in which differential ground motion can induce substantial additional stresses. Therefore, for a seismic analysis of lifeline structures to be rigorous, it behooves to take into account the spatial variability of the ground motion, at least approximately.
2.2 Review of Previous Work

Past work on the subject of strong motion arrays and spatial variability of ground motion has mainly focused on four research areas, which will succinctly be presented in subsequent paragraphs.

1. Design, site selection, and deployment of strong motion instrument arrays (e.g. Iwan, 1979), which is an area that deals, essentially, with topics such as:

- Favorable array locations.

- Design of arrays for source mechanisms and wave propagation studies.

- Design of arrays for local effects studies.

- Array construction and operation, and implementation.

Thus, the goal aimed at in this research area, is an improvement in the understanding of ground motion nature by providing measurements resulting from actual earthquakes.

2. Interpretation of actual earthquake records for specific array-sites and seismic events (e.g. Loh et al., 1982, Bolt et al., 1982, Harichandran and Vanmarcke, 1984, Abrahamson, 1985, Loh and Yeh, 1988). This research area has flourished after the installation of the SMART-1 (Strong Motion Array in Taiwan), located in the north-east corner of Taiwan (Lotung City), and which was begun in September 1980. Being a dense network of strong motion accelerographs, the SMART-1 provides a good op-
portunity for the study of spatial variations of seismic waves. Based on the SMART-1 data, the following topics have been tackled:

- **Generation of Fourier amplitude spectra for different station pairs.**

- Moving window analysis in the time and frequency domains for the study of spatial variations of ground motion.

- **Identification of wave types and their directions of propagation.**

- **Description of seismic wave coherency and power spectrum as functions of, wave number, frequency, azimuth of propagation and wave type.**

- **Space-time correlations.**

**3. Formulation of analytical tools (both deterministic and statistical) for the processing and interpretation of recordings obtained with large instrument arrays (e.g. Burg, 1964, Aki and Richard, 1980, Vanmarcke, 1983, Harichandran and Vanmarcke, 1984, Loh and Yeh, 1988).** This research area is a natural complement to the two aforementioned ones, and it focuses on:

- **Development of schemes for seismic array data processing.**

- **Development of analytical models for the space-time variation of earthquake ground motions.**
4. Stochastic characterization of spatial variabilities of ground motion, and analysis of structures and facilities to spatially varying seismic motions. Among the contributors to this research area, we can cite the following:

- Kausel and Pais, 1984, investigated the spatial and temporal variabilities of seismic ground motions that may be expected in soil deposits, by means of simple physical models for stochastic SH waves travelling in a homogeneous medium. The statistical properties of the motions at two different points on the surface and/or within the soil mass were computed and analyzed.

- Harada, 1984, presented a probabilistic description of spatial variation of strong earthquake-generated ground displacement. Maximum values for the ground displacement, the relative displacement between two points on ground surface, and the ground strain, were expressed in terms of the spatial correlation function, which may be estimated from data analysis.

- Harada and Shinozuka, 1986, in a continuation of the work just described, introduced the notion of ground deformation spectra, which express the relationship between the maximum value of the relative displacement between two points on ground surface and the separating distance. The spatial correlation function was estimated from data analysis, and the theoretical development was based on univariate and spatially unidimensional time-space stochastic processes.

- Hindy and Novak, 1980, investigated theoretically the response of buried pipelines to
partially correlated seismic excitations (an exponential decay of cross-spectrum was assumed with respect to frequency and separating distance) in both lateral and longitudinal directions. It was found that partial correlation of seismic excitations could produce excessive stress in the pipe, which would depend on the degree of correlation of the excitation and its frequency content. Further, axial stresses were found to be higher than bending stress, and to be decreasing with the increase of the pipe radius or the wall thickness. The analytical development was based on random vibration theory.

- Lee and Penzien, 1983, presented a stochastic method for seismic analysis of structures and piping systems subjected to multiple support excitations. In either the time domain or the frequency domain, peak response statistics could be found, including the effects of modal cross-correlation and cross-correlation of multiple support excitations.

- Zerva et al., 1988, developed a stochastic model for the ground excitations. Based on this model, the responses of pipelines and single span simply supported bridges to perfectly and partially correlated seismic excitations were investigated. It was found that for continuous pipelines, the spatial character of the seismic input was of importance, and that the differential ground motion was likely to cause damage at the joints. However, it was concluded that the effect of differential ground motion was not significant for single-span simply supported bridges, even though it was found that the bridge response at certain sections would be slightly
higher for the case of partially correlated excitations than for the case of perfectly correlated excitations.

- Harichandran and Wang, 1988, investigated the response of simple beams to spatially varying earthquake excitations, using random vibration theory. It was concluded that the assumption of identical support excitations leads to conservative estimates of the maximum beam response, while the assumption of time-delayed support excitations can lead to unconservative estimates. Incidentally, it is to be noted that these conclusions concern maximum beam response only, and do not apply to arbitrary sections along the beam. Therefore, for design purposes, the situation still needs further investigation.

Having briefly exposed the work done on the subject of spatial variability of ground motion, it behooves to mention that further investigation is still needed with regard to both the seismological aspect and the engineering aspect of the problem. Indeed, from a seismological viewpoint, further exploration of effects of source mechanisms, geology, stratigraphy, local site, etc., ought to be done so as to improve the available ground motion models. Regarding the engineering aspect, on the other hand, it is essential to provide practical means, as an alternative to random vibration theory, for the seismic analysis of elongated structures, incorporating the spatial variability of the ground motion, at least approximately. Also, as an additional note to the engineering aspect, it is important to shed some light on the as yet unresolved issue of the response of structures to incoherent seismic motions, as opposed to the importance
of wave travelling effects that was recognized about two decades ago in independent pioneering studies by Newmark [33] and Scanlan [40]. As was described earlier, the present thesis work aims at contributing to the engineering aspect of the problem of spatial variability of ground motion.

2.3 Relevance of Proposed Work

From an earthquake engineering viewpoint, the most prominent parameter characterizing ground motions is the maximum ground acceleration, and seismic design criteria are most often expressed in terms of maximum acceleration. A design value for the maximum acceleration may be obtained from an attenuation relationship as a function of a specified magnitude and distance, from correlations with a specified Modified Mercalli Intensity, or directly from a regional risk map which corresponds to an appropriate mean return period.

The maximum acceleration per se is by no means a sufficient representation of earthquake ground motions for seismic analysis and design purposes. It serves, however, as an anchor for more sophisticated and detailed ground motion descriptions. Typically, the seismic input takes the form of time histories, spectral density functions, or smooth response spectra, all of which can be conveniently scaled with respect to the maximum ground acceleration.

Time history analyses performed on different accelerograms - all scaled to the same maximum acceleration - can provide valuable information as to the variability of the seismic response. However, such a task requires extensive calculations and is expensive
for practical purposes.

Spectral density functions along with duration of strong ground motion constitute a second representation of seismic loading. A fundamental property of the spectral density function lies in the fact that the square root of its integral over all frequencies is equal to the r.m.s. ground acceleration. Since the r.m.s. ground acceleration is proportional to the peak ground acceleration, it is possible to scale the seismic input described by a spectral density function by adjusting the area under the spectrum. There are more sophisticated models of spectral density functions, based on the concept of evolutionary spectra, which can handle non-stationary processes, whose statistics are time dependent. But a spectral density function, as a description mode for a seismic input, is not commonly used in seismic design practice, because it requires involved stochastic analyses.

The last and most common representation of earthquake ground motions for seismic analysis and design is by means of the response spectrum. The combination of this seismic loading representation with the modal superposition method is widely used in earthquake resistant designs of conventional above-ground structures for the approximate computation of the structural seismic response. The fundamental requirement for the applicability of this method is that the structure at hand, simply or multiply supported, be subjected to a uniform translational seismic excitation. Such an assumption seems to be realistic for non-elongated structures, which extend over short distances relative to earthquake vibration wavelengths. However, it is not the case for elongated
structures, such as bridges or dams, which are generally subjected to changing motions along their length. This twofold situation has provided the essential impetus for the work contemplated in this thesis, whose objective is the provision of a practical means for the seismic analysis and design of an extended facility accounting, at least in an approximate way, for partially correlated seismic excitations (imperfectly coherent seismic motions combined with wave travelling effects). An attractive alternative for the practical means sought after, would be to develop a procedure that modifies the design response spectrum - assumed to be spatially homogeneous - by means of simple models for the cross-correlation functions. In other words, it will be assumed that the response spectra do not change in horizontal planes, even though the motions may not be spatially uniform. The cross-correlation characteristics will be obtained from models that account for the physical characteristics of the wave-propagation phenomenon. The advantage of such an alternative, over the random vibration approach for instance, is the possible inclusion of the potentially important problem of spatial variability of earthquake ground motions into seismic design practice.
Chapter 3

General Derivation of the
Modified Response Spectrum Model

3.1 Introduction

In earthquake resistant design, it is common to assume that the entire base of a structure is subjected to a uniform ground motion. In other words, the same seismic motion is assumed to be acting, simultaneously, at all points attaching the structure to the ground. This hypothesis in the treatment of earthquake excitations is undoubtedly advantageous, because it substantially facilitates the dynamic analysis, which can be performed by means of the well established and widely used response spectrum method. However, such a hypothesis inherently implies that the ground motion is a result of spatially uniform, vertically propagating shear waves, or, that the base dimensions of the structure at hand, are small relative to the seismic vibration wavelengths. As a consequence, it is clear that the assumption of uniform ground motion is inappropriate for extended facilities, and hence, that the use of the response spectrum method is invalidated for such structures. Therefore, it behooves to develop a procedure that, not only addresses the problem of multiple support excitation, but also is practical enough, in order to gain acceptance within the engineering design community. As was mentioned in earlier parts of this dissertation, a promising alternative would consist in modifying the design response spectrum, so as to account for the spatial character
of the seismic input. Such a development is the object of the present chapter.

In brief, the design response spectrum, as it is classically understood, is considered to be given at a site of interest. This design response spectrum will be modified, so as to account for the spatial character of the seismic input exerted on an extended facility to be implemented in that site. The modification procedure will be based on adjusting each spectral value of the given design response spectrum. Such a task will be achieved by examining each modal equation, and expressing the mean value of the maximum modal response for the case of partially correlated excitations, in terms of the homologous modal response had the seismic input been uniform. By so doing, a modified design response spectrum will be derived, and it will be expressed in terms of the given design response spectrum, by means of a relation that takes the spatially varying nature of the ground motion into account. It is worth mentioning at this point, that relating the mean values of the maximum modal responses, as was stated earlier, is the end result of a multi-step process, which starts by relating the spectral density functions of these very responses. While the spectrum modification procedure will be developed by means of a random vibration analysis, such an analysis will be transparent to the prospective user of the model.

Prior to getting into the development per se, it is important to state the assumptions and hypotheses which the present work is based upon:

• Earthquake ground motions are probabilistically modeled by means of a homogenous space-time random field, which is considered as a collection of temporal random
processes at each of the spatial locations. Both seismic input and structural output are assumed to be zero-mean stationary Gaussian Processes. In fact, the stationarity of the structural response would be justified even if the seismic input were considered to be transient stationary, so long as its duration would be several times larger than the fundamental period of the structure.

- The Design Response Spectrum (mean value $R$ and standard deviation $\sigma_R$) is assumed to be given. It is also assumed to be spatially homogeneous within the site of interest, even though the support motions may be different from one location to another.

- Auto-spectra of the ground motion acceleration are considered to be the same at every location, to be consistent with the given design response spectrum, and to follow a model whose mathematical expression is given.

- Cross-spectra are related to auto-spectra by means of the coherency function, whose mathematical expression is assumed to be given.

- Soil-structure interaction effects are neglected, and support motions are considered to be equal to free-field motions.

- Structures are assumed to be classically damped.

It is important to mention at this stage, that the proposed procedure is independent of the mathematical expressions of both the auto-spectra and the coherency function.
of the ground motion. All it is based on, is that these two functions are given, as opposed to being unknown to be determined.

3.2 Discrete Systems

In this section, the derivation of the modified response spectrum model will be presented for extended lumped mass systems, such as industrial buildings. The formulation will, at first, account for one ground motion component, and will, in a second phase, be extended to multicomponent ground motion.

3.2.1 Case of a Single Ground Motion Component

The coupled equations of motion of a linear, lumped mass, multi-degree of freedom, multiply-supported structural system subjected to uniform undimensional translational seismic excitations can be written in matrix form as follows:

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
M_s & 0 \\
0 & M_b
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
\ddot{U}_s \\
\ddot{U}_b
\end{bmatrix}
+ 
\begin{bmatrix}
C_s & C_{sb} \\
C_{bs} & C_b
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
\dot{U}_s \\
\dot{U}_b
\end{bmatrix}
+ 
\begin{bmatrix}
K_s & K_{sb} \\
K_{bs} & K_b
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
U_s \\
U_b
\end{bmatrix}
= 
\begin{bmatrix}
0 \\
P_b
\end{bmatrix}
\tag{3.2.1.1}
\]

where:

- \(s\) and \(b\) are subscripts referring to structure and base (foundation) respectively.

- \(sb\) and \(bs\) are pairs of subscripts referring to coupling between structure and base.

- \(M\) refers to mass matrices.

- \(C\) refers to damping matrices.
$K$ refers to stiffness matrices.

$U$, $\dot{U}$, and $\ddot{U}$ refer to vectors of, absolute displacement, absolute velocity, and absolute acceleration, respectively.

$P_b$ is a vector of reaction forces at the base (support points).

Note that there is no mass coupling between the structure and the base because masses are lumped.

Let's now decompose the displacements into a rigid body component and a non-rigid body component.

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
U_s \\
U_b
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
T_s & U_0 \\
T_b & U_0
\end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix}
V_s \\
V_b
\end{bmatrix} \quad (3.2.1.2)
\]

where:

$T_sU_0$ is the rigid body component of the structural displacement.

$V_s$ is the non rigid body component of the structural displacement (relative displacement).

$T_bU_0$ is the rigid body component of the base displacement.

$V_b$ is the non rigid body component of the base displacement.

$U_0$ is a scalar in this case, since a single ground motion component is under consideration. $U_0 = u_0$. 
$T_s$ and $T_b$ are transformation matrices (influence vectors in this case), for the structure and the base respectively, which satisfy the rigid body condition:

$$
\begin{bmatrix}
K_s & K_{sb} \\
K_{bs} & K_b
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
T_s \\
T_b
\end{bmatrix} =
\begin{bmatrix}
0 \\
0
\end{bmatrix} \quad (3.2.1.3)
$$

$$
\Rightarrow K_s T_s + K_{sb} T_b = 0 \quad (3.2.1.4)
$$

Note that likewise, there are no damping forces induced by a rigid body velocity.

Note that $V_b = 0$ since the ground motion is uniform.

Let's combine equations (3.2.1.2) and (3.2.1.1), and make use of the rigid body condition (3.2.1.3), to write the equations of motion for the structural part:

$$
M_s \ddot{V}_s + C_s \dot{V}_s + K_s V_s = -M_s T_s \ddot{u}_0 \quad (3.2.1.5)
$$

Assuming that the structure is classically damped, and using modal coordinates, one gets:

$$
\begin{cases}
(\Phi^T M_s \Phi) \ddot{\Phi} \dot{Y} + (\Phi^T C_s \Phi) \dot{\Phi} \dot{Y} + (\Phi^T K_s \Phi) Y = -\Phi^T M_s T_s \ddot{u}_0 \\
V_s = \Phi Y
\end{cases} \quad (3.2.1.6)
$$

where:

$Y$ is a vector of modal coordinates.

$\Phi$ is a matrix containing the mode shapes of the structure.
From (3.2.1.6), the $k^{th}$ modal equation can be written as follows:

$$\ddot{y}_k + 2\beta_k \omega_k \dot{y}_k + \omega_k^2 y_k = -\gamma_k \ddot{u}_0$$  (3.2.1.7)

where:

$y_k$ is the $k^{th}$ modal coordinate

$\beta_k$ is the viscous damping ratio for mode $k$, such that:

$$2\beta_k \omega_k = \frac{\phi_k^T C_s \phi_k}{\phi_k^T M_s \phi_k}$$

$\omega_k$ is the natural frequency for mode $k$, such that:

$$\omega_k^2 = \frac{\phi_k^T K_s \phi_k}{\phi_k^T M_s \phi_k}$$

$\gamma_k$ is the participation factor for mode $k$, such that:

$$\gamma_k = \frac{\phi_k^T M_s T_s}{\phi_k^T M_s \phi_k}$$

The modal equation (3.2.1.7) could be solved in a number of ways. For design purposes, however, the response spectrum method is the most widely used means to compute the maximum value (in the absolute sense) of the modal response. Namely, if $R(\omega, \beta)$ is the design response spectrum at the site of interest then:

$$|y_k|_{\text{max}} = |\gamma_k| \cdot R(\omega_k, \beta_k)$$  (3.2.1.8)
It is important to note that, in fact, \( |y_{k_{\text{max}}}| \) is the mean value of the maximum modal response.

Alternatively, \( y_k \) could be characterized by its spectral density function given by:

\[
S_{y_k}(\omega) = \gamma_k^2 |H_k(\omega)|^2 S_{\tilde{u}_o}(\omega) \tag{3.2.1.9}
\]

where:

\( S_{y_k}(\omega) \) is the spectral density function of \( y_k \).

\[ H_k(\omega) = \frac{1}{\omega^2_k - \omega^2 + 2i\beta_k\omega_k\omega} \]

is the complex frequency function (transfer function) for mode \( k \).

\( S_{\tilde{u}_o}(\omega) \) is the spectral density function of the ground acceleration at the site of interest.

Since stationary Gaussian Processes are assumed, a description through spectral density functions is a complete characterization in the probabilistic sense.

Having presented the case of uniform seismic excitations, where any physical response can be computed by means of the response spectrum method combined with the mode superposition method, let's examine the less trivial case of non-uniform seismic input.

The coupled equations of motion of a linear, lumped mass, multi-degree of freedom, multiply-supported structural system subjected to non uniform unidimensional translational seismic excitations are also given, in matrix form, by the general system of equations (3.2.1.1). However, for the case of non-uniform seismic input, support
motions are different from one location to another. For this reason, the structural response will not be decomposed into a rigid body component and a non rigid body component, as for the case of uniform seismic input; because such a decomposition would make the computation of the non rigid body component of the response very complicated. Indeed, this response component would be affected by both the rigid body part of the loading (inertia forces due to uniform seismic input) and the non rigid part of it. This situation would induce a mixed input problem (acceleration and displacement), which is highly undesirable.

The strategy to be adopted for the problem of multiple support excitation, is a decomposition of the structural response into a pseudo-static component and a dynamic component [9]. Hence, let us perform the following decomposition:

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
U_s \\
U_b
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
U_s^* \\
U_b
\end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix}
V_s \\
0
\end{bmatrix}
\] (3.2.1.10)

where:

\(U_s^*\) is the pseudo-static component of structural displacement.

\(V_s\) is the dynamic component of structural displacement.

For the static (pseudo-static) case, (3.2.1.1) yields:

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
K_s & K_{sb} \\
K_{bs} & K_b
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
U_s^* \\
U_b
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
0 \\
P_{bs}
\end{bmatrix}
\] (3.2.1.11)

where:
$P_s$, is a vector of reaction forces at the support points due to static displacements: $U_s^*.$

\[ (3.2.1.11) \implies K_s U_s^* + K_{sb} U_b = 0 \quad (3.2.1.12) \]

\[ \implies U_s^* = -K_s^{-1} K_{sb} U_b \quad (3.2.1.13) \]

From (3.2.1.11), the equations of motion for the structural part read as follows:

\[ M_s \dddot{V}_s + C_s \ddot{V}_s + K_s V_s = -M_s \dddot{U}_s - C_s \dddot{U}_b - (K_s U_s^* + K_{sb} U_b) \quad (3.2.1.14) \]

By virtue of (3.2.1.12), and by neglecting the support damping contributions and the structural damping term, one gets:

\[ M_s \dddot{V}_s + C_s \ddot{V}_s + K_s V_s = -M_s \dddot{U}_s \quad (3.2.1.15) \]

Which can be rewritten as:

\[ M_s \dddot{V}_s + C_s \ddot{V}_s + K_s V_s = M_s K_s^{-1} K_{sb} \dddot{U}_b \quad (3.2.1.16) \]

by making use of (3.2.13).

Note that it is possible to retrieve the equations of motion for the case of uniform seismic input. Indeed, $U_b = T_b U_0 \implies U_s^* = -K_s^{-1} K_{sb} T_b U_0$ from (3.2.1.13)

\[ \implies U_s^* = -K_s^{-1} (-K_s T_s) U_0 \quad \text{from (3.2.1.4).} \]

\[ \implies U_s^* = T_s U_0 \quad (3.2.1.17) \]
By substituting (3.2.17) into (3.2.15), one gets the equations of motion for the case of uniform seismic motion given by (3.2.15). Hence, if seismic motions are uniform, then the static component of the structural response is equal to the rigid body component of it.

After this brief remark, let's proceed with the case of non-uniform seismic input. Assuming classical damping, and using modal coordinates, one can transform (3.2.16) into:

\[
\begin{align*}
\begin{cases}
(\Phi^T M_s \Phi) \ddot{Y} + (\Phi^T C_s \Phi) \dot{Y} + (\Phi^T K_s \Phi) Y &= \Phi^T M_s K_s^{-1} K_s \ddot{U}_b \\
V_s &= \Phi Y
\end{cases} \\
(3.2.18)
\end{align*}
\]

\(\ddot{U}_b\) is a vector containing support accelerations.

\(\ddot{U}_b = [\ddot{u}_i]^T, \quad i = 1, 2, ..., n\)

\(i\) indicates the support number (or the support point).

\(n\) is the total number of supports.

From (3.2.18), the \(k^{th}\) modal equation can be written as follows:

\[
\ddot{y}_k + 2\beta_k \omega_k \dot{y}_k + \omega_k^2 y_k = \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{ki} \ddot{u}_i
\]

(3.2.19)

\(i\) indicates the support point

\(k\) indicates the mode.

Because of the nature of the seismic loading, (3.2.19) cannot be solved by means of the design response spectrum, which was used to solve (3.2.17). However, \(y_k\) can be
characterized in a stochastic sense by the following:

$$S_{y_k}^p(\omega) = |H_k(\omega)|^2 S_{\ddot{s}_k}(\omega) \quad (3.2.1.20)$$

where:

$S_{y_k}^p(\omega)$ is the spectral density function of $y_k$ for the case of partially correlated excitations (non uniform seismic input).

The superscript $p$ stands for partially correlated excitations.

$$\ddot{s}_k(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{ki} \ddot{u}_i(t) \quad (3.2.1.21)$$

$S_{\ddot{s}_k}(\omega)$ is the spectral density function of $\ddot{s}_k$.

Let's express $S_{\ddot{s}_k}(\omega)$ in terms of auto-spectra and cross-spectra of the ground acceleration at the different supports. Prior to doing so, let's do the same work for the autocorrelation function $R_{\ddot{s}_k}(\tau)$.

$$R_{\ddot{s}_k}(\tau) = E[\ddot{s}_k(t)\ddot{s}_k(t + \tau)]$$

$$= E \left[ \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{ki} \ddot{u}_i(t) \right) \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{ki} \ddot{u}_i(t + \tau) \right) \right]$$

$$= E \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{kj} \ddot{u}_i(t) \ddot{u}_j(t + \tau) \right]$$

By changing order of operation between expectation and summation, one gets:
\[ R_{\tilde{a}_k}(\tau) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{kj} E[\tilde{u}_i(t)\tilde{u}_j(t+\tau)] \]

\[ = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{kj} R_{\tilde{u}_i\tilde{u}_j}(\tau) \]

Hence,

\[ R_{\tilde{a}_k}(\tau) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{kj} R_{\tilde{u}_i\tilde{u}_j}(\tau) \quad (3.2.1.22) \]

By taking Fourier transforms in (3.2.1.22), one gets:

\[ S_{\tilde{a}_k}(\omega) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{kj} S_{\tilde{u}_i\tilde{u}_j}(\omega) \quad (3.2.1.23) \]

Let's now make use of the following equations:

\[ S_{\tilde{u}_i\tilde{u}_j}(\omega) = S_{\tilde{u}_j\tilde{u}_i}^*(\omega) \quad (3.2.1.24) \]

\[ S_{\tilde{u}_i\tilde{u}_j}(\omega) = r_{ij}(\omega, d_{ij}) S_{\tilde{u}_0}(\omega) \quad (3.2.1.25) \]

Where:

* indicates complex conjugate.

\( r_{ij}(\omega, d_{ij}) \) is the coherency function of the seismic motion, which is taken to be an exponentially decaying function of both frequency, \( \omega \), and distance separating two locations, \( d_{ij} \).

\( S_{\tilde{u}_0}(\omega) \) is the autospectrum of the ground acceleration common to all locations.
By virtue of (3.2.1.24) and (3.2.1.25), (3.2.1.23) can be rewritten as:

\[
S_{\tilde{u}_k}(\omega) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{ki}^2 S_{\tilde{u}_0}(\omega) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j \neq i}^{n} A_{ki} A_{kj} S_{\tilde{u}_i \tilde{u}_j}(\omega)
\]

\[
= \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{ki}^2 S_{\tilde{u}_0}(\omega) + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{kj} \text{Real} (S_{\tilde{u}_i \tilde{u}_j}(\omega))
\]

\[
= \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{ki}^2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{kj} \rho_{ij} \right] S_{\tilde{u}_0}(\omega)
\]

where \( \rho_{ij} \) is the real part of the coherency function. It is the frequency dependent spatial correlation coefficient.

Hence,

\[
S_{\tilde{u}_k}(\omega) = \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{ki}^2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{kj} \rho_{ij} \right] S_{\tilde{u}_0}(\omega) \quad (3.2.1.26)
\]

Therefore, \( S_{y_k}(\omega) \) can be written as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
S_{y_k}(\omega) &= \left| H_k(\omega) \right|^2 \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{ki}^2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{kj} \rho_{ij} \right] S_{\tilde{u}_0}(\omega) \\
&= \frac{1}{\gamma_k^2} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{ki}^2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{kj} \rho_{ij} \right] S_{y_k}(\omega) \\
\end{align*}
\quad (3.2.1.27)
\]

Combining (3.2.1.9) and (3.2.1.27), it is possible to express the spectral density function of \( y_k \) for the case of partially correlated excitations, \( S_{y_k}(\omega) \), in terms of the spectral density function of \( y_k \) for the case of fully correlated excitations, \( S_{y_k}(\omega) \):

\[
S_{y_k}(\omega) = \frac{1}{\gamma_k^2} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{ki}^2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{kj} \rho_{ij} \right] S_{y_k}(\omega) \quad (3.2.1.28)
\]

By considering all \( \tilde{u}_i \)'s identical (uniform seismic input) in the \( k^{th} \) modal equation for
the case of non uniform seismic input (3.2.1.14), one gets:

\[ \ddot{y}_k + 2\beta_k \omega_k \dot{y}_k + \omega_k^2 y_k = \bar{u}_0 (\sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{ki}) \] (3.2.1.29)

where \( \bar{u}_0(t) \) is the ground acceleration acting at all support points if the ground motion is assumed to be uniform (no loss of coherence and no travelling wave effects).

Comparing (3.2.1.29) and (3.2.1.7), and identifying participation factors, one gets:

\[ \gamma_k = -\sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{ki} \] (3.2.1.30)

Before getting any further in the development, let us examine two extreme cases:

1. Case of fully correlated support motions: \( \rho_{ij} 's = 1 \) (3.2.1.28) reads as follows:

\[
S_{y_k}^p(\omega) = \frac{1}{\gamma_k^2} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{ki}^2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{kj} \right] S_{y_k}(\omega) \\
= \frac{1}{\gamma_k^2} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{ki} \right)^2 S_{y_k}(\omega)
\]

Using (3.2.1.30), one gets:

\[ S_{y_k}^p(\omega) = S_{y_k}(\omega) \]

Which is an expected result because one should be able to get to the case of uniform seismic input starting from the case of non uniform seismic input and considering all support motions to be identical.

2. Case of uncorrelated support motions \( \rho_{ij} 's = 0 \) (3.2.1.28) reads as follows:

\[
S_{y_k}^p(\omega) = \frac{1}{\gamma_k^2} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{ki}^2 \right] S_{y_k}(\omega)
\]
\[ S_{y_k}^p(\omega) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{ki}^2}{(\sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{ki})^2} S_{y_k}(\omega) \]

Closing this parenthesis, and pursuing the procedure development, it has been noted that (3.2.1.28) expresses the relationship between spectral density functions for the cases of partially and fully (perfectly) correlated seismic excitations. Let us now relate the corresponding response spectra. In other words, let us express the response spectrum (mean value of the maximum response) for the case of partially correlated seismic excitations in terms of the "classical" response spectrum (mean value of the maximum response for the case of uniform seismic input).

Finding the mean value of the maximum of a stochastic variable given its spectral density function is a complex problem, and exact solutions are not available. However, under reasonable assumptions, satisfactory results can be reached. For the present case, and as was stated in the introduction to this chapter, all stochastic processes are assumed to be zero-mean, stationary, and Gaussian. Such simplifying assumptions, but not unjustified for seismic motions, render the task of seeking an expected maximum value feasible. To briefly justify the aforementioned assumptions, it is worth mentioning that while earthquake induced ground motions are inherently non-stationary, the strong phase of such motions, during which the peak response generally occurs, is usually considered to be nearly stationary. The Gaussian character of the seismic motions is acceptable on the basis of the central limit theorem, since the earthquake motions
result from the accumulation of a large number of randomly arriving pulses.

If $x(t)$ is a random process satisfying the precedent assumptions, then a prescribed duration $\tau$ must be imposed in order to find a realistic maximum absolute value [35]. For the present case, $\tau$ is the duration of the strong motion phase. Let the maximum value be $x_\tau$ such that:

$$x_\tau = \max_\tau |x(t)|$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.2.1.31)

Because of the random nature of $x(t)$, $x_\tau$ is also random. But in practice, the interest is in the mean value (and the standard deviation) $\bar{x}_\tau$ and $\sigma_{x_\tau}$, of $x_\tau$.

Assuming the excursions above a certain level (barrier) of the process $x(t)$ to be mutually independent and to have a negligible duration (Poisson process), Davenport [11] has shown that the mean value $\bar{x}_\tau$ and the standard deviation $\sigma_{x_\tau}$ are approximately given by:

$$\bar{x}_\tau = \left[\sqrt{2ln\nu} + \frac{\gamma}{\sqrt{2ln\nu}}\right] \sigma_x$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.2.1.32)

$$\sigma_{x_\tau} = \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{6} \sqrt{2ln\nu}} \sigma_x$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.2.1.33)

where:

$\sigma_x$ is the root mean square of the process $x(t)$ given by:

$$\sigma_x^2 = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} S_x(\omega)d\omega$$
\( S_z(\omega) \) is the spectral density function of \( x(t) \).

\( \tau \) is the prescribed duration.

\( \gamma \) is Euler's constant = 0.577216.

\( \nu \) is the mean zero-crossing rate of the process \( x(t) \).

Prior to further elaborating on \( \nu \), let us define some necessary parameters:

\( G_z(\omega) \), the one-sided spectral density function of the process \( x(t) \) defined by:

\[
\sigma^2_z = \int_0^\infty G_z(\omega) \, d\omega
\]

or

\[
G_z(\omega) = \begin{cases} 
2S_z(\omega) & \omega \geq 0 \\
0 & \omega < 0 \end{cases}
\]

\( S_z(\omega) \) being an even function of \( \omega \).

\( \lambda_i \), \( i \)th spectral moment of the process \( x(t) \) given by:

\[
\lambda_i = \int_0^\infty \omega^i G_z(\omega) \, d\omega
\]

Having defined these parameters,

\[
\nu = \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{\sigma_z}{\sigma_x} = \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{\sqrt{\lambda_2}}{\sqrt{\lambda_0}}
\]

where \( \sigma_z \) is the root mean square of the process \( \dot{x}(t) \), given by:
\[ \sigma_z^2 = \int_0^\infty G_z(\omega)d\omega = \int_0^\infty \omega^2 G_z(\omega)d\omega = \lambda_2 \]

Note that \( \sigma_z^2 = \lambda_0 \).

For the sake of completeness, one ought to mention that more involved work has been done on the distribution of the extreme values of the process \( x(t) \). Namely, Vanmarcke [47] derived a distribution for the first-crossing time of a given level by \( \left| x \right| \), which takes into account the statistical dependence among crossings. Based on Vanmarcke’s work, Der Kiureghian [13] has given empirical expressions for \( \bar{x} \) and \( \sigma_x \). The difference between Der Kiureghian’s expressions and Davenport’s expressions increases with decreasing bandwidth of the process. This difference results from the fact that for narrow-band processes, statistical dependence should not be disregarded. However, in many applications, including earthquake engineering, the description of the dynamic loads contains considerable inaccuracies [36]. Therefore, for the purposes of the present work, the practical and satisfactory model proposed by Davenport will be retained.

Starting from (3.2.1.28) relating power spectra, let us try to relate response spectra (mean value of maximum response) by means of Davenport’s expressions:

(3.2.1.28) \( \implies \)

\[ G_{y_k}^p(\omega) = \frac{1}{\gamma_k^2} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{ki}^2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} A_{ki}A_{kj} \rho_{ij} \right] G_{y_k}(\omega) \quad (3.2.1.33) \]
The above equation relates the one-sided spectral density functions of \( y_k \) for the cases of partially correlated seismic excitations and fully correlated seismic excitations. Having related the one-sided spectral density functions, one can relate the spectral moments:
Let \( \lambda_m \) and \( \lambda_m^p \) be the \( m^{th} \) spectral moments of the modal response \( y_k \) for the cases of fully correlated and partially correlated seismic excitations, respectively.

Hence,

\[
\lambda_m = \int_0^\infty \omega^m G_{y_k}(\omega) d\omega \quad (3.2.1.34)
\]

\[
\lambda_m^p = \int_0^\infty \omega^m G_{y_k}^p(\omega) d\omega \quad (3.2.1.35)
\]

Let's express \( \lambda_m^p \) in terms of \( \lambda_m \).

\[
\lambda_m^p = \int_0^\infty \omega^m G_{y_k}^p(\omega) d\omega \\
= \int_0^\infty \omega^m \frac{1}{\gamma_k^2} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{ki}^2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{kj} \rho_{ij} \right] G_{y_k}(\omega) d\omega \\
= \frac{1}{\gamma_k^2} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{ki}^2 \int_0^\infty \omega^m G_{y_k}(\omega) d\omega + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{kj} \int_0^\infty \rho_{ij} \omega^m G_{y_k}(\omega) d\omega \right]
\]

Define:

\[
\rho_{ijm} = \frac{\int_0^\infty \rho_{ij} \omega^m G_{y_k}(\omega) d\omega}{\int_0^\infty \omega^m G_{y_k}(\omega) d\omega} \quad (3.2.1.36)
\]

Using (3.2.1.34) and (3.2.1.36), \( \lambda_m^p \) can be rewritten as:
\[ \lambda_m^p = \frac{1}{\gamma_k^2} \left[ \lambda_m \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{ki}^2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{kj} \rho_{ijm_k} \lambda_m \right] \]

Hence,

\[ \lambda_m^p = \frac{1}{\gamma_k^2} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{ki}^2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{kj} \rho_{ijm_k} \right] \lambda_m \quad (3.2.1.37) \]

(3.2.1.37) relates the \( m^{th} \) spectral moments. Of interest for the evaluation of the peak response statistics are the zeroth and second spectral moments. Incidentally, \( \rho_{ij0k} \) represents the spatial correlation (cross-correlation) coefficient between the relative responses of two identical oscillators \((\omega_k, \beta_k)\) respectively subjected to \( \ddot{u}_i(t) \) and \( \ddot{u}_j(t) \).

While \( \rho_{ij2k} \) represents the spatial correlation (cross-correlation) coefficient between the relative velocities of the two identical oscillators subjected to the same respective seismic loading.

Having related spectral moments, let's relate necessary parameters for the evaluation of the peak response statistics:

1. Root Mean Square of the Processes:

Let \( \sigma_{y_k} \) and \( \sigma_{y_k}^p \) be the root mean square of the modal response \( y_k \) for the cases of uniform and non uniform seismic input, respectively:

\[ \sigma_{y_k} = \sqrt{\lambda_0} \quad (3.2.1.38) \]

\[ \sigma_{y_k}^p = \sqrt{\lambda_0^p} \quad (3.2.1.39) \]
Let's express $\sigma_{y_k}^p$ in terms of $\sigma_{y_k}$:

$$
\sigma_{y_k}^p = \sqrt{\frac{\lambda_0}{\gamma_k}} \left[ \frac{1}{\gamma_k} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} A^2_{ki} + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{kj} \rho_{ij0k} \right] \lambda_0 \right]^{1/2}
$$

Hence,

$$
\sigma_{y_k}^p = \left[ \frac{1}{\gamma_k^2} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} A^2_{ki} + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{kj} \rho_{ij0k} \right] \right]^{1/2} \sigma_{y_k} \quad (3.2.1.40)
$$

2. Mean Zero-Crossing Rate:

Let $\nu$ and $\nu^p$ be the mean zero-crossing rates of the modal response $y_k$ for the cases of fully correlated and partially correlated seismic excitations:

$$
\nu = \frac{1}{\pi} \left( \frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_0} \right)^{1/2} \quad (3.2.1.41)
$$

$$
\nu^p = \frac{1}{\pi} \left( \frac{\lambda_2^2}{\lambda_0^2} \right)^{1/2} \quad (3.2.1.42)
$$

Let's express $\nu^p$ in terms of $\nu$:

$$
\nu^p = \frac{1}{\pi} \left( \frac{\lambda_2^2}{\lambda_0^2} \right)^{1/2} = \frac{1}{\pi} \left[ \frac{1}{\gamma_k^2} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} A^2_{ki} + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{kj} \rho_{ij2k} \right] \lambda_2 \right]^{1/2}
$$

$$
= \left[ \frac{1}{\gamma_k^2} \frac{1}{\lambda_0^2} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} A^2_{ki} + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{kj} \rho_{ij0k} \right] \lambda_0 \right]^{1/2} \frac{1}{\pi} \left( \frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_0} \right)^{1/2}
$$

Using (3.2.1.41), $\nu^p$ can be rewritten as:
\[ \nu^p = \left[ \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{ki}^2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{kj} \rho_{ij2k}}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{ki}^2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{kj} \rho_{ij0k}} \right]^{1/2} \]

(3.2.1.43)

3. Peak Factors:

By virtue of (3.2.1.32) and (3.2.1.33) (Davenport's expressions), the peak response statistics for the case of uniform and non uniform seismic input can be written as follows:

a) Uniform seismic input

\[
\left\{ \begin{align*}
\text{Mean}(\max(y_k)_r) &= p_r \cdot \sigma_{y_k} \\
\sigma(\max(y_k)_r) &= q_r \cdot \sigma_{y_k}
\end{align*} \right. \tag{3.2.1.44}
\]

\[
\left\{ \begin{align*}
\text{Mean}(\max(y_k)_r) &= p_r \cdot \sigma_{y_k} \\
\sigma(\max(y_k)_r) &= q_r \cdot \sigma_{y_k}
\end{align*} \right. \tag{3.2.1.45}
\]

where \( p_r \) and \( q_r \) are peak factors given by:

\[ p_r = \sqrt{2 \ln \nu_T} + \frac{\gamma}{\sqrt{2 \ln \nu_T}} \tag{3.2.1.46} \]

\[ q_r = \pi \frac{1}{\sqrt{6} \sqrt{2 \ln \nu_T}} \tag{3.2.1.47} \]

b) Non uniform seismic input:

\[
\left\{ \begin{align*}
\text{Mean}(\max(y_k)_r) &= p_r^p \cdot \sigma_{y_k}^p \\
\sigma^p(\max(y_k)_r) &= q_r^p \cdot \sigma_{y_k}^p
\end{align*} \right. \tag{3.2.1.48}
\]

\[
\left\{ \begin{align*}
\text{Mean}(\max(y_k)_r) &= p_r^p \cdot \sigma_{y_k}^p \\
\sigma^p(\max(y_k)_r) &= q_r^p \cdot \sigma_{y_k}^p
\end{align*} \right. \tag{3.2.1.49}
\]
where $p_r^p$ and $q_r^p$ are peak factors given by:

$$p_r^p = \sqrt{2ln\nu_r^p} + \frac{\gamma}{\sqrt{2ln\nu_r^p}} \quad (3.2.1.50)$$

$$q_r^p = \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{6}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2ln\nu_r^p}} \quad (3.2.1.51)$$

Let’s express $p_r^p$ in terms of $p_r$, and $q_r^p$ in terms of $q_r$.

$$p_r^p = \sqrt{2ln\nu_r^p} + \frac{\gamma}{\sqrt{2ln\nu_r^p}} = \sqrt{2ln\nu R_1} + \frac{\gamma}{\sqrt{2ln\nu R_1}}$$

$$q_r^p = \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{6}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2ln\nu_r^p}} = \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{6}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2ln\nu R_1}}$$

where $\tau_1$ is such that:

$$\nu R_1 = \nu R_1 \implies \tau_1 = \frac{\nu R_1}{\nu \tau}$$

$$\tau_1 = \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{ki}^2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} A_{ki}A_{kj} \rho_{ij} \right]^{1/2} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{ki}^2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} A_{ki}A_{kj} \rho_{ij} \right)^{1/2} \quad (3.2.1.52)$$

Hence,

$$p_r^p = \sqrt{2ln\nu R_1} + \frac{\gamma}{\sqrt{2ln\nu R_1}}$$
\[ q_r^p = \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{6 \sqrt{2 \ln \nu \tau_1}}} \]

And finally:

\[ p_r^p = p_{r_1} \] (3.2.1.53)

\[ q_r^p = q_{r_1} \] (3.2.1.54)

The last two equations express that the peak factors for the case of partially correlated seismic excitations, over a duration \( \tau \), are equal to the peak factors for the case of fully correlated seismic excitations, over a duration \( \tau_1 \). \( \tau_1 \) and \( \tau \) are related by (3.2.1.52).

At present, the final step in the process is reached, and it is to relate the peak response statistics in each one of the two cases of seismic excitations.

(3.2.1.48) \[ \Rightarrow \text{Mean}(\max(y_k)_\tau) = p_r^p \sigma_{y_k}^p \]

(3.2.1.40) (3.2.1.53) \[ \Rightarrow \text{Mean}(\max(y_k)_\tau) = p_{r_1} \sigma_{y_k} \frac{1}{\gamma_k} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{ki}^2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{kj} \rho_{ijkl} \right]^{1/2} \]

\[ \Rightarrow \text{Mean}(\max(y_k)_\tau) = \text{Mean}(\max(y_k)_{\tau_1}) \frac{1}{\gamma_k} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{ki}^2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{kj} \rho_{ijkl} \right]^{1/2} \] (3.2.1.55)
Hence, (3.2.1.55) expresses the mean value of the maximum $k^{th}$ modal response for the case of partially correlated seismic excitations, in terms of the maximum $k^{th}$ modal response for the case of fully correlated seismic excitations. Let's define a modified response spectrum, which accounts for the spatial character of the seismic input as follows:

$$\text{Mean}(\max(y_k)_r) = |\gamma_k| R_r^p(\omega_k, \beta_k)$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.2.1.56)

where $R_r^p(\omega, \beta)$ is the modified response spectrum, and $\gamma_k$ is the participation factor for mode $k$.

Also,

$$\text{Mean}(\max(y_k)_{r_1}) = |\gamma_k| R_{r_1}(\omega_k, \beta_k)$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.2.1.57)

where $R_{r_1}(\omega, \beta)$ is the response spectrum which assumes identical support motions.

Hence, (3.2.1.55), (3.2.1.56), and (3.2.1.57) $\implies$

$$R_r^p(\omega_k, \beta_k) = R_{r_1}(\omega_k, \beta_k) \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{ki}^2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{kj} \rho_{ij0k} \right]^{1/2} \frac{1}{|\gamma_k|}$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.2.1.58)

$$\rho_{ij0k} = \frac{\int_{0}^{\infty} \rho_{ij} G_{Y_k}(\omega) d\omega}{\int_{0}^{\infty} G_{Y_k}(\omega) d\omega} = \frac{\int_{0}^{\infty} \rho_{ij} \mid H_k(\omega) \mid^2 G_{u_0}(\omega) d\omega}{\int_{0}^{\infty} \mid H_k(\omega) \mid^2 G_{u_0}(\omega) d\omega}$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.2.1.36)

Note that the pair $(\omega_k, \beta_k)$ is used in a generic (dummy) sense in (3.2.1.58). Alternatively, (3.2.1.58) enables any modal response to be modified to account for partially
correlated seismic excitations. However, the modification factor (or correction factor) will vary from mode to mode.

For the sake of completeness, let us also mention that an analogous equation to (3.2.1.55) could be arrived at for the standard deviation of the maximum modal response, namely,

\[
(3.2.1.49) \implies \sigma^p (\max(y_k)_r) = q_r^p \sigma^p_{y_k}
\]

\[
(3.2.1.40) \implies \sigma^p (\max(y_k)_r) = q_r \sigma_{y_k} \frac{1}{\gamma_k} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{ki}^2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{kj} \rho_{ij0k} \right]^{1/2}
\]

(3.2.1.54)

\[
(3.2.1.45) \implies \sigma^p (\max(y_k)_r) = \sigma (\max(y_k)_r) \frac{1}{\gamma_k} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{ki}^2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{kj} \rho_{ij0k} \right]^{1/2}
\]

(3.2.1.59)

Hence, (3.2.1.59) expresses the standard deviation of the maximum modal response for the case of non uniform seismic input, in terms of the standard deviation of the maximum modal response for the case of uniform seismic input.

An analogous equation to (3.2.1.59) could be written for the standard deviation to be accounted for, in the modified response spectrum:

\[
\sigma (R^p_r(\omega_k, \beta_k)) = \sigma (R_{ri}(\omega_k, \beta_k)) \frac{1}{\gamma_k} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{ki}^2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{kj} \rho_{ij0k} \right]^{1/2}
\]

(3.2.1.60)
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where:

\[ \sigma(R_{r_1}(\omega, \beta)) \] is the standard deviation relative to the "classical" response spectrum, which assumes identical support motions.

\[ \sigma(R^p(\omega, \beta)) \] is the modified standard deviation to account for the spatial character of the seismic input. It is relative to the modified response spectrum.

For practical purposes \( r \) and \( r_1 \) will be considered equal. There is a number of reasons favoring such a simplifying consideration. Firstly, the sensitivity of peak response statistics to the prescribed duration (strong phase duration) is not very pronounced because of the logarithmic function in the expression of the peak factors. Secondly, the measurement of the strong phase duration has some inherent inaccuracy. Thirdly, equation (3.2.1.52) suggests that from a practical viewpoint, the ratio of \( r_1 \) to \( \tau \) may be assumed to be close to unity. Therefore, if \( r_1 \) and \( \tau \) are taken to be equal, then they both can be omitted in the final equations where they appear as parameters of the response spectra. Such an omission is by no means detrimental to the formulation presented herein, since the response spectrum, as a means of representing earthquake ground motion, does not include the strong phase duration.

By virtue of the above, (3.2.1.58) could be rewritten as:

\[
R^p(\omega_k, \beta_k) = R(\omega_k, \beta_k) \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{ki}^2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{kj} \rho_{ijk} \right]^{1/2} \frac{1}{|\gamma_k|}
\]  
(3.2.1.61)

Likewise, (3.2.1.60) could be rewritten as:
\[
\sigma(R^p(\omega_k, \beta_k)) = \sigma(R(\omega_k, \beta_k)) \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{ki}^2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{kj} \rho_{ij} \right]^{1/2} \frac{1}{|\gamma_k|} \quad (3.2.1.62)
\]

Where in both equations \(\rho_{ij0k}\) has been written as \(\rho_{ijk}\) for the sake of ease of notation.

A last aspect, which will be examined in the context of the present formulation, is the situation where a given mode does not contribute to the structural response under uniform seismic excitations. In other words, the case where \(\gamma_k = 0\) is under consideration. It is important to point out that this situation implies, by no means, that this very mode will have no contribution to the structural response under non uniform seismic excitations. This fact can be observed from the following:

\[
\gamma_k = 0 \implies S_{y_k}(\omega) = \gamma_k^2 |H_k(\omega)|^2 S_{\bar{u}_0}(\omega) = 0 \quad \text{from} (3.2.1.9)
\]

Also,

\[
\gamma_k = 0 \implies \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{ki} = 0, \quad \text{from} (3.2.1.30)
\]

However,

\[
\gamma_k = 0 \not\implies S_{y_k}^p(\omega) = |H_k(\omega)|^2 \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{ki}^2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{kj} \rho_{ij} \right] S_{\bar{u}_0}(\omega) = 0, \quad \text{from} (3.2.1.27)
\]

Hence, while the spectral density function of \(y_k\) for the case of uniform seismic input vanishes, that for the case of non uniform seismic input does not. The way to proceed in this case would be as follows:
Let \( S_k(\omega) = |H_k(\omega)|^2 S_{u_0}(\omega) \) (3.2.1.63)

which represents the spectral density function of \( y_k \) for the case of uniform seismic input, and for a participation factor \( \gamma_k \) equal to unity. Alternatively, \( y_k \) would be such that:

\[
\ddot{y}_k + 2\beta_k \omega_k \dot{y}_k + \omega_k^2 y_k = -\ddot{u}_0
\]  (3.2.1.64)

Hence,

\[
S_{y_k}(\omega) = \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{ki}^2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{kj} \rho_{ij} \right] S_k(\omega) \quad (3.2.1.65)

Following the procedure presented earlier, one gets:

\[
\text{M}^{\text{mean}}(\text{max}(y_k)) = \text{Mean}(\text{max}(y_k)) \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{ki}^2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{kj} \rho_{ij} \right]^{1/2} \quad (3.2.1.66)
\]

\[
\sigma^p(\text{max}(y_k)) = \sigma(\text{max}(y_k)) \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{ki}^2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{kj} \rho_{ij} \right]^{1/2} \quad (3.2.1.67)
\]

where:

\[
\text{M}^{\text{mean}}(\text{max}(y_k)) = 1 \cdot R^p(\omega_k, \beta_k) \quad (3.2.1.68)
\]

\[
\text{Mean}(\text{max}(y_k)) = 1 \cdot R(\omega_k, \beta_k) \quad (3.2.1.69)
\]
\[ \sigma^p(\max(y_k)) = \sigma(R^p(\omega_k, \beta_k)) \] (3.2.1.70)

\[ \sigma(\max(y_k)) = \sigma(R(\omega_k, \beta_k)) \] (3.2.1.71)

Therefore, the modified response spectrum model is given by:

\[ R^p(\omega_k, \beta_k) = R(\omega_k, \beta_k) \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{ki}^2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} A_{ki}A_{kj}\rho_{ijk} \right]^{1/2} \] (3.2.1.72)

And the standard deviation to be accounted for is given by:

\[ \sigma(R^p(\omega_k, \beta_k)) = \sigma(R(\omega_k, \beta_k)) \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{ki}^2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} A_{ki}A_{kj}\rho_{ijk} \right]^{1/2} \] (3.2.1.73)

Notice that (3.2.1.63) and (3.2.1.65) could have been used from the beginning of the development, thereby avoiding the issue of mode participation. It has not been done so, however, so as to put into focus the interesting issue of having a mode which does not participate to the structural response under uniform seismic excitations, but which does participate to it under non uniform seismic excitations. This issue will be illustrated in the last part of this chapter.

As a closing statement for this section, it is worth mentioning that the developed procedure enables the use of the mode superposition method in combination with a modified response spectrum model to treat the problem of multiply-supported structures subjected to imperfectly correlated seismic excitations.
3.2.2 Case of Multicomponent Ground Motion

Having presented the case of a single ground motion component in the previous section, let's extend the formulation to the case of multicomponent ground motion. The assumption of uncorrelated (statistically independent) ground motion components, which is routinely made in practice, will also be followed in the present development. The reason for adopting such an assumption, is that accounting for statistical dependence would not necessarily improve the quality of the formulation. On the contrary, it would require a more involved work, throughout which many unresolved questions would arise, that would necessitate making supplementary assumptions, whose underlying justification would be more mathematical convenience than physical evidence.

From an organizational viewpoint, the present section will be very similar to the previous one. For the sake of brevity, results arrived at in the previous section and needed in the present one will merely be used as such, without redevelopment.

The coupled equations of motion of a linear, three-dimensional, lumped mass, multi-degree of freedom, multiply-supported structural system subjected to uniform (or non uniform), three-dimensional translational seismic excitations can be expressed in matrix form by means of (3.2.1.1):

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
    M_s & 0 \\
    0 & M_h
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
    \ddot{U}_s \\
    \ddot{U}_b
\end{bmatrix}
+ \begin{bmatrix}
    C_s & C_{sb} \\
    C_{bs} & C_b
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
    \dot{U}_s \\
    \dot{U}_b
\end{bmatrix}
+ \begin{bmatrix}
    K_s & K_{sb} \\
    K_{bs} & K_b
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
    U_s \\
    U_b
\end{bmatrix}
= \begin{bmatrix}
    0 \\
    P_b
\end{bmatrix} (3.2.1.1)
\]

All parameters have already been defined. The advantage of the above equation is
that it is general enough to encompass different situations (uniform seismic input, non-uniform seismic input, unidimensional seismic input, three-dimensional seismic input). Clearly though, the size and the structure of the parameters will accordingly vary from one situation to another.

Let’s first examine the case of uniform seismic input (fully correlated seismic excitations). The equations of motion for the structural part are given by (3.2.1.5), in which the parameters are adjusted to the three-dimensional case:

\[
M_s\ddot{V}_s + C_s\dot{V}_s + K_sV_s = -M_sT_s\ddot{u}_0
\]

(3.2.1.5)

The intermediate steps between (3.2.1.1) and (3.2.1.5) have been purposely skipped:

\[
\ddot{u}_0 = \begin{bmatrix} \ddot{u}_{01} & \ddot{u}_{02} & \ddot{u}_{03} \end{bmatrix}^T
\]

(3.2.2.1)

where:

\(\ddot{u}_{01}\) and \(\ddot{u}_{02}\) are the ground accelerations for the two horizontal components.

\(\ddot{u}_{03}\) is the ground acceleration for the vertical component.

Assuming that the structure is classically damped, and using modal coordinates, one gets:

\[
\begin{cases}
(\Phi^T M_s \Phi)\ddot{Y} + (\Phi^T C_s \Phi)\dot{Y} + (\Phi^T K_s \Phi)Y = -\Phi^T M_s T_s \ddot{u}_0 \\
V_s = \Phi Y
\end{cases}
\]

(3.2.2.2)
where all parameters have previously been defined. From (3.2.2.2), the $k^{th}$ modal equation can be written as follows:

$$
\ddot{y}_k + 2\beta_k \omega_k \dot{y}_k + \omega_k^2 y_k = -\gamma_k \ddot{u}_{01} - \gamma_k \ddot{u}_{02} - \gamma_k \ddot{u}_{03}
$$

(3.2.2.3)

where $\gamma_{kq}$ is the participation factor for mode $k$ associated with the $q^{th}$ ground motion component.

$k = 1, 2, ..., \text{total number of modes.}$

$q = 1, 2, 3.$

$$
\gamma_{kq} = \frac{\phi_k^T M_s T_{sq}}{\phi_k^T M_s \phi_k}
$$

(3.2.2.4)

where $T_{sq}$ is such that:

$$
T_s = [T_{s1} \ T_{s2} \ T_{s3}]
$$

(3.2.2.5)

(3.2.2.5) expresses that the influence matrix $T_s$ is the assemblage of three vectors, $T_{sq}(q = 1, 2, 3)$, each one relative to a ground motion component.

Let $R_q(\omega, \beta)$ ($q = 1, 2, 3$) be the design response spectrum corresponding to the $q^{th}$ ground motion component at the site of interest. If the ground motion components are uncorrelated, then it can be shown that the mean value of the maximum modal response is approximately given by the SRSS (square root of sum of square) combination of the three component contributions:
\[ |y_k|_{\text{max}} = \sqrt{\sum_{q=1}^{3} \gamma_{kq} R_q^2(\omega_k, \beta_k)} \]  

(3.2.2.6)

\[ |y_k|_{\text{max}} \] is in fact the mean value of the maximum modal response since \( R_q \)'s give mean values.

The spectral density function of \( y_k \) is given by:

\[ S_{y_k}(\omega) = |H_k(\omega)|^2 S_{\ddot{z}_k}(\omega) \]  

(3.2.2.7)

where:

\[ \ddot{z}_k(t) = \sum_{q=1}^{3} \gamma_{kq} \ddot{u}_{0q}(t) \]  

(3.2.2.8)

Since the ground motion components are uncorrelated, \( S_{\ddot{z}_k}(\omega) \) will be given by:

\[ S_{\ddot{z}_k}(\omega) = \sum_{q=1}^{3} \gamma_{kq}^2 S_{\ddot{u}_{0q}}(\omega) \]  

(3.2.2.9)

Combining (3.2.2.9) and (3.2.2.7), one gets:

\[ S_{y_k}(\omega) = \sum_{q=1}^{3} \gamma_{kq}^2 |H_k(\omega)|^2 S_{\ddot{u}_{0q}}(\omega) \]  

(3.2.2.10)

(3.2.2.10) may be used to derive (3.2.2.6). Indeed, let's express the one-sided spectral density function of \( y_k, G_{y_k}(\omega) \):

\[ G_{y_k}(\omega) = \sum_{q=1}^{3} \gamma_{kq}^2 |H_k(\omega)|^2 G_{\ddot{u}_{0q}}(\omega) \]  

(3.2.2.11)
where:

\( G_{\tilde{u}_{0q}}(\omega) \) is the one-sided spectral density function of \( \tilde{u}_{0q}(t) \).

Let's relate the zeroth spectral moments:

\[
\lambda_{0k} = \sum_{q=1}^{3} \lambda_{0kq} \tag{3.2.2.12}
\]

where:

\[
\lambda_{0k} = \int_{0}^{\infty} G_{y_k}(\omega) d\omega \tag{3.2.2.13}
\]

\[
\lambda_{0kq} = \int_{0}^{\infty} \gamma_{kq}^2 | H_k(\omega) |^2 G_{\tilde{u}_{0q}}(\omega) d\omega \tag{3.2.2.14}
\]

Note that:

\[
\lambda_{0k} = \left( \frac{| y_k |_{max}}{p_k} \right)^2 \tag{3.2.2.15}
\]

\[
\lambda_{0kq} = \left( \frac{\gamma_{kq} R_q(\omega_k, \beta_k)}{p_{kq}} \right)^2 \tag{3.2.2.16}
\]

where \( p_k \) and \( p_{kq} \) are peak factors. For practical purposes, as described in [14] and [42], the peak factors will be considered approximately equal. Therefore, by substituting (3.2.1.15) and (3.2.1.16) into (3.2.1.12), one gets:

\[
| y_k |_{max} = \sqrt{\sum_{q=1}^{3} \gamma_{kq}^2 R_q^2(\omega_k, \beta_k)} = \text{Mean}(\text{max}(y_k))
\]

which is (3.2.2.6).
Having presented the case of a three-dimensional uniform seismic input, whose three translational components are uncorrelated, let's examine the case of a non-uniform seismic input (partially correlated seismic excitations). The assumption of statistically independent ground motion components is, of course, retained.

The equations of motion for the structural part are given by (3.2.1.16), in which the parameters are adjusted to the three-dimensional case:

\[ M_s \ddot{V}_s + C_s \dot{V}_s + K_s V_s = M_s K_s^{-1} K_{sb} \ddot{U}_b \quad (3.2.2.16) \]

\( \ddot{U}_b \) is a vector containing support accelerations in three directions.

\[ \ddot{U}_b = [\ddot{u}_{qi}]^T \quad (3.2.2.17) \]

where:

\[ q = 1, 2, 3 \] refers to the ground motion component. 

\[ i = 1, 2, ..., n \] refers to the support point.

Assuming classical damping, and using modal coordinates, one gets:

\[
\begin{align*}
(\Phi^T M_s \Phi) \ddot{Y} + (\Phi^T C_s \Phi) \dot{Y} + (\Phi^T K_s \Phi) Y &= \Phi^T M_s K_s^{-1} K_{sb} \ddot{U}_b \\
V_s &= \Phi Y
\end{align*}
\quad (3.2.2.18)
\]

From (3.2.2.18), the \( k^{th} \) modal equation can be written as:

\[ \ddot{y}_k + 2\beta_k \omega_k \dot{y}_k + \omega_k^2 y_k = \sum_{q=1}^{3} \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{ki} \ddot{u}_{qi} \quad (3.2.2.19) \]
where \( k \) indicates the mode, \( q \) the ground motion component, and \( i \) the support point. Notice that if \( \bar{u}_{qi} = \bar{u}_{0q} \) (uniform seismic input), then by comparing (3.2.2.3) and (3.2.2.19), one gets:

\[
\gamma_{kq} = -\sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{kqi} \tag{3.2.2.20}
\]

Because of the non uniform nature of the seismic loading, (3.2.2.19) cannot be solved by means of the design response spectrum, as was the case for (3.2.2.3) (uniform seismic input). Hence, let's characterize \( y_k \) in a stochastic sense by expressing its spectral density function:

\[
S_{y_k}^p(\omega) = \left| H_k(\omega) \right|^2 S_{\delta_k}(\omega) \tag{3.2.2.21}
\]

where:

\[
\delta_k(t) = \sum_{q=1}^{3} \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{kqi} \bar{u}_{qi}(t) \tag{3.2.2.22}
\]

Notice that \( \delta_k(t) \) in (3.2.2.8) is different form \( \delta_k(t) \) in (3.2.2.22).

Let's express \( S_{\delta_k}(\omega) \) in terms of auto-spectra and cross-spectra of ground acceleration at the different supports and for the different ground motion components. Let's first do the same work for the auto-correlation function \( R_{\delta_k}(\tau) \).
\[ R_{\bar{s}_k}(\tau) = E[\bar{s}_k(t)\bar{s}_k(t+\tau)] \]
\[ = E \left[ \left( \sum_{q=1}^{3} \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{kqi} \bar{u}_{qi}(t) \right) \left( \sum_{q=1}^{3} \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{kqi} \bar{u}_{qi}(t+\tau) \right) \right] \]
\[ = E \left[ \sum_{q=1}^{3} \sum_{r=1}^{3} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} A_{kqi} A_{krj} \bar{u}_{qi}(t) \bar{u}_{rj}(t+\tau) \right] \]

By exchanging expectation and summation, one gets:

\[ R_{\bar{s}_k}(\tau) = \sum_{q=1}^{3} \sum_{r=1}^{3} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} A_{kqi} A_{krj} E[\bar{u}_{qi}(t)\bar{u}_{rj}(t+\tau)] \]

Since the different components are uncorrelated, \( R_{\bar{s}_k}(\tau) \) will reduce

\[ R_{\bar{s}_k}(\tau) = \sum_{q=1}^{3} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} A_{kqi} A_{krj} R_{\bar{u}_{qi}\bar{u}_{rj}}(\tau) \tag{3.2.223} \]

By taking Fourier transforms in (3.2.223), one gets:

\[ S_{\bar{s}_k}(\omega) = \sum_{q=1}^{3} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} A_{kqi} A_{kqj} S_{\bar{u}_{qi}\bar{u}_{qj}}(\omega) \tag{3.2.224} \]

Let's make use of the following equations:

\[ S_{\bar{u}_{qi}\bar{u}_{qj}}(\omega) = S_{\bar{u}_{qi}\bar{u}_{qj}}^*(\omega) \tag{3.2.225} \]

\[ S_{\bar{u}_{qi}\bar{u}_{qj}}(\omega) = r_{qij} S_{\bar{u}_{qj}}(\omega) \tag{3.2.226} \]

Where:

* indicates complex conjugate.
\( r_{qij} \) is the coherency function of the seismic motion for component \( q \) (along axis \( q \)) between stations \( i \) and \( j \). It will be assumed that for component \( q \), there will be a loss of correlation along axis \( q \) only. Hence, depending upon the location of the support points \( i \) and \( j \) there may or may not be a loss of correlation so far as component \( q \) is concerned.

\( S_{\bar{u}_{0q}}(\omega) \) is the autospectrum of the ground acceleration corresponding to component \( q \), and common to all locations.

By virtue of (3.2.2.25) and (3.2.2.26), (3.2.2.24) can be rewritten as:

\[
S_{\bar{u}_k}(\omega) = \sum_{q=1}^{3} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{kqi}^2 S_{\bar{u}_{0q}}(\omega) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j \neq i}^{n} A_{kqi} A_{kqj} S_{\bar{u}_{qi} \bar{u}_{qj}}(\omega) \right]
\]

\[
= \sum_{q=1}^{3} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{kqi}^2 S_{\bar{u}_{0q}}(\omega) + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} A_{kqi} A_{kqj} \text{Real}(S_{\bar{u}_{qi} \bar{u}_{qj}}(\omega)) \right]
\]

\[
= \sum_{q=1}^{3} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{kqi}^2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} A_{kqi} A_{kqj} \rho_{qij} \right] S_{\bar{u}_{0q}}(\omega)
\]

where \( \rho_{qij} \) is the frequency dependent spatial correlation coefficient. It is the real part of the coherency function \( r_{qij} \).

Hence,

\[
S_{\bar{u}_k}(\omega) = \sum_{q=1}^{3} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{kqi}^2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} A_{kqi} A_{kqj} \rho_{qij} \right] S_{\bar{u}_{0q}}(\omega)
\]  \hspace{1cm} (3.2.2.27)

Therefore, \( S_{\bar{u}_k}(\omega) \) can be written as follows:

\[
(3.2.2.21) \rightarrow (3.2.2.27)
\]
\[ S_{y_k}^p(\omega) = \sum_{q=1}^{3} |H_k(\omega)|^2 \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{kqi}^2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} A_{kqi} A_{kjg} \rho_{qij} \right] S_{\tilde{u}_\omega}(\omega) \]  

(3.2.2.28)

It is appropriate at this point to recall (3.2.2.10), which expresses the spectral density function of \( y_k \) for the case of uniform seismic input:

\[ S_{y_k}(\omega) = \sum_{q=1}^{3} \gamma_{kq}^2 |H_k(\omega)|^2 S_{\tilde{u}_\omega}(\omega) \]  

(3.2.2.10)

By comparing (3.2.2.28) and (3.2.2.10), one can observe that both \( S_{y_k}^p(\omega) \) and \( S_{y_k}(\omega) \) can be written in an analogous way:

\[ S_{y_k}^p(\omega) = \sum_{q=1}^{3} S_{y_kq}^p(\omega) \]  

(3.2.2.29)

\[ S_{y_k}(\omega) = \sum_{q=1}^{3} S_{y_kq}(\omega) \]  

(3.2.2.30)

where:

\[ S_{y_kq}^p = |H_k(\omega)|^2 \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{kqi}^2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} A_{kqi} A_{kjg} \rho_{qij} \right] S_{\tilde{u}_\omega}(\omega) \]  

(3.2.2.31)

\[ S_{y_kq} = \gamma_{kq}^2 |H_k(\omega)|^2 S_{\tilde{u}_\omega}(\omega) \]  

(3.2.2.32)

Hence, the contribution from component \( q \) to the spectral density function of \( y_k \) for the case of partially correlated seismic excitations can be expressed in terms of its homologous for the case of fully correlated seismic excitations as follows:
\[ S_{y_k}(\omega) = \frac{1}{\gamma_{kq}} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{kqi}^2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} A_{kqi} A_{kqj} \rho_{qij} \right] S_{y_k}(\omega) \] (3.2.2.33)

which is the equation that was arrived at for the case of a single ground motion component (3.2.1.28). Therefore, based on the results reached in the previous section, the mean values of the maximum modal responses due to component \( q \), for the cases of partially and fully correlated seismic excitations are related as follows:

\[ \text{Mean}(\max(y_{kq})) = \text{Mean}(\max(y_{kq})) \frac{1}{\gamma_{kq}} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{kqi}^2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} A_{kqi} A_{kqj} \rho_{qijk} \right]^{1/2} \] (3.2.2.34)

where:

\[ \rho_{qijk} = \frac{\int_{0}^{\infty} \rho_{qij} G_{y_{kq}}(\omega) d\omega}{\int_{0}^{\infty} G_{y_{kq}}(\omega) d\omega} \] (3.2.2.35)

\[ G_{y_{kq}}(\omega) = \gamma_{kq}^2 \left| H_k(\omega) \right|^2 G_{\tilde{u}_{qk}}(\omega) \] (3.2.2.36)

\( \rho_{qijk} \) represents the spatial correlation (cross-correlation) coefficient between the relative responses of two identical oscillators \( (\omega_k, \beta_k) \) respectively subjected to \( \tilde{u}_{q1}(t) \) and \( \tilde{u}_{qj}(t) \).

Proceeding in an analogous way to that of the previous section, a modified response spectrum which accounts for spatial correlation of seismic motions for component \( q \) can be expressed:
\[ R^p_q(\omega_k, \beta_k) = R_q(\omega_k, \beta_k) \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{ki}^2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} A_{kqi} A_{kj} \rho_{qij} \right]^{1/2} \frac{1}{\gamma_{kq}} \tag{3.2.2.37} \]

\( R^p_q \) is the mean value of the maximum modal response (for a participation factor equal to unity) due to ground motion component \( q \) accounting for non-uniform seismic excitations. \( R_q \) is the homologous value for the case of uniform seismic excitations. \( R_q \) is assumed to be given.

At present, let's express the maximum modal value of the response in terms of the maximum modal values due to each ground motion component.

\[ (3.2.2.29) \Rightarrow G^p_{y_k}(\omega) = \sum_{q=1}^{3} G^p_{y_{k_q}}(\omega) \tag{3.2.2.38} \]

Where \( G^p_{y_k}(\omega) \) and \( G^p_{y_{k_q}}(\omega) \) are one-sided spectral density functions.

By going to zeroth spectral moments, one gets:

\[ \lambda^p_{0_k} = \sum_{q=1}^{3} \lambda^p_{0_{kq}} \tag{3.2.2.39} \]

where:

\[ \lambda^p_{0_k} = \int_0^\infty G^p_{y_k}(\omega) d\omega \tag{3.2.2.40} \]

\[ \lambda^p_{0_{kq}} = \int_0^\infty G^p_{y_{k_q}}(\omega) d\omega \tag{3.2.2.41} \]

Note that:
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\[ \lambda^{p}_{0k} = \left( \frac{M^{p}_{can}(\max(y_k))}{p_k} \right)^2 \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.2.2.42)

\[ \lambda^{p}_{0kq} = \left( \frac{\gamma_{kq} R^{p}_{q}(\omega_k, \beta_k)}{p_{kq}} \right)^2 \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.2.2.43)

By virtue of a previous argument on peak factors, and by substituting (3.2.2.42) and (3.2.2.43) into (3.2.2.39), one gets:

\[ M^{p}_{can}(\max(y_k)) = \sqrt{\sum_{q=1}^{3} \gamma_{kq}^2 (R^{p}_{q}(\omega_k, \beta_k))^2} \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.2.2.44)

Let's compare (3.2.2.44) with (3.2.2.6):

\[ \text{Mean}(\max(y_k)) = \sqrt{\sum_{q=1}^{3} \gamma_{kq}^2 R^2_{q}(\omega_k, \beta_k)} \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.2.2.6)

As can be observed from the two previous equations, a procedure has been proposed, based on a modified response spectrum model, which enables the computation of the mean value of the maximum modal response for the case of non-uniform seismic input. The way the mean value of the maximum modal response is expressed is exactly analogous to the way it would be expressed had the seismic input been uniform. The only difference is that the "classical" response spectrum is replaced by a modified response spectrum model which accounts for the spatial character of the seismic input.

It is worth mentioning that, for practical purposes, providing a combination rule for the case of non-uniform seismic motions which is exactly analogous to that for the case of uniform seismic motions is very important. Analogously to the previous section,
the standard deviation to be accounted for in the modified response spectrum model, relative to component \( q \), is given by:

\[
\sigma(R^p_q(\omega, \beta)) = \sigma(R_q(\omega, \beta)) \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} A^2_{ki} + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{kj} \rho_{qij} \right]^{1/2} \frac{1}{\gamma_{kq}}
\]

(3.2.2.45)

where \( \sigma(R^p_q) \) and \( \sigma(R_q) \) are the standard deviations to be taken into account for the cases of non uniform and uniform seismic input, respectively.

Finally, the standard deviation of the maximum modal response \( y_k \) will be expressed as:

\[
\sigma^p(\text{max}(y_k)) = \sqrt{\sum_{q=1}^{3} \gamma^2_{kq} \left[ \sigma(R^p_q(\omega, \beta)) \right]^2}
\]

(3.2.2.46)

As a last remark, let us note that the case of no participation of a given mode under a given component of uniform seismic motion, is handled in exactly the same way, based on the results of the previous section. Namely,

\[
R^p_q(\omega, \beta) = R_q(\omega, \beta) \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} A^2_{ki} + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{kj} \rho_{qij} \right]^{1/2}
\]

(3.2.2.47)

\[
\sigma(R^p_q(\omega, \beta)) = \sigma(R_q(\omega, \beta)) \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} A^2_{ki} + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{kj} \rho_{qij} \right]^{1/2}
\]

(3.2.2.48)

\[
\text{Mean}(\text{max}(y_{kq})) = R^p_q(\omega, \beta)
\]

(3.2.2.49)
\[ \sigma^p(\max(y_{kq})) = \sigma(R^p_0(\omega_k, \beta_k)) \] (3.2.2.50)

The combination of the different component contributions is performed as already presented.

3.2.3 Application to Shear Buildings Subjected to a Single Ground Motion Component

The purpose of the present section is to illustrate the use of the procedure developed earlier, through the relatively easy case of frame structures behaving as shear beams (shear buildings), subjected to a single ground motion component. If the seismic excitations at the support points are fully correlated (i.e. no loss of coherence and no phase delay), then the maximum modal responses can be obtained form the design response spectrum \( R(\omega, \beta) \), given at the site of interest. However, if the seismic excitations are imperfectly (partially) correlated, may it be due to a loss of coherence, a phase delay, or both, \( R(\omega, \beta) \) is no longer the means by which the maximum modal responses can be obtained. A modified response spectrum model, which accounts for spatial variability of earthquake ground motions, has been derived. It has been expressed in terms of, the given design response spectrum \( R(\omega, \beta) \), at the site of interest, and the given coherency characteristics of the seismic motion.

3.2.3.1 Single Bay Shear Buildings

Consider the case of a N-story single bay frame structure behaving as a shear
beam (rigid girders, axial deformations in columns neglected), subjected to a single horizontal component of partially correlated ground motions (fig. 3.1). For the sake of simplicity, column stiffnesses will be assumed equal.

![Figure 3.1](image)

The dynamic equations for the N degree-of-freedom structural part can be written based on (3.2.1.16).

Namely,

\[ M_s \ddot{V}_s + C_s \dot{V}_s + K_s V_s = M_s K_s^{-1} K_{sb} \ddot{U}_b \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.2.1.16)
All parameters retain the same definition as in earlier parts. Because of the column stiffnesses, purposely chosen to be equal, (3.2.1.16) reduces for the present case to the following:

\[ M_s \ddot{V}_s + C_s \dot{V}_s + K_s V_s = -M_s E \ddot{s} \]  
(3.2.3.1.1)

where:

\[ E^T = [1 \cdots 1] \] is an influence vector.
\[ \ddot{s}(t) = \frac{1}{2}(\ddot{u}_1(t) + \ddot{u}_2(t)). \]

Assuming that the system is classically damped, and using modal coordinates, one gets:

\[
\begin{cases}
(\Phi^T M_s \Phi) \ddot{Y} + (\Phi^T C_s \Phi) \dot{Y} + (\Phi^T K_s \Phi) Y = -\Phi^T M_s E \ddot{s} \\
V_s = \Phi Y
\end{cases}
\]  
(3.2.3.1.2)

From which the \( k \)th modal equation can be written as:

\[ \ddot{y}_k + 2\beta_k \omega_k \dot{y}_k + \omega_k^2 y_k = -\gamma_k \ddot{s}(t) \]  
(3.2.3.1.3)

where \( \gamma_k \) is the participation factor for mode \( k \).

\[ \gamma_k = \frac{\phi_k^T M_s E}{\phi_k^T M_s \phi_k} \]

The previous modal equation could be rewritten as:

\[ \ddot{y}_k + 2\beta_k \omega_k \dot{y}_k + \omega_k^2 y_k = -\frac{\gamma_k}{2} \ddot{u}_1 - \frac{\gamma_k}{2} \ddot{u}_2 \]  
(3.2.3.1.4)
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which follows the same pattern as the general modal equation (3.2.1.19):

\[
\ddot{y}_k + 2\beta_k \omega_k \dot{y}_k + \omega_k^2 y_k = \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{ki} \ddot{u}_i
\]  

(3.2.1.19)

Note that in the present case \( n \) (the number of support points) is equal to two. And that:

\[
A_{k1} = -\frac{\gamma_k}{2}
\]  

(3.2.3.1.5)

\[
A_{k2} = -\frac{\gamma_k}{2}
\]  

(3.2.3.1.6)

Note also that (3.2.1.30) is satisfied:

\[
\gamma_k = -\sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{ki}
\]  

(3.2.1.30)

Therefore, by applying (3.2.1.61) to this case, the modified response spectrum model can be expressed as follows:

\[
R^n(\omega_k, \beta_k) = R(\omega_k, \beta_k) \left[ \frac{1 + \rho_{12k}}{2} \right]^{1/2}
\]  

(3.2.3.1.7)

where:

\( \rho_{12} \) is the frequency-dependent spatial correlation between stations 1 and 2.

\[
\rho_{12k} = \frac{\int_{0}^{\infty} \rho_{12} G_{y_k}(\omega) d\omega}{\int_{0}^{\infty} G_{y_k}(\omega) d\omega}
\]
\[ G_{y_k}(\omega) = \gamma_k^2 \left| H_k(\omega) \right|^2 G_{\tilde{u}_o} \]

Hence, the maximum modal response (in the mean value sense) for equation (3.2.3.1.4) can be expressed as:

\[ \text{Mean}(\max(y_k)) = \gamma_k \left| R^p(\omega_k, \beta_k) \right| \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.2.3.1.8)

It can be observed that the expression of the maximum modal response for the case of partially correlated seismic motions is exactly analogous to that for the case of fully correlated seismic motions. The difference is that \( R^p(\omega, \beta) \) has replaced \( R(\omega, \beta) \).

Prior to ending the present case, let's examine the extreme situations for (3.2.3.1.7):

1. \( \tilde{u}_1(t) \) and \( \tilde{u}_2(t) \) are fully correlated (i.e. no loss of coherence and no phase delay, \( \tilde{u}_1(t) = \tilde{u}_2(t) \)), \( \rho_{12} = \rho_{120} = 1 \), and the relation between the response spectra reads as follows:

\[ R^p(\omega, \beta) = R(\omega, \beta) \]

which is an expected result.

2. \( \tilde{u}_1(t) \) and \( \tilde{u}_2(t) \) are fully negatively correlated (a particular case of time-delayed excitations: no loss of coherence, and out-of-phase excitations, \( \tilde{u}_1(t) = -\tilde{u}_2(t) \)), \( \rho_{12} = -1 (\rho_{120} = -1) \), and the relation between the response spectra shows that the response spectrum for the case of partially correlated excitations is null.

\[ R^p(\omega, \beta) = 0 \]
In words, such a loading leads to no response for the given structural system. However, such a result can by no means be generalized to any single bay shear building in which the column stiffnesses would not be equal. Further, it is interesting to note that for the case at hand (single bay shear building with identical columns), the non-uniform seismic loading could be decomposed into a symmetrical part (rigid body component) and an antisymmetrical part (non rigid body component) (fig. 3.2). And one would observe that the antisymmetrical part of the loading does not contribute to the structural response, although it does produce stresses in the members.

\[ \tilde{u}_1 + \tilde{u}_2 = \tilde{s} + \tilde{s} + \tilde{d} - \tilde{d} \]

**Figure 3.2**
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Let

\[
\begin{align*}
\ddot{s} &= \frac{1}{2} (\ddot{u}_1 + \ddot{u}_2) & \ddot{u}_1 &= \dddot{s} + \ddot{d} \\
\ddot{d} &= \frac{1}{2} (\ddot{u}_1 - \ddot{u}_2) & \ddot{u}_2 &= \dddot{s} - \ddot{d}
\end{align*}
\]

Based on this argument, the equations of motion (3.2.3.1.1) could be derived without resorting to the general formulation. However, the above considerations are valid for the present case only, and are not applicable to any general situation.

3. \( \ddot{u}_1(t) \) and \( \ddot{u}_2(t) \) are fully uncorrelated (i.e. total loss of coherence), \( \rho_{12} = 0 \), \( \rho_{12k} = 0 \), and the relation between the response spectra reads as follows:

\[
R^p(\omega, \beta) = R(\omega, \beta) \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}
\]

Finally, having examined the extreme situations, one can state that, for the case at hand, the structural response is overpredicted if the assumption of fully correlated excitations is made, while it is underpredicted under the assumption of fully negatively correlated excitations.

3.2.3.2 Multibay Shear Building

Consider the case of a N-story multibay frame structure behaving as a shear beam, subjected to a single horizontal component of partially correlated ground motions (fig. 3.3). For the sake of making the illustration simple and useful, column stiffnesses will be assumed equal.
The equations of motion for the N degree-of-freedom structural part can be written based on (3.2.1.16):

\[ M_s \ddot{V}_s + C_s \dot{V}_s + K_s V_s = M_s K_s^{-1} K_{sb} \bar{U}_b \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.2.1.16)

Because of the stiffness properties of the structure, (3.2.1.16) reduces for the present case to the following:
\[ M_s \ddot{V}_s + C_s \dot{V}_s + K_s V_s = -M_s E \ddot{s} \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.2.3.2.1)

where

\[ E^T = [1 \ 1 \ \cdots \ 1] \] is an influence vector.

\[ \ddot{s}(t) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \ddot{u}_i(t) \] is the static response component.

i indicates the support point.

n is the total number of supports.

In the context of the general formulation, note that:

\[ U_s^s = E s \]

which is the pseudo-static (also referred to as static) component of the structural displacement.

Assuming classical damping, and using modal coordinates, one can write the \( k^{th} \) modal equation as:

\[ \ddot{y}_k + 2 \beta_k \omega_k \dot{y}_k + \omega_k^2 y_k = -\gamma_k \ddot{s}(t) \] \hspace{1cm} (3.2.3.2.2)

where \( \gamma_k \) is the participation factor for mode \( k \).

\[ \gamma_k = \frac{\phi_k^T M_s E}{\phi_k^T M_s \phi_k} \]
(3.2.3.2.2) could be rewritten as:

\[ \ddot{y}_k + 2\beta_k \omega_k \dot{y}_k + \omega_k^2 y_k = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left( \frac{-\gamma_k}{n} \right) \ddot{u}_i \]  (3.2.3.2.3)

Hence, in the context of the general formulation:

\[ A_{ki} = -\frac{1}{n} \gamma_k \]  (3.2.3.2.4)

And

\[ \gamma_k = -\sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{ki} \]

By applying (3.2.1.61) to this case, the modified response spectrum model can be expressed as follows:

\[ R^p(\omega_k, \beta_k) = R(\omega_k, \beta_k) \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \left[ 1 + \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} \rho_{ij} \right] \right\}^{1/2} \]  (3.2.3.2.5)

\[ \rho_{ijk} = \frac{\int_{0}^{\infty} \rho_{ij} |H_k(\omega)|^2 G_{iu}(\omega) d\omega}{\int_{0}^{\infty} |H_k(\omega)|^2 G_{iu}(\omega) d\omega} \]

\( \rho_{ij} \) is the frequency-dependent spatial correlation between stations \( i \) and \( j \). Hence, the maximum modal response for equation (3.2.3.2.3) is given by:

\[ \text{Mean}(\text{max}(y_k)) = |\gamma_k| \cdot R^p(\omega_k, \beta_k) \]  (3.2.3.2.6)

which is a similar equation to the case of fully correlated support motions, except for the fact that \( R(\omega_k, \beta_k) \) replaces \( R^p(\omega_k, \beta_k) \).

Finally, let's examine insightful extreme situations for (3.2.3.2.5):
1. Support motions are fully correlated: All $\rho_{ij}$'s = 1, the response spectra relation reads as follows:

$$R^p(\omega, \beta) = R(\omega, \beta) \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \left[ 1 + \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} 1 \right] \right\}^{1/2}$$

$$= R(\omega, \beta) \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \left[ 1 + \frac{2}{n} C_n^2 \right] \right\}^{1/2}$$

$$= R(\omega, \beta) \left[ \frac{1}{n} + \frac{2}{n^2 (n-2)!} \right]^{1/2}$$

$$= R(\omega, \beta) \left[ \frac{1}{n} + \frac{n-1}{n} \right]^{1/2} = R(\omega, \beta)$$

Hence, $R^p(\omega, \beta) = R(\omega, \beta)$, which is an expected result.

2. Support motions are uncorrelated: All $\rho_{ij}$'s = 0

$$R^p(\omega, \beta) = R(\omega, \beta) \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \left[ 1 + \frac{2}{n} \cdot 0 \right] \right\}^{1/2} = R(\omega, \beta) \sqrt{\frac{1}{n}}$$

Hence,

$$R^p(\omega, \beta) = R(\omega, \beta) \sqrt{\frac{1}{n}}$$

3.3 Continuous Systems: Case of Bridges Subjected to a Single Ground Motion Component

The present section aims at extending the procedure developed for discrete systems to a particular case of elongated continuous systems, namely, that of bridges subjected to a single component of partially correlated seismic excitations. At first, the general formulation for a multispans bridge will be exposed. Then, an application of this formulation to the case of a single span bridge will be presented. Throughout this section, previously derived results will be used as such, without unnecessary redevelopments.

3.3.1 Multispan Bridges
Consider the case of a multispans bridge, modelled as a continuous beam, subjected to horizontal transverse partially correlated seismic excitations (fig. 3.4). Note that for the purpose of the present formulation, the bridge could have also been subjected to partially correlated vertical support motions as well.

![Diagram of a multispans bridge](image)

**Figure 3.4**

There are several ways of solving this problem. The modal superposition method combined with the response spectrum method is commonly used if the structure at hand is subjected to uniform translational excitations. However, if the seismic excitations are imperfectly correlated, then the use of the aforementioned approach is invalidated. The aim of the present work, therefore, is to develop a modified response spectrum model, which essentially is an adjustment of the widely used response spectrum to the situation of spatially varying ground motions.

The equation of motion for a beam flexure situation with viscous damping is given by:
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\[ m \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial t^2} + c \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + EI \frac{\partial^4 u}{\partial x^4} = 0 \] (3.3.1.1)

where:

- \( u(x,t) \) is the total horizontal transverse displacement of the beam.
- \( m \) is the mass per unit length assumed to be constant.
- \( c \) is the viscous damping per unit length assumed to be constant. (It is therefore, implicitly assumed proportional)
- \( EI \) is the flexural rigidity of the beam assumed to be constant.

Let's first examine the case of uniform support motions:

\[ \dddot{u}_i(t) = \dddot{u}_0(t) \quad i = 1, \ldots, n \]

The displacement of the beam can be decomposed as follows:

\[ u(x,t) = u_0(t) + v(x,t) \] (3.3.1.2)

where:

- \( u_0(t) \) is a rigid body displacement of the beam, induced by identical support motions applied statically.
- \( v(x,t) \) is the relative component of the beam displacement.

Substituting (3.3.1.2) into (3.3.1.1), one gets:

\[ m \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial t^2} + c \frac{\partial v}{\partial t} + EI \frac{\partial^4 v}{\partial x^4} = m \frac{\partial^2 u_0}{\partial t^2} + c \frac{\partial u_0}{\partial t} - EI \frac{\partial^4 u_0}{\partial x^4} \] (3.3.1.3)
$-m \frac{\partial^2 u_0}{\partial t^2}$ is the essential part of the effective loading. Indeed, the damping term $c \frac{\partial u_0}{\partial t}$ is neglected for practical purposes, and the term $EI \frac{\partial^4 u_0}{\partial x^4}$ vanishes from considerations relative to the static case.

Hence, (3.3.1.3) reduces to:

$$m \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial t^2} + c \frac{\partial v}{\partial t} + EI \frac{\partial^4 v}{\partial x^4} = -m \frac{\partial^2 u_0}{\partial t^2} \quad (3.3.1.4)$$

Let us expand the dynamic part of the displacement $v(x, t)$ in terms of modal coordinates:

$$v(x, t) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \phi_j(x)y_j(t) \quad (3.3.1.5)$$

where:

$\phi_j(x)$ is the $j^{th}$ mode shape of the structure.

$y_j(t)$ is the $j^{th}$ modal coordinate.

Substituting (3.3.1.5) into (3.3.1.4), one gets:

$$m \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \phi_j(x) \frac{d^2 y_j}{dt^2} + c \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \phi_j(x) \frac{dy_j}{dt} + EI \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{d^4 \phi_j(x)}{dx^4} y_j = -m \frac{\partial^2 u_0}{\partial t^2} \quad (3.3.1.6)$$

Multiplying through by $\phi_k(x)$, integrating over the length of the beam, and using orthogonality of mode shapes, leads to:

$$\left[ m \int_0^L \phi_k^2 dx \right] \frac{d^2 y_k}{dt^2} + \left[ c \int_0^L \phi_k^2 dx \right] \frac{dy_k}{dt} + \left[ EI \int_0^L \frac{d^4 \phi_k}{dx^4} \phi_k dx \right] y_k = -m \int_0^L \phi_k \bar{u}_0 dx \quad (3.3.1.7)$$

(3.3.1.7) is in fact the $k^{th}$ modal equation, which can be rewritten as:

$$\ddot{y}_k + 2\beta_k \omega_k \dot{y}_k + \omega_k^2 y_k = -\gamma_k \bar{u}_0 \quad (3.3.1.8)$$
where:

$\beta_k$ is the viscous damping ratio for mode $k$, such that:

$$2\beta_k \omega_k = \frac{c}{m}$$

$\omega_k$ is the natural frequency for mode $k$, such that:

$$\omega_k^2 = \frac{EI \frac{d^4}{dx^4} \phi_k}{m \phi_k}$$

$\gamma_k$ is the participation factor for mode $k$, such that:

$$\gamma_k = \frac{\int_0^L \phi_k(x) dx}{\int_0^L \phi_k^2(x) dx}$$

The modal equation (3.3.1.8) could be solved by means of the response spectrum method. Indeed, if $R(\omega, \beta)$ is the design response spectrum given at the site of interest, then the mean value of the maximum modal response can be expressed by:

$$\text{Mean } (\max(y_k)) = |\gamma_k| R(\omega_k, \beta_k) \quad (3.3.1.9)$$

Alternatively, $y_k$ could be characterized by its spectral density function given by:

$$S_{y_k}(\omega) = \gamma_k^2 |H_k(\omega)|^2 S_{\tilde{w}}(\omega) \quad (3.3.1.10)$$

where all parameters have already been defined.

Having presented the case of uniform seismic motions, let's examine the more general situation of non uniform seismic motions. The equation of motion is also given
by (3.3.1.1). Similarly to the formulation for discrete systems, the displacement of the beam is decomposed by means of the following:

\[ u(x, t) = u_s(x, t) + v(x, t) \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.3.1.11)

where:

\[ u_s(x, t) \] is the pseudo static displacement induced by the support motions applied statically.

\[ v(x, t) \] is the dynamic component of the displacement.

\[ u_s(x, t) \] can be expressed in terms of the support motions as follows:

\[ u_s(x, t) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} h_i(x) u_i(t) \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.3.1.12)

where:

\[ i \] indicates the support point.

\[ n \] is the total number of supports.

\[ h_i(x) \] for \( i = 1, \ldots, n \) are shape functions obtained from static beam deflection.

By virtue of previous arguments, the equation of motion (3.3.1.1) can be written as:

\[ m \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial t^2} + c \frac{\partial v}{\partial t} + EI \frac{\partial^4 v}{\partial x^4} = -m \frac{\partial^2 u_s}{\partial t^2} \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.3.1.13)

Similarly to the case of uniform seismic motion, modal decomposition of the dynamic component of the displacement can be made, and the \( k^{th} \) modal equation reads as follows:
\[ \ddot{y}_k + 2\beta_k \omega_k \dot{y}_k + \omega_k^2 y_k = -\frac{\int_0^L \phi_k(x) \ddot{u}_s dx}{\int_0^L \phi_k^2(x) dx} \]  

(3.3.1.14)

where all parameters have already been defined. Let’s substitute (3.3.1.12) into the
right hand side of the above equation:

\[ -\frac{\int_0^L \phi_k(x) \ddot{u}_s dx}{\int_0^L \phi_k^2(x) dx} = -\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^L \phi_k(x) h_i(x) \ddot{u}_i(t) dx}{\int_0^L \phi_k^2(x) dx} \]

Let

\[ A_{ki} = -\frac{\int_0^L \phi_k(x) h_i(x) dx}{\int_0^L \phi_k^2(x) dx} \]  

(3.3.1.15)

Hence, by using (3.3.1.15), the \( k^{th} \) modal equation can be rewritten as:

\[ \ddot{y}_k + 2\beta_k \omega_k \dot{y}_k + \omega_k^2 y_k = \sum_{i=1}^n A_{ki} \ddot{u}_i \]  

(3.3.1.16)

which has the same form as the equation arrived at for the case of discrete systems, (3.2.1.19). This equation, as mentioned in earlier sections, cannot be solved by means
of the design response spectrum, which was used to solve the equation for the case
of uniform seismic loading (3.3.1.8). It is important to note that, since the modal
equation for uniform and non uniform seismic inputs for the present case have exactly
the same form as those for the case of discrete systems, the modified response spectrum
model for the former case will be a replica of that of the latter case, with the use of
the relevant parameters of course. In other words, from (3.3.1.8) and (3.3.1.16), it can
be shown that:
\[
S_{Y_k}^p(\omega) = \frac{1}{\gamma_k^2} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{ki}^2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} A_{ki}A_{kj}\rho_{ij} \right] S_{Y_k}(\omega)
\]
which expresses the spectral density function of \(Y_k\) for the case of partially correlated support motions in terms of its homologous for the case of fully correlated support motions. Notice that (3.3.1.17) is identical to (3.2.1.28), which expresses the above relation for the case of discrete systems. Therefore, by virtue of (3.2.1.61), the modified response spectrum model to be used for the response analysis of the multispans bridge subjected to multiple support excitations is given by:

\[
R^p(\omega_k, \beta_k) = R(\omega_k, \beta_k) \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{ki}^2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} A_{ki}A_{kj}\rho_{ijk} \right]^{1/2} \frac{1}{|\gamma_k|}
\]

Recall that:

\[
\rho_{ijk} = \frac{\int_0^\infty \rho_{ij} |H_k(\omega)|^2 G_{u_0}(\omega) d\omega}{\int_0^\infty |H_k(\omega)|^2 G_{u_0}(\omega) d\omega}
\]

\(A_{ki}\)'s and \(\gamma_k\) are parameters relative to the present case.

Likewise, based on (3.2.1.62), the standard deviation to be accounted for, in the modified response spectrum model is given by:

\[
\sigma(R^p(\omega_k, \beta_k)) = \sigma(R(\omega_k, \beta_k)) \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{ki}^2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} A_{ki}A_{kj}\rho_{ijk} \right]^{1/2} \frac{1}{|\gamma_k|}
\]

Note that (3.2.1.68), (3.2.1.69), ..., (3.2.1.73) are used to handle the situation where a mode under consideration does not contribute to the structural response due to a
uniform seismic input.

In conclusion, a general modified response spectrum model has been arrived at. It can handle both, discrete systems and the case of continuous system presented herein, for the seismic analysis under spatially varying ground motions.

3.3.2 Single Span Bridges

The present section aims at illustrating the use of the modified response spectrum model, through a relatively simple, but very insightful case study. Consider a single span extended bridge, modeled as a simple beam, and subjected to spatially varying horizontal transverse support motions (fig. 3.5).

![Diagram of a single span bridge with transverse supports and displacements](image)

**Figure 3.5**

Since the structure at hand is not subjected to uniform translational excitations, the use of the modal superposition method combined with the response spectrum method is invalidated. Let's, then, use the modified response spectrum model, which accounts for the spatial character of the seismic input, for the computation of modal responses.
The modes and frequencies of a simple beam in flexure are given by:

**mode shapes:**

\[ \phi_k(x) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{L}} \sin \frac{k\pi x}{L} \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.3.2.1)

so that

\[ \int_0^L \phi_k(x)\phi_l(x)dx = \delta_{kl} \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.3.2.2)

where \( \delta_{kl} \) is Kroenecker symbol given by:

\[
\delta_{kl} = \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{if } k = l \\
0 & \text{if } k \neq l 
\end{cases}
\]

**frequencies:**

\[ \omega_k = k^2 \pi^2 \sqrt{\frac{EI}{mL^4}} \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.3.2.3)

where \( EI \) and \( m \) have already been defined.

The participation factor of a mode is given by:

\[ \gamma_k = \frac{\int_0^L \phi_k(x)dx}{\int_0^L \phi_k^2(x)dx} = \int_0^L \phi_k(x)dx \]

using (3.3.2.1), one gets:

\[ \gamma_k = \frac{\sqrt{2L}}{k\pi} [1 - (-1)^k] = \begin{cases} 
0 & \text{if } k \text{ is even} \\
2\frac{\sqrt{2L}}{k\pi} & \text{if } k \text{ is odd} 
\end{cases} \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.3.2.4)

In other words, if \( k \) is even, which means that the mode under consideration is anti-symmetrical with respect to mid-span, then this very mode will not contribute to the
structural response under uniform support excitations. However, if \( k \) is odd, which means that the mode in question is symmetrical with respect to midspan, then there will be a contribution from this mode to the structural response under uniform support excitations.

The equation of motion is given by (3.3.1.13):

\[
m \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial t^2} + c \frac{\partial v}{\partial t} + EI \frac{\partial^4 v}{\partial x^4} = -m \frac{\partial^2 u_s}{\partial t^2}
\]  

(3.3.1.13)

where:

\[
u_s(x,t) = \sum_{i=1}^{2} h_i(x) u_i(t)
\]  

(3.3.2.5)

\[
h_4(x) = 1 - \frac{x}{L}
\]  

(3.3.2.6)

\[
h_2(x) = \frac{x}{L}
\]  

(3.3.2.7)

Using modal coordinates, the \( k^{th} \) modal equation can be written as:

\[
\ddot{y}_k + 2\beta_k \omega_k \dot{y}_k + \omega_k^2 y_k = \sum_{i=1}^{2} A_{ki} \ddot{u}_i
\]  

(3.3.2.8)

where, by virtue of (3.3.1.15), \( A_{k1} \) and \( A_{k2} \) are given by:

\[
A_{k1} = -\frac{\sqrt{2L}}{k\pi} \quad \forall k
\]  

(3.3.2.9)
\[ A_{k_2} = \begin{cases} \frac{-\sqrt{2L}}{k\pi} & \text{if } k \text{ is odd} \\ \frac{\sqrt{2L}}{k\pi} & \text{if } k \text{ is even} \end{cases} \]  

The last two equations confirm (3.3.2.4) since,

\[ \gamma_k = -\sum_{i=1}^{2} A_{ki} \]

Hence, the \( k^{th} \) modal equation can be rewritten as:

\[ \ddot{y}_k + 2\beta_k \omega_k \dot{y}_k + \omega_k^2 y_k = -\frac{\sqrt{2L}}{k\pi} \begin{cases} \ddot{u}_1 + \ddot{u}_2 & \text{if } k \text{ is odd} \\ \ddot{u}_1 - \ddot{u}_2 & \text{if } k \text{ is even} \end{cases} \]  

And by virtue of earlier development, the modified response spectrum model will be given by:

\[ R^p(\omega_k, \beta_k) = R(\omega_k, \beta_k) \begin{cases} \sqrt{\frac{1 + \rho_{12k}}{2}} & \text{if } k \text{ is odd} \\ \frac{2\sqrt{2L}}{k\pi} \sqrt{\frac{1 - \rho_{12k}}{2}} & \text{if } k \text{ is even} \end{cases} \]  

Hence,

\[ M\text{ean}(\max(y_k)) = R^p(\omega_k, \beta_k) \begin{cases} \gamma_k & \text{if } k \text{ is odd} \\ 1 & \text{if } k \text{ is even} \end{cases} \]

which can be rewritten as:

\[ M\text{ean}(\max(y_k)) = R(\omega_k, \beta_k) \begin{cases} \frac{2\sqrt{2L}}{k\pi} \sqrt{\frac{1 + \rho_{12k}}{2}} & \text{if } k \text{ is odd} \\ \frac{2\sqrt{2L}}{k\pi} \sqrt{\frac{1 - \rho_{12k}}{2}} & \text{if } k \text{ is even} \end{cases} \]
Analogously,

\[
\sigma^p(\max(y_k)) = \sigma(R(\omega_k, \beta_k)) \begin{cases} 
\frac{2\sqrt{2L}}{k\pi} \sqrt{\frac{1 + \rho_{12k}}{2}} & \text{if } k \text{ is odd} \\
\frac{2\sqrt{2L}}{k\pi} \sqrt{\frac{1 - \rho_{12k}}{2}} & \text{if } k \text{ is even}
\end{cases} 
\] (3.3.2.15)

Therefore, the use of the modified response spectrum model for the computation of modal responses under non uniform seismic input has been illustrated.

Let's now examine this problem from another viewpoint so as to get more physical insight. Namely, let us decompose the seismic loading into a symmetrical part (rigid body component), and an antisymmetrical part (non rigid body component) (fig. 3.6).

\[
\begin{align*}
\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
\overrightarrow{\ddot{u}}_1
\end{array}
\end{array}
= &
\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
\overrightarrow{\ddot{u}}_1
\end{array}
\end{array}
\end{array} +
\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
\overrightarrow{\ddot{s}}
\end{array}
\end{array} +
\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
\overrightarrow{\ddot{d}}
\end{array}
\end{array} =
\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
\overrightarrow{-\ddot{d}}
\end{array}
\end{array}
\end{array}
\end{array}
\end{array}
\end{align*}
\]

\text{symmetrical part} \hspace{1cm} \text{antisymmetrical part}

\text{Figure 3.6}

where:

\[
\begin{align*}
\ddot{s}(t) &= \frac{1}{2}(\ddot{u}_1(t) + \ddot{u}_2(t)) \hspace{1cm} (3.3.2.16) \\
\ddot{d}(t) &= \frac{1}{2}(\ddot{u}_1(t) - \ddot{u}_2(t)) \hspace{1cm} (3.3.2.17)
\end{align*}
\]

In the present case, both parts of the loading will cause a structural response. In fact, in the context of a mode superposition analysis, the response at any arbitrary point receives contributions from both symmetrical and antisymmetrical modes (with respect
to midspan). Symmetrical modes with respect to midspan will be exclusively excited by the symmetrical part of the loading, while antisymmetrical modes will be exclusively excited by the antisymmetrical part. Hence, in the case of partially correlated excitations, there will be a modal response at any given mode. It is worth mentioning at this point that such a fact would not be captured by the "classical" response spectrum method since it is based on the assumption that the seismic excitation is a uniform translation (full correlation), which inherently ignores the contribution of antisymmetrical modes to the total response.

Following the decomposition of the seismic loading, let's decompose any modal response as:

\[ y_k = y_{k1} + y_{k2} \quad (3.3.2.18) \]

where:

- \( y_k \) is the \( k^{th} \) modal response.
- \( y_{k1} \) is the contribution to the \( k^{th} \) modal response from the symmetrical part of the loading.
- \( y_{k2} \) is the contribution to the \( k^{th} \) modal response from the antisymmetrical part of the loading.

Using \((3.3.1.14)\) \( y_{k1} \) and \( y_{k2} \) will be such that:

\[ \ddot{y}_{k1} + 2\beta_k \omega_k \dot{y}_{k1} + \omega^2_k y_{k1} = - \left[ \int_0^L \phi_k(x) dx \right] \ddot{s}(t) \quad (3.3.2.19) \]
\[ \ddot{y}_k + 2\beta_k \omega_k \dot{y}_k + \omega_k^2 y_k = - \left[ \int_0^L \phi_k(x) \left( 1 - \frac{2x}{L} \right) \right] \ddot{d}(t) \quad (3.3.2.20) \]

\[ \int_0^L \phi_k(x) \, dx = \frac{\sqrt{2L}}{k\pi} [1 - (-1)^n] = \begin{cases} \frac{2\sqrt{2L}}{k\pi} & \text{if } k \text{ is odd} \\ 0 & \text{if } k \text{ is even} \end{cases} \quad (3.3.2.4) \]

\[ \int_0^L \phi_k(x) \left( 1 - \frac{2x}{L} \right) \, dx = \frac{\sqrt{2L}}{k\pi} [1 + (-1)^k] = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } k \text{ is odd} \\ \frac{2\sqrt{2L}}{k\pi} & \text{if } k \text{ is even} \end{cases} \]

Therefore, \( y_{k1} \) and \( y_{k2} \) are mutually exclusive. Alternatively, if \( k \) is odd, the mode is symmetrical with respect to midspan, then:

\[ y_k = y_{k1} \quad \text{and} \quad y_{k2} = 0 \]

which means no contribution from the antisymmetrical part of the loading, which is expected. On the other hand, if \( k \) is even, the mode is antisymmetrical, then:

\[ y_k = y_{k2} \quad \text{and} \quad y_{k1} = 0 \]

which means no contribution from the symmetrical part of the loading, which is also expected. Therefore, the \( k^{th} \) modal equation can be written as:

\[ \ddot{y}_k + 2\beta_k \omega_k \dot{y}_k + \omega_k^2 y_k = -\frac{2\sqrt{2L}}{k\pi} \begin{cases} \ddot{s}(t) & \text{if } k \text{ is odd} \\ \ddot{d}(t) & \text{if } k \text{ is even} \end{cases} \quad (3.3.2.21) \]

which is exactly identical to the equation (3.3.2.11), derived based on the general formulation.

Before closing this section, let's examine extreme situation for (3.3.2.14):
\[ \text{Mean}(\max(y_k)) = 2 \frac{\sqrt{2L}}{k\pi} R(\omega_k, \beta_k) \begin{cases} 
 \sqrt{\frac{1 + \rho_{12k}}{2}} & \text{if } k \text{ is odd} \\
 \sqrt{\frac{1 - \rho_{12k}}{2}} & \text{if } k \text{ is even} 
\end{cases} \] (3.3.2.14)

1. \( \tilde{u}_1(t) \) and \( \tilde{u}_2(t) \) are identical (fully correlated), then \( \rho_{12} = 1 \) and \( \rho_{12k} = 1 \), and (3.3.2.14) reads as follows:

\[ \text{Mean}(\max(y_k)) = 2 \frac{\sqrt{2L}}{k\pi} R(\omega_k, \beta_k) \begin{cases} 
 1 & \text{if } k \text{ is odd} \\
 0 & \text{if } k \text{ is even} 
\end{cases} \]

which is an expected result.

2. \( \tilde{u}_1(t) \) and \( \tilde{u}_2(t) \) are fully negatively correlated, \( \rho_{12} = -1 \), \( \rho_{12k} = -1 \), and (3.3.2.14) becomes:

\[ \text{Mean}(\max(y_k)) = 2 \frac{\sqrt{2L}}{k\pi} R(\omega_k, \beta_k) \begin{cases} 
 0 & \text{if } k \text{ is odd} \\
 1 & \text{if } k \text{ is even} 
\end{cases} \]

which also is expected.

3. \( \tilde{u}_1(t) \) and \( \tilde{u}_2(t) \) are fully uncorrelated, \( \rho_{12} = 0 \), \( \rho_{12k} = 0 \), and (3.3.2.14) takes the form of:

\[ \text{Mean}(\max(y_k)) = 2 \frac{\sqrt{2L}}{k\pi} R(\omega_k, \beta_k) \begin{cases} 
 \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} & \text{if } k \text{ is odd} \\
 \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} & \text{if } k \text{ is even} 
\end{cases} \]
Chapter 4

Effect of Spatial Variation of Seismic Excitations on Modal Cross-Correlation

4.1 Introduction

The modified response spectrum model developed in chapter 3 is a means for the computation of modal responses for the case of partially correlated seismic excitations. This model takes the form of an adjustment of the classical response spectrum, to the situation of non-uniform seismic input. The computation of a physical (as opposed to modal) response of interest, should it be for the case of uniform or non-uniform seismic excitations, is based on the combination of the classical or modified response spectrum model, with the modal superposition method. In practice, this computation procedure translates into the use of combination rules for maximum modal responses. For the case of uniform support excitations, a number of combination rules, with different levels of sophistication, has been proposed. The simplest rule is the so-called SAV, which stands for sum of absolute values, and which generally is overconservative. A combination rule, which is widely used in practice, is the SRSS rule. It stands for square root of sum of squares, and it is more suitable than the previous one. However, it may be on the unconservative side for closely spaced modes situations, such as seismic analyses of nuclear power plants. To overcome this shortcoming of the SRSS rule, more elaborated rules, which account for modal cross-correlations, exist. Different expressions for the
cross-correlations coefficients, based on different considerations, have been suggeted by Wilson et al. [52], Rosenblueth et al. [38], and Der Kiureghian [14], to cite a few only. Among the aforementioned formulations, the one proposed by the latter author, based on a random vibration analysis, may be considered to be the most rigorous.

The present chapter aims at proposing expressions for the modal cross-correlation coefficients for the case of multiple support excitations, thereby providing a combination rule for the maximum modal responses given by the modified response spectrum model. It is important to mention that the work spirit of this chapter is similar to that of the previous one. Namely that, the expressions for the modal cross-correlation coefficients sought after, will take the form of an adjustment, or an extension, of the homologous coefficients for the case of uniform support excitations. The formulation will, at first, account for a single ground motion component, and will, afterwards, be extended to multicomponent ground motion.

4.2 Case of a Single Ground Motion Component

Let's first go over the derivation of the existing expressions of modal cross-correlation coefficients for the case of uniform support excitations. The following formulation is due to Der Kiureghian [14]. The dynamic response of a linear, multidegree-of-freedom system, discrete or continuous, classically damped, subjected to a single component of uniform translational ground motion, can be determined by solving the modal equation of motion (3.2.1.7 or 3.3.1.8):
\[ \ddot{y}_k + 2\beta_k \omega_k \dot{y}_k + \omega_k^2 y_k = -\gamma_k \bar{u}_0(t) \]  \hspace{1cm} (4.2.1)

where:

\( k \) is the mode number.

\( \gamma_k \) is the participation factor for mode \( k \).

Any response quantity \( z(t) \) linearly related to the modal coordinates can be found using the relation:

\[ z(t) = \sum_k L_k y_k(t) \]  \hspace{1cm} (4.2.2)

where \( L_k \)'s are constant, and depend on the response of interest. From [9] and [14], the one-sided spectral density function of the response of interest, \( G_s(\omega) \) is given by:

\[ G_s(\omega) = \sum_k \sum_l L_k L_l H_k^*(\omega) H_l(\omega) \gamma_k \gamma_l G_{\bar{u}_0}(\omega) \]  \hspace{1cm} (4.2.3)

where:

\( k \) and \( l \) indicate modes.

* indicates the complex conjugate.

\( H_k(\omega) \) is the transfer function (for displacement response) of mode \( k \) given by:

\[ H_k(\omega) = \frac{1}{\omega_k^2 - \omega^2 + 2i\beta_k \omega_k \omega} \]

\( G_{\bar{u}_0}(\omega) \) is the one-sided spectral density function of the input excitation.

Define \( E_k \) and \( E_l \) such that:
\[ E_k = L_k \gamma_k \quad (4.2.4) \]
\[ E_l = L_l \gamma_l \quad (4.2.5) \]

where \( E_k \) and \( E_l \) may be considered effective participation factors for modes \( k \) and \( l \) respectively. Hence, (4.2.3) can be rewritten as:

\[ G_s(\omega) = \sum_k \sum_l E_k E_l H_k^*(\omega) H_l(\omega) G_{\tilde{u}u}(\omega) \quad (4.2.6) \]

Incidentally, by switching \( k \) and \( l \) in the double summation, the real parts of \( H_k^*(\omega) H_l(\omega) \) will remain, while the imaginary parts will cancel out.

In order to evaluate the mean value of the peak response, it is necessary to compute the spectral moments of the response. The \( m^{th} \) spectral moment of \( \varepsilon(t) \) is given by:

\[ \lambda_m = \int_0^\infty \omega^m G_s(\omega) d\omega \quad (4.2.7) \]

Substituting (4.2.6) into (4.2.7), one gets:

\[ \lambda_m = \sum_k \sum_l E_k E_l \text{Real} \int_0^\infty \omega^m H_k^*(\omega) H_l(\omega) G_{\tilde{u}u}(\omega) d\omega \quad (4.2.8) \]

Let

\[ \lambda_{m,kl} = \text{Real} \int_0^\infty \omega^m H_k^*(\omega) H_l(\omega) G_{\tilde{u}u}(\omega) d\omega \quad (4.2.9) \]

where \( \lambda_{m,kl} \) is the \( m^{th} \) cross-spectral moment associated with modes \( k \) and \( l \). Hence, (4.2.8) can be rewritten as:

\[ \lambda_m = \sum_k \sum_l E_k E_l \lambda_{m,kl} \quad (4.2.10) \]
Let
\[ \epsilon_{m,kl} = \frac{\lambda_{m,kl}}{\sqrt{\lambda_{m,kk}\lambda_{m,ll}}} \]  
(4.2.11)

where \( \epsilon_{m,kl} \) is the \( m^{th} \) cross-correlation coefficient between modes \( k \) and \( l \). Hence, (4.2.8) can take the following form:
\[ \lambda_m = \sum_k \sum_l E_k E_l \epsilon_{m,kl} \sqrt{\lambda_{m,kk}\lambda_{m,ll}} \]  
(4.2.12)

where:
\[ \lambda_{m,kk} = \int_0^\infty \omega^m |H_k(\omega)|^2 G_{\eta\eta}(\omega) d\omega \]  
(4.2.13)

Note that \( \epsilon_{0,kl} \) is the cross-correlation coefficient between the \( k^{th} \) and the \( l^{th} \) modal responses. And that \( \epsilon_{2,kl} \) is the cross-correlation coefficient between the \( k^{th} \) and the \( l^{th} \) modal “velocities” (time derivatives of the response of interest). \( \epsilon_{1,kl} \) has no obvious physical interpretation. However, it behaves similarly to cross-correlation coefficients [14]. It is also shown in [14] that:

If \( \frac{\omega_k}{\omega_l} \rightarrow 1 \), then \( \epsilon_{m,kl} \rightarrow 1 \), \( m = 0, 1, 2 \)

If \( \frac{\omega_k}{\omega_l} \rightarrow 0 \), then \( \epsilon_{m,kl} \rightarrow 0 \), \( m = 0, 1, 2 \)

The mean value of the maximum response and the zeroth spectral moment of the response are related as follows:
\[ \lambda_0 = \left[ \frac{\text{Mean} \ (\text{max}(z))}{p} \right]^2 \]  
(4.2.14)
where \( p \) is a peak factor. Hence,

\[
\lambda_{0, kk} = \left[ \frac{R(\omega_k, \beta_k)}{p_k} \right]^2
\]

(4.2.15)

where:

\( R(\omega, \beta) \) is the mean response spectrum given at the site of interest.

\( p_k \) is a peak factor.

Therefore, by writing (4.2.12) for \( m = 0 \),

\[
\lambda_0 = \sum_k \sum_l E_k E_l \epsilon_{0, kl} \sqrt{\lambda_{0, kk} \lambda_{0, ll}}
\]

(4.2.16)

and substituting (4.2.14) and (4.2.15) into (4.2.16), and by simplifying peak factors for practical purposes [14] and [41], one gets:

\[
[\text{Mean}(\max(z))]^2 = \sum_k \sum_l \epsilon_{0, kl} E_k E_l R(\omega_k, \beta_k) R(\omega_l, \beta_l)
\]

(4.2.17)

which can be rewritten as:

\[
\text{Mean}(\max(z)) = [\sum_k \sum_l \epsilon_{0, kl} \text{Mean}(\max(z_k)) \text{Mean}(\max(z_l))]^{1/2}
\]

(4.2.18)

where:

\[
\text{Mean}(\max(z_k)) = E_k R(\omega_k, \beta_k)
\]

\[
\text{Mean}(\max(z_l)) = E_l R(\omega_l, \beta_l)
\]

which are the mean values of the maximum \( k^{th} \) and \( l^{th} \) modal responses, respectively (they may be negative).
For structures with well-separated frequencies, the coefficients $\epsilon_{0,kl}$ vanish for $k \neq l$, and (4.2.18) becomes:

$$ Mean(max(z)) = \left[ \sum_k (Mean(max(z_k)))^2 \right]^{1/2} $$ (4.2.19)

which is the SRSS rule for modal combination.

At present, let us extend this existing formulation to the case of multiple support excitations. The goal which is aimed at, is to get an analogous equation to (4.2.18) that would read as follows:

$$ Mean^p(max(z)) = \left[ \sum_k \sum_l \epsilon_{0,kl}^p Mean^p(max(z_k)) Mean^p(max(z_l)) \right]^{1/2} $$

where:

The superscript $p$ stands for partially correlated seismic excitations.

$$ Mean^p(max(z_k)) = E_k^p R^p(\omega_k, \beta_k) $$

$$ Mean^p(max(z_l)) = E_l^p R^p(\omega_l, \beta_l) $$

$R^p(\omega, \beta)$ is the modified response spectrum model.

$\epsilon_{0,kl}^p$ is the modified cross-correlation coefficient between modes $k$ and $l$ for the case of non uniform support motions. Ideally, it should be expressed as the product of $\epsilon_{0,kl}$ and a correction factor, that accounts for the spatial character of the seismic input.
Let's start the formulation by writing the \( k^{th} \) modal equation for a linear, multidegree-of-freedom, multiply-supported system, discrete or continuous, classically damped, subjected to a single component of non uniform translational ground motion (3.2.1.19 or 3.3.1.16):

\[
\ddot{y}_k + 2\beta_k \omega_k \dot{y}_k + \omega_k^2 y_k = \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{ki} \ddot{u}_i
\]

where all parameters have already been defined.

Any response quantity \( z(t) \) linearly related to the modal coordinates can be expressed as

\[
z(t) = \sum_k L_k y_k(t)
\]

where \( L_k \)'s are constant, depending on the response of interest. Let

\[
\ddot{s}_k(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{ki} \ddot{u}_i(t)
\]

The spectral density function of the response, \( S^p_z(\omega) \) is given by:

\[
S^p_z(\omega) = \sum_k \sum_l L_k L_l H^*_k(\omega) H_l(\omega) S_{\ddot{s}_k \ddot{s}_l}(\omega)
\]

where the superscript \( p \) stands for partially correlated seismic excitations. By switching \( k \) and \( l \) in the double summation, the real parts of \( H^*_k(\omega) H_l(\omega) S_{\ddot{s}_k \ddot{s}_l}(\omega) \) will remain, while the imaginary parts will cancel out. In order to evaluate spectral moments of the response, one needs to express the one-sided spectral density function of the response, \( G^p_z(\omega) \). \( G^p_z(\omega) \) is such that:

\[
\int_0^\infty G^p_z(\omega) d\omega = \int_{-\infty}^\infty S^p_z(\omega) d\omega
\]
Hence, let's express the right hand side of (4.2.24):

\[
\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} S_p^2(\omega) d\omega = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_k \sum_l L_k L_l H_k^*(\omega) H_l(\omega) S_{\tilde{i}k \tilde{i}l}(\omega) d\omega
\]

\[
= \int_{0}^{\infty} \sum_k \sum_l L_k L_l 2 \text{ Real } [H_k^*(\omega) H_l(\omega) S_{\tilde{i}k \tilde{i}l}(\omega)] d\omega
\]

Therefore,

\[
G^p_s(\omega) = 2 \sum_k \sum_l L_k L_l \text{ Real } [H_k^*(\omega) H_l(\omega) S_{\tilde{i}k \tilde{i}l}(\omega)] 
\]  (4.2.25)

Let's now express spectral moments:

\[
\lambda^p_m = \int_{0}^{\infty} \omega^m G^p_s(\omega) d\omega 
\]  (4.2.26)

Substituting (4.2.25) into (4.2.26), one gets:

\[
\lambda^p_m = \sum_k \sum_l L_k L_l 2 \text{ Real } \int_{0}^{\infty} \omega^m H_k^*(\omega) H_l(\omega) S_{\tilde{i}k \tilde{i}l}(\omega) d\omega 
\]  (4.2.27)

Analogously to the case of uniform excitations, let:

\[
\lambda^p_{m,kl} = 2 \text{ Real } \int_{0}^{\infty} \omega^m H_k^*(\omega) H_l(\omega) S_{\tilde{i}k \tilde{i}l}(\omega) d\omega 
\]  (4.2.28)

and hence,

\[
\lambda^p_m = \sum_k \sum_l L_k L_l \lambda^p_{m,kl} 
\]  (4.2.29)

where \( \lambda^p_{m,kl} \) is the \( m^{th} \) cross-spectral moment associated with modes \( k \) and \( l \) for the case of non uniform seismic input. Let's also define the \( m^{th} \) cross-correlation coefficient between modes \( k \) and \( l \) for the case of non uniform seismic input:

\[
\epsilon^p_{m,kl} = \frac{\lambda^p_{m,kl}}{\sqrt{\lambda^p_{m,kk} \lambda^p_{m,ll}}} 
\]  (4.2.30)
Therefore, (4.2.29) could be rewritten as:

\[ \lambda_m^p = \sum_k \sum_l L_k L_l \varepsilon_{m,kl}^{p} \lambda_{m,kl}^{p} \lambda_{m,li}^{p} \]  \hspace{1cm} (4.2.31)

(4.2.31) could rewritten for \( m = 0 \) (zeroth spectral moment) as:

\[ \lambda_0^p = \sum_k \sum_l L_k L_l \varepsilon_{0,kl}^{p} \lambda_{0,kl}^{p} \lambda_{0,li}^{p} \]  \hspace{1cm} (4.2.32)

where:

\[ \lambda_{0,kl}^{p} = 2 \int_0^{\infty} | H_k(\omega) |^2 S_{x_k}(\omega)d\omega \]

which is equivalent to

\[ \lambda_{0,kl}^{p} = \int_0^{\infty} | H_k(\omega) |^2 G_{x_k}(\omega)d\omega \]  \hspace{1cm} (4.2.33)

From previous arguments:

\[ \lambda_0^p = \left[ \frac{M_{\text{mean}}(\max(z))}{p} \right]^2 \]  \hspace{1cm} (4.2.34)

\[ \lambda_{0,kl}^{p} = \left[ \frac{M_{\text{mean}}(\max(y_k))}{p_k} \right]^2 \]  \hspace{1cm} (4.2.35)

where \( p \) and \( p_k \) are peak factors. By virtue of [14] and [42], (4.2.32) leads to:

\[ M_{\text{mean}}(\max(z)) = \left[ \sum_k \sum_l \varepsilon_{0,kl}^{p} L_k L_l M_{\text{mean}}(\max(y_k)) M_{\text{mean}}(\max(y_l)) \right]^{1/2} \]  \hspace{1cm} (4.2.36)

From (3.2.1.56),

\[ M_{\text{mean}}(\max(y_k)) = | \gamma_k | R^p(\omega_k, \beta_k) \]  \hspace{1cm} (4.2.37)

\[ M_{\text{mean}}(\max(y_l)) = | \gamma_l | R^p(\omega_l, \beta_l) \]  \hspace{1cm} (4.2.38)

where \( R^p(\omega, \beta) \) is the modified response spectrum model.
Define:

\[ E_k^p = \gamma_k | L_k = \begin{cases} E_k & \text{if } \gamma_k > 0 \\ -E_k & \text{if } \gamma_k < 0 \end{cases} \]  

(4.2.39)

\[ E_i^p = \gamma_i | L_i = \begin{cases} E_i & \text{if } \gamma_i > 0 \\ -E_i & \text{if } \gamma_i < 0 \end{cases} \]  

(4.2.40)

By using (4.2.39), (4.2.40), (4.2.37), and (4.2.38) into (4.2.36), one gets:

\[ M^p\text{ean}(\max(z)) = \left[ \sum_k \sum_l c_{0,kl}^p E_k^p E_i^p R^p(\omega_k, \beta_k) R^p(\omega_l, \beta_l) \right]^{1/2} \]  

(4.2.41)

which can be rewritten as:

\[ M^p\text{ean}(\max(z)) = \left[ \sum_k \sum_l c_{0,kl}^p M^p\text{ean}(\max(z_k)) M^p\text{ean}(\max(z_l)) \right]^{1/2} \]  

(4.2.42)

where

\[ M^p\text{ean}(\max(z_k)) = E_k^p R^p(\omega_k, \beta_k) \]  

(4.2.43)

\[ M^p\text{ean}(\max(z_l)) = E_l^p R^p(\omega_l, \beta_l) \]  

(4.2.44)

Notice that if \( \gamma_k = 0 \) (or \( \gamma_l = 0 \)), then (4.2.41) still holds true, with:

\[ M^p\text{ean}(\max(z_k)) = L_k R^p(\omega_k, \beta_k) \]  

(4.2.45)

where \( R^p(\omega_k, \beta_k) \) is given by (3.2.1.72), which addresses the case of no modal participation under uniform seismic input.

Hence, (4.2.42) represents the equation that was aimed at. At present, let’s express \( c_{0,kl}^p \) in terms of \( c_{0,kl} \). Let’s first express \( \lambda_{0,kl}^p \) in terms of \( \lambda_{0,kl} \). From (4.2.28):

\[ \lambda_{0,kl}^p = 2 \text{ Real} \int_0^\infty H_k^*(\omega) H_l(\omega) S_{kk'i}(\omega) d\omega \]  

(4.2.46)
The first step is to express $S_{\tilde{s}_k \tilde{s}_l}(\omega)$ in terms of auto-spectra and cross-spectra of the ground acceleration at the different supports. The cross correlation $R_{\tilde{s}_k \tilde{s}_l}(\tau)$ can be written as:

$$
R_{\tilde{s}_k \tilde{s}_l}(\tau) = E[\tilde{s}_k(t)\tilde{s}_l(t + \tau)]
= E\left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{ki} \tilde{u}_i(t)\right)\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{li} \tilde{u}_i(t + \tau)\right)\right]
= E\left[\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{lj} \tilde{u}_i(t)\tilde{u}_j(t + \tau)\right]
$$

Exchanging the order of summation and expectation, $R_{\tilde{s}_k \tilde{s}_l}(\tau)$ reads as:

$$
R_{\tilde{s}_k \tilde{s}_l}(\tau) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{lj} R_{\tilde{u}_i \tilde{u}_j}(\tau) 
$$

where:

- $i$ and $j$ denote support points.
- $k$ and $l$ denote mode numbers.

By taking Fourier transforms in (4.2.47), the cross-spectral density function, $S_{\tilde{s}_k \tilde{s}_l}(\omega)$ is given by:

$$
S_{\tilde{s}_k \tilde{s}_l}(\omega) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{lj} S_{\tilde{u}_i \tilde{u}_j}(\omega) 
$$

Hence, $\chi_{0,kl}^p$ can be written as:

$$
\chi_{0,kl}^p = 2 \text{ Real} \int_0^\infty H_k^*(\omega) H_l(\omega) \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{lj} S_{\tilde{u}_i \tilde{u}_j}(\omega) d\omega
$$

$$
= \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{lj} 2 \text{ Real} \int_0^\infty H_k^*(\omega) H_l(\omega) S_{\tilde{u}_i \tilde{u}_j}(\omega) d\omega
$$

$$
= \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{lj} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} H_k^*(\omega) H_l(\omega) S_{\tilde{u}_i \tilde{u}_j}(\omega) d\omega
$$

Hence,

$$
\chi_{0,kl}^p = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{lj} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} H_k^*(\omega) H_l(\omega) S_{\tilde{u}_i \tilde{u}_j}(\omega) d\omega
$$
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Recall that:

\[ S_{u_iu_j}(\omega) = r_{ij}(\omega, d_{ij}) S_{\bar{u}_o}(\omega) \]  \hfill (3.2.1.25)

where \( r_{ij} \) is the coherency function between stations \( i \) and \( j \).

Define:

\[ r_{ijkl} = \frac{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} H_k^*(\omega) H_l(\omega) S_{u_iu_j}(\omega) d\omega}{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} H_k^*(\omega) H_l(\omega) S_{\bar{u}_o}(\omega) d\omega} \]  \hfill (4.2.50)

where:

\[ \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} H_k^*(\omega) H_l(\omega) S_{\bar{u}_o}(\omega) = \text{Real} \int_{0}^{\infty} H_k^*(\omega) H_l(\omega) G_{\bar{u}_o}(\omega) d\omega = \lambda_{0,kl} \]

Hence,

\[ r_{ijkl} = \frac{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} H_k^*(\omega) H_l(\omega) S_{u_iu_j}(\omega) d\omega}{\lambda_{0,kl}} \]  \hfill (4.2.51)

\( r_{ijkl} \) can be thought of as the ratio of the covariance of the relative responses of 2 oscillators \( (\omega_k, \beta_k) \) and \( (\omega_l, \beta_l) \), respectively subjected to the partially correlated excitations \( \bar{u}_i(t) \) and \( \bar{u}_j(t) \), to the homologous covariance for the case of fully correlated excitations.

Hence, \( \lambda_{0,kl}^p \) can be written as:

\[ \lambda_{0,kl}^p = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{lj} r_{ijkl} \lambda_{0,kl} \]  \hfill (4.2.52)

or as:

\[ \lambda_{0,kl}^p = \lambda_{0,kl} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{lj} r_{ijkl} \]  \hfill (4.2.53)

Therefore, \( \varepsilon_{0,kl}^p \) can be expressed as:

\[ \varepsilon_{0,kl}^p = \frac{\lambda_{0,kl}^p}{\sqrt{\lambda_{0,kk}^p \lambda_{0,kl}^p}} \quad \text{from} \quad (4.2.30) \]  \hfill (4.2.54)
\[ \lambda_{0,kl} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{lj} r_{ijkl}}{\sqrt{\lambda_{0, kk} \lambda_{0, ll}}} \left\{ \frac{\left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{kj} r_{ikj} \right) \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} A_{li} A_{lj} r_{ijl} \right)}{\left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{kj} r_{ikj} \right) \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} A_{li} A_{lj} r_{ijl} \right)} \right\}^{1/2} \]

Using \( \epsilon_{0,kl} = \frac{\lambda_{0,kl}}{\sqrt{\lambda_{0, kk} \lambda_{0, ll}}} \) in the above equation, one gets

\[ \epsilon_{0,kl}^{P} = \epsilon_{0,kl} \left\{ \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{lj} r_{ijkl}}{\left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{kj} r_{ikj} \right) \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} A_{li} A_{lj} r_{ijl} \right)} \right\}^{1/2} \] (4.2.55)

Notice that \( r_{ijkk} \) can be rewritten as:

\[ r_{ijkk} = \frac{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |H_k(\omega)|^2 S_{\tilde{u}_i \tilde{u}_j}(\omega) d\omega}{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |H_k(\omega)|^2 S_{\tilde{u}_0}(\omega) d\omega} \]

\[ \Rightarrow \]

\[ r_{ijkk} = \frac{\int_{0}^{\infty} \rho_{ij} |H_k(\omega)|^2 G_{\tilde{u}_0}(\omega) d\omega}{\int_{0}^{\infty} |H_k(\omega)|^2 G_{\tilde{u}_0}(\omega) d\omega} \] (4.2.56)

where \( \rho_{ij} \) is the frequency dependent spatial correlation coefficient of the seismic motion between stations \( i \) and \( j \). It is the real part of the coherency function \( r_{ij} \). From (4.2.56), one remarks that \( r_{ijkk} \) is nothing but \( \rho_{ijk} \).

Hence,

\[ r_{ijkk} = \rho_{ijk} \] (4.2.57)

Similarly,

\[ \rho_{ijl} = \rho_{ijl} \] (4.2.58)
Therefore, (4.2.55) could be rewritten as:

\[
\varepsilon_{0,kl}^P = \varepsilon_{0,kl} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{lj} r_{ij kl}}{\left\{ \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{kj} \rho_{ijk} \right) \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{lj} \rho_{ijl} \right) \right\}^{1/2}}
\] (4.2.59)

Finally, the combination rule has been extended to the case of partially correlated excitations. And the modal cross-correlation coefficient for such a case has been expressed in terms of the homologous coefficient for the case of fully correlated (identical) excitations.

As a closing part of this section, let's examine extreme cases for (4.2.55) or (4.2.59).

1. Support motions are fully correlated:

All \( r_{ij kl} = 1 \), (4.2.55) reads as:

\[
\varepsilon_{0,kl}^P = \varepsilon_{0,kl} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{lj}}{\left\{ \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{kj} \right) \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{lj} \right) \right\}^{1/2}}
\]

\[
= \varepsilon_{0,kl} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{lj}}{\left\{ \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{lj} \right)^2 \right\}^{1/2}}
\]

\[
= \varepsilon_{0,kl}
\]

Hence,

\[
\varepsilon_{0,kl}^P = \varepsilon_{0,kl}
\]

which is an expected result.
2. Support motions are mutually uncorrelated: All \( r_{ij} = 0 \)

\[
\lambda_{0,k}^p = \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{li} \lambda_{0,kl} \quad \text{from} \quad (4.2.49)
\]

Hence,

\[
\epsilon_{0,kl}^p = \epsilon_{0,kl} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{li}}{\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{ki}^2 \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{li}^2\right)^{1/2}}
\]

Since

\[
\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{li}\right)^2 \leq \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{ki}^2\right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{li}^2\right)
\]

\( \epsilon_{0,kl}^p \leq \epsilon_{0,kl} \) in this case.
4.3 Case of Multicomponent Ground Motion

Having presented a modal combination rule, and expressed a modal cross-correlation coefficient for the case of a single component of non uniform translational ground motion, let's extend this formulation to the situation of non uniform uncorrelated multicomponent ground motion. Prior to tackling the problem of non uniform multicomponent ground motion, let's extend the existing formulation for a single uniform ground motion component [14] to the case of uniform uncorrelated multicomponent ground motion.

A typical modal equation for a linear, three-dimensional, lumped mass, multidegree of freedom, multiply-supported system, subjected to uniform, three-dimensional translational seismic excitations reads as follows: (3.2.2.3)

\[ \ddot{y}_k + 2\beta_k\omega_k\dot{y}_k + \omega_k^2 y_k = -\sum_{q=1}^{3} \gamma_{kq} \ddot{u}_q \]  

(4.3.1)

where:

- \( q \) indicates the ground motion component
- \( k \) indicates the mode number

All parameters have already been defined.

Any response quantity \( z(t) \) linearly related to the modal coordinates can be expressed as:

\[ z(t) = \sum_k L_k y_k(t) \]  

(4.3.2)

where \( L_k \)'s are constant, and depend on the response of interest.
Let

\[ \tilde{s}_k(t) = -\sum_{q=1}^{3} \gamma_{kq} \tilde{u}_{0q}(t) \]  \hspace{1cm} (4.3.3)\]

The spectral density function of the response, \( S_x(\omega) \) is given by:

\[ S_x(\omega) = \sum_k \sum_l L_k L_l H_k^*(\omega) H_l(\omega) S_{\tilde{s}_k \tilde{s}_l}(\omega) \]  \hspace{1cm} (4.3.4)\]

Let's express \( S_{\tilde{s}_k \tilde{s}_l}(\omega) \).

The cross-correlation function \( R_{\tilde{s}_k \tilde{s}_l}(\tau) \) is given by:

\[
R_{\tilde{s}_k \tilde{s}_l}(\tau) = E[\tilde{s}_k(t)\tilde{s}_l(t+\tau)] \\
= E\left[ \left( \sum_{q=1}^{3} \gamma_{kq} \tilde{u}_{0q}(t) \right) \left( \sum_{q=1}^{3} \gamma_{lq} \tilde{u}_{0q}(t+\tau) \right) \right] \\
= E\left[ \sum_{q=1}^{3} \sum_{r=1}^{3} \gamma_{kq} \gamma_{lr} \tilde{u}_{0q}(t) \tilde{u}_{0r}(t+\tau) \right]
\]

Exchanging the order of summation and expectation, \( R_{\tilde{s}_k \tilde{s}_l}(\tau) \) can be written as:

\[
R_{\tilde{s}_k \tilde{s}_l}(\tau) = \sum_{q=1}^{3} \sum_{r=1}^{3} \gamma_{kq} \gamma_{lr} R_{\tilde{u}_{0q} \tilde{u}_{0r}}(\tau) \]  \hspace{1cm} (4.3.5)\]

Since the ground motion components are assumed uncorrelated, (4.3.5) reduces to:

\[
R_{\tilde{s}_k \tilde{s}_l}(\tau) = \sum_{q=1}^{3} \gamma_{kq} \gamma_{lq} R_{\tilde{u}_{0q}}(\tau) \]  \hspace{1cm} (4.3.6)\]

And by taking Fourier transform, one gets:

\[
S_{\tilde{s}_k \tilde{s}_l}(\omega) = \sum_{q=1}^{3} \gamma_{kq} \gamma_{lq} S_{\tilde{u}_{0q}}(\omega) \]  \hspace{1cm} (4.3.7)\]

Therefore, (4.3.4) may be rewritten as:

\[
S_x(\omega) = \sum_k \sum_l L_k L_l H_k^*(\omega) H_l(\omega) \sum_{q=1}^{3} \gamma_{kq} \gamma_{lq} S_{\tilde{u}_{0q}}(\omega)
\]
\[ S_x(\omega) = \sum_{q=1}^{3} \sum_{k} \sum_{l} L_k L_l H_k^*(\omega) H_l(\omega) \gamma_{kq} \gamma_{lq} S_{\ddot{u}_q}(\omega) \quad (4.3.8) \]

From (4.3.8), the one-sided spectral density function of the response can be expressed as:

\[ G_x(\omega) = \sum_{q=1}^{3} \sum_{k} \sum_{l} L_k L_l H_k^*(\omega) H_l(\omega) \gamma_{kq} \gamma_{lq} G_{\ddot{u}_q}(\omega) \quad (4.3.9) \]

Let:

\[ E_{kq} = L_k \gamma_{kq} \quad (4.3.10) \]

\[ E_{lq} = L_l \gamma_{lq} \quad (4.3.11) \]

where \( E_{kq} \) and \( E_{lq} \) can be viewed as effective participation factors.

Hence, (4.3.9) becomes:

\[ G_x(\omega) = \sum_{q=1}^{3} \sum_{k} \sum_{l} E_{kq} E_{lq} H_k^*(\omega) H_l(\omega) G_{\ddot{u}_q}(\omega) \quad (4.3.12) \]

The spectral moments of the response are then given by:

\[ \lambda_m = \int_0^\infty \omega^m G_x(\omega) d\omega \quad (4.3.13) \]

\[ \lambda_m = \sum_{q=1}^{3} \sum_{k} \sum_{l} E_{kq} E_{lq} \text{Real} \int_0^\infty \omega^m H_k^*(\omega) H_l(\omega) G_{\ddot{u}_q}(\omega) d\omega \quad (4.3.14) \]

Similarly to the case of a single ground motion component, define \( \lambda_{mq,kl} \) by:

\[ \lambda_{mq,kl} = \text{Real} \int_0^\infty \omega^m H_k^*(\omega) H_l(\omega) G_{\ddot{u}_q}(\omega) d\omega \quad (4.3.15) \]

where \( \lambda_{mq,kl} \) is the \( m^{th} \) cross-spectral moment associated with modes \( k \) and \( l \) for the \( q^{th} \) ground motion component. Hence,

\[ \lambda_m = \sum_{q=1}^{3} \sum_{k} \sum_{l} E_{kq} E_{lq} \lambda_{mq,kl} \quad (4.3.16) \]
The zeroth spectral moments are of interest. For \( m = 0 \), (4.3.16) reads as:

\[
\lambda_0 = \sum_{q=1}^{3} \sum_{k} \sum_{l} E_{kq} E_{lq} \lambda_{0q,kl} \tag{4.3.17}
\]

Define \( \epsilon_{0q,kl} \) by:

\[
\epsilon_{0q,kl} = \frac{\lambda_{0q,kl}}{\sqrt{\lambda_{0q,kk} \lambda_{0q,ll}}} \tag{4.3.18}
\]

\( \epsilon_{0q,kl} \) is the modal response cross-correlation coefficient between modes \( k \) and \( l \) for the \( q^{th} \) ground motion component. Therefore,

\[
\lambda_0 = \sum_{q=1}^{3} \sum_{k} \sum_{l} E_{kq} E_{lq} \epsilon_{0q,kl} \sqrt{\lambda_{0q,kk} \lambda_{0q,ll}} \tag{4.3.19}
\]

By virtue of arguments made in the previous section, (4.3.19) leads to:

\[
Mean(max(z)) = \left( \sum_{q=1}^{3} \sum_{k} \sum_{l} E_{kq} E_{lq} \epsilon_{0q,kl} R_q(\omega_k, \beta_k) R_q(\omega_l, \beta_l) \right)^{1/2} \tag{4.3.20}
\]

where \( R_q(\omega, \beta) \) is the mean response spectrum of the \( q^{th} \) ground motion component given at the site of interest.

Define:

\[
Mean(max(z_{kq})) = E_{kq} R_q(\omega_k, \beta_k) \tag{4.3.21}
\]

\[
Mean(max(z_{lq})) = E_{lq} R_q(\omega_l, \beta_l) \tag{4.3.22}
\]

(4.3.21) and (4.3.22) give the mean values of the maximum response due to modes \( k \) and \( l \) respectively, associated with the \( q^{th} \) ground motion component.

Finally, (4.3.20) may be rewritten as:

\[
Mean(max(z)) = \left( \sum_{q=1}^{3} \sum_{k} \sum_{l} \epsilon_{0q,kl} \ Mean(max(z_{kq})) \ Mean(max(z_{lq})) \right)^{1/2} \tag{4.3.23}
\]
(4.3.20) and (4.3.23) provide a modal combination rule for the case of uniform uncorrelated multicomponent translational ground motion.

At present, let's extend this formulation to the case of non uniform uncorrelated multicomponent translational ground motion. Similarly to the previous section, the goal is to arrive at equations analogous to (4.3.20) and (4.3.23).

A typical modal equation for a linear, three-dimensional lumped mass, multi-degree of freedom, multiply-supported system subjected to spatially varying three-dimensional seismic excitations, reads as follows: (3.2.2.19)

\[ \ddot{y}_k + 2\beta_k \omega_k \dot{y}_k + \omega_k^2 y_k = \sum_{q=1}^{3} \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{kiq} \ddot{u}_{qi} \]  

(4.3.24)

where:

- \( q \) indicates the ground motion component.
- \( i \) indicates the support number
- \( k \) indicates the mode number.

Recall from (3.2.2.20) that:

\[ \gamma_{qi} = -\sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{qi} \]  

(4.3.25)

Any response quantity \( z(t) \) linearly related to the modal coordinates can be found using:

\[ z(t) = \sum_{k} L_k y_k(t) \]  

(4.3.26)

Let \( \ddot{s}_k(t) \) and \( \ddot{s}_{qi}(t) \) be given by:

\[ \ddot{s}_k(t) = \sum_{q=1}^{3} \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{kiq} \ddot{u}_{qi}(t) \]  

(4.3.27)
\[ \tilde{s}_{kq}(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{kqi} \tilde{u}_{qi}(t) \]  

(4.3.28)

or equivalently,

\[ \tilde{s}_{k}(t) = \sum_{q=1}^{3} \tilde{s}_{kq}(t) \]  

(4.3.29)

The spectral density function of the response \( S^p_x(\omega) \), is given by:

\[ S^p_x(\omega) = \sum_{k} \sum_{l} L_k L_l H^*_k(\omega) H_l(\omega) S_{\tilde{s}_k \tilde{s}_l}(\omega) \]  

(4.3.30)

where \( p \) stands for the case of partially correlated seismic excitations.

Let's express \( S_{\tilde{s}_k \tilde{s}_l}(\omega) \). The cross-correlation function \( R_{\tilde{s}_k \tilde{s}_l}(\tau) \) is given by:

\[
R_{\tilde{s}_k \tilde{s}_l}(\tau) = E[\tilde{s}_k(t)\tilde{s}_l(t+\tau)]
\]

\[
= E \left[ \left( \sum_{q=1}^{3} \tilde{s}_{kq}(t) \right) \left( \sum_{q=1}^{3} \tilde{s}_{lq}(t+\tau) \right) \right]
\]

\[
= E \left[ \sum_{q=1}^{3} \sum_{r=1}^{3} \tilde{s}_{kq}(t)\tilde{s}_{lr}(t+\tau) \right]
\]

switching orders between summation and expectation, \( R_{\tilde{s}_k \tilde{s}_l}(\tau) \) may be written as:

\[
R_{\tilde{s}_k \tilde{s}_l}(\tau) = \sum_{q=1}^{3} \sum_{r=1}^{3} E[\tilde{s}_{kq}(t)\tilde{s}_{lr}(t+\tau)]
\]  

(4.3.31)

Assuming uncorrelated ground motion components, (4.3.31) becomes:

\[
R_{\tilde{s}_k \tilde{s}_l}(\tau) = \sum_{q=1}^{3} R_{\tilde{s}_{kq} \tilde{s}_{lq}}(\tau)
\]  

(4.3.32)

Taking Fourier transforms, \( S_{\tilde{s}_k \tilde{s}_l}(\omega) \) can be written as:

\[
S_{\tilde{s}_k \tilde{s}_l}(\omega) = \sum_{q=1}^{3} S_{\tilde{s}_{kq} \tilde{s}_{lq}}(\omega)
\]  

(4.3.33)

Substituting (4.3.33) into (4.3.30), \( S^p_x(\omega) \) can be expressed as:

\[
S^p_x(\omega) = \sum_{k} \sum_{l} L_k L_l H^*_k(\omega) H_l(\omega) \sum_{q=1}^{3} S_{\tilde{s}_{kq} \tilde{s}_{lq}}(\omega)
\]
\[ S_{x}^P(\omega) = \sum_{q=1}^{3} \sum_{k} \sum_{l} L_{k} L_{l} H_{k}^*(\omega) H_{l}(\omega) S_{\xi_{k\xi_{l}}}(\omega) \] (4.3.34)

And the one-sided spectral density function, \( G_{x}^P(\omega) \), will be given by:

\[ G_{x}^P(\omega) = \sum_{q=1}^{3} \sum_{k} \sum_{l} L_{k} L_{l} 2 \text{ Real} \left[ H_{k}^*(\omega) H_{l}(\omega) S_{\xi_{k\xi_{l}}}(\omega) \right] \] (4.3.35)

From (4.3.37), the spectral moments will read as:

\[ \lambda_{m}^{P} = \int_{0}^{\infty} \omega^{m} G_{x}^{P}(\omega) d\omega \] (4.3.36)

or

\[ \lambda_{m}^{P} = \sum_{q=1}^{3} \sum_{k} \sum_{l} L_{k} L_{l} 2 \text{ Real} \int_{0}^{\infty} \omega^{m} H_{k}^*(\omega) H_{l}(\omega) S_{\xi_{k\xi_{l}}}(\omega) d\omega \] (4.3.37)

similarly to the uniform seismic input case, define:

\[ \lambda_{mq,kl}^{P} = 2 \text{ Real} \int_{0}^{\infty} \omega^{m} H_{k}^*(\omega) H_{l}(\omega) S_{\xi_{k\xi_{l}}}(\omega) d\omega \] (4.3.38)

where \( \lambda_{mq,kl}^{P} \) is the \( m^{th} \) cross-spectral moment associated with modes \( k \) and \( l \) for the spatially varying \( q^{th} \) ground motion component.

(4.3.37) can be rewritten as:

\[ \lambda_{m}^{P} = \sum_{q=1}^{3} \sum_{k} \sum_{l} L_{k} L_{l} \lambda_{mq,kl}^{P} \] (4.3.39)

which for zeroth moments can be written as:

\[ \lambda_{0}^{P} = \sum_{q=1}^{3} \sum_{k} \sum_{l} L_{k} L_{l} \lambda_{0q,kl}^{P} \] (4.3.40)

Define:

\[ \epsilon_{0q,kl}^{P} = \frac{\lambda_{0q,kl}^{P}}{\sqrt{\lambda_{0q,kk}^{P} \lambda_{0q,ll}^{P}}} \] (4.3.41)
which is the modal response cross-correlation coefficient between modes $k$ and $l$ relative to the spatially varying $q^{th}$ ground motion component.

Substituting (4.3.41) into (4.3.40),

$$
\lambda_0^p = \sum_{q=1}^{3} \sum_{k} \sum_{l} c^{p}_{0q,kl} L_k L_l \sqrt{\lambda_{0q,kk}^p \lambda_{0q,ll}^p}
$$

(4.3.42)

Let's now make use of the following:

$$
\lambda_0^p = \left[ \frac{\text{Mean}(\max(z))}{p} \right]^2
$$

(4.3.43)

$$
\lambda_{0q,kk}^p = \left[ \frac{\gamma_{kq} R_q^p(\omega_k, \beta_k)}{p_k} \right]^2
$$

(4.3.44)

$$
\lambda_{0q,il}^p = \left[ \frac{\gamma_{lq} R_q^p(\omega_l, \beta_l)}{p_l} \right]^2
$$

(4.3.45)

where:

$p, p_k,$ and $p_l$ are peak factors

$R_q^p(\omega, \beta)$ is the modified response spectrum model for component $q$. (3.2.2.37)

(4.3.42) can be rewritten as:

$$
\text{Mean}(\max(z)) = \left[ \sum_{q=1}^{3} \sum_{k} \sum_{l} c^{p}_{0q,kl} L_k L_l \left| \gamma_{kq} \right| \left| \gamma_{lq} \right| R_q^p(\omega_k, \beta_k) R_q^p(\omega_l, \beta_l) \right]^{1/2}
$$

(4.3.46)

Define:

$$
E_{kq}^p = \left| \gamma_{kq} \right| L_k =
\begin{cases}
E_{kq} & \text{if } \gamma_{kq} > 0 \\
-E_{kq} & \text{if } \gamma_{kq} < 0
\end{cases}
$$

(4.3.47)

$$
E_{lq}^p = \left| \gamma_{lq} \right| L_l =
\begin{cases}
E_{lq} & \text{if } \gamma_{lq} > 0 \\
-E_{lq} & \text{if } \gamma_{lq} < 0
\end{cases}
$$

(4.3.48)
Using (4.3.47) and (4.3.48), (4.3.46) may be rewritten as:

\[
M^p_{\text{can}}(\max(z)) = \left[ \sum_{q=1}^{3} \sum_{k} \sum_{l} \varepsilon_{0q,kl}^p E_{kq}^p R_{q}^p(\omega_k, \beta_k) E_{lq}^p R_{q}^p(\omega_l, \beta_l) \right]^{1/2} \tag{4.3.49}
\]

Define:

\[
M^p_{\text{can}}(\max(z_{kq})) = E_{kq}^p R_{q}^p(\omega_k, \beta_k) \tag{4.3.50}
\]

\[
M^p_{\text{can}}(\max(z_{lq})) = E_{lq}^p R_{q}^p(\omega_l, \beta_l) \tag{4.3.51}
\]

(4.3.50) and (4.3.51) give the mean value of the maximum response of interest due to modes \(k\) and \(l\) respectively, associated with ground motion component \(q\). (4.3.49) can be rewritten as:

\[
M^p_{\text{can}}(\max(z)) = \left[ \sum_{q=1}^{3} \sum_{k} \sum_{l} c_{0q,kl}^p M^p_{\text{can}}(\max(z_{kq})) M^p_{\text{can}}(\max(z_{lq})) \right]^{1/2} \tag{4.3.52}
\]

Notice that (4.3.49) and (4.3.52) are analogous to (4.3.20) and (4.3.23), which was the goal aimed at.

Prior to expressing \(c_{0q,kl}^p\) in terms of \(\varepsilon_{0q,kl}\), which is the last task in this section, let’s mention that (4.3.52) can handle the case of no participation of a given mode under a given component of uniform excitations.

Say

\[
\gamma_{kq} = 0,
\]

then,

\[
M^p_{\text{can}}(\max(z_{kq})) = L_k R_{q}^p(\omega_k, \beta_k) \tag{4.3.53}
\]

where \(R_{q}^p(\omega_k, \beta_k)\) is given by (3.2.2.47).
Let’s now express $\epsilon_{0q,kl}^p$ in terms of $\epsilon_{0q,kl}$. At first, let’s express $\lambda_{0q,kl}^p$ in terms of $\lambda_{0q,kl}$.

$$\lambda_{0q,kl}^p = 2 \text{ Real } \int_0^\infty H_k^*(\omega) H_i(\omega) S_{\tilde{s}_k \tilde{s}_l}(\omega) \quad (4.3.54)$$

Let’s write $S_{\tilde{s}_k \tilde{s}_l}(\omega)$ out:

The cross-correlation function $R_{\tilde{s}_k \tilde{s}_l}(\tau)$ is given by:

$$R_{\tilde{s}_k \tilde{s}_l}(\tau) = E[\tilde{s}_k(t) \tilde{s}_l(t + \tau)]$$

$$= E \left[ \sum_{i=1}^n A_{kqi} \tilde{u}_{qi}(t) \left( \sum_{j=1}^n A_{lqj} \tilde{u}_{qj}(t + \tau) \right) \right]$$

$$= E \left[ \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n A_{kqi} A_{lqj} \tilde{u}_{qi}(t) \tilde{u}_{qj}(t + \tau) \right]$$

which leads to:

$$R_{\tilde{s}_k \tilde{s}_l}(\tau) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n A_{kqi} A_{lqj} R_{\tilde{u}_i \tilde{u}_j}(\tau) \quad (4.3.55)$$

Taking Fourier transforms in (4.3.55),

$$S_{\tilde{s}_k \tilde{s}_l}(\omega) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n A_{kqi} A_{lqj} S_{\tilde{u}_i \tilde{u}_j}(\omega) \quad (4.3.56)$$

Hence,

$$\lambda_{0q,kl}^p = 2 \text{ Real } \int_0^\infty H_k^*(\omega) H_i(\omega) \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n A_{kqi} A_{lqj} S_{\tilde{u}_i \tilde{u}_j}(\omega) d\omega$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n A_{kqi} A_{lqj} 2 \text{ Real } \int_0^\infty H_k^*(\omega) H_i(\omega) S_{\tilde{u}_i \tilde{u}_j}(\omega) d\omega$$

$$\lambda_{0q,kl}^p = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n A_{kqi} A_{lqj} \int_0^\infty H_k^*(\omega) H_i(\omega) S_{\tilde{u}_i \tilde{u}_j}(\omega) d\omega \quad (4.3.57)$$

Analogously to the case of a single ground motion component, define:

$$r_{qijk} = \frac{\int_0^\infty H_k^*(\omega) H_i(\omega) S_{\tilde{u}_i \tilde{u}_j}(\omega) d\omega}{\int_0^\infty H_k^*(\omega) H_i(\omega) S_{\tilde{u}_0 \tilde{u}_j}(\omega) d\omega} \quad (4.3.58)$$

116
\[ r_{qijkl} = \frac{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} H_k^*(\omega) H_i(\omega) S_{\bar{u}_q \bar{u}_j} (\omega) d\omega}{\lambda_{0q,kl}} \]  

(4.3.59)

where \( r_{qij} \) is such that:

\[ S_{\bar{u}_q \bar{u}_j} (\omega) = r_{qij} S_{\bar{u}_0} (\omega) \]  

(4.3.60)

It is the coherency function between stations \( i \) and \( j \) along the \( q^{th} \) component of ground motion.

Hence,

\[ \lambda_{0q,kl}^p = \lambda_{0q,kl} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{lj} r_{qij} r_{qjk} \]  

(4.3.61)

Consequently,

\[ \lambda_{0q,kk}^p = \lambda_{0q,kk} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{kj} r_{qijk} \]  

(4.3.62)

\[ \lambda_{0q,ll}^p = \lambda_{0q,ll} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{lj} r_{qijl} \]  

(4.4.63)

Note that:

\[ r_{qijkk} = \frac{\int_{0}^{\infty} \rho_{qij} | H_k(\omega) |^2 G_{\bar{u}_0 \bar{u}_k}(\omega) d\omega}{\int_{0}^{\infty} | H_k(\omega) |^2 G_{\bar{u}_0 \bar{u}_k}(\omega) d\omega} \]  

(4.3.64)

\[ r_{qijll} = \frac{\int_{0}^{\infty} \rho_{qij} | H_l(\omega) |^2 G_{\bar{u}_0 \bar{u}_l}(\omega) d\omega}{\int_{0}^{\infty} | H_l(\omega) |^2 G_{\bar{u}_0 \bar{u}_l}(\omega) d\omega} \]  

(4.4.65)

Comparing (4.3.62) and (4.3.63) with (3.2.2.35), one remarks that:

\[ r_{qijkk} = \rho_{qijkk} \]  

(4.3.66)

\[ r_{qijll} = \rho_{qijl} \]  

(4.3.67)

where \( \rho_{qij} \) is the real part of \( r_{qij} \).
Therefore, $\varepsilon_{0q,kl}^p$ can be written as:

$$
\varepsilon_{0q,kl}^p = \frac{\lambda_{0q,kl}}{\sqrt{\lambda_{0q,kk} \lambda_{0q,ll}}} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} A_{kq'i} A_{lq'j} r_{qijl}}{\left\{ (\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} A_{kq'i} A_{kq'^j} \rho_{qijk}) (\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} A_{lq'i} A_{lq'^j} \rho_{qijl}) \right\}^{1/2}}
$$

(4.3.68)

since

$$
\varepsilon_{0q,kl} = \frac{\lambda_{0q,kl}}{\sqrt{\lambda_{0q,kk} \lambda_{0q,ll}}}
$$

(4.3.18)

$\varepsilon_{0q,kl}^p$ can be expressed as:

$$
\varepsilon_{0q,kl}^p = \varepsilon_{0q,kl} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} A_{kq'i} A_{lq'j} r_{qijl}}{\left\{ (\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} A_{kq'i} A_{kq'^j} \rho_{qijk}) (\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} A_{lq'i} A_{lq'^j} \rho_{qijl}) \right\}^{1/2}}
$$

(4.3.69)

Finally, a modal combination rule has been proposed for the case of uncorrelated non uniform multicomponent translational seismic excitations (4.3.49) and (4.3.52). In this combination rule, the modal cross-correlation coefficients have been expressed in terms of the homologous coefficients for the case of uniform seismic input (4.3.69).
Chapter 5

Validation of the Theoretical Response Spectrum Model
Through Digital Simulation of Seismic Ground Motion

5.1 Introduction

The modified response spectrum model developed in Chapter 3 is a means for the computation of modal responses for the case of structures subjected to imperfectly correlated seismic excitations. This model is the result of a theoretical development based upon the probabilistic modeling of earthquake ground motions by means of a homogeneous Gaussian space-time random field. The purpose of the present chapter is to validate the model through digital simulation of seismic ground motion. In other words, a sample of a random field will be simulated, and the response spectrum, corresponding to a given effective seismic loading expressed as a combination of support motions (temporal processes), will be computed and compared with the prediction given by the modified response spectrum model. In the context of the present thesis, a modified response spectrum model has been derived to handle general situations. However, for the purposes of this chapter, two cases will be examined; namely those of structures having two and three support points, and subjected to a single ground motion component.
5.2 Simulation of Unidimensional Homogeneous Gaussian Space-Time Random Fields Using Spectral Representation

The Spectral Representation Method proposed by Shinozuka et al. [41] is used for the simulation of an unidimensional homogeneous Gaussian space-time random field which is viewed as a collection of temporal random processes at each of the spatial locations. This section aims at presenting, very concisely, the essence of the aforementioned method.

As its name indicates, the first step in this approach is the specification of a target cross-spectral density matrix:

\[
[S(\omega)] = \begin{bmatrix}
S_{11}(\omega) & S_{12}(\omega) & \cdots & S_{1n}(\omega) \\
S_{21}(\omega) & S_{22}(\omega) & \cdots & S_{2n}(\omega) \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
S_{n1}(\omega) & S_{n2}(\omega) & \cdots & S_{nn}(\omega)
\end{bmatrix}
\]  

(5.2.1)

where:

- \( n \) is the number of spatial locations (support points).
- \( S_{ij}(\omega) \) is the cross-spectral density function between locations \( i \) and \( j \).

Note that due to the assumption of homogeneity, the target cross-spectral density matrix \([S(\omega)]\) is Hermitian.

The following step in the method is to find a matrix \([H(\omega)]\) such that:
\[ \begin{bmatrix} S(\omega) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} H(\omega) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} H^*(\omega) \end{bmatrix}^T \]  

(5.2.2)

where:

* indicates complex conjugate

\( \tau \) indicates transpose

To find \([H(\omega)]\) in an efficient way, we assume it to be a lower triangular matrix. In other words, a Choleski decomposition of the matrix \([S(\omega)]\) is sought after.

It turns out that the elements of the matrix \([H(\omega)]\) are given by:

\[ H_{kk}(\omega) = \left[ \frac{D_k(\omega)}{D_{k-1}(\omega)} \right]^{1/2} \]  

(5.2.3)

where:

\( k = 1, 2, ..., n \)

\( D_k(\omega) \) is the \( k^{th} \) principal minor of \([S(\omega)]\) with \( D_0(\omega) \) being defined as unity.

and

\[ H_{jk}(\omega) = H_{kk}(\omega) \frac{\begin{bmatrix} S(\omega) \end{bmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1, 2, ..., k - 1, j \end{pmatrix}}{D_k(\omega)} \]  

(5.2.4)

where:

\( k = 1, 2, ..., n \)
\[ j = k + 1, \ldots, n \]

\[
[S(\omega)] \begin{pmatrix}
1, 2, \ldots, k - 1, j \\
1, 2, \ldots, k - 1, k
\end{pmatrix}
\]

is the determinant of a submatrix of \([S(\omega)]\) obtained by deleting all elements except the \((1, 2, \ldots, k - 1, j)\) th rows and \((1, 2, \ldots, k - 1, k)\) th columns.

It is worth noting that the above decomposition is valid only when the matrix \([S(\omega)]\) is Hermitian and positive definite. Since the cross-spectral density matrix \([S(\omega)]\) is known to be only non-negative definite, special consideration is needed in those cases where \([S(\omega)]\) has a zero principal minor \([41]\).

Once the matrix \([H(\omega)]\) is determined, the last step in the method is to simulate the field \(u_j(t) \ (j = 1, 2, \ldots, n)\) by the following series:

\[
u_j(t) = 2 \sum_{m=1}^{j} \sum_{l=1}^{N} |H_{jm}(\omega_l)| \sqrt{\Delta \omega} \cos(\omega_l t + \theta_{jm}(\omega_l) + \phi_{ml})
\]

(5.2.5)

where:

\(\Delta \omega\) is the frequency increment.

\(\omega_l = l \Delta \omega\)

\(N\) is such that \(N \Delta \omega\) is an upper cut-off frequency.

\(\theta_{jm}(\omega_l)\) is a phase spectrum given by:

\[
\theta_{jm}(\omega_l) = \tan^{-1} \left[ \frac{ImH_{jm}(\omega_l)}{ReH_{jm}(\omega_l)} \right]
\]

(5.2.6)

\(\phi_{ml}\) are independent random phase angles uniformly distributed over the range
$(0, 2\pi)$.

It is worth mentioning that the digital generation of sample functions (5.2.5) can be efficiently performed by means of the FFT technique.

Finally, it is to be noted that the simulated processes are asymptotically Gaussian as $N$ becomes large by virtue of the central limit theorem. Also, it may be shown that in terms of ensemble averages:

$$E[u_j(t)] = 0$$

$$E[u_j(t)u_k(t + \tau)] = R_{jk}(\tau)$$

is the Wiener-Khintchine transform of $S_{jk}(\omega)$.

So long as the assumption of independent random phase angles uniformly distributed over the range $(0, 2\pi)$ is valid.

### 5.3 Case of Two Support Points

The situation that is of interest in the present section is that of a $N$-story single bay frame structure behaving as a shear beam, subjected to a single horizontal component of partially correlated ground motions. For the sake of simplicity of illustration, column stiffnesses will be assumed equal (fig. 3.1). As was arrived at in section 3.2.3.1, the modified response spectrum model is expressed as follows:

$$R^f(\omega_k, \beta_k) = R(\omega_k, \beta_k) \left[\frac{1 + \rho_{12k}}{2}\right]^{1/2} \quad (3.2.3.1.7)$$

where:

$R(\omega, \beta)$ is the response spectrum at the site of interest.
\[
\rho_{12k} = \frac{\int_0^\infty \rho_{12} | H_k(\omega) |^2 G_{u_0}(\omega) d\omega}{\int_0^\infty | H_k(\omega) |^2 G_{\bar{u}_0}(\omega) d\omega}
\]

\(\rho_{12}\) is the frequency-dependent spatial correlation coefficient between stations 1 and 2.

Incidentally, it is worth mentioning that (3.2.3.1.7) expresses the modified response spectrum model for the case of symmetrical modes with respect to midspan in a simply supported bridge (3.3.2.12).

It was also shown that the effective seismic loading, so far as the floor responses are concerned, is \(\tilde{s}(t) = \frac{1}{2}(\tilde{u}_1(t) + \tilde{u}_2(t))\). Therefore, the aim herein is to examine how well the modified response spectrum model given by (3.2.3.1.7) predicts the response spectrum corresponding to \(\tilde{s}(t)\). To do so, \(\tilde{u}_1(t)\) and \(\tilde{u}_2(t)\) will be simulated as part of an unidimensional homogeneous Gaussian random field, using spectral representation.

The target cross-spectral density matrix is given by:

\[
[S(\omega)] = \begin{bmatrix}
S_{11}(\omega) & S_{12}(\omega) \\
S_{21}(\omega) & S_{22}(\omega)
\end{bmatrix}
\tag{5.3.1}
\]

where the assumption of a common auto spectrum to all spatial locations is maintained in order to render the validation process meaningful. Hence,

\[
S_{11}(\omega) = S_{22}(\omega) - S(\omega)
\tag{5.3.2}
\]

Also,

\[
S_{12}(\omega) = S_{21}(\omega) = r_{12}(\omega, D_{12}) S(\omega)
\tag{5.3.3}
\]
where $r_{12}$ is the coherency function.

By virtue of (5.2.3) and (5.2.4), the elements of the matrix $[H(\omega)]$ are given by:

$$H_{11}(\omega) = \sqrt{S(\omega)}$$  \hspace{1cm} (5.3.4)

$$H_{21}(\omega) = \sqrt{S(\omega)} r_{21}$$  \hspace{1cm} (5.3.5)

$$H_{22}(\omega) = \sqrt{S(\omega)} \sqrt{1 - |r_{21}|^2}$$  \hspace{1cm} (5.3.6)

And (5.2.5) shows that $\bar{u}_1(t)$ and $\bar{u}_2(t)$ can be simulated by the following series:

$$\bar{u}_1(t) = 2 \sum_{j=1}^{N} |H_{11}(\omega_j)| \sqrt{\Delta \omega} \cos(\omega_j t + \phi_{1j})$$  \hspace{1cm} (5.3.7)

$$\bar{u}_2(t) = 2 \sum_{j=1}^{N} |H_{21}(\omega_j)| \sqrt{\Delta \omega} \cos(\omega_j t + \theta_{21}(\omega_j) + \phi_{1j})$$

$$+ |H_{22}(\omega_j)| \sqrt{\Delta \omega} \cos(\omega_j t + \phi_{2j})$$  \hspace{1cm} (5.3.8)

where:

$N \Delta \omega$ is an upper cut-off frequency

$\omega_j = j \Delta \omega$

$$\theta_{21}(\omega) = \tan^{-1} \left[ \frac{Im H_{21}(\omega)}{Re H_{21}(\omega)} \right]$$

$\phi_{ij}$ and $\phi_{2j}$ are independent random phase angles uniformly distributed between 0 and $2\pi$.

A Kanai-Tajimi type of autospectrum has been chosen:
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\[ S(\omega) = S_0 \frac{\omega_g^4 + 4\beta_g^2 \omega_g^2 \omega^2}{(\omega_g^2 - \omega^2)^2 + 4\beta_g^2 \omega_g^2 \omega^2} \]  (5.3.9)

where: \( \omega_g \) and \( \beta_g \) are the ground characteristics chosen to be:

\[ \omega_g = 6\pi(rd/s) \]
\[ \beta_g = 0.5 \]

\( S_0 \) is a constant equal to \( \frac{1}{3600} \) so that the peak acceleration is about 0.5g.

A model for the coherency function proposed by Loh and Yeh [30] has been adopted:

\[ r(\omega, D) = \exp\left(-\alpha \frac{|D|}{2\pi V}\right) \exp\left(i\omega \frac{D}{V}\right) \]  (5.3.10)

\( \alpha \) is a constant equal to 0.125

\( D \) is the distance between the two spatial locations

\( V \) is the phase velocity of the dominant wave (or the apparent wave-propagation velocity between the two spatial locations).

The FFT (Fast Fourier Transform) technique is used for the computation of \( \ddot{u}_1(t) \) and \( \ddot{u}_2(t) \). The Fourier transform at zero frequency is taken to be null so as to yield zero-mean temporal processes. For the cases studied, the number of samplings has been \( 2^{11} = 2048 \), with a time increment of 0.01 sec. These data lead to a time history duration of 20.48 sec. It is to be noted that the dominant frequency chosen in the autospectra, 3hz, is much smaller than the Nyquist frequency, 50 hz in these cases, which rules out aliasing problems. For the sake of making the obtained time histories more realistic, they are windowed, once computed, by means of the following function:
\[ W(t) = \begin{cases} 
\frac{t}{0.1T} & 0 < t < 0.1T \quad \text{(build-up phase)} \\
1 & 0.1T < t < 0.9T \quad \text{(strong phase)} \\
\frac{-t}{0.1T} & 0.9T < t < T \quad \text{(die-out phase)}
\end{cases} \]

where \( T \) is the duration of the time history.

In this section, three case studies are looked at:

1. \( V = 500 \text{m/s} \) and \( D = 200 \text{m} \).

The windowed acceleration time histories at locations 1 and 2 are shown in fig. 5.1 and fig. 5.2. The pseudo-acceleration spectra at locations 1 and 2, the pseudo-velocity spectra at locations 1 and 2, and the relative displacement spectra at locations 1 and 2 are shown in fig. 5.3, fig. 5.4, and fig. 5.5 respectively. It can be observed that spectra at both locations are close, which is in agreement with the assumption of spatially homogeneous spectra made prior to developing the model. Exact spectra for \( \tilde{s}(t) = \frac{1}{2}(\tilde{u}_1(t) + \tilde{u}_2(t)) \) are computed and compared against the model predictions given by (3.2.3.1.7). Satisfactory model predictions for the three spectra are shown in fig. 5.6, fig. 5.7, and fig. 5.8. Incidentally, a damping ratio equal to 1\% has been used for all spectra. In fig. 5.9, fig. 5.10, and fig. 5.11, an assessment of the effect of assuming full coherence is aimed at. In other words, the same exact spectra as those in fig. 5.6, fig. 5.7, and fig. 5.8 are compared against model predictions which disregard loss of coherence and account for wave travelling effects exclusively. Alternatively, in fig. 5.6, fig. 5.7, and fig. 5.8, \( \rho_{12} \), the frequency dependent spatial correlation coefficient has
been taken as:

\[ \rho_{12}(\omega, D) = \exp\left(-\alpha \frac{\omega |D|}{2\pi V}\right) \cos \omega \frac{D}{V} \]  \hspace{1cm} (5.3.11)

which rightly accounts for both loss of coherence effects (exponentially decaying function), and wave travelling effects. Whereas in fig. 5.9, fig. 5.10, and fig. 5.11, \( \rho_{12} \) has been taken as:

\[ \rho_{12} = \cos \omega \frac{D}{V} \]  \hspace{1cm} (5.3.12)

which, wrongly but purposely accounts for wave travelling effects only.

Upon observation of these figures, one can see that, for the case at hand, the impact of neglecting loss of coherence effects is practically null, except for those frequencies where \( \frac{\omega D}{V} \) is an odd multiple of \( \pi \), \( (\cos \frac{\omega D}{V} = -1) \), and where the model results slightly underpredict the exact ones. The justification of this observation is that at those very frequencies, the model is applied to a situation where the components of \( \tilde{u}_1(t) \) and \( \tilde{u}_2(t) \) are fully coherent but 180 degrees out of phase, and hence, cancellation effects are important. However, it is worth noting that if a stronger decay were considered in the coherency function, the above conclusions could be changed.
Figure 5.1 Windowed Acceleration Time History at Location 1

Figure 5.2 Windowed Acceleration Time History at Location 2
Figure 5.3 Acceleration Spectra at Locations 1 and 2

Figure 5.4 Velocity Spectra at Locations 1 and 2
Figure 5.5 Displacement Spectra at Locations 1 and 2

Figure 5.6 Acceleration Spectra: Exact vs Model Prediction
Figure 5.7 Velocity Spectra: Exact vs Model Prediction

Figure 5.8 Displacement Spectra: Exact vs Model Prediction
Figure 5.9 Effect of Full Coherence on Acceleration Spectra

Figure 5.10 Effect of Full Coherence on Velocity Spectra
Figure 5.11 Effect of Full Coherence on Displacement Spectra
2. \[ V = 500\text{m/s} \text{ and } D = 500\text{m} \]

Apart from the fact that the separating distance has been increased to \( D = 500\text{m} \) in this case study, the results observed are very similar to those of the previous one. The figures are in a sequence analogous to that of case study 1.
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*Figure 5.12 Windowed Acceleration Time History at Location 1*
Figure 5.13 Windowed Acceleration Time History at Location 2

Figure 5.14 Acceleration Spectra at Locations 1 and 2
Figure 5.15 Velocity Spectra at Locations 1 and 2

Figure 5.16 Displacement Spectra at Locations 1 and 2
Figure 5.17 Acceleration Spectra: Exact vs Model Prediction

Figure 5.18 Velocity Spectra: Exact vs Model Prediction
Figure 5.19 Displacement Spectra: Exact vs Model Prediction

Figure 5.20 Effect of Full Coherence on Acceleration Spectra
Figure 5.21 Effect of Full Coherence on Velocity Spectra

Figure 5.22 Effect of Full Coherence on Displacement Spectra
3. The third case that has been examined is one where the support motions at both supports are uncorrelated. In other words, the target cross-spectral density matrix has been set to be:

\[
[S(\omega)] = \begin{bmatrix}
S(\omega) & 0 \\
0 & S(\omega)
\end{bmatrix}
\]  

Hence,

\[
H_{11} = \sqrt{S(\omega)}
\]  

(5.3.13)

\[
H_{21} = 0
\]  

(5.3.14)

\[
H_{22} = \sqrt{S(\omega)}
\]  

(5.3.15)

By virtue of the fact that \(\rho_{12} = 0\), (3.2.3.1.7) reads as follows:

\[
R^p(\omega, \beta) = R(\omega, \beta) \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}
\]  

(5.3.16)

The windowed acceleration time histories at locations 1 and 2 are displayed in fig. 5.23 and fig. 5.24. The pseudo-acceleration, pseudo-velocity, and relative-displacement spectra at locations 1 and 2 are shown in fig. 5.25, fig. 5.26, and fig. 5.27, respectively. And finally, the model predictions are proved to be satisfactory by comparison to the exact spectra, as it is shown in fig. 5.28, fig. 5.29, and fig. 5.30.
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Figure 5.23 Windowed Acceleration Time History at Location 1

Figure 5.24 Windowed Acceleration Time History at Location 2
Figure 5.25 Acceleration Spectra at Locations 1 and 2

Figure 5.26 Velocity Spectra at Locations 1 and 2
Figure 5.27 Displacement Spectra at Locations 1 and 2

Figure 5.28 Acceleration Spectra: Exact vs Model Prediction
Figure 5.29 Velocity Spectra: Exact vs Model Prediction

Figure 5.30 Displacement Spectra: Exact vs Model Prediction
5.4 Case of Three Support Points

The situation under examination in the present section is that of a \( N \)-story double bay (three support points) frame structure behaving as a shear beam subjected to a single horizontal component of partially correlated ground motions. Similarly to the previous section, column stiffnesses will be assumed equal for the sake of illustration. As was arrived at in section (3.2.3.2), the modified response spectrum model is expressed as follows:

\[
R^p(\omega_k, \beta_k) = R(\omega_k, \beta_k) \left[ \frac{1}{n} \left( 1 + \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} \rho_{ij} \right) \right]^{1/2}
\]  (3.2.3.2.5)

which yields, after setting \( n \) to 3:

\[
R^p(\omega_k, \beta_k) = R(\omega_k, \beta_k) \left[ \frac{1}{3} + \frac{2}{9} (\rho_{12k} + \rho_{23k} + \rho_{13k}) \right]^{1/2}
\]  (5.4.1)

where:

\[
\rho_{ij} = \frac{\int_0^\infty \rho_{ij} |H_k(\omega)|^2 G_{\tilde{u}_ \omega} d\omega}{\int_0^\infty |H_k(\omega)|^2 G_{\tilde{u}_ \omega} d\omega}
\]

The effective seismic loading, so far as the floor responses are concerned, is \( \tilde{s}(t) = \frac{1}{3} (\tilde{u}_1(t) + \tilde{u}_2(t) + \tilde{u}_3(t)) \). Therefore, the goal that is aimed at in this section is to examine how well the modified response spectrum model given by (5.4.1) predicts the response spectrum corresponding to \( \tilde{s}(t) \).

Similarly to the previous section, \( \tilde{u}_1(t) \), \( \tilde{u}_2(t) \) and \( \tilde{u}_3(t) \) will be generated as part of an unidimensional homogeneous Gaussian random field, using spectral representation.
The target cross-spectral density matrix is given by:

\[
[S(\omega)] = \begin{bmatrix}
S_{11}(\omega) & S_{12}(\omega) & S_{13}(\omega) \\
S_{21}(\omega) & S_{22}(\omega) & S_{23}(\omega) \\
S_{31}(\omega) & S_{32}(\omega) & S_{33}(\omega)
\end{bmatrix}
\]  
\text{(5.4.2)}

where:

\[
S_{11}(\omega) = S_{22}(\omega) = S_{33}(\omega) - S(\omega)
\]  
\text{(5.4.3)}

\[
S_{ij}(\omega) = S_{ji}^{*}(\omega) = r_{ij}(\omega, D_{ij})S(\omega)
\]  
\text{(5.4.4)}

By virtue of (5.2.3) and (5.2.4), the elements of the matrix \([H(\omega)]\) are given by:

\[
H_{11}(\omega) = \sqrt{S(\omega)}
\]  
\text{(5.4.5)}

\[
H_{21}(\omega) = \sqrt{S(\omega)}r_{21}
\]  
\text{(5.4.6)}

\[
H_{22}(\omega) = \sqrt{S(\omega)}\sqrt{1 - |r_{21}|^2}
\]  
\text{(5.4.7)}

\[
H_{31}(\omega) = \sqrt{S(\omega)}r_{31}
\]  
\text{(5.4.8)}

\[
H_{32}(\omega) = \frac{r_{32} - r_{31}r_{12}}{\sqrt{1 - |r_{12}|^2}} \sqrt{S(\omega)}
\]  
\text{(5.4.9)}
\[ H_{33}(\omega) = \left[ 1 - |r_{13}|^2 - |r_{23}|^2 - 2 |r_{12}||r_{13}| \cos(\theta_{12} + \theta_{23} - \theta_{13}) \right]^{1/2} \sqrt{S(\omega)} \]  

(5.4.10)

where \( r_{ij} \) is the coherency function between stations \( i \) and \( j \). And \( \theta_{ij} \) is the corresponding phase spectrum.

(5.2.5) shows that \( \tilde{u}_1(t) \), \( \tilde{u}_2(t) \), and \( \tilde{u}_3(t) \) can be simulated by the following series:

\[ \tilde{u}_1(t) = 2 \sum_{j=1}^{N} |H_{11}(\omega_j)| \sqrt{\Delta \omega} \cos(\omega_j t + \phi_{1j}) \]  

(5.4.11)

\[ \tilde{u}_2(t) = 2 \sum_{j=1}^{N} |H_{21}(\omega_j)| \sqrt{\Delta \omega} \cos(\omega_j t + \theta_{21}(\omega_j) + \phi_{1j}) \]

\[ + |H_{22}(\omega_j)| \sqrt{\Delta \omega} \cos(\omega_j t + \phi_{2j}) \]  

(5.4.12)

\[ \tilde{u}_3(t) = 2 \sum_{j=1}^{N} |H_{31}(\omega_j)| \sqrt{\Delta \omega} \cos(\omega_j t + \theta_{31}(\omega_j) + \phi_{1j}) \]

\[ + |H_{32}(\omega_j)| \sqrt{\Delta \omega} \cos(\omega_j t + \theta_{32}(\omega_j) + \phi_{2j}) \]

\[ + |H_{33}(\omega_j)| \sqrt{\Delta \omega} \cos(\omega_j t + \phi_{3j}) \]  

(5.4.13)

where \( N, \omega_j \) and \( \theta_{ij} \) have already been defined. \( \phi_{1j}, \phi_{2j}, \) and \( \phi_{3j} \) are independent random phase angles uniformly distributed between 0 and 2\( \pi \).

The same autospectrum and coherency function models have been taken in this section as in the previous one. The FFT technique has been used for the generation of time histories using the same characteristics (sampling rate, etc.) as earlier. And
the same windowing process has been applied. Response spectra have been computed accounting for a damping ratio of 1%.

The case studied in this section is as follows:

\[ V = 500 \text{m/s} \]

\[ D_{12} = 200 \text{m}, D_{23} = 300 \text{m}, D_{13} = 500 \text{m}. \]

Windowed acceleration time histories at locations 1, 2, and 3 are displayed in fig. 5.31, fig. 5.32, and fig. 5.33. The spatial homogeneity of the spectra is verified in fig. 5.34, fig. 5.35, and fig. 5.36. Finally, exact spectra for \( \tilde{s}(t) = \frac{1}{3}(\tilde{u}_1(t) + \tilde{u}_2(t) + \tilde{u}_3(t)) \) are computed and compared against the model predictions given by (5.4.1) which prove to be satisfactory as can be seen from fig. 5.37, fig. 5.38, and fig. 5.39.
Figure 5.31 Windowed Acceleration Time History at Location 1

Figure 5.32 Windowed Acceleration Time History at Location 2
Figure 5.33 Windowed Acceleration Time History at Location 3

Figure 5.34 Acceleration Spectra at Locations 1, 2 and 3
Figure 5.35 Velocity Spectra at Locations 1, 2 and 3

Figure 5.36 Displacement Spectra at Locations 1, 2 and 3
Figure 5.37 Acceleration Spectra: Exact vs Model Prediction

Figure 5.38 Velocity Spectra: Exact vs Model Prediction
Figure 5.39 Displacement Spectra: Exact vs Model Prediction
Chapter 6

Practical Considerations on the Theoretical Response Spectrum Model

6.1 Introduction

The modified response spectrum model developed in Chapter 3 is a means for the computation of modal responses for the case of structures subjected to imperfectly correlated seismic excitations. This model is the result of a theoretical development, and takes the form of an involved mathematical expression which may not be appealing in practical situations. Therefore, in order to succeed in including the problem of spatially varying seismic excitations into seismic design practice by way of the present model, it behooves to seek reasonable simplifications which would render this model more appealing. Another aim of the present chapter is to demonstrate the applicability of the derived model to the evaluation of Torsional Response Spectra from Translational Response Spectra.

6.2 Simplification of the Derived Model Expression

The modified response spectrum model for the case of discrete systems subjected to one component of non-uniform horizontal ground motion reads as follows (3.2.1.61):

\[ R^p(\omega_k, \beta_k) = R(\omega_k, \beta_k) \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{ki}^2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} A_{ki} A_{kj} \rho_{ijkl} \right]^{1/2} \frac{1}{\gamma_k} \]
where

$$\rho_{ijk} = \frac{\int_0^\infty \rho_{ij} | H_k(\omega) |^2 G_{uv}(\omega) d\omega}{\int_0^\infty | H_k(\omega) |^2 G_{uv}(\omega) d\omega}$$

All parameters have already been defined in earlier sections. It suffices to examine the case referred to above since it constitutes the basis for the more elaborate models involving multiple components of ground motion. Two issues are worthy of consideration. On one hand, it would be advantageous to avoid the calculation of the $A_k$'s, which are structure dependent. On the other hand, it would be attractive to provide an easier expression for $\rho_{ijk}$.

Regarding the first issue, an ideal situation corresponds to the case of a multibay shear building with equal column stiffness. For this case equations (3.2.3.2.5) reads as follows:

$$R^p(\omega_k, \beta_k) = R(\omega_k, \beta_k) \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \left[ 1 + \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} \rho_{ijk} \right] \right\}^{1/2}$$

The assumption of equal column stiffness greatly facilitates the expression of the model, and renders it structure independent. In design practice, it is common to assume that all inner columns are equal and have twice the stiffness of the outer columns. Such an assumption leads to the following model expression:

$$R^p(\omega_k, \beta_k) = R(\omega_k, \beta_k) \left[ \frac{2n-3}{2(n-1)^2} + \frac{1}{(n-1)^2} \left( \frac{1}{2} \rho_{1nk} + \sum_{i=2}^{n-1} \rho_{ink} ight) \right. \\
+ \left. \sum_{j=2}^{n-1} \rho_{1jk} + 2 \sum_{i=2}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n-1} \rho_{ijk} \right]^{1/2}$$

(6.2.1)
when the two expressions given above are evaluated numerically, it is found that they yield almost the same result for $R^p(\omega_k, \beta_k)$. Thus, the modified spectrum is not sensitive to the actual distribution of column stiffness. This is true even for the case of a single bay shear building with unequal columns.

Regarding the second issue, it is possible to derive an attractive approximation to $\rho_{ijk}$ if a White Noise type of autospectrum is assumed. Indeed, if that assumption is made, $\rho_{ijk}$ can be rewritten as:

$$
\rho_{ijk} = \frac{4\beta_k \omega_k^3}{\pi} \int_0^\infty \rho_{ij} |H_k(\omega)|^2 \, d\omega \quad (6.2.2)
$$

where the following result has been made use of:

$$
\int_0^\infty |H_k(\omega)|^2 \, d\omega = \frac{\pi}{4\beta_k \omega_k^3} \quad (6.2.3)
$$

Furthermore, the frequency-dependent spatial correlation coefficient between stations $i$ and $j$ can be assumed to be of the form [30]:

$$
\rho_{ij}(\omega) = e^{-a\omega \tau} \cos \omega \tau \quad (6.2.4)
$$

where:

$$
a = \frac{1}{16\pi}
$$

and

$\tau$ is the travel time between stations $i$ and $j$

With these assumptions, it can be shown (see appendix I) that for lightly damped systems, a satisfactory approximation to equation (6.2.2) is:

$$
\rho_{ijk} \approx \frac{4\beta_k}{\pi} [A(\omega_k, \beta_k, \tau) + B(\omega_k, \tau)] \quad (6.2.5)
$$
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where,

\[ A(\omega_k, \beta_k, \tau) = e^{-\omega_k \tau} \left( \frac{\sin \omega_k \tau - a \cos \omega_k \tau}{\omega_k \tau} + \left( \frac{\pi}{4\beta_k} - 1 \right) \cos \omega_k \tau \right) \]  \hspace{1cm} (6.2.6)

\[ B(\omega_k, \tau) = \frac{a}{\omega_k \tau} \]  \hspace{1cm} (6.2.7)

For the case of two supports, the correction factor \[ \left[ \frac{1 + \rho_{12k}}{2} \right]^{1/2} \], which adjusts the "classical" response spectrum to the situation of spatially varying ground motion is plotted in fig. 6.1 versus the dimensionless parameter \[ \frac{\tau}{T_k} \], where \( T_k \) is the period corresponding to mode \( k \).
Figure 6.1 Plot of the Response Spectrum Correction Factor
6.3 Application of the Modified Response Spectrum Model to the Evaluation of Torsional Response Spectra

The present section aims at expressing Torsional Response Spectra in terms of Translational Response Spectra by way of a correction factor which accounts for the spatial character of the translational seismic input.

Consider the case of a single bay structure subjected to non-uniform horizontal transverse support motions. Since the two support motions are not equal, this will create a torsional effect on the structure. The purpose of this section is to express the Torsional Response Spectrum as a function of the Translational Response Spectrum.

Suppose that $u_1$ and $u_2$ are the two horizontal transverse support motions. Then, the torsional effect can be characterized by $\phi$ given by:

$$\phi = \frac{u_2 - u_1}{D} \quad (6.3.1)$$

where $D$ is the distance between the two supports.

From previous developments it can be shown that the response spectrum corresponding to $\phi$ can be written in terms of the response spectrum corresponding to $u_1$ and $u_2$ as follows:

$$R_\phi(\omega_k, \beta_k) = R_u(\omega_k, \beta_k) \frac{2}{D} \left[ \frac{1 - \rho_{12k}}{2} \right]^{1/2} \quad (6.3.2)$$

where:

$$\rho_{12k} = \frac{\int_0^\infty \rho_{12} |H_k(\omega)|^2 G_{\bar{u}_0}(\omega) d\omega}{\int_0^\infty |H_k(\omega)|^2 G_{\bar{u}_0}(\omega) d\omega} \quad (6.3.3)$$

$G_{\bar{u}_0}(\omega)$ is the translational autospectrum, common to both locations.
All other parameters have already been defined.

The approximation derived for $\rho_{ijk}$ in the previous section holds true for $\rho_{12k}$. Thus, the correction factor $\frac{2}{D} \left[ \frac{1 - \rho_{12k}}{2} \right]^{1/2}$ can readily be evaluated.

Figure 6.2 Torsional Response Spectrum Correction Factor
Chapter 7

Conclusions and Suggestions

7.1 Conclusions

The spatial variability of seismic ground motion is an important aspect, which should be taken into account at least approximately, for the earthquake resistant design of extended facilities. This situation has motivated the present work, whose main objective is to provide a practical means for the design of elongated structures accounting for partially correlated seismic excitations.

A procedure for the modification of the design response spectrum is proposed in this report, which enables addressing the problem of multiply-supported structures subjected to imperfectly correlated seismic excitations. The technique is an extension to the response spectrum method which is a commonly used tool in earthquake resistant design, thereby allowing the inclusion of this potentially important problem into seismic design practice. A modified response spectrum model is developed for the design of extended facilities subjected to single and multicomponent ground motion, and a modal combination rule is proposed for each case. The modification procedure is based on adjusting each spectral value of the given design response spectrum by means of a correction factor which depends on the structural properties and on the characteristics of the wave propagation phenomenon. The theoretical model is validated through digital simulation of seismic ground motion, whereby model predic-
tions are found to be in good agreement with exact results. Finally, some practical considerations on the theoretical response spectrum model are addressed. They aim at suggesting reasonable simplifications which render the model more appealing in practical situations.

7.2 Suggestions for Further Research

A modified response spectrum model for the design of extended structures subjected to spatially varying ground motion has been developed in this report. Further research in this area should address the following points.

- Further investigation of the effect of incoherent seismic motions on the response of structures, while the importance of wave travelling effects was recognized about two decades ago.

- Investigation of efficient ways of combining the static part and the dynamic part of the response.

- Inclusion of soil-structure interaction effects.
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Appendix I: Approximate Evaluation of $\rho_{ijk}$

$$
\rho_{ijk} = \frac{4\beta_k \omega_k^3}{\pi} \int_0^\infty \rho_{ij} |H_k(\omega)|^2 \, d\omega \\
= \frac{4\beta_k \omega_k^3}{\pi} [I_1 + I_2]
$$

where:

$$I_1 = \int_0^{\omega_k} \rho_{ij} |H_k(\omega)|^2 \, d\omega$$

and

$$I_2 = \int_{\omega_k}^{\infty} \rho_{ij} |H_k(\omega)|^2 \, d\omega$$

$$I_1 = \int_0^{\omega_k} \frac{e^{-a\omega_\tau} \cos \omega_\tau}{(\omega_k^2 - \omega^2)^2 + 4\beta_k^2 \omega_\tau^2 \omega^2} \, d\omega \approx \frac{1}{\omega_k^3} \int_0^{\omega_k} e^{-a\omega_\tau} \cos \omega_\tau \, d\omega$$

$$\approx \frac{1}{\omega_k^3} \left[ \frac{a}{\omega_k \tau} + e^{-a\omega_\tau} \left( \sin \omega_k \tau - a \cos \omega_k \tau \right) \right]$$

$$I_2 = \int_{\omega_k}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-a\omega_\tau} \cos \omega_\tau}{(\omega_k^2 - \omega^2)^2 + 4\beta_k^2 \omega_\tau^2 \omega^2} \, d\omega \approx \frac{1}{\omega_k^3} \frac{\pi}{4\beta_k} (1 - 1) e^{-a\omega_\tau} \cos \omega_k \tau$$

Thus,

$$\rho_{ijk} \approx \frac{4\beta_k}{\pi} [A(\omega_k, \beta_k, \tau) + B(\omega_k, \tau)]$$

where $A(\omega_k, \beta_k, \tau)$ and $B(\omega_k, \tau)$ are given by equations (6.2.6) and (6.2.7) respectively.

The above approximation has been numerically tested, and has been found to yield very satisfactory results.