List of Figures

Figure 3.1: Rapid instrumental intensity map for the Parkfield earthquake (CSMIP 2006). 18

Figure 3.2: Contour map of near-fault peak ground accelerations (CSMIP; Shakal, et al. 2005; Graphic generated by Pete Roffers at CSMIP). 19

Figure 3.3: Particle displacement motions of Parkfield Earthquake of 28 Sep 2004 (CSMIP 2006). 20

Figure 3.4: Location and photograph of the Parkfield school building strong motion station. 21

Figure 3.5: Instrumentation layout of the Parkfield school building. 22

Figure 3.6: Elevation views of the Parkfield school building (CSMIP). 23

Figure 3.7: Acceleration strong motion time histories (East/West direction) of the Parkfield school building. 24

Figure 3.8: Acceleration strong motion time histories (North/South direction) of the Parkfield school building. 25

Figure 3.9: Location and photograph of the Templeton hospital. 26

Figure 3.10: Instrumentation layout of the Templeton hospital. 27

Figure 3.11: Acceleration strong motion time histories (East/West direction) of the Templeton hospital during the 2003 San Simeon Earthquake. 28

Figure 3.12: Acceleration strong motion time histories (North/South direction) of the Templeton hospital during the 2003 San Simeon Earthquake. 29

Figure 4.1: First three modeshapes of the Parkfield school building generated from the 2004 Parkfield Earthquake. 40

Figure 4.2: One-mode model for the 1993 Parkfield school records. 43
Figure 4.3: Two-mode model for the 1993 Parkfield school records. 44
Figure 4.4: Three-mode model for the 1993 Parkfield school records. 45
Figure 4.5: One-mode model for the 1994 Parkfield school records. 46
Figure 4.6: Two-mode model for the 1994 Parkfield school records. 47
Figure 4.7: Three-mode model for the 1994 Parkfield school records. 48
Figure 4.8: One-mode model for the 2004 Parkfield school records. 49
Figure 4.9: Two-mode model for the 2004 Parkfield school records. 50
Figure 4.10: Three-mode model for the 2004 Parkfield school records. 51
Figure 4.11: Amplitude dependence of the E-W and N-S mode frequency estimates for the Parkfield school building. The window analysis is performed on the 2004 Parkfield Earthquake. 54
Figure 4.12: Amplitude dependence of the E-W and N-S mode damping estimates for the Parkfield school building. The window analysis is performed on the 2004 Parkfield Earthquake. 54
Figure 4.13: Amplitude dependence of the E-W and N-S mode frequency estimates for the Parkfield school building. The window analysis is performed on the 1993 Parkfield Earthquake. 55
Figure 4.14: Amplitude dependence of the E-W and N-S mode damping estimates for the Parkfield school building. The window analysis is performed on the 1993 Parkfield Earthquake. 55
Figure 4.15: Amplitude dependence of the E-W and N-S mode frequency estimates for the Parkfield school building. The window analysis is performed on the 1994 Parkfield Earthquake. 56
Figure 4.16: Amplitude dependence of the E-W and N-S mode damping estimates for the Parkfield school building. The window analysis is performed on the 1994 Parkfield Earthquake. 56
Figure 4.17: First three modeshapes of the Templeton hospital building generated from the 2003 San Simeon Earthquake. 59

Figure 4.18: One-mode model for the 2003 Templeton hospital records. 60
Figure 4.19: Two-mode model for the 2003 Templeton hospital records. 61
Figure 4.20: Three-mode model for the 2003 Templeton hospital records. 62
Figure 4.21: Amplitude dependence of the west wing and north wing frequency estimates for Templeton hospital building. The window analysis is performed on the 2003 San Simeon Earthquake. 64
Figure 4.22: Amplitude dependence of the west wing and north wing mode damping estimates for Templeton hospital building. The window analysis is performed on the 2003 San Simeon Earthquake. 64
Figure 4.23: Amplitude dependence of the west wing and north wing frequency estimates for Templeton hospital building. The window analysis is performed on the 2004 San Simeon aftershock. 65
Figure 4.24: Amplitude dependence of the west wing and north wing mode damping estimates for Templeton hospital building. The window analysis is performed on the 2004 San Simeon aftershock. 65
Figure 5.1: Illustration of the nailed sheathing connection and pinching hysteresis curve (Judd 2005). 68
Figure 5.2: Illustrative example of the free body diagram concept to calculate a hystersis curve. 72
Figure 5.3: Hysteresis curves of the east wall. 74
Figure 5.4: Hysteresis curves of the diaphragm. 74
Figure 5.5: Hysteresis curves of the south wall. 75
Figure 5.6: Hysteresis curves of the south shear wall. 75
Figure 5.7: Corrected hysteresis curves of non wood-frame structures (Cifuentes 1984). 77

Figure 5.8: Comparison of the pre- and post-processed hysteresis curves from the east wall. 80
Figure 5.9: Comparison of the pre- and post-processed hysteresis curves from the diaphragm. 80
Figure 5.10: Comparison of the pre- and post-processed hysteresis curves from the south wall. 81
Figure 5.11: Comparison of the pre- and post-processed hysteresis curves from the south shear wall. 81
Figure 5.12: Comparison between hysteresis loops derived from measured displacements and double-integrated accelerations. Seismic Level 1 (5% g). 83
Figure 5.13: Comparison between hysteresis loops derived from measured displacements and double-integrated accelerations. Seismic Level 2 (20% g). 83
Figure 5.14: Comparison between hysteresis loops derived from measured displacements and double-integrated accelerations. Seismic Level 3 (50% g). 84
Figure 5.15: Comparison between hysteresis loops derived from measured displacements and double-integrated accelerations. Seismic Level 4 (80% g). 84
Figure 5.16: Comparison between hysteresis loops derived from measured displacements and double-integrated accelerations. Seismic Level 5 (100% g). 85
Figure 5.17: Fourier transform of the acceleration time histories from the east wall and diaphragm. 91
Figure 5.18: Fourier transform of the acceleration time histories from the south wall and south shear wall. 91
Figure 5.19: STFT of the Parkfield school building with 4 second time intervals. 92

Figure 5.20: Wigner-Ville spectrums of the east wall. 93
Figure 5.21: Wigner-Ville spectrums of the south wall. 94
Figure 5.22: Forced vibration results with low level shaking force on the three-Story Del Mar apartment (Camelo 2003). 98
Figure 5.23: Forced vibration results with low level shaking force on the three-Story Del Mar apartment (Camelo 2003). 98
Figure 5.24: Hysteresis loop and damping estimate of the three-story Del Mar apartment building at low level shaking forces. 99
Figure 5.25: Hysteresis loop and damping estimate of the three-story Del Mar apartment building at middle level shaking forces. 99
Figure 5.26: Hysteresis loop of the three-story Del Mar apartment building at high level shaking forces. 100
Figure 5.27: Comparison of modal parameter estimates from UCSD and MODE-ID analyses on the same test structure. 102
Figure 5.28: Variations in the damping estimate through time. Hysteresis curves are from Test Phase 9 at seismic level 4. 105
Figure 5.29: Variations in the damping estimate through time. Hysteresis curves are from Test Phase 10 at seismic level 4. 105
Figure 5.30: Variations in the damping estimate through time. Hysteresis curves are from Test Phase 10 at seismic level 5. 106
Figure 6.1: Geometry of the plane stress element. 110
Figure 6.2: Hysteresis behavior with pinching. F is a generalized action and e is a generalized deflection. Required parameters are F_y, F_u, k, α, β, and ρ where y = yield and u = ultimate. An illustrative history follows the path 0-1-2-3-4-5-6-7-8-10-11-12-13-14. 111
Figure 6.3: Sample of the different types of model discretizations used (south-west point of view). 113
Figure 6.4: Black elements show the windows and door openings in the structure. The procedure models these as openings. 113

Figure 6.5: (From left to right) Model 1. Walls and diaphragm have same set of parameters. Model 2. Walls and diaphragm have different set of parameters. Model 3. East-West walls, North-South walls, and diaphragm have different set of parameters. 114

Figure 6.6: Parkfield Earthquake Input – Linear Model a) No horizontal ground motion b) No horizontal ground motion but with adjusted displacement time c) With horizontal ground motion and obtained from an east wall sensor location d) With horizontal ground motion and obtained from Parkfield sensor locations e) Add viscous damping in the model and obtained from an east wall sensor location f) Add viscous damping in the model and obtained from Parkfield sensor locations. 117

Figure 6.7: Earthquake Ground Motion Input – Nonlinear Model. a) No horizontal ground motion b) With horizontal ground motion c) Add 10% viscous damping in the model and obtained from an east wall sensor location f) Add viscous damping in the model and obtained from Parkfield sensor locations. 118

Figure 6.8: Data misfit surface between shear modulus and shear yield strength. Axes values are relative to the nominal values of the parameters. 121

Figure 6.9: Data misfit surface between shear modulus and shear ultimate strength. Axes values are relative to the nominal values of the parameters. 122

Figure 6.10: Data fit of the Parkfield school record from SPSA identified parameters. 127

Figure 6.11: Hysteresis curves obtained from the SPSA identified numerical model. 128

Figure 6.12: Samples from both prior (green) and posterior (black) PDF. 133

Figure 6.13: Posterior samples for different pairs of uncertain parameters in Model 1. X marks the mean of the posterior PDF. This illustrates the difficulty in identifying hysteretic structures. 134
Figure 6.14: Data fit of Model 3 predicted by the most probable model from Bayesian updating and model selection. 137
Figure 6.15: Extracted hysteresis loop from east wall. Model chosen by Bayesian model selection. 139
Figure 6.16: Extracted hysteresis loop from diaphragm. Model chosen by Bayesian model selection. 140
Figure 6.17: Extracted hysteresis loop from south wall. Model chosen by Bayesian model selection. 140
Figure 6.18: (Top) Structural deformations up to the first 2 seconds of seismic record. (Bottom) Structural deformations up to the first 3 seconds of the seismic record. 142
Figure 6.19: (Top) Structural deformations up to the first 5 seconds of seismic record. (Bottom) Structural deformations up to the first 6 seconds of the seismic record. 143
Figure 6.20: Structural deformations up to the first 8 seconds of the seismic record. 144
Figure 6.21: Displacement particle motion of instrumented stations during the Parkfield Earthquake. The Parkfield school building is located in the middle of the figure (CSMIP 2006). 144
Figure 6.22: Energy dissipation in the east-west motion. 10% damping can be seen at the top left and bottom right corners. 146
Figure 6.23: Energy dissipation in the north-south motion. More than 20% damping can be seen at east and west walls. 146