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## CHAPTER I

### 1.0 Introduction

When planning the design of a structure or a facility in a region of potentiä seismic activity, it becomes necessary to estimate the ground motion intensity to which the structure will be exposed duringits economic life. The required information on the site intensity has to be derived using the seismic information available for the region, such as frequency of occurrence of earthquakes, Richter magnitude levels, etc.

Seismic Hazard Models are utilized to obtain the probabilities of the different ground intensity leve1s at a site. Therefore, the use of an established methodology to perform seismic hazard analysis and hence to synthesize the available seismological information for the purpose of obtaining a reliable estimate of future seismic loading at a site is necessary.

The principal objective of the current work is that of describing a set of computer programs organized in a consistent way in order to be used to perform seismic hazard analysis at a specified geographic location.

The programs have been developed at Stanford University. They are based on probabilistic seismic risk models discussed in detail by Shah, . Mortgat, and Kiremidjian (1975), and Mortgat (1978). They have been utilized for hazard mapping of Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Algeria, offshore Alaska, Calífornia, and Hondüras (currently in progress) (1, 2, 3, 4, 7).*

The programs constitute a complementary set and are sufficient for the analysis. They are written in FORTRAN IV and have been tested on the Stanford IBM $370 / 168$ computer. Certain programs, such as plotting and mapping routines, are system oriented and can be used only at the Stanford Computer Center.
*Numbers correspond to items in Reference List (see Appendix A).

### 1.1 Scope

The subsequent chapters of this work will be devoted to the description and implementation of each of the (ten) programs constituting the set, namely:
1.) Program REPLACE.LETTER.MAGNITUDE
2.) Program INTENSITY.MAGNITUDE
3.) Program GENER.MAGNITUDE
4.) Program PLOT.EPI
5.) Program REGRESSION.ANALYSIS
6.) Program ACC.LINE.AREA
7.) Program SORT.MAGNITUDE
8.) Program SEISMIC.HAZARD
9.) Program CONST.PROB
10.) Program PLOT. ISO

The items listed below will be included in each chapter in order to properly describe each computer program.

- Purpose and description of the program
- Description of input data
- Macro flow chart*
- Sample problem(s)
- Presentation and comments on the output

The sample problems will be presented with the purpose of illustrating the method and testing of the programs. They will be independent from one another and the data used will correspond to a hypothetical though a realistic situation.

Figure (1-1) shows schematically the three stages of the present form of seismic hazard analysis used at Stanford. Each of the three stages and
*Macro flow charts have been included for each program in order to show the overall logic. The statements and symbols used in the current work are shown in Figures (1-4) and (1-5).
their related programs are summarized in the general flow chart shown in Figure (1-2). Each item presented in the chart will be discussed briefly in the remaining sections of this chapter. The reader is advised to consult references (1) and (6) for a detailed explanation of the theoretical development of the problem.

### 1.2 Remarks on the Flow Chart for Seismic Hazard Analysis (Figure 1-2)

Item (0)
There are various parameters used in the literature to represent the seismic loading. They are:

- Richter Magnitude (RM)
- Modified Mercalli Intensity (MMI)
- Peak Ground Acceleration or Velocity (PGA, PGV)
- Spectral Intensity
- Root Mean Square (RMS) acceleration, velocity or displacement However, for structural engineering and design purposes, the most commonly and conveniently used parameter is the Peak Ground Acceleration (PGA).

To estimate probabilistically the Peak Ground Acceleration levels throughout a geographical location, one needs to get information regarding past seismic events. In particular, the following information is needed:

- Epicentral locations of past seismic events
- Time of occurrence
- Magnitude associated with each occurrence
- Depth of hypocenter
- Acceleration records associated with the above occurrences at different sites
- If possible, information on how energy (or Peak Ground Acceleration) attenuates from source of energy release to any site away from the source
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I. Stage No. 1--Data Treatment
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Figure 1-2 (Con't.)

II. Stage No. 2--Seismic Modeling of the Region

III. Stage No. 3--Seismic Hazard Mode1


Figure 1-2 (Con't.)

*See Appendix B for auxiliary program which is used to check the Input Data for program SEISMIC. HAZARD.

- Any other pertinent geological and seismological information about the region considered.

Unfortunately, it is seldom possible to have all the available data with complete information. In view of the problem, there are several techniques available by which the data can be treated to achieve a reasonably complete form. The techniques* currently used will be briefly discussed in the following paragraphs and dealt with in more detail in the next chapters.

The first step of the analysis consists of storing in the computer the information on past seismic events (RAW DATA FILE). An example of the format for data storage and record presentation is shown in Figure (1-3).

Item (I-1)--Check if the information regarding past seismic events is complete

If earthquake records belonging to the RAW DATA FILE are missing epicentral location and magnitude information, these will be disregarded and hence excluded as direct input in the analysis. However, the analyst must be aware of the existence of these events in order to complement his subjective information on the seismicity of the region.

Item (I-2)--Some records contain a letter magnitude instead of a numerical Richter Magnitude

Frequently, events are recorded and assigned a letter symbol or class instead of a numerical Richter-Magnitude. In general, the class or letter associated with the particular event covers a specific range on the magnitude scale. For example, CLASS $C(6 \leq M \leq 6.9)$ stands for an earthquake with a Richter Magnitude between 6.0 and 6.9 . Since it is more practical to work with numerical quanfities rather than ranges, PROGRAM.REPLACE.
*The presented methodology applies to correcting the available data only. It does not check the validity of the data, such as incompleteness, biases in time, population, etc.

where: SOURCE: refers to the person, institution, etc., recording the data.
CLASS: letter symbol representing Richter Magnitude.
RADIUS: radius of felt area.
DEPTH: hypocentral depth (kms).

MS: Average surface wave magnitude.
MB: Average body wave magnitude.
MR1: Richter Magnitude (originally supplied with raw data).
MR2: Richter Magnitude (as obtained after treatment of records missing magnitude information).

FIGURE 1-3

LETTER:. MAGNITUDE (Chapter II) will be used for the purpose of replacing the letter symbols by an appropriate numerical Richter Magnitude level.

Item (I-3)--Some records contain information on intensity (MMI) instead
of magnitude
It is very common to find earthquake records in the data set (RAW DATA file) described in terms of intensity (MMI) only. As such information is not directly usable in the analysis, an intensity vs. magnitude relationship is needed to express the magnitude in terms of intensity.

Several attempts have been made in the past to correlate magnitude to intensity using regression analysis to fit to the data a straight line relationship of the form:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{M}=\mathrm{B} \cdot \mathrm{I}+\mathrm{A} \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where: $M=$ Richter magnitude
I = Intensity (MMI)
$A, B=$ regression coefficients

Such relations are only valid onsa regional basis. Therefore, it is good practice to obtain a specific intensity vs. magnitude relation for the region $\sigma f$ interest using the information contained in the records considered to be complete (specifically those records having both an MMI and Richter magnitude value).

With the purpose of obtaining the regression coefficients ( $A$ and $B$ ), and the magnitude value for the incomplete records in the RAW DATA FILE, programs REGRESSION.ANALYSXS and INTENSITY.MAGNITUDE will be used in conjunction (Chapters III and VI).

Item (I-4)--Some records are missing information both on magnitude and intensity

In case there are earthquake records in the RAW DATA FILE missing both magnitude and intensity information, rather than disregarding the events,
a Monte Carlo simulation process is used to generate the missing parameters.

From the earthquake records containing complete information, that is, a11 events containing information on time of occurrence, epicentral location, hypocentral depth, Richter Magnitude, etc., a probability distribution function (normalized histogram) on magnitude is constructed. For this purpose, program REGRESSION.ANALYSIS with one of ite optional capabilities will be used (Chapter VI). Once the distribution on magnitude is known, program GENER.MAGNITUDE is implemented in order to generate the missing; information (Chapter IV).

Item (I-5)--Records missing hypocentral depth
Rather than disregarding these events, information on hypocentral depth is supplied by judgement. Normally, the analysf is able to assign hypocentral depths basing his judgement on seismological and geologic information available for the region of interest.

Item (II-1)--Epicentral maps and location of seismic sources
Stage No. 2 (seismic modeling of the region) is initiated with this step. At this point of the analysis, the untreated earthquake data (RAW DATA FILE) should be in complete form, that is, information on time of occurrence, epicentral location, depth of hypocenter, Richter Magnitude, etc., is known for each record. Program PLOT.EPICENTERS will incorporate such information (specifically epicentral locations) to obtain maps displaying epicenters for the region of interest.

Having the epicentral map will enable the analyst to model the region into seismic sources. Geological and seismological information together with judgement is used to model the seismic sources.

```
Item (II-2)--Program Regression Analysis
```

Once the epicenters have been associated to the various seismic sources within the region, the present step requires the development of recurrence relationships for each individual source. These are obtained by fitting to the data (for each source) a regression line of the form:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{Ln} e^{N(M)}=\alpha+\beta M \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { where: } \begin{aligned}
N(M) & =\text { number of events above Richter Magnitude }(M) \\
M & =\text { Richter Magnitude } \\
\alpha \text { and } \beta & =\text { regression coefficients }
\end{aligned}
\end{aligned}
$$

The constant $\alpha$ being a measure of the number of events above magnitude zero for a given source and $\beta$, a measure of the sources' seismic severity.

For the purpose of obtaining Eq. (1.2), program REGRESSION.ANALYSIS will be used (Chapter VI).

Item (III-1)--Seismic Hazard Mode1 Selection
Stage No. 3 is initiated with this step. The analyst can choose between the two available seismic hazard models, namely:
1.) Classical Model
2.) Bayesian Model

A brief discussion on the differences between both models (based on the key elements associated to seismic hazard models, reference 9) will be presented in the following paragraphs. The key elements are:

- Source geometry
- Earthquake recurrence mode1
- Tectonic model and travel path
- Attenuation uncertainty

Table 1 summarizes the main characteristics of each model.

TABLE 1

|  | Classical Model | Bayesian Model |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Source Geometry | Line <br> Area | Line <br> Area <br> Dipping Planes |
| Tectonic Model | No rupture | Rupture |
| Earthquake <br> Recurrence Mode1 | Poisson | Poisson <br> + <br> Bernoulli <br> + |
| Attenuation Uncertainty |  | Bayesian |

## Source Geometry

The Classical Model (Reference 1) represents the seismic sources either by straight lines (Line Sources) or circular area sources.

The Bayesian Model (Reference 6) permits the use of more general source geometry by introducing trapezoid area sources and dipping plane sources.

## Earthquake Recurrence Mode1

Both models use a Poisson process for earthquake occurrence. In the Classical Model, the distribution on the different magnitude occurrences is introduced directly in the Poisson model through the use of a constant mean rate of occurrence for each Richter Magnitude level.

The Bayesian model treats the mean rate of occurrence as a random variable and the information on magnitude is modeled by a Bernoulli trial in which the probability of success is also treated as a random variable. The input to the model is obtained from two sources, namely:
1.) Subjective information (obtained from expert's past experience)
2.) Recorded data (e.g., RAW DATA FILE).

Both are combined with different weights (depending on the expert) through the use of Bayesian Statistics.

## Tectonic Model

The Classical model assumes that the total energy released during an earthquake is radiated from the hypocenter (point model). The maximum intensity at a given site is governed by its distance from the hypocenter.

The Bayesian Model associates fault rupture with energy release and the intensity of ground shaking is determined by the fault slip that is closest to the site (significant distance).

Attenuation Uncertainty
The Classical model treats the energy attenuation deterministically. No probability distribution with respect to the mean value of attenuation is associated.

The Bayesian Mode1 treats the scatter of the data about the attenuation relationship in a probabilistic manner. It considers a log-normal distribution with respect to the mean value.

Judging from the differences (key elements) mentioned for both models, it is evident that the Bayesian approach is a more consistent and advanced method of assessing seismic exposure. However, rather than disregarding the Classical approach, it has been included in the current work as a matter of completeness and comparison.

Item (III-2)--PROGRAM ACC.LINE. AREA

In the event of selecting the Classical Approach for seismic hazard analysis, program ACC.LINE.AREA, (which incorporates the theory behind the Classical mode1), will be used to compute the probabilities of exceedance for a given ground parameter (e.g., PGA, PGV, etc.) and a given
time period of interest, at a specified site or sites due to line or circular seismic sources.

Item (III-3) Program SORT.MAGNITUDE and Item (III-4) Program SEISMIC.HAZARD
In the event of selecting the Bayesian Approach for seismic hazard analysis, program SOR'i'.MAGNITUDE (Chapter VIII) will be used to sort the treated earthquake records as a function of their magnitude, the output will be used to obtain the sample likelihood function in the Bernoulli trial of program SEISMIC.HAZARD (which incorporates the theory behind the Bayesian model), and is used to compute the probabilities of exceedance for a given ground parameter and a given time period of interest, at a specified site or sites due to line, area, and dipping plane sources (see Ref. 6 for details).

Item (III-5)--PROGRAM CONST. PROB
The output of either program ACC.LINE.AREA or program SEISMIC.HAZARD, in the form of cumulative or complementary cumulative distribution functions (e.g., $P\{A \leq a\}$ or $P\{A>a\}$ ) for a given period of interest, ground parameter, and at a site or at the nodes of a grid, provides the necessary information for the implementation of program CONST. PROB. This program will allow the analyst to obtain the value of the ground parameter at a site for a specific probability of exceedance (1-P\{non-exceedance\}).

Item (III-6)--Program PLOT.ISO
The use of program PLOT.ISO for the purpose of developing regional seismic hazard maps (e.g., in the form of iso-acceleration contours, isovelocity contours, etc.), will conclude with the present form of seismic hazard methodology. This program is system dependent.

FIGURE 1-4

## FLOW CHART CONVENTION

Operator
Arithmetic Operators

- Addition
- Subtraction
- Multiplication
- Division
- Exponentiation

Relational Operators

- Less <
- Less than or equal $\leq$
- Equal =
- Greater than or equal $\geq$
- Greater >
- Not equal $\neq$


## Figure 1-5 Flow Chart Convention



## CHAPTER II

PROGRAM REPLACE.LETTER.MAGNITUDE

### 2.1 Purpose and Description of the Program

Frequently, when dealing with past earthquake records, the analyst is faced with events having a Richter Magnitude expressed by a letter symbol instead of a numerical value. The common classification encountered in practice is shown below:

| Symbol |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
|  | $7.0 \leq M \leq 7.7$ |
| C | $6.0 \leq M \leq 6.9$ |
| D | $5.3 \leq M \leq 5.9$ |
| E | $4.0 \leq M \leq 5.2$ |
| F | $M<4.0$ |

Since working with ranges is not practical, the present program, through a simulation process, replaces the letter symbol by a numerical Richter Magnitude. A random number generator is used for this purpose and a uniform distribution is assumed over the magnitude range corresponding to each letter symbol.

In its present form, program REPLACE.LETTER.MAGNITUDE has practically no limitations regarding the number of earthquake records to be processed. The actual iteration control statement for the number of records has been set arbitrarily to one thousand.

The present version has been divided into a main routine and one subroutine. It contains 40 executable Fortran statements and the space requirements is approximately 1952 bytes.

### 2.2 Description of Input Data

Input data for program REPLACE.LETTER.MAGNITUDE will consist of one set of cards (or card images). Standard Fortran formats have been used
and are identified by $A$, or $F$ specifications. It must be pointed out that
for this and the rest of the computer programs included under Stage $I$
(Data Treatment, Figs. 1-1 and 1-2), the input and output formats are based on the earthquake record organization shown in Fig. 1-3.*

The organization of data on each card, along with a description of
the items, is given in the following paragraph.
I. Earthquake Record--(5A8, A1, A8, A6, F4.0, A5, F4.0, A4) --(number of cards as required) Col. 1-40 Datal (Dummy variable)

| 41-41 | Letter | (Letter symbol for Richter Magnitude) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $42-55$ | Data2 | (Dummy variable) |
| $56-59$ | RMS | (Surface wave magnitude) |
| $60-64$ | Data3 | (Dummy variable) |
| $65-68$ | RM | (Richter Magnitude) |
| $69-72$ | Data4 | (Dummy variable) |

*If the analyst decides to use a different earthquake record organization from the ones shown in Fig. 1-3, the input and output formats for the programs included under Stage I will have to vary accordingly.

### 2.3 Macro Flow Chart for Program REPLACE.LETTER.MAGNITUDE


I. Iteration on the number of records in this run

II. Check letter symbol and replace it by a numerical RM




### 2.4 Sample Prob1em

The earthquake records shown below constitute the input for program REPLACE.LETTER.MAGNITUDE. It can be observed that all the records are missing magnitude information. (In columns 56-59, RMS $=0$ and in columns 65-68, $\mathrm{RM}=0$.$) It can also be observed that in column 41$ all the events contain a letter symbol from which a numerical Richter Magnitude can be generated.

INPUT DATA for program replace. letter.magintude (sample froblem)

| A. GRAN | 19 | 06 | 1925 | 14 | 44 | 35.800 N | -0.400h | E | 6. |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A.GPAN | 20 | 06 | 1925 | 12 | 33 | 35.800 N | -0.400H | E | 6. |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| A. GRAN | 21 | 06 | 1925 | 03 | 01 | 35.800 H | -0.400\% | E | 6. |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| A. GRAN | 04 | 11 | $194 \%$ | 12 | 36 | 35.700 N | -0.7004 | F | 5. | 50 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| A.ERAN | 20 | 06 | 1952 | 16 | 42 | 35.800 N | $-0.5004$ | F | 5. |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| A.GRAN | 01 | 01 | 1956 | 07 | 22 | 35.800 N | -0.300 ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | F | 5.5 | 20 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| A. GRan | 14 | 02 | 1957 | 06 | 12 | 35.800 N | $-0.400 \mathrm{H}$ | F | 5. | 30 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| H. BEFH | 08 | 06 | 1957 | 18 | 19 | 35.700 N | -0.5004 | E | 5. |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| H. BENH | 02 | 10 | 1957 | 02 | 45 | 35.700 N | -0.70.0n | F | 4.5 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

### 2.5 Output for Program REPLACE.LETTER.MAGNITUDE

The computer output for program REPLACE.LETTER.MAGNITUDE is shown below. Note that the generated magnitude appears between columns 73 and 76. Also, whenever a letter symbol is replaced by a numerical Richter Magnitude, a symbol (the letter "L") is printed next to the value generated in order to indicate which records have been treated.

OUTPUT FOR PROGRAM REPLACE.LETTER. MAGNITUDE (SAMPLE PROBLEH)

| A. GRAN | 19 | 06 | 1925 | 14 | 44 | 35.800 N | -0.400N | E | 6. |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 5.25 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A. GRAN | 20 | 06 | 1925 | 12 | 33 | 35.800 N | -0.4004 | E | 6. |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 4.95 |
| A.GPAN | 21 | 06 | 1925 | 03 | 01 | 35.800 N | -0.400H | E | 6. |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 4.40 |
| A.gRan | 04 | 11 | 1949 | 12 | 36 | 35.70014 | -0.700W | F | 5. | 50 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 3.45 |
| A.GPAN | 20 | 05 | 1952 | 16 | 42 | 35.800 N | -0.2004 | F | 5. |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 3.90 |
| A.GRAN | 01 | 01 | 1956 | 07 | 22 | 35.800 H | -0.3004 | F | 5.5 | 20 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 3.50 |
| A.GRAN | 14 | 02 | 1957 | 05 | 12 | 35.800 N | -0.400\% | F | 5. | 30 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 3.65 |
| H. EENH | 03 | 06 | 1957 | 18 | 19 | 35.70 CH | -0.5004 |  | 5 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 4.75 |
| H.EENH | 02 | 10 | 1957 | 02 | 45 | 35.700 H | $-0.700 \mathrm{w}$ |  | 4.5 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 3.25 |

CHAPTER III

## PROGRAM INTENSITY.MAGNITUDE

### 3.1 Introduction

When past earthquake records contain information on intensity (MMI), instead of Richter Magnitude, the current methodology (as shown in Figure 1-2, item I-3) indicates the use of two programs in conjunction, namely:
1.) Program REGRESSION.ANALYSIS
2.) Program INTENSITY.MAGNITUDE

Program REGRESSION.ANALYSIS will assist the user in developing an intensity vs. magnitude relationship of the form: (See Fig. 3-1):

$$
\begin{equation*}
M=B I+A \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

```
where M = Richter Magnitude
    I = Epicentral intensity
    A, B = regression coefficients
```

The use of program REGRESSION.ANALYSIS for this purpose will be deferred until Chapter VI (Sample Problem \#3). It will be assumed at this time that the analyst knows the numerical values of the coefficients $A$ and $B$ and the standard deviation (SIGMA) of the Gaussian distribution associated to the mean value of magnitude estimated by Eq. 3.1 (Figure 3-1).

### 3.2 Description of Program INTENSITY.MAGNITUDE

Program INTENSITY.MAGNITUDE has been designed for the purpose of supplying a Richter Magnitude value to those events in the Raw Data File containing information only on intensity (MMI). The values supplied by the program are obtained using simulation techniques. A probabilistic relationship between the $R M$ and the MMI is implied.

Information on the parameters $A$ and $B$ in Eq. 3.1 and on the parameter SIGMA (standard deviation) are provided by the analyst as input data together with any number of earthquake records requiring treatment (the use of data format as presented in Fig. 1-3 is understood).

The present version has been divided into a main routine and two subroutines. It contains 100 executable FORTRAN statements, and the space requirements are approximately 4520 bytes. There is practically no limitation regarding the number of earthquake records to be processed. The actual iteration control statement for the number of events has been set arbitrarily to 500. The number of standard deviations (SIGMA) on each side of the mean has been set equal to 3 .

### 3.3 Description of Input Data

Input data for program INTENSITY.MAGNITUDE will consist of two sets of cards (or card images). The first contains information on the Regression parameters (A, B, and SIGMA). The second set contains information on past seismic events. The organization of data on each card, along with a description of the items, is given in the following paragraphs.
I. Regression parameters--(3F10.7) One card required

Col. 1-10 BETA (coefficient B in Eq. 3.1)
11-20 CONST (coefficient A in Eq. 3.1)
21-30 SIG (standard deviation on magnitude SIGMA)
II. Earthquake Record--(42A1, F4.1, 26A1, F4.2, A4)
-- (number of cards as required)
Col. 1-42 DUM1 (dummy variable)
43-46 XINT (MMI--Modified Merca11i Intensity)
47-72 DUM2 (dummy variable)
73-76 XMG (Richter Magnitude)
77-80 CHECK (dummy variable)


Figure 3-1. Intensity versus Magnitude relationship.

### 3.4 Macro Flow Chart for Program INTENSITY. MAGNITUDE


I. Read parameters obtained from linear regression analysis

II. Iteration on the number of earthquake records in this run




### 3.5 Sample Problem

Assume that the regression coefficients A and B in Eq. 3.1 and the parameter SIGMA (standard deviation) are known to the analyst and have the following numerical values:

$$
\begin{aligned}
B & =0.436 \\
A & =1.439 \\
\text { SIGMA } & =0.498
\end{aligned}
$$

Further, assume that the raw data file for a particular region consists of the earthquake records shown below. Note that three of the records (marked with a star) are missing magnitude information completely. The rest of the events contain RM values in columns $73-76$. The treatment of the data in order to achieve a complete form is required.

INPUT FOR PROGRAM INTENS.MAG (SAMPLE PRCBLEM)

| 1.439 |  |  | . 436 |  |  | . 498 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A.GRAN | 09 | 10 | 1790 | 01 | 00 | 35.700N | -0.700W |  | 10 |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | * |
| A.GRAN | 21 | 05 | 1889 | 04 | 15 | 35.700 N | -0.800W |  |  | . 5 |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | * |
| A.GRAN | 24 | 07 | 1912 | 18 | 06 | 35.700 N | -0.400W | E | 7 |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | * |
| A.GRAN | 19 | 06 | 1925 | 14 | 44 | 35.800 N | -0.400W | E | 6 |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 4.05 |  |
| A.gran | 20 | 06 | 1925 | 12 | 33 | 35.800 N | -0.400w | E | 6 |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 4.10 |  |
| A.gran | 21 | 06 | 1925 | 03 | 01 | 35.800 N | -0.400w | E | 6 |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 4.05 |  |
| A.GRAN | 04 | 11 | 1949 | 12 | 36 | 35.700 N | -0.700W | F | 5 | . | 50 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 3.35 |  |
| A.GRAN | 20 | 06 | 1952 | 16 | 42 | 35.800 N | -0.200w | F | 5 | . |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 3.80 |  |
| A.GRAN | 01 | 01 | 1956 | 07 | 22 | 35.800 N | -0.300W | F |  | . 5 | 20 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 3.70 |  |
| A.GRAN | 14 | 02 | 1957 | 06 | 12 | 35.800 N | -0.400W | F | 5 | 5. | 30 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 3.15 |  |
| H.BENH | 08 | 06 | 1957 | 18 | 19 | 35.700 N | -0.500w | E | 5 | . |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 4.05 |  |
| H.BENH | 02 | 10 | 1957 | 02 | 45 | 35.700 N | -0.700W | F |  | . 5 |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 3.20 |  |
| H.BENH | 12 | 12 | 1959 | 20 | 00 | 35.800 N | -0.600W | E | 7 | . | 75 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 4.25 |  |
| H.BENH | 01 | 06 | 1960 | 11 | 40 | 35.700 N | -0.600W | F | 5 |  | 20 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 3.50 |  |
| H.BENH | 23 | 01 | 1961 | 02 | 46 | 35.800 N | -0.300W | F | 4 |  | 25 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 3.25 |  |
| H.BENH | 15 |  | 1962 |  |  | 36.200 N | -0.700W |  |  |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 3.40 |  |
|  |  | DUM (1-42) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | DUM2 |  | $(47-72)$ |  | XMG |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

### 3.6 Output for Program INTENSITY.MAGNITUDE

The computer output for program INTENSITY.MAGNITUDE (sample problem) is shown below. Observe that the Richter Magnitude values generated by the program are listed between columns 73 and 76 , together with a letter: symbol (I) in order to identify which earthquake records have been treated. In addition, the mean values for magnitude as estimated by Eq. 3.1 are printed next the the symbol (I).

The last three lines of the output contain general information on statistics for the run.

OUTPUT FOR PROGRAM INTENS.MAG (SAMPLE PROBLEM)

| A. GRAN | 09 | 10 | 1790 | 01 | 00 | 35.700 N | -0.700W |  | 10.0 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 6.92 | I | 5.80 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A. GRAN | 21 | 05 | 1889 | 04 | 15 | 35.700 N | -0.800W |  | 7.5 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 5.04 | I | 4.71 |
| A. GRAN | 24 | 07 | 1912 | 18 | 06 | 35.700 N | -0.400W | E | 7.0 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 4.24 | I | 4.49 |
| A. GRAN | 19 | 06 | 1925 | 14 | 44 | 35.800 N | -0.400w | E | 6.0 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 4.05 |  |  |
| A.GRAN | 20 | 06 | 1925 | 12 | 33 | 35.800 N | -0.400w | E | 6.0 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 4.10 |  |  |
| A. GRAN | 21 | 06 | 1925 |  | 01 | 35.800 N | -0.400w | E | 6.0 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 4.05 |  |  |
| A. GRAN | 04 | 11 | 1949 | 12 | 36 | 35.700 N | -0.700W | F | 5.0 | 50 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 3.35 |  |  |
| A. GRaN | 20 | 06 | 1952 | 16 | 42 | 35.800 N | -0.200w | F | 5.0 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 3.80 |  |  |
| A. GRAN | 01 | 01 | 1956 | 07 | 22 | 35.800 N | -0.300W | F | 5.5 | 20 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 3.70 |  |  |
| A.GRAN | 14 | 02 | 1957 | 06 | 12 | 35.800 N | -0.400W | F | 5.0 | 30 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 3.15 |  |  |
| H. BENH | 08 | 06 | 1957 | 18 | 19 | 35.700 N | -0.500w | E | 5.0 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 4.05 |  |  |
| H. BENH | 02 | 10 | 1957 | 02 | 45 | 35.700 N | -0.700W | F | 4.5 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 3.20 |  |  |
| H. BENH | 12 | 12 | 1959 | 20 | 00 | 35.800 N | -0.6004 | E | 7.0 | 75 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 4.25 |  |  |
| H. BENH | 01 | 06 | 1960 | 11 | 40 | 35.700 N | -0.600W | F | 5.0 | 20 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 3.50 |  |  |
| H. BENH | 23 | 01 | 1961 | 02 | 46 | 35.800 N | -0.300W | F | 4.0 | 25 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 3.25 |  |  |
| H. BENH | 15 | 07 | 1962 |  | 56 | 36.200 N | -0.700W | F | 4.0 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 3.40 |  |  |
| NUMBER O | OR | REC | CORDS | READ |  |  |  | 16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NUMBER O | OF | NO | Magni | TUD |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NUMBER O | OF | GEN | IERATED | O M | mag | FROM IN |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7376 |  |  |

### 4.1 Introduction

In dealing with past earthquake records, it is common to find events with no information regarding both the intensity and the magnitude. Rather than disregarding these events, the missing magnitude and intensity can be obtained by using simulation techniques.

It will be necessary for the analyst to construct a histogram relating the number of events (frequency) to a set of magnitude intervals. For this reason, all the earthquake records available for the region and containing complete information are used. Namely, events containing:

- Time of occurrence
- Epicentral location
- Depth of hypocenter
- Richter Magnitude

Normally, an upper limit on Richter Magnitude is selected by the analyst when constructing the histogram (e.g., $R M=4.00,4.50$ or 5.00 maximum), based on the assumption that any large event would be thorougly documented, and implying that only small events may be missing information.

As shown in Figure 1-2, Item I-4, the present data treatment analysis requires the use of two programs in conjunction, namely:
1.) Program REGRESSION.ANALYSIS.
2.) Program GENER.MAGNITUDE

Program REGRESSION.ANALYSIS will assist the user in the derivation of the histogram on magnitude thus simplifying the construction of a CDF (Cumulative Distribution Function) necessary for simulation. The use of program

REGRESSION.ANALYSIS for this purpose will be deferred until Chapter VI (Sample Problem 非2, page 80). It will be assumed at this time that the analyst knows the distribution on magnitude and the CDF for the region of interest.

### 4.2 Description of Program GENER.MAGNITUDE

Program GENER.MAGNITUDE supplies a Richter Magnitude value to those records which belong to the raw data set and which are missing information on both magnitude and intensity. The program uses a random number generator, thus setting a correlation between uniform probability distribution between 0 and 1 and the $C D F$ on magnitude $\left(P\left\{M \leq m_{i}\right)\right.$, as obtained from the records with complete information.

The user supplies any number of earthquake records (using the same format shown in Figure 1-3, page 10) and the program will automatically search columns 73-76 (see Fig. 1-3) for a Richter Magnitude value. If a zero magnitude is associated to any particular record, a random number is generated and an RM level is chosen from the CDF. Figure $4-1$ summarizes the procedure.

In its present form, program GENER.MAGNITUDE contains 50 executable Fortran statements. There is practically no limitation regarding the number of earthquake records to be processed. The actual iteration control statement for the number of records has been set arbitrarily equal to 800.

### 4.3 Description of Input Data

Input data for program GENER. MAGNITUDE will consist of any number of cards (or card images) containing information on past earthquakes.

The organization of data on each card, along with a description of the ftems, is given in the following section.

## Figure 4-1

Histogram obtained with the aid of program REGRESSION.ANALYSIS (Chapter VI)

*Note: Since the CDF is computed on a regional basis, the values for $P\left\{M \leq M_{i}\right\}$ (Probability of Magnitude (M) less than or equal to a given magnitude level ( $M_{i}$ )) have to be included as part of the main program. (See program's listing, Appendix C, Lines 38-42.)

### 4.4 Macro Flow Chart for Program GENER.MAGNITUDE


I. Iteration on the number of records in this run


I. Earthquake Record(s)--(9A8, F4.2, A4) Number of cards as required Col. 1-72 DUMMY (Data within this column is not used by program) 73-76 RM* (Richter Magnitude) 77-80 CHECK (Data within this column is not used by program)

### 4.5 Sample Problem

Assume that for a given region of interest, the following CDF has been obtained using all the available earthquake records containing complete information.


The earthquake records shown below constitute the input data deck for this particular example. Note that " RM " is equal to zero for all the events.
*The program checks for an RM-value equal to zero in each record included in the input data deck. If a non-zero value is found, the analysis will be automatically skipped for that particular record; therefore the user does not have to select, prior to the run, the events which need treatment. Instead, he can use the whole raw data file as input.

## INPUT FOR PROGRAM GENER.MAGNITUDE (SAMPLE PROBLEM]



### 4.6 Output for Program GENER.MAGNITUDE (Sample Problem)

The computer output for program GENER.MAGNITUDE (sample problem) is shown below. Note that the magnitude values generated by the program are listed between columns 73 and 76. A letter symbol (R) has been printed next to each generated magnitude in order to identify which records have been treated.

OUTPUT FOR PROGRAM GENER.MAGNITUDE (SAMPLE PROBLEM)


## CHAPTER V

PROGRAM PLOT.EPI

### 5.1 Introduction

At this point of the analysis (Fig. 1-2), the earthquake data (raw data file) for the region of interest should be in "complete" form. This implies that all the records should contain information on at least the time of occurrence, the epicentral location, the depth of hypocenter, and the Richter Magnitude. Figure 5-1 shows the actual format of earthquake records in complete form (treated earthquake data).

Figure 5-1

| EARTHQUAKE DATA IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER <br>  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| s | D | M | $Y$ | H | M | 1 L | L | C | M | $\boldsymbol{R}$ | D | M | M | M | 11 | 5 |
| 0 | A | 0 | $E$ | 0 | I | - A | 0 | $L$ | M | A | E | S | 8 | R | R | $\gamma$ |
| U | $Y$ | N | A | U | N | 1 | N | $\stackrel{\text { A }}{ }$ | $I$ | 0 | P |  |  | 1 | 2 | M |
| 8 |  | T | R | R | U | I | G | 5 |  | $I$ | T |  |  |  |  | B |
| c |  | H |  |  | T | $T$ | $I$ | 5 |  | $U$ | H |  |  |  |  |  |
| E |  |  |  |  | E | U | T |  |  | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | U |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $E$ | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $E$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A.GRAN |  | 03 | 1819 |  |  | 35.400 N | 00,100E |  | 10.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 5.67 | I |
| A.GRAN | 02 | 03 | 1825 | 07 | 00 | 36.400 N | 02.800E |  | 10.5 |  |  |  |  |  | 6.51 | I |
| A. Gran |  | 12 | 1846 |  |  | 36.600 N | 02.200E |  | 6.5 |  |  |  |  |  | 4.07 | 1 |
| A. GRAN | 18 | 06 | 1847 | 05 | 00 | 36,700N | 02.900E |  | 6.5 |  |  |  |  |  | 4.88 | 1 |
| A.GRAN | 08 | 02 | 1850 |  |  | 36.300 N | 04.800E |  | 9.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 5.71 | 1 |
| A.GRAN | 17 | 12 | 1850 | 12 | 30 | 36.500 N | 07.400E |  | 6.5 |  |  |  |  |  | 4.61 | 1 |
| A.GRAN | 22 | 11 | 1851 | 09 | 30 | 35.400 N | 00.100E |  | 8.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 5.50 | I |
| A.GRAN | 15 | 05 | 1854 |  |  | 30.400 N | 02.700E |  | 6.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 4.50 | I |
| A.GRAN | 21 | 08 | 1856 | 21 | 00 | 37.100 N | 05.700E |  | 9.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 6.25 | L |
| A.GRAN | 22 | 08 | 1856 | 22 | 00 | 37.100 N | 05.700E |  | 10.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 5.95 | I |
| A.GRAN | 27 | 09 | 1860 |  |  | 36.300 N | 04.500E |  | 7.5 |  |  |  |  |  | 5.11 | I |
| A. GRAN | 08 | 06 | 1862 | 12 | 45 | 35.700 N | 00.500E |  | 6.5 |  |  |  |  |  | 4.44 | I |
| A. GRAN | 30 | 11 | 1862 | 00 | 25 | 36.500 N | 05.300E |  | 7.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 4.62 | $I$ |
| A.GRAN | 02 | 01 | 1867 | 07 | 13 | 36.416 N | 02.683E |  | 10.5 |  |  |  |  |  | 6.17 | I |
| A. GRAN | 04 | 02 | 1867 | 13 | 37 | 35.000 N | 04.000E |  | 6.0 | 200 |  |  |  |  | 4.40 | I |
| A.GRAN 17 | 17 | 08 | 1863 | 17 | 00 | 36.400 N | 01.200E |  | 6.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 3.95 | I |
| A.GRAN | 20 | C9 | 1869 |  |  | 36.500 N | 02.600E |  | 5.5 |  |  |  |  |  | 3.81 | I |
| A.GRAN | 16 | 11 | 1869 | 12 | 45 | 34.900 N | 05.900E |  | 9.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 5.73 | $I$ |
| A.GRAN | 29 | 07 | 1872 | 08 | 15 | 35.900 N | 09.100 E |  | 7.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 4.28 | I |
| A.GRAN | 28 | 03 | 1874 | 11 | 10 | 36.600 N | 02.200E |  | 7.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 5.10 | 1 |
| A.GRAN | 23 | 03 | 1876 | 06 | 34 | 36.500 N | O2.600E |  | 7.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 4.73 | I |
| A. GRAN 1 | 16 | 01 | 1685 |  |  | 35.500 N | 05.700E |  | 6.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 4.53 | I |
| A.GEAN | 03 | 12 | 1885 | 20 | 30 | 35.100 N | 04.600E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.75 | R |
| A. GRAN | 01 | 07 | 1886 | 09 | 45 | 36.500 H | 05.300E |  | 7.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 4.69 | I |
| A.GRAN | 09 | 09 | 1886 | 11 | 15 | 36.200 N | 03.600E |  | 7.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 4.93 | I |
| A.GRAN | OS | 01 | 1837 | 20 | 00 | 36.100 N | 04.600E |  | 8.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 5.09 | I |
| A.GRAN | 29 | 11 | 1887 | 13 | 30 | 35.583 N | 00.333E |  | 9.5 |  |  |  |  |  | 5.84 | I |
| A. GRAN | 06 | 01 | 1888 | 23 | 40 | 36.500 N | 02.600E |  | 8.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 5.12 | I |
| A.GRAN | 21 | 05 | 1839 | 04 | 1.5 | 35.700 N | -0.800W |  | 7.5 |  |  |  |  |  | 5.08 | 1 |
| A. GRAN | 30 | 07 | 1890 |  |  | 35.700 N | 00.500E |  | 6.5 |  |  |  |  |  | 4.48 | I |
| A.GRAN | 15 | 01 | 1691 | 04 | 00 | 36.500 N | 01.800E |  | 10.0 | 200 |  |  |  |  | 6.36 | I |
| A.GRAN | 1: | 03 | 1908 | 00 | 06 | 36.400 H | 02.800E |  | 8.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 4.89 | 1 |
| A.GRAN | 17 | 06 | 1908 | 00 | 24 | 36.500 N | 07.500E |  | 7.5 |  |  |  |  |  | 5.25 | I |
| A.GRAN | 04 | 08 | 1908 | 02 | 11 | 36.400 N | 06.600E | D | 0.0 |  |  |  |  | 5.10 | 5.10 |  |
| GUTE | 16 | 06 | 1910 | 04 | 16 | 36.500 N | -4.000N |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  | 6.10 | 6.10 |  |

A new column (SYMB) has been added in order to indicate which earthquake records have been treated using the programs discussed in Chapters II through IV. Recall that:

I stands for a record treated using Program INTENSITY.MAGNITUDE
L stands for a record treated using Program REPLACE.LETTER.MAGNITUDE and $R$ stands for a record treated using Program GENER.MAGNITUDE.

The next step in the analysis is to plot the epicenters using the above information for the region of interest. For this, the data under the columns labelled Latitude and Longitude in Figure $5-1$ will be used by program PLOT.EPI.

This stage of the seismic hazard methodology will enable the analyst to acquire a good understanding of the spatial distribution of earthquakes throughout the region. Most important, it will help the user to model the seismicity of the region by grouping the events into seismic sources (i.e., line sources and area sources). Hence, the analyst must obtain geological and seismological information for the particular location.

The process of grouping the events into seismic sources is difficult and should be done with great care. The seismic events must be associated with the geotectonic features within the region. This process requires proper communication between the analyst and experts such as seismologists and geologists.

### 5.2 Program PLOT.EPI

Program PLOT.EPI has been deisgned to plot to scale the epicenters recorded in the given region in a parallelogram area (the present version uses a Conformal Lambert projection, see Ref. 10). The data (as shown in Figure 5-1) will constitute the major part of the input (specifically for each event the magnitude and the latitude and longitude, measured in degrees,
with the convention that the quadrant north of the equator and east of Greenwich is positive). The program utilizes a series of symbols (dots, squares, etc.) to differentiate between the Richter Magnitude levels corresponding to each event on the plot (see Figure 5-5).

Program PLOT.EPI has the optional capability of plotting up to 10 cities with their corresponding names. This option can be specified by setting the parameter "NOCITY" different from zero and by including the coordinates of each city as part of the input data deck.

Program PLOT.EPI is system dependent. Its use is limited to Stanford's Computer Center since it uses plotting and mapping routines which are system oriented. The present dimensions allow for a maximum of 500 epicenters and ten cities.

### 5.3 Description of Input Data

Input data for program PLOT.EPI will consist of ten sets of cards. The organization of data on each card, along with a description of the items, is given in the following sections.

I--Epicenter data format--(20A4)--One card
Col. 1-80 FRMT (format required to read epicentral coordinates and magnitude. See data set X.)

II--Identification card--(3I5, 16A4)--One card
Col. 1-5 NDTP (number of plot types or different grids, e.g., plots with different scales or parameters)

6-10 ICAL (Plotter size, if $3=11$ inches, default $4=33$ inches)

11-15 (FN (Flag for Lambert projection, if $0=1 / 180^{\circ}$

$$
\left.1=0 / 360^{\circ}\right)
$$

16-80 HED1 (Run identification)

III--Lambert Projection*--(5F10.0)--One card


IV--Plot flags--(5I5)--One card

| Col. | $1-5$ | NOPL |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | (Number of plots with the same parameters)

V--Grid description--(6F10.0)--One card--(see Fig. 5-5)

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
\text { Col. } 1-10 & \text { XXOR } & \text { (X-coord. }{ }^{\circ} \text { of origin) } \\
11-20 & \text { YYOR } & \text { (Y-coord. }{ }^{\circ} \text { of origin) } \\
21-30 & \text { XXRT } & \text { (X-coord. }{ }^{\circ} \text { of right bottom corner) } \\
31-40 & \text { YYRT } & \text { (Y-coord. }{ }^{\circ} \text { of right bottom corner) } \\
41-50 & \text { XXUP } & \text { (X-coord. } 0^{\circ} \text { of left top corner) } \\
51-60 & Y Y U P & \text { (Y-coord. }{ }^{\circ} \text { of left top corner) }
\end{array}
$$

VI--Labe1 Description-(7F10.0)--One card--(see Fig. 5-5)

| Col. | 1-10 | DXCR | (X-distance ${ }^{\circ}$ between | marks) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 11-20 | DYCR | (Y-distance ${ }^{\mathrm{O}}$ between | marks) |
|  | 21-30 | DXL.B | (X-distance ${ }^{0}$ between | labels) |
|  | 31-40 | DYLB | (Y-distance ${ }^{\circ}$ between | labels) |
|  | 41-50 | CRCR | (Marks inside grid? | If $0=$ NO) |

*These parameters depend on the maps available for the region (i.e.,

```
VII--Flag for magnitudes to be plotted*--(16I5)---One card
    Co1. 1-5 SKIP2 (No magnitude in data)
                    6-10 SKIP3 (Magnitude 3)
                11-15 SKIP4 (Magnitude 4)
            16-20 SKIP5 (Magnitude 5)
            21-25 SKIP6 (Magnitude 6)
            26-30 SKIP7 (Magnitude 7)
            31-35 SKIP8 (Magnitude 8)
VIII--Cities--(2F10.0, 12AI)--NOCITY number of cards
    Co1. 1-10 XXCITY(IX) (X-coord. ' of city)
                    11-20 YYCITY(IX) (Y-coord. ' of city)
            21-32 CITY(IX,1-12) (Name of city)
    IX---Plot identification--(I5, 70A1)--One card
        Co1. 1-5 NORC (Number of earthquake records to be read)
            6-75 HED2 (Title for the plot)
    X--Coordinates }\mp@subsup{}{}{\circ}\mathrm{ of epicenters-(FMRT)--NORC number of cards
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline Use format & ( XXCK & (Longitude \({ }^{\circ}\) ) \\
\hline given in & \{ YYCK & (Latitude \({ }^{\text {O }}\) ) \\
\hline data set I & ( XMP & (Richter Magnitude) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
Note: Do-Loop on NOPL (see data set IV) starts at data set IX.
Do-Loop on NOTP (see data set II) starts at data set II.
```

*If any SKIP* (where * can be any number between 2 and 8) is read as 1 , the magnitude corresponding to * will not be plotted.

```
5.4 Macro Flow Chart for Program PLOT.EPI
```



Input format statement to read earthquake epicentral coordinates

Read: 1. Number of plot types (different grids
2. Plotter size
3. Flag for Lambert projection
4. Run identification

Print run identification and number of plot types

Print format to be used when reading epicentral coordinates
I. Initialize plot

II. Iteration control on the number of plot types in this run




IV. Iteration on the number of grids of the same size (NOPL)



VI. End of plot


### 5.5 Sample Problem

Plot the epicenters for the earthquakes listed in Figure 5-2 below.
The grid covering the region of interest is defined by the following parameters (data set $V$ ):

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { XXOR }=30^{\circ} \text { (east of Greenwich) ; YYOR }=30^{\circ} \text { (north of the equator) } \\
& \text { XXRT }=33^{\circ} \text { (east of Greenwich) ; YYRT }=30^{\circ} \text { (north of the equator) } \\
& \text { XXUP }=30^{\circ} \text { (east of Greenwich) ; YYUP }=33^{\circ} \text { (nozth of the equator) }
\end{aligned}
$$

Figure 5-2

EARTHQUAKE DATA IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER



The Lambert Projection parameters (data set III) selected for this example are as follows:

STLT1 $=30^{\circ}$ (north of the equator)
STLN $=31^{\circ}$ (east of Greenwich)
SCAL $=1$ to $2,000,000$
(Recall that the parameters given above depend on the available geographic and geologic maps for the region considered.)

In addition to the epicenters, two cities, "namely:

$$
\begin{array}{r}
\operatorname{CITY} 1\left(31.0^{\circ}, 30.50^{\circ}\right) \\
\text { and } \operatorname{CITY} 2\left(32.0^{\circ}, 30.006^{\circ}\right)
\end{array}
$$

will be plotted. Figure $5-3$ shows a listing of the input data deck for program PLOT.EPI. Each data set as described in Section 5.3 is indicated with the corresponding item number.
5.6 Output for Program PLOT.EPI (Sample Problem)

Figure 5-4 shows the listing of the output for program PLOT.EPI as obtained on the line printer. It contains basically the mapping parameters as given by the analyst (echo printing), plus the events' coordinates sorted by magnitude ranges (i.e., where $3+$ indicates évents with magnitude between 3 and 4). The output as obtained on the Calcomp Plotter is shown in Figure 5-5.

### 5.6.1 Source Mechanisms

Several different types of sources can be used to represent the seismicity of any location, namely:

- Point sources
- Line sources
- Area sources
- Dipping plane sources

INPUT DATA FOR PROGRAM PLOT.EPI (SAMPLE PROBLEM)

OUTPUT FOR PROGRAM PLOT.EPI (SAMPLE PROBLEM)
Figure 5-4


Figure 5-5 Epicentral Map

For the purpose of illustrating the seismic modelling of a given region, it will be assumed in this case that the analyst, after correlating the earthquake epicenters (shown in Fig. 5-5) with tectonic features identified within the region, has grouped the events in three seismic sources (two line sources and one area source). Figure 5-6 shows the location of the seismic sources and the events associated to each one.

In order to increase the organization of earthquake data after the location of seismic sources, it is good practice to sort* the recorded events (as shown in Figure 5-2) by sources. Figure $5-7$ shows a listing of the data sorted by sources (as grouped in Figure 5-6).

[^1]

Figure 5-6 Location of Seismic Sources

Figure 5－7

| EARTHQU <br>  |  |  | TA S ＊＊＊＊ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ORTEI } \\ & * * * * \end{aligned}$ |  | by SOURCE <br>  | S <br> 大为米夷米米 $\%$ 关 |  |  |  | ＊＊＊ | ＊＊＊ |  | ＊＊＊＊＊ | ＊＊＊＊＊ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S | D | M | $Y$ | H | M | L | L | C | H | R | D | M | M | M | H | 5 |
| 0 | A | 0 | E | 0 | I | A | 0 | L | M | A | E | 5 | B | R | R | Y |
| U | $Y$ | N | A | U | N | T | N | A | I | 0 | P |  |  | 1 | 2 | M |
| R |  | T | R | R | U | I | G | 5 |  | I | T |  |  |  |  | B |
| C |  | H |  |  | T | $T$ | I | 5 |  | U | H |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| E |  |  |  |  | E | U | T |  |  | S |  |  |  |  |  | L |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | D | U |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | E | D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ＊＊＊＊＊＊＊ | ＊＊＊＊ | ＊＊＊＊ | ＊＊＊＊＊＊ | ＊＊＊＊ | ＊＊＊＊ | ＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊ | ＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊ | ＊＊＊ | ＊＊ | ＊ | ＊＊＊ | ＊＊ | ＊＊＊ | ＊＊＊＊＊ | ＊＊＊＊ | ＊＊＊＊ |
| LIME SOUR | URCE | E 1 | 18 | RECC | RDS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A．GRAN | 02 | 03 | 1900 | 07 | 00 | 32.600 N | 30.750 E |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.50 | 3.50 |  |
| A．GRAN | 030 | 05 | 1902 | 05 |  | 32.500 N | 30.900 E |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.75 | 3.75 |  |
| A．GRAN | 050 | 03 | 1905 | 01 |  | 32.350 N | 30．900E |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4.75 | 4.75 |  |
| A．GRAN | 05 | 03 | 1912 | 02 |  | 32.000 N | 30.500 E |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.25 | 3.25 |  |
| A．GRAN | 08 | 01 | 1920 | 02 |  | 32.200 N | 30．700E |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.00 | 6.00 |  |
| A．GRAN | 04 | 08 | 1965 | 09 |  | 32.000 N | 30．600E |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4.65 | 4.65 |  |
| A．GRAN | 03 | 08 | 1973 | 08 |  | 32.400 N | 30.750 E |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5.00 | 5.00 |  |
| A．GRAN | 06 | 04 | 1976 | 05 |  | 32.150 N | 30．530E |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.25 | 3.25 |  |
| LINE SOUR | URCE | E 2 | $2(9)$ | 2ECO | ROS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A．GRAN | 04 | 07 | 1916 | 01 |  | 31.600 N | 30．530E |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.50 | 3.50 |  |
| A．GRAN | 06 | 08 | 1921 | 09 |  | 31.700 N | 30．650E |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4.50 | 4.50 |  |
| A．GRAN | 040 | 01 | 1935 | 15 |  | 31.450 N | 31.000 E |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5.55 | 5.55 |  |
| A．GRAN | 10 | 08 | 1937 | 01 |  | 31.200 N | 30．900E |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.80 | 3.60 |  |
| A．GRaN | 04 | 12 | 1940 | 03 |  | 31.250 N | 31.200 E |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4.10 | 4.10 |  |
| A．GRAN | 12 | 01 | 1972 | 11 |  | 31.750 N | 30.900 E |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4.65 | 4.65 |  |
| A．GRAH | 11 | 05 | 1975 | 01 |  | 31.500 H | 30.750 E |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.30 | 6.30 |  |
| A．GRAN | 01 | 08 | 1976 | 08 | 12 | 30.500 N | 31.250 E |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.50 | 3.50 |  |
| A．GRAN | 01 | 07 | 1978 | 03 | 15 | 30.500 N | $32.420 E$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4.25 | 4.25 |  |
| AREA SOU | URCE | CE 1 | 1195 | REC | CORDS | S 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A．GRAN | 17 | 02 | 1923 | 08 | 00 | 31.050 N | 32．350E |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4.35 | 4.35 |  |
| A．GRAN | 16 | 01 | 1925 | 14 | 00 | 30.700 N | 32.700 E |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5.60 | 5.60 |  |
| A．GRAIN | 30 | 11 | 1925 | 12 | 15 | 31.500 N | 32．400E |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.50 | 3.50 |  |
| A．GRAN | 14 | 02 | 1948 | 01 | 00 | 31.650 N | 32.450 E |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5.60 | 5.60 |  |
| A．GRAN | 13 | 04 | 1950 | 13 | 30 | 31.150 N | 32.600 E |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.80 | 3.80 |  |
| A．GRAN | 18 | 11 | 1951 | 02 | 15 | 31.300 N | 32．150E |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.00 | 7.00 |  |
| A．GRAN | 15 | 06 | 1954 | 06 | 35 | 31.100 N | 32.000 E |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5.60 | 5.60 |  |
| A．GRAN | 02 | 12 | 1958 | 06 | 15 | 30.900 N | 31．800E |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.00 | 3.00 |  |
| A．GRAN | 18 | 01 | 1960 | 04 | 18 | 30.620 N | 32.250 E |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4.65 | 4.85 |  |
| A．GRAN | 01 | 01 | 1968 | 13 | 14 | 30.550 N | 32.570 E |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.40 | 3.40 |  |
| A．GRAN | 04 | 10 | 1959 | 02 | 00 | 30.850 N | 32.150 E |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.15 | 3.15 |  |
| A．GRAN | 03 | 12 | 1970 | 10 | 12 | 30.350 N | 32.570 E |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.00 | 3.00 |  |
| A．GRAN | 17 | 03 | 1972 | 13 | 05 | 30.850 N | 32.460 E |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4.50 | 4.50 |  |
| A．GRAN | 08 | 11 | 1973 | 15 | 00 | 32.600 N | 32.750 E |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.50 | 3.50 |  |
| A．GRAN | 16 | 10 | 1976 | 10 | 00 | 31.400 N | 32.650 E |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.65 | 3.65 |  |

PROGRAM REGRESSION.ANALYSIS

### 6.1 Introduction

At this stage of the analysis (Fig. 1-2, item II-2), all the available data on past seismic events has been grouped into Seismic Sources (Fig. 5-6). The analyst is ready to describe the seismicity of each source using recurrence relationships of the form:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{Ln}_{e} N(M)=\alpha+\beta M \tag{6.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where: $N(M)=$ number of events of magnitude greater or equal to M

M = Richter Magnitude
$\alpha$ and $\beta=$ regression constants
where alpha ( $\alpha$ ) is a measure of the number of events above magnitude zero for a given source. Beta ( $\beta$ ) is the slope of the line and measures the seismic severity of the source.

### 6.2 Description of the Program REGRESSION.ANALYSIS

The program REGRESSION.ANALYSIS has been designed to determine the two parameters ( $\alpha$ and $\beta$ ), given a set of earthquake events corresponding to a specific seismic source.

In order to implement the program, the analyst has to set the value of two parameters, namely:

RMMN $=$ smallest Richter Magnitude of interest
RMIC $=$ Richter Magnitude increment
The parameter (RMMN) in normally taken as 3.0 , since it is considered that earthquakes with magnitudes less than three have none or very little effect
on structures. Events having magnitudes less than RMMN are automatically disregarded by the program and hence excluded as direct input for the analysis.

The parameter RMIC is normally defined as 0.25 , since in practice magnitudes are rounded off to the closest multiple of $1 / 4$. The program will automatically divide the Richter Magnitude scale in bands of width RMIC starting at RMMN and construct a histogram with the number of earthquakes in each Richter Magnitude band. The next step is to obtain a cumulative histogram of the number of events of magnitude greater or equal to any given magnitude band and through linear regression analysis to fit a straight line on the cumulative histogram. The two sets of variables of the regression are thus the Richter Magnitude band and the number of events of magnitude greater or equal to the corresponding band width.

If the data connot be represented by one straight line, the program allows for a bilinear fit. This is done by assigning as an input a breaking point magnitude RMBK. The data is then treated as two separate sets; all the points of magnitude smaller or equal to RMBK on one hand and all the points larger or equal to RMBK on the other. The intersection between the two lines (real breaking point magnitude) is computed by the program.

How to incorporate the results as produced by program REGRESSION.ANALYSIS to the seismic hazard model (Classical or Bayesian) will be presented in a later chapter. However, it is necessary at this stage of the analysis to make a few comments on the parameter alpha ( $\alpha$ ) (see Eq. 6.1), since its final form depends on the seismic hazard model to be selected by the analyst.

If the Classical model (III-1, Figure 1-2) is to be used, the coefficient $\alpha$ as obtained from the log-linear fit is normalized with respect to time (time period of the data for a given source) and length or area of the source.

If the Bayesian model (III-1, Fig. 1-2) is to be used, normalization of the coefficient $\alpha$ is not necessary.

Program REGRESSION.ANALYSIS possesses other useful optional capabilities. It can be used for regression analysis between any pair of variables (one dependent and one independent). The linear scale is used for the independent variable (X) and the logarithmic scale is used for the dependent variable (Y), the program can also be used to obtain the cumulative distribution function (CDF) for Richter Magnitude, necessary for the implementation of program GENER.MAGNITUDE (Chapter IV). These options can be specified by setting certain parameters to 1 in the input data deck.

If a linear-linear regression analysis is needed, the program may be used after making the following modifications to the present version (see Appendix C for program's listing).

| Line | Present Form | Modified Form |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 222 | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{IX})=\mathrm{ALOG}(\mathrm{YY}(\mathrm{IX}))$ | $\mathrm{Y}(\mathrm{IX})=\mathrm{YY}(\mathrm{IX})$. |
| 294 | $\mathrm{XX} 1=\operatorname{EXP}(\mathrm{ALPHA}(\mathrm{IR})+\mathrm{BETA}(\mathrm{IR}) * 3)$. | $\mathrm{XX} 1=\mathrm{ALPHA}(\mathrm{IR})+\mathrm{BETA}(\mathrm{IR}) * 3$. |
| 295 | $\mathrm{XX} 2=\operatorname{EXP}(\mathrm{ALPHA}(\mathrm{IR})+\mathrm{BETA}(\mathrm{IR}) * 5)$. | $\mathrm{XX} 2=\mathrm{ALPHA}(\mathrm{IR})+\mathrm{BETA}(\mathrm{IR}) * 5$. |
| 296 | $\mathrm{XX} 3=\operatorname{EXP}(\mathrm{ALPHA}(\mathrm{IR})+\mathrm{BETA}(\mathrm{IR}) * 6)$. | $\mathrm{XX} 3=\mathrm{ALPHA}(\mathrm{IR})+\mathrm{BETA}(\mathrm{IR}) * 6$. |
| 297 | $\mathrm{XX} 4=\operatorname{EXP}(\mathrm{ALPHA}(\mathrm{IR})+\mathrm{BETA}(\mathrm{IR}) * 7)$. | $\mathrm{XX} 4=\mathrm{ALPHA}(\mathrm{IR})+\mathrm{BETA}(\mathrm{IR}) * 7$. |

In its present form, the program can handle up to 2500 earthquake records when used to compute the recurrence relationship between Richter Magnitude and cumulative number of events. If used as a general purpose program for regression analysis between any pair of variables, the array dimensions have been set arbitrarily to a maximum number of 50 values of $X$ and $Y$. If confidence levels are needed, the program can handle up to 5 different intervals at one time.

The present version has been divided into a main routine plus one library subprogram. It contains 217 executable FORTRAN statements. The space requirement is approximately 18180 bytes.

### 6.3 Description of Input Data

Input data for program REGRESSION.ANALYSIS will consist of six sets of cards. The organization of data on each card, along with a description of the items, is given in the following section.


```
                            If = 0, only X is input (as RM), Y is
                                    automatically computed from histogram.
    51-55 SKIPRG If = 0, the regression analysis will be
                                    executed.
                                    If = 1, the regression analysis will not
                                    be executed and only the histogram will be
                                    computed.
                    56-60 SKIPDZ If = 0, the intervals (as defined by RMIC
                    above) with no event, will not be considered
                        in regression analysis.
                                    If = 1, all intervals will be considered--
                                    use this for earthquake recurrence relationship.
                    61-65 NBCNF Number of confidence intervals to be computed,
                                    5 maximum per recurrence relationship
III--Confidence levels--(8F10.2)--One card (read only if NBCNF f 0)
            Col. 1-50 CNF Confidence levels (5 maximum per recurrence
                                    relation)
IV--Run identification--(4A4, I4, 2F10.0)--One card
            Co1. 1-16 HED2 Heading
            17-20 NBRCTT Number of records to be read
            21-30 A Length or area of seismic source. Input
                                    different from zero only if alpha (\alpha) is to
                                    be normalized.
    V--X and Y values--(FMT)--NBRCTT number of cards
            Col. -- X 
VI--RM-Richter Magnitude values (FMT)--NBRCTT number of cards
    Col. -- RM Independent variable {Richter Magnitude}
                            (Only if SKIPCD = 0)
```

NOTE: Several data sets can be processed in one run by repeating the input sequence described above starting at data set III.

### 6.4 Macro Flow Chart for Program REGRESSION.ANALYSIS


I. Read and print data





IV. Regression analysis


Separate values of independent
variable (RM) corresponding
to each regression line


Only one regression line will be fitted through the data




### 6.5 Sample Problems

6.5.1 Sample Problem No. 1

Obtain the recurrence relationship (Eq. 6.1) for a seismic source with 18 epicenters associated to it. Figure 6-1 shows the listing of the events (recorded for a time period of 125 years) in chronological order. The following assumptions will be made for this particular case, namely:

1) The parameter alpha ( $\alpha$ ) in Eq. 6.1 will not be normalized with respect to time nor area or length of the seismic source.
2) A minimum Richter Magnitude level (RMMN--data set II) equal to 3.00 will be used in the analysis.
3) A Richter Magnitude increment (RMIC--see data set II) equal to 0.20 will be used to compute the cumulative histogram.
4) As a first trial, (RMBK--breaking point magnitude, see data set II) will be set equal to zero assuming that only one regression line will represent the data in good approximation.
5) A Cutoff Magnitude (obtained from geological information) equal to 6.5 is given for the source. The computation of a $90 \%$ confidence interval is required.

Figure 6-3 shows the output for program REGRESSION.ANALYSIS (sample problem No. 1) where:

NBRC $=$ number of earthquake records used in the analysis.
AREA $=$ area or length of the seismic source under consideration (shown as zero since normalization of alpha is not required).

RMBK $=$ breakoff magnitude
$\mathrm{X}-$ Mean $=$ mean of independent variable ( RM in this case).
Y-Mean $=$ mean of dependent variable (number of earthquakes in this case--log scale).

EARTHQUAKE DATA IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER

| S | D | M | $Y$ | H | M | L | L | C | M | R | D | M | M | M | M | 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | A | 0 | E | 0 | I | A | 0 | L | M | A | $E$ | 5 | B | R | R | $Y$ |
| U | $\gamma$ | N | A | U | N | T | N | A | I | D | P |  |  | 1 | 2 | M |
| R |  | T | R | R | U | I | G | 5 |  | I | T |  |  |  |  | B |
| C |  | H |  |  | T | T | I | 5 |  | U | H |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| E |  |  |  |  | $E$ | U | T |  |  | S |  |  |  |  |  | L |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | D | U |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | E | D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\varepsilon$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ******** |  | *** | ***** | *** | *** | *********** | ********* | *** | **** | ** | *** | *** | *** | ****** | ****** | **** |
| A.GRAN | 17 | 12 | 1850 | 12 | 30 | 36.500 N | 07.400E |  | 6.5 |  |  |  |  | 4.61 | 4.61 | I |
| A.GRAN | 17 | 06 | 1408 | 00 | 24 | 36.500 N | 07.500E |  | 7.5 |  |  |  |  | 5.25 | 5.25 | I |
| A.GRAN | 04 | 08 | 1003 | 02 | 11 | 36.400 N | 06.600E | 0 | 8.0 |  |  |  |  | 5.10 | 5.10 |  |
| A.GRAN | 03 | 12 | 1428 | 05 | 30 | 36.400 N | 07.200E | D |  |  |  |  |  | 5.00 | 5.00 |  |
| A.GRAN | 10 | 02 | 1937 | 18 | 16 | 36.400 N | 07.500E | D | 9.0 |  |  |  |  | 5.40 | 5.40 |  |
| A. GRAN | 06 | 08 | 1947 | 09 | 46 | 36.300 N | 06.667E | D | 8.5 |  |  |  |  | 5.30 | 5.30 |  |
| A.GRAN | 27 | 10 | 1947 | 10 | 29 | 37.600 N | 08.500E | D | 5.5 |  |  |  |  |  | 5.40 | L |
| A.GRAN | 22 | 11 | 1950 | 02 | 43 | 36.100 N | 07.200E | E | 5.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 4.10 | L |
| A.GRAN | 01 | 04 | 1952 | 04 | 21 | 36.500 N | 07.300E | E | 6.0 |  |  |  |  | 4.50 | 4.50 |  |
| A.GRAN | 12 | 04 | 1952 | 16 | 23 | 36500 N | 07.300E | E | 5.5 |  |  |  |  | 4.20 | 4.20 |  |
| A.GRAN | 23 | 05 | 1956 | 06 | 37 | 36.400 N | 07.300E | E | 7.5 |  |  |  |  |  | 5.00 | L |
| A.GRAN | 26 | 06 | 1956 | 01 | 50 | 36.000 N | 08.100E | E | 7.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 4.15 | L |
| A.GRAN | 02 | 09 | 1958 | 12 | 26 | 36.500 N | 07.400E | $F$ | 5.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 3.55 | L |
| A.GRAN | 14 | 11 | 1959 | 16 | 10 | 36.400 N | 07.500E | $F$ | 4.5 |  |  |  |  |  | 3.05 | 1 |
| A. GRAN | 05 | 03 | 1960 | 04 | 18 | 36.600 N | 07.100E | F | 5.5 |  |  |  |  |  | 4.00 | L |
| A.GRAN | 02 | 12 | 1961 | 12 | 40 | 36.500 N | 08.200E |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5.50 | 5.50 |  |
| A.GRAN | 14 | 03 | 1963 | 12 | 25 | 36.200 N | 06.100E | E | 7.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 4.40 | $L$ |
| A, GRAN | 14 | 04 | 1967 | 23 | 44 | 36500 N | 07.800E | E |  |  |  |  |  | 4.30 | 4.30 |  |

Figure 6-1
Figure 6-2 shows a listing of the data deck for sample problem Number 1. Each data set as described in Section 6.2 is indicated with the corresponding item number.

INPUT DATA FOR PROGRAM REGRESSION ANALYSIS (SAMPLE PROBLEM I)

$\stackrel{\circ}{9}$


```
XVAR = variance of independent variable.
YVAR = variance of dependent variable
COVARXY = covariance
VAR(LNNM) = variance of the loge {cumulative number of occurrences}.
STDV(LNNM) = standard deviation of {cumulative number of occurrences}.
CONF.VALUE = value of t-student's distribution as computed by library
    subprogram (see Maero Flow Chart).
UPCNF = value of upper confidence interval for a given RM.
DNCNF = value of lower confidence interval for a given RM.
The rest of the terms shown in Figure \(6-3\) and the output itself is self-explanatory. Figure 6-4 is a plot of the recurrence relationship and confidence interval obtained. Note that the regression line has been extended beyond the last data point in order to intercept the cutoff magnitude line.
```


### 6.5.2 Sample Problem No. 1 (Part 2)

In Sample Problem No. 1 (see page 73), the value of the parameter RMBK (breakoff magnitude) was defined as zero in the input data, implying a one line fit to the data. It can be observed from Figure 6-4 that one regression line does not represent the data well since for the magnitude range between 4.0 and 5.0 the cumulative number of occurrences is underestimated and beyond Richter Magnitude $=5.0$, it is overestimated. Therefore, it seems reasonable to run a second trial, this time with the parameter RMBK $=4.20$, implying a bi-1inear fit. The rest of the input data (Figure 6-2) will remain the same, except that this time no confidence interval will be required. Figure 6-5 shows the updated listing of the input data deck.

Figure 6-6 shows the output for program REGRESSION. ANALYSIS (Sample Problem No. 1, Part 2). This time, two sets of values regarding regression

Figure 6-4 Recurrence Relationship for Seismic Source (Sample Problem No. 1)


## Figure 6-5

INPUT DATA FOR PROGRAM REGRESSION ANALYSIS (SAMPLE PROBLEM 1-PART 2)

| 3.0 |  | . 20 |  |  | . 2 | 125. |  | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  |  | I |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SAMPLE P | PROBLE | M 1 | 18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | IV |
| A. GRAN : | 1712 | 1850 | 12 | 30 | 36.500 N | 07.400E |  | 6.5 |  |  |  | 4.61 | 4.61 | I |  |
| A.GRAN 1 | 1706 | 1908 | 00 | 24 | 36.500 N | 07.500E |  | 7.5 |  |  |  | 5.25 | 5.25 | I |  |
| A. GRAN 0 | 0408 | 1908 | 02 | 11 | 36.400 N | 06.600E | 0 | 8.0 |  |  |  | 5.10 | 5.10 |  |  |
| A. GRAN 0 | 0312 | 1928 | 05 | 30 | 36.400 N | 07.200E | D |  |  |  |  | 5.00 | 5.00 |  |  |
| A.GRAN 1 | 1002 | 1937 | 18 | 16 | 36.400 N | 07.500E | D | 9.0 |  |  |  | 5.40 | 5.40 |  |  |
| A.GRAN 0 | 0608 | 1947 | 09 | 46 | 36.300 N | 06.667E | D | 8.5 |  |  |  | 5.30 | 5.30 |  |  |
| A. GRAN 2 | 2710 | 1947 | 10 | 29 | 37.600 N | 03.500E | D | 5.5 |  |  |  |  | 5.40 | L |  |
| A.GRAN 2 | 2211 | 1950 | 02 | 43 | 35.100 N | 07.200E | E | 5.0 |  |  |  |  | 4.10 | L | VI |
| A.GPAN 0 | 0104 | 1952 | 04 | C1 | 36.500 N | 07.300 E | E | 6.0 |  |  |  | 4.50 | 4.50 |  |  |
| A.GRAN 1 | 1204 | 1952 | 16 | 23 | 36500 N | 07.300E | E | 5.5 |  |  |  | 4.20 | 4.20 |  |  |
| A. GRAN 2 | 2305 | 1956 | 06 | 37 | 36.400 N | 07.300E | E | 7.5 |  |  |  |  | 5.00 | $L$ |  |
| A.GRAN 2 | 2606 | 1956 | 01 | 50 | 36.000 H | 0.3.100E | E | 7.0 |  |  |  |  | 4.15 | L |  |
| A.GRAN 0 | 0209 | 1955 | 12 | 26 | 36.500 N | 07.400E | F | 5.0 |  |  |  |  | 3.55 | L |  |
| A. GRAN 1 | 1411 | 1955 | 16 | 10 | 36.400 N | 07.500E | F | 4.5 |  |  |  |  | 3.05 | $L$ |  |
| A.GRAN 0 | 0503 | 1950 | 04 | 18 | 36.600 N | 07.100E | F | 5.5 |  |  |  |  | 4.00 | L |  |
| A. GRAN 0 | 0212 | 1961 | 12 | 40 | 36.500 N | 08.200E |  |  |  |  |  | 5.50 | 5.50 |  |  |
| A.GRAN 1 | 1403 | 1963 | 12 | 25 | 36.200 N | 06.100 E | E | 7.0 |  |  |  |  | 4.40 | L |  |
| A. GRAN 1 | 1404 | 1967 | 23 | 44 | 36500 N | 07.800E | E |  |  |  |  | 4.30 | 4.30 |  |  |

온
요
coefficients for Lines 1 and 2 are presented. The last two lines of output represent the coordinates of the real breakpoint magnitude as computed by the program.

Figure 6-7 shows the new bi-linear recurrence relationship for the seismic source under consideration. As it can be observed, the approximation obtained with two lines is better than with one.

### 6.5.3 Sample Problem No. 2

This example will illustrate the application of program REGRESSION.ANALYSIS in computing the histogram of number of events versus Richter Magnitude necessary for the construction of a CDF on magnitude and for the implementation of program GENER.MAGNITUDE (discussed previously in Chapter IV).

In order to use program REGRESSION.ANALYSIS for this purpose, one of the program's optional capabilities will be set by declaring the parameters SKIPCD (see data set II) equal to zero, and SKIPRG (see data set II) equal to 1 in the input data deck.

The earthquake records selected for this example are listed in Figure 6-8. Only seismic events containing Richter Magnitude values between 3.0 and 5.0 have been included. The reasons for doing this are as follows:

1) Earthquakes with Richter Magnitude levels below 3.0 are considered to have practically no effect on damage to structures and hence these will be disregarded for the analysis.
2) Richter Magnitude $=5.0$ has been selected as an upper limit, based on the assumption that any large event would be thorough1y documented, implying that only small events may be missing magnitude information.

Figure 6-9 shows the listing of the input data deck for this sample problem.
6.5.4 Output for Program REGRESSION.ANALYSIS (Sample Problem No. 2)

Figure $6-10$ shows the listing of the output for sample problem No. 2 . The program has computed the number of events or frequency for each Richter
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Figure 6-8


Figure 6-9

INPUT DATA FOR PROGRAM REGRESSION ANALYSIS (SAMPLE PROBLEM 2)

| $\begin{gathered} (72 \times, F 3.2) \\ 0.0 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | . 2 | 0. |  |  | 78.0 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | II |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SAMPLE PROBLEM $232 \ldots$ IV |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A. GRAN | 02 | 03 | 1900 | 07 | 00 | 32.600 N | 30.750 E |  |  |  |  |  | 3.50 | 3.50 |  |
| A.GRAN | 03 | 05 | 1902 | 05 | 00 | 32.500 N | 30.900E |  |  |  |  | 3.75 | 3.75 |  |
| A. GRAN | 050 | 03 | 1905 | 01 | 00 | 32.350 N | 30.900 E |  |  |  |  | 4.75 | 4.75 |  |
| A.GRAN | 050 | 03 | 1912 | 02 | 00 | 32.000 N | 30.500 E |  |  |  |  | 3.25 | 3.25 |  |
| A.GRAN | 04 | 09 | 1916 | 01 | 00 | 31.600 N | 30.530E |  |  |  |  | 3.50 | 3.50 |  |
| A.GRAN | 08 | 01 | 1920 | 02 | 30 | 32.200 N | 30.700E |  |  |  |  | 3.50 | 3.50 |  |
| A.GRAN | 06 | 08 | 1921 | 09 | 10 | 31.700 N | 30.650 E |  |  |  |  | 4.50 | 4.50 |  |
| A. GRAN | 170 | 02 | 1923 | 08 | 00 | 31.050 N | 32.350 E |  |  |  |  | 4.35 | 4.35 |  |
| A. GRAN | 160 | 01 | 1925 | 14 | 00 | 30.700 N | 32.700E |  |  |  |  | 3.50 | 3.50 |  |
| A.GRAN | 301 | 11 | 1725 | 12 | 15 | 31.500N | 32.400 E |  |  |  |  | 3.50 | 3.50 |  |
| A.GRAN | 04 | 01 | 1935 | 15 | 30 | 31.450 N | 31.000 E |  |  |  |  | 4.00 | 4.00 |  |
| A.GRAN | 10 | 08 | 1937 | 01 | 15 | 31.200 N | 30.900 E |  |  |  |  | 3.80 | 3.80 |  |
| A.GRAN | 041 | 12 | 1940 | 03 | 00 | 31.250 N | 31.200 E |  |  |  |  | 4.10 | 4.10 |  |
| A. GRAN | 14 | 02 | 1948 | 01 | 00 | 31.250 N | 32.450 E |  |  |  |  | 3.50 | 3.50 |  |
| A.GRAN | 13 | 04 | 1950 | 13 | 30 | 31.150 N | 32.600 E |  |  |  |  | 3.80 | 3.80 | VI |
| A.GRAN | 131 | 11 | 1951 | 02 | 15 | 31.300 N | 32.150 E |  |  |  |  | 3.75 | 3.75 |  |
| A. GRAN | 15 | 06 | 1954 | 06 | 35 | 31.100 N | 32.000 E |  |  |  |  | 3.75 | 3.75 |  |
| A. GRan | 021 | 12 | 1958 | 06 | 15 | 30.900 N | 31.800 E |  |  |  |  | 3.00 | 3.00 |  |
| A.GRAN | 18 | 01 | 1960 | 04 | 18 | 30.620 N | 32.250 E |  |  |  |  | 4.50 | 4.50 |  |
| A.GRAN | 04 | 08 | 1965 | 09 | 30 | 32.000N | 30.600 E |  |  |  |  | 4.65 | 4.65 |  |
| A.GRAN | 010 | 01 | 1968 | 13 | 14 | 30.550 N | 32.570E |  |  |  |  | 3.40 | 3.40 |  |
| A.GRAN | 041 | 10 | 1969 | 02 | 00 | 30.850 H | 32.150 E |  |  |  |  | 3.15 | 3.15 |  |
| A.GRAN | 031 | 12 | 1970 | 10 | 12 | 30.350 N | 32.570E |  |  |  |  | 3.00 | 3.00 |  |
| A.GRAN | 12 | 01 | 1972 | 11 | 05 | 31.750 N | 30.900 E |  |  |  |  | 4.65 | 4.65 |  |
| A.GRAN | 17 | 03 | 1972 | 13 | 05 | 30.850 N | 32.460E |  |  |  |  | 4.50 | 4.50 |  |
| A.GRAN | 030 | 08 | 1973 | 08 | 30 | 32.400 N | 30.750 E |  |  |  |  | 4.50 | 4.50 |  |
| A. GRAN | 081 | 11 | 1973 | 15 | 00 | 32.600 N | 32.750 E |  |  |  |  | 3.50 | 3.50 |  |
| A.GRAN | 11 | 05 | 1975 | 01 | 15 | 31.500 N | 30.750 E |  |  |  |  | 3.50 | 3.50 |  |
| A. GRAN | 06 | 04 | 1976 | 05 | 00 | 32.150 N | 30.530 E |  |  |  |  | 3.25 | 3.25 |  |
| A.GRAN | 010 | 08 | 1976 | 08 | 12 | 30.500 N | $31.250 E$ |  |  |  |  | 3.50 | 3.50 |  |
| A. GRAN | 16 | 10 | 1976 | 10 | 00 | 31.400 N | 32.650 E |  |  |  |  | 3.65 | 3.65 |  |
| A. GRAN | 010 | 07 | 1978 | 03 | 15 | 30.500 N | 32.420 E |  |  |  |  | 4.25 | 4.25 |  |



Magnitude interval (defined as 0.25 in this case). Using the results listed under the heading "Interval Frequency" (see Figure 6-10) will facilitate the construction of the histogram on magnitude and hence of the CDF necessary for the implementation of program GENER.MAGNITUDE.

A plot of the normalized historgram and of the CDF is shown in Figure 6-11.

### 6.5.5 Sample Problem No. 3

This example will illustrate the application of program REGRESSION.ANALYSIS in computing the coefficients $A$ and $B$ (see equation below) and the parameter SIGMA (standard deviation) necessary for the implementation of program INTENSITY.MAGNITUDE (discussed previously in Chapter III).

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathrm{M} & =\mathrm{BI}+\mathrm{A}  \tag{3.1}\\
\text { where: } \quad \mathrm{M} & =\text { Richter Magnitude } \\
\mathrm{I} & =\text { MMI-Modified Mercalli Intensity }
\end{align*}
$$

(repeated)

The earthquake records selected for this example are listed in Figure 6-12. Only events containing both Richter Magnitude and MMI values have been included. (Recall that since a relation of the form shown above has to be established on a regional basis, only those earthquake records containing both parameters RM,MMI are used.)

In order to use program REGRESSION.ANALYSIS for this purpose, one of the program's optional capabilities will be set by declaring the parameters SKIPCD (see data set II) equal to $1, \operatorname{SKIPRG}$ (see data set II) equal to zero, and SKIPDZ (see data set II) equal to zero.

Figure 6-13 shows the listing of the input data deck for this sample problem.

### 6.5.6 Output for Program REGRESSION. ANALYSIS (Sample Problem No. 3)

Figure 6-14 shows the listing of the output for Sample Problem No. 3. The program has computed the values of the coefficients $A$ and $B$ (identified

Figure 6-11 RM-Hisotgram and CDF--Sample Problem No. 2



Figure 6-12
EARTHQUAKE DATA IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER

| 5 | D | M | $Y$ | H | M | L | L | C | M | R | D | M | M | M | M |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | A | 0 | E | 0 | I | A | 0 | 1 | M | A | E | S | B | R | R | Y |
| U | $\gamma$ | N | A | U | N | T | N | A | I | D | $p$ |  |  | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| R |  | T | R | R | U | I | G | 5 |  | I | T |  |  |  |  | B |
| C |  | H |  |  | T | T | I | 5 |  | U | H |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| E |  |  |  |  | E | U | $T$ |  |  | S |  |  |  |  |  | L |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | D | U |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $E$ | D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $E$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ******** | *** | *** | ***\#** | *** | *** | ********* | ********** | ** | **** | 相 | *** | ** | *** | **** | ***** | *** |
| A.GRAN | 17 | 12 | 1850 | 12 | 30 | 36.500 N | 07.400E |  | 6.5 |  |  |  |  | 4.61 | 4.61 | I |
| A.GRAN | 17 | 06 | 1908 | 00 | 24 | 36.500 N | 07.500E |  | 7.5 |  |  |  |  | 5.25 | 5.25 | I |
| A.GRAN | 04 | 08 | 1908 | 02 | 11 | 36.400 N | 06.600E | D | 8.0 |  |  |  |  | 5.10 | 5.10 |  |
| A.GRAN | 03 | 12 | 1928 | 05 | 30 | 36.400 N | 07.200E | D |  |  |  |  |  | 5.00 | 5.00 |  |
| A. GRAN | 10 | 02 | 1937 | 18 | 16 | 36.400 N | 07.500E | D | 9.0 |  |  |  |  | 5.40 | 5.40 |  |
| A.GRAN | 06 | 08 | 1947 | 09 | 46 | 36.300 N | 06.667E | D | 8.5 |  |  |  |  | 5.30 | 5.30 |  |
| A.GRAN | 27 | 10 | 1947 | 10 | 29 | 37.600 N | 08.500E | D | 5.5 |  |  |  |  |  | 5.40 | L |
| A.GRAN | 22 | 11 | 1950 | 02 | 43 | 36.100 N | 07.200E | E | 5.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 4.10 | L |
| A.GRAN | 01 | 04 | 1952 | 04 | 21 | 36.500 N | 07.300E | $E$ | 6.0 |  |  |  |  | 4.50 | 4.50 |  |
| A.GRAN | 12 | 04 | 1952 | 16 | 23 | 36500 N | 07.300E | E | 5.5 |  |  |  |  | 4.20 | 4.20 |  |
| A.GRAN | 23 | 05 | 1956 | 06 | 37 | 36.400 N | 07.300E | E | 7.5 |  |  |  |  |  | 5.00 | L |
| A.GRAN | 26 | 06 | 1956 | 01 | 50 | 36.000 N | 08.100E | E | 7.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 4.15 | L |
| A. GRAN | 02 | 09 | 1958 | 12 | 26 | 36.500 N | 07.400E | F | 5.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 3.55 | L |
| A. GRAN | 14 | 11 | 1959 | 16 | 10 | 36.400 N | 07.500E | F | 4.5 |  |  |  |  |  | 3.05 | L |
| A.GRAN | 05 | 03 | 1960 | 04 | 18 | 36.600 N | 07.100E | $F$ | 5.5 |  |  |  |  |  | 4.00 | L |
| A.GRAN | 02 | 12 | 1961 | 12 | 40 | 36.500 N | 08.200E |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5.50 | 5.50 |  |
| A.GRAN | 14 | 03 | 1963 | 12 | 25 | 36.200 N | 06.100E | E | 7.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 4.40 | L |
| A.GRAN | 14 | 04 | 1967 | 23 | 44 | 36500 N | 07.800E | $E$ |  |  |  |  |  | 4.30 | 4.30 |  |

INPUT DATA FOR FROGRAM REGRESSION ANALYSIS (SAMPLE PROBLEM 3)

| 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0. | . | 125. |  | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | II |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SAMPLE | FROBL | EM 3 | 18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | IV |
| A.GRAN | 1712 | 1850 | 12 | 30 | 36.500 N | 07.400E |  | 6.5 |  |  |  | 4.61 | 4.61 | I |  |
| A. GRAN | 1706 | 1909 | 00 | 24 | 36.500 N | 07.500E |  | 7.5 |  |  |  | 5.25 | 5.25 | I |  |
| A.GRAN | 0408 | 1908 | 02 | 11 | 36.400 N | 06.600 E | D 8 | 8.0 |  |  |  | 5.10 | 5.10 |  |  |
| A.GRAN | 0312 | 1528 | 05 | 30 | 36.400 N | 07.200E | D 8 | 8.0 |  |  |  | 5.00 | 5.00 |  |  |
| A.GRAN | 1002 | 1937 | 18 | 16 | 36.400 N | 07.500E |  | 9.0 |  |  |  | 5.40 | 5.40 |  |  |
| A.GRAN | 0608 | 1947 | 09 | 46 | 36.300 N | 06.667E | D 8 | 8.5 |  |  |  | 5.30 | 5.30 |  |  |
| A. GRAF | 2710 | 1947 | 10 | 29 | 37.600 N | 08.500E | D 5 | 5.5 |  |  |  |  | 5.40 | $L$ |  |
| A.GRAN | 2211 | 1950 | 02 | 43 | 36.100 N | 07.200E | E 5 | 5.0 |  |  |  |  | 4.10 | 1 |  |
| A.GRAN | 0104 | 1952 | 04 | 21 | 36.500 N | 07.300E | E 6 | 6.0 |  |  |  | 4.50 | 4.50 |  | V |
| A.GRAN | 1204 | 1952 | 16 | 23 | 36.500 N | 07.300E |  | 5.5 |  |  |  | 4.20 | 4.20 |  |  |
| A.GRAN | 2305 | 1950 | 06 | 37 | 36.400 N | 07.300E | E 7 | 7.5 |  |  |  |  | 5.00 | $L$ |  |
| A.GRAN | 2606 | 1956 | 01 | 50 | 36.000 N | 08.100E | E 7 | 7.0 |  |  |  |  | 4.15 | L |  |
| A.GRAN | 0209 | 1958 | 12 | 26 | 36.500 N | 07.400E | F 5 | 5.0 |  |  |  |  | 3.55 | L |  |
| A. GRAN | 1411 | 1959 | 16 | 10 | 36.400 N | 07.500E | F 4 | 4.5 |  |  |  |  | 3.05 | L |  |
| A.GRAN | 0503 | 1960 | 04 | 18 | 36.600 N | 07.100E |  | 5.5 |  |  |  |  | 4.00 | L |  |
| A.GRAN | 0212 | 1961 | 12 | 40 | 36.500 N | 08.200E |  | 7.5 |  |  |  | 5.50 | 5.50 |  |  |
| A.GRAN | 1403 | 1963 | 12 | 25 | 36.200 N | 06.100 E | E 7 | 7.0 |  |  |  |  | 4.40 | $L$ |  |
| A.GRAN | 1404 | 1967 | 23 | 443 | 36500 N | 07.800E | E 6 | 6.0 |  |  |  | 4.30 | 4.30 |  |  |

Figure 6-13
as alpha and beta in Figure 6-14) and the statistics for the regression line.

Figure 6-15 shows the plot of the Magnitude--MMI values and the line fitted to the data.

Figure 6-14
OUTPUT FOR program regression analysis (sample problem 3)*

*Program REGRESSION. ANALYSIS has been modified (see page 61) in order to obtain a linear-linear fit.

Figure 6-15
Intensity vs Magnitude Relationship for Sample Problem 3


### 7.1 Introduction

The Classical approach to seismic hazard analysis (one of the two seismic hazard models, see Fig. 1-2) will be discussed and implemented through the use of program ACC.LINE.AREA.

The four key elements associated to seismic hazard models are:

- Earthquake recurrence model
- Source geometry
- Tectonic model and travel path
- Attenuation uncertainty

Their treatment under the present approach, along with a brief summary of the theory behind the Classical model will be presented in the following sections.

### 7.1.1 Theoretical Background*

Poisson Mode1 of Seismic Occurrences
Earthquake occurrences have been modeled using the Poisson probability law. For earthquake events to follow the Poisson model, the following assumptions must be valid:
1.) Earthquakes are spatially independent.
2.) Earthquakes are temporally independent.
3.) Probability that two seismic events will take place at the same location and at the same time approaches zero.
${ }^{\text {F }}$ Summary taken from Reference 1.

In its general form, the Poisson Law can be written as

$$
\begin{equation*}
P_{n}(t)=\frac{e^{-\lambda t}(\lambda t)^{n}}{n!} \tag{7.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where: $P_{n}(t)=$ Probability of having $n$ events in time period $t$ $\mathrm{n}^{*}=$ number of events $\lambda=$ mean rate of occurrence per unit of time Recurrence relationships (as obtained in Chapter VI) enable the analyst to obtain mean number of occurrences above Richter Magnitude M for a given source. This relationship in its general form can be written as:

$$
\begin{equation*}
N(M)=\phi(M, A, T) \tag{7.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where: $N(M)=$ Number of occurrences above Richter Magnitude M M = Richter Magnitude $A=$ Source characteristic (area source, or line source) T = Time period of data base

In particular, for the present seismic hazard methodology, the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{Ln}_{e} N(M)=\alpha+\beta M \tag{6.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

(repeated)
has been adopted.
Normalizing the regression coefficient $\alpha$ in Eq. 6.1 with respect to time and area or length of a particular source give the expression:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{Ln} N^{\prime}(M)=\alpha^{\prime}+\beta M \tag{7.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

```
where N'(M) = normalized mean number of events above magnitude M
    for unit time (1 year) and unit area or unit length
    \alpha' = \alpha - ln(AT) for area source
    \alpha' = \alpha - ln(LT) for line source
```

```
A = area of the area source (degrees of latitude and
    longitude)
L = length of line source (degrees of latitude and
    longitude)
T = time for which data was obtained.
```

Thus, depending on the source and the value of $M$, the mean number of events above magnitude $M$ for a unit area for area source, a unit length for line source, and a unit time is given by:

$$
\begin{equation*}
N^{\prime}(M)=\exp \left\{\alpha^{\prime}+\beta M\right\} \tag{7.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

replacing $\lambda$ in Eq. 7.1 by $N^{\prime}(M)$, the following equation is obtained for the probability of having $n$ events in time period $t$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
P_{n}(t)=\frac{\exp \left\{-\exp \left(\alpha^{\prime}+\beta M\right) t\right\}\left\{\exp \left(\alpha^{\prime}+\beta M\right) t\right\}^{n}}{n!} \tag{7.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

## Source Mechanisms

The present model considers three different types of sources to represent the seismicity of any geographical location. They are:

- Point source
- Line source
- Area source

Point source
For this type of source, all occurrences (past and future) take place at one point. The recurrence relationship can be normalized with respect to time T as follows:

$$
\begin{equation*}
N^{\prime}(M)=\frac{N(M)}{T} \tag{7.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Substituting the value of $N^{\prime}(M)$ in the Poisson law of Eq. 7.1 , we get:

$$
\begin{equation*}
P_{n}(M>m, t)=\frac{\exp \left\{-N^{\prime}(m) t\right\}\left\{N^{\prime}(m) t\right\}^{n}}{n!} \tag{7.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $P_{n}(M>m, t)$ gives the probability that there will be $n$ events of Richter magnitude greater than $m$ in time period $t$.

For engineering purposes, we are usually interested in determining the probability of at least one event greater than $m$ in time period $t$. This probability is given by
$P\{$ at least one event of Magnitude $M>m$ in time $t\}=1-\exp \left\{-N^{\prime}(m) t\right\}$

Line Source
For a line source, it is assumed that epicenters lie along a linear fault. For a line source of length $L$ (fault length L) and the data base for a time period $T$, the recurrence relationship of Chapter VI, Eq. 6.1 can be normalized to:

$$
\begin{equation*}
N^{\prime}(m)=\frac{N(M)}{L T} \tag{7.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Substituting the value of $N^{\prime}(\mathrm{m})$ in the Poisson Law of Eq .7 .1 we get:

$$
P_{n}(M>m, t)=\frac{\exp \left\{-N^{\prime}(m) t\right\}\left\{N^{\prime}(m) t\right\}^{n}}{n!}
$$

The probability of at least one event of magnitude greater than $m$ for a future time period $t$ is given by:
$P($ at least one earthquake of $M>m$ in time $t)=1-\exp \left\{-N^{\prime}(m) t\right\} \quad(7.8)^{\prime}$

## Area source

When past earthquake epicenters do not lie on a line (i.e., along a given fault line) but are scattered over a region, the seismic source is considered as an area source. The present model considers horizontal full circles or sections of a circle at constant depth to represent
area sources. For an area source of area $A$ and data base for a time period T, the recurrence relationship of Chapter VI, Eq. 6.1 can be normalized to:

$$
\begin{equation*}
N^{\prime}(m)=\frac{N(m)}{A T} \tag{7.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Substituting (7.10) in the Poisson law of Eq. 7.1 gives:

$$
P_{n}(M>m, t)=\frac{\exp \left\{-N^{\prime}(m) t\right\}\left\{N^{\prime}(m) t\right\}^{n}}{n!}
$$

The probability of at least one event of magnitude greater than $m$ for a future time period $t$ is given by:
$P\{$ at least one earthquake of $M>m$ in time $t\}=1-\exp \left\{-N^{\prime}(m) t\right\}$

Peak Ground Acceleration at a Site
As mentioned in Chapter $I$, the most commonly used parameter to describe the seismic loading at a given site is the peak ground acceleration (PGA). In the previous section, the probability of exceeding a magnitude level ( $m$ ) in time $t$ was determined by using the Poisson model and the recurrence relationships for a given source. For design purposes we are interested in obtaining information on probable loadings at a site. For this, the following parameters have to be known:
1.) Probabilistic information on Richter Magnitude for a source as a function of future time $t$.
2.) Distance from site to source.
3.) Attenuation of peak ground acceleration from source to site.

The first parameter was determined in Eqs. 7.8, 7.8', and 7.8' for each type of source. Several attenuation formulas are available which give relationships between the Richter Magnitude (M), the epicentral distance or hypocentral distance and PGA. The most commonly used
relationship is of the form given by:

$$
\begin{equation*}
A=\frac{b_{1} \exp \left(b_{2} M\right)}{\left(R_{h}+b_{4}\right)^{b_{3}}} \tag{7.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

where: $A=$ Peak ground acceleration
$\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{h}}=$ hypocentral distance from source to site
M = Richter Magnitude
$b_{1}, b_{2}, b_{3}$, and $b_{4}$ are attenuation constants
Equation 7.11 is incorporated in Eqs. 7.8, 7.8' and 7.9' for each source type considered (point, line and area source, respectively), in order to determine the peak ground acceleration at a site in a probabilistic sense.

The probability distribution on peak ground acceleration (A) at a site for a point source is given by:

$$
\begin{equation*}
P\{A>a, t\}=1-\exp \left\{-\gamma\left(\frac{a}{b_{1}}\right)^{\delta}\left(R_{h}+b_{4}\right)^{\rho} t\right\} \tag{7.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

where: $\gamma=e^{\alpha^{\prime}}$

$$
\delta=\beta / b_{2}
$$

$$
\rho=\frac{\beta b_{3}}{b_{2}}
$$

See Figure 7-1.
Similarly, for a line source (see Figure 7-1):

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.\mathrm{P}\{A>a, t\}=1-\exp \left\{-\gamma\left(\frac{a}{b_{1}}\right)^{\delta} t \int_{\ell}^{\ell} 2\left(d^{2}+\ell^{2}+h^{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}+b_{4}\right)^{\rho} d \ell\right\} \tag{7.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

for an area source (see Figure 7-2):

$$
\begin{equation*}
P\{A>a, t\}=1-\exp \left\{-\gamma\left(\frac{a}{b_{1}}\right){ }^{\delta} t \theta \int_{R_{1}}^{R_{2}}\left(R_{h}+b_{4}\right)^{\left.\rho_{R d r}\right\}}\right. \tag{7.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

## SITE <br> POINT SOURCE
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Figure 7-2

In general, a site is usually surrounded by any or all of the three sources discussed previously. The probabilistic loading due to such a case can be obtained by the following expression:

$$
\begin{align*}
P\{A>a, t\}= & 1-\exp \left\{-\sum_{i=1}^{N P} \gamma_{i}\left(\frac{a}{b_{1}}\right)^{\delta} i_{t}\left(R_{h_{i}}+b_{4}\right)^{\rho}\right. \\
& -\sum_{j=1}^{N L} \gamma_{j}\left(\frac{a}{b_{1}}\right)^{\delta} j_{t} \int_{\ell}^{\ell} 2{ }_{1 j}\left\{\left(d_{j}^{2}+\ell^{2}+h_{j}^{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}+b_{4}\right\}^{\rho j} d \ell \\
& \left.-\sum_{k=1}^{N A} \gamma_{k}\left(\frac{a}{b_{1}}\right)^{\delta_{k}}{ }_{t \theta_{k}} \int_{R_{k}}^{R} 2 k_{\left(R_{h}\right.}+b_{4}\right) \tag{7.15}
\end{align*}
$$

$\mathrm{NP}=$ number of point sources in the region
$\mathrm{NL}=$ number of line sources in the region
$N A=$ number of area sources in the region
It should be pointed out that the present approach assumes that the total energy released during an earthquake is radiated from the hypocenter (point model) and that the maximum intensity at a given site is governed by its distance from the hypocenter. Also the energy attenuation, Eq. 7.11 has been incorporated in the Poisson model in a deterministic sense. An uncertainty about the mean value of the attenuation, to account for the scatter present in the data, is not incorporated in the model.

### 7.1.2 Purpose and description of program ACC.LINE.AREA

Program ACC.LINE.AREA has been designed to compute the seismic exposure of a site by combining the effect of all the seismic sources identified within the geographic location and to provide an estimate of the probability of occurrence at a site of at least one acceleration greater or equal to a given PGA within the future time period $t$ of interest (see Eq. 7.15). A cumulative distribution function (CDF) or a complementary
distribution function (1-CDF) is developed at a site. By choosing a large number of sites at the nodes of a grid covering a given region, seismic exposure within the region can be described. It must be kept in mind that an identical procedure can be applied to any other parameter such as maximum ground velocity, etc., by using different attenuation functions.

Since the hypocentral distance is a parameter in the attenuation relationship (Eq. 7.11), the area and line sources are divided in small segments in order to take into consideration the distance variation to the site from different parts of a source. The size of the segments is chosen small enough such that the approximation from a continuous to discrete computation is acceptable and the replacement of the integration sign in Eq. 7.15 by summation is valid. The seismicity within a source remains the same from segment to segment. The ground parameter (PGA, PGV, etc.) used in the model is also discretized to equal step increments.

The present version can handle only point, line and circular area sources at a constant depth (no dipping planes allowed). The units of length used by the program are degrees of latitude and longitude. The unit of time is normally given in years. The regression parameter (alpha) in Eq. 7.3 must be normalized with respect to time in years and length or area in degrees and degrees square, respectively. The attenuation constants $b_{1}, b_{2}, b_{3}$, and $b_{4}$ must be properly scaled in order to match the degree-latitute-longitude units.

In its present form, program ACC.LINE.AREA has been divided into a main routine and two subprograms. It contains 433 executable FORTRAN statements. The space requirements are approximately 17124 bytes. The actual array dimensions can accomodate up to 62 seismic sources; there is no limitation with respect to the number of sites or nodal points chosen. The number of future time periods of interest is limited to

10 per run. The discretized ground parameter (e.g., PGA, PGV, etc.) is limited to 30 equal step increments. The program can handle several nodal grids in one run.

### 7.2 Description of Input Data

Input data for program ACC. LINE.AREA will consist of six sets of cards. The organization of data on each card, along with a description of the items, is given in the following paragraphs.
I. Run Identification--(20A4)--One card

Col. 1-80 HED1 (Identification label)
II. Attenuation Constants--Card One--Geometric Constants--(10I5)

Co1. $\begin{array}{cc}1-10 & \text { B1 } \\ 11-20 & \text { B2 } \\ 21-30 & \text { B3 } \\ 31-40 & B 4\end{array}\left\{\begin{array}{c}\text { Constants in attenuation relationship of the } \\ \text { form: } \\ A=\frac{b_{1} \exp \left(b_{2} M\right)}{b_{3}} \\ \left(R_{h}+b_{4}\right)\end{array}\right.$
41-50 DELTAL (sten size for line integration in degrees, i.e. $0.05^{\circ}$ )
51-60 DELTAC (step size for circle integration in degrees)
III. Problem Description (Three Cards)

Col. NL (Number of line sources for the region)
6-10 NA (Number of area sources for the region)
11-15 NT (Number of time periods of interest)
16-20 NY (Number of step intervals for ground parameter of interest, see Card 3)

21-30 NBGD (Number of grids)
31-35 SKSAVE If 0, the program will save the output on disc, (logical unit must be specified in JCL).

If 1 , no output will be saved.

Card 2－－Time periods of interest（NT values－－maximum 10 per run）
Input 8 values per card（8F10．0）
Co1．1－10 $T(1)$（time period of interest $⿰ ⿰ 三 丨 ⿰ 丨 三 ⿻ ⿻ 一 𠃋 十 一 ~() ~$
11－20 $T(2)$（time period of interest \＃2）
．． $\mathrm{T}(\mathrm{NT})$（time period of interest 非T）
71－80 T（8）（time period of interest \＃8）
Card 3－－Discretized ground parameter－－NY step increments
Input 8 values per card（maximum of 30 discretized values）－－（8F10．0）
Co1．1－10 $\quad$ GG（1）（ground parameter，discrete value 非1）
11－20 $Y G(2)$（ground parameter，discrete value 非2）
．． $\mathrm{YG}(\mathrm{NY})$（ground parameter，discrete value 非NY）
Note：The program computes the probability of exceeding at least once at the site，the values of the parameter specified above．Usually the YG are input in ascending order to describe a discretized （1－CDF）curve．

IV．Properties of Line Sources（Three Cards per Source）
Card 1－－Identification of the line source－－（20A4）
Co1．1－80 HED2（Source＇s identification label）

Card 2－－Properties to the left of breaking point magnitude（RMBK）in
sources＇recurrence relationship and coordinates＇of souces＇
endpoints－$-(7$ F10．0）
Co1．1－10 ALPHA1（Normalized intercept $\alpha^{\prime}$ ，see Eq．7．3）
11－20 BETA1（Slope（ $\beta$ ）of line 1，see Eq．7．3）
21－30 XL1（X－coordinate of source＇s origin（degrees longitude））

31－40 XL2（X－coordinate of source＇s end（degrees
longitude））
41－50 YL1（Y－coordinate of source＇s origin（degrees
latitude））

Co1. 51-60 YL2 (Y-coordinate of source's end (degrees latitude))

61-70 HL (depth of the source (degrees))
Card 3--Properties to the right of breaking point magnitude--(If only
one line has been fitted to the data, see Chapter VI, Problem 1),
input same $\alpha$ and $\beta$ as in Card 2 and breakpoint magnitude $=$ zero)

| Co1. | 1-10 | ALPHA2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | (normalized intercept) 0 (slope of Line 2)

V. Properties of Area Sources (Three Cards per Source)

Card 1--Identification of the Area Source--(20A4)
Col. 1-80 HED2 (source's identification labe1)
Card 2--Properties to the left of breaking point magnitude in source's recurrence relationship and coordinates of source's center-(6F10.0)

Col. 1-10 ALPHA1 (Normalized intercept $\alpha^{\prime}$ of line 1)
11-20 BETA1 (slope $\beta$ of line 1--refer to Figure 6.7)
21-30 XL1 (X-coordinate of circle's center (degrees longitude))

31-40 YL1 (Y-coordinate of circle's center (degrees 1atitude))

41-50 XL2 (radius of the circle (degrees))
51-60 HL (depth of the source (degrees))
Card 3--Properties to the right of breaking point magnitude. If only one line has been fitted to the data, input same $\alpha$ and $\beta$ as in Card 2 and breakpoint magnitude $=$ zero)

Col. 1-10 ALPHA2 (normalized intercept of line 2, refer to Fig. 6.7)
11-20 BETA2 (slope of line 2, refer to Fig. 6.7)
21-30 RML (breakpoint magnitude)

31-40 RMMX (cutoff magnitude for source)
VI. Description of Grid--2 cards per grid

Card 1--Grid's identification--(20A4)
Col. 1-80 HED2 (name of grid)
Card 2--Grid's description--(8F10.0)--See Figure 7-3
Col. 1-10 XBEGIN (X-coordinate of grid's origin (degrees longitude))

11-20 YBEGIN (Y-coordinate of grid's origin (degrees latitude))

21-30 XEND (X-coordinate of grid's end (degrees longitude))

31-40 YEND (Y-coordinate of grid's end (degrees longitude))

41-50 DX (X-increment (degrees longitude))
51-60 DY (Y-increment (degrees latitude))
Note: Both origin and end should coincide, and DX, DY input as zero if only one site is considered.

Figure 7-3 Typical Nodal Grid


Note: Grid will be covered row-wise from left to right starting with the bottom row--XBECIN, YBEGIN \{ have to be nlaced XEND, YEND as shown

### 7.3 Macro Flow Chart for Program ACC. LINE.AREA


I. Read and Print Data










Figure 7-4 Seismic Sources for Region of Interest

### 7.4 Sample Problem

Suppose that for a particular region of interest, the epicentral map shown in Figure 7-4 has been obtained, and that three seismic sources (two line sources and one area source) have been modeled after correlating past events to major fault systems and tectonic features identified within the region.

The future seismic exposure (PGA) for "CITY2" (see map) for a time period of 50 years is required. For this purpose, the following assumptions are made:
1.) Past earthquake events (as recorded for the region) have been classified as shallow with hypocenters between 0 and 15 km .
2.) The average depth of the three seismic sources has been set equal to 10 km ( 0.087 degrees for the particular geographic location).
3.) The length in degrees of the two line sources are, respectively:

Line Source $1=0.871^{\circ}$
Line Source $2=0.764^{\circ}$
These lengths have been obtained in the following manner:

4.) The radius (in degrees) of the area source is

$$
\mathrm{R}=0.749^{\circ}
$$

and is defined as the distance from the centroid of the epicenters associated to the source to the most distant epicenter in the source.
5.) From regression analysis (Chapter VI), the following recurrence coefficients have been obtained.

Line Source 1 (bi-1inear recurrence relationship)
ALPHA1 $=2.58$, BETA1 $=-1.09 ;$ ALPHA2 $=24.00$, BETA2 $=-4.55$
Cutoff magnitude $=6.8$, breakpoint magnitude $=6.45$
Line Source 2 (bi-linear recurrence relationship)
$\mathrm{ALPHA1}=3.17, \mathrm{BETA1},=-0.74 ; \mathrm{ALPHA} 2=79.15, \mathrm{BETA} 2=-12.4$
Cutoff Magnitude $=7.8$, breakpoint magnitude $=6.50$
Area Source 1 (bi-linear recurrence relationship)
$\mathrm{ALPHA} 1=0.14, \mathrm{BETA} 1=-0.07, \mathrm{ALPHA} 2=79.90, \mathrm{BETA} 2=-13.04$
Cutoff magnitude $=6.5$, breakpoint magnitude $=6.15$
Note: All alpha values have been normalized with respect to time $t=50$ years and length or area of source (in degrees).
6.) The attenuation parameters $b_{1}, b_{2}, b_{3}$, and $b_{4}$ in Eq. 7.11 for PGA are as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{b}_{1}=0.00429937 \\
& \mathrm{~b}_{2}=0.800 \\
& \mathrm{~b}_{3}=2.000 \\
& \mathrm{~b}_{4}=0.3673769
\end{aligned}
$$

7.) Sources' Coordinates and Site

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Line Source 1: } X \text {-coordinate of origin }=30.50^{\circ} \text { (longitude) } \\
& \text { Y-coordinate of origin }=31.97^{\circ} \text { (latitude) } \\
& \mathrm{X} \text {-coordinate of end }=30.92^{\circ} \text { (longitude) } \\
& \text { Y-coordinate of end }=32.62^{\circ} \text { (1atitude) } \\
& \text { Line Source 2: } X \text {-coordinate of origin }=30.51^{\circ} \text { (longitude) } \\
& \text { Y-coordinate of origin }=31.75^{\circ} \text { (1atitude) } \\
& \mathrm{X} \text {-coordinate of end }=31.30^{\circ} \text { (longitude) } \\
& \text { Y-coordinate of end }=31.00^{\circ} \text { (1atitude) } \\
& \text { Area Source 1: X-coordinate of center }=32.39^{\circ} \text { (longitude) } \\
& \mathrm{Y} \text {-coordinate of center }=31.078^{\circ} \text { (1atitude) }
\end{aligned}
$$

INPUT DATA FOR PROGRAM ACC.LINE.AREA (SAMPLE PROBLEM)


Figure 7-5

$$
\begin{aligned}
\text { Site (City2): } \quad X \text {-coordinate } & =32.00^{\circ} \text { (1ongitude) } \\
Y \text { Y-coordinate } & =32.06^{\circ} \text { (1atitude) }
\end{aligned}
$$

Figure 7-5 shows the listing of the input data deck for program ACC.LINE.AREA (Sample Problem). Each data set as described in Section 7.2 is indicated with the corresponding item number.
7.5 Output for Program ACC.LINE.AREA

Figure 7-6 shows the listing of the output for program ACC.LINE.AREA as obtained on the line printer. It contains basically the parameters given in the input list (echo printing), plus the probabilities of exceedance and non-exceedance for each discrete value of the ground parameter of interest (PGA discretized at equal increments of 0.05 g ) listed under the heading "Probability Distribution of Peak Ground Acceleration."

Figure $7-7$ shows a plot of the complementary cumulative distribution function (1-CDF) as computed for the site of interest (CITY2).

### 7.6 Acceleration Zone Graph (AZG)

Consider the complementary cumulative distribution function on peak ground acceleration for CITY2 and for an exposure time of 50 years (see Fig. 7-7); then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{P}_{50}\{\mathrm{~A}>0.10 \mathrm{~g}\}=0.7512 \tag{7.16}
\end{equation*}
$$

Equation 7.16 can be interpreted in the following way: for CITY2, there is a $75 \%$ chance that during the next 50 years the peak ground acceleration of 0.10 g will be exceeded at least once.

Thus, there's a $25 \%$ chance that for "CITY2," 0.10 g PGA will not be exceeded a single time. Hence,
$P\{$ zero exceedance of 0.10 g in 50 years $\} \cong 0.25$
From the binomial probability law, it is known that for independent trials with probability of success $p$ at each trial, the probability of $\mathbf{r}$ successes in n trials is given by:

OUTPUT FOR PROGRAM ACC.LINE.AREA (SAMPLE PROBLEM i)

PROGRAM ACC.LINE.AREA (SAMPLE PROBLEM)
ATTENUATION CONSTANTS


AREA SOURCES
************
AREA SOURCE 1

| ALPHAI | BETAI |
| :--- | :---: |
| $0.140000+00$ | $-0.700000-01$ |


| XO | YO |
| :---: | :---: |
| $0.323900+02$ | $0.310780+02$ |

$\begin{array}{cc}\mathrm{R} & \mathrm{HA} \\ 0.74900 \mathrm{D}+00 & 0.87000 \mathrm{D}-01\end{array}$
SECOND REGRESSION CONSTANTS ALPHAZ BETAZ

MR
$0.799000+02-0.130400+02 \quad 0.615000+01 \quad 0.650000+01$
***********ROBABILITYDISTRIBUTIONOFPEAKGROUNDACCELERATION ***

SITE OF INTEREST (CITY 2 )
GEOMETRIC CONSTANTS

| $N L=2$ | $\mathrm{NA}=$ | 1 | NXMAX $=$ | NYMAX= |  | $N T=$ |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SITE LOC | ION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $X=3$ | .000 $Y=$ | 32.060 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TIME PER | = 50.00 | YRS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $P G A=$ | 0.0500 | 0.1000 | 0.1500 | 0.2000 | 0.2500 | 0.3000 | 0.3500 | 0.4000 | 0.4500 | 0.5000 |
| $P(Y>Y O)$ | 1.0000 | 0.7512 | 0.0043 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| $P(Y<Y O)$ | 0.0000 | 0.2488 | 0.9957 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |
| PGA $=$ | 0.5500 | 0.6000 | 0.6500 | 0.7000 | 0.7500 | 0.8000 |  |  |  |  |
| $P(Y>Y O)$ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| $P(Y<Y O)$ | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 | 1.0000 |  |  |  |  |

Figure 7-6

Plot of $P\left\{A>A_{0}\right\}$ or $(1-C D F)$ for site $(C I T Y 2)$ and $t=50$ years


Figure 7-7

$$
\begin{equation*}
P_{n}(r)=\binom{n}{r} p^{r}(1-p)^{n-r} \tag{7.17}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $r=0,1,2, \ldots n \quad$ and $\quad\binom{n}{r}=\frac{n!}{r!(n-r)!}$
Let each trial be a one-year duration for which we are observing the level of peak ground acceleration. Define success as that event when the peak ground acceleration for a given trial (year) exceeds 0.10 g . Thus, the probability of zero exceedance of level 0.10 g in 50 years is the same as the probability of zero successes in 50 trials. Hence from Eq. 7.17:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& P_{50}(0)=\binom{50}{0} p^{0}(1-p)^{50} \\
& P_{50}(0)=(1-p)^{50}
\end{aligned}
$$

However,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{P}_{50}(0)=0.250 \\
& \\
& (1-\mathrm{p})^{50}=0.250 \\
& \text { or } p=0.027
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus, for CITY2, there is a 2.7 percent chance that in any given year, a peak ground acceleration of 0.10 g will be exceeded. Knowing that the Return Period is defined as:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{RP}=1 / \mathrm{p} \tag{7.18}
\end{equation*}
$$

the return period $R P$ in "CITY2" for a peak ground acceleration of 0.10 g is $1 / 0.027 \approx 37$ years.

Thus, using the complementary cumulative distribution function computed for "CITY2" (Fig. 7-7), a table of Peak ground acceleration and return period can be developed and plotted to obtain a curve referred to as an Acceleration Zone Graph (AZG). Table 1 and Figure 7-8 show the values of Return Period versus PGA and the AZG for "CITY2."

Table 1

Table of Return Period vs PGA for CITY2

| PGA in $g$ <br> units | Return Period <br> in Years |
| :---: | :---: |
| 0.06 | 18 |
| 0.075 | 23 |
| 0.100 | 37 |
| 0.110 | 63 |
| 0.120 | 87 |
| 0.130 | 141 |
| 0.140 | 358 |
| 0.150 | 10000 |

Figure 7-8 Acceleration Zone Granh (AZG) for CITY2


The acceleration zone graph can be used to estimate the probable future loading on a structure. For this, the designer or analyst must establish a relation between the economic life of the structure (in years), the risk he is willing to take, and the return period. For this, the binomial distribution given by

$$
P_{n}(r)=\left(\begin{array}{r}
n  \tag{7.17}\\
r
\end{array} p^{r}(1-p)^{n-r}\right.
$$

is used as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\text { let } \mathrm{n}= & \text { economic life of the structure in years (number of trials) } \\
\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{n}}(\mathrm{r}=0)= & \text { risk level the analyst is willing to take for the non- } \\
& \text { exceedance of a loading level. }
\end{aligned}
$$

Assume the exposure life of a structure has been estimated to be 50 years and the risk level taken by the analyst is 10 percent of exceeding a specified load level. Then from Eq. 7.17,

$$
\begin{aligned}
0.90 & =(1-p)^{50} \\
\text { or } \quad p & =0.0021
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\text { therefore, } \quad R P=\frac{1}{0.0021} \cong 475 \text { years }
$$

From Figure $7-8$, for an $R P=475$ years, a PGA level of 0.14 g is obtained. Normally, this would be the acceleration level used to estimate the lateral load for design purposes.

## CHAPTER VIII

## Bayesian Approach--Program SORT.MAGNITUDE

### 8.1 Introduction

In the following chapters, the Bayesian model for seismic hazard analysis will be used. (Figure 1-2, Stage III, Item 1.)

Prior to the execution of the main seismic hazard program, program SEISMIC.HAZARD (Chapter IX), it is necessary for the analyst to sort the seismic events which have been collected for a given region, and which have been organized according to the different seismic sources identified within the region (Figure 5-7), as a function of their Richter Magnitude:levels. For this purpose, the implementation of program SORT.MAGNITUDE is necessary.

### 8.2 Description of Program SORT.MAGNITUDE

Program SORT.MAGNITUDE has been deisgned to sort the earthquake records (in complete form) gathered for a particular region of interest as a function of their Richter Magnitude levels.

The user has to input the earthquake records corresponding to each seismic source and the program will automatically organize the events in increasing order with respect to magnitude bands (where the width of the band has been set equal to 0.25 in the program; see Macro Flow Chart).

The output of the program will be used later (Chapter IX) to obtain the sample likelihood function in the Bernoulli trial of program SEISMIC.HAZARD.

In its present form, program SORT.MAGNITUDE has been organized in a main routine. It contains 38 executable FORTRAN statements and the space requirements is approximately 8400 bytes. The actual version can handle any number of data sets containing any number of earthquake records.

### 8.3 Description of Input Data

Input data for program SORT.MAGNTTUDE will consist of three sets of cards. The organization of the data on each card, along with a description of the items, is given in the following sections.
I. Number of Data Sets to be Sorted--(I5)--One Card

Col. $1-5$ NOSC (number of data sets to be sorted--the earthquake data gathered for each seismic source is considered to constitute a data set).
II. Data Set Identification--(4A4,I4)--One Card

Col. $1-16$ (identification label for data set)
17-20 NORC (number of records contained in the set)
III. Earthquake Record--(72X,F4.2)--One Card per Record

Col. 73-76 RMG (Richter Magnitude Value for the record)

Note: Do-Loop on NOSC number of data sets, starts at II.

### 8.4 Macro Flow Chart For Program SORT.MAGNITUDE


I. Read Number of Data Sets to be Sorted

II. Iteration on the Number of Data Sets in this Run

III. Read and Write Data Set Identification plus the Number of Records Contained in the Set


V. Iteration on the maximum number of RM-increments for current data set.



Figure 8-1

INPUT DATA FOR PROGRAM SORT.MAGNITUDE (SAMPLE PROBLEM)


Figure 8-2

### 8.5 Sample Problem

Assume that for a given region, the past seismic events have been grouped into two Seismic Sources (Source 1 and Source 2, respectively). Figure (8-1) shows the earthquake data sorted by sources and organized in chronological order. The events are to be sorted as a function of their Richter Magnitude.

In this particular example, two data sets will be processed, namely:

- Earthquakes Associated to Source 1
- Earthquakes Associated to Source 2

Figure (8-2) shows the listing of the input data deck. Each data set as described in Section 8.3 is indicated with the corresponding item number.

### 8.6 Output for Program SORT.MAGNITUDE

Figure (8-3) shows a listing of the output for program SORT.MAGNITUDE (Sample Problem). Note that for each data set (Source 1 and Source 2), the number of events with Richter Magnitude levels falling within the magnitude ranges ( $\mathrm{RM} \pm 0.125$ ) have been listed.

For example, consider Source 1 and note that between the Magnitude range ( $3.875 \leq \mathrm{RM}=4.00 \leq 4.125$ ), 6 events out of 22 were located.

## OUTPUT FOR PROGRAM SORT.MAGNITUDE (SAMPLE PROBLEM)

| * SOURCE 1 |  | NUMBER OF | RECORDS | 22 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 EVENTS SMALLER |  | THAN RM 2. | TOTAL | 22 |
| MAGNITUDE 2.00 | PLUS | 0 | EVENTS |  |
| MAGNITUDE 2.25 | plus | 0 | EVENTS |  |
| MAGNITUDE 2.50 | FLUS | 0 | EVENTS |  |
| MAGNITUDE 2.75 | FLUS | 0 | EVENTS |  |
| MAGNITUDE 3.00 | PLUS | 0 | EVENTS |  |
| MAGNITUDE 3.25 | PLUS | 4 | EVENTS |  |
| Magnitude 3.50 | PLUS | 3 | EVENTS |  |
| MAGNITUDE 3.75 | PLUS | 5 | EVENTS |  |
| MAGNITUDE 4.00 | plus | 6 | EVENTS |  |
| Magnitude 4.25 | PLUS | 1 | EVENTS |  |
| MAGNITUDE 4.50 | PLUS | 1 | EVENTS |  |
| MAGNITUDE 4.75 | plus | 2 | EVENTS |  |
| * SOURCE 2 |  | NUMBER OF | RECORDS | 23 |
| 0 EVENTS SM | ALLER | THAN RM 2. | total | 23 |
| MAGNITUDE 2.00 | PLUS | 0 | EVENTS |  |
| MAGNITUDE 2.25 | PLUS | 0 | EVENTS |  |
| Magnitude 2.50 | PLUS | 0 | EVENTS |  |
| MAGNITUDE 2.75 | PLUS | 0 | EVENTS |  |
| MAGNITUDE 3.00 | PLUS | 2 | EVENTS |  |
| MAGNITUDE 3.25 | PLUS | 0 | EVENTS |  |
| MAGNITUDE 3.50 | PLUS | 1 | EVENTS |  |
| MAGNITUDE 3.75 | PLUS | 5 | EVENTS |  |
| MAGNITUDE 4.00 | PLUS | 3 | EVENTS |  |
| MAGNITUDE 4.25 | PLUS | 6 | EVENTS |  |
| MAGNITUDE 4.50 | PLUS | 1 | EVENTS |  |
| MAGNITUDE 4.75 | PLUS | 0 | EVENTS |  |
| MAGNITUDE 5.00 | plus | 1 | EVENTS |  |
| MAGNITUDE 5.25 | PLUS | 0 | EVENTS |  |
| MAGNITUDE 5.50 | PLUS | 1 | EVENTS |  |
| MAGNITUDE 5.75 | flus | 3 | EVENTS |  |

Figure 8-3

## Bayesian Approach--Program SEISMIC. HAZARD

### 9.1 Introduction

The Bayesian Approach (one of the two seismic hazard models, see Figure 1 -2) is discussed and implemented through the use of program SEISMIC.HAZARD.

The four key èlements associated with the seismic hazard models are:

- Source Geometry
- Earthquake Recurrence Mode1
- Tectonic Model and Travel Path
- Attenuation Characteristics and Associated Uncertainty

Their treatment under the present approach, along with a summary of the theory behind the present model is presented. A description of the program and a practical example is included.

### 9.2 Theoretical Background*

Earthquake Recurrence Model
Earthquake occurrences are assumed to follow a Poisson process with mean rate of occurrence independent of magnitude. In its most general form, the conditional Poisson Law can be written as:

$$
\begin{equation*}
P_{N}(n / \lambda)=\frac{e^{-\lambda t}(\lambda t)^{n}}{n!} \tag{9.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

for $t>0$ and $n=$ integer $\geq 0$
*Taken from Reference 5.
where: $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{N}}(\mathrm{n} / \lambda)=$ Probability of having n events in time period $t$, given $\lambda$.
$\mathrm{n}=$ Number of events.
$\lambda=$ Mean rate of occurrence per unit of time
A Bayesian approach is used so that historical data and subjective information can be effectively combined and used in the analysis. Assuming that the number of seismic events for a future time $t$ follows a Poisson Law, there is still uncertainty about the parameter $\lambda$, the mean rate of occurrence in Eq. 9.1. Therefore, $\lambda$ is treated as a random variable. The probabilistic information on $\lambda$ can be obtained through historical data or from subjective knowledge of the analyst. The subjective probability distribution on $\lambda$ is called the prior distribution. The concept of conjugate prior is used for analytical simplicity.

The prior distribution for the random variable $\lambda$ is chosen as the gamma distribution with parameters $\lambda^{\prime}$ and $U^{\prime}$. The prior can thus be written as:

$$
\begin{equation*}
f^{\prime} \Lambda(\lambda)=\frac{\lambda^{\prime}\left(\lambda^{\prime} \lambda\right)^{U^{\prime}-1} e^{-\lambda^{\prime} \lambda}}{\Gamma\left(U^{\prime}\right)} \quad \lambda>0 ; \lambda^{\prime}>0 ; v^{\prime}>0 \tag{9.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

$$
\text { where: } \Gamma\left(v^{\prime}\right)=\int_{0}^{\infty} e^{-u u^{\prime}-1} d u
$$

' The sample likelihood function on $\lambda$ is obtained by using the historical information available for the region. Since the event-generating process is assumed to be a Poisson process, the sample likelihood function on $\lambda$ is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
L(\lambda / N, T)=\frac{e^{-\lambda T}(\lambda T)^{N}}{N!} \quad T>0 ; N \geq 0 \tag{9.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where: $T=$ time of the data base
$N=$ number of events greater than a fixed lower bound M observed during time period $T$

Combining the prior distribution and the sample likelihood function by means of Bayes' theorem, the posterior distribution on $\lambda$ is obtained as:

$$
\begin{equation*}
f_{\Lambda}^{\prime \prime}(\lambda)=N_{1} L(\lambda) f_{\Lambda}^{\prime}(\lambda) \tag{9.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where: $N_{1}$ is a normalizing constant

Introducing $N_{1}, L(\lambda)$ and $f^{\prime}(\lambda)$ in Eq. 9.4, the posterior distribution is written as:

$$
\begin{gather*}
\mathrm{f}_{\Lambda}^{\prime \prime}(\lambda)=\frac{\lambda^{\prime \prime}\left(\lambda^{\prime \prime} \lambda\right)^{v^{\prime \prime}-1} e^{-\lambda^{\prime \prime} \lambda}}{\Gamma\left(u^{\prime \prime}\right)} \quad \lambda \geq 0 ; \lambda^{\prime \prime}>0 ; u^{\prime \prime}>0  \tag{9.5}\\
\text { where: } \lambda^{\prime \prime}=\lambda^{\prime}+\mathrm{T} \\
u^{\prime \prime}=v^{\prime}+\mathrm{N}
\end{gather*}
$$

In Eq. 9.1, the conditional probability on the number of events $n$ is based on $\lambda$. The unconditional or the marginal distribution on $n$ can be obtained by using Eq. 9.5 together with Eq. 9.1 and integrating over all $\lambda$ s. Thus,

$$
\begin{equation*}
P_{N}(n)=\frac{\Gamma\left(n+u^{\prime \prime}\right)}{n n!\Gamma\left(u^{\prime \prime}\right)} \frac{t^{n} \lambda^{\prime \prime \prime}}{\left(t+\lambda^{\prime \prime}\right)^{n+u^{\prime \prime}}} \tag{9.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

for $n \geq 0 ; v^{\prime \prime}>0 ; \lambda^{\prime \prime}>0$ and $t>0$

Equation 9.6 is called the Marginal Bayesian distribution of $n$ and it gives the probability of the number of events above a predetermined lower bound $M$, in time period $t$.

## Richter Magnitude

A Bernoulli trial is used to model information on magnitudes. Given that an event has occurred, the probability that it is of any given Richter Magnitude can be represented in terms of a Bernoulli trial. If the seismic event that has occurred is of the $M$ under consideration, then
the outcome of the Bernoulli trial is a success. Conversely, failure at each trial implies that the seismic event that has occurred is of $M$ other than the one under consideration.

The available data on Richter Magnitude have been discretized every $\frac{1}{4}$ Richter unit $\left(M_{i}\right)$. The number of different $M i^{\prime}$ s expected to occur is thus finite. This allows for the use of a discrete probability model.

If $\mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{M}_{i}}=$ probability of success at each trial corresponding to $\mathrm{M}_{i}$ and $\mathrm{q}_{\mathrm{Mi}}=1-\mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{i}}}=$ probability of failure at each trial, using the binomial law:

$$
\begin{equation*}
P_{R}\left(r_{M i} / n, p_{M_{i}}\right)=C_{n}{ }^{r_{M_{i}}}{ }_{p_{M_{i}}}^{r_{i}}\left(1-p_{M_{i}}\right){ }^{n-r_{i}} \tag{9.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

for $n$ integer $>0, r_{M_{i}}=$ integer; $0 \leq r_{M_{i}} \leq n$ and $0 \leq p_{M_{i}} \leq 1$ where: $P_{R}\left(r_{M_{i}} / n, p_{M_{i}}\right)$ is the probability that $r_{M_{i}}$ events of Magnitude $M_{i}$ will occur out of a total of $n$ events given that the probability of occurrence of $M_{i}$ is $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{M}_{i}}$ at each trial, and:

$$
C_{n}^{r_{i}}=\frac{n!}{r_{M_{i}}!\left(n-r_{M_{i}}\right)!}
$$

Equation 9.7 represents the generating process for the number of events $M_{i}$. However, this information in conditional on the knowledge about $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{i}}}$ (the probability of success corresponding to $\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{i}}$ ), to incorporate the historical as well as subjective information on $\mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{M}_{i}}$, this parameter is treated as a random variable and a Bayesian formulation is used.

The conjugate prior distribution on $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{i}}}$ is assumed to be Beta type and is given by:

$$
\begin{align*}
& f_{p}^{\prime}\left(p_{M_{i}}\right)=\frac{1}{B_{M_{i}}^{\prime}} p_{M_{i}}^{\varepsilon_{M_{i}}^{\prime}-1}\left(1-p_{M_{i}}\right)^{M_{i}}{ }^{\eta_{i}^{\prime}}-\varepsilon_{i}^{\prime}-1  \tag{9.8}\\
& \text { For } 0 \leq p_{M_{i}} \leq 1, \varepsilon_{M_{i}}^{\prime} \geq 0, \eta_{M_{i}}^{\prime}-\varepsilon_{M_{i}}^{\prime} \geq 0 \\
& \text { where: } B_{M_{i}^{\prime}}^{\prime}=\frac{\Gamma\left(\varepsilon_{M_{i}^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right) \Gamma\left(\eta_{M_{i}^{\prime}}^{\prime}-\varepsilon_{M_{i}}^{\prime}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\eta_{M_{i}^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right)}
\end{align*}
$$

and the parameters $\eta_{M_{i}}^{\prime}$ and $\varepsilon_{M_{i}}^{\prime}$ are obtained from the subjective information. A prior distribution of a similar form has to be assumed for each of the magnitudes considered.

Using historical information one can obtain the sample likelihood function on $\mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{i}}}$. Noting that the generating process (Eq. 9.7) is a binomial process, the sample likelihood function on $\mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{M}_{i}}$ is given by:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{L}\left(\mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{M}_{i}} / \mathrm{N}, \mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{M}_{\mathbf{i}}}\right)=\mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{i}}}^{\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{i}}}\left(1-\mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{i}}}\right)^{\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{M}_{i}}} \tag{9.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

This operation must be repeated for each of the different magnitudes considered and combined with the corresponding prior distributions to obtain the posterior distributions.

From Equations 9.8 and 9.9 , the posterior distribution can be written as:

$$
\begin{align*}
& f_{p}^{\prime \prime}\left(p_{M_{i}}\right)=  \tag{9.10}\\
& \text { for } 0 \leq p_{M_{M_{i}}^{\prime \prime}} \leq p_{M_{i}}^{\varepsilon_{M_{i}^{\prime}}^{\prime \prime}}-1, \varepsilon_{M_{i}}^{\prime \prime} \geq 0, \eta_{M_{i}}^{\prime \prime}-\varepsilon_{M_{i}}^{\prime \prime} \geq 0 \\
& \text { where: } \quad \varepsilon_{M_{i}^{\prime \prime}}^{\prime \prime}-\varepsilon_{M_{i}^{\prime \prime}}^{-1}=\varepsilon_{M_{i}^{\prime}}^{\prime}+R_{M_{i}} \\
& \\
& \eta_{M_{i}}^{\prime \prime}=\eta_{M_{i}}^{\prime}+N
\end{align*}
$$

$$
\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{M}_{\mathbf{i}}^{\prime}}^{\prime \prime}=\frac{\Gamma\left(\xi_{M_{i}^{\prime}}^{\prime \prime}\right) \Gamma\left(\eta_{\mathrm{M}_{i}}^{\prime \prime}-\xi_{M_{i}}^{\prime \prime}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\eta_{\mathrm{M}_{i}^{\prime}}^{\prime \prime}\right)}
$$

In Eq. 9.7, the conditional probability on the number of successes $r_{M_{i}}$ is based on $P_{M_{i}}$ and $n$. The condition on $p_{M_{i}}$ can be removed using Eq. 9.10 and integrating over a.11 the values of $\mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{i}}}$. Thus,

$$
\begin{gathered}
P_{R}\left(r_{M_{i}} / n\right)=C_{n}^{r_{M_{i}}}\left\{\frac{\Gamma\left(\eta_{M_{i}}^{\prime \prime}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\xi_{M_{i}}^{\prime \prime}\right) \Gamma\left(\eta_{M_{i}}^{\prime \prime}-\xi_{M_{i}}^{\prime \prime}\right)} \cdot \frac{\Gamma\left(\alpha_{M_{i}}\right) \Gamma\left(\beta_{M_{i}}-\alpha_{M_{i}}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\beta_{M_{i}}\right)}\right\} \\
\text { for } n \text { integer }>0, r_{M_{i}} \text { integer, } 0 \leq r_{M_{i}} \leq n \\
\text { where: } \quad r_{M_{i}}+\xi_{M_{i}}^{\prime \prime}=\alpha_{M_{i}} \\
n+\eta_{M_{i}^{\prime \prime}}^{\prime \prime}=\beta_{M_{i}}
\end{gathered}
$$

The above expression is the distribution on the number of earthquakes of a fixed $M_{i}$ given that $n$ earthquakes have occurred. There is a similar distribution for each $M_{i}$ considered.

The distribution of the number of events of each magnitude independently of the number of trials is obtained by combining Eq. 9.11 and Eq. 9.6.

Thus,

$$
\begin{array}{r}
P_{R}\left(r_{M_{i}}\right)=\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\left\{C_{n}^{r_{M_{i}}} \frac{\Gamma\left(\eta_{M_{i}}^{\prime \prime}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\xi_{M_{i}}^{\prime \prime}\right) \Gamma\left(\eta_{M_{i}}^{\prime \prime}-\xi_{M_{i}}^{\prime \prime}\right)} \cdot \frac{\Gamma\left(r_{M_{i}}+\xi_{M_{i}}^{\prime \prime}\right) \Gamma\left(n+\eta_{M_{i}}^{\prime \prime}-r_{M_{i}}-\xi_{M_{i}}^{\prime \prime}\right)}{\Gamma\left(n+\eta_{M_{i}^{\prime \prime}}^{\prime \prime}\right)}\right. \\
 \tag{9.12}\\
\left.\quad \frac{\Gamma\left(n+U^{\prime \prime}\right) t^{n} \lambda^{\prime \prime} u^{\prime \prime}}{n!\Gamma^{\prime}\left(U^{\prime \prime}\right)\left(t+\lambda^{\prime \prime}\right)^{n+u^{\prime \prime}}}\right\}
\end{array}
$$

## Seismic Sources Geometry

The present model considers two different types of sources to represent the seismicity of a given region. They are:

- Area Sources
- Line Sources


## Area Sources

When past earthquake epicenters do not lie on a line (i.e., along a given fault line) but are scattered over a region, the seismic source is considered as an area source. The present model (unlike the Classical Model--Chapter VII, which considers only sources at constant depth under the surface of the ground) introduces the concept of dipping plane sources (trapezoids or triangles), allowing for the modelling of dipping faults. Planes can he vertical or dipping at an angle. If a change of direction or dip occurs within a source, a number of trapezoids can be combined to accomodate the geometry (see Figure 9-1). Area Sources as defined in the Classical Model (Chapter VII) can still be represented by near horizontal trapezoids.

## Line Sources

Line sources are used to model regions where recorded hypocenters lie fairly well along a line at constant depth. The source can be broken up in several segments to satisfy geometric constraints.

Tectonic Model and Travel Path
The present model incorporates the fault rupture concept first proposed by Ang (1974) and further developed by DerKiureghian and Ang (1975, 1977). The model is based on the assumption that an earthquake originates at the focus and propagates as an intermittant series of fault slips in the ruptured zone of the earth's crust. The maximum intensity of ground shaking at a site is determined by the slip that is closest to the site (Significant Distance, see Figure 9-1).

Figure 9-1 Typical Dipping Fault Surface


The length of rupture can be related to the total energy released. Several relationships have been presented (Krinitzsky, 1974; Patwardhan and others, 1975).

Specific boundary conditions are required to determine the rupture process near the extremities of the fault to satisfy geometric constraints (fault dimensions) as well as seismic ones (rupture areas).

The three possible boundary conditions are shown in Figure 9-2.

## Strong Ground Motion Attenuation

The most commonly used attenuation relationships are of the form:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{a}=\mathrm{f}(\mathrm{M}, \mathrm{R}) \tag{9.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

where: $\mathrm{a}=$ ground motion parameter
$M=$ Magnitude of event
$R=$ distance from point of energy release to site

These relationships are based on regression analysis of the pertinent ground motion data. Confidence intervals for the least square fit are quite wide because of a considerable data scatter. Therefore there is a high degree of uncertainty associated with values as predicted by these relationships.

The present model uses this type of attenuations associated with a log-normal distribution in order to incorporate the uncertainty inherent in the use of such relations.

### 9.3 Description of Program SEISMIC.HAZARD

Program SEISMIC.HAZARD has been designed to compute the seismic exposure of a region. This is done by combining the effect of all seismic sources identified within the region to provide an estimate of the probability of occurrence of at least one event (assumed to be independent),


Rupture Length L Corresponding to Richter Magnitude $\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{i}}$

$\operatorname{KXBD}()=$,


Boundary Condition -1
$\operatorname{KXBD}()=$,
with a given ground parameter level (e.g., PGA, PGV, etc.) within a future time period of interest "t." A cumulative distribution function (CDF) or a complementary cumulative distribution function (1-CDF) for a ground parameter of interest is developed at a site. By choosing a large number of sites at the nodes of a grid covering a region (Figure 9-9), seismic exposure within the region can be described.

The present version can handle line sources at constant depth, modeled by one or a series of straight line segments, area sources at constant depth, modeled by near horizontal trapezoids and sources having one or several dipping planes, modeled by bands (each band subdivided into one or more elements (trapezoids)). In order to describe the source geometry properly, the analyst is required to input the coordinates (in degrees of latitutde and longitude) of the segment's endpoints (or nodes) for line sources, and for the vertices (or nodes) of each trapezoid describing constant depth area sources or describing the different bands in dipping plane sources (see Figure 9-3). The program will automatically transform the nodal coordinates (longitude-positive for east, latitude-positive for north) to kilometers taking into consideration the geographic location of the region (e.g., north or south of the Equator, east or west of Greenwich).

Since the significant distance is a parameter in the attenuation relationships considered by the program (Eq. 9.13), the area and line sources are divided in small segments in order to take into consideration the distance variation to the site(s) from different parts of a source. The analyst is required to input the segment size. Usually the size of the segments is chosen small enough (e.g., 10 km ) such that the approximation from a continuous to discrete computation is acceptable. The seismicity within a source remains the same from segment to segment.

The quantities $M$ (magnitude) and the ground parameter (s) of interest (e.g., PGA, PGV, etc.) are discretized to equal step increments. Hence, integration in the equations presented in Section 9.2, can be replaced by summations.

The fault rupture for area sources is considered as an area (a rectangle of height equal to half its length, see Figure 9-1). The length is taken from the available relationships for length of fault rupture. The analyst is required to input the rupture length for each magnitude considered in the run. The specific boundary conditions (shown in Figure 9--2) required to determine the rupture process near the extremities of the fault(s) (or seismic sources) are also specified by setting KXBD ( , ) equal to $-1,0$, or 1 (see Section 9.5). If the point model (total energy released during an earthquake is radiated from the hypocenter) instead of the fault rupture model is desired, setting the rupture lengths equal to zero in the input data deck will automatically indicate the program to use the point source mode1.

Information on the values of attenuation coefficients is included as part of the input data deck. The parameter XSIG (number of standard deviations on each side of the mean, see Section 9.5) will indicate the program if whether to consider the attenuation probabilistically or deterministically. Setting XSIG equal to 0 will automatically indicate the program to treat attenuation deterministically.

A fixed format table (discussed in detail in Section 9.5) is recommended for the input of the parameters for the Poisson and Bernoulli models discussed in Section 9.2.

In its present form, program SEISMIC.HAZARD has been divided into a main routine and thirteen subprograms. It contains 1966 executable FORTRAN statements. The space requirements are approximately 251812 bytes. The
actual array dimensions can accomodate up to 30 seismic sources, 210 nodes, 54 elements (trapezoids) and analyze 13 parameters (e.g., PGA, PGV, etc.)
in one run. There is practically no limitation with respect to the number of grids considered per run and the number of sites or nodal points chosen per grid.

### 9.4 Description of Input Data

Input data for program SEISMIC.HAZARD will consist of thirteen sets of cards. The organization of data on each card, along with a description of the items, is given in the following paragraphs.
I. Run Identification--(20A4)--Two cards

| Co1. | $1-80$ | HED1 |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
|  | (Identification Labe1)--Card One |  |
| $1-80$ | HED2 | (Identification Labe1)--Card Two |

II. Lambert Projection--(4F10.0)--One card

| Col. | 1-10 | STLT1 | (Standard Latitude 1)* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 11-20 | STLT2 | (Standard Latitude 2; input as zero if only |
|  |  |  | one standard latitude is used) |
|  | 21-30 | STLN | (Standard longitude)* |
|  | 31-40 | SCAL | (Not used in the program, Scale to be used for |
|  |  |  | future seismic exposure maps (i.e., program |
|  |  |  | PLOT.ISO, Chapter XI)* |

III. Frame Description**--(6F10.0)--One Card

Col. 1-10 XXOR (X-coordinate of origin, in degrees)
11-20 YYOR (Y-coordinate of origin, in degrees)

[^2]| Col. 21-30 | XXRT | (X-coordinate of right bottom corner) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $31-40$ | YYRT | (Y-coordinate of right bottom corner) |
| $41-50$ | XXUP | (X-coordinate of left top corner) |
| $51-60$ | YYUP | (Y-coordinate of left top corner) |

IV. Problem Description--(16I5)--One card

V. Time Period and Magnitude--(3F10.0)--One card

| Co1. $1-10$ TM | (Time period of interest, i.e., $10,20,50,100$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |
|  | yrs, etc.) |  |
| $11-20$ | DLMG | (Magnitude increment, i.e., 0.25) |
| $21-30$ | STMG | (Smallest magnitude of interest, i.e., $R M=3.00)$ |

VI. Nodal Coordinates--(NOND Cards, see IV)--(I5,4F10.0)

Col. 1-5 IXWC (Node index, i.e., 1, 2, 3, etc.)
6-15 XXIN (X-coordinate of node, in degrees)
*See Data Set X and Figure 9-8.


| Col. $16-25$ | YYIN | (Y-coordinate of node, in degrees) |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
| $26-35$ | ZZIN | (Depth-negative kilometers, see Fig. 9-3) |

VII. Elements' Description--(4I5)--(NOEL Cards, see IV)

Co1. 1-5 IXTP (1) (Index of node $I$ )
6-10 IXTP(2) (Index of node J)
11-15 IXTP(3) (Index of node K)
16-20 IXTP(4) (Index of node L)
VIII. Area Sources' Properties-- (At least five cards per source)

Card 1--(19A4, I4)
Co1. 1-75 HED2 (Area source identification)
76-80 NB (Number of different magnitudes)
Card 2--Geometric Description and Boundary Conditions--(5I5)
Col. 1-5 NOBD (Number of bands)

| $6-10$ | $\operatorname{KXBD}(\mathrm{IX}, 1)$ | (Boundary Condition 1--Deep) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $11-15$ | $\operatorname{KXBD}(\mathrm{IX}, 2)$ | (Boundary Condition 2--Shallow) |

16-20 $\operatorname{KXBD}(\operatorname{IX}, 3) \quad$ (Boundary Condition 3--corresponding to side $I, J$ of first element in source

21-25 KXBD (IX,4) (Boundary Condition 4--corresponding to side $K$, L of last element in source

Card 3--Number of Elements in Bands--(16I5)
Col. 1-5 NBELBD(1) (Number of elements in band 1--deep)
6-10 NBELBD (2) (Number of elements in band 2)
$\vdots$ NBELBD (NOBD) (Number of elements in band NOBD--shallowest)
Note: for a given area source, the number of elements in each band are read in starting with the deepest band and moving up to the shallowest. For example, refer to Fig. 9-5: The area source shown conatins two bands (band 1--deepest, and

Top View

*Note: If area sources at constant depth are considered within a given region, because of program's algorithm, the analyst has to consider a small slope within the source in order for the program to identify a shallow and deep boundary. If the difference in depth between the opposite boundaries is given small enough, the effect on overall analysis is negligible. Also, as a general rule, all trapezoids must have the parallel sides each at a constant depth.
**When inputting a source from left to right, the element's nodal indexes are always read in, following a counter-clockwise sense and the node indexes are input in such a way that the shallow nodes occupy positions 1 and 4 of vector IXTP and deep nodes positions 2 and 3 , and boundary conditions 3 and 4 correspond to west and east, respectively.

Figure 9-4 (Continued)



For each boundary (e.g., deep, shallow, west, or east), the variable $\operatorname{KXBD}($,$) can take one of three possible values:$

If $\operatorname{KXBD}()=$,-1 , the edge of the rupture area coincides with the edge of the source but the center of energy release is not fixed at the centroid of rupture area, see Fig. 9-2.

If $\operatorname{KXBD}()=$,0 , the center of energy release coincides with the centroid of the rupture area but half the rupture may extend beyond the source boundary, see Fig. 9-2.

If $\operatorname{KXBD}()=$,1 , the edge of the rupture zone coincides with the edge of the source but does not extend beyond it, see Fig. 9-2.
band 2--shallowest), each band is formed of only one element (trapezoid), therefore for this particular case: $\operatorname{NOBD}=2$ and hence, $\operatorname{NBELB}(1)=1$ and $\operatorname{NBELBD}(2)=1$

Card 4--Section of Source ** -- (8F10.0)
Col. 1-10 XXSC(1) (Horizontal distance to deepest boundary measured from local coordinate system; input always as zero)

11-20 ZZSC(1) (Depth of deepest boundary in km-negative)
-••
. . $\operatorname{XXSC}(N O B D+1)$ (Horizontal distance from XXSC(1) in km-positive)
. . . ZZSC (NOBD+1) (Depth of shallowest boundary in km-negative)

See
Fig. 9-6
${ }^{* *}$ Coordinates measured from a local reference system as shown in Fig. 9-6 Card 5--Parameters of Poisson and Bernoulli Model*--(8F10.0)

Col. 1-10 TMDA(IXSC) (Time data base)
11-20 XNBDA(IXSC) (Number of events greater than STMG; smallest magnitude of interest)

21-30 XNBMG(IXSC,1) (Number of successes for $\mathrm{RM}=\mathrm{STMG}$ )
31-40 XNBMG(IXSC,2) (Number of successes for $\mathrm{RM}=$ (STMG + DLMG)
. . . XNBMG(IXSC, NB) (Number of successes for largest RM on this source)

Note that IXSC is the index of the iteration control statement for the total number of sources in this run. $N B=$ number of different magnitudes in this source.

[^3]Figure 9-6

Top View of Typical Dipping Plane Source


SECTION A-A
IX. Line Sources' Properties--(At least 3 cards per source)

Card 1--(19A4, I4)
Col. 1-75 HED2 (Line source identification)
76-80 NB (Number of different magnitudes)
Card 2--Geometric Description and Boundary Conditions--(5I5)
Co1. 1-5 NOSG (Number of sigments)
6-10 NBELBD ( ) (Index of first node)

11-15 $\operatorname{KXBD}(\mathrm{IX}, 3) \quad$ (Boundary condition $1-$ first node) | Fee |
| :--- |
| Fig. |
| $9-7$ |

16-20 $\operatorname{KXBD}(\operatorname{IX}, 4) \quad$ (Boundary condition 2--last node)
Card 3--Parameters of Poisson and Bernoulli Mode1*--(8F10.0)

Co1. 1-10 TMDA(IXSC) (Time data base)
11-20 XNBDA(IXSC) (Number of events greater than STMG)
21-30 XNBMG(IXSC,1) (Number of successes for RM = STMG)
31-40 XNBMG (IXSC,2) (Number of successes for $\mathrm{RM}=\mathrm{STMG}+\mathrm{DLMG}$ )
. . . XNBMG (IXSC,NB) (Number of successes for largest RM on
this source)
X. Attenuation Information--(NOVB sets of 2 or 3 cards)

Card 1--Identification--(5A4, 3F10.0)
Col. 1-20 HEDVB( , IXVB) (Attenuation identification)
21-30 DLVBEX(IXVB) (Increment for parameter in this iteration, i.e., if parameter is PGA then the increment could be taken as 0.02 G )

31-40 DNVBEX(IXVB) (Smallest value of interest of parameter in this iteration)

41-50 UPVBEX(IXVB) (Largest value of interest of parameter in this iteration)

Note: IXVB is the index of the iteration control statement on the number of ground parameters in this run.
*Detailed explanation will be deferred until Section 9.5; see Fig. 9-11.

Figure 9-7


Note: In contrast to area sources (where nodal indexes can be numbered in any arbitrary order), for line sources the nodal indexes have to be numbered in sequential order, starting with the first node. The boundary conditions $\operatorname{KXBD}($,$) can take one of the three possible values, that is,$ $-1,0$, or 1 (see Fig. 9-2). Depth of all nodes in the source has to be constant.

Card 2--Attenuation Coefficients for Magnitude Smaller than XMX--(8F10.0)
where $X M X$ is the maximum $M$ value for which the coefficients in attenuation relationships of the form:


Co1. $1-10$ Bl (IXTT) (Coefficient $\mathrm{b}_{1}$ )
11-20 B2 (IXTT) (Coefficient $\mathrm{b}_{2}$ )
21-30 B3(IXTT) (Coefficient $b_{3}$ )
31-40 B4 (IXTT) (Coefficient $b_{4}$ )
41-50 SIGLN(IXTT) (Standard deviation of log-normal distribution associated to attenuation; input in log-scale)

51-60 XMX (Maximum magnitude for which coefficients above are valid--if XMS is input as zero, the coefficient is valid for all magnitudes)

Card 3--Input only is XMX is different from zero--(8F10.0)

| Co1. $1-10$ | $B 1$ (IXTT) | (Coefficient $b_{1}$, linear scale) |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
| $11-20$ | B2 (IXTT) | (Coefficient $b_{2}$, linear sca1e) |

XI. Information on Distribution Associated to Attenuation Relation--(I10, 7F10.0)

Col. 1-10 MXDTIC (Number of steps in distribution; use 85)
11-20 XSIG (Number of standard deviations on each side of the mean--if XSIG $=0$, the median curve is used)

21-30 DEPTH (Depth to establish the limit between different attenuation relationships--see Fig. 9-8; this value is irrelevant if the same attenuation is input twice)

Figure 9-8


SHALLOW ATTENUATION

Note: The program handles two attenuation relationships/ground parameter (i.e., NOAT $=1$ or 2 , see IV). The parameter Detph in Data Set XI establishes the depth limit between the two relationships. Also the program allows considering validity of the Attenuation Relationships for magnitude ranges (e.g., valid between $R M=3.00$ and $R M=6.00$, etc.)

Two attenuation laws have to be input for each loading parameter studied. If only one attenuation law is available, it should be repeated.

```
    Col. 31-40 C1 (Coefficient C C used to determine b ; see
                Eq. below)
    41-50 C2 (Coefficient }\mp@subsup{C}{2}{}\mathrm{ used to determine }\mp@subsup{b}{3}{}\mathrm{ ; see
                Eq. below)
                            Ground parameter =}\frac{\mp@subsup{b}{1}{}\mp@subsup{e}{}{\mp@subsup{b}{2}{}M}}{(R+\mp@subsup{b}{3}{}\mp@subsup{)}{}{\mp@subsup{b}{4}{\prime}}
                where: }\mp@subsup{b}{3}{}=\mp@subsup{C}{1}{}\mp@subsup{e}{}{\mp@subsup{C}{2}{M}
            51-60 RPICVR (Vertical integration step in km; if input as
                zero, DEFAULT = 10 km)
                    61-70 RPICHZ (Horizontal integration step in km; if input
                as zero, DEFAULT = 10 km)
                    71-80 EPS (Parameter used for horizontal and parallel
                        checks, use 0.10 km)
XII. Rupture Length*--(8F10.0)--(At least two cards)
Col. 1-10 RUPTUR(1) (Horizontal rupture length corresponding
                                    to STMG--smallest magnitude of interest
                                    in km)
11-20 RUPTUR(2) (Horizontal rupture length corresponding
                                    to STMG + DLMG)
. . . RUPTUR(MGMX)** (Horizontal rupture length corresponding
                                    to MGMX--largest magnitude of interest)
Note: The program will compute the vertical rupture length as one-half the horizontal.
```

[^4]XIII. Grid Description--(2 Cards per grid)

Card 1--Identification--(20A4)
Col. 1-80 HED2 (Grid identification label)

Card 2--Grid Coordinates--(7F10.0, 2I5)
Col. 1-10 XXOR (X-coordinate of origin, degrees) 11-20 YYOR (Y-coordinate of origin--degrees) 21-30 XXRT (X-coordinate of right bottom corner) 31-40 YYRT (Y-coordinate of right bottom corner) 41-50 XXUP (X-coordinate of left top corner, degrees) Fig. 9-9
*Note: Assumed equally spaced--See Fig. 9-9.

Figure 9-9 Typical Grids



Plan View of Non-Orthogonal Grid

Note: The program allows for grids making an angle with the horizontal. The flexibility when covering a given region is increased with this option.


Side View of Typical Grid
Note: ZZSITE is given in kilometers (negative) if zero, nodal points or sites are assumed at ground surface.

### 9.4.1 Recommendations

A number of recommendations regarding the input and uses of the program are summarized in the following paragraphs:

- The relationship between distances in degrees (input) and in kilometers (used in the analysis) is obtained using Lambert conformal projections (see Ref. 10). The parameters needed to define the projection are:
---One or two standard latitudes: parallels at the contact or at intersections between the cone and the earth.
---The standard longitude plotted vertically on the maps available.
---One point of reference from which the distances are computed. A11 distances should be positive, therefore this point should be chosen at the left bottom corner of the area of interest. The exact location of this point is irrelevant (XXOR, YYOR).
---The coordinate sign convention is as follows: North and east are positive. Hence, in the example of Figure 9-10, the site and sources are located in the northeast quadrangle.
- A number of loading parameters (PGA, PGV, etc.) can be studied in one run (NOVB). They each require two attenuation relationships -- A shallow one and a deep one. If only one attenuation is available, it should be input twice and the value of the parameter DEPTH (coordinate $\mathrm{X}_{1}$ ) is irrelevant.
- The output of the program can be saved on disk in the standard line printer format (SAUT = 1) and in a condensed version for plotting purpose (SADT $=1$ ). The output for the first leading parameter studied is directed to logical unit IWPT (1ine printer, default $=6$ ) and, if required, to logical units IWUT and IWDT, respectively, for theline printer copy and the condensed version. The program increments by one of these logical units for any additional loading parameter and creates a different file for each
of them. Therefore, if, for example, three parameters are studied and a11 outputs are required, nine files will be created.
- The coordinates of all nodes are input sequentially. Their input order is irrelevant. The elements (trapezoids or triangles) are described by their node indices. The elements are input in the order they are selected in the area sources (ie., the element of the first source first and so on).
- The area sources are input firsț, followed by the line sources.
- When inputting an area source (Figure 9-1):
---The lines defining the bands must be horizontal (i.e., $A_{1}, A_{2}$, $A_{3}, A_{4}, A_{5}$ are at the same depth, similarly $B_{1}, B_{2}, B_{3}, B_{4}$ are at the same depth.
---The slope of each trapezoid or triangle in a same band must be constant.
---The order of indexing of element nodes is irrelevant since they are explicitly input in cards VII (i.e., $B_{1}, A_{1}, A_{2}, B_{2}$ could be $10,7,3,1)$.
---The indexing of the elements must be sequential in each band (either from left to right or right to left) starting with the deepest band and moving upwards.
---A triangle is input by repeating the first and last node (i.e., $B_{2}, A_{2}, A_{3}, B_{2}$ ). See convention in Figure 9-4.
---If necessary, a rupture area will spread over several elements within a source, but will not extend from a source to another even if they are adjacent (see boundary conditions)
--The four boundary conditions are input in the following order: Deep, shallow, side of the first element in the source, side of the last element in the source. In the example, sources are input from
left to right; therefore, the two last boundary conditions are west and east.
---The seismicity is treated as homogeneous over the whole source.
- When inputting a line source (Figure 9-7) :
_--All the nodes must be at constant depth.
---The nodes must be numbered sequentially along the line either from left to right or right to left.
---If necessary, the rupture length will spread over several segments, but will not extend to another line source.
---The first boundary condition applies to the side of the line with the smaller node index. In the example the line sources are input from left to right (west to east).
---The seismicity is treated as homogeneous over the whole line.


### 9.5 Program's Organization

### 9.5.1 Description of Subroutines

The program SEISMIC.HAZARD has been divided into a main routine plus a series of subroutines. A brief description of the function of each is given in the following paragraphs.

Input: Reads all the data sets discussed in Section 9.4, except for Data Set XII and XIII.

LMBRT and Function CONFRM: Transformation of nodal coordinates from degrees longitude and latitude to kilometers.

Initia: Reads fault rupture lengths, generates magnitudes for output purposes, computes coefficient " $C$ " in attenuation relationship(s). Checks whether point source model or rupture model is required and whether attenuation is to be considered probabilistically or deterministically.

Function Gauss: Evaluates the integral of the normal distribution $f_{X}(x)$ over the 1 imits $-\infty$ to $x$.

Bernui: Computes the geometry of each seismic source (i.e., area, length, etc.), computes probability distributions given by Eqs. 9.6 and 9.11 for each source.

Output: Selects both the output to be listed on the line printer and to be saved on disk for plotting purposes.

INTGAR: Obtains shortest distance from site(s) to area sources. Checks if the perpendicular from site(s) to source falls within or outside the source.

EDGECK: Computes the shortest distance from site(s) to sources' edges.

INTGHZ: Computes the contribution to site's loading from each segment in which a line source has been subdivided. Considers area sources to be composed of a series of line sources subdivided in small segments and computes the contribution of each segment to the loading of a site(s).

PBPDF, PWPDF: Computes the contribution of the last segment considered to each ground parameter.

SUMQ: Computes the term $P\left\{A \leq a_{i}\right\}$ for each seismic source.

### 9.5.2 Macro Flow Chart

A Macro flow chart of program SEISMIC. HAZARD is presented in order to show its overall logic. The flow chart follows.

## Macro F1ow Chart For Program SEISMIC.HAZARD


I. Read Data In

II. Initialize variables

III. Iteration on the Source for Initialization

IV. Iteration over the number of grids


IV.A. Iteration on the Number of Parameters to be Studied




### 9.6 Samp1e Problem

Suppose the analyst has obtained the epicentral map shown in Figure 9-10 for a given region* (shown with dotted lines), and that three seismic sources (one line source composed of two segments, one area source (trapezoid) at constant depth, and one area source with dipping planes) have been identified. after associating past events to major fault systems in the region. The future seismic exposure (PGA-Peak Ground Acceleration in this example) for the grid shown below and a time period of 50 years is required.

*This implies that Stages I and II (see Fig. 1-2) have been completed.

Figure 9-10



Note: Even though the area source is considered at constant depth, due to computer algorithm, a difference in height of 0.10 km between opposite parallel boundaries is given by the analyst.
*Note: Distances in parentheses are "exact," as computed by program PLOT.DATA (Appendix B). In the present example, the "approximate" distances were used instead of the "exact" ones. Normally, a second run would be necessary.

## Figure 9-10 (Continued)

## Area Source 2 (Sec. B-B)



Line Source 1 (Sec. C-C)


Boundary Conditions:

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\operatorname{KXBD}(I X, 3)=1 & \text { See Data } \\
\operatorname{KXBD}(I X, 4)=1 & \text { Set IX } \\
& \text { Card } 2
\end{array}
$$

Note: Line Source 1 is formed of two segments.
*Note: Distances in parentheses are "exact," as computed by program PLOT. DATA (Appendix B). In the present example, the "approximate" distances were used instead of the "exact" ones. Normally, a second run would be necessary.

Tables 2, 3, and 4 show the seismic parameters for each source (1, 2, and 3, respectively). A detailed explanation of the parameters is given in Table 2.

As mentioned previously, the Richter magnitude is treated as a discrete variable. Its values are rounded off to the closest multiple of .25 on the Richter magnitude scale. These rounded off values are referred thereafter as $M_{i}^{\prime}$ 's (3.5; 3.75; 4.0; 4.25, etc.). Events of $M_{i}$ smaller than 3.5 are not considered in the model (although they are used in obtaining the subjective information on occurrences). Events of $M_{i}$ smaller than 3.0 are totally disregarded.

The data is analyzed in two steps. In the first step information is obtained to determine the rate of occurrence of events independently of magnitude. This is used as an input to the Poisson-gamma model. In. the second step information is gathered about the distribution of magnitudes of these events. For each $M_{i}$ the probability of success given one trial is determined. A trial is defined as the occurrence of an earthquake. A success is defined as the earthquake being of the $M_{i}$ considered while a failure is defined as the earthquake being of any other magnitude. This is used as the input to the Bernoulli-Beta model.

The analysis is based on two sources of information: the available data and the sujective input introduced through Bayesian analysis.

## Poisson Mode1

The generating process for the number of occurrences is the Poisson model with uncertain mean rate of occurrence $\lambda$ (Eq. 9.1). The parameter $\lambda$ is treated as a random variable and Bayesian statistics are applied to it.

The sample likelihood function on $\lambda$ (Eq. 9.3) is derived from the generating Poisson model. The parameters $T$ and $N$ of the sample likelihood
function are determined from the available data. T represents the time base for which the data is available: 125 years for Area Sources 1 and 2, and 50 years for Line Source 1. N represents the total number of occurrences abserved on the source considered during this time period.

The gamma prior distribution on $\lambda$ (Eq. 9.2) is based on the subjective input of the analyst. The numerical values of the parameters $\lambda^{\prime}$ and $V^{\prime}$ are obtained from this subjective input. For this example, it is assumed that the values of $\lambda^{\prime}$ and $\nu^{\prime}$ are respectively equal to $T$ and $N$ of the corresponding source. The implication of this assumption is that the subjective information of the expert is similar to the available data. In other words, the analyst has as much confidence in his subjective input as he has in the data.

Based on the values of $\lambda^{\prime}, \nu^{\prime}, T$ and $N$, the parameters $\lambda^{\prime \prime}$ and $\nu^{\prime \prime}$ of the posterior distribution on $\lambda$ (Eq. 9.5) can be calculated for each source. It should be pointed out that in the absence of any subjective information (diffuse prior), the analysis can be carried out with objective data alone and in the absence of any objective data, the analysis can be carried out with subjective information alone. Knowledge of $\lambda^{\prime \prime}$ and $\nu^{\prime \prime}$ completely defines--in a posterior sense--the probability function for the mean rate of occurrence $\lambda$ for the source considered during a future time $t$. Convolving the conditional Poisson generating process for the number of occurrences with the posterior distribution on $\lambda$, the marginal distri bution for the number of occurrences (Eq. 9.6) is derived for each source considered. This distribution does not give any information on the magnitude of the occurrences. The next step is to obtain the posterior conditional distribution on magnitudes.

## Bernoulli Trials

The generating process for the number $r_{M_{i}}$ of events of any specific $M_{i}$ given that a total of $n$ events have occurred is the binomial model. However, the probability of success $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{i}}}$ for each trial has been assumed to be uncertain. The parameter $\mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{M}_{i}}$ is treated as a random variable and Bayesian statistics is applied to it.

The sample likelihood function on $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{i}}}$ (Eq. 9.9) is derived from the generating binomial process. From the available data, the parameters $N$ and $R_{M_{i}}$ of the sample likelihood function can be determined. $N$ represents the total number of events recorded on the source under consideration and $R_{M_{i}}$ represents the number of earthquakes of magnitude $M_{i}$ (successes) recorded on the same source. $R_{M_{i}}$ must be determined for each source and each $M_{i}$.

Using the conjugate beta prior (Eq. 9.8) for the distribution on $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{i}}}$, the parameters $\eta_{M_{i}}^{\prime}$ and $\xi^{\prime} M_{i}$ are determined from the analyst's subjective input. For this example, it is assumed that the analytical recurrence relationship fitted tothe data for each source constitutes the subjective input. For each individual source, the analytical relationship describing the recurrence of various $M_{i}$ events is given by the following log-linear relationship (refer to Chapter VI).

$$
\ln N(M)=\alpha+\beta M
$$

where: $N(M)=$ Number of events above magnitude $M$
$M=$ Richter magnitude
$\alpha$ and $\beta$ are regression constants.
The prior $\eta_{M_{i}}^{\prime}$ represents the subjective knowledge about the number of events for a source above the fixed lower bound $\left(M_{i}=3.5\right)$. As an example, consider the line source 1 . From Figure $9-11$ the $\eta_{M_{i}}^{\prime}$ corresponding
to this source is $16 . \varepsilon_{M_{i}}^{\prime}$ represents the number of earthquakes of magnitude $M_{i}$. Again from Ftgure 9.11 , for $M=3.50, N c=16$ and for $M=3.75, N c=14$, thus, for $M_{i}=3.50, \xi_{M_{i}}^{\prime}$ is equal to $16-14=2$. Because of the definition of the prior, within each source, $\eta_{M_{i}}^{\prime}$ is constant for all $M_{i}^{\prime}$ s. If the prior had been input differently such as in the form of a distribution for each $M_{i}$, different $\eta_{M_{i}}^{\prime}$ could have been obtained.

Having determined the parameters of the sample likelihood function as well as the ones of the prior distribution, the posterior parameters $\eta_{M_{i}}^{\prime \prime}$ and $\xi_{M_{i}}^{\prime \prime}$ (Eq. 9.10) can be obtained by using the concept of conjugate distribution. The knowledge of $\eta_{M}^{\prime \prime}$ and $\xi_{M_{i}}^{\prime \prime}$ completely defines--in the posterior sense--the probability distribution of the probability of success $\mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{M}_{i}}$ of magnitude $\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{i}}$ on the source considered.

The marginal distribution on the number of successes $\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{i}}$ 's (Eq. 9.11) is obtained by convolving the posterior distribution on $\mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{i}}}$ and the conditional generating process of $\mathrm{r}_{\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{i}}}$. However, this marginal distribution is still conditional on the number of events $n$.

Combining the distribution of $r_{M_{i}}$ for given $n$ (Eq. 9.11), with the distribution on $n$ (Eq. 9.6) gives the marginal Bayesian distribution on $r_{M_{i}}$ (Eq. 9.12). This information completes the description of seismicity for a given source.

To obtain the probabilistic information on the peak ground acceleration at the site, the above information on the seismicity of various sources must be combined with an attenuation relationship.

The attenuation relationship used in this example is the empirical relation derived by Idriss et al. (1977) from a data base of shallow earthquakes recorded on stiff soil. The relation is given by:

$$
A=\frac{190.67 e^{0.823 M}}{\left(R+b_{3}\right)^{1.561}} \quad \text { (See Data Set XI, Section 9.4) }
$$

with standard deviation $\sigma_{1 \mathrm{nA}}=0.568$ and $\mathrm{b}_{3}=0.864 \mathrm{e}^{0.463 \mathrm{M}}$
where: $A=P G A$ (Ground parameter of interest in this example)
It will be assumed in this example that the relation given above is valid for the magnitude range ( $3.5,8.00$ ).

The Horizontal Rupture lengths associated to each Richter Magnitude level (discretized to 0.25 ) are summarized in the table below.

Tab1e 1

| Richter Magnitude | 3.50 | 3.75 | 4.00 | 4.25 | 4.50 | 4.75 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Horizontal Rupture <br> Length (km) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 5.00 |
| Richter Magnitude | 5.00 | 5.25 | 5.50 | 5.75 | 6.00 | 6.25 |
| Horizontal Rupture <br> Length (km) | 6.00 | 7.60 | 9.20 | 12.00 | 15.00 | 18.00 |
| Richter Magnitude | 6.50 | 6.75 | 7.00 | 7.25 | 7.50 | 7.75 |
| Horizontal Rupture <br> Length (km) | 26.00 | 45.00 | 80.00 | 135.00 | 230.00 | 400.00 |

Figure 9-12 shows the listing of the input data deck. Each data set as described in Section 9.4 is indicated with the corresponding item number. It is important to note that in Data Set X (Fig. 9-12) the cards containing information on the attenuation coefficients (Card 2 and Card 3, respectively) are identical. This is because only one attenuation is available, the limiting depth between both relationships (parameter DEPTH in Data Set XI) read in as ( -15.000 km , see XI in Fig. 9-12) is irrelevant.

Figure 9-11 Recurrence Relationship for Line Source 1


Figure 9-12

INPUT DATA FOR PROGRAM SEISMIC.HAZARD (SAMPLE PROBLEM)

As obtained from historical
$U^{\prime \prime}$ is a parameter of the posterior distribution $\lambda$


Table 3 Scismic "arancters for Area Source 1

Table 4 Seismic Parameters for Area Source 2


### 9.7 Output for Program SEISMIC.HAZARD

Figure 9-13 shows the output for the sample problem as obtained in the line printer (i.e., logical unit equa1s 6). In general, the output is self-explanatory; however, comments have been included next to some of the items.

Figure 9-14 shows the output for the sample problem as saved on disk (i.e., $L U^{*}$ number $=10$; see Data Set IV in Fig. 9-12).

Figure 9-15 shows the output saved on disk for plotting purposes (i.e., $\mathrm{LU}^{*}$ number $=12$; see Data Set IV in Figure 9-12) and to be used later as part of the input data for program CONST.PROB. (Chapter X).

[^5]OUTPUT FOR PROGRAM SEISMIC.HAZARD (SAMPLE PROBLEM)-AS OBTAINED ON LINE PRINTER-

| PROGRAM SEISMIC HAZARD | (SAMPLE PROBLEM) |
| :--- | :---: |
| PROGRAM SEISMIC HAZARD | (SAMPLE PROBLEM) |
| STANDARD LATITUDE 1 | 30.0000 |
| STANDARD LATITUDE 2 | 0.0000 |
| STANDARD LONGITUDE | 31.0000 |
| NUMBER OF AREA SOURCES | 2 |
| NUMBER OF LINE SOURCES | 1 |
| NUMBER OF NCDES | 13 |
| NUMBER OF ELEMENTS | 3 |
| NUMEER OF GRIDS | 1 |
| NUMBER OF VARIABLES | 1 |
| NUMBER OF ATTNARIABLE | 2 |
| LINES PRINTED PER SITE | 4 |
| MAX NO. OF MAG | 18 |

SAVE RESULTS ON DISK (PLOTTING FORMAT) 40 VALUES PER SITE
SAVE COPY OF OUTPUT ON DISK 4 LINES PER SITE

*Last two columns: $X$ and $Y$ coordinates of each node have been transformed from degrees (longitude, latitude) to kilometers by subroutine LMBRT.

NUTBER OF ELEMENT IN EACH BAND STARTING WITH DEEPEST ONE 1

Figure 9-13

OUTPUT FOR PROGRAM SEISMIC. hazard (SAMPLE PROBLEM) AS SAVED ON DISK
PROGRAM SEISMIC HAZARD (SAMPLE FROBLEM)


## Figure 9-15

OUTPUT FOR PROGRAM SEISMIC.HAZARD (SAMPLE PROBLEM)-AS STORED ON DISK FOR PLOTTING PURPOSES
 $0.000000 .000000 .00000 \quad 0.000000 .00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000$ $\begin{array}{llllllllllllll}1.00000 & 0.75177 & 0.17427 & 0.03273 & 0.00809 & 0.00229 & 0.00072 & 0.00025 & 0.00007 & 0.00003\end{array}$ $0.000010 .000000 .000000 .000000 .000000 .00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.000000 .00000 \quad 0.00000$ $0.000000 .000000 .000000 .000000 .000000 .00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000$ $0.000000 .000000 .000000 .00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.000000 .00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000$ $1.000000 .487480 .11490 \quad 0.028610 .009420 .003630 .00150 \quad 0.000690 .00030 \quad 0.00014$ $0.000070 .000040 .000020 .000010 .000010 .000000 .000000 .00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000$ $0.00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000$ $\begin{array}{lllllllllll}0.00000 & 0.00000 & 0.00000 & 0.00000 & 0.00000 & 0.00000 & 0.00000 & 0.00000 & 0.00000 & 0.00000\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llllllllllll}1.00000 & 0.61883 & 0.09821 & 0.01559 & 0.00306 & 0.00090 & 0.00026 & 0.00008 & 0.00000 & 0.00000\end{array}$ $0.000000 .000000 .000000 .000000 .000000 .000000 .00000 \quad 0.000000 .00000 \quad 0.00000$ $0.000000 .000000 .000000 .000000 .000000 .000000 .000000 .00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000$ $0.000000 .000000 .000000 .000000 .000000 .000000 .00000 \quad 0.000000 .00000 \quad 0.00000$ $\begin{array}{lllllllllll}1.00000 & 0.99993 & 0.98972 & 0.90660 & 0.74962 & 0.57322 & 0.41335 & 0.29582 & 0.19809 & 0.14037\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lllllllllllll}0.09637 & 0.07307 & 0.04726 & 0.03466 & 0.02956 & 0.02073 & 0.01484 & 0.01210 & 0.00837 & 0.00683\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lllllllllllll}0.00449 & 0.00372 & 0.00305 & 0.00225 & 0.00186 & 0.00152 & 0.00106 & 0.00078 & 0.00064 & 0.00051\end{array}$ $0.000320 .000290 .000260 .00020 \quad 0.000140 .000130 .000110 .000090 .000070 .00006$ $1.00000 \quad 0.998120 .895550 .651530 .455010 .317050 .220320 .157640 .108370 .07959$ $\begin{array}{lllllllllllll}0.05705 & 0.04507 & 0.03097 & 0.02380 & 0.02071 & 0.01562 & 0.01158 & 0.00996 & 0.00730 & 0.00614\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llllllllllll}0.00440 & 0.00373 & 0.00307 & 0.00256 & 0.00215 & 0.00177 & 0.00143 & 0.00119 & 0.00098 & 0.00076\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llllllllllll}0.00063 & 0.00056 & 0.00051 & 0.00040 & 0.00030 & 0.00027 & 0.00024 & 0.00019 & 0.00015 & 0.00014\end{array}$ $1.00000 \quad 0.929960 .495660 .198490 .08917 \quad 0.043640 .02226 \quad 0.01230 \quad 0.00646 \quad 0.00382$ $0.002210 .001480 .000800 .000520 .000410 .00025 \quad 0.0001410 .000110 .000070 .00005$ $0.000020 .000010 .000010 .000010 .000010 .00000 \quad 0.000000 .000000 .00000 \quad 0.00000$ $\begin{array}{lllllllllll}0.00000 & 0.00000 & 0.00000 & 0.00000 & 0.00000 & 0.00000 & 0.00000 & 0.00000 & 0.00000 & 0.00000\end{array}$ $1.00000 \quad 0.81212 \quad 0.25418 \quad 0.063940 .020590 .007790 .00309 \quad 0.001420 .000610 .00030$ 0.000140 .000060 .000030 .000020 .000010 .000010 .000000 .000000 .000000 .00000 $0.000000 .00000 \quad 0.000000 .000000 .000000 .000000 .00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000$ $\begin{array}{llllllllllll}0.00000 & 0.00000 & 0.00000 & 0.00000 & 0.00000 & 0.00000 & 0.00000 & 0.00000 & 0.00000 & 0.00000\end{array}$ $1.00000 \quad 0.99254 \quad 0.73347 \quad 0.33817 \quad 0.15346 \quad 0.07355 \quad 0.03638 \quad 0.01959 \quad 0.010020 .00573$ $\begin{array}{lllllllllllllllll}0.00322 & 0.00213 & 0.00114 & 0.00072 & 0.00057 & 0.00035 & 0.00021 & 0.00016 & 0.00008 & 0.00006\end{array}$ $0.000030 .000020 .000010 .000010 .000010 .000000 .000000 .000000 .00000 \quad 0.00000$ $\begin{array}{llllllllllll}0.00000 & 0.00000 & 0.00000 & 0.00000 & 0.00000 & 0.00000 & 0.00000 & 0.00000 & 0.00000 & 0.00000\end{array}$ $1.00000 \quad 0.63920 \quad 0.1263410 .021930 .005050 .0013510 .000350 .000120 .000030 .00001$ $0.00000 \quad 0.000000 .000000 .000000 .000000 .000000 .000000 .000000 .00000 \quad 0.00000$ $0.000000 .000000 .000000 .000000 .000000 .00000 \quad 0.000000 .00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000$ $0.000000 .000000 .000000 .000000 .000000 .000000 .000000 .00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000$ $1.00000 \quad 0.502930 .136980 .039420 .014700 .006270 .002850 .001420 .000670 .00037$ $0.000190 .000130 .000050 .000030 .000020 .000020 .000010 .00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000$ $0.000000 .000000 .000000 .000000 .000000 .000000 .00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000$ $0.000000 .000000 .000000 .000000 .00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000$ $1.00000 \quad 0.226900 .029040 .004400 .000890 .00021 \quad 0.000050 .000010 .00000 \quad 0.00000$ $0.000000 .000000 .000000 .000000 .00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000$ $0.000000 .000000 .00000 \quad 0.000000 .00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000$ $0.000000 .000000 .00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000$ 1.000000 .456870 .1080510 .026190 .008320 .003080 .001210 .000520 .000210 .00009 $0.000040 .000020 .000010 .000000 .000000 .000000 .00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.000000 .00000$ $0.000000 .000000 .000000 .000000 .00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000$ $0.000000 .00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000$ $1.00000 \quad 0.046750 .003600 .000390 .000040 .00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000$ $0.000000 .000000 .000000 .000000 .000000 .00000 \quad 0.000000 .000000 .00000 \quad 0.00000$ $0.000000 .000000 .00000 \quad 0.000000 .00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000$ $0.000000 .000000 .00000 \quad 0.000000 .00000 \quad 0.000000 .000000 .000000 .00000 \quad 0.00000$ $1.000000 .002140 .00015 \quad 0.000020 .00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000$ $\begin{array}{lllllllllllll}0.00000 & 0.00000 & 0.00000 & 0.00000 & 0.00000 & 0.00000 & 0.00000 & 0.00000 & 0.00000 & 0.00000\end{array}$ $0.000000 .000000 .00000 \quad 0.000000 .00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000$ $0.000000 .000000 .000000 .00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000 \quad 0.00000$

CHAPTER X

Program CONST.PROB

### 10.1 Introduction

At this point of the analysis (see Fig. 1-2, Item III-5), the probabilities of exceedance for a given ground motion parameter(s) and for a given time period of interest " $t$," have been determined through the use of one of the two available main programs (program ACC.LINE.AREA, incorporating the theory behind the "Classical" seismic hazard model, or program SEISMIC.HAZARD, incorporating the theory behind the "Bayesian" seismic hazard mode1). The probabilities of exceedance have been obtained in the form of cumulative distribution function(s) (CDF) or complementary cumulative distribution function(s) (1-CDF) by both programs. This has been done for one or several sites (or nodal points) within a given region, depending on the interests and needs of the analyst.

The next step consists of selecting the value(s) of the ground motion parameter(s) which correspond to a given probability of non-exceedance (risk leve1 taken by the analyst-mee Chapter VII). Program CONST.PROB has been designed for this purpose.

### 10.2 Description of the Program

Program CONST. PROB computes the value of a specific ground motion parameter (e.g., PGA, PGV, etc.) given a probability of exceedance (1 - probability of non-exceedance) and a (1-CDF) as obtained from one of the two main programs discussed in Chapters VII and IX.

Using the discretized (1-CDF) at a site (or sites) and linear interpolation, the program determines the ground motion parameter value

Figure 10-1
(1 - CDFs), as computed by program ACC.LINE.AREA or by program SEISMIC. HAZARD for a given grid, ground motion parameter (A) and time period of interest "t."


Detail B-B

corresponding to the level of exceedance chosen by the analyst. Figure 10-1 summarizes the procedure.

In its present form Program CONST. PROB has been organized in a main routine. It contains 67 executable FORTRAN statements and the space requirements is approximately 71100 bytes. The actual version can handle up to 300 nodal points (or sites) and 7 levels of exceedance in one run.

### 10.3 Description of Input Data

Input data for program CONST.PROB consists of nine sets of cards. The organization of data on each card, along with a description of the items, is given in the following paragraphs.
I. Lambert Projection*--(4F10.0)--1 card

| Co1. | 1-10 | STL1 |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | (Standard latitude 1)

II. Labe1 Description**--(7F10.0)--1 card

| Col. | $1-10$ | DXCR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $11-20$ | DYCR | (X-distance between marks (degrees)) |
| $21-30$ | DXLB | (X-distance between labels (degrees)) |
| $31-40$ | DYLB | (Y-distance between labels (degrees)) |
| $41-50$ | DCLV | Increments between contours |
| $51-60$ | XMDC | Label every XMDC contour |
| $61-70$ | CRCR | Marks inside grid. If $0=$ NO. |

[^6]III. General Information--(2I5, 7F10.0)--One card

| Col. | $1-5$ | NOPD |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $6-10$ | NDLV | (Number of data sets required) |
|  |  | 7 maximum/run) |
|  |  | (First level of exceedance) |
| $11-20$ | $\operatorname{PBLV}(1)$ |  |
| $21-30$ | $\operatorname{PBLV}(2)$ | (Second level of exceedance) |
| $\vdots$ |  | (Seventh level of exceedance) |

IV. Run Identification*--(20A4)--2 cards

Card 1
Col. 1-80 HED1 (Identification)

Card 2
Col. 1-80 HED1 (Identification)
V. Variable Identification--(5A4, 4F10.0)--One card

Col. 1-20 HED2 (Variable identification, e.g., PGA, PGV, etc.)
21-30 VBPR (Variable increment: 4 values, namely:

1. Parameter's step increment, e.g., $20 \mathrm{~cm} / \mathrm{sec}^{2}$ if PGA)
2. Minimum ground parameter's level of interest.
3. Maximum ground parameter's level of interest.
4. Time of interest "t."
VI. Grid Identification--(20A4)--One card

Co1. 1-80 HED3 (Grid identification label)
*Note that Data Sets IV-IX inclusive can be read from Unit IIN (see Macro Flow Chart) as created by program SEISMIC. HAZARD.
VII. Grid Description*--(215, 6F10.0)--One card

CoI. 1-5 NXMX (Number of points in the $X$ direction)
6-10 NYMX (Number of points in the $Y$ direction)
11-20 XXOR (X-coordinate of origin)

21-30 YYOR (Y-coordinate of origin)
31-40 XXRT (X-coordinate of bottom right corner)
41-50 YYRT (Y-coordinate of bottom right corner)
51-60 XXUP (X-coordinate of top left corner)
61-70 YYUP (Y-coordinate of top left corner)
VIII. Number of Values in $(1-\mathrm{CDF})-$-(I5)--One card

Col. $1-5$ NOVB (Number of values in (1-CDF) used to describe (1 - CDF), i.e., 40)
IX. Levels of exceedance in $(1-\operatorname{CDF}) \mathrm{s}--(10 \mathrm{~F} 8.0)--(N X M X * N Y M X)$ cards or sets of cards

Col. 1-10 PB(1) (Probability of exceedance corresponding to the smallest ground parameter level)
. . . $P B()$
. . . PB(NOVB) (Probability of exceedance corresponding to the largest ground parameter level)

Note: Do-Loop on NOPD (number of runs required) starts at card 4.
*Refer to Figure 9-9.
10.4 Macro Flow Chart for Program CONST.PROB

* Unit $=5$ Card reader and Unit $=6 \quad$ Line Printer

I. Read and Print Data







### 10.5 Sample Problem

Using the output for the sample prob1em in Chapter IX (see Figures 9-10 and 9-17), assume that the analyst is interested in knowing the ground motion parameter values (PGA in this case) at each nodal point or site of the grid shown on page and corresponding to a probability of exceedance of 5 percent or a probability of non-exceedance of 95 percent.

Figure $10-2$ shows the listing of the input data deck. Each data set as described in Section 10.3 is indicated with the corresponding item number.

Figures $10-3$ and $10-4$ show the output for program CONST. PROB as obtained on the line printer and disk.

Figure 10-2

INPUT DATA FOR PROGRAM CONST.PROB (SAMPLE PROBLEM)
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## Figure 10-4

## OUTPUT FOR PROGRAM CONST.PROB (SAMPLE PROBLEM)--AS SAVED ON DISK

| PROGRAM SEISMIC HAZARD | (SAMPLE | PROBLEM) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| PROGRAM SEISMIC HAZARD | (SAMPLE | PROBLEM) |  |  |  |  |
| 30.00000 | 0.00000 | 31.00000 | 2000000. |  |  |  |
| 1 | 4 | 4 |  |  |  |  |
| 30.000 | 30.000 | 33.000 | 30.000 | 30.000 | 33.000 |  |
| 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |  |
| PROB. OF EXCEED. | 0.050 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 29.799 | 58.539 | 57.560 | 55.042 |  |  |  |
| 51.670 | 237.877 | 211.770 | 97.206 |  |  |  |
| 66.431 | 112.671 | 54.623 | 57.831 |  |  |  |
| 37.881 | 54.183 | 19.932 | 19.041 |  |  |  |

## CHAPTER XI

## Program PLOT.ISO

### 11.1 Introduction

This chapter concludes the presentation of the seismic hazard methodology currently used at Stanford, by discussing the last step in the analysis, namely the preparation of an exposure map (see Figure 1-1, Item II-6). Program PLOT.ISO is discussed and implemented in the remaining sections of this chapter.

### 11.2 Description of the Program

Once a complementary distribution function (1-CDF) has been established for each nodal point or site of a grid covering a given region (program SEISMIC.HAZARD or program ACC. LINE.AREA), a seismic exposure map can be prepared for any desired probability of non-exceedance. Program CONST. PROB selects the ground parameter values at each nodal point for a given probability of exceedance (1 - probability of non-exceedance) and for a given time period of interest, thus producing the necessary information to be used by program PLOT.ISO. This program selects the minimum and maximum values of the specific ground motion parameter of interest (i.e., PGA, PGV, etc.) from the data obtained by program CONST. PROB, and computes the number of contours to be plotted based on the parameter "DCLV" (increment between contours) given by the analyst in the input data deck. A second order polynomial is used to interpolate between the parameter's values at the grid's nodes in order to establish the locus of points corresponding to each contour. A file containing contour information is created on tape and plotted on the 11 or 33 inch Calcomp plotter. A conformal Lambert projection is used.

The program has the optional capability of transforming the ground parameter (PGA) into intensity using Richter-Gutenberg's relation $\{I=3(\operatorname{LOG}(P G A)+0.5)\}$. This option can be specified by setting the parameter "SKIPAC" different from zero in the input data deck. (If a different intensity vs PGA relation is required, Line 781 (see program's listing in Appendix C) should be modified accordingly.)

Program PLOT.ISO is system dependent. Its use is limited to Stanford's Computer Center since it uses plotting routines which are system oriented. The present dimensions allow for a maximum of 1600 levels for the ground motion parameter per grid (i.e., a grid having 40 rows and 40 columns or 1600 sites). The program handles any number of different grids per run.

### 11.3 Description of Input Data

Input data for program PLOT.ISO consists of eight sets of cards. The organization of data on each card, along with a description of the items, is given in the following sections.
I. Identification Card--(3I5, 16A4)--One card

| Co1. $1-5$ | NOTP | (Number of plot types (i.e., different grids)) |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
| $6-10$ | ICAL | (Plotter size: If $=3,11$ inch size (default), |
|  | If $=4,33$ inch size) |  |
| $11-15$ | NN | (Flag for Lambert Projection, $0=0 / 180^{\circ}, 1=0 / 360^{\circ}$ ) |
| $16-80$ | HED1 | (Run identification) |

II. Lambert Projection--(5F10.0)--One card

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
\text { Co1. } 1-10 & \text { STLTI } & \text { (Standard latitude }{ }^{\circ} 1 \text { ) } \\
11-20 & \text { STLT2 } & \text { (Standard latitude }{ }^{\mathrm{o}} 2 \text {; if read as zero, only } \\
& & \text { one standard latitude }{ }^{\circ} \text { used) }
\end{array}
$$

| Col. $21-30$ | STLN | (Standard longitude ${ }^{0}$ ) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $31-40$ | SCAL | (Scale (1/SCAL)) |
| $41-50$ | DTLB | (Distance between grid and label-default $=0.5$ inch) |

III. Plot Flags--(6F10.0)--One card

Col. 1-5 NOPL (Number of plots with same parameters)
6-10 NXMX (Number of points in X-direction; i.e., number of columns in grid)

11-15 NYMX (Number of points in Y-direction; i.e., number of rows in grid)

16-20 PLFR (Plot frame ?, if $0=$ NO)
21-25 SKIPAC (Transformation from acceleration to intensity ?
If $0=$ NO)
IV. Grid Description--(6F10.0)--One card (see Fig. 9-9)

| Col. 1-10 | XXOR | ( X -coordinate ${ }^{0}$ of origin) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 11-20 | YYOR | (Y-coordinate ${ }^{\circ}$ of origin) |
| 21-30 | XXRT | (X-coordinate ${ }^{0}$ of right bottom corner) |
| 31-40 | YYRT | (Y-coordinate ${ }^{0}$ of right bottom corner) |
| 41-50 | XXUP | (X-coordinate ${ }^{\circ}$ of left top corner) |
| 51-60 | YYUP | (Y-coordinate ${ }^{\circ}$ of left top corner) |

V. Labe1 description--(7F10.0)--One card
$\begin{array}{lll}\text { Co1. } & 1-10 & \text { DXCR }\end{array} \quad$ (X-distance between marks, degrees) $)$ (Y-distance between marks, degrees)
VI. Plot Identification--(75Al, I5)--One card

```
Co1. 1-75 HED2 (Title of plot)
76-80 NOMD (Number of modifications in fourpt)
```

VII. Calls Needing Modifications*--(16I5)--16 Values per card,

Input only if NOMD $\neq 0$
Col. $1-5$ NBCL(1) (First fourpt call needing modification)
6-10 NBCL(2) (Second fourpt call needing modification) -••

NBCL(NOMD) (Last fourpt call needing modification)
VIII. Ground Parameter's Values at Grid's Nodes**--(8F10.0)--8 values/card

Col. 1-10 AA(1,1) (Ground parameter value at grid's origin)
11-20 AA(1,2) (Ground parameter value at right of origin)
. . AA (1,NXMX) (Ground parameter value at XXRT, YYRT)
Repeat "NYMX" times, read data in by rows, see Fig. 9-9.
Do-Loop on NOTP starts at Data Set V

If "DCLV" is different between two plots, the do-1oop has to be done on NOTP, starting at Data Set II.
*See explanatory note, page
**These values correspond to the output produced by Program CONST.PROB. (i.e., ground parameter's values obtained for a given probability of exceedance ( $1-P\{$ non-exceedance $\}$ ) and time period $t$ for a whole set of nodal points or sites).


Read: 1. Number of plot types (different grids)
2. Plotter size
3. Flag for Lambert projection
4. Run identification

Print: Run identification and number of plot types
I. Iteration on the number of plot types in this run (NOTP types)





### 11.5 Sample Problem

A seismic exposure map for the ground parameter "PGA" (Peak Ground Acceleration) for a future time period of 50 years and for a probability of exceedance of 5 percent (95 percent probability of non-exceedance) is required for the region shown in Figure 9-10. The computer output as obtained by program CONST.PROB (Chapter X, Figure 10-4) is used as part of the input for program PLOT.ISO.

Figure 11-1 shows the listing of the input data deck for program PLOT.ISO. Each data set as described in Section 11.3 is indicated in the figure by the corresponding item number.

INPUT DATA FOR PROGRAM PLOT.ISO (SAMPLE PROBLEM)


Figure 11-1
Figure 11-2
OUTPUT FOR PROGRAM PLOT.ISO (SAMPLE PROBLEM)-AS OBTAINED ON LINE PRINTER-


Figure 11-3
Seismic Exposure Map for PGA, Probability of Exceedance of 5 Percent and Time Period of 50 Years


### 11.6 Output for Program PLOT.ISO

Figure 11-2 shows the output for the sample problem as obtained on the line printer.

Figure 11-3 shows the exposure map ${ }^{*}$, as obtained on the Calcomp Plotter. The units of the acceleration levels are in $\mathrm{cm} / \mathrm{sec}^{2}$.
*Explanatory Note: When the contour is not uniquely defined (i.e., there are four points at the same level within a quadrangle, see figure below), the program draws the contour such that the change in slope is minimum and prints a message (FOURPT call number). If after inspection of the plot, it appears that the other choice should have been made, the program should be re-run setting a flag (NBCL--see Data Sets VI and VII) for that FOURPT call number. The contour corresponding to the largest slope variation will then be drawn.


Program identifies $\theta_{1}$, as the minimum slope prints FOURPT call number and draws contours as shown.

Four points at the same level within quadrangle.

After inspection, program is re-run setting a flag. Contours are drawn as shown.
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APPENDIX B
Program PLOT.DATA

## APPENDIX B

Program PLOT.DATA

Purpose: This program checks and plots the data used in the main program (SEISMIC.HAZARD) in Chapter IX. It uses the same input as program SEISMIC. HAZARD, with the following addition necessary for plotting.

1. The first card defining the number of plots and the plotter to be used.
2. One card at the beginning of each data set (area) describing the spacing for labels and marks.

## Input Format

I. Identification Card--(5I5,52A1)--One Card

Col. 1-5 NOTP (Number of data sets to be plotted)
6-10 ICAL (Plotter size: $3=11$ inches-default. $4=33$ inches)

11-15 NN (Flag for Lambert Projection; $0=0 / 180^{\circ}$ $\left.1=0 / 360^{\circ}\right)$

16-20 PLOT (Plot data? $0=$ NO)
21-25 PLFR (Plot frame? $0=$ NO)
26-77 HED1 (Run Identification)
II. Labe1 Description--(7F10.0)--One card

Co1. 1-10 DXCR (X-distance, degrees, between marks)
11-20 DYCR (Y-distance, degrees, between marks)
21-30 DXLB (X-distance, degrees, between labels)
31-40 DYLB (Y-distance, degrees, between labels)
41-50 DCLV (Increment between contours)
51-60 XMDC (Labe1 every XMDC contour)
61-70 CRCR (Marks inside grid? $0=0$ )

Note: The cards following are the same as for Program SEISMIC.HAZARD. Do-Loop on "NOTP" starts at Card 2.

Figure 1 shows the input data deck for Program PLOT.DATA (same data as in sample problem in Chapter IX).

Figure 2 shows the output as obtained on the line printer.
Figure 3 shows the output as obtained on the Calcomp plotter.

## Figure 1

INPUT DATA FOR PROGRAM PLOT.DATA (SAMPLE PROBLEM


OUTPUT FOR PROGRAM PLOT.DATA (SAMPLE PROBLEMM)-AS OBTAINED ON LINE PRINTER




Figure 3 Seismic Source Map


## APPENDIX C

## Program Listings

## Available on Request

 fromThe John A. Blume Earthquake Engineering Center


[^0]:    *Each of the above three stages are explained further in the following sections.

[^1]:    *It must be pointed out that all the manipulation done on past earthquake data to achieve formats shown in Figures $1-3,5-2,5-7$, etc. is done using the editing capabilities made available to the user by the Computer Center.

[^2]:    ${ }^{*}$ These parameters depend on the maps available to the analyst as obtained from an atlas or any other source (see reference 10).
    **These parameters will be used when plotting seismic exposure maps (i.e., program PLOT.ISO in Chapter XI).

[^3]:    *Detailed explanation will be deferred until Section 9.5.

[^4]:    *Taken from relationships presented by Krinitzsky (1974), or Patwardhan et al. (1975).
    **If rupture (MGMX) is read in as zero, the point source model is used instead of the rupture model.

[^5]:    *Proper control cards must be included in the job card list (JCL) when saving data on disk. For this particular example and for Stanford's Computer Center, the job control cards used are as follows:
    //GO.FT1OFOO1 DD UNIT=DISK,DSN=WYL.??\$???.FILENAME, DISP=(, KEEP) , DCB=PRINT, SPACE=(TRK, (2, 1), RLSE), VOL=SER=PUB $\emptyset \varnothing 5$
    //G0.FT12F001 DD . . . . . . . . . . .

[^6]:    *Same parameters as in Data Set II (Program SEISMIC HAZARD, Chapter IX). **Parameters used for plotting purposes (to be discussed in Chapter XI).

