Probabilistic Model for Seismic Slope Stability Analysis

A model for probabilistic stability analysis of earth slopes under earthquake loading is presented. Significant uncertainties associated with conventional pseudo-static methods of seismic stability analysis are recognized and probabilistic tools are introduced for their description and amelioration. The proposed method of analysis accounts for: the variability of material strength parameters; the uncertainty in the exact location of potential failure surfaces; and the uncertainty in the value of the maximum slope acceleration during an earthquake. The soil material comprised in the slope is assumed to be probabilistically homogeneous with strength parameters being identically distributed random variables with given statistical values. Potential failure surfaces are considered to have an exponential shape defined with the aid of three random variables. Slope safety is measured in terms of its probability of failure. The seismic load is introduced into the analysis through the maximum horizontal acceleration experienced by the slope during an earthquake. Two different attenuation relationships are employed to determine the maximum horizontal ground acceleration and the corresponding results are compared and discussed.
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Preface

This the first in a series of reports on a project under the general title "Reliability Analysis of Soil Slopes During Earthquakes". This study is sponsored by the Earthquake Hazard Mitigation Program of the National Science Foundation (ASRA) under Grant No. ENV 77-16185. Dr. Michael Gaus is the program manager of this project of which the first author is the principal investigator.

Three reports of this series, although not issued simultaneously, compose a unity in content. These are the following:


The first of these reports presents the model and discusses its applicability and limitations. The second is a document pertaining to the computer program "RASSUEL" that has been developed to perform the probabilistic seismic stability analysis; it provides a description of the various functions and options available in the program as well as guidelines for its use. Finally, the third report presents the results of a case study involving the assessment of the safety of a natural slope loca-
ted near Slingerlands, New York.
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ABSTRACT

The present work provides a model for probabilistic stability analysis of earth slopes under earthquake loading. Significant uncertainties associated with conventional pseudo-static methods of seismic stability analysis are recognized and probabilistic tools are introduced for their description and amelioration. In particular, the proposed method of analysis accounts for (a) the variability of material strength parameters, (b) the uncertainty in the exact location of potential failure surfaces, and (c) the uncertainty in the value of the maximum slope acceleration during an earthquake.

The soil material comprising the slope is assumed to be probabilistically homogeneous with strength parameters \(c\) and \(\tan\phi\) being identically distributed random variables with given statistical values. Potential failure surfaces are considered to have an exponential shape (log-spiral), defined with the aid of three random variables (two geometric parameters and the frictional strength parameter).

The safety of the slope is measured in terms of its probability of failure \(P_f\) rather than the customary factor of safety. The numerical values of \(P_f\) are obtained through a Monte Carlo simulation of failure.

The seismic load is introduced into the analysis through the maximum horizontal acceleration \(a_{\text{max}}\) experienced by the slope during an earthquake. This is assumed to be a random variable, the probability distribution of which is found to depend on the earthquake magnitude, the type of earthquake source considered (i.e., point, line, or area source), the distance
between the source and the site and a number of regional parameters.
In addition, for the purposes of this study, it is assumed that the
slope is rigid, and therefore, the maximum acceleration of the slope
mass is equal to that of the ground.

Two different attenuation relationships are employed to determine
the maximum horizontal ground acceleration and the corresponding results
are compared and discussed.
1. PROBABILISTIC SEISMIC STABILITY ANALYSIS

1.1 Introduction

Soil slopes, whether naturally formed or man-made (in the form of earth dams, cuts, embankments, etc.), are among the most frequently encountered geotechnical structures. Although much experience has already accumulated about their design and performance, geotechnical engineers still face considerable uncertainties when they analyze their stability. These uncertainties reflect the slope’s loading conditions, the ground water conditions, the material parameters, the location and shape of the potential failure surface, the particular method used in the analysis, etc. The possibility of an earthquake renders such analyses even more complicated.

Conventionally, the safety of soil slopes is measured in terms of a "factor of safety ($F_s$)". In general, this factor is arbitrary in scale since it merely reflects whether a structure is safe ($F_s > 1$), or unsafe ($F_s < 1$). A factor of safety of two, for example, does not necessarily imply that the slope is twice as safe as one with a factor of safety of one. It simply states that the former is safer than the latter. The confidence with which one should view the factor of safety is also open to question. The literature is filled with reports of structures which have failed with factors of safety greater than one, and others, which have shown a remarkable success with factors as low as 0.6 [23].

To overcome the shortcomings associated with the conventional analysis, geotechnical engineers have suggested the use of more rational approaches to design, based on probability theory and reliability analysis [e.g., 20, 21,
In particular, probabilistic slope stability analysis has been pursued by Wu and Kraft [50], Matsuo and Kuroda [28], Catalan and Cornell [11], Vanmarcke [44] and Alonso [1], among others.

A probabilistic formulation of the slope stability problem is based on the recognition that both the available resistance \((R)\) and the driving load \((S)\) along a potential failure surface are random variables.

The difference between \(R\) and \(S\) is also a random variable often called the **safety margin** \(SM\) (i.e., \(SM = R - S\)). Failure of the slope occurs when its safety margin \(SM\) receives a negative value; i.e.,

\[
"\text{Failure"} = [SM = R - S < 0]
\]

The probability of the occurrence of this event is equal to the probability of failure \(p_f\) of the slope. Thus,

\[
p_f = P[\text{Failure}] = P[SM < 0] (1-1)
\]

where \(P[\ ]\) denotes the probability of the occurrence of the event in brackets.

The complement of the probability of failure is called the **reliability** \(R\) of the slope. Hence,

\[
R = 1 - p_f (1-2)
\]

If \(f_R(R)\) and \(f_S(S)\) represent the probability density functions of the resistance \(R\) and loading \(S\), respectively, the expression for the probability of failure becomes [20]

\[
p_f = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} F_R(S) f_S(S) \, dS (1-3)
\]

where \(F_R(\ )\) is the cumulative distribution of the resistance \(R\).
In the case where the density functions of both the resistance and the loading receive simple analytical expressions (e.g., uniform, exponential, normal, lognormal, etc.), the probability of failure may be determined by performing the integration indicated in Equation (1-3). In Table 1 are given the analytical expressions for the probability of failure $p_f$ for some frequently employed empirical distributions for the capacity of a structure $C$ (its resistance) and the demand $D$ (the applied loading) [4]. If, on the other hand, the expressions for the density functions for the resistance and loading are complicated (as is often the case in actual geotechnical situations), the integration indicated in Equation (1-3) is not easy to accomplish analytically. In this case, solutions must be obtained numerically or by using some simulation technique.
### Table 1. Probability of Failure for Some Empirical Models (after [4])

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISTRIBUTION OF C AND D</th>
<th>( f_c(c) )</th>
<th>( f_D(d) )</th>
<th>( P_f )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uniform</td>
<td>( \frac{1}{C_{\text{max}} - C_{\text{min}}} )</td>
<td>( \frac{1}{D_{\text{max}} - D_{\text{min}}} )</td>
<td>( \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{D_{\text{max}} - 2C_{\text{min}} + D_{\text{min}}}{C_{\text{max}} - C_{\text{min}}} \right) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exponential</td>
<td>( a_C \exp(-a_CC) )</td>
<td>( a_D \exp(-a_DD) )</td>
<td>( \frac{a_D}{a_C + a_D} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>( \frac{1}{S_C \sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{C - \bar{C}}{S_C} \right)^2 \right) )</td>
<td>( \frac{1}{S_D \sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{D - \bar{D}}{S_D} \right)^2 \right) )</td>
<td>( \frac{1}{2} \text{erf}\left( \frac{\bar{C} - \bar{D}}{\sqrt{S_C^2 + S_D^2}} \right) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log-normal</td>
<td>( \frac{1}{C_{\text{ln}} \sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \left( \ln C - \ln C_{\text{ln}} \right)^2 \right) )</td>
<td>( \frac{1}{D_{\text{lnD}} \sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \left( \ln D - \ln D_{\text{lnD}} \right)^2 \right) )</td>
<td>( \frac{1}{2} \text{erf}\left( \frac{\ln \bar{C} - \ln \bar{D}}{\sqrt{\text{ln}(1+\nu^2)\text{ln}(1+\nu^2)}} \right) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rayleigh</td>
<td>( a_C C \exp(-a_C C^2/2) )</td>
<td>( a_D D \exp(-a_D D^2/2) )</td>
<td>( \frac{4a_C(a_C^2+2a_D)}{a_D(a_C+a_D)} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gamma</td>
<td>( \frac{\lambda^n \Gamma(n-1) \mu^m e^{-\mu D}}{\Gamma(n)} )</td>
<td>( \frac{\mu^m e^{-\mu D} \cdot \mu D^{-1}}{\Gamma(m)} )</td>
<td>( 1 - \frac{\Gamma(mn)}{\Gamma(m)\Gamma(n)} \left( \frac{\mu + \lambda}{\mu} \right)^{mn} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>( \lambda C_{\text{min}} )</td>
<td>( \lambda D_{\text{min}} )</td>
<td>( \frac{\lambda D_{\text{max-D}} \alpha_D (D_{\text{max-D}} - D_{\text{min}})}{\alpha_D (D_{\text{max-D}} - D_{\text{min}}) - D_{\text{min}}} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weibull</td>
<td>( \frac{\alpha_C (C_{\text{min}}) \beta_C}{\theta_C} \exp\left(-\left( \frac{C - C_{\text{min}}}{\theta_C} \right)^\beta_C \right) )</td>
<td>( \frac{\alpha_D (D_{\text{min}}) \beta_D}{\theta_D} \exp\left(-\left( \frac{D - D_{\text{min}}}{\theta_D} \right)^\beta_D \right) )</td>
<td>( \infty \int e^{-y} \exp\left(-\frac{\theta_D}{\theta_D + \frac{1}{2}(C_{\text{min}} - D_{\text{min}})} \right) dy )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Note: erf( ) = error function  
B( ) = beta function  
\( B_u( ) \) = incomplete beta function,  
\( v = (D-C_{\text{min}})/(C_{\text{max}}-C_{\text{min}}) \)
1.2 Description of Failure Surfaces

The shape of the surface along which soil slopes fail is most frequently assumed to be of a planar or circular cylindrical form. Different shapes, however, have also been employed in the past. Collin [14] introduced cycloidal surfaces to analyze the stability of soil slopes while Rendulic [33] and Frühlich [18] assumed that slopes slide along paths having the shape of a logarithmic spiral. The same mode of failure was later employed by other investigators [e.g., 17]. Furthermore, the sliding block type of failure has also been considered [10,30], especially when well defined zones exist within the soil profile. Finally, irregular shapes have been introduced by assuming failure surfaces to be composed of line segments with inclinations to the horizontal following a Fibonacci sequence [10].

In a stochastic description of the development and propagation of failure surfaces inside slopes composed of particulate materials, it was found [6] that the most probable failure path followed an exponential law. More recently, a generalized limiting equilibrium method was applied by Baker et al [8] to the evaluation of the stability of soil slopes using the calculus of variations. In this formulation of the problem, the shape of the failure surface and the distribution of the normal stress along this surface were left as variables to be determined by the mathematical (as opposed to trial and error) minimization of the factor of safety. It was subsequently concluded that the most critical failure surface had the form of a logarithmic spiral.
In the present study, it is assumed that the failure surface, created interior to a soil slope during an earthquake, has an exponential shape (log spiral) expressed in the form (Figure 1)

\[ r = r_o \exp (-\theta t) \]  \hspace{1cm} (1-4)

where
- \( r \) = the radius of the spiral,
- \( r_o \) = the initial radius (value of \( r \) for \( \theta = 0 \)),
- \( \theta \) = the angle between \( r \) and \( r_o \), and
- \( t = \tan \phi \), where \( \phi \) = soil strength parameter.

The location in the interior of the slope mass of a potential failure surface, as given by Equation (1-4) and illustrated in Figure 1, depends on the following three factors:

1. the position along the slope boundary of the initiation point (point A),
2. the location of the center of the log spiral (point 0), and
3. the numerical value of the \( \phi \)-parameter of soil strength.

In general, the point of initiation of the failure surface is not known in advance. Studies on the development and propagation of failure surfaces in elastic slopes have indicated that the most likely point for the initiating of failure is the toe of the slope [34]. Failure surfaces initiation at specified points on the ground surface (along the base of the slope) have also been used [10]. In the present study, the assumption is made that failure surfaces pass through the toe of the slope.
FIGURE 1. SHAPE OF FAILURE SURFACE
The center of the log spiral may be expressed in polar coordinates by means of two variables, \( h_0 \) and \( \theta_0 \) (Figure 1). Introducing \( h_0 = r_0 \cos \theta_0 \) into Equation (1-4), the latter receives the form

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{h_0}{\cos \theta_0} \exp(-\delta t)
\end{align*}
\]

(1-5)

The uncertainty around the exact location of the center 0 of the log spiral can be accounted by considering its polar coordinates \( h_0 \) and \( \theta_0 \) to be random variables receiving values within specified intervals; i.e.,

\[
\begin{align*}
{h_0}_{\text{min}} & \leq h_0 \leq {h_0}_{\text{max}} \\
{\theta_0}_{\text{min}} & \leq \theta_0 \leq {\theta_0}_{\text{max}}
\end{align*}
\]

where \( {h_0}_{\text{min}}, {\theta_0}_{\text{min}}, {h_0}_{\text{max}}, \) and \( {\theta_0}_{\text{max}} \) are the minimum and maximum values that can be received by \( h_0 \) and \( \theta_0 \), respectively. Taking advantage of previous experience with log spiral failure surfaces [18,33], the limiting values of \( h_0 \) and \( \theta_0 \) may be taken empirically to be \( h_0{\text{min}} = 0, \quad h_0{\text{max}} = 3h \) and \( \theta_0{\text{min}} = \beta' - \pi/3, \quad \theta_0{\text{max}} = \beta' \), where \( \beta' = \pi/2 - \beta \), and \( h \) and \( \beta \) are the height and angle of the slope, respectively.

Furthermore, random variables \( h_0 \) and \( \theta_0 \) are assumed to follow the general beta distribution expressed in the form [20]

\[
f(x) = \lambda x^{a} (x-x_{\text{min}})^{a} (x_{\text{max}}-x)^{b} x, \quad x_{\text{min}} < x < x_{\text{max}}
\]

(1-6)

where \( x \) represents \( h_0 \) or \( \theta_0 \).
\( x_{\text{min}}, x_{\text{max}} \) are the minimum and maximum values of \( x \) respectively,

\( \alpha_x, \beta_x \) are the parameters of the beta distribution,

\[
\lambda_x = \frac{\Gamma(\alpha_x + \beta_x + 2)}{\Gamma(\alpha_x + 1) \Gamma(\beta_x + 1)} \cdot \frac{1}{(x_{\text{max}} - x_{\text{min}})^{\alpha_x + \beta_x}}, \text{ and}
\]

\( \Gamma(\cdot) \) is the gamma function.

Parameters \( \alpha_x \) and \( \beta_x \) of the beta distribution can be obtained in terms of the statistical values of \( x \) as follows [20]:

\[
\alpha_x = \frac{-2}{\bar{x} - (1 - \bar{x}) - (1 + \bar{x})}
\]

\[
\beta_x = \frac{\alpha_x + 1}{x} - (\alpha_x + 2)
\]

where \( \bar{x} = \frac{(x - x_{\text{min}})}{(x_{\text{max}} - x_{\text{min}})} \), and

\[
\bar{\sigma}_x^2 = \frac{(x_{\text{max}} - x_{\text{min}})^2}{\sigma_x^2}
\]

In the subsequent applications of Equation (1-6), it will be also assumed that \( h_o \) and \( \theta_o \) are symmetric around their mean values (i.e., \( \alpha_x = \beta_x \)).
According to the procedure presented above, for a fixed value of the strength parameter $t (=\tan \phi)$, the locations of the failure surface depend only on the values of the two geometric parameters $h_0$ and $\theta_0$. As an example, in Figure 2 are shown failure surfaces corresponding to characteristic values of $h_0$ and $\theta_0$. The slope considered has a height $h = 30$ ft and angle $\beta = 30^\circ$, while the $t$ parameter is taken equal to $t = 0.58 (\phi = 30^\circ)$. 
FIGURE 2. FAILURE SURFACES FOR CHARACTERISTIC VALUES OF THE CENTER COORDINATES $h_o$ and $\theta_o$. 
1.3 Mean Failure Surface

Let \( r, h, \theta_0 \) and \( t \), appearing in Equation (1-5), be denoted by \( y, \), \( x_1, x_2 \) and \( x_3 \), respectively. Equation (1-5) may then be rewritten as

\[
y = y(x_1, x_2, x_3) = \frac{x_1}{\cos x_2} \exp(-\theta x_3)
\]

(1-7)

in which \( x_1, x_2 \) and \( x_3 \) are independent random variables.

If the mean values and standard deviations of random variables \( x_i \), \( i = 1, 2, 3 \), are known, then an approximate expression for the mean value \( \bar{y} \) of function \( y \) can be obtained by using a method developed by Rosenblueth [35]. To illustrate this method, consider first that \( y \) is a function of a single variable \( x \), the skewness coefficient of which is unknown or nil. Rosenblueth showed that \( \bar{y} \) may be obtained as the average of two point estimates of \( y(x) \): one for \( x = \bar{x} + \sigma_x \) and, another, for \( x = \bar{x} - \sigma_x \), where \( \bar{x} \) and \( \sigma_x \) are the mean value and standard deviation of \( x \), respectively. Thus, in the case of a function of one variable, \( \bar{y} \) is approximately equal to

\[
\bar{y} = \frac{1}{2} \left[ y(\bar{x} + \sigma_x) + y(\bar{x} - \sigma_x) \right]
\]

Similarly, the mean value \( \bar{y} \) of the function given by Equation (1-7) is equal to

\[
\bar{y} = \frac{1}{8} \sum_{i=1}^{8} y_i(x_{1i} + \sigma_{x_1}, x_{2i} + \sigma_{x_2}, x_{3i} + \sigma_{x_3})
\]

(1-8)

where the eight point estimates of \( y \) correspond to the eight possible combinations of the values \( x_i = \bar{x}_i \pm \sigma_{x_i} \), \( i = 1, 2, 3 \). That is, the first term in the summation on the RHS of Equation (1-8) is \( y_1 = y(\bar{x}_1 + \sigma_{x_1}, \bar{x}_2 + \sigma_{x_2}, \bar{x}_3 + \sigma_{x_3}) \), the second term is \( y_2 = y(\bar{x}_1 + \sigma_{x_1}, \bar{x}_2 + \sigma_{x_2}, \bar{x}_3 - \sigma_{x_3}) \), the third term is \( y_3 = y(\bar{x}_1 + \sigma_{x_1}, \bar{x}_2 - \sigma_{x_2}, \bar{x}_3 + \sigma_{x_3}) \), and so on.
As an example, consider a slope of a height \( h = 20 \text{ ft.} \) and angle \( \beta = 45^\circ \) (Figure 3). The material strength parameter \( t(=\tan \phi) \) is assumed to have a mean value \( \bar{t} = 0.58 \) \((= 30^\circ)\) and a coefficient of variation \( V_t = 15\% \). In Table 2 are listed the mean values \( \bar{x}_i \), standard deviations \( \sigma_i \) and the points of evaluation \( \bar{x}_i \pm \sigma_i \) of the random variables \( x_i \), \( i = 1, 2, 3 \). The center of the failure surface that corresponds to \( (\bar{x}_1 + \sigma_{x_1}, \bar{x}_2 + \sigma_{x_2}) \) is shown in Figure 3 as point \( 0_{++} \). Similarly, points \( 0_{-+}, 0_{+-} \), and \( 0_{--} \) have coordinates \( (\bar{x}_1 + \sigma_{x_1}, \bar{x}_2 - \sigma_{x_2}), (\bar{x}_1 - \sigma_{x_1}, \bar{x}_2 + \sigma_{x_2}), (\bar{x}_1 - \sigma_{x_1}, \bar{x}_2 - \sigma_{x_2}) \), respectively. Two failure surfaces correspond to each center depending on the value of the strength parameter \( x_3 \): one, for \( x_3 = \bar{x}_3 + \sigma_{x_3} \) and, another, for \( x_3 = \bar{x}_3 - \sigma_{x_3} \). The mean failure surface (with its angle at 0), obtained using Equation (1-8), is shown in Figure 3.

If, on the other hand, in determining \( \bar{y} \) the variations of \( x_1 \), \( x_2 \) and \( x_3 \) were neglected while their point estimates were taken to be equal to their mean values, the corresponding expression for \( \bar{y} \) would be

\[
\bar{y} = y(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2, \bar{x}_3) \quad (1-8a)
\]

Thus, for the case of the slope examined in the above example, \( \bar{y} \) would be reduced to

\[
\bar{y} = y(30, 15, 0.58) = 31.06 \exp(-0.58)\]

This expression for \( \bar{y} \) is also shown in Figure 3 from which it can be seen that \( \bar{y} \) lies very close to the mean failure surface obtained using Equation (1-8).
\[ y = 31.06 \exp(-0.588) \]

FIGURE 3. MEAN FAILURE SURFACE FOR ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLE
TABLE 2. STATISTICAL VALUES AND POINTS OF EVALUATION
OF THE THREE RANDOM VARIABLES $h_o$, $\theta_o$ and $t$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Random Variable $x_i$</th>
<th>Mean Value $\bar{x}_i$</th>
<th>Standard Deviation $\sigma_{x_i}$</th>
<th>Points $\bar{x}<em>i + \sigma</em>{x_i}$</th>
<th>Points $\bar{x}<em>i - \sigma</em>{x_i}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$x_1$ ($=h_o$) (ft)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>40.50</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_2$ ($=\theta_o$) (degrees)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>20.25</td>
<td>9.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_3$ ($=t$)</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.667</td>
<td>0.493</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.4 Resisting and Driving Forces Along Failure Surfaces

The static forces acting on a differential element along the failure surface are shown in Figure 4. The weight $dW$ of a slice of width $dx$ is equal to

$$dW = \gamma_m (z-w) \, dx + \gamma_s \, w \, dx$$

(1-9)

where

- $\gamma_m$ = the total unit weight of the soil above the water table,
- $\gamma_s$ = the saturated unit weight,
- $z$ = the distance from the failure surface to the slope boundary, and
- $w$ = the distance from the failure surface to the water table.

The location of the water table is defined by the dimensionless parameter $r_u$ expressed as [9]

$$r_u = \frac{u}{\gamma_m (z-w) + \gamma_s \, w}$$

(1-10)

where $u$ is the pore water pressure at the failure surface (assumed hydrostatic), and $z$, $w$, $\gamma_s$ and $\gamma_m$ are defined in Equation (1-9). The distance $w$ from the failure surface to the water table is found from Equation (1-10) as

$$w = \frac{u}{\gamma_w} = r_u \frac{\gamma_m}{\gamma_w + r_u \left( \gamma_m - \gamma_s \right)} \, z$$

where $\gamma_w$ is the unit weight of the water.
FIGURE 4. FORCES ON A DIFFERENTIAL ELEMENT ALONG THE FAILURE SURFACE
The normal and tangential (to the failure surface) components of the weight \( dW \) are denoted by \( dN \) and \( dT \), respectively, and are equal to

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{dN}{w} &= dW \cos \delta \\
\frac{dT}{w} &= dW \sin \delta
\end{align*}
\]

where \( \delta \) (Figure 4) is the slope of the failure surface.

In the present study, the additional load on the slope due to an earthquake will be introduced in terms of the maximum value of the acceleration \( a \) at the site of the slope. Furthermore, it will be assumed that the magnitude of the vertical component (with an upward direction) of the maximum acceleration is equal to two-thirds of that of the horizontal component (with a direction away from the slope)\(^{[43]} \); and that both act on the slope mass simultaneously. Thus, the angle \( \alpha \) between the maximum acceleration \( a \) and the horizontal direction is equal to \( 33.7^\circ \) (\( \alpha = 33.7^\circ \)).

Because of the uncertainties involved in determining the maximum acceleration, the latter will be considered as a random variable the statistical characteristics of which will be examined in detail in Section 2 of this report.

The components of the earthquake loading along the normal and tangential direction of the failure surface are equal to

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{dN_{eq}}{w} &= dW \cdot a \cdot \sin[-(\alpha + \delta)] \\
\frac{dT_{eq}}{w} &= dW \cdot a \cdot \cos(\alpha + \delta)
\end{align*}
\]

(1-12)
By combining Equations (1-11) and (1-12), the values are found of the total normal ($dN$) and tangential ($dT$) forces acting on the differential segment of the failure surface; i.e.,

$$dN = dN_w + dN_{eq}$$  \hspace{1cm} (1-13)

$$dT = dT_w + dT_{eq}$$

If the resisting and driving forces along $dL$ (Figure 4) are denoted by $dR$ and $dS$, respectively, one has

$$dS = dT$$  \hspace{1cm} (1-14)

$$dR = dN \cdot t + c \cdot dL$$

where $c$ and $t$ are the two strength parameters of the soil material.

The failure surface given by Equation (1-5), may be expressed in Cartesian coordinates as follows:

$$x = x(\theta) = r_0 \sin \theta_o + r_0 \exp(-\theta t) \sin(\theta - \theta_o)$$

$$y = y(\theta) = r_0 \cos \theta_o - r_0 \exp(-\theta t) \cos(\theta - \theta_o)$$

The length $dL$ of a differential element along the failure surface is equal to

$$dL = \left\{\left[x'(\theta)\right]^2 + \left[y'(\theta)\right]^2\right\}^{1/2} d\theta$$  \hspace{1cm} (1-15)

where $x'(\theta)$ and $y'(\theta)$ are the derivatives of $x(\theta)$ and $y(\theta)$ with respect to $\theta$; i.e.,

$$x'(\theta) = r_0 \exp(-\theta t) \left[\cos(\theta - \theta_o) - tsin(\theta - \theta_o)\right]$$  \hspace{1cm} (1-16)

$$y'(\theta) = r_0 \exp(-\theta t) \left[+ \sin(\theta - \theta_o) + t \cos(\theta - \theta_o)\right]$$
Equations (1-15) and (1-16) are combined to yield

\[ dL = dL(h_o, \theta_o, t) = r_o \exp(-8t)(1 + t^2)^{1/2} \, d\theta \]

(1-17)

Consequently, the total length \( L \) of the failure surface is equal to

\[ L = \int_0^\theta_H dL = \int_0^\theta_H r(1 + t^2)^{1/2} \, d\theta \]

(1-18)

where \( r \) is given by Equation (1-4), and \( \theta_H \) is the upper limit of angle \( \theta \) (Figure 1) and corresponds to the terminal point of the failure surface along the slope boundary. After the integration indicated by Equation (1-18) is performed, it is found that

\[ L = \frac{h_o}{\cos \theta_o} (1 + \frac{1}{t^2})^{1/2} \left[ \exp(-\theta_H t) + 1 \right] \]

(1-19)

The total resisting and driving forces, \( R \) and \( S \), respectively, can be found through an integration of Equations (1-14); i.e.,

\[ R = \int_0^L dR \]

(1-20)

\[ S = \int_0^L dS \]

The developments presented above were concerned with failure surfaces originating at the toe of the slope. It is possible, however, that a discontinuity (e.g., a relic slip surface) already existed in the interior of the soil mass. Since its length \( L_d \) can be of any size between 0 and \( L \), the probability density function of \( L_d \) can be assumed uniform in the interval \((0, L)\), where \( L \) is given by Equation (1-19). Along \( L_d \) the c-parameter of strength is zero while \( t \) is assumed constant and equal to its mean...
value \bar{t}. The option to account in this manner for a possible initial discontinuity is available in the computer program RASSUEL (see Section 1.6)[5].

The integration of Equations (1-14) requires consideration of the relative position along the failure surface of three characteristic points. These are shown in Figure 5 (as points I, C and S). There are six possible arrangements of the three points (Figure 6), if a failure surface terminates at the boundary behind the crest of the slope; and two arrangements, if the surface ends on the slope (i.e., in this case, there is no point C).
Point A: Initial point of failure surface.
Point I: Lowest point of failure surface.
Point C: Point of intersection between failure surface and the vertical through point B.
Point S: End-point of initial discontinuity (if considered).
Point H: End-point of failure surface.

FIGURE 5. SLOPE GEOMETRY WITH CHARACTERISTIC POINTS ALONG THE FAILURE SURFACE.
FIGURE 6. THE SIX POSSIBLE ARRANGEMENTS OF POINTS I, C AND S ALONG THE FAILURE SURFACE
1.5 Variability of Soil Strength Parameters

The uncertainty in the numerical values of soil strength may be attributed to the following three reasons:

(a) The limited information about actual subsurface conditions,
(b) Measurement or "engineering" errors, and
(c) The inherent variability of soil itself.

The last is by far the most important cause of uncertainty. On the basis of results obtained from a large number of tests on natural soils, it was found [25] that the inherent variability of soil was so great that the effects of test imprecision may be overwhelmed. Research studies have been recently undertaken with an objective to quantify this uncertainty and describe the spatial variation of soil strength and strength parameters [2,24,45].

To account for the variation in the numerical values of soil strength parameters, geotechnical engineers have considered them to be random variables and have proposed probabilistic models for their description. Thus, Lumb [27] found that the two strength parameters (c and t) followed a normal distribution. This conclusion was drawn from his study on a large amount of test data from soils of the area of Hong Kong (namely, a soft marine clay, a residual silty sand, an alluvial sandy clay and a residual clayey silt). Additional studies of frequency distributions of soil properties [i.e.,37,40,etc.] came to support Lumb's conclusion that strength parameters are normal-like variates.
In a more recent work, however, Lumb [26] found that the c-parameter of strength followed more closely a beta rather than a normal distribution, and that only its central portion could be approximated as a normal variate. The use of the beta distribution for modelling soil strength parameters was also suggested by Harr [20] who, recognizing the versatility of the beta model, recommended its use to obtain approximations for many geotechnical data sets whose measures must be positive and of a limited range (in contrast to normal variates that receive values between $-\infty$ and $\infty$).

In compliance with the above findings, the present study assumes that strength parameters $c$ and $t (=\tan\phi)$ are random variables following the beta (or, Pearson's type I) distribution, given by Equation (1-6).
1.6 Probability of Failure

In Section 1.4, the resisting and driving forces along a potential failure surface of a soil slope have been expressed as integrals of functions containing a number of random variables (Equations 1-20). As it was stated in the Introduction, use of a numerical scheme is necessary in order to determine the probability of failure $p_f$ of a structure if its load and resistance are not simple analytical functions (such as those appearing in Table 1). In this study, the numerical values of $p_f$ are determined through a Monte Carlo [19,36] simulation of failure. A flow chart indicating the operations that led to the probability of failure is given in Figure 7.

The Monte Carlo simulation of failure involves (a) the generation of failure surfaces by selecting values of three random variables: two geometric parameters ($h_o$ and $\theta_o$) and strength parameter $t (=\tan\phi)$, and (b) the calculation of the total resistance $R$ and driving force $S$ (acting along the generate failure surface) by selecting values from two additional random variables: strength parameter $c$ and slope's maximum horizontal acceleration $a_{\text{max}}$. If this procedure is repeated $N$ times and the event "failure" (i.e., $R < S$) occurs $M$ times, then the probability of failure $p_f$ is close to the relative frequency $M/N$, provided that $N$ is large enough [32]; i.e.,

$$p_f = \frac{M}{N}$$
INPUT

I. Expressions of resistance $R$ and loading $S$ in terms of the random variables.

II. Probability density functions of the following random variables:
   (a) maximum ground acceleration ($a_{\text{max}}$)
   (b) strength parameters ($c$ and $t$)
   (c) geometric parameters ($h_0$, $\theta_0$)

Select a random variable from each of the distributions

Calculate the values of the driving force $S$ and resistance $R$ letting the random variables take the values found above

Repeat $N$ times

Check $R < S$

Yes $M$ times

No $N-M$ times

OUTPUT

Probability of Failure

$P_f = \frac{M}{N}$

FIGURE 7: FLOW CHART OF THE OPERATIONS INVOLVED IN DETERMINING THE PROBABILITY OF FAILURE
The present probabilistic seismic stability analysis has been incorporated into a computer program called RASSUEL. A description of the program and its capabilities together with guidelines for its use is given in a separate report [5]. The flow chart for program RASSUEL is shown in Figure 8.
START

READ DATA AND OPTIONS

PRINT DATA AND OPTIONS SPECIFIED

GENERATE TABLES OF CUMULATIVE DISTRIBUTIONS FOR HO, THETA, PHI, AND C

GRAPHICS?

YES

DRAW SLOPE GEOMETRY

NO

K=1, M=0

SELECT VALUES FOR: ACC, PHI, THETA, HO, C FROM CUMULATIVE DISTRIBUTIONS

CHECK FAILURE SURFACE TERMINATION POINT

ON SLOPE

STABILITY ANALYSIS FOR SLOPE FAILURE. FIND R AND S

CALCULATE SM=S-S

IF SM < 0, M=M+1

PRINT K, HO, THETA, PHI, C, ACC, L, SM, SF

GRAPHICS?

YES

DRAW A SAMPLE OF FAILURE SURFACES

NO

NO

K=N?

YES

COMPUTE PF=M/N

CALCULATE MEAN VALUE AND COEFFICIENT OF VARIATION FOR SM, SF, AND L

SORTING?

YES

SORT SM, SF, AND L

NO

PRINT RESULTS

STOP

FIGURE 8. FLOW CHART FOR PROGRAM 'RASSUEL'
2. STATISTICAL DESCRIPTION OF SEISMIC PARAMETERS

2.1 Introduction

From an engineering point of view, one is interested in one or more parameters that reflect ground motion characteristics rather than in the details of an earthquake record. Examples of such parameters are the maximum value of the ground acceleration, velocity or displacement, the spectral ordinates, the duration of the earthquake, etc. In the model presented in the previous section, the effect of an earthquake on the stability of soil slopes was introduced through the maximum value of the horizontal acceleration \(a_{\text{max}}\) experienced at the site of the slope.

There are many factors which affect the numerical values of \(a_{\text{max}}\) and they may be divided into three categories [22]; namely, (a) source factors (e.g., location and dimension of source, stress conditions at the source, radiation pattern, etc.), (b) travel path (e.g., geometric spreading of waves, energy absorption, inhomogeneities of medium, etc.), and (c) local conditions (e.g., subsurface conditions, topographic variations, etc.). Although considerable research effort is underway aiming at an improved description of each significant factor, the available information is utilized in the current state-of-the-art through a limited number of representative parameters from each category. Thus, the earthquake magnitude is employed to represent the source factors, the distance between source and site of interest reflects the travel path and local conditions are accounted through a number of regional parameters. In addition, the maximum acceleration of the slope mass is assumed to be identical to that of the ground (rigid body assumption).
Many relationships have been proposed over the years to provide the maximum horizontal ground acceleration \((a_{\text{max}})\) as a function of the earthquake magnitude \((m)\), the distance \((R)\) between source and site, and the regional parameters. Idriss [22], in his presentation of the state-of-the-art of ground motions, made reference to thirty-two such relationships that cover the period between 1956 and 1978. Predicted values of \(a_{\text{max}}\) are different for different relationships; and this disagreement in the results is often quite large, especially for sites close to the earthquake source.

In view of the inherent uncertainties in available attenuation relationships, any prediction for the maximum ground acceleration must be based on a statistical formulation of the problem. Thus, in the present study, \(a_{\text{max}}\) will be considered as a random variable and its frequency and cumulative distributions will be derived. The dependence of the latter on regional and other parameters will be also investigated. Finally, as one of the objectives of this study is to provide a stability analysis for soil slopes located in the seismic environment of the State of New York, regional parameters will receive values pertinent to this part of the country.
2.2 Earthquake Magnitude

The empirical formula most commonly employed to yield the number of earthquakes $n_m$ exceeding a certain magnitude $m$ is Richter's log-linear relationship [16] expressed in the form

$$\log n_m = a - bm$$  \hspace{1cm} (2-1)

where $a$ and $b$ are regional constants.

The natural logarithm of $n_m$ can be obtained from Equation (2-1) as

$$\ln n_m = (\ln 10) \log_{10} n_m = (\ln 10)(a - bm)$$

from which one has than $n_m$ is equal to

$$n_m = \exp[(\ln 10)(a - bm)] = \exp(a \cdot \ln 10) \exp(-bm \cdot \ln 10)$$

or,

$$n_m = 10^a \exp(-\beta m)$$  \hspace{1cm} (2-2)

where $\beta = b \ln 10$.

For Equation (2-2) to gain engineering significance, lower and upper limits for magnitude $m$ have to be imposed. Thus, if $m_0$ and $m_1$ denote the lower and upper limits of $m$, respectively, Equation (2-2) becomes

$$\log n_m = a - b(m - m_0), \hspace{1cm} m_0 \leq m \leq m_1$$  \hspace{1cm} (2-3)
From Equation (2-2), one has that the expected number of earthquakes \( n_{m_0} \) with magnitude greater than the assumed lower bound \( m_0 \) is equal to

\[
n_{m_0} = 10^a \exp(-\beta m_0)
\]  

(2-4)

The ratio of \( n_m \) over \( n_{m_0} \) signifies the probability with which the earthquake magnitude \( M \) is greater than \( m \) \cite{42}; i.e.,

\[
P[M > m] = \frac{n_m}{n_{m_0}} = \frac{10^a \exp(-\beta m)}{10^a \exp(-\beta m_0)} = \exp[-\beta(m-m_0)], \quad m_0 < m.
\]  

(2-5)

The cumulative density function \( F(m) \) of the earthquake magnitude \( m \) is equal to

\[
F(m) = P[M \leq m] = 1 - P[M > m]
\]

Introducing Equation (2-5) into the above expression, it is found that

\[
F(m) = 1 - \exp[-\beta(m-m_0)]
\]  

(2-6)

A normalizing factor is required so that \( F(m) \) becomes unity when \( m \) receives its maximum value \( m_1 \). If this factor is denoted by \( k \), from Equation (2-6) one has

\[
F(m_1) = k[1 - \exp[-\beta(m_1-m_0)]] = 1
\]

or,

\[
k = \left(1 - \exp[-\beta(m_1-m_0)]\right)^{-1}
\]  

(2-7)

Thus, \( F(m) \) may be written as
\[ F(m) = \begin{cases} 0 & m < m_0 \\ k \{1 - \exp[-\beta(m-m_0)]\} & m_0 \leq m \leq m_1 \\ 1 & m_1 < m \end{cases} \]  

(2-8)

where \( k \) is given in Equation (2-7).

The probability density function \( f(m) \) of the magnitude \( m \) can be found by forming the derivative of Equation (2-8) with respect to \( m \). Thus, one has

\[ f(m) = \begin{cases} 0 & m < m_0 \\ \beta k \exp[-\beta(m-m_0)] & m_0 \leq m \leq m_1 \\ 0 & m_1 < m \end{cases} \]  

(2-9)

where \( k \) is given in Equation (2-7).

In the case of New York State, the lower and upper limits of the magnitude \( m \) have been found \([31]\) to be equal to 2.0 and 6.3, respectively. For the Northeastern United States, the values of the \( \beta \) parameter varies between 1.35 and 1.54 \([31]\). In Table 3 are given the values of the \( \beta \) parameter for various seismic regions of the United States, while the world-wide range of values for \( \beta \) is between 1.61 and 2.88 \([46]\).

The mean value and variance of the earthquake magnitude \( m \) are given by the following expressions:

\[ \bar{m} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} m f(m) \, dm \]  

(2-10)

\[ \text{Var}(m) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (m - \bar{m})^2 f(m) \, dm \]

where \( f(m) \) is the probability density function of \( m \), given by Equation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEISMIC REGION</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southern New England</td>
<td>2.19(+0.12)</td>
<td>1800-1959; 135 events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Mississippi River Valley</td>
<td>2.00(+0.25)</td>
<td>1833-1972; 250,000 km$^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North and Central America</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>1963-1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern California</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1934-1963; 10,126 events 296,000 km$^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Substituting the latter into Equations (2-10) and performing the indicated integrations, it is found that

\[
\bar{m} = k\left[ m_0 + \frac{1}{\beta} \left( m_1 + \frac{1}{\beta} \right) \exp[-\beta(m_1-m_0)] \right]
\]

Var(m) = \frac{\bar{m}}{\beta} \left\{ \frac{2\bar{m} m_0^2}{\beta} + \frac{2m_0^2}{\beta} \right\}

In Figures 9 and 10 are shown the probability density function and cumulative distribution of m, respectively, for a value of the \( \beta \)-parameter equal to 1.35, 1.5, and 2.5.

In Appendix A are given the expressions for the probability density function and cumulative distribution of the earthquake magnitude for the case of a log-quadratic frequency-magnitude relationship. Such a relationship appears to best represent available seismic data for New York State and it is studied in detail in the third report of this series, RPI Report No. CE-78-7.
$f(m) = \frac{\beta \exp[-\beta (m-m_0)]}{1-\exp[-\beta (m_1-m_0)]}$

Range ofMagnitude:
Lower Limit: $m_0 = 2.0$
Upper Limit: $m_1 = 6.3$

$\beta = 1.5$
$\beta = 1.35$

FIGURE 9. PROBABILITY DENSITY FUNCTION OF EARTHQUAKE MAGNITUDE
FIGURE 10. CUMULATIVE DISTRIBUTION OF EARTHQUAKE MAGNITUDE

Range of Magnitude:
Lower Limit: $m_o = 2.0$
Upper Limit: $m_1 = 6.3$

$F(m) = \frac{1 - \exp[-\beta(m - m_o)]}{1 - \exp[-\beta(m_1 - m_o)]}$
2.3 Maximum Horizontal Ground Acceleration

The most frequently used attenuation relationships are expressed in the following form [16]:

\[ a_{\text{max}} = b_1 e^{b_2 m} (R + b_4)^{b_3} \]  \hspace{1cm} (2-12)

where \( a_{\text{max}} \) is the maximum acceleration (in cm/sec), \( m \) is the earthquake magnitude, \( R \) is the distance between source and site (in km) and \( b_1, b_2, b_3 \) and \( b_4 \) are regional parameters. Values that have been proposed for these parameters are listed in Table 4.

Comparisons made between observed and computed values of ground motion parameters have indicated that their ratio follows closely a log-normally* distributed random variable. Denoting the latter by \( \varepsilon \) and introducing it into Equation (2-12), one has

\[ a_{\text{max}} = b_1 e^{b_2 m} (R + b_4)^{b_3} \varepsilon \]  \hspace{1cm} (2-13)

The logarithm of \( \varepsilon \) has been found to have a mean value equal to zero \((\ln \varepsilon = 0)\) and a standard deviation \((\sigma_{\ln \varepsilon})\) between 0.5 and 1.0 [29,31].

In general, three types of earthquake sources can be distinguished, namely, (a) a point source, (b) a line (or, fault) source, and (c) an area source. These are shown schematically in Figure 11.

A point source represents the fundamental case in seismic risk analysis. A line source is used for the seismic description of a region where a fault has been clearly identified. When this is not the case, \*A variable is log-normally distributed, if its natural logarithm is normally distributed.
### TABLE 4. VALUES OF THE COEFFICIENTS OF THE ATTENUATION RELATIONSHIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COEFFICIENT</th>
<th>(b_1)</th>
<th>(b_2)</th>
<th>(b_3)</th>
<th>(b_4)</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1260</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>31,42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1350</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>31,42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1100</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>31,42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1230</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1,183</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>16,31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Values suggested for the Northeast United States*
FIGURE 11. SCHEMATIC REPRESENTATION OF THE THREE POSSIBLE EARTHQUAKE SOURCES
or when the data and other information available are very limited, a description of the earthquake source as an area source may be considered. In the case where the source is located at a distance from the site greater than two times the focal depth $h$, the shape of the source is not important [15]. Thus, the shape for the area source is assumed to be circular with its center on the site, and earthquake occurrences are taken as uniformly distributed over this area. As a result, any earthquake that may occur outside the defined circular area is considered to have a negligible effect on the slope.

In Appendix B are given the analytical expressions of the probability distributions of the maximum acceleration for the three types (i.e., point, line and area) of earthquake source.
2.4 Probability Distribution of the Maximum Horizontal Ground Acceleration (Point Source)

From Equation (2-10), one has that \( a_{\text{max}} = a_{\text{max}}(m) \) is a monotonic function of magnitude \( m \), the probability density function of which is given by Equation (2-9). Using the concept of transformation of variables [20], the distribution of \( a_{\text{max}} \) can be obtained as

\[
f(a_{\text{max}}) = \frac{f_{m}(m)}{|\frac{da_{\text{max}}}{dm}|} \tag{2-14}
\]

where \( a_{\text{max}} \) substituted for \( m \) in \( f_{m}(m) \), and \( |\frac{da_{\text{max}}}{dm}| \) is the absolute value of the derivative of \( a_{\text{max}} \) with respect to \( m \). The latter is found from Equation (2-12) to be equal to

\[
|\frac{da_{\text{max}}}{dm}| = b_{1}b_{2}^{m}(R+b_{4})^{b_{3}} = b_{2}a_{\text{max}} \tag{2-15}
\]

Combining Equations (2-9), (2-14) and (2-15), it is found that

\[
f(a_{\text{max}}) = \frac{k}{b_{2}} \cdot \frac{1}{a_{\text{max}}} \exp[-\beta(m-m_{0})] \]

Solving Equation (2-12) for \( m \) and substituting into the above expression, one has that the probability density function of the maximum horizontal ground acceleration is equal to

\[
f(a_{\text{max}}) = \frac{k}{b_{2}} \cdot \frac{1}{a_{\text{max}}} \exp[-\beta(\frac{1}{b_{2}} \ln \frac{a_{\text{max}}}{b_{1}(R+b_{4})^{b_{3}} - m_{0}})] \tag{2-16}
\]
The range of variation of $a_{\text{max}}$ can be found by introducing the lower and upper limits of magnitude $m$ into Equation (2-12). Thus,

$$b_1 e^{-(R+b_4)} \leq a_{\text{max}} \leq b_1 e^{-(R+b_4)}$$  \hspace{1cm} (2-17)

The two attenuation relationships that have been suggested for the Northeastern United States (Table 4) are as follows:

$$a_{\text{max}} = 1100 e^{0.5m(R+25)-1.32} \quad \text{(Case 1)}$$  \hspace{1cm} (2-18)

$$a_{\text{max}} = 1.183 e^{1.15m_R-1.0} \quad \text{(Case 2)}$$  \hspace{1cm} (2-19)

where $m$ is a random variable the frequency distribution of which is given by Equation (2-9).

In Figures 12 and 13 are shown the frequency and cumulative distributions of $a_{\text{max}}$ found using Equation (2-18) (Case 1) and in Figures 14 and 15 are shown the same quantities that correspond to Equation (2-19) (Case 2).

When the error term $\varepsilon$ is considered, the expressions of the attenuation relationships given by Equations (2-18) and (2-19), become

$$a_{\text{max}} = 1100 e^{0.5m(R+25)-1.32 \varepsilon} \quad \text{(Case 1)}$$  \hspace{1cm} (2-20)

$$a_{\text{max}} = 1.183 e^{1.15m_R-1.0 \varepsilon} \quad \text{(Case 2)}$$  \hspace{1cm} (2-21)

where $\varepsilon$ is log-normally distributed with median and standard deviation equal to 1.0 and 0.5, respectively.
Attenuation Relationship:

$$a_{\text{max}} = 1100 e^{0.5m(R+25)-1.32}$$

Range of Magnitude:

- Lower Limit: $$m_0 = 2.0$$
- Upper Limit: $$m_1 = 6.3$$

$\beta$-parameter: $$\beta = 1.5$$

Distance between Source and Site:

1. $$R = 100 \text{ km}$$
2. $$R = 25 \text{ km}$$
3. $$R = 10 \text{ km}$$
4. $$R = 1 \text{ km}$$

FIGURE 12. FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF MAXIMUM GROUND ACCELERATION (CASE 1)
Attenuation Relationship:

\[ a_{\text{max}} = 1100 e^{0.5m(R+25)} - 1.32 \]

Range of Magnitude:
- Lower Limit: \( m_o = 2.0 \)
- Upper Limit: \( m_1 = 6.3 \)

\( \beta \)-parameter: \( \beta = 1.5 \)

Distance between Source and Site:
- (1) \( R = 100 \) km
- (2) \( R = 25 \) km
- (3) \( R = 10 \) km
- (4) \( R = 1 \) km

FIGURE 13. CUMULATIVE DISTRIBUTION OF MAXIMUM GROUND ACCELERATION (CASE 1)
Attenuation Relationship:

\[ a_{\text{max}} = 1.183 e^{1.15m_R - 1.0} \]

Range of Magnitude:

- Lower Limit: \( m_0 = 2.0 \)
- Upper Limit: \( m_1 = 6.3 \)

\( \beta \)-parameter: \( \beta = 1.5 \)

Distance between Source and Site:

1. \( R = 100 \) km
2. \( R = 25 \) km
3. \( R = 10 \) km
4. \( R = 1 \) km

**FIGURE 14. FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF MAXIMUM GROUND ACCELERATION (CASE 2)**
Attenuation Relationship:

\[ a_{\text{max}} = 1.183 \times 1.15^{m - 1.0} \]

Range of Magnitude:

Lower Limit: \( m_0 = 2.0 \)
Upper Limit: \( m_1 = 6.3 \)

\( \beta \)-parameter: \( \beta = 1.5 \)

Distance between Source and Site:

(1) \( R = 100 \text{ km} \)
(2) \( R = 25 \text{ km} \)
(3) \( R = 10 \text{ km} \)
(4) \( R = 1 \text{ km} \)

Figure 15. Cumulative Distribution of Maximum Ground Acceleration (Case 2)
In Figures 16 and 17 are shown the frequency and cumulative distribution of $a_{\text{max}}$ that correspond to Equation (2-20) (Case 1) while in Figures 18 and 19 are shown the same quantities that correspond to Equation (2-21) (Case 2).
Attenuation Relationship:

\[ a_{\text{max}} = 1100 e^{0.5m} (R + 25)^{-1.32} \epsilon \]

Range of Magnitude:
- Lower Limit: \( m = 2.0 \)
- Upper Limit: \( m = 6.3 \)

\( \beta \)-parameter: \( \beta = 1.5 \)

Error Term \( \epsilon \):
- \( \epsilon = 1.0 \)
- \( \sigma_\epsilon = 0.5 \)

Distance between Source and Site:
1. \( R = 100 \text{ km} \)
2. \( R = 25 \text{ km} \)
3. \( R = 10 \text{ km} \)
4. \( R = 1 \text{ km} \)

**Figure 16.** Frequency Distribution of Maximum Ground Acceleration (With Error Term - Case 1)
Attenuation Relationship:
\[ a_{\text{max}} = 1100 \cdot e^{0.5m(R+25)^{1.32}} \]

Range of Magnitude:
Lower limit: \( m_0 = 2.0 \)
Upper limit: \( m_1 = 6.3 \)

\( \beta \)-parameter: \( \beta = 1.5 \)

Error Term \( \varepsilon \): median \( \varepsilon = 1.0 \), \( \sigma_\varepsilon = 0.5 \)

Distance between Source and Site:
1. \( R = 100 \) km
2. \( R = 25 \) km
3. \( R = 10 \) km
4. \( R = 1 \) km

MAXIMUM GROUND ACCELERATION

Figure 17. Cumulative Distribution of Maximum Ground Acceleration (with error term - Case 1)
Attenuation Relationship:

\[ a_{\text{max}} = 1.183 e^{1.15m} R^{-1.0} \epsilon \]

Range of Magnitude:
- Lower Limit: \( m_0 = 2.0 \)
- Upper Limit: \( m_1 = 6.3 \)

\( \beta \)-parameter: \( \beta = 1.5 \)

Error Term \( \epsilon \): median \( \epsilon = 1.0 \), \( \sigma_\epsilon = 0.5 \)

Distance between Source and Site:
1. \( R = 100 \text{ km} \)
2. \( R = 25 \text{ km} \)
3. \( R = 10 \text{ km} \)
4. \( R = 1 \text{ km} \)

**Figure 18.** Frequency distribution of maximum ground acceleration (with error term - case 2)
Attenuation Relationship:

\[ a_{\text{max}} = 1.183 e^{1.15m_R - 1.0 \varepsilon} \]

Range of Magnitude:
- Lower Limit: \( m_0 = 2.0 \)
- Upper Limit: \( m_1 = 6.3 \)

\( \beta \)-parameter: \( \beta = 1.5 \)

Error Term \( \varepsilon \): median \( \varepsilon = 1.0 \), \( \sigma_\varepsilon = 0.5 \)

Distance between Source and Site:
- (1) \( R = 100 \text{ km} \)
- (2) \( R = 25 \text{ km} \)
- (3) \( R = 10 \text{ km} \)
- (4) \( R = 1 \text{ km} \)

FIGURE 19. CUMULATIVE DISTRIBUTION OF MAXIMUM GROUND ACCELERATION (WITH ERROR TERM - CASE 2)
2.5 Statistical Values of Maximum Horizontal Ground Acceleration (Point Source)

The exact values of the mean $\bar{a}_{\text{max}}$ and variance $\text{Var}(a_{\text{max}})$ of the maximum horizontal acceleration are equal to

$$
\bar{a}_{\text{max}} = \int a_{\text{max}} f(a_{\text{max}}) \, da_{\text{max}}
$$

$$
\text{Var}(a_{\text{max}}) = \int (a_{\text{max}} - \bar{a}_{\text{max}})^2 f(a_{\text{max}}) \, da_{\text{max}}
$$

(2-22)

where $f(a_{\text{max}})$ is given by Equation (2-16), and the limits of the integrations are given by Equation (2-17).

A convenient and yet accurate way to obtain the statistical values of $a_{\text{max}}$ is to apply the Monte Carlo technique using Equation (2-12). This procedure involves the selection of a large number of values for the random variable $m$ from its cumulative distribution $F(m)$, given by Equation (2-8). These values are then substituted into Equation (2-18) and the corresponding values of $a_{\text{max}}$ are collected and analyzed statistically to obtain $\bar{a}_{\text{max}}$ and $\text{Var}(a_{\text{max}})$.

An estimate of $\bar{a}_{\text{max}}$ and $\text{Var}(a_{\text{max}})$ can also be obtained through a Taylor series expansion of the function $a_{\text{max}}(m)$ around the value $a_{\text{max}}(\bar{m})$, where $\bar{m}$ is the mean value of the magnitude. Thus,

$$
\bar{a}_{\text{max}} = a_{\text{max}}(\bar{m}) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2 a_{\text{max}}}{\partial m^2}(\bar{m}) \text{Var}(m)
$$

(2-23)

$$
\text{Var}(a_{\text{max}}) \approx \left( \frac{\partial a_{\text{max}}}{\partial m} \right)^2 \text{Var}(m)
$$
where \( \bar{a} \) in the derivatives denotes that the latter are evaluated at the mean value \( \bar{m} \) of magnitude \( m \).

After the derivatives of \( a_{\text{max}} \) are obtained from Equation (2-12) and introduced into Equations (2-23), the latter become

\[
\bar{a}_{\text{max}} = \frac{b_1 e^{b_2 \bar{m}}}{b_3} [1 + \frac{1}{2} b_2^2 \text{Var}(m)] \quad (R+b_4)
\]

\[
\text{Var}(a_{\text{max}}) = \frac{b_2 e^{b_2 \bar{m}}}{b_3^2} \frac{1}{(R+b_4)^2} \text{Var}(m)
\]

where the mean value \( \bar{m} \) and the variance \( \text{Var}(m) \) of magnitude \( m \) are given by Equations (2-11).

In Table 5 are listed the mean value \( \bar{a}_{\text{max}} \), standard deviation \( S_{a_{\text{max}}} \), and coefficient of variation \( V_{a_{\text{max}}} \) of the maximum horizontal ground acceleration for a point source and for the two attenuation relationships, given by Equations (2-18) and (2-19), respectively.

In Figures 20 and 21 is shown the expected value of the maximum acceleration as a function of distance \( R \) for the two attenuation relationships. For comparison purposes, in the same figures are shown the results for the case where a more critical range of variation for the magnitude \( m \) is assumed (i.e., \( 4.0 \leq m \leq 8.0 \)).
**TABLE 5. STATISTICAL VALUES OF MAXIMUM HORIZONTAL GROUND ACCELERATION (POINT SOURCE)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTENUATION RELATIONSHIP*</th>
<th>DISTANCE [km]</th>
<th>MONTE CARLO SIMULATION</th>
<th>TAYLOR SERIES EXPANSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$R$</td>
<td>$a_{\text{max}}$ [g]</td>
<td>$\sigma_{a_{\text{max}}}$ [g]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\mu_{a_{\text{max}}}$ [g]</td>
<td>$\sigma_{a_{\text{max}}}$ [g]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CASE 1</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0594</td>
<td>0.0244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0410</td>
<td>0.0176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.0256</td>
<td>0.0110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.0075</td>
<td>0.0031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0.0035</td>
<td>0.0015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CASE 2</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0355</td>
<td>0.0684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0040</td>
<td>0.0077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.0016</td>
<td>0.0031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.0004</td>
<td>0.0007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
<td>0.0004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*CASE 1: $a_{\text{max}} = 1100 e^{0.5m(R+25)^{-1.32}}$

*CASE 2: $a_{\text{max}} = 1.183 e^{1.15m R^{-1.0}}$
Attenuation Relationship:

\[
a_{\text{max}} = 1100 \cdot e^{0.5m (R+25)^{-1.32}}
\]

\(\beta\)-parameter: \(\beta = 1.5\)

Range of Magnitude:

(1) Lower Limit: \(m^0 = 2.0\)
Upper Limit: \(m_1 = 6.3\)

(2) Lower Limit: \(m^0 = 4.0\)
Upper Limit: \(m_1 = 8.0\)
Attenuation Relationship:

\[ a_{\text{max}} = 1.183 e^{1.15m_R} - 1.0 \]

\( \beta \)-parameter: \( \beta = 1.5 \)

Range of Magnitude:

1. Lower Limit: \( m_o = 2.0 \)
   - Upper Limit: \( m_l = 6.3 \)

2. Lower Limit: \( m_o = 4.0 \)
   - Upper Limit: \( m_l = 8.0 \)

FIGURE 21. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN \( \bar{a}_{\text{max}} \) AND DISTANCE R (CASE 2)
The influence of the $\beta$-parameter (see Equation 2-9) on the expected value $\bar{a}_{\text{max}}$ of the maximum ground horizontal ground acceleration is shown in Figures 22 and 23. Figure 22 corresponds to Equation (2-18) while Figure 23 to Equation (2-19).
Attenuation Relationship:

\[
a_{\text{max}} = 1100 e^{-0.50(R+25) - 1.32}
\]

Range of Magnitude:
Lower Limit: \( m_{\text{b}} = 2.0 \)
Upper Limit: \( m_{\text{I}} = 6.3 \)

\( \beta \)-parameter:
(1) \( \beta = 1.35 \)
(2) \( \beta = 1.5 \)
(3) \( \beta = 2.5 \)

**FIGURE 22. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN \( a_{\text{max}} \) AND DISTANCE R FOR VARIOUS VALUES OF \( \beta \)-PARAMETER (CASE 1)**
Attenuation Relationship:

\[ a_{\text{max}} = 1.183 e^{1.15m} R^{-1.0} \]

Range of Magnitude:

Lower Limit: \( m_0 = 2.0 \)
Upper Limit: \( m_1 = 6.3 \)

\( \beta \)-parameter:

1. \( \beta = 1.35 \)
2. \( \beta = 1.5 \)
3. \( \beta = 2.5 \)

Figure 23. Relationship between \( a_{\text{max}} \) and distance \( R \) for various values of \( \beta \)-parameter (Case 2)
3. DISCUSSION

In a conventional seismic or static stability analysis, the safety of a soil slope is measured by means of a factor of safety $FS$. Material and seismic parameters entering the expression for $FS$ are conventionally treated as single-valued quantities. However, soil properties (e.g., $c$ and $\phi$) and ground motion parameters (i.e., $a_{max}$) are generally random variables, the variability of which lend themselves to a probabilistic formulation of the stability problem. A pseudo-static, probabilistic model, as employed in the present work, is capable of accounting for (a) the variability in the numerical values of the material strength parameters, (b) the uncertainty in the location of the failure surface inside the soil slope, and (c) the uncertainty in the exact value of the seismic load.

The soil material comprising the slope was assumed to be statistically homogeneous with strength parameters $c$ and $t (=\tan\phi)$ along potential failure surfaces being identically distributed random variables with given mean values $(\bar{c}, \bar{t})$ and coefficients of variation $(V_c, V_t)$. Following results found by previous investigators, the probability distributions of $c$ and $t$ were assumed to follow the beta (or, Pearson's type I) model.

Potential failure surfaces were taken to be of a log-spiral type and were defined with the aid of three random variables: strength parameter $t$ and two geometric parameters $h_o$ and $\theta_o$. The statistical
values and bounds of $h_o$ and $\theta_o$ were determined empirically, taking advantage of previous experience with log-spiral types of surfaces. Thus, generated failure surfaces were within a realistic range (Figure 2). In Section 1.3, a procedure was presented for an approximate determination of the most probable (mean) failure surface. For the slope considered in the illustrative example (Figure 3), it was found that, by neglecting the variances of the three random variables $(h_o, \theta_o, t)$, the corresponding failure surface (see Equation 1-8a) lay very close to the mean surface.

The safety of the slope was measured in this study in terms of its probability of failure $p_f$, the numerical values of which were obtained through a Monte Carlo simulation of failure. In Figure 7 was given the flow-chart of the operations followed during the simulation. After values of the random variables were selected from their distributions, the resisting ($R$) and driving ($S$) forces were calculated and compared. Thus, failure corresponded to the case wherein $R$ was exceeded by $S$ ($R < S$). This procedure was repeated a large number of times and the probability of failure $p_f$ was obtained as the ratio of the number of counted failures $M$ over the total number of repetitions $N (p_f = M/N)$. Implied in this method was a frequency interpretation of the probability ($p_f$) of a random event ("failure") in a specified random experiment (generation of a failure surface and comparison of the resulting values of $R$ and $S$).

In his discussion on the precision of the frequency interpretation of probability, Papoulis [32, p. 4] stated: "This interpretation is obviously imprecise; however, it cannot be essentially improved ... probability, like any physical theory is related to physical phenomena only in inexact terms. Nevertheless, the theory is an exact discipline
developed logically from clearly defined axioms, and when it is applied to real problems, it works". Furthermore, as in the developed procedure the selection of failure surfaces was limited to those passing through the toe, the resulting value of the probability of failure may be considered as an upper bound.

It should be noted that this study did not attempt a "system" approach to the reliability of slopes. Such an approach, in which the slope is considered as a series system with infinite components (potential failure surfaces), has been pursued in the past by Catalan and Cornell [11] who provided an approximate formulation of slope stability by transforming the slope reliability problem into a level-crossing one. The authors remarked that "the conceptualization of a slope as a series system with infinitely many distinct, but correlated modes was not found to be the most fruitful approach".

In the present analysis, the resistance R developed along a potential failure surface was assumed to be constant during the earthquake loading. This is a reasonable assumption for a wide variety of soils, particularly cohesive ones [3]. The proposed approach is not directly applicable to the analysis of soil slopes when the material’s strength decreases during the cyclic loading. This could be, for example, the case of liquefaction of saturated sands or sensitive clays [3]. The applicability and limitation of the above assumption has been also recognized by other researchers of the subject: "Because
of these difficulties, it is not at the present time possible to make an accurate determination of the behavior of soils (cohesionless soils and sensitive clays) which are susceptible to liquefaction-like phenomena ... Fortunately, not all soils are susceptible to such phenomena. For many soils, the resistance to shear is largely unaffected by repeated cycles of loading" [48].

The seismic load was introduced into the present analysis through the maximum acceleration experienced by the slope mass during an earthquake. The maximum horizontal acceleration of the slope was taken to be identical to that of the ground (rigid body assumption). Furthermore, it was assumed that the magnitude of the vertical component (with an upward direction) of the maximum acceleration was equal to two-thirds of that of the horizontal component (with a direction away from the slope) [43]; and that both components acted on the slope mass simultaneously.

Three types of factors have an affect on ground motion parameters, in general, and maximum ground acceleration, in particular. These are (a) source related factors, (b) travel path related factors, and (c) factors reflecting site conditions. The current state-of-the-art is limited to considering only a few representatives from each type [22]. Thus, in the present study, source factors were accounted through the earthquake magnitude, travel path factors through the distance between source and site, and local factors through a number of regional parameters.
Comparisons between observed and computed values of the maximum horizontal acceleration have indicated that their ratio (the "error term $e$") follows closely a log-normal distribution. When the "error term $e$" was included in the present study, the two attenuation relationships received the expressions given in Equations (2-20)(Case 1) and (2-21)(Case 2). The frequency and cumulative distributions of $a_{\text{max}}$ were obtained for a median and standard deviation of $e$ equal to 1.0 and 0.5, respectively. These are shown in Figures 16 and 17 for Case 1 and in Figures 18 and 19 for Case 2.

Three types of earthquake sources were considered (Figure 11); namely, (a) a point source, (b) a line (or, fault) source, and (c) an area source. A point source (Figure 11a) constitutes the fundamental type of earthquake source. A line source (Figure 11b) is used if a fault has been clearly identified in a certain region, or if a string of earthquakes occurred over a period of time along a well defined line. An area source (Figure 11c) is used when the earthquakes that have occurred at a certain site are almost uniformly distributed over an area, or when there is very limited seismic data and other information [16].

In the case of a point source, the frequency $f(a_{\text{max}})$ and cumulative $F(a_{\text{max}})$ distributions of the maximum horizontal acceleration $a_{\text{max}}$ were derived from the distribution of the magnitude by a transformation of variables (Section 2.4). The expressions for $f(a_{\text{max}})$ and $F(a_{\text{max}})$ for the line and area sources were given in Appendix B. In Appendix B were
also given the expressions for \( f(a_{\text{max}}) \) and \( F(a_{\text{max}}) \) for the case of a log-quadratic frequency-magnitude relationship (for point source).

The statistical values of the maximum horizontal acceleration were found through a Monte Carlo simulation for the two attenuation relationships used, given by Equations (2-18) (Case 1) and (2-19) (Case 2), and for a range of values for the distance \( R \) (point source). The results were listed in Table 5, from which it can be seen that the expected values of \( a_{\text{max}} \) were always higher in Case 1 than in Case 2. The opposite was true for the coefficient of variation \( V_{a_{\text{max}}} \) of \( a_{\text{max}} \). In Table 5 were also listed the estimates for the statistical values of \( a_{\text{max}} \) that were obtained through a Taylor series expansion (see Equations 2-23). From a comparison of the results, it can be seen that the expected values of \( a_{\text{max}} \) for the two cases were very similar while the values of the standard deviations found through the Taylor series expansion were much lower.

In order to examine the importance of the limits \((m_0, m_1)\) of the magnitude \( m \) on the expected value of the maximum horizontal acceleration, the latter was determined for two sets of limiting values of \( m \): one, for \( m_0 = 2.0 \) and \( m_1 = 6.3 \) (pertinent to New York State), and, another, for \( m_0 = 4.0 \) and \( m_1 = 8.0 \). The results are shown in Figures 20 (Case 1) and 21 (Case 2), from which it can be seen that for the more critical range of magnitude, the expected values of \( a_{\text{max}} \) are considerably higher.
The magnitude of an earthquake was considered as a random variable the frequency and cumulative distributions of which were derived in Section 2.2 and were given by Equation (2-7) and (2-8), respectively. These expressions correspond to a log-linear frequency-magnitude relationship. The case of a log-quadratic frequency-magnitude relationship was also examined and the results were presented in Appendix A.

A reasonable range of variation for the earthquake magnitude $m$ in New York State has been found [31] to be between $m_o = 2.0$ and $m_l = 6.3$ ($2.0 \leq m \leq 6.3$). The same range of variation for $m$ was also adopted in the present study. The influence of the $\beta$-parameter (see Equation 2-2) on the frequency $f(m)$ distributions of magnitude $m$ was examined for three values of $\beta$; namely, $\beta = 1.35$, 1.5 and 2.5. The results were shown in Figures 9 and 10, from which one has that $f(m)$ and $F(m)$ are not affected much when $\beta$ varies between 1.35 and 1.50 (a range that corresponds to the Northeastern United States [31]). A value of $\beta = 2.50$, however, resulted to considerable differences in the two distributions.

Two different attenuation relationships that have been proposed for the Northeastern United States were used to obtain the maximum horizontal ground acceleration $a_{\text{max}}$ as a function of the earthquake magnitude, the distance between the source and the site and a number of regional parameters. These were given by Equations (2-18) (Case 1) and (2-19) (Case 2). The frequency and cumulative distributions of $a_{\text{max}}$ that correspond to
each of the two attenuation relationships are shown in Figures 12 and 13 (Case 1) and 14 and 15 (Case 2), respectively.

Finally, the influence of the $\beta$-parameter (see Equation 2-2) on the expected value $\bar{a}_{\text{max}}$ of $a_{\text{max}}$ was also examined and the results were shown in Figures 23 (Case 1) and 24 (Case 2). It can be seen that, for both cases, a smaller value of the $\beta$-parameter resulted to a higher value of $\bar{a}_{\text{max}}$. 
4. SUMMARY

A model was developed to determine the reliability of earth slopes subjected to earthquake loading. The material comprising the slope was assumed to be probabilistically homogeneous with strength parameters being random variables following a beta distribution. Potential failure surfaces were considered to be of an exponential shape (log spiral) and were defined with the aid of three random variables: two geometric and one strength parameters. The seismic load was introduced through the maximum acceleration \(a_{\text{max}}\) experienced by the slope during an earthquake. The statistical characteristics of \(a_{\text{max}}\) were determined by exploring the dependence of the latter on such factors as the earthquake magnitude, the type of earthquake source and the location of the slope. The measure used to assess the reliability of a soil slope was its probability of failure the numerical values of which were determined through a Monte Carlo simulation.
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APPENDIX A: DISTRIBUTION OF EARTHQUAKE MAGNITUDE FOR A LOG-
QUADRATIC FREQUENCY-MAGNITUDE RELATIONSHIP

A general quadratic relationship between the logarithm of the
number of earthquakes $n_m$ exceeding a certain magnitude $m$ and the magnitude
$m$ can be written in the following form:

$$\ln(n_m) = a + bm + cm^2$$  \hspace{1cm} (A-1)

where $a$, $b$, and $c$ are regional parameters.

From Equation (A-1), one has

$$n_m = \exp(a + bm + cm^2).$$  \hspace{1cm} (A-2)

If $m_o$ and $m_l$ denote the lower and upper limit of $m$, respectively,
Equation (A-1) may be written as

$$\ln(n_m) = a + b(m - m_o) + c(m - m_o)^2, \hspace{0.5cm} m_o \leq m \leq m_l$$  \hspace{1cm} (A-3)

From Equation (A-2), one has that the expected number of earth-
quakes ($n_m$) with magnitude greater than the assumed lower bound ($m_o$)
is equal to

$$n_m = \exp(a + bm_o + cm_o^2)$$  \hspace{1cm} (A-4)
The ratio of $n_m$ over $n_{m_o}$ signifies the probability with which the earthquake magnitude is greater than $m$ [42]; i.e.,

$$P[M > m] = \frac{n_m}{n_{m_o}} = \frac{\exp(a+b_m+c_n^2)}{\exp(a+b_m+c_n^2)} = \exp[b(m-m_o)+c(m^2-m_o^2)], m > m_o \ (A-5)$$

The cumulative density function $F(m)$ of the earthquake magnitude $m$ is equal to

$$F(m) = P[M \leq m] = 1 - P[M > m]$$

Introducing Equation (A-5) in the above expression, one has

$$F(m) = 1 - \exp[b(m-m_o)+c(m^2-m_o^2)] \ (A-6)$$

The normalizing factor $k$ can be determined from the condition $F(m_1) = 1$; i.e.,

$$F(m_1) = k\{1 - \exp[b(m_1-m_o)+c(m_1^2-m_o^2)]\} = 1$$

or,

$$k = \left\{1 - \exp[b(m_1-m_o)+c(m_1^2-m_o^2)]\right\}^{-1} \ (A-7)$$

Thus, the cumulative density function for the earthquake magnitude is equal to

$$F(m) = \begin{cases} 
0 & \text{if } m < m_o \\
\frac{k(1 - \exp[b(m-m_o)+c(m^2-m_o^2)])}{1} & \text{if } m_o \leq m \leq m_1 \\
1 & \text{if } m_1 < m 
\end{cases} \ (A-8)$$
where \( k \) is given by Equation (A-7). The probability density function \( f(m) \) can again be formed by taking the derivative of \( F(m) \) with respect to \( m \), i.e.,

\[
f(m) = -k(b-2cm)\exp[b(m-m_0)+c(m_0^2-m^2)], \quad m_0 < m < m_1
\]  
(A-9)
APPENDIX B: MAXIMUM ACCELERATION FOR THREE TYPES OF EARTHQUAKE SOURCES

(a) Point Source

For an attenuation relationship expressed in the form

$$a_{\text{max}} = b_1 e^{-b_3 (R + b_4)}$$

the corresponding probability density function $f(a_{\text{max}})$ and range of variation of $a_{\text{max}}$ were given by Equations (2-16) and (2-17), respectively. The cumulative distribution $F(a_{\text{max}})$ of $a_{\text{max}}$ (i.e., the probability with which $a_{\text{max}}$ receives values smaller than or equal to a certain value) can be obtained through a integration of Equation (2-16). Thus,

$$F(a_{\text{max}}) = k[1 - \exp[-b_3 \ln \frac{a_{\text{max}} (R+b_4)}{b_1} - b_2 m]]$$

If the upper limit of the earthquake magnitude ($m_1$) is unrestricted (i.e., $m_1 = \infty$), Equation (B-1) receives the form

$$F(a_{\text{max}}) = 1 - (R+b_4) \exp(b_3 m)$$

In the case of the log-quadratic frequency-magnitude relationship presented in Appendix A, the cumulative distribution of $a_{\text{max}}$ is equal to

$$F(a_{\text{max}}) = k[1 - \exp[b(G-m_o) + c(G^2 - m_o^2)]]$$

where $k$ is given by Equation (A-7), and

$$G = \frac{1}{b_2} \ln \frac{a_{\text{max}} (R+b_4)}{b_1}$$
The frequency distribution of \( a_{\text{max}} \) can be found by forming the derivative of Equation (B-3) with respect to \( a_{\text{max}} \); i.e.,

\[
f(a_{\text{max}}) = -\frac{k}{b^2} \frac{1}{a_{\text{max}}} (2cG+b)\exp[b(G-m_0)+c(G^2-m_0^2)]
\]

(b) **Line Source**

In the case of the line source, for the log-linear frequency-magnitude relationship and \( \theta = 90^\circ \) (Figure 11b), the cumulative distribution \( F(a_{\text{max}}) \) of the maximum acceleration \( a_{\text{max}} \) has the form

\[
F(a_{\text{max}}) = 1-[(1-k)+k\exp(\theta m_o)(\frac{a_{\text{max}}}{b_1}) \cdot I]
\]

where \( k, \beta, m_o, b_1, b_2, b_3 \) are defined as before,

\[
I = \int \frac{2R}{\rho R^2 - D^2} \rho (R) \, d\rho, \text{ and}
\]

\( R, r_o, D \) and \( \rho \) are shown in Figure 11b.

The probability density function of \( a_{\text{max}} \) can be found by forming the derivative of Equation (B-5) with respect to \( a_{\text{max}} \); thus,
\[
f(a_{\text{max}}) = \frac{k}{b_1} \frac{b_2^n}{b_2} I (\beta_m)(-\frac{\beta}{b_2} + 1)
\]

An alternative formulation of the line source, convenient for use is a Monte Carlo simulation scheme, is as follows:

Assuming that the earthquake has the same likelihood of occurrence at each point along the fault, a random number (RAN) can be used to determine the position of the source along the fault. Thus, for

\[
x = \text{RAN} \cdot l, \quad 0 \leq x \leq l
\]

where \( l \) is the length of the fault, the distance \( z \) between the center of the line and the simulated earthquake (Figure 11b) is equal to

\[
z = (x - \frac{l}{2}), -\frac{l}{2} \leq z \leq \frac{l}{2}
\]

Applying the cosine law, it is found that the distance \( R \) from the site to the simulated earthquake is equal to

\[
R = [z^2 + D^2 - 2zD\cos(\theta)]^{1/2}
\]

(c) **Area Source**

In the case of a log-linear frequency-magnitude relationship, the probability with which the maximum acceleration \( A_{\text{max}} \) receives values larger than \( a_{\text{max}} \) is equal to [42]
\[ P[A_{\text{max}} > a_{\text{max}}] = (1-k) + \frac{2}{d^2-h^2} k[\exp(\beta m)] b_1^{\beta/b_2} b_{\text{max}}^{-\beta/b_2} \quad (B-8) \]

where

\[
H = h \left[ 1 - \left( d/h \right) \right]^{\frac{b_3}{b_2}} \frac{b_3}{b_2}^{\beta+2}
\]

\[ b, h \text{ are defined in Figure 11c, and} \]

\[ \beta, b_1, b_2, b_3 \text{ are regional parameters.} \]

The cumulative distribution \( F(a_{\text{max}}) \) of \( a_{\text{max}} \) can be obtained as the complement of Equation (B-8), i.e.,

\[
F(a_{\text{max}}) = 1 - \left[ (1-k) + \frac{2}{d^2-h^2} k[\exp(\beta m)] b_1^{\beta/b_2} b_{\text{max}}^{-\beta/b_2} \right] \quad (B-9)
\]

The frequency distribution \( f(a_{\text{max}}) \) can be found from Equation (B-9) by forming the derivative of \( F(a_{\text{max}}) \) with respect to \( a_{\text{max}} \), or

\[
f(a_{\text{max}}) = \frac{2k}{d^2-h^2} \cdot \frac{\beta}{b_2} \cdot b_{\text{max}}^{-\beta/b_2} \cdot H \cdot \exp(\beta m) \cdot a_{\text{max}}^{-(\beta/b_2+1)}
\]

A simpler formulation of the area source (equivalent to the one used in the case of the line source) can be achieved by considering the circular area as consisting of uniformly distributed point sources with a varying radius \( R_p \). The value of \( R_p \) must be chosen so that the following expression is true:
\[(\text{Area}_p) = (\text{RAN})(\text{Area}_S)\]

or, \[\pi R_p^2 = (\text{RAN})(\pi R_S^2)\]

or, \[R_p^2 = (\text{RAN})R_S^2\] \hspace{1cm} (B-11)

where \(R_p\) = the distance from the site to the point source (a random variable),

\(R_S\) = the radius of the area source, and

\(\text{RAN}\) = a random number between 0 and 1.

From Equation (B-11), one has that \(R_p\) is equal to

\[R_p = \sqrt{\text{RAN} \cdot R_S}, \quad 0 \leq R_p \leq R_S\] \hspace{1cm} (B-12)