UCLA

UCLA Previously Published Works

Title

Centrifuge modeling studies of site response in soft clay over wide strain range

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/57b2p20n>

Journal

Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering, 140(2)

ISSN

1090-0241

Authors

Afacan, KB
Brandenberg, SJ
Stewart, JP

Publication Date

2014-01-28

DOI

10.1061/(ASCE)GT.1943-5606.0001014

Peer reviewed

1This version is the author's final version. The typeset version of the article can be found by
2following the URL below.

3[http://dx.doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)GT.1943-5606.0001014](http://dx.doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)GT.1943-5606.0001014)

4 **Centrifuge Modeling Studies of Site Response in Soft Clay over Wide Strain Range**

5 **by: Kamil B. Afacan¹, Scott J. Brandenburg², M. ASCE., and Jonathan P. Stewart³, F. ASCE.**

6**Abstract:** Centrifuge models of soft clay deposits were shaken with suites of earthquake ground
7motions to study site response over a wide strain range. The models were constructed in an
8innovative hinged-plate container to effectively reproduce one dimensional ground response
9boundary conditions. Dense sensor arrays facilitate back-calculation of modulus reduction and
10damping values that show modest misfits from empirical models. Low amplitude base motions
11produced nearly elastic response in which ground motions were amplified through the soil
12column and the fundamental site period was approximately 1.0s. High intensity base motions
13produced shear strains higher than 10%, mobilizing shear failure in clay at stresses larger than
14the undrained monotonic shear strength. We attribute these high mobilized stresses to rate
15effects, which should be considered in strength parameter selection for nonlinear analysis. This
16nonlinear response de-amplified short period spectral accelerations and lengthened the site
17period to 3.0s. The nonlinearity in spectral amplification is parameterized in a form used for site
18terms in ground motion prediction equations to provide empirical constraint unavailable from
19ground motion databases.

20

21

31 PhD Candidate, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of California, Los Angeles,
490095-1593

52 Associate Professor and Vice Chair, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of California,
6Los Angeles, 90095, email: sjbrandenberg@ucla.edu; Corresponding Author

73Professor and Chair, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of California, Los Angeles,
890095.

23INTRODUCTION

24The influence of soil conditions on earthquake ground motions is typically evaluated in practice
 25either through the use of simplified site amplification functions or site-specific one-dimensional
 26(1-D) ground response analysis. Site amplification functions are typically empirically derived
 27from ground motion data (e.g., Borchardt, 1994), but the available data cannot fully constrain
 28highly nonlinear site response. The nonlinear component of site amplification functions is
 29therefore often constrained by ground response analyses for regional site profiles (e.g., Walling
 30et al., 2008). Because site amplification functions utilize relatively generic descriptions of site
 31condition (e.g., time-averaged shear wave velocity in the upper 30 m, V_{s30}), their estimates of
 32site amplification can be more approximate than those from ground response analysis, which
 33use more site-specific information (e.g., Baturay and Stewart, 2003).

34 While both site amplification functions and site-specific analyses draw upon ground
 35response modeling, there is considerable ambiguity on how those simulations should be
 36performed for conditions producing large-strain site response. The two principal options for
 37ground response analysis are equivalent linear methods, in which the soil is modeled as visco-
 38elastic with shear modulus and damping selected to be compatible with the level of mobilized
 39shear strain, or nonlinear methods, in which plasticity models are utilized to simulate the soil's
 40constitutive behavior. The equivalent linear method has historically been more popular than
 41nonlinear analysis in practice (Kramer and Paulsen 2004), although there is a general consensus
 42that nonlinear analysis is preferred for high intensity motions that mobilize large-strain response
 43in the soil (i.e., for shear strains approaching 1% or more), and nonlinear methods are now

44more commonly used in practice. A number of hurdles related to parameter selection and other
45matters have tempered the use of nonlinear methods, although many of those issues have been
46addressed in recent work (e.g., Kwok et al., 2007; Stewart and Kwok, 2008; Phillips and Hashash,
472009; and Hashash et al., 2010).

48 The work described in this manuscript was undertaken to fill the gap in available data for
491-D soil response at very large strains approaching shear failure for the purpose of ultimately
50validating nonlinear ground response analysis methods, and for validating the nonlinear
51component of relatively simplified amplification functions. This problem is of considerable
52practical importance because design-level ground motions in seismically active regions are
53strong, and in soft soils will induce large strain response of the type investigated here.
54Moreover, large-strain response is the condition where nonlinear analysis is thought to be most
55useful, yet for which the available data for validation is most sparse (e.g., Yee et al., 2013).

56 We describe a ground response data set from centrifuge experiments in which small-
57and large-strain responses are recorded. We sought boundary conditions compatible with 1-D
58vertical shear wave propagation, which was not achieved in previous large centrifuge site
59response models (e.g., Wilson et al. 1997), though it was achieved using small centrifuge
60models with relatively sparse sensor arrays (e.g., Fiegel 1995). In this study, two centrifuge
61models were constructed and tested on the 9m radius geotechnical centrifuge at the
62NEES@UCDavis experimental facility. The models were composed of soft young bay mud, which
63is naturally occurring clay whose dynamic properties are well characterized in the literature. We
64describe the centrifuge models (soil properties, container), the ground motions applied in the
65testing, and the principal test results (stress-strain curves, modulus reduction and damping, and

66site amplification). Due to length restrictions, we defer nonlinear ground response analysis of
67the experiment to a later publication.

68

69CENTRIFUGE MODELS

70Specimen Configuration and Construction

71As shown in Fig. 1, two centrifuge models called AHA01 and AHA02 were constructed in a
72hinged plate container from layers of soft San Francisco bay mud. The profiles consisted of a
73layer of sand over lightly overconsolidated ($OCR = 1$ to 1.2) bay mud atop overconsolidated bay
74mud ($OCR = 2$ to 4). This profile is consistent with natural geologic conditions in many parts of
75the San Francisco bay area (e.g., Merritt Sand over young bay mud in many parts of Oakland).
76San Francisco bay mud was selected for this study because it is naturally occurring clay from a
77seismically active region, its dynamic properties have been previously studied, and ground
78motion recordings are available for multiple sites that are underlain by bay mud from which
79prior work has evaluated site amplification that can be compared to the results of this study.
80The high plasticity of bay mud renders low permeability and slow consolidation times, so thin
81layers of dense Monterey sand were placed between the clay layers to act as drainage
82boundaries to facilitate specimen construction. These thin sand layers likely introduced a small
83amount of phase shift as the waves propagated vertically through the soil profile, but are not
84anticipated to significantly alter site response considering that they are stiff, strong, and thin
85relative to the clay layers, and also thin relative to the wavelengths of the vertically propagating
86shear waves (e.g., Santamarina et al. 2001).

Figure 1. Elevation view of centrifuge models AHA01 and AHA02

Models were constructed by mixing the bay mud as slurry at a water content of 1.4 times its liquid limit, pouring enough slurry into the model container to obtain the proper lift thickness after consolidation, placing pore pressure transducers (PPTs) in the center of the slurry, and consolidating with a hydraulic press. Consolidation from slurry was performed before the model container was placed on the centrifuge arm. Additional details on specimen construction and instrumentation are presented by Harounian et al. (2010) and Afacan et al. (2011). PPTs were used to monitor excess pore pressure and consolidation was deemed complete when the degree of consolidation at the center of the clay lift had reached at least 95%. Accelerometers and bender elements were installed within completed lifts by cutting small holes in the clay, placing the instruments, and hand-backfilling around the instruments with cuttings. Linear potentiometers measured settlement and lateral displacement. A total of 106 accelerometers, 34 pore pressure transducers (PPTs), and 22 linear potentiometers were utilized.

103 Properties of Bay Mud Materials

104 Table 1 shows the principal index properties of the bay mud and sand materials used in
 105 specimen construction. The bay mud has a PI of 43 and USCS classification of MH. The sand
 106 material has no fines and a USCS classification of SP. In this section, we focus principally on the
 107 shear-wave velocity of both materials and the monotonic undrained shear strength of the clay
 108 materials. These are the most directly relevant soil properties for ground response analysis.

109 **Table 1.** Bay mud and sand soil properties.

Parameter	Bay Mud	Sand
USCS Classification	MH	SP
Specific Gravity	2.65	2.64
Unit Weight, γ (kN/m ³) ^a	16 to 17	19.8
Compression index, C_c	0.43	--
Recompression index, C_r	0.04	--
PL (%)	40-43	--
LL (%)	84-86	--
FC (%)	100	0
Friction Angle, ϕ' (°) ^b	20	-

110a

$$g = \frac{g_w G_s (1+w)}{1+w G_s}$$

111^bPark(2011)

112

113 We originally sought to develop a profile of shear wave velocity in the centrifuge
 114 specimen using bender element tests. One source and two receiver bender elements were
 115 placed in each clay layer following consolidation, and travel times were measured using cross-
 116 correlation of the receiver signals. Receiver-to-receiver measurements cancel sources of
 117 peripheral phase lag such as trigger delay, rise time in the piezo crystals, and soil-bender
 118 interaction that are present in source-to-receiver measurements (e.g., Lee and Santamarina,
 119 2005; Brandenburg et al. 2008). Unfortunately, the insulator coating on many of the bender

elements was inadequate, and electrical current leaked from the source element into the soil and the direct arrival of this current at the receiver obscured the reading of physical waves in the receiver signals. As a result of these difficulties, physically meaningful bender element measurements were recovered for only a single clay lift in AHA02 and for the upper sand layer.

Because the bender elements only provided a measurement of V_s in one lift of clay rather than all of the lifts as originally intended, we utilized the available measurement to calibrate relations from the literature between the maximum (small strain) shear modulus, G_{max} , confining pressure, and OCR. Yamada et al. (2008) provide the following general expression for the effective stress-dependence of G_{max} in normally consolidated soil (the equation is slightly modified here to become dimensionless):

$$\frac{G_{max}}{p_a} = \alpha \left(\frac{\sigma'_{mc}}{p_a} \right)^n \quad (1)$$

Where $n=1.0$ for clay, σ'_{mc} is the mean effective stress, and α is dependent on soil type. Based on a similar relation by Hardin and Drnevich (1972), we expect G_{max} to be proportional to OCR^c (where $c = 0.3$ for clay with $PI=40$). We insert this term into Eq (1) and re-write the expression in terms of vertical effective consolidation stress σ'_{vc} , as follows:

$$\frac{G_{max}}{p_a} = \alpha \times \left(\frac{1 + 2K_0}{3} \right)^n \times OCR^c \left(\frac{\sigma'_{vc}}{p_a} \right)^n \quad (2)$$

where K_0 is the coefficient of lateral earth pressure at rest. The available bender element data is from a clay layer for which $\sigma'_{vc} = 117$ kPa, $\sigma'_{sat}=16.4$ kN/m³, and $OCR=1.15$; $V_s=108$ m/s was

138measured in this layer. Converting V_s to G_{max} using the classical relation $V_s = \sqrt{G_{max} / \rho}$ (where ρ

139is mass density) and applying $K_0 = (1 - \sin \phi) \text{OCR}^{\sin \phi} = 0.69$ [Jaky (1944) and Schmidt (1966)], we
 140compute $\phi = 20.2^\circ$, which is consistent with prior experience for similar materials (Yamada et al.,
 1412008). Values of G_{max} are then obtained for other layers using $\phi = 20.2^\circ$ in Eq. (2), with the results
 142shown in Fig. 2 following conversion to V_s .

143

(a) AHA01

(b) AHA02

144**Figure 2.** Profiles of vertical effective stress, shear wave velocity, and undrained shear strength.

145The in-flight s_u profile was computed using Eq. 3, while vane shear tests were performed after

146spin-down.

147

148 We apply a similar approach for seismic velocities in sand. In this case, the overburden
149 scaling coefficient is $n=0.5$ (Yamada et al., 2008) and the OCR scaling coefficient is $c=0$ (Hardin
150 and Drnevich, 1972). A shear wave velocity measurement indicating $V_s = 138$ m/s was obtained
151 from bender element data in the upper sand layer in AHA02 for which $\sigma'_{vc}=28$ kPa. Using unit
152 weight of 19.8 kN/m³, we compute $\rho=821$ for the sand materials. Values of G_{max} and V_s for all
153 sand layers are then computed using Eq. (2) with the results shown in Fig. 2. Using the profiles
154 in Fig. 2, the values of V_{s30} and site period are 114 m/s and 1.1 s for AHA01 and 126 m/s and 0.95 s
155 for AHA02.

156 The profiles in Fig. 2 were tested by comparing their implied theoretical travel times
157 from the base of the model container to each sensor position to those measured when the base
158 of the model container was shaken with a high frequency (500 Hz model scale) low amplitude
159 harmonic motion. The high frequency motion was selected to improve resolution in travel time
160 measurements. Reasonable agreement was observed in a least-squares sense (details in Afacan
161 et al. 2011), and the measured travel time values were within 10% of those predicted by Eq. 2.

162 The shear strength of the clay was measured using a small hand vane device following
163 spin-down of the centrifuge, with the results in Fig. 2. The measured shear strengths are
164 potentially biased relative to those in effect under “in flight” conditions as a result of reduced
165 effective stresses due to swelling of the clay during the gradual spin-down of the centrifuge
166 which requires about 20 minutes. Changes in pore pressure due to swelling were observed in
167 PPT readings in the overconsolidated clay layers. The in-flight shear strengths in Fig. 2 were
168 derived from strength normalization concepts (Ladd, 1991):

$$\frac{S_u}{\sigma_{vc}} = 0.22 \times OCR^{0.8}$$

where 0.22 is the undrained strength ratio of the same bay mud material measured in direct simple shear tests by Park (2011), and $0.8 = 0.88(1 - C_r/C_c)$ is the recommended exponent from Ladd (1991) for homogenous sedimentary clays of low to moderate sensitivity. As shown in Fig. 2, this relation produces good agreement with measured vane shear strengths in low-OCR layers relatively unaffected by swelling during spin-down. Vane shear strengths in the deeper more heavily overconsolidated layers were lower than predicted in Eq. (3), which is likely due to a decrease in effective stress due to more rapid consolidation of these stiff layers during spin-down.

Model Container

The present test sequence was the first to utilize the NEES@UCDavis hinged-plate model container (HPC) illustrated in Fig. 3. The HPC consists of five steel annular rings with end plates that are free to rotate (details can be found on the NEES@UCDavis website nees.ucdavis.edu). Each ring rests atop ball bearings supported by rigid side walls, and the container exhibits essentially zero shear stiffness (an empty container can easily be deformed by hand). Accordingly, the model stiffness is controlled by the soil inside the container with essentially zero contribution from the container itself. For this reason, the container is better suited to site response studies than comparatively stiff shear beam container systems used in prior testing on the UC Davis large centrifuge. The principal limitation of the container relative to “ideal” boundary conditions for site response is that it has finite mass that will contribute to the

dynamic response of the soil model. The mass of each ring assembly is 25 kg (125 kg total for all five rings), which is approximately 12% of the mass of the contained soil.

Figure 3. NEES@UCDavis hinged-plate container used in this study (Lars Pedersen, personal communication).

GROUND MOTIONS

The base of the model container was shaken by a sequence of ground motions that included (i) scaled versions of earthquake recordings, (ii) small amplitude sine sweeps for the purpose of identifying the small-strain properties of the soil model, and (iii) small amplitude sine waves having approximately 20 cycles. We focus herein on the data produced by the scaled earthquake motions; results for other motions are given in data reports (Harounian et al. 2010a; Afacan et al. 2011). The selected ground motions are listed in Table 2, and response spectra are plotted in Fig. 4. The digital ground motion records and the metadata were obtained from the

203 PEER-NGA ground motion database (Chiou et al, 2008), and subsequently conditioned for use
 204 on the centrifuge. The selected motions cover a range of site conditions likely to exist beneath
 205 soft clay deposits ($V_{s30} = 198$ to 705 m/s), and to cover a range of magnitudes that contribute
 206 significantly to seismic hazard in many seismically active crustal regions. Furthermore, the peaks
 207 in the response spectra range from approximately 0.3 s to 2 s, which straddles the site period. In
 208 some cases, multiple scaled versions of the same ground motion were imposed on the model to
 209 observe effects of amplitude for the same motion, while in other cases a large amplitude
 210 motion was only applied once to mobilize large shear strains in the model. Excess pore
 211 pressures mobilized in the clay layers during shaking were small, and sufficient time was
 212 permitted between each sequential shake to permit these small excess pore pressures to
 213 dissipate.

214

215 **Table 2.** Characteristics of recorded earthquake ground motions utilized in this study. Motion
 216 and record/component codes are from PEER-NGA database (Chiou et al., 2008)

Earthquake	Record/Component	M_w	R_{jb} (km)	V_{s30} (m/s)	PGA (g)	PGV (cm/s)	PGD (cm)
1979 Coyote Lake, CA	CYC160	5.7	5.3	597	0.157	10.8	1.3
1994 Northridge, CA	RRS228	6.7	0.0	282	0.838	166.1	28.8
1994 Northridge, CA	WPI046	6.7	2.1	286	0.455	92.8	56.6
1994 Northridge, CA	SCS142	6.7	5.4	251	0.897	102.8	47.0
1995 Kobe, Japan	NIS000	6.9	7.1	609	0.509	37.3	9.5
1995 Kobe, Japan	PRI090/ KP4090	6.9	3.3	198	0.325	23.28	13.1
1989 Loma Prieta, CA	LGP090	6.9	0.0	478	0.605	51.0	11.5
1999 Hector Mine, CA	HEC000	7.1	10.4	685	0.266	28.5	22.5
1999 Chi Chi, Taiwan	TCU045-W	7.6	26.0	705	0.474	36.7	50.7

217

218

Figure 4. Response spectra of the ground motions utilized in this study.

Fig. 5 shows the peak horizontal acceleration recorded in the soil near the base of the centrifuge models (PHA_b) and recorded near the ground surface (PHA_0). We generally see amplification for $PHA_b \leq 0.2g$ and de-amplification for $PHA_b \geq 0.3g$, with mixed results at intermediate amplitudes. These varying levels of site amplification indicate nonlinearity.

227**Figure 5.** Peak base acceleration (PHA_b) and surface acceleration (PHA_0) recorded in the
228centrifuge models for tests involving earthquake ground motion excitation.

229

230 The centrifuge shaking table is able to replicate key features of the earthquake motions,
231although some differences arise from imperfections in the feedback control loop, particularly at
232high frequencies. Therefore, the recorded base motions should always be used in lieu of the
233command motions when analyzing the model response. Some of the motions utilized herein
234were conditioned for use on the centrifuge prior to the present work by Mason et al. (2010).
235Furthermore, the motions on the base plate of the model container are different from the
236motions within the soil near the base of the model container. This is likely caused by slip
237between the latex membrane and container base. For this reason, we herein interpret the most
238deeply embedded ground motion recording as being representative of the base motion.

239

240**TEST DATA**

241All experimental data are uploaded to the NEEShub central data repository (Harounian et al.
2422013a,b), and details of the data processing methods utilized to convert the raw recorded data
243files into prototype engineering units are included in the data reports. In addition to recorded
244data, several derived quantities (e.g., 5% damped pseudo-acceleration response spectra) are
245archived in NEEShub. The data are presented in prototype units, and were converted using scale
246factors defined in the data reports (Harounian et al. 2010, Afacan et al. 2011). Acceleration time
247series were high-pass filtered in the frequency domain using an acausal Butterworth filter to
248remove low frequency noise; the selection of the corner frequency followed protocols

249described by Boore and Bommer (2005), which is intended to apply the smallest possible
250amount of filtering while achieving realistic velocity and displacement.

251 An example of corrected acceleration histories from the dense instrument array in the
252center of model AHA02 for the LGPC090 motion with $PHA_b = 0.049g$ and $0.50g$ are presented in
253Fig. 6. At the ground surface, the small amplitude base motion was amplified by 1.5 ($PGA_0 =$
2540.072 g) whereas the large amplitude motion was de-amplified at high frequencies by 0.58
255($PGA_0 = 0.29$ g). A change in frequency content is also evident for the strong base motion due to
256nonlinear site response.

257

258 **Figure 6.** Acceleration time series for motion LGPC090 for (a) $PHA_b=0.049g$ and (b) $PHA_b=0.50g$.

259

260 PERFORMANCE OF HINGED-PLATE CONTAINER

261A number of previous centrifuge modeling studies utilized flexible shear beam (FSB) containers
262consisting of aluminum or steel rings separated by rubber layers that allow the container to
263deform in a step-wise manner. Container shear stiffness introduces an undesired boundary

condition for 1-D site response modeling due to reflections of seismic energy from the container walls. These undesired boundary conditions cause horizontal spatial variation in the ground motions, with the largest effects near the container rings and smaller effects near the center of the soil model. The effects are anticipated to be largest for soft soil conditions, and may be negligible for stiff soil profiles for which the finite container stiffness is a smaller fraction of the system stiffness. Similarly, the effects are anticipated to increase with shaking intensity due to reduction in the shear modulus of the soil at large shear strains.

Undesirable performance of shear beam containers is likely to have affected measured responses in previous studies. For example, Lai et al. (2001) and Elgamal et al. (2005) presented a test program on dense sand constructed in an FSB container. They found that damping values back-calculated from acceleration array data were higher than empirical curves. Utilizing wavelet analysis to analyze the time-dependent frequency content of vertical array acceleration data, they observed that near the walls of the container the frequency content of the ground motion was spread over a larger band than the motions near the center of the model. Moreover, shear strains were larger near the walls of the shear beam container for saturated sand models. These observations were attributed in part to p-waves generated at the container boundary. They acknowledged that container performance might contribute to the high damping values, but indicated that further investigation was needed to explain the experimental finding. Fiegel (1995) implemented a hinged-plate container on the small 1m diameter Schaevitz centrifuge at UC Davis, and found that the ground motions near the center of the container were very similar to those offset from the centerline at the same elevation.

285Furthermore, significantly more ground motion amplification was observed in a rigid container
286compared with the hinged-plate container for high intensity input motions.

287 We examine the influence of container stiffness by comparing data from test CSP5
288(Wilson et al. 1997) with test AHA01. This comparison was chosen because (i) CSP5 utilized a
289FSB container whereas AHA01 utilized the HPC container, (ii) both models contained layers of
290lightly overconsolidated San Francisco Bay mud, and (iii) the same ground motion recorded at
291Port Island during the 1995 Kobe earthquake was input to the base of both models.
292Furthermore, a high intensity ground motion is selected because large strains were induced in
293the clay thereby reducing its shear stiffness, exacerbating any undesired container effects.
294Acceleration response spectra (5% damping) for a ground motion recorded from an
295accelerometer embedded near the surface of the soft clay deposit, and on the container ring at
296the same elevation are shown in Fig. 7. The ground motion in the clay layer should be identical
297to the motion on the container at the same elevation if 1-D site response conditions were
298achieved during the tests. The two response spectra for CSP5 exhibit significant differences at
299short periods, with the container ground motion approximately twice as large as the soil ground
300motion. On the other hand, the two response spectra for AHA01 are essentially identical at all
301periods. This indicates that the HPC container produced better 1-D boundary conditions than
302the FSB container, and is therefore better suited for site response modeling.

303

Figure 7. Acceleration response spectra (5% damping) near the top of a soft clay layer and on the container ring at the same elevation for (a) test CSP5 tested in a flexible shear beam container (Wilson et al., 1997), and (b) test AHA01 tested in a hinged-plate container. Deformations exaggerated, and pile foundations from CSP5 omitted for clarity.

311 DATA INTERPRETATION

312 Derivation of Shear Stresses and Strains

313 The time-dependence of shear stresses and shear strains was evaluated at selected depths
 314 within clay layers from the corrected data using the procedure of Zeghal and Elgamal (1994).
 315 Referring to Fig. 8, shear stress at depth z and time t was computed by summing the inertia of
 316 overlying soil as:

$$317 \quad \tau_z(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{N(z)} \rho_i \cdot \ddot{u}_i(t) \cdot \Delta z_i \quad (4)$$

318 where index i denotes discrete depth intervals above depth z , each of which has an
 319 accelerometer at the middle of the depth interval (i.e., depth z occurs at the boundary between
 320 intervals i and $i+1$); $N(z)$ is the number of such depth intervals; ρ_i is mass density for depth

321 interval i ; $\ddot{u}_i(t)$ is the horizontal acceleration for depth interval i at time t (from the corrected

322 acceleration time series), and Δz_i is the tributary depth associated with interval i .

323

324 **Figure 8.** Schematic illustration of profile layering used for stress and strain computations.

325

326 The average shear strain at depth z was computed assuming 1-D wave propagation
327 conditions (i.e., $\gamma = \partial u / \partial z$) as:

328 (5)

$$\gamma_z(t) = \frac{u_i - u_{i+1}}{0.5 \cdot (\Delta z_i + \Delta z_{i+1})}$$

329 The numerator in Eq. 5 represents the differential horizontal displacement between the
330 accelerometers immediately above and below depth z , and the denominator represents the
331 vertical distance between those accelerometers.

332 An example set of stress histories, strain histories, and normalized stress-strain curves at
333 two depths are shown in Fig. 9. Shear stresses are normalized by the undrained monotonic
334 shear strength computed using Eq. (3). The stress and strain histories are shown for the RRS228
335 motion with various base motion intensities ($PHA_b = 0.069g, 0.29g$ and $0.60g$). The normalized
336 stress-strain curves span approximately one loading cycle at the time interval in the strain
337 history when the peak strain occurs.

Figure 9. Stress and strain histories evaluated in relatively soft and firm clay layers when subjected to motion RRS228 at (a) 7.3 m depth, (b) 18.5 m depth and corresponding stress-strain loops extracted from the shaded areas (c) at 7.3 m depth and (d) 18.5 m depth.

342

The lowest-amplitude stress and strain histories (for $PHA_b = 0.069g$ in Fig. 9 a,b) have similar waveforms, which is generally compatible with the assumption of linear (or equivalent-linear) analyses in which the strain history scaled by a constant shear modulus produces the stress history (along with some phase shift from damping). This similarity of waveforms breaks down at larger strains (e.g., $PHA_b = 0.60g$ in Fig. 9a), where the stress/strain ratio is higher for

the small cycles between 20 and 27s than for the large cycle at 28s. The different stress/strain ratios with time for the large intensity motion is caused by the significant reduction in shear modulus associated with such large shear strains. Equivalent linear analysis, in which the shear modulus is independent of time, cannot capture this type of behavior.

Turning next to the stress-strain loops, secant shear modulus decreases as cyclic strain increases in a manner that is similar to traditional cyclic laboratory tests. However, the stress-strain loops are not smooth due to the broadband nature of the input motions. At a depth of 7.3m near the center of the uppermost lift of clay, the shear strain for the motion with $PHA_b = 0.60g$ exceeds 10%, while the shear stress exceeds the monotonic undrained shear strength by more than 50%. Strain rate effects explain why the mobilized shear stress exceeded the monotonic undrained strength, as demonstrated later. At a depth of 18.5m, where the clay was overconsolidated, the shear strains are lower (near 1%), and mobilized shear stresses do not reach the monotonic undrained strength.

Modulus Reduction and Damping Behavior

Published modulus reduction and damping curves are generally empirically verified to shear strains up to approximately 0.3 to 0.5%, and are often fit with hyperbolic functions that provide a good match with data in this range of strains (e.g., Darendeli, 2001). In practice, these functional forms are often extrapolated to higher shear strains beyond the calibration range, and can provide implied shear strengths that are significantly different from the soil shear strength (e.g., Stewart and Kwok 2008). It is of interest to compare the modulus reduction and damping behavior evaluated from the centrifuge test data against these published curves, especially in regard to large strain behavior.

Referring to the schematic stress-strain loop in Fig. 10, we apply the approach of Zeghal and Elgamal (1994) to compute secant shear modulus, G_{sec} , and damping, D . Stress-strain loops like those shown in Fig. 9 were generated for each ground motion imposed on the models, and G_{sec} and D were computed. The area of each loop required to obtain D was computed using trapezoidal integration. The small strain shear modulus was computed as $G_{max} = \rho V_s^2$, and normalized shear modulus G_{sec}/G_{max} and D were plotted versus shear strain in Fig. 10a-b. Extracting G_{sec} and D from the centrifuge data is more complicated than with strain-controlled harmonic laboratory tests because the broadband excitation in the centrifuge models caused asymmetric stress-strain loops that sometimes did not close (e.g., Fig. 10). Furthermore, shear strains smaller than about 0.02% could not be accurately measured in the centrifuge because the signal to noise ratio in the acceleration records is too low at small shaking levels, and because of A/D conversion resolution. Therefore, the data in Fig. 11 are plotted only for $\gamma_c > 0.02\%$.

Figure 10. Schematic illustration of non-symmetric stress strain loop and quantities used for evaluation of secant modulus G_{sec} and hysteretic damping D

Figure 11. (a) Normalized shear modulus curves, (b) damping curves and (c) normalized shear stress vs shear strain curves for AHA02 and (d) modulus reduction residuals, (e) damping residuals, (f) stress residuals for Dar01 and YEA13 models. In legend, Dar01 = Darendeli (2001), VD91 = Vucetic and Dobry (1991), and YEA13 = Yee et al. (2013). Parameter $(s_u)_d$ is the strain rate compatible shear strength.

Also shown in Fig.10a are the recommended modulus reduction relations from Vucetic and Dobry (1991) and Darendeli (2001). Two curves are plotted for the Darendeli relation to bound

the range of consolidation stress and overconsolidation ratio for the clay in the centrifuge models (the Vucetic and Dobry relation is independent of confining pressure). The Darendeli model is extended to 10% (beyond the upper bound of experimental validation) for the purpose of comparing with the centrifuge test data. In general, Darendeli's functional form appears to provide a reasonable characterization of the observed modulus reduction behavior in the centrifuge models, although a more formal assessment of bias is given below.

Damping values computed from the centrifuge test data (Fig. 11b) exhibit significant scatter, and tend to be higher than the published trends. This observation is similar to several studies that have utilized 1-D array data to characterize stress-strain behavior for centrifuge models and field arrays (e.g., Elgamal et al. 2001, Tsai and Hashash 2009).

Fig. 11c shows backbone stress-strain data in which shear stress is normalized by the undrained monotonic shear strength (s_u) and a higher, strain rate-compatible shear strength, $(s_u)_d$. According to Sheahan et al. (1996), undrained shear strength increases approximately 9%

per log cycle increase of strain rate, $\dot{\gamma}$. The monotonic undrained strength was measured in the

laboratory at a traditional $\dot{\gamma}$ (e.g., 0.006%/s to reach 10% strain in 30 minutes), whereas $\dot{\gamma}$ as

high as 6000%/s (model scale) was observed during the centrifuge tests. This six order of

magnitude increase in $\dot{\gamma}$ corresponds to $(s_u)_d/s_u = 1.09^6 = 1.67$. Values of $(s_u)_d$ were obtained

for each motion by computing the peak strain rate mobilized during each motion, and

415correcting as demonstrated above. This is admittedly an extrapolation of Sheahan's findings
416because strain rates mobilized in the centrifuge were much higher than those imposed in
417laboratory studies. In Fig 10c, the $\sigma_c/(s_u)_d$ values approach unity at high strain values, whereas
418 σ_c/s_u values significantly exceed unity. This shows that strain-rate corrections should be applied
419to shear strengths for site response problems. Strain rates mobilized in centrifuge models are
420approximately two orders of magnitude larger than those anticipated for prototype conditions,
421but the increase in shear strength is nevertheless significant. We recognize that rate effects may
422also be present for shear stiffness (i.e., V_s or G_{max}), but in this case the geophysical
423measurements were made at strain rates that were not significantly different from those
424mobilized during shaking since we used bender element measurements and high frequency
425harmonic motions to measure the V_s profile. Therefore we did not correct shear stiffness for
426rate effects.

427 Along with the data, Fig. 11c also shows stress-strain curves implied by Darendeli's
428functional form. The shear strength implied by extrapolating the function to high strain is
429significantly smaller than the monotonic undrained strength of the clay, which is clear from the
430stress-strain curves (Fig. 11c) but not evident from the modulus reduction plots (Fig. 11a). Yee et
431al. (2013) proposed a procedure to adjust the modulus reduction curve to provide the desired
432undrained shear strength [taken as $(s_u)_d$] at high strains. The resulting modulus reduction,
433damping, and stress-strain curves are shown with dotted lines in Figs. 11a-c. The modified
434stress-strain relation asymptotically approaches $(s_u)_d$ as shear strain goes to infinity, which
435provides a better match to the $\sigma_c/(s_u)_d$ data. The improved fit is not visible from the modulus
436reduction curves, which are poorly suited to visualization of large-strain behavior (i.e., very

small variations in modulus reduction at high strain cause large variations in implied shear stress).

The data points in Figs. 11a-c correspond to a variety of σ_v' and OCR values, complicating the data-model comparison. To facilitate a more formal evaluation of model performance, we compute residuals defined as the difference between the recorded data and the models (Sheather, 2009) for modulus reduction (R_G), damping (R_D), and normalized stress (R_τ) as follows:

(6a)

$$R_G = \frac{\frac{\sigma_{sec}}{\sigma_{max}} \ddot{\epsilon}}{\ddot{\epsilon}_{data}} - \frac{\frac{\sigma_{sec}}{\sigma_{max}} \ddot{\epsilon}}{\ddot{\epsilon}_{Model}}$$

(6b)

$$R_D = D_{data} - D_{Model}$$

(6c)

$$R_\tau = \frac{\tau_{data} - \tau_{Model}}{(s_u)_d}$$

Model equations are omitted for brevity (they can be found in the references), but include effects of consolidation stress, OCR, and plasticity index. Within the strain range of applicability of the Darendeli model ($\epsilon_c \leq \epsilon \leq 0.3\%$), modulus reduction residuals (Fig. 11d) generally indicate negative bias (i.e., model too linear) whereas damping residuals indicate positive residuals (model damping too low). The dispersion of modulus reduction and damping results can be represented by standard deviations of the residuals in Figs. 10d-e, which are 0.083 and 8.33%, respectively, for $\epsilon = 0.3\%$. These can be compared to standard deviations of 0.065 and 2.04% over a comparable strain range for the data used to develop the Darendeli model.

455 At large strains, the most relevant results are the stress residuals (Fig. 11f), which are
456 significantly positive for Darendeli (model underpredicts stress) and close to zero for Yee et al.
457 These differences in large strain soil properties have been shown to significantly affect the
458 results of nonlinear ground response analyses, as shown for example in comparisons to vertical
459 array data by Yee et al. (2013).

460 Spectral Amplification of Ground Motions

461 Having described dynamic properties of the clay during the centrifuge tests, we now turn our
462 attention to spectral amplification. The term 'spectral amplification' refers to the ratio of the 5%
463 damped pseudo acceleration (PSA) response spectra of the recorded ground surface and
464 container base motions:

$$465 \quad F(T) = \frac{PSA_0(T)}{PSA_b(T)} \quad (7)$$

466 Response spectra for the LGPC090 motion at three intensity levels are shown in Fig. 12a, while
467 Fig. 12b shows the period-dependent spectral amplification values, F . Several trends are
468 evident from the spectra and amplification plots. First, amplification levels are relatively flat for
469 $T < 0.5$ s and are strongly variable with the level of input motion (weak motions producing
470 amplification near 2 and strong motions producing amplification near 0.5). Second, relatively
471 narrow-band and substantial amplification up to a factor of 3 occurs near the elastic site period
472 (near 1.0s) for the weakest motion, whereas stronger motions both lengthen the period to as
473 much as 3s and broaden the spectral peak. These effects are expected because of the modulus
474 decrease and damping increase when the soil is subjected to increased shaking intensities.

475 Third, for periods beyond the site period, amplification levels are larger than 1.0, with the
 476 relative levels of amplification being the inverse of the short period trends (amplification
 477 increasing with strength of input motion). This apparent reversal of traditionally understood
 478 nonlinear effects appears to result from the transfer of energy to increasingly long periods as
 479 the soil softens. The response spectra extend to periods of only 5s because low frequency noise
 480 in the acceleration records rendered poor signal-to-noise ratio at longer periods.

481

482 **Figure 12.** (a) Acceleration response spectra for base and top of the model for the LGPC090
 483 ground motion for different $PHA_b = 0.049g, 0.18g, 0.50g$ respectively and (b) Amplification
 484 Factors for the LGPC090 ground motion.

485

486 Spectral amplification is parameterized as a function of V_{s30} in the site terms used in the
 487 Next Generation Attenuation (NGA) ground motion prediction equations (GMPEs). GMPE site
 488 terms represent the ratio of mean ground motion for a given V_{s30} to that for a reference velocity

489(V_{ref}), with both motions corresponding to outcropping (ground surface) conditions. The
490functional form of the site terms includes a linear amplification term that captures the scaling of
491ground motion with V_{s30} and a nonlinear term that captures the variation of F with PHA_b (or a
492reference PSA term) for the given V_{s30} . The centrifuge models have a strong impedance contrast
493at the base of the clay (the container base is essentially rigid), which is atypical of field
494conditions. Moreover, spectral amplification from Eq. (7) is defined as surface-to-base rather
495than surface-to-surface for two different site conditions. Accordingly, we do not expect a perfect
496match to the overall level of site amplification (represented by the linear component of site
497terms) but we consider the test data to be useful for checking the nonlinear terms in the
498GMPEs.

499 To investigate the nonlinearity implied by the test results, we plot in Fig. 13 spectral
500amplification factors (F) for $T = 0.01s, 0.1s, 1.0s$, and $3.0s$ versus PHA_b . Also shown for
501comparison are the predictions of the site term in the Boore and Atkinson (2008) GMPE, which
502is adapted from the model of Choi and Stewart (2005). There are several interesting features in
503these plots. First, the slopes of the $\ln(F)$ vs. $\ln(PHA_b)$ relations for large PHA_b , which are denoted
504as b values and effectively parameterize the nonlinearity, are similar between the GMPE and
505data. This is not necessarily expected, because the GMPE site term was derived for sites
506generally significantly stiffer than those in the centrifuge tests (even the NEHRP Class E sites
507used in the model development), so the comparison here represents an extrapolation of the
508model. Second, we do not see clear evidence of an inflection point in the $\ln(F)$ vs. $\ln(PHA_b)$ data
509for very strong PHA_b , where soil failure is occurring. This suggest that amplification models with
510a simple linear representation of the $\ln(F) - \ln(PHA_b)$ relationship at large PHA_b may be

511 acceptable. Third, the data for $T = 0.1$ s and 1.0 s indicate a clear break from relatively linear site
 512 response (roughly independent of PHA_b) for low input motion levels to nonlinear at transitional
 513 PHA_b values ranging from about 0.01 g to 0.1 g. Roughly similar transitional PHA_b values are
 514 reflected in the GMPE site terms, as shown in Fig. 13. Fourth, the data for $T = 3.0$ s indicate a
 515 generally flat trend with PHA_b , potentially even trending upward (positive b) for high values of
 516 PHA_b . This effect is not captured by the model, which retains a reduced level of nonlinearity at
 517 long period.

518

519

520 **Figure 13.** Amplification factor versus peak horizontal acceleration at (a) $T=0.01$ s, (b) $T=0.1$ s, (c)
 521 $T=1$ s and (d) $T=3$ s for all of the ground motions recorded in this study. In legend, BA08 = Boore
 522 and Atkinson (2008).

523

524 In Fig. 14 we plot the period-dependence of slope parameter b computed from the test
 525 data using results with $PHA_b \geq 0.1g$. Also shown in Fig. 14 are the trends of slope identified in
 526 previous models derived from ground motion data (Choi and Stewart 2005) and equivalent-
 527 linear simulations (Walling et al. 2008). The principal difference between b value trends in the
 528 two prior models is the significant dip between 0.1s and 1.0s in the simulation-based results
 529 (Walling et al. 2008). Interestingly, the centrifuge data are more consistent with the relatively
 530 flat trend of the model derived from data (Choi and Stewart 2005).

531

532 **Figure 14.** Slope of the amplification factors from centrifuge test data compared with similar
 533 slopes from data- and simulation-driven models. In legend, CS05 = Choi and Stewart (2005),
 534 BA08 = Boore and Atkinson (2008), and WEA08 = Walling et al (2008).

535

536 CONCLUSIONS

537 We present a centrifuge modeling study of site response in soft clay spanning a broad strain
538 range that includes nearly linear and strongly nonlinear soil behavior. The model response was
539 characterized using dense sensor arrays and 1-D shaking conditions were achieved using an
540 innovative hinged-plate container. The test data provides a useful resource for validating
541 nonlinear site response from empirical models and wave propagation routines.

542 Modulus reduction and damping values back-calculated from the recorded acceleration
543 data indicate modest misfit relative to empirical models within the strain range of applicability
544 of those models ($\sigma_c < 0.3\%$). The bias is towards the models having too-high modulus
545 reduction at low strain and too-low damping. The damping values exhibited significant scatter
546 as a result of the complex shapes of the hysteresis loops that result from broadband excitation.
547 Perhaps the most significant aspect of the observed soil behavior was a large-strain response in
548 which mobilized shear stresses significantly exceeded the undrained monotonic shear strength
549 by factors on the order of 1.5 to 2.0. These large stresses mobilize at shear strains beyond
550 approximately 5%. We attribute these high stresses to strain-rate effects that temporarily
551 increase the available shear resistance in the clay during strong shaking. Following the
552 recommendation of Sheahan et al. (1996) that shear strength increases by 9% per log-cycle
553 increase in strain rate, shear strength at the model scale strain rates observed in the centrifuge
554 models would be 67% higher than observed at typical laboratory strain rates. Although strain
555 rates in the centrifuge are unrealistically high, strength increases on the order 40% would be
556 expected based on the prototype strain rates more representative of field conditions compared
557 with the much lower strain rates in typical laboratory tests. The rate correction is therefore a

558potentially important consideration for selecting shear strength for nonlinear site response
559studies.

560 We compare the amplification of response spectral accelerations observed from
561centrifuge modeling to levels predicted by nonlinear site factors in ground motion prediction
562equations. Of particular interest in these comparisons is the nonlinearity of site response, which
563is typically quantified by the rate of change of amplification with base peak acceleration (PHA_b).
564When plotted in log-log space, amplification levels decrease nearly linearly with increasing PHA_b
565at a slope denoted as b . Values of b are poorly constrained by empirical ground motion
566databases, particularly for the soft soil condition utilized in the centrifuge modeling. The
567interpreted b -values indicate substantial nonlinearity for periods at and below the elastic site
568period of approximately 1.0s and effectively linear response at longer periods (e.g., 3.0s).

569Acknowledgments

570The authors would like to thank Alek Harounian, DongSoon Park, and Lijun Deng for assistance
571constructing and testing the centrifuge models, and NEES@UCDavis personnel, including Dan
572Wilson, Ross Boulanger, Bruce Kutter, Chad Justice, Ray Gerhard, Peter Rojas, Lars Pederson,
573Anatoliy Ganchenko, and Jenny Chen for their assistance during this sometimes difficult project.
574Funding for this work was provided by the United States Geological Survey under contract
575number 08HQGR0037. The contents of this paper reflect the views of the authors who are
576responsible for the facts and accuracy of the data presented herein. The contents do not
577necessarily reflect the official views or policies of the United States federal government. This
578paper does not constitute a standard, specification, or regulation. This material is based upon
579research performed in a renovated collaboratory by the National Science Foundation under

580 Grant No. 0963183, which is an award funded under the American Recovery and Reinvestment
581 Act of 2009 (ARRA).

582 References

583 Afacan, K.B., Harounian, A., Brandenburg, S.J., and Stewart, J.P., (2011). "Evaluation of non-linear site
584 response of soft clay using centrifuge models: Centrifuge data report for AHA02." *UCLA-SGEL Report*,
585 University of California, Los Angeles, 43 pgs.

586 Baturay, M.B. and Stewart, J.P. (2003). ["Uncertainty and bias in ground motion estimates from ground
587 response analyses."](#) *Bull. Seism. Soc. Am.*, 93 (5), 2025-2042.

588 Boore, D.M. and Atkinson, G.M. (2008). "Ground-motion prediction equations for the average horizontal
589 component of PGA, PGV, and 5%-damped PSA at spectral periods between 0.01s and 10.0s."
590 *Earthquake Spectra*. 24(1), 99-138.

591 Boore, D.M. and Bommer, J.J. (2005). "Processing of strong-motion accelerograms: needs, options and
592 consequences." *Soil Dyn. Earthquake Engrg.*, 25(2), 93-115.

593 Borchardt, R.D., (1994). "Estimates of site-dependent response spectra for design (Methodology and
594 Justification)." *Earthquake Spectra*, 10, 617-653.

595 Brandenburg, S.J., Kutter, B.L., and Wilson, D.W. (2008). "Fast stacking and phase corrections of shear
596 wave signals in a noisy environment." *J. Geotech. Geoenviron. Eng.*, ASCE, 134 (8), 1154-1165.

597 Chiou, B.S.J., Darragh, R., Dregor, D., and Silva, W.J. (2008). "NGA project strong-motion database,"
598 *Earthquake Spectra*, 24, 23-44.

599 Choi, Y and Stewart, J.P., (2005). ["Nonlinear site amplification as function of 30 m shear wave velocity,"](#)
600 *Earthquake Spectra*, 21, 1-30.

601 Darendeli, M. B. (2001). "Development of a new family of normalized modulus reduction and material
602 damping curves." *PhD Thesis*, The University of Texas, Austin, TX.

603 Elgamal, A., Lai, T., Yang, Z., and He, L. (2001). "Dynamic soil properties, seismic downhole arrays and
604 applications in practice." *Proc., 4th Int. Conf. on Recent Advances in Geotechnical Earthquake
605 Engineering and Soil Dynamics*, Univ. of Missouri-Rolla, San Diego.

606 Elgamal, A., Yang, Z., Lai, T., Kutter, B.L., and Wilson, D.W. (2005). "Dynamic response of saturated dense
607 sand in laminated centrifuge container." *J. Geotech. & Geoenviron. Eng.*, 131 (5), 598-609.

608 Fiegel, G. L. (1995). "Centrifugal and Analytical Modeling of Soft Soil Sites Subjected to Seismic Shaking."
609 *PhD Thesis*, The University of California, Davis.

610 Hardin, B.O. and Drnevich, V.P. (1972). "Shear modulus and damping in soils: design equations and
611 curves." *J. of the Soil Mechanics and Foundations Div.*, ASCE, 98 (SM7), 667-692.

612 Harounian, A. (2010). "Evaluation of non-linear site response of soft clay using centrifuge models:
613 Centrifuge data report for AHA01." *M.S. Thesis*, University of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA.

614 Harounian, A., Afacan, K.B., Stewart, J.P., and Brandenburg, S.J. (2013a). "AHA01: Evaluation of nonlinear
615 site response of soft clay using centrifuge models." *Network for Earthquake Engineering Simulation
616 (database). Dataset. DOI: 10.4231/D32B8VB9D*

617 Harounian, A., Afacan, K.B., Stewart, J.P., and Brandenburg, S.J. (2013b). "AHA02: Evaluation of nonlinear
618 site response of soft clay using centrifuge models." *Network for Earthquake Engineering Simulation
619 (database). Dataset. DOI: 10.4231/D3XK84Q4D*

620 Hashash, Y.M., Philips, C., and Groholski, D.R. (2010). "Recent advances in non-linear site response
621 analysis." *5th International Conference on Recent Advances in Geotechnical Earthquake Engineering
622 and Soil Dynamics*, May 24-29, San Diego, Paper no. OSP 4.

623 Jaky, J. (1944). "The coefficient of earth pressure at rest." *J. Soc. Hung. Archit. Eng.*, 78 (22), 355-358.

624 Kramer, S.L. and Paulsen, S.B. (2004). "Practical use of geotechnical site response models." *Proc. Int.
625 Workshop on Uncertainties in Nonlinear Soil Properties and their Impact on Modeling Dynamic Soil
626 Response*, PEER Center Headquarters, Richmond, CA

627 Kwok, A.O., Stewart, J.P., Hashash, Y.M.A., Matasovic, N., Pyke, R., Wang, Z., and Yang, Z. (2007). "Use of
628 exact solutions of wave propagation problems to guide implementation of nonlinear seismic ground
629 response analysis procedures." *J. Geotech. & Geoenv. Eng.*, ASCE, 133 (11), 1385-1398.

630 Ladd, C.C. (1991). "Stability evaluation during staged construction." *J. Geotech. Eng. Div., ASCE*, 117(4),
631 540-615.

632 Lai, T., Elgamal, A., Wilson, D.W., and Kutter, B.L. (2001). "Numerical modeling for site seismic response in
633 laminated centrifuge container." *Proc. 1st Albert CAQUOT Int. Conf.*, Paris.

634 Lee, J.S. and Santamarina, J.C. (2005). "Bender elements: Performance and signal interpretation."
635 *J. Geotech. & Geoenviron. Eng.*, ASCE, 131 (9), 1063-1070.

636 Mason, H.B., Kutter, B.L., Bray, J.D., Wilson, D.W., and Choy, B.Y. (2010). "Earthquake motion selection and
637 calibration for use in a geotechnical centrifuge." *7th International Conference on Physical Modeling*
638 *in Geotechnics*, Zurich Switzerland, July 2010.

639 Park, D.S. (2011). "Strength loss and softening of sensitive clay slopes." *PhD Thesis*, University of
640 California, Davis, Davis, CA.

641 Phillips, C., and Hashash, Y.M.A. (2009). "[Damping formulation for nonlinear 1-D site response analyses](#)",
642 *Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering*, 29, 1143-1158.

643 Santamarina, J.C., Klein K.A., and Fam, M.A. (2001). "Soils and waves." John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., Chichester,
644 West Sussex, England., 488 p.

645 Schmidt, B. (1966). "Discussion of earth pressures at rest related to stress history." *Canadian*
646 *Geotechnical Journal*, 13 (4), 239-242.

647 Sheahan, T., Ladd, C., and Germaine, J. (1996). "Rate-dependent undrained shear behavior of saturated
648 clay." *J. Geotech. & Geoenviron. Eng.*, ASCE, 122 (2), 99-108.

649 Sheather, S.J. (2009). *A Modern Approach to Regression with R*. Springer Science Business Media, New
650 York, NY, 407 pg.

651 Stewart, J.P. and Kwok, A.O. (2008). "[Nonlinear seismic ground response analysis: code usage protocols](#)
652 [and verification against vertical array data.](#)" *Geotechnical Engineering and Soil Dynamics IV*, May 18-
653 22, 2008, Sacramento, CA, ASCE Geotechnical Special Publication No. 181, D. Zeng, M.T. Manzari, and
654 D.R. Hiltunen (eds.), 24 pgs

655 Tsai, C..C. and Hashash, Y.M. (2009). "Learning of dynamic soil behavior from downhole arrays." *J.*
656 *Geotech. & Geoenviron. Eng.*, ASCE, 135 (6), 745-757.

657 Vucetic, M. and Dobry, R. (1991). "Effect of soil plasticity on cyclic response." *J. Geotech. & Geoenviron.*
658 *Eng.*, ASCE, 114 (2), 133-149.

659Walling, M., Silva, W.J., and Abrahamson, N.A. (2008). "Nonlinear site amplification factors for
660 constraining the NGA models." *Earthquake Spectra*, 24, 243–255.

661Wilson, D.W., Boulanger, R.W., and Kutter, B.L. (1997). "Soil-pile-superstructure interaction at soft or
662 liquefiable soil sites - Centrifuge data report for Csp5." Report No. UCD/CGMDR-97/06, Center for
663 Geotechnical Modeling, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of California,
664 Davis.

665Yamada, S., Hyodo, M., Orense, R. P., Dinesh, S. V., and Hyodo, T. (2008). "Strain-dependent dynamic
666 properties of remolded sand-clay mixtures." *J. Geotech. & Geoenviron. Eng.*, ASCE, 134 (7), 972–981.

667Yee, E., Stewart, J.P., and Tokimatsu, K. (2013). "Elastic and large-strain nonlinear seismic site response
668 from analysis of vertical array recordings." *J. Geotech. Geoenviron. Eng.*, DOI: 10.1061/
669 (ASCE)GT.1943-5606.0000900

670Zeghal, M. and A. W. Elgamal. (1994). "Analysis of site liquefaction using earthquake records." *J.*
671 *Geotech. & Geoenviron. Eng.*, ASCE, 120 (6), 996-1017.