

Spatial Correlation of Ground Motions in Seismic Hazard Assessment

Taojun Liu tliu82@uwo.ca

Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering University of Western Ontario London, Ontario, Canada



Outline

- Introduction
- Spatial Correlations of Ground-Motion Parameters
 - Estimation of spatial correlations
 - Observed spatial correlations of ground motion parameters
- Simulation of Spatial Correlated Ground Motions
 - Test using stochastic finite-fault program (EXSIM)
 - Potential simulation method
- Summary



Introduction

- What is spatial correlation? The similarity of ground motions at two sites.
- Spatial correlation of ground motion parameters Ground Motion Prediction Equation:

$$\ln A_{ij} = f(M_i, R_{ij}, \theta_{ij}) + \eta_j + \varepsilon_{ij}$$

 η_j and ε_{ij} represent the interevent variability and the intraevent variability, respectively.

• Spatial correlation is important for seismic hazard assessment of spatially distributed structures and/or structures with large foot print, such as highway and pipeline.

Simulation-Based Seismic Risk Analysis Framework





Estimation of Spatial Correlations

• The total correlation coefficient (between $\eta_j(T_1) + \varepsilon_{ij}(T_1)$ and $\eta_j(T_2) + \varepsilon_{kj}(T_2)$):

$$\rho_T(\Delta, T_1, T_2) = \frac{\rho_\eta(T_1, T_2)\sigma_\eta(T_1)\sigma_\eta(T_2) + \rho_\varepsilon(\Delta, T_1, T_2)\sigma_\varepsilon(T_1)\sigma_\varepsilon(T_2)}{\sigma_T(T_1)\sigma_T(T_2)}$$

or
$$\rho_T(\Delta, T_1, T_2) = \frac{\left[\sigma_T(T_1)\right]^2 + \left[\sigma_T(T_2)\right]^2 - \left[\sigma_d(\Delta, T_1, T_2)\right]^2}{2\sigma_T(T_1)\sigma_T(T_2)}$$

where $[\sigma_d(\Delta, T_1, T_2)]^2$: variance of $[\eta_j(T_1) + \varepsilon_{ij}(T_1)] - [\eta_j(T_2) + \varepsilon_{kj}(T_2)]$ (Boore *et al.*, 1997)

Western

Estimation of Spatial Correlations

• The intraevent spatial correlation coefficient (i.e., spatial correlation within a single event) can be expressed as:

$$\rho_{\varepsilon}(\Delta, T_1, T_2) = 1 - \frac{\left[\sigma_d(\Delta, T_1, T_2)\right]^2}{2\sigma_{\varepsilon}(T_1)\sigma_{\varepsilon}(T_2)}$$

• If T_1 and T_2 equal to <u>*T*</u>, we have:

$$\rho_{\varepsilon}(\Delta, T) = 1 - \frac{\left[\sigma_{d}(\Delta, T)\right]^{2}}{2\left[\sigma_{\varepsilon}(T)\right]^{2}}$$

• Empirical relation for $\rho_{\varepsilon}(\Delta, T)$:

$$\rho_{\varepsilon}\left(\Delta,T\right) = \exp\left(-\alpha\Delta^{\beta}\right)$$



Observed Spatial Correlations



Western Simulation of Spatial Correlated Ground Motions

• EXSIM stochastic finite-fault program (Motazedian and Atkinson (2005)), a freely-available and widely-used program that has been validated under a range of conditions.

• Chi-Chi Earthquake

• Ground Motion Prediction Equations (GMPEs):

$$\ln A = c_0 + c_1 \ln R + c_2 R + c_3 \ln \left(\frac{V_{S30}}{V_{ref}}\right) + \varepsilon$$

where *A* is the ground-motion parameter; $R = \sqrt{R_{rup}^2 + h^2}$, where R_{rup} is the closest distance from the recording site to the fault rupture plane and *h* is an "added depth" term that builds in near-source saturations due to finite-fault effects. $V_{ref} = 760$ m/s, c_0 , c_1 , c_2 and c_3 are regression coefficients to be determined, and ε is the intraevent residual.



Model Parameters in EXSIM

Parameter	Parameter value
Fault orientation (strike/dip)	5° /34°
Fault dimensions along strike and dip (km)	110 by 40
Depth of the upper edge of the fault (km)	0
Mainshock moment (dyne·cm)	$2.8 imes 10^{27}$
Subfault dimensions (km)	5 imes 5
Stress parameter $\Delta \sigma$ (bar)	100
Radiation-strength factor	1.0
Number of subsources summed	176
Q(f)	$117 \cdot f^{0.77}$
Geometric spreading	1/R for $R < 50$ km
	$1/R^0$ for 50 km $\le R < 150$ km
	$1/R^{0.5}$ for $R \ge 150$ km
Windowing function	Cosine-tapered boxcar
Kappa (sec)	0.06
Crustal amplification	Boore and Joyner (1997) western North
	America generic rock site
Crustal shear-wave velocity (km/sec)	3.2
Rupture velocity (km/sec)	$0.8 \times$ (shear-wave velocity)
Crustal density (g/cm ³)	2.7

Model bias (log₁₀[Obs./Sim.]) of EXSIM simulations



Averaged model bias at 389 stations. 95% confidence interval of the mean is shown in dashed lines.



Estimated intraevent spatial correlation coefficient $\rho_{\varepsilon}(\Delta, T)$ samples and their fitted curves of SAs for *T* equal to 0.3, 1.0 and 3.0 sec: (a) using the Chi-Chi records; (b) using simulation records (one trial).





Ground motions of Chi-Chi records and simulation (one trial) versus R_{jb} (closest horizontal distance from site to surface projection of the rupture) in units of g for SA at 1.0 sec.

We introduce an additional intraevent variability (i.e., an error term $\varepsilon_{\rm E}(T)$) to the ground-motion parameter from the EXSIM simulations, $\varepsilon_{\rm sim}(T)$, whose standard deviation is $\sigma_{\varepsilon sim}(T)$, such that the new error term from the simulations after this post-processing, $\varepsilon'_{\rm sim}(T)$, is given by,

$$\varepsilon_{\rm sim}'(T) = \varepsilon_{\rm sim}(T) + \varepsilon_{\rm E}(T)$$

where $\varepsilon_{\rm E}(T)$ is a normal variate with zero mean and standard deviation of $\sigma_{\rm E}(T)$ such that the variance of $\varepsilon'_{\rm sim}(T)$, $\sigma^2_{\epsilon}(T)$, equals the variance obtained from the actual records:

$$\sigma_{\varepsilon}^{2}(T) = \sigma_{\varepsilon sim}^{2}(T) + \sigma_{E}^{2}(T)$$



After post-processing:







Comparison of the intraevent spatial correlation coefficient of the Chi-Chi records, EXSIM simulation and modified simulation with added variability for SA at 0.3 and 3.0 sec (only fitted curves are shown)



Potential Simulation Method for Spatially Correlated Ground Motions

• Coherency,

$$\left|\overline{\gamma}_{jk}\left(\omega\right)\right| = \frac{\left|\overline{S}_{jk}\left(\omega\right)\right|}{\sqrt{\overline{S}_{jj}\left(\omega\right)\overline{S}_{kk}\left(\omega\right)}}$$

is a measure of "similarity" in the seismic motions, and indicates the degree to which the data recorded at the two stations are related by means of a linear transfer function.



Summary

- Spatial correlation is important in seismic hazard assessment
- Spatial correlations of ground motion parameters (PGA, SAs) are investigated
- The widely-used stochastic simulation technique fails to reproduce observed spatial correlations
- Potential simulation method: coherency-based method



Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge the contributions of

Dr. Hanping Hong,Dr. Katsuichiro Goda,Dr. Gail M. Atkinson *and*Dr. Karen Assatourians

for the presented information.

Western **Detailed information on this talk can be found in:**

Taojun Liu, Gail M. Atkinson, Hanping Hong, and Karen Assatourians (2011) Intraevent Spatial Correlation Characteristics of Stochastic Finite-Fault Simulations, submitted to *Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America*.

Goda, K. and Hong, H.P. (2008) Spatial correlation of peak ground motions and response spectra, *Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America*, **98**, 1: 354-365.

Goda, K. and Hong, H.P. (2008) Estimation of Seismic Loss for Spatially Distributed Buildings, *Earthquake Spectra*, **24**, pp. 889-910.

Hong, H.P., Goda, K. and Davenport, A. G. (2006) Seismic hazard analysis: a comparative study, *Canadian Journal of Civil Engineering*, **33**(9), 1156-1171.



Thank you!