# Impact of hazard-consistent ground motion duration in structural collapse risk assessment

## Digital Appendix

Reagan Chandramohan, Jack W. Baker, and Gregory G. Deierlein

Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA

## May 26, 2016

### Version 2.1

## Contents

1	Overview	7	2
2	Source-sp 2.1 Seat 2.2 Eug	Decific targets         tle	<b>3</b> 3 3
	2.3 San	Francisco	4
3	Selected a	ground motions	5
	3.1 Seat 3.1. 3.1. 3.1. 3.1. 3.1. 3.1. 3.1. 3.1	tile $S_a(1.8 \mathrm{s}) = 0.17 \mathrm{g}$ intensity level (4.70 % in 50 year hazard level)2 $S_a(1.8 \mathrm{s}) = 0.20 \mathrm{g}$ intensity level (3.31 % in 50 year hazard level)3 $S_a(1.8 \mathrm{s}) = 0.24 \mathrm{g}$ intensity level (2.00 % in 50 year hazard level)4 $S_a(1.8 \mathrm{s}) = 0.28 \mathrm{g}$ intensity level (1.34 % in 50 year hazard level)5 $S_a(1.8 \mathrm{s}) = 0.32 \mathrm{g}$ intensity level (1.00 % in 50 year hazard level)6 $S_a(1.8 \mathrm{s}) = 0.36 \mathrm{g}$ intensity level (0.67 % in 50 year hazard level)7 $S_a(1.8 \mathrm{s}) = 0.40 \mathrm{g}$ intensity level (0.50 % in 50 year hazard level)	5 5 8 11 14 17 20 23
	3.2 Eug 3.2. 3.2. 3.2. 3.2. 3.2. 3.2. 3.2. 3.2	$S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.49 \text{ g intensity level } (0.23\% \text{ in 50 year hazard level}) \dots \dots \dots$ ene $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.14 \text{ g intensity level } (4.70\% \text{ in 50 year hazard level}) \dots \dots \dots \dots$ $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.17 \text{ g intensity level } (3.31\% \text{ in 50 year hazard level}) \dots \dots \dots$ $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.23 \text{ g intensity level } (2.00\% \text{ in 50 year hazard level}) \dots \dots \dots$ $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.28 \text{ g intensity level } (1.34\% \text{ in 50 year hazard level}) \dots \dots \dots$ $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.32 \text{ g intensity level } (1.00\% \text{ in 50 year hazard level}) \dots \dots \dots$ $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.38 \text{ g intensity level } (0.67\% \text{ in 50 year hazard level}) \dots \dots \dots$ $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.42 \text{ g intensity level } (0.50\% \text{ in 50 year hazard level}) \dots \dots \dots$	20 29 29 32 35 38 41 44 47 50
	3.3 San 3.3. 3.3. 3.3. 3.3.	Francisco $\ldots$ $\ldots$ $\ldots$ 1 $S_a(1.8 \mathrm{s}) = 0.27 \mathrm{g}$ intensity level (4.70 % in 50 year hazard level) $\ldots$ 2 $S_a(1.8 \mathrm{s}) = 0.31 \mathrm{g}$ intensity level (3.31 % in 50 year hazard level) $\ldots$ 3 $S_a(1.8 \mathrm{s}) = 0.37 \mathrm{g}$ intensity level (2.00 % in 50 year hazard level) $\ldots$ 4 $S_a(1.8 \mathrm{s}) = 0.42 \mathrm{g}$ intensity level (1.34 % in 50 year hazard level) $\ldots$	53 53 54 55 57

3.3.5	$S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.46 \text{ g}$ intensity level (1.00 % in 50 year hazard level)	 	58
3.3.6	$S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.51 \text{ g}$ intensity level (0.67 % in 50 year hazard level)	 	59
3.3.7	$S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.55 \text{ g}$ intensity level (0.50 % in 50 year hazard level)	 	61
3.3.8	$S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.65 \text{ g}$ intensity level (0.25 % in 50 year hazard level)	 	62

63

#### 4 Collapse fragility curves

## **1** Overview

This document provides additional data and plots describing the structural collapse risk calculations presented in Chandramohan et al. [1].

Section 2 tabulates the source-specific conditional median target  $Ds_{5-75}$  (5-75% significant duration) values, and the corresponding percentage contributions to the total seismic hazard from each type of seismic source, conditional on the exceedance of  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s})$ , at the eight different intensity levels, and the three considered sites in Seattle (Washington), Eugene (Oregon), and San Francisco (California).

Section 3 contains plots of the  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in all three ground motion groups: the *CS and duration* group, the *CS only* control group, and the *CS and causal parameters* group, at the eight different ground motion intensity levels, and the three considered sites. These groups of ground motions were used to estimate the collapse risk of an eight-story reinforced concrete moment frame building using the multiple stripe analyses technique [2]. Plots of the  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the selected ground motions are overlaid against their corresponding source-specific target distributions.

The ground motions in the *CS* and duration group were selected to match the source-specific target distributions of  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra at each intensity level. Ground motions to match targets corresponding to interface earthquakes were selected from a pool of 3955 ground motions recorded from the following large magnitude interface earthquakes: 1974 Lima (Peru), 1985 Valparaiso (Chile), 1985 Michoacan (Mexico), 2003 Hokkaido (Japan), 2010 Maule (Chile), and 2011 Tohoku (Japan). The process by which these ground motions were baseline corrected and filtered is described in the digital appendix to Chandramohan et al. [3]. Ground motions to match targets corresponding to both crustal and in-slab earthquakes were selected from the PEER NGA-West2 database [4].

The ground motions in the *CS* only control group, on the other hand, were selected to match the source-specific target distributions of response spectra only, without imposing any constraints on the  $Ds_{5-75}$  of the selected ground motions. For this group, ground motions corresponding to all types of seismic sources were chosen from the PEER NGA-West2 database.

The ground motions in the *CS and causal parameters* group were also selected to match the source-specific target distributions of response spectra only, but in addition, only those ground motions recorded from earthquakes whose magnitudes and source-to-site distances lie within an allowable range around the mean magnitude and source-to-site distance of earthquakes from each type of contributing source, obtained from seismic hazard deaggregation results [5], were considered for selection. Constraints were also placed on the site  $Vs_{30}$  of the ground motions selected from the PEER NGA-West2 database, assuming the structure is located on a rock site with  $Vs_{30} = 760 \text{ m/s}$ . Since this information was not available for the ground motions recorded from the large magnitude interface earthquakes, the  $Vs_{30}$  constraint was not imposed on the ground motions selected to match targets corresponding to interface earthquakes. The constraints imposed on the magnitude, source-to-site distance, and site  $Vs_{30}$  of the selected ground motions are summarized in tables.

Section 4 contains plots of the collapse fragility curves of the eight-story reinforced concrete moment frame building, estimated using the three different groups of ground motions, selected for each of the three considered sites. The plots also contain the seismic hazard curves and the  $MCE_R$  ground motion intensity levels at each site.

## 2 Source-specific targets

## 2.1 Seattle

Table 1: Source-specific conditional median target  $Ds_{5-75}$  values, and the corresponding percentage contributions to the total seismic hazard from each type of seismic source (indicated in parentheses), conditional on different exceedance probabilities of  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s})$  at Seattle.

Intensity level $S_a(1.8{ m s})({ m g})$	Hazard level % in 50 years	Interface earthquakes	In-slab earthquakes	Crustal earthquakes
0.17	4.70	36 s (42 %)	9 s (30 %)	5 s (28 %)
0.20	3.31	36 s (44 %)	9 s (27 %)	5 s (29 %)
0.24	2.00	36 s (47 %)	9 s (22 %)	5 s (31 %)
0.28	1.34	37 s (49 %)	9 s (19 %)	6 s (32 %)
0.32	1.00	37 s (50 %)	9 s (17 %)	6 s (33 %)
0.36	0.67	37 s (52 %)	9 s (14 %)	6 s (34 %)
0.40	0.50	37 s (52 %)	9 s (12 %)	6 s (35 %)
0.49	0.25	37 s (54 %)	9 s (8 %)	6 s (38 %)

## 2.2 Eugene

Table 2: Source-specific conditional median target  $Ds_{5-75}$  values, and the corresponding percentage contributions to the total seismic hazard from each type of seismic source (indicated in parentheses), conditional on different exceedance probabilities of  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s})$  at Eugene.

Intensity level $S_a(1.8  { m s})({ m g})$	Hazard level % in 50 years	Interface earthquakes	In-slab earthquakes	Crustal earthquakes
0.14	4.70	33 s (91 %)	9 s (9 %)	_
0.17	3.31	33 s (93 %)	9 s (7 %)	_
0.23	2.00	33 s (95 %)	9 s (5 %)	_
0.28	1.34	34 s (96 %)	9 s (4 %)	_
0.32	1.00	34 s (97 %)	9 s (3 %)	_
0.38	0.67	34 s (98 %)	9 s (2 %)	_
0.42	0.50	34 s (98 %)	9 s (2 %)	_
0.55	0.25	34 s (99 %)	9 s (1 %)	-

## 2.3 San Francisco

Intensity level $S_a(1.8{ m s})({ m g})$	Hazard level % in 50 years	Interface earthquakes	In-slab earthquakes	Crustal earthquakes
0.27	4.70	_	_	11 s (100 %)
0.31	3.31	_	_	11 s (100 %)
0.37	2.00	_	_	11 s (100 %)
0.42	1.34	_	_	12 s (100 %)
0.46	1.00	_	-	12 s (100 %)
0.51	0.67	_	_	12 s (100 %)
0.55	0.50	_	-	12 s (100 %)
0.65	0.25	_	_	12 s (100 %)

Table 3: Source-specific conditional median target  $Ds_{5-75}$  values, and the corresponding percentage contributions to the total seismic hazard from each type of seismic source (indicated in parentheses), conditional on different exceedance probabilities of  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s})$  at San Francisco.

## **3** Selected ground motions

## 3.1 Seattle

3.1.1 
$$S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.17 \text{ g}$$
 intensity level (4.70 % in 50 year hazard level)







Figure 1:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the *CS and duration* group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.17 \text{ g}$  intensity level (4.70 % in 50 year hazard level) in Seattle.





(a) Interface earthquakes: 42 / 100 ground motions



(b) In-slab earthquakes: 30 / 100 ground motions



(c) Crustal earthquakes: 28 / 100 ground motions

Figure 2:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the CS only group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.17 \text{ g}$  intensity level (4.70 % in 50 year hazard level) in Seattle.

#### 3.1.1.3 CS and causal parameters group

Table 4: Constraints on the magnitude, M, source-to-site distance, R, and site  $Vs_{30}$  of the selected ground motions, relative to the target mean causal magnitude and source-to-site distance obtained from deaggregation results, at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.17 \text{ g}$  intensity level (4.70% in 50 year hazard level) in Seattle.

Seismic	Та	arget me	ean				No. of	No. of			
source type	$ar{M}$	<b>Ā</b> (km)	Vs <sub>30</sub> (m/s)	$M_{min}$	$M_{max}$	<b>R</b> <sub>min</sub> (km)	<b>R</b> <sub>max</sub> (km)	Vs <sub>30,min</sub> (m/s)	Vs <sub>30,max</sub> (m/s)	suitable records	selected records
Interface	8.9	117	760	8.6	9.2	77	157	_	_	204	42
In-slab	6.9	65	760	6.4	7.4	45	85	360	1160	98	30
Crustal	6.9	9	760	6.4	7.4	4	14	360	1160	97	28



(a) Interface earthquakes: 42 / 100 ground motions







(c) Crustal earthquakes: 28 / 100 ground motions

Figure 3:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the CS and causal parameters group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.17 \text{ g}$  intensity level (4.70 % in 50 year hazard level) in Seattle.

3.1.2  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.20 \text{ g}$  intensity level (3.31 % in 50 year hazard level)



#### 3.1.2.1 CS and duration group

(c) Crustal earthquakes: 29 / 100 ground motions

Figure 4:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the *CS and duration* group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.20 \text{ g}$  intensity level (3.31 % in 50 year hazard level) in Seattle.





(a) Interface earthquakes: 44 / 100 ground motions



(b) In-slab earthquakes: 27 / 100 ground motions



(c) Crustal earthquakes: 29 / 100 ground motions

Figure 5:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the CS only group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.20 \text{ g}$  intensity level (3.31 % in 50 year hazard level) in Seattle.

#### 3.1.2.3 CS and causal parameters group

Table 5: Constraints on the magnitude, M, source-to-site distance, R, and site  $Vs_{30}$  of the selected ground motions, relative to the target mean causal magnitude and source-to-site distance obtained from deaggregation results, at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.20 \text{ g}$  intensity level (3.31 % in 50 year hazard level) in Seattle.

Seismic	Та	arget me	ean				No. of	No. of			
source type	$ar{M}$	<b>Ā</b> (km)	Vs <sub>30</sub> (m/s)	$M_{min}$	$M_{max}$	<b>R</b> <sub>min</sub> (km)	<b>R</b> <sub>max</sub> (km)	Vs <sub>30,min</sub> (m/s)	Vs <sub>30,max</sub> (m/s)	suitable records	selected records
Interface	8.9	116	760	8.6	9.2	76	156	-	_	187	44
In-slab	6.9	64	760	6.4	7.4	44	84	360	1160	74	27
Crustal	6.9	8	760	6.4	7.4	3	13	360	1160	90	29



(a) Interface earthquakes: 44 / 100 ground motions







(c) Crustal earthquakes: 29 / 100 ground motions

Figure 6:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the CS and causal parameters group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.20 \text{ g}$  intensity level (3.31 % in 50 year hazard level) in Seattle.

3.1.3  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.24 \text{ g}$  intensity level (2.00 % in 50 year hazard level)



#### 3.1.3.1 CS and duration group

(c) Crustal earthquakes: 31 / 100 ground motions

Figure 7:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the *CS and duration* group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.24 \text{ g}$  intensity level (2.00 % in 50 year hazard level) in Seattle.





(a) Interface earthquakes: 47 / 100 ground motions



(b) In-slab earthquakes: 22 / 100 ground motions



(c) Crustal earthquakes: 31 / 100 ground motions

Figure 8:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the CS only group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.24 \text{ g}$  intensity level (2.00 % in 50 year hazard level) in Seattle.

#### 3.1.3.3 CS and causal parameters group

Table 6: Constraints on the magnitude, M, source-to-site distance, R, and site  $Vs_{30}$  of the selected ground motions, relative to the target mean causal magnitude and source-to-site distance obtained from deaggregation results, at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.24 \text{ g}$  intensity level (2.00% in 50 year hazard level) in Seattle.

Seismic	Та	arget me	ean				No. of	No. of			
source type	$ar{M}$	<b>Ā</b> (km)	Vs <sub>30</sub> (m/s)	$M_{min}$	$M_{max}$	<b>R</b> <sub>min</sub> (km)	<b>R</b> <sub>max</sub> (km)	Vs <sub>30,min</sub> (m/s)	Vs <sub>30,max</sub> (m/s)	suitable records	selected records
Interface	8.9	114	760	8.6	9.2	74	154	-	_	168	47
In-slab	6.9	62	760	6.4	7.4	42	82	360	1160	48	22
Crustal	6.9	7	760	6.4	7.4	2	12	360	1160	82	31



(a) Interface earthquakes: 47 / 100 ground motions







(c) Crustal earthquakes: 31 / 100 ground motions

Figure 9:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the *CS and causal parameters* group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.24 \text{ g}$  intensity level (2.00 % in 50 year hazard level) in Seattle.

3.1.4  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.28 \text{ g}$  intensity level (1.34 % in 50 year hazard level)



#### 3.1.4.1 CS and duration group

(c) Crustal earthquakes: 32 / 100 ground motions

Figure 10:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the CS and duration group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.28 \text{ g}$  intensity level (1.34 % in 50 year hazard level) in Seattle.





(a) Interface earthquakes: 49 / 100 ground motions



(b) In-slab earthquakes: 19 / 100 ground motions



(c) Crustal earthquakes: 32 / 100 ground motions

Figure 11:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the *CS only* group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.28 \text{ g}$  intensity level (1.34 % in 50 year hazard level) in Seattle.

#### 3.1.4.3 CS and causal parameters group

Table 7: Constraints on the magnitude, M, source-to-site distance, R, and site  $Vs_{30}$  of the selected ground motions, relative to the target mean causal magnitude and source-to-site distance obtained from deaggregation results, at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.28 \text{ g}$  intensity level (1.34% in 50 year hazard level) in Seattle.

Seismic	Та	arget me	ean				No. of	No. of			
source type	$ar{M}$	<b>Ā</b> (km)	Vs <sub>30</sub> (m/s)	$M_{min}$	$M_{max}$	<b>R</b> <sub>min</sub> (km)	<b>R</b> <sub>max</sub> (km)	Vs <sub>30,min</sub> (m/s)	Vs <sub>30,max</sub> (m/s)	suitable records	selected records
Interface	8.9	113	760	8.6	9.2	73	153	-	_	151	49
In-slab	7.0	61	760	6.5	7.5	41	81	360	1160	47	19
Crustal	6.9	6	760	6.4	7.4	1	11	360	1160	71	32



(a) Interface earthquakes: 49 / 100 ground motions







(c) Crustal earthquakes: 32 / 100 ground motions

Figure 12:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the CS and causal parameters group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.28 \text{ g}$  intensity level (1.34 % in 50 year hazard level) in Seattle.

3.1.5  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.32 \text{ g}$  intensity level (1.00 % in 50 year hazard level)



#### 3.1.5.1 CS and duration group

(c) Crustal earthquakes: 33 / 100 ground motions

Figure 13:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the CS and duration group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.32 \text{ g}$  intensity level (1.00 % in 50 year hazard level) in Seattle.





(a) Interface earthquakes: 50 / 100 ground motions



(b) In-slab earthquakes: 17 / 100 ground motions



(c) Crustal earthquakes: 33 / 100 ground motions

Figure 14:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the *CS only* group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.32 \text{ g}$  intensity level (1.00 % in 50 year hazard level) in Seattle.

#### 3.1.5.3 CS and causal parameters group

Table 8: Constraints on the magnitude, M, source-to-site distance, R, and site  $Vs_{30}$  of the selected ground motions, relative to the target mean causal magnitude and source-to-site distance obtained from deaggregation results, at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.32 \text{ g}$  intensity level (1.00% in 50 year hazard level) in Seattle.

Seismic	Ta	arget me	ean				No. of	No. of			
source type	$ar{M}$	<b>Ā</b> (km)	Vs <sub>30</sub> (m/s)	$M_{min}$	$M_{max}$	<b>R</b> <sub>min</sub> (km)	<b>R</b> <sub>max</sub> (km)	Vs <sub>30,min</sub> (m/s)	Vs <sub>30,max</sub> (m/s)	suitable records	selected records
Interface	8.9	112	760	8.6	9.2	72	152	-	_	141	50
In-slab	7.0	60	760	6.5	7.5	40	80	360	1160	33	17
Crustal	6.9	6	760	6.4	7.4	1	11	360	1160	67	33



(a) Interface earthquakes: 50 / 100 ground motions



(b) In-slab earthquakes: 17 / 100 ground motions



(c) Crustal earthquakes: 33 / 100 ground motions

Figure 15:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the CS and causal parameters group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.32 \text{ g}$  intensity level (1.00 % in 50 year hazard level) in Seattle.

3.1.6  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.36 \text{ g}$  intensity level (0.67 % in 50 year hazard level)



3.1.6.1 CS and duration group

(c) Crustal earthquakes: 34 / 100 ground motions

Figure 16:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the CS and duration group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.36 \text{ g}$  intensity level (0.67 % in 50 year hazard level) in Seattle.





(a) Interface earthquakes: 52 / 100 ground motions



(b) In-slab earthquakes: 14 / 100 ground motions



(c) Crustal earthquakes: 34 / 100 ground motions

Figure 17:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the *CS* only group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.36 \text{ g}$  intensity level (0.67 % in 50 year hazard level) in Seattle.

#### 3.1.6.3 CS and causal parameters group

Table 9: Constraints on the magnitude, M, source-to-site distance, R, and site  $Vs_{30}$  of the selected ground motions, relative to the target mean causal magnitude and source-to-site distance obtained from deaggregation results, at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.36 \text{ g}$  intensity level (0.67 % in 50 year hazard level) in Seattle.

Seismic	Ta	arget me	ean				No. of	No. of			
source type	$ar{M}$	<b>Ā</b> (km)	Vs <sub>30</sub> (m/s)	$M_{min}$	$M_{max}$	<b>R</b> <sub>min</sub> (km)	<b>R</b> <sub>max</sub> (km)	Vs <sub>30,min</sub> (m/s)	Vs <sub>30,max</sub> (m/s)	suitable records	selected records
Interface	8.9	111	760	8.6	9.2	71	151	-	_	132	52
In-slab	7.0	58	760	6.5	7.5	38	78	360	1160	28	14
Crustal	7.0	5	760	6.5	7.5	0	10	360	1160	68	34



(a) Interface earthquakes: 52 / 100 ground motions



(b) In-slab earthquakes: 14 / 100 ground motions



(c) Crustal earthquakes: 34 / 100 ground motions

Figure 18:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the CS and causal parameters group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.36 \text{ g}$  intensity level (0.67 % in 50 year hazard level) in Seattle.

3.1.7  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.40 \text{ g}$  intensity level (0.50 % in 50 year hazard level)



#### 3.1.7.1 CS and duration group

(c) Crustal earthquakes: 36 / 100 ground motions

Figure 19:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the CS and duration group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.40 \text{ g}$  intensity level (0.50 % in 50 year hazard level) in Seattle.





(a) Interface earthquakes: 52 / 100 ground motions



(b) In-slab earthquakes: 12 / 100 ground motions



(c) Crustal earthquakes: 36 / 100 ground motions

Figure 20:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the CS only group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.40 \text{ g}$  intensity level (0.50 % in 50 year hazard level) in Seattle.

#### 3.1.7.3 CS and causal parameters group

Table 10: Constraints on the magnitude, M, source-to-site distance, R, and site  $Vs_{30}$  of the selected ground motions, relative to the target mean causal magnitude and source-to-site distance obtained from deaggregation results, at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.40 \text{ g}$  intensity level (0.50% in 50 year hazard level) in Seattle.

Seismic	z Target mean					No. of	No. of				
source type	$ar{M}$	<b>Ā</b> (km)	Vs <sub>30</sub> (m/s)	$M_{min}$	$M_{max}$	<b>R</b> <sub>min</sub> (km)	<b>R</b> <sub>max</sub> (km)	Vs <sub>30,min</sub> (m/s)	Vs <sub>30,max</sub> (m/s)	suitable records	selected records
Interface	8.9	110	760	8.6	9.2	70	150	-	_	129	52
In-slab	7.0	58	760	6.5	7.5	38	78	360	1160	26	12
Crustal	7.0	5	760	6.5	7.5	0	10	360	1160	61	36



(a) Interface earthquakes: 52 / 100 ground motions







(c) Crustal earthquakes: 36 / 100 ground motions

Figure 21:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the CS and causal parameters group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.40 \text{ g}$  intensity level (0.50 % in 50 year hazard level) in Seattle.

3.1.8  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.49 \text{ g}$  intensity level (0.25 % in 50 year hazard level)



#### 3.1.8.1 CS and duration group

(c) Crustal earthquakes: 38 / 100 ground motions

Figure 22:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the CS and duration group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.49 \text{ g}$  intensity level (0.25 % in 50 year hazard level) in Seattle.





(a) Interface earthquakes: 54 / 100 ground motions



(b) In-slab earthquakes: 8 / 100 ground motions



(c) Crustal earthquakes: 38 / 100 ground motions

Figure 23:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the CS only group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.49 \text{ g}$  intensity level (0.25 % in 50 year hazard level) in Seattle.

#### 3.1.8.3 CS and causal parameters group

Table 11: Constraints on the magnitude, M, source-to-site distance, R, and site  $Vs_{30}$  of the selected ground motions, relative to the target mean causal magnitude and source-to-site distance obtained from deaggregation results, at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.49 \text{ g}$  intensity level (0.25% in 50 year hazard level) in Seattle.

Seismic	Ta	arget me	ean			Selection	on const	raints		No. of	No. of
source type	$ar{M}$	<b>Ā</b> (km)	Vs <sub>30</sub> (m/s)	$M_{min}$	$M_{max}$	<b>R</b> <sub>min</sub> (km)	<b>R</b> <sub>max</sub> (km)	Vs <sub>30,min</sub> (m/s)	Vs <sub>30,max</sub> (m/s)	suitable records	selected records
Interface	9.0	108	760	8.7	9.3	68	148	-	_	99	54
In-slab	7.1	56	760	6.6	7.6	36	76	360	1160	18	8
Crustal	7.0	4	760	6.5	7.5	0	9	360	1160	55	38



(a) Interface earthquakes: 54 / 100 ground motions







(c) Crustal earthquakes: 38 / 100 ground motions

Figure 24:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the CS and causal parameters group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.49 \text{ g}$  intensity level (0.25 % in 50 year hazard level) in Seattle.

## 3.2 Eugene

#### 3.2.1 $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.14 \text{ g}$ intensity level (4.70 % in 50 year hazard level)



#### 3.2.1.1 CS and duration group

(b) In-slab earthquakes: 9 / 100 ground motions

Figure 25:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the CS and duration group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.14 \text{ g}$  intensity level (4.70 % in 50 year hazard level) in Eugene.





(a) Interface earthquakes: 91 / 100 ground motions



(b) In-slab earthquakes: 9 / 100 ground motions

Figure 26:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the CS only group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.14 \text{ g}$  intensity level (4.70 % in 50 year hazard level) in Eugene.

#### 3.2.1.3 CS and causal parameters group

Table 12: Constraints on the magnitude, M, source-to-site distance, R, and site  $Vs_{30}$  of the selected ground motions, relative to the target mean causal magnitude and source-to-site distance obtained from deaggregation results, at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.14 \text{ g}$  intensity level (4.70% in 50 year hazard level) in Eugene.

Seismic	Т	arget me	ean			Selection	on const	raints		No. of	No. of
source type	$ar{M}$	<b>Ā</b> (km)	Vs <sub>30</sub> (m/s)	$M_{min}$	$M_{max}$	<b>R</b> <sub>min</sub> (km)	<b>R</b> <sub>max</sub> (km)	Vs <sub>30,min</sub> (m/s)	Vs <sub>30,max</sub> (m/s)	suitable records	selected records
Interface In-slab	8.8 7.0	85 67	760 760	8.5 6.5	9.1 7.5	5 47	165 87	360	_ 1160	323 123	91 9



(a) Interface earthquakes: 91 / 100 ground motions



(b) In-slab earthquakes: 9 / 100 ground motions

Figure 27:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the CS and causal parameters group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.14 \text{ g}$  intensity level (4.70 % in 50 year hazard level) in Eugene.

3.2.2  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.17 \text{ g}$  intensity level (3.31 % in 50 year hazard level)



3.2.2.1 CS and duration group

(b) In-slab earthquakes: 7 / 100 ground motions

Figure 28:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the CS and duration group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.17 \text{ g}$  intensity level (3.31 % in 50 year hazard level) in Eugene.





(a) Interface earthquakes: 93 / 100 ground motions



(b) In-slab earthquakes: 7 / 100 ground motions

Figure 29:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the CS only group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.17 \text{ g}$  intensity level (3.31 % in 50 year hazard level) in Eugene.

#### 3.2.2.3 CS and causal parameters group

Table 13: Constraints on the magnitude, M, source-to-site distance, R, and site  $Vs_{30}$  of the selected ground motions, relative to the target mean causal magnitude and source-to-site distance obtained from deaggregation results, at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.17 \text{ g}$  intensity level (3.31 % in 50 year hazard level) in Eugene.

Seismic	Т	arget me	ean				No. of	No. of			
source type	$ar{M}$	<b>Ā</b> (km)	Vs <sub>30</sub> (m/s)	$M_{min}$	$M_{max}$	$R_{min}$ (km)	<b>R</b> <sub>max</sub> (km)	Vs <sub>30,min</sub> (m/s)	$Vs_{30,max} \ ( ext{m/s})$	suitable records	selected records
Interface In-slab	8.8 7.0	82 65	760 760	8.5 6.5	9.1 7.5	2 45	162 85	_ 360	_ 1160	301 95	93 7



(a) Interface earthquakes: 93 / 100 ground motions



(b) In-slab earthquakes: 7 / 100 ground motions

Figure 30:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the CS and causal parameters group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.17 \text{ g}$  intensity level (3.31 % in 50 year hazard level) in Eugene.

3.2.3  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.23 \text{ g}$  intensity level (2.00 % in 50 year hazard level)



3.2.3.1 CS and duration group

(b) In-slab earthquakes: 5 / 100 ground motions

Figure 31:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the *CS and duration* group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.23 \text{ g}$  intensity level (2.00 % in 50 year hazard level) in Eugene.





(a) Interface earthquakes: 95 / 100 ground motions



(b) In-slab earthquakes: 5 / 100 ground motions

Figure 32:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the CS only group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.23 \text{ g}$  intensity level (2.00 % in 50 year hazard level) in Eugene.

#### 3.2.3.3 CS and causal parameters group

Table 14: Constraints on the magnitude, M, source-to-site distance, R, and site  $Vs_{30}$  of the selected ground motions, relative to the target mean causal magnitude and source-to-site distance obtained from deaggregation results, at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.23 \text{ g}$  intensity level (2.00% in 50 year hazard level) in Eugene.

Seismic	Та	arget me	ean				No. of	No. of			
source type	$ar{M}$	<b>Ā</b> (km)	Vs <sub>30</sub> (m/s)	$M_{min}$	$M_{max}$	<b>R</b> <sub>min</sub> (km)	<b>R</b> <sub>max</sub> (km)	Vs <sub>30,min</sub> (m/s)	Vs <sub>30,max</sub> (m/s)	suitable s	selected records
Interface In-slab	8.8 7.0	79 62	760 760	8.5 6.5	9.1 7.5	0 42	159 82	_ 360	_ 1160	247 58	95 5



(a) Interface earthquakes: 95 / 100 ground motions



(b) In-slab earthquakes: 5 / 100 ground motions

Figure 33:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the CS and causal parameters group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.23 \text{ g}$  intensity level (2.00 % in 50 year hazard level) in Eugene.

3.2.4  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.28 \text{ g}$  intensity level (1.34 % in 50 year hazard level)



#### 3.2.4.1 CS and duration group

(b) In-slab earthquakes: 4 / 100 ground motions

Figure 34:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the CS and duration group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.28 \text{ g}$  intensity level (1.34 % in 50 year hazard level) in Eugene.





(a) Interface earthquakes: 96 / 100 ground motions



(b) In-slab earthquakes: 4 / 100 ground motions

Figure 35:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the CS only group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.28 \text{ g}$  intensity level (1.34 % in 50 year hazard level) in Eugene.

#### 3.2.4.3 CS and causal parameters group

Table 15: Constraints on the magnitude, M, source-to-site distance, R, and site  $Vs_{30}$  of the selected ground motions, relative to the target mean causal magnitude and source-to-site distance obtained from deaggregation results, at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.28 \text{ g}$  intensity level (1.34% in 50 year hazard level) in Eugene.

Seismic	Т	arget me	ean			Selection	on const	raints		No. of	No. of
source type	$ar{M}$	<b>Ā</b> (km)	Vs <sub>30</sub> (m/s)	$M_{min}$	$M_{max}$	<b>R</b> <sub>min</sub> (km)	<b>R</b> <sub>max</sub> (km)	Vs <sub>30,min</sub> (m/s)	Vs <sub>30,max</sub> (m/s)	suitable s	selected records
Interface In-slab	8.9 7.0	77 61	760 760	8.6 6.5	9.2 7.5	0 41	157 81	360	_ 1160	221 49	96 4



(a) Interface earthquakes: 96 / 100 ground motions



(b) In-slab earthquakes: 4 / 100 ground motions

Figure 36:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the CS and causal parameters group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.28 \text{ g}$  intensity level (1.34 % in 50 year hazard level) in Eugene.

3.2.5  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.32 \text{ g}$  intensity level (1.00 % in 50 year hazard level)



3.2.5.1 CS and duration group

(b) In-slab earthquakes: 3 / 100 ground motions

Figure 37:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the CS and duration group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.32 \text{ g}$  intensity level (1.00 % in 50 year hazard level) in Eugene.





(a) Interface earthquakes: 97 / 100 ground motions



(b) In-slab earthquakes: 3 / 100 ground motions

Figure 38:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the CS only group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.32 \text{ g}$  intensity level (1.00 % in 50 year hazard level) in Eugene.

#### 3.2.5.3 CS and causal parameters group

Table 16: Constraints on the magnitude, M, source-to-site distance, R, and site  $Vs_{30}$  of the selected ground motions, relative to the target mean causal magnitude and source-to-site distance obtained from deaggregation results, at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.32 \text{ g}$  intensity level (1.00% in 50 year hazard level) in Eugene.

Seismic	Та	arget me	ean			Selection	on const	raints		No. of	No. of
source type	$ar{M}$	<b>Ā</b> (km)	Vs <sub>30</sub> (m/s)	$M_{min}$	$M_{max}$	<b>R</b> <sub>min</sub> (km)	<b>R</b> <sub>max</sub> (km)	Vs <sub>30,min</sub> (m/s)	Vs <sub>30,max</sub> (m/s)	suitable records	selected records
Interface In-slab	8.9 7.0	76 58	760 760	8.6 6.5	9.2 7.5	0 38	156 78	_ 360	_ 1160	199 37	97 3



(a) Interface earthquakes: 97 / 100 ground motions



(b) In-slab earthquakes: 3 / 100 ground motions

Figure 39:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the CS and causal parameters group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.32 \text{ g}$  intensity level (1.00 % in 50 year hazard level) in Eugene.

3.2.6  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.38 \text{ g}$  intensity level (0.67 % in 50 year hazard level)



3.2.6.1 CS and duration group

(b) In-slab earthquakes: 2 / 100 ground motions

Figure 40:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the CS and duration group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.38 \text{ g}$  intensity level (0.67 % in 50 year hazard level) in Eugene.





(a) Interface earthquakes: 98 / 100 ground motions



(b) In-slab earthquakes: 2 / 100 ground motions

Figure 41:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the CS only group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.38 \text{ g}$  intensity level (0.67 % in 50 year hazard level) in Eugene.

#### 3.2.6.3 CS and causal parameters group

Table 17: Constraints on the magnitude, M, source-to-site distance, R, and site  $Vs_{30}$  of the selected ground motions, relative to the target mean causal magnitude and source-to-site distance obtained from deaggregation results, at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.38 \text{ g}$  intensity level (0.67 % in 50 year hazard level) in Eugene.

Seismic	Т	arget me	ean			Selection	on const	raints		No. of	No. of
source type	$ar{M}$	<b>Ā</b> (km)	Vs <sub>30</sub> (m/s)	$M_{min}$	$M_{max}$	<b>R</b> <sub>min</sub> (km)	<b>R</b> <sub>max</sub> (km)	Vs <sub>30,min</sub> (m/s)	Vs <sub>30,max</sub> (m/s)	suitable records	selected records
Interface In-slab	8.9 7.0	74 57	760 760	8.6 6.5	9.2 7.5	0 37	154 77	360	_ 1160	180 27	98 2



(a) Interface earthquakes: 98 / 100 ground motions



(b) In-slab earthquakes: 2 / 100 ground motions

Figure 42:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the CS and causal parameters group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.38 \text{ g}$  intensity level (0.67 % in 50 year hazard level) in Eugene.

3.2.7  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.42 \text{ g}$  intensity level (0.50 % in 50 year hazard level)

3.2.7.1

CS and duration group



(b) In-slab earthquakes: 2 / 100 ground motions

Figure 43:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the CS and duration group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.42 \text{ g}$  intensity level (0.50 % in 50 year hazard level) in Eugene.





(a) Interface earthquakes: 98 / 100 ground motions



(b) In-slab earthquakes: 2 / 100 ground motions

Figure 44:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the CS only group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.42 \text{ g}$  intensity level (0.50 % in 50 year hazard level) in Eugene.

#### 3.2.7.3 CS and causal parameters group

Table 18: Constraints on the magnitude, M, source-to-site distance, R, and site  $Vs_{30}$  of the selected ground motions, relative to the target mean causal magnitude and source-to-site distance obtained from deaggregation results, at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.42 \text{ g}$  intensity level (0.50% in 50 year hazard level) in Eugene.

Seismic	Т	arget me	ean			Selection	on const	raints		No. of	No. of
source type	$ar{M}$	<b>Ā</b> (km)	Vs <sub>30</sub> (m/s)	$M_{min}$	$M_{max}$	<b>R</b> <sub>min</sub> (km)	<b>R</b> <sub>max</sub> (km)	Vs <sub>30,min</sub> (m/s)	$Vs_{30,max} \ ( ext{m/s})$	suitable records	selected records
Interface In-slab	8.9 7.1	73 56	760 760	8.6 6.6	9.2 7.6	0 36	153 76	_ 360	_ 1160	164 24	98 2



(a) Interface earthquakes: 98 / 100 ground motions



(b) In-slab earthquakes: 2 / 100 ground motions

Figure 45:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the CS and causal parameters group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.42 \text{ g}$  intensity level (0.50 % in 50 year hazard level) in Eugene.

3.2.8  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.55 \text{ g}$  intensity level (0.25 % in 50 year hazard level)



3.2.8.1 CS and duration group

(b) In-slab earthquakes: 1 / 100 ground motions

Figure 46:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the CS and duration group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.55 \text{ g}$  intensity level (0.25 % in 50 year hazard level) in Eugene.





(a) Interface earthquakes: 99 / 100 ground motions



(b) In-slab earthquakes: 1 / 100 ground motions

Figure 47:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the CS only group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.55 \text{ g}$  intensity level (0.25 % in 50 year hazard level) in Eugene.

#### 3.2.8.3 CS and causal parameters group

Table 19: Constraints on the magnitude, M, source-to-site distance, R, and site  $Vs_{30}$  of the selected ground motions, relative to the target mean causal magnitude and source-to-site distance obtained from deaggregation results, at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.55 \text{ g}$  intensity level (0.25 % in 50 year hazard level) in Eugene.

Seismic	Та	arget me	ean			Selection	on const	raints		No. of	No. of
source type	$ar{M}$	<b>Ā</b> (km)	Vs <sub>30</sub> (m/s)	$M_{min}$	$M_{max}$	<b>R</b> <sub>min</sub> (km)	<b>R</b> <sub>max</sub> (km)	Vs <sub>30,min</sub> (m/s)	Vs <sub>30,max</sub> (m/s)	suitable records	selected records
Interface In-slab	8.9 7.1	70 55	760 760	8.6 6.6	9.2 7.6	0 35	150 75		_ 1160	128 15	99 1



(a) Interface earthquakes: 99 / 100 ground motions



(b) In-slab earthquakes: 1 / 100 ground motions

Figure 48:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the CS and causal parameters group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.55 \text{ g}$  intensity level (0.25 % in 50 year hazard level) in Eugene.

#### 3.3 San Francisco

3.3.1  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.27 \text{ g}$  intensity level (4.70 % in 50 year hazard level)



#### 3.3.1.1 CS and duration group

(a) Crustal earthquakes: 100 / 100 ground motions

Figure 49:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the *CS and duration* group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.27 \text{ g}$  intensity level (4.70 % in 50 year hazard level) in San Francisco.



#### 3.3.1.2 CS only group

(a) Crustal earthquakes: 100 / 100 ground motions

Figure 50:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the CS only group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.27 \text{ g}$  intensity level (4.70 % in 50 year hazard level) in San Francisco.

#### 3.3.1.3 CS and causal parameters group

Table 20: Constraints on the magnitude, M, source-to-site distance, R, and site  $Vs_{30}$  of the selected ground motions, relative to the target mean causal magnitude and source-to-site distance obtained from deaggregation results, at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.27 \text{ g}$  intensity level (4.70 % in 50 year hazard level) in San Francisco.

Seismic	Т	arget me	ean			Selection	on const	raints		No. of	No. of
source type	$\bar{M}$	<b>Ā</b> (km)	<b>Vs<sub>30</sub></b> (m/s)	$M_{min}$	$M_{max}$	<b>R</b> <sub>min</sub> (km)	<b>R</b> <sub>max</sub> (km)	Vs <sub>30,min</sub> (m/s)	Vs <sub>30,max</sub> (m/s)	suitable records	selected records
Crustal	7.7	14	760	7.2	8.2	0	29	360	1160	163	100



(a) Crustal earthquakes: 100 / 100 ground motions

Figure 51:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the CS and causal parameters group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.27 \text{ g}$  intensity level (4.70 % in 50 year hazard level) in San Francisco.





3.3.2.1 CS and duration group

(a) Crustal earthquakes: 100 / 100 ground motions

Figure 52:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the *CS and duration* group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.31 \text{ g}$  intensity level (3.31 % in 50 year hazard level) in San Francisco.



#### 3.3.2.2 CS only group

(a) Crustal earthquakes: 100 / 100 ground motions

Figure 53:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the CS only group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.31 \text{ g}$  intensity level (3.31 % in 50 year hazard level) in San Francisco.

#### 3.3.2.3 CS and causal parameters group

Table 21: Constraints on the magnitude, M, source-to-site distance, R, and site  $Vs_{30}$  of the selected ground motions, relative to the target mean causal magnitude and source-to-site distance obtained from deaggregation results, at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.31 \text{ g}$  intensity level (3.31 % in 50 year hazard level) in San Francisco.

Seismic	Ta	arget me	ean			Selection	on const	raints		No. of	No. of
source type	$ar{M}$	<b>Ā</b> (km)	Vs <sub>30</sub> (m/s)	$M_{min}$	$M_{max}$	<b>R</b> <sub>min</sub> (km)	<b>R</b> <sub>max</sub> (km)	Vs <sub>30,min</sub> (m/s)	$Vs_{30,max} \ ( ext{m/s})$	suitable records	selected records
Crustal	7.7	14	760	7.2	8.2	0	29	360	1160	162	100



(a) Crustal earthquakes: 100 / 100 ground motions

Figure 54:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the CS and causal parameters group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.31 \text{ g}$  intensity level (3.31 % in 50 year hazard level) in San Francisco.

#### 3.3.3 $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.37 \text{ g}$ intensity level (2.00 % in 50 year hazard level)

#### 3.3.3.1 CS and duration group



(a) Crustal earthquakes: 100 / 100 ground motions

Figure 55:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the *CS and duration* group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.37 \text{ g}$  intensity level (2.00 % in 50 year hazard level) in San Francisco.





(a) Crustal earthquakes: 100 / 100 ground motions

Figure 56:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the CS only group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.37 \text{ g}$  intensity level (2.00 % in 50 year hazard level) in San Francisco.

#### 3.3.3.3 CS and causal parameters group

Table 22: Constraints on the magnitude, M, source-to-site distance, R, and site  $Vs_{30}$  of the selected ground motions, relative to the target mean causal magnitude and source-to-site distance obtained from deaggregation results, at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.37 \text{ g}$  intensity level (2.00 % in 50 year hazard level) in San Francisco.

Seismic	Ta	arget me	ean			Selection	on const	raints		No. of	No. of
source type	$ar{M}$	<b>Ā</b> (km)	Vs <sub>30</sub> (m/s)	$M_{min}$	$M_{max}$	<b>R</b> <sub>min</sub> (km)	<b>R</b> <sub>max</sub> (km)	Vs <sub>30,min</sub> (m/s)	Vs <sub>30,max</sub> (m/s)	suitable records	selected records
Crustal	7.7	14	760	7.2	8.2	0	29	360	1160	158	100



(a) Crustal earthquakes: 100 / 100 ground motions

Figure 57:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the CS and causal parameters group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.37 \text{ g}$  intensity level (2.00 % in 50 year hazard level) in San Francisco.

3.3.4  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.42 \text{ g}$  intensity level (1.34 % in 50 year hazard level)



3.3.4.1 CS and duration group

(a) Crustal earthquakes: 100 / 100 ground motions

Figure 58:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the *CS and duration* group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.42 \text{ g}$  intensity level (1.34 % in 50 year hazard level) in San Francisco.



3.3.4.2 CS only group

(a) Crustal earthquakes: 100 / 100 ground motions

Figure 59:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the CS only group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.42 \text{ g}$  intensity level (1.34 % in 50 year hazard level) in San Francisco.

#### 3.3.4.3 CS and causal parameters group

Table 23: Constraints on the magnitude, M, source-to-site distance, R, and site  $Vs_{30}$  of the selected ground motions, relative to the target mean causal magnitude and source-to-site distance obtained from deaggregation results, at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.42 \text{ g}$  intensity level (1.34 % in 50 year hazard level) in San Francisco.

Seismic source type	Т	Target mean				No. of	No. of				
	$\bar{M}$	<b>Ā</b> (km)	Vs <sub>30</sub> (m/s)	$M_{min}$	$M_{max}$	<b>R</b> <sub>min</sub> (km)	<b>R</b> <sub>max</sub> (km)	Vs <sub>30,min</sub> (m/s)	Vs <sub>30,max</sub> (m/s)	suitable records	selected records
Crustal	7.8	14	760	7.3	8.3	0	29	360	1160	154	100



(a) Crustal earthquakes: 100 / 100 ground motions

Figure 60:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the CS and causal parameters group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.42 \text{ g}$  intensity level (1.34 % in 50 year hazard level) in San Francisco.





3.3.5.1 CS and duration group

(a) Crustal earthquakes: 100 / 100 ground motions

Figure 61:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the *CS and duration* group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.46 \text{ g}$  intensity level (1.00 % in 50 year hazard level) in San Francisco.



#### 3.3.5.2 CS only group

(a) Crustal earthquakes: 100 / 100 ground motions

Figure 62:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the CS only group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.46 \text{ g}$  intensity level (1.00 % in 50 year hazard level) in San Francisco.

#### 3.3.5.3 CS and causal parameters group

Table 24: Constraints on the magnitude, M, source-to-site distance, R, and site  $Vs_{30}$  of the selected ground motions, relative to the target mean causal magnitude and source-to-site distance obtained from deaggregation results, at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.46 \text{ g}$  intensity level (1.00 % in 50 year hazard level) in San Francisco.

Seismic source type	Та	Target mean				No. of	No. of				
	$ar{M}$	<b>Ā</b> (km)	Vs <sub>30</sub> (m/s)	$M_{min}$	$M_{max}$	<b>R</b> <sub>min</sub> (km)	<b>R</b> <sub>max</sub> (km)	Vs <sub>30,min</sub> (m/s)	Vs <sub>30,max</sub> (m/s)	suitable records	selected records
Crustal	7.8	14	760	7.3	8.3	0	29	360	1160	149	100



(a) Crustal earthquakes: 100 / 100 ground motions

Figure 63:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the CS and causal parameters group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.46 \text{ g}$  intensity level (1.00 % in 50 year hazard level) in San Francisco.

#### 3.3.6 $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.51 \text{ g}$ intensity level (0.67 % in 50 year hazard level)

#### 10 1.0 Cumulative probability Selection Target $S_a(T)$ (g) 1 0.5 0.1 Selection geometric mean Target median Target 2.5 and 97.5 percentile 0.0 0.01 $D_{5-75}^{10}$ (s) 100 200 1 0.1 T(s)

#### 3.3.6.1 CS and duration group

(a) Crustal earthquakes: 100 / 100 ground motions

4

Figure 64:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the *CS and duration* group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.51 \text{ g}$  intensity level (0.67 % in 50 year hazard level) in San Francisco.





(a) Crustal earthquakes: 100 / 100 ground motions

Figure 65:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the CS only group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.51 \text{ g}$  intensity level (0.67 % in 50 year hazard level) in San Francisco.

#### 3.3.6.3 CS and causal parameters group

Table 25: Constraints on the magnitude, M, source-to-site distance, R, and site  $Vs_{30}$  of the selected ground motions, relative to the target mean causal magnitude and source-to-site distance obtained from deaggregation results, at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.51 \text{ g}$  intensity level (0.67 % in 50 year hazard level) in San Francisco.

Seismic source type	Ta	Target mean				No. of	No. of				
	$ar{M}$	<b>Ā</b> (km)	Vs <sub>30</sub> (m/s)	$M_{min}$	$M_{max}$	<b>R</b> <sub>min</sub> (km)	<b>R</b> <sub>max</sub> (km)	Vs <sub>30,min</sub> (m/s)	Vs <sub>30,max</sub> (m/s)	suitable records	selected records
Crustal	7.8	14	760	7.3	8.3	0	29	360	1160	141	100



(a) Crustal earthquakes: 100 / 100 ground motions

Figure 66:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the CS and causal parameters group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.51 \text{ g}$  intensity level (0.67 % in 50 year hazard level) in San Francisco.

3.3.7  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.55 \text{ g}$  intensity level (0.50 % in 50 year hazard level)



3.3.7.1 CS and duration group

(a) Crustal earthquakes: 100 / 100 ground motions

Figure 67:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the *CS and duration* group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.55 \text{ g}$  intensity level (0.50 % in 50 year hazard level) in San Francisco.



3.3.7.2 CS only group

(a) Crustal earthquakes: 100 / 100 ground motions

Figure 68:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the CS only group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.55 \text{ g}$  intensity level (0.50 % in 50 year hazard level) in San Francisco.

#### 3.3.7.3 CS and causal parameters group

Table 26: Constraints on the magnitude, M, source-to-site distance, R, and site  $Vs_{30}$  of the selected ground motions, relative to the target mean causal magnitude and source-to-site distance obtained from deaggregation results, at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.55 \text{ g}$  intensity level (0.50 % in 50 year hazard level) in San Francisco.

Seismic source type	Т	Target mean				No. of	No. of				
	$\bar{M}$	<b>Ā</b> (km)	<b>Vs<sub>30</sub></b> (m/s)	$M_{min}$	$M_{max}$	<b>R</b> <sub>min</sub> (km)	R <sub>max</sub> (km)	Vs <sub>30,min</sub> (m/s)	Vs <sub>30,max</sub> (m/s)	suitable records	selected records
Crustal	7.8	13	760	7.3	8.3	0	28	360	1160	135	100



(a) Crustal earthquakes: 100 / 100 ground motions

Figure 69:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the CS and causal parameters group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.55 \text{ g}$  intensity level (0.50 % in 50 year hazard level) in San Francisco.

3.3.8  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.65 \text{ g}$  intensity level (0.25 % in 50 year hazard level)



3.3.8.1 CS and duration group

(a) Crustal earthquakes: 100 / 100 ground motions

Figure 70:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the CS and duration group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.65 \text{ g}$  intensity level (0.25 % in 50 year hazard level) in San Francisco.



#### 3.3.8.2 CS only group

(a) Crustal earthquakes: 100 / 100 ground motions

Figure 71:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the CS only group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.65 \text{ g}$  intensity level (0.25 % in 50 year hazard level) in San Francisco.

#### 3.3.8.3 CS and causal parameters group

Table 27: Constraints on the magnitude, M, source-to-site distance, R, and site  $Vs_{30}$  of the selected ground motions, relative to the target mean causal magnitude and source-to-site distance obtained from deaggregation results, at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.65 \text{ g}$  intensity level (0.25 % in 50 year hazard level) in San Francisco.

Seismic source type	Ta	Target mean				No. of	No. of				
	$ar{M}$	<b>Ā</b> (km)	Vs <sub>30</sub> (m/s)	$M_{min}$	$M_{max}$	<b>R</b> <sub>min</sub> (km)	<b>R</b> <sub>max</sub> (km)	Vs <sub>30,min</sub> (m/s)	Vs <sub>30,max</sub> (m/s)	suitable records	selected records
Crustal	7.9	13	760	7.4	8.4	0	28	360	1160	123	100



(a) Crustal earthquakes: 100 / 100 ground motions

Figure 72:  $Ds_{5-75}$  and response spectra of the ground motions selected in the CS and causal parameters group at the  $S_a(1.8 \text{ s}) = 0.65 \text{ g}$  intensity level (0.25 % in 50 year hazard level) in San Francisco.

## 4 Collapse fragility curves





Figure 73: Collapse fragility curves of the eight-story reinforced concrete moment frame building, estimated using the three groups of ground motions selected for each site (with median,  $\mu$ , and lognormal standard deviation,  $\beta$ , indicated in the legend), along with the seismic hazard curve and the MCE<sub>R</sub> ground motion intensity level at that site.

## References

- Chandramohan R, Baker JW, Deierlein GG. Impact of hazard-consistent ground motion duration in structural collapse risk assessment. *Earthquake Engineering & Structural Dynamics* 2016; 45(8):1357–1379, doi:10.1002/eqe.2711.
- [2] Jalayer F. Direct probabilistic seismic analysis: Implementing non-linear dynamic assessments. PhD Thesis, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 2003.
- [3] Chandramohan R, Baker JW, Deierlein GG. Quantifying the Influence of Ground Motion Duration on Structural Collapse Capacity Using Spectrally Equivalent Records. *Earthquake Spectra* 2016; 32(2):927–950, doi:10.1193/122813EQS298MR2.

- [4] Ancheta TD, Darragh RB, Stewart JP, Seyhan E, Silva WJ, Chiou BSJ, Wooddell KE, Graves RW, Kottke AR, Boore DM, et al. PEER NGA-West2 Database. *Technical Report PEER 2013/03*, Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center, Berkeley, CA 2013.
- [5] McGuire RK. Probabilistic seismic hazard analysis and design earthquakes: Closing the loop. *Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America* 1995; **85**(5):1275–1284.