

Optimal single concave sliding device properties for isolated multi-span continuous deck bridges depending on the ground motion characteristics

Original

Optimal single concave sliding device properties for isolated multi-span continuous deck bridges depending on the ground motion characteristics / Castaldo, P.; Miceli, E.. - In: SOIL DYNAMICS AND EARTHQUAKE ENGINEERING. - ISSN 0267-7261. - ELETTRONICO. - 173:(2023), pp. 1-16. [10.1016/j.soildyn.2023.108128]

Availability:

This version is available at: 11583/2981027 since: 2023-08-11T04:36:41Z

Publisher:

Elsevier

Published

DOI:10.1016/j.soildyn.2023.108128

Terms of use:

This article is made available under terms and conditions as specified in the corresponding bibliographic description in the repository

Publisher copyright

(Article begins on next page)

OPTIMAL SINGLE CONCAVE SLIDING DEVICE PROPERTIES FOR ISOLATED MULTI-SPAN CONTINUOUS DECK BRIDGES DEPENDING ON THE GROUND MOTION CHARACTERISTICS

P. Castaldo¹, E. Miceli²

¹ Department of Structural, Geotechnical and Building Engineering (DISEG), Politecnico di Torino, Turin, Italy, e-mail: paolo.castaldo@polito.it ; pcastaldo@unisa.it

² Department of Structural, Geotechnical and Building Engineering (DISEG), Politecnico di Torino, Turin, Italy (corresponding author), e-mail: elena.miceli@polito.it

ABSTRACT

The present study investigates the analysis of the optimal friction coefficient with respect to the seismic performance of isolated multi-span continuous deck bridges, equipped with single concave friction pendulum (FPS) isolators. A six-degree-of-freedom system is used to model the structural system and the FPS friction property is described by means of a law that considers the dependency on the velocity. The equations of motions have been implemented in nondimensional form by considering the peak ground acceleration-to-velocity ratio (PGA/PGV) and the peak ground acceleration (PGA) as ground motion parameters for two different sets of seismic records: near-fault and far-field inputs. In addition, different bridge models are considered for various parameters (i.e., pier period, deck period, friction coefficient and mass of the structural system). The results show the effectiveness of the PGA/PGV ratio within the proposed nondimensionalization together with the existence of an optimum value of the friction coefficient that minimizes the nondimensional response of the pier. At the end, a linear regression expression is presented with the aim to compute the optimal value of the normalized friction coefficient as a function of the deck period and PGA/PGV ratio, which can be used in the preliminary phase to design the FPS bearings. Additionally, a multivariate non-linear regression expression is also provided to evaluate the pier response.

Keywords: multi-span continuous deck bridges, seismic isolation, non-dimensional equations, seismic performance, optimal friction coefficient, PGA/PGV ratio.

1. INTRODUCTION

Currently, one of the most effective solutions to enhance the seismic performance of bridges is the adoption of the isolation technique. The main effect of this strategy is to reduce the seismic inertia forces acting on the deck and thus transmitted to the substructure, by increasing the period of the isolation system [1]-[3]. Among the possible isolation devices (e.g., high or low damping elastomeric bearings, lead-rubber bearings, sliding bearings) [4]-[6], the friction pendulum system (FPS) bearings have the important advantages of both decoupling the isolation period from the deck mass and dissipating energy thanks to the friction between the concave surface and slider [7]-[9]. Many researches have investigated the behaviour of the FPS isolators through both experimental and numerical analyses [10]-[20]. In detail, the improvement of the seismic performance of a three-span continuous deck highway bridge, adopting double concave friction pendulum devices, is commented in [21]. In [22], different mathematical models are studied to represent the response of bridges under real earthquake ground motions, demonstrating the accuracy of the results when simplified

approaches are adopted to model the flexibility of the piers and of the deck. An experimental test on a 1:6 scale railway bridge isolated with friction pendulum bearings is described in [23] using a shake table, with the goal to study the influence of transverse poundings on the seismic response. Three-dimensional models of multi-span steel girder bridges isolated with FPS devices are investigated in [24], by changing many modeling parameters (i.e., geometrical and material characteristics of the bridge and isolator design properties). The effectiveness of variable friction pendulum system for a three-span continuous deck bridge under near-fault ground motions is analyzed in [25]. Seismic reliability-based abacuses for the design of FPS devices have been proposed in [26] for multi-span continuous deck bridges.

Contextually, Jangid [27]-[28] observed the existence of an optimal value for the friction coefficient in isolators able to minimize the structural response under seismic events, including respectively stochastic random processes and near-fault ground motions as seismic inputs. Successively, other works have been focused on this issue proposing non-dimensional analyses of different structural systems as a function of the most relevant parameters. Specifically, the research of [29] considered the influence of the seismic input intensity and the soil condition on the optimal friction coefficient for isolated piers. Nondimensionalizations with respect to the seismic input intensity for multi-span continuous deck bridges isolated with single and double concave FPS devices have been proposed, respectively, by [30] and [31]. Similarly, in [32] it was performed a normalization of the time of the seismic input with respect to its harmonic frequency ω , to evaluate the dynamics of the sliding response of structures. The frequency content of the ground motions in terms of PGA/PGV ratio has been considered to assess the optimal properties of the FPS isolators for base-isolated buildings in [33]. The PGA/PGV ratio has been also adopted by [34]-[36] to investigate the relation between the optimal isolator properties and the ground motion inputs for seismically isolated bridges.

This work examines the seismic performance of multi-span continuous composite or reinforced concrete (RC) deck bridges isolated with single concave FPS devices. The aim is to evaluate the influence of ground motion characteristics on the optimal friction coefficient of the isolators by means of a non-dimensionalization of the motion equations. In agreement with [15],[22],[30]-[31], a six-degree-of-freedom (dof) model has been adopted, including 5 dofs for the lumped masses of the RC pier and 1 additional dof for the composite or RC deck, which is considered infinitely rigid. Two FPS devices are modelled, respectively, on top of the elastic RC pier and on the rigid RC abutment. The latter is modelled as a fixed support in order to include the interaction between the deck and the abutment. The velocity dependency of the FPS device behavior is taken into account according to [10]. To include the record-to-record variability, different sets of ground motions are considered, including both far-field (FF) records with different ranges of peak ground acceleration-to-velocity ratios (i.e., PGA/PGV) and near-fault (NF) inputs [33]. By including the PGA/PGV ratio, the non-dimensionalization of the motion equations with respect to the seismic intensity has been proposed. In addition, a wide parametric analysis is implemented (i.e., the pier period, the ratio between the deck period and the period associated to the ground motion input, the friction coefficient and the ratio between the mass of the deck and of the pier). In this way, the normalized responses in terms of peak horizontal displacement of the pier and of the isolators are assessed. Finally, a linear regression expression is evaluated in order to compute the normalized friction coefficient of the isolators with respect to the ratio between the deck period and the ground motion period. This proposed expression can be very useful for a preliminary design of the FPS devices to isolate multi-span continuous composite or RC deck bridges. Additionally, a multivariate non-linear regression expression is also provided to evaluate the seismic pier response.

2. NON-DIMENSIONAL ANALYSIS FOR MULTI-SPAN CONTINUOUS DECK BRIDGES ISOLATED WITH FPS DEVICES

To model the response of multi-span continuous composite or RC deck bridges isolated with single concave FPS devices, a 6-dof system is implemented, according to [15],[22],[30]-[31]. Specifically,

5 dofs are adopted for the elastic RC pier and 1 additional dof for the rigid composite or RC deck (Figure 1(a)). The choice of discretizing the pier in 5 lumped masses is a trade-off between the computational effort and the accuracy in the assessment of the corresponding elastic response, as commented in [30]. Two FPS devices are placed, respectively, on top of the rigid and fixed RC abutment and on top of the pier, as shown in Figure 1(a). In agreement with [15],[22],[30]-[31], it is underlined that the presence of non-structural elements such as parapets or kerbs are not modelled. In addition, the effects of soil-structure interaction [7],[37]-[38] as well as the combination of horizontal and vertical components of ground motions or the asynchronous effects [3],[20],[38]-[40] are not included in the present study. It should also be underlined that this model is representative of multi-span continuous deck bridges having spans of similar length and piers with similar stiffness. The analysis can be effective also for piers with different heights depending on the effects due to the higher modes.




Figure 1 6dof model of a multi-span continuous deck bridge isolated by FPS devices (a); response of the FPS device on the pier (b).

The dimensional equations of motion for the 6-dof system under a seismic input $\ddot{u}_g(t)$ along the longitudinal direction are:

$$m_d \ddot{u}_d(t) + m_d \ddot{u}_{p5}(t) + m_d \ddot{u}_{p4}(t) + m_d \ddot{u}_{p3}(t) + m_d \ddot{u}_{p2}(t) + m_d \ddot{u}_{p1}(t) + c_d \dot{u}_d(t) + F_p(t) + F_a(t) = -m_d \ddot{u}_g(t) \quad (1a)$$

$$m_{p5} \ddot{u}_{p5}(t) + m_{p5} \ddot{u}_{p4}(t) + m_{p5} \ddot{u}_{p3}(t) + m_{p5} \ddot{u}_{p2}(t) + m_{p5} \ddot{u}_{p1}(t) - c_d \dot{u}_d(t) + c_{p5} \dot{u}_{p5}(t) + k_{p5} u_{p5}(t) - F_p(t) = -m_{p5} \ddot{u}_g(t) \quad (1b)$$

$$m_{p4} \ddot{u}_{p4}(t) + m_{p4} \ddot{u}_{p3}(t) + m_{p4} \ddot{u}_{p2}(t) + m_{p4} \ddot{u}_{p1}(t) - c_{p5} \dot{u}_{p5}(t) - k_{p5} u_{p5}(t) + c_{p4} \dot{u}_{p4}(t) + k_{p4} u_{p4}(t) = -m_{p4} \ddot{u}_g(t) \quad (1c)$$

$$m_{p3} \ddot{u}_{p3}(t) + m_{p3} \ddot{u}_{p2}(t) + m_{p3} \ddot{u}_{p1}(t) - c_{p4} \dot{u}_{p4}(t) - k_{p4} u_{p4}(t) + c_{p3} \dot{u}_{p3}(t) + k_{p3} u_{p3}(t) = -m_{p3} \ddot{u}_g(t) \quad (1d)$$

$$m_{p2} \ddot{u}_{p2}(t) + m_{p2} \ddot{u}_{p1}(t) - c_{p3} \dot{u}_{p3}(t) - k_{p3} u_{p3}(t) + c_{p2} \dot{u}_{p2}(t) + k_{p2} u_{p2}(t) = -m_{p2} \ddot{u}_g(t) \quad (1e)$$

$$m_{p1} \ddot{u}_{p1}(t) - c_{p2} \dot{u}_{p2}(t) - k_{p2} u_{p2}(t) + c_{p1} \dot{u}_{p1}(t) + k_{p1} u_{p1}(t) = -m_{p1} \ddot{u}_g(t) \quad (1f)$$

where u_d represents the horizontal displacement of the deck relative to the pier top, u_{pi} is the displacement of the i -th lumped mass of the pier with respect to the subsequently inferior one, m_d is the deck mass, m_{pi} and k_{pi} are, respectively, the mass and stiffness of the i -th dof of the pier, assumed equal for all the dofs, c_{pi} is the inherent viscous damping coefficient of each dof of the pier, c_d is the viscous coefficient of the bearing, t is the time instant, the dot indicates differentiation over time, while $F_a(t)$ and $F_p(t)$ are the resisting forces of the FPS devices placed on top of the abutment and of the pier, respectively, expressed as [8]:

$$F_a(t) = \frac{m_d g}{2} \left[\frac{1}{R_a} \left(u_d(t) + \sum_{i=1}^5 u_{pi} \right) + \mu_a \left(\dot{u}_d + \sum_{i=1}^5 \dot{u}_{pi} \right) \text{sgn} \left(\dot{u}_d + \sum_{i=1}^5 \dot{u}_{pi} \right) \right] \quad (2a)$$

$$F_p(t) = \frac{m_d g}{2} \left[\frac{1}{R_p} u_d(t) + \mu_p (\dot{u}_d) \text{sgn}(\dot{u}_d) \right] \quad (2b)$$

The first part of both Eq.s(2a,b) indicates the elastic component of the force while the second addendum is the friction one (Figure 1(b)). In detail, $k_d = W / R = m_d g / (2R)$, g is the gravity constant, R represents the radius of curvature of the FPS bearing on the abutment (i.e., R_a) or on the pier (i.e., R_p), μ denotes the sliding friction coefficient for the FPS bearing on the abutment (i.e., μ_a) or on the pier (i.e., μ_p). The difference between Eq.(2a) and Eq.(2b) is that $F_a(t)$ depends on the displacement and velocity of the deck with respect to the ground while the force on the pier $F_p(t)$ is a function of the relative displacement and velocity of the deck with respect to the pier top. According to the experimental results [8],[10],[14],[16], the sliding friction coefficient of teflon-steel interfaces is velocity-dependent and can be expressed as:

$$\mu(\dot{u}) = f_{\max} - (f_{\max} - f_{\min}) \cdot \exp(-\alpha |\dot{u}|) \quad (3)$$

where $\dot{u} = \dot{u}_d$ in case of μ_p or $\dot{u} = \dot{u}_d + \sum_{i=1}^5 \dot{u}_{pi}$ in case of μ_a , f_{\max} and f_{\min} are the sliding coefficients at large and zero velocity respectively, α is the parameter that controls the transition from low to large velocities. According to [16],[31]-[33], it can be assumed $f_{\max} = 3f_{\min}$ with $\alpha = 30$.

Eq.s(1a-f) are based on the assumptions of equal FPS isolators with low curvatures: $f_{\max} = f_{\max,a} = f_{\max,b}$ and $f_{\min} = f_{\min,a} = f_{\min,b}$ as well as $R = R_a = R_p$. Therefore, the fundamental period of the isolated bridge is $T_d = 2\pi \sqrt{m_d / (2k_d)} = 2\pi \sqrt{R / g}$, which does not depend on the mass of the bridge but only on the radius of curvature of the isolating device [8].

In this study, it is proposed a non-dimensional analysis following the approaches of [30]-[33] inspired by [41]-[42]. In detail, according to Buckingham's Π -theorem [43]-[44], it is possible to normalize the dimensional terms of Eq.s(1a-f) by means of time-scale and length-scale factors. In the following, the time scale is assumed as $1 / \omega_g$, where $\omega_g = 2\pi / T_g$ is herein assumed as representative circular frequency of the ground motion and, in a simplified way, calculated as the ratio between the peak ground acceleration and velocity (i.e., $\omega_g = PGA / PGV$), while the length scale is assumed as a_0 / ω_g^2 , where a_0 is an acceleration measuring the seismic intensity. Thus, the seismic input can be expressed as:

$$\ddot{u}_g(t) = a_0 l(t) = a_0 \ell(\tau) \quad (4)$$

where $l(t)$ is a nondimensional function describing the variation of the seismic input over time, while $\ell(\tau)$ is obtained from $l(t)$ by means of the time scale, such that $\tau = t\omega_g$. By dividing Eq.s(1a-f) by the deck mass m_d and introducing both the time and length scale factors, the nondimensional equations become:

$$\ddot{\psi}_d(\tau) + \ddot{\psi}_{p5}(\tau) + \ddot{\psi}_{p4}(\tau) + \ddot{\psi}_{p3}(\tau) + \ddot{\psi}_{p2}(\tau) + \ddot{\psi}_{p1}(\tau) + 2\xi_d \frac{\omega_d}{\omega_g} \dot{\psi}_d(\tau) + \left[\frac{1}{2} \frac{\omega_d^2}{\omega_g^2} \psi_d(\tau) + \frac{\mu_p(\dot{u}_d)g}{2a_0} \text{sgn}(\dot{\psi}_d) \right] + \left[\frac{1}{2} \frac{\omega_d^2}{\omega_g^2} \left(\psi_d(\tau) + \sum_{i=1}^5 \psi_{pi}(\tau) \right) + \frac{g}{2a_0} \mu_a(\dot{u}_d + \sum_{i=1}^5 \dot{u}_{pi}) \left(\text{sgn} \left(\dot{\psi}_d + \sum_{i=1}^5 \dot{\psi}_{pi} \right) \right) \right] = -\ell(\tau) \quad (5a)$$

$$\lambda_{p5} \left[\ddot{\psi}_{p5}(\tau) + \ddot{\psi}_{p4}(\tau) + \ddot{\psi}_{p3}(\tau) + \ddot{\psi}_{p2}(\tau) + \ddot{\psi}_{p1}(\tau) \right] - 2\xi_d \frac{\omega_d}{\omega_g} \dot{\psi}_d(\tau) + 2\xi_{p5} \frac{\omega_{p5}}{\omega_g} \lambda_{p5} \dot{\psi}_{p5}(\tau) + \lambda_{p5} \frac{\omega_{p5}^2}{\omega_g^2} \psi_{p5}(\tau) - \left[\frac{1}{2} \frac{\omega_d^2}{\omega_g^2} \psi_d(\tau) + \frac{\mu_p(\dot{\psi}_d)g}{2a_0} \text{sgn}(\dot{\psi}_d) \right] = -\lambda_{p5} \ell(\tau) \quad (5b)$$

$$\lambda_{p4} \left[\ddot{\psi}_{p4}(\tau) + \ddot{\psi}_{p3}(\tau) + \ddot{\psi}_{p2}(\tau) + \ddot{\psi}_{p1}(\tau) \right] - 2\xi_{p5} \frac{\omega_{p5}}{\omega_g} \lambda_{p5} \dot{\psi}_{p5}(\tau) + 2\xi_{p4} \frac{\omega_{p4}}{\omega_g} \lambda_{p4} \dot{\psi}_{p4}(\tau) - \lambda_{p5} \frac{\omega_{p5}^2}{\omega_g^2} \psi_{p5}(\tau) + \lambda_{p4} \frac{\omega_{p4}^2}{\omega_g^2} \psi_{p4}(\tau) = -\lambda_{p4} \ell(\tau) \quad (5c)$$

$$\lambda_{p3} \left[\ddot{\psi}_{p3}(\tau) + \ddot{\psi}_{p2}(\tau) + \ddot{\psi}_{p1}(\tau) \right] - 2\xi_{p4} \frac{\omega_{p4}}{\omega_g} \lambda_{p4} \dot{\psi}_{p4}(\tau) + 2\xi_{p3} \frac{\omega_{p3}}{\omega_g} \lambda_{p3} \dot{\psi}_{p3}(\tau) - \lambda_{p4} \frac{\omega_{p4}^2}{\omega_g^2} \psi_{p4}(\tau) + \lambda_{p3} \frac{\omega_{p3}^2}{\omega_g^2} \psi_{p3}(\tau) = -\lambda_{p3} \ell(\tau) \quad (5d)$$

$$\lambda_{p2} \left[\ddot{\psi}_{p2}(\tau) + \ddot{\psi}_{p1}(\tau) \right] - 2\xi_{p3} \frac{\omega_{p3}}{\omega_g} \lambda_{p3} \dot{\psi}_{p3}(\tau) + 2\xi_{p2} \frac{\omega_{p2}}{\omega_g} \lambda_{p2} \dot{\psi}_{p2}(\tau) - \lambda_{p3} \frac{\omega_{p3}^2}{\omega_g^2} \psi_{p3}(\tau) + \lambda_{p2} \frac{\omega_{p2}^2}{\omega_g^2} \psi_{p2}(\tau) = -\lambda_{p2} \ell(\tau) \quad (5e)$$

$$\lambda_{p1} \ddot{\psi}_{p1}(\tau) - 2\xi_{p2} \frac{\omega_{p2}}{\omega_g} \lambda_{p2} \dot{\psi}_{p2}(\tau) + 2\xi_{p1} \frac{\omega_{p1}}{\omega_g} \lambda_{p1} \dot{\psi}_{p1}(\tau) - \lambda_{p2} \frac{\omega_{p2}^2}{\omega_g^2} \psi_{p2}(\tau) + \lambda_{p1} \frac{\omega_{p1}^2}{\omega_g^2} \psi_{p1}(\tau) = -\lambda_{p1} \ell(\tau) \quad (5f)$$

where $\psi_d = \frac{u_d \omega_g^2}{a_0}$ and $\psi_{pi} = \frac{u_{pi} \omega_g^2}{a_0}$ are the normalized displacements of the deck and of the i -th

lumped mass of the pier, respectively, $\omega_d = \sqrt{k_d/m_d}$ and $\omega_{pi} = \sqrt{k_{pi}/m_{pi}}$ are the circular vibration frequencies of the isolated deck and of the i -th dof of the pier, respectively, $\xi_d = c_d/2m_d \omega_d$ and $\xi_{pi} = c_{pi}/2m_{pi} \omega_{pi}$ are the damping factors of the isolated deck and of the i -th dof of the pier, respectively, and $\lambda_p = \lambda_{pi} = m_{pi}/m_d$ is the mass ratio corresponding to the i -th lumped mass (where all the lumped masses are assumed equal). It follows that the nondimensional or normalized parameters of the problem, denoted as Π variables, are:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_{\omega_p} &= \frac{\omega_p}{\omega_d}, \quad \Pi_{\omega_g} = \frac{\omega_d}{\omega_g}, \quad \Pi_\lambda = \lambda_p, \quad \Pi_{\xi_d} = \xi_d, \quad \Pi_{\xi_p} = \xi_{pi}, \\ \Pi_{\mu,a} &= \frac{\mu_a \left(\dot{u}_d + \sum_{i=1}^5 \dot{u}_{pi} \right) g}{a_0}, \quad \Pi_{\mu,p} = \frac{\mu_p(\dot{u}_d) g}{a_0} \end{aligned} \quad (6a,b,c,d,e, f,g)$$

where the first term measures the degree of isolation, while the second one indicates the ratio between the circular frequency of the isolated system and PGA/PGV . The terms $\Pi_\lambda = \lambda_p$, $\Pi_{\xi_d} = \xi_d$, $\Pi_{\xi_p} = \xi_{pi}$ have been previously explained. The last two terms $\Pi_{\mu,a}$ and $\Pi_{\mu,p}$ represent the normalized friction coefficients. It is worth underling that even if the two isolators have equal mechanical and geometrical properties, the corresponding normalized friction coefficients (i.e., Eq.s6(f,g)) are different since they refer to different sliding velocities during the dynamic response. For this reason, each one is used in its peak stead, as follows: $\Pi_\mu^* = \Pi_{\mu,a}^* = \Pi_{\mu,p}^* = f_{\max} g/a_0$.

3. DIFFERENT SETS OF THE SEISMIC INPUTS

According to the Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering (PBEE) approach [45]-[46], the performance of the structural system has to be predicted accounting for a wide range of possible ground motions. To this goal, the seismic input is herein given by the product of an intensity measure (IM) denoted as a_0 and a nondimensional function $\ell(\tau)$, such that the uncertainties of the seismic

intensity are separated from those related to the characteristics of the record (i.e., record-to-record variability in addition to the event-to-event variability). In this context, the choice of the IM is important to respect the criteria of efficiency, sufficiency and hazard compatibility in agreement with [47]-[49].

In this study, the *PGA* has been selected as seismic intensity measure a_0 to achieve results useful in any site of the world where the seismic design is based on elastic pseudo-acceleration spectra according to the codes.

It is worthy to highlight that the time scale, adopted in the proposed non-dimensionalization, is the inverse of the ratio $\omega_g = PGA / PGV$ and this ratio has been considered efficient in describing the effects of the seismic input on the isolation effectiveness [33]-[36] and also in being representative of the ground motion characteristics in terms of frequency content [50]-[54].

For the purposes of this work, a group of 85 non-frequent natural ground motions has been selected, divided into two sets: the first set is made of 45 far-field (FF) records (Table 1-Table 3) [51] and the second one is composed of 40 near-fault (NF) inputs (Table 4) [55].

Table 1: Subset of far-field records corresponding to high $PGA(g)/PGV$ values [$PGA(g)/PGV > 1.2$ s/m].

Earthquake	Date	M	Site	Epic. Dist. (km)	Comp.	PGA (g)	PGV (m/s)	PGA(g)/PGV (s/m)	Soil
Parkfield California	June 27 1966	5.6	Temblor No. 2	7	N65W	0.269	0.145	1.86	Rock
Parkfield California	June 27 1966	5.6	Cholame, Shandon No. 5	5	N85W	0.434	0.255	1.70	Rock
San Francisco California	Mar. 22 1957	5.25	Golden Gate Park	11	S80E	0.105	0.046	2.28	Rock
San Francisco California	Mar. 22 1957	5.25	State Bldg., S.F.	17	S09E	0.085	0.051	1.67	Stiff Soil
Helena Montana	Oct. 31 1935	6	Carroll College	8	N00E	0.146	0.072	2.03	Rock
Lytle Creek	Sep. 12 1970	5.4	Wrightwood, California	15	S25W	0.198	0.096	2.06	Rock
Oroville California	Aug. 1 1975	5.7	Seismogr. Station Oroville	13	N53W	0.084	0.044	1.91	Rock
San Fernando California	Feb. 9 1971	6.4	Pacomia Dam	4	S74W	1.075	0.577	1.86	Rock
San Fernando California	Feb. 9 1971	6.4	Lake Hughes, Station 4	26	S21W	0.146	0.085	1.72	Rock
Nahanni N.W.T., Canada	Dec. 23 1985	6.9	Site 1, Iverson	7.5	LONG	1.101	0.462	2.38	Rock
Central Honshu Japan	Feb. 26 1971	5.5	Yoneyama Bridge	27	TRANS	0.151	0.059	2.56	Stiff Soil
Near E. Coast of Honshu Japan	May. 11 1972	5.8	Kushiro Central Wharf	33	N00E	0.146	0.060	2.43	Stiff Soil
Honshu Japan	Apr. 5 1966	5.4	Hoshina-A	4	N00E	0.270	0.111	2.43	Stiff Soil
Monte Negro Yugoslavia	Apr. 9 1979	5.4	Albatros Hotel, Ulcinj	12.5	N00E	0.042	0.016	2.63	Rock
Banja Luka Yugoslavia	Aug. 13 1981	6.1	Seism. Station, Banja Luka	8.5	N90W	0.074	0.032	2.31	Rock

Table 2: Subset of far-field records corresponding to medium $PGA(g)/PGV$ values [0.8 s/m $< PGA(g)/PGV < 1.2$ s/m].

Earthquake	Date	M	Site	Epic. Dist. (km)	Comp.	PGA (g)	PGV (m/s)	PGA(g)/PGV (s/m)	Soil
Imperial Valley California	May 18 1940	6.6	El Centro	8	S00E	0.348	0.334	1.04	Stiff Soil
Kern County California	July 21 1952	7.6	Taft Lincoln School Tunnel	56	S69E	0.179	0.177	1.01	Rock
Kern County California	July 21 1952	7.6	Taft Lincoln School Tunnel	56	N21E	0.156	0.157	0.99	Rock
Borrego Mtn. California	April 8 1968	6.5	San Onofre SCE Power Plant	122	N57W	0.046	0.042	1.10	Stiff Soil
Borrego Mtn. California	April 8 1968	6.5	San Onofre SCE Power Plant	122	N33E	0.041	0.037	1.11	Stiff Soil
San Fernando California	Feb. 9 1971	6.4	3838 Lankershim Blvd., L.A.	24	S90W	0.150	0.149	1.01	Rock
San Fernando California	Feb. 9 1971	6.4	Hollywood Storage P.E. Lot, L.A.	35	N90E	0.211	0.211	1.00	Stiff Soil
San Fernando California	Feb. 9 1971	6.4	3407 6th Street, L.A.	39	N90E	0.165	0.166	0.99	Stiff Soil
San Fernando California	Feb. 9 1971	6.4	Griffith Park Observatory, L.A.	31	S00W	0.180	0.205	0.88	Rock
San Fernando California	Feb. 9 1971	6.4	234 Figueroa St., L.A.	41	N37E	0.199	0.167	1.19	Stiff Soil
Near E. Coast of Honshu, Japan	Nov. 16 1974	6.1	Kashima Harbor Works	38	N00E	0.07	0.072	0.97	Stiff Soil
Near E. Coast of Honshu, Japan	Aug. 2 1971	7	Kushiro Central Wharf	196	N90E	0.078	0.068	1.15	Stiff Soil
Monte Negro Yugoslavia	Apr. 15 1979	7	Albatros Hotel, Ulcinj	17	N00E	0.171	0.194	0.88	Rock
Mexico Earthq.	Sept. 19 1985	8.1	El Suchil, Guerrero Array	230	S00E	0.105	0.116	0.91	Rock
Mexico Earthq.	Sept. 19 1985	8.1	La Villita, Guerrero Array	44	N90E	0.123	0.105	1.17	Rock

Table 3: Subset of far-field records corresponding to low $PGA(g)/PGV$ values [$PGA(g)/PGV < 0.8$ s/m].

Earthquake	Date	M	Site	Epic. Dist. (km)	Comp.	PGA (g)	PGV (m/s)	PGA(g)/PGV (s/m)	Soil
Long Beach California	Mar. 10 1933	6.3	Subway Terminal, L.A.	59	N51W	0.097	0.237	0.41	Rock
Long Beach California	Mar. 10 1933	6.3	Subway Terminal, L.A.	59	N39E	0.064	0.173	0.37	Rock
Lower Calif.	Dec. 30 1934	6.5	El Centro	58	S00W	0.160	0.209	0.77	Stiff Soil
San Fernando California	Feb. 9 1971	6.4	2500 Wilshire Blvd., L.A.	40	N61W	0.101	0.193	0.52	Stiff Soil
San Fernando California	Feb. 9 1971	6.4	3550 Wilshire Blvd., L.A.	39	WEST	0.132	0.216	0.61	Stiff Soil
San Fernando California	Feb. 9 1971	6.4	222 Figueroa St., L.A.	41	S37W	0.129	0.186	0.69	Stiff Soil
San Fernando California	Feb. 9 1971	6.4	3470 Wilshire Blvd., L.A.	39	S90W	0.114	0.186	0.61	Stiff Soil
San Fernando California	Feb. 9 1971	6.4	4680 Wilshire Blvd., L.A.	38	N15E	0.117	0.215	0.54	Stiff Soil
San Fernando California	Feb. 9 1971	6.4	445 Figueroa St., L.A.	41	S38W	0.119	0.173	0.69	Rock
San Fernando California	Feb. 9 1971	6.4	Hollywood Storage L.A.	32	S00W	0.106	0.170	0.62	Stiff Soil
Near E. Coast of Honshu, Japan	May 16 1968	7.9	Muroran Harbor	290	N00E	0.226	0.334	0.68	Stiff Soil
Near E. Coast of Honshu, Japan	June 17 1973	7.4	Kushiro Central Wharf	112	N00E	0.205	0.275	0.75	Stiff Soil
Mexico Earthq.	Sept. 19 1985	8.1	Zihuatenejo, Guerrero Array	135	S00E	0.103	0.159	0.65	Rock
Mexico Earthq.	Sept. 19 1985	8.1	Teacalco, Cuerrero Array	333	N00E	0.052	0.074	0.70	Rock

Table 4: Set of near-fault records.

Earthquake	Date	M	Site	Epic. Dist. (km)	Comp.	PGA (g)	PGV (m/s)	PGA(g)/PGV (s/m)	Soil
Imperial Valley-06	1979	6.53	Subway Terminal, L.A.	7.31	SN	0.180	0.545	0.33	C
Imperial Valley-06	1979	6.53	Subway Terminal, L.A.	0.07	SN	0.378	1.150	0.33	C
Imperial Valley-06	1979	6.53	El Centro	7.05	SN	0.357	0.779	0.46	C
Imperial Valley-06	1979	6.53	El Centro	3.95	SN	0.375	0.915	0.41	C
Imperial Valley-06	1979	6.53	El Centro	1.35	SN	0.442	1.119	0.39	C
Imperial Valley-06	1979	6.53	El Centro	0.56	SN	0.462	1.088	0.42	C
Imperial Valley-06	1979	6.53	El Centro	3.86	SN	0.468	0.486	0.96	C
Imperial Valley-06	1979	6.53	El Centro	5.09	SN	0.417	0.596	0.70	C
Morgan Hill	1984	6.19	El Centro	0.53	SN	0.814	0.623	1.31	B
Loma Prieta	1989	6.93	El Centro	9.96	SN	0.294	0.308	0.95	B
Loma Prieta	1989	6.93	El Centro	3.88	SN	0.944	0.970	0.97	B
Landers	1992	7.28	El Centro	2.19	SN	0.704	1.406	0.50	B
Landers	1992	7.28	El Centro	23.62	SN	0.236	0.566	0.42	C
Northridge-01	1994	6.69	El Centro	5.43	SN	0.617	0.674	0.92	B
Northridge-01	1994	6.69	El Centro	5.43	SN	0.518	0.674	0.77	B
Northridge-01	1994	6.69	El Centro	5.92	SN	0.724	1.203	0.60	C
Northridge-01	1994	6.69	El Centro	5.48	SN	0.426	0.878	0.49	C
Northridge-01	1994	6.69	El Centro	6.5	SN	0.870	1.672	0.52	C
Northridge-01	1994	6.69	El Centro	5.35	SN	0.594	1.303	0.46	C
Northridge-01	1994	6.69	El Centro	5.19	SN	0.828	1.136	0.73	B
Northridge-01	1994	6.69	El Centro	5.30	SN	0.733	1.227	0.60	B
Kobe, Japan	1995	6.9	El Centro	0.96	SN	0.854	0.963	0.89	C
Kobe, Japan	1995	6.9	El Centro	0.27	SN	0.645	0.726	0.89	C
Kocaeli, Turkey	1999	7.51	El Centro	10.92	SN	0.241	0.512	0.47	B
Chi-Chi, Taiwan	1999	7.62	El Centro	3.14	SN	0.664	0.777	0.85	B
Chi-Chi, Taiwan	1999	7.62	El Centro	9.96	SN	0.383	0.753	0.51	C
Chi-Chi, Taiwan	1999	7.62	El Centro	3.78	SN	0.286	0.461	0.62	B
Chi-Chi, Taiwan	1999	7.62	El Centro	0.66	SN	0.375	1.655	0.23	B
Chi-Chi, Taiwan	1999	7.62	El Centro	5.97	SN	0.224	0.409	0.55	B
Chi-Chi, Taiwan	1999	7.62	El Centro	5.30	SN	0.157	0.604	0.26	B
Chi-Chi, Taiwan	1999	7.62	3470 WilshireBlvd., L.A.	0.32	SN	0.564	1.846	0.31	B
Chi-Chi, Taiwan	1999	7.62	4680 WilshireBlvd., L.A.	0.91	SN	0.331	0.886	0.37	B
Chi-Chi, Taiwan	1999	7.62	445 Figueroa St., L.A.	2.76	SN	0.310	0.678	0.46	B
Chi-Chi, Taiwan	1999	7.62	Hollywood Storage L.A.	5.18	SN	0.235	0.578	0.41	B
Chi-Chi, Taiwan	1999	7.62	Muroran Harbor	7.00	SN	0.127	0.437	0.29	B
Chi-Chi, Taiwan	1999	7.62	Kushiro Central Wharf	2.13	SN	0.212	0.684	0.31	C
Chi-Chi, Taiwan	1999	7.62	Zihuatenejo, Guerrero Array	1.51	SN	0.295	1.090	0.27	B
Chi-Chi, Taiwan	1999	7.62	Teacalco, Cuerrero Array	6.10	SN	0.133	0.621	0.21	B
Chi-Chi, Taiwan	1999	7.62	Teacalco, Cuerrero Array	9.35	SN	0.224	0.424	0.53	B
Chi-Chi, Taiwan	1999	7.62	Mesa VibradoraC.U., Mexico City	9.96	SN	0.303	0.676	0.45	C

In detail, the set of the FF records is divided into three subsets with 15 records, depending on the value of the PGA/PGV ratio: high ratio ($PGA(g)/PGV > 1.2 \text{ s/m}$), medium ratio ($0.8 \text{ s/m} < PGA(g)/PGV < 1.2 \text{ s/m}$) and low ratio ($PGA(g)/PGV < 0.8 \text{ s/m}$).

The NF records of the second set have a low $PGA(g)/PGV$ ratio, i.e., on average lower than 0.8 s/m . In general, high PGA/PGV ratios are associated to seismic inputs of short durations and containing high energy content in the low period range while those with low PGA/PGV ratios are pulse-type motions with longer durations and contain high energy content in the high period range [50]-[51],[56]. It is noteworthy that, as underlined in [33], the normalized response of the same system subjected to a seismic input having the same PGA/PGV ratio is different, even if the response is normalized with respect to a time scale equal to $1/\omega_g$. This happens because although the ratio PGA/PGV is a very effective parameter in providing information on the frequency content and duration of ground motions [33],[50]-[51], it is not completely representative of the ground motion input. It follows the importance to consider a wide set of natural records.

4. DETERMINISTIC PARAMETERS

The seismic performance of multi-span continuous composite or RC deck bridges isolated with FPS devices is evaluated by considering different ranges of the structural parameters relevant to the problem (introduced in Section 2), according to [56]-[58]. Specifically, 4 values of the pier period: $T_p = [0.05, 0.1, 0.15, 0.2] \text{ s}$, 11 values of the period ratio: $T_d/T_g = [2, 2.5, 3, 3.5, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16]$; 3 values of the mass ratio: $\Pi_\lambda = [0.1, 0.15, 0.2]$; 85 values of the normalized friction coefficient

corresponding to its peak: $\Pi_{\mu}^* = [0 - 1.5]$ with a smaller step for values lower than 0.3. Furthermore, the normalized viscous damping factors inherent to the isolator and to the pier are set, respectively, equal to $\Pi_{\xi_d} = 0\%$ and $\Pi_{\xi_p} = 5\%$.

By combining all these structural parameters, a total number of 11200 different bridge models is obtained. Then, solving each structural model for the 85 ground motions, 952000 non-linear dynamic analyses have been carried out. The equations of motion in non-dimensional form (i.e., Eq.s(5a-f)) have been solved in Matlab–Simulink, adopting the ode3 (Bogacki-Shampine) solver [59].

The response parameters (i.e., engineering demand parameters - EDPs) computed with respect to ground in order to evaluate the seismic performance of the bridge models are the peak isolator displacement in its normalized value $\psi_{d,\max} = \frac{u_{d,\max} \omega_g^2}{a_0}$ and the peak pier displacement in its

normalized value $\psi_{p,\max} = \frac{u_{p,\max} \omega_g^2}{a_0} = \frac{\left(\sum_{i=1}^5 u_{pi} \right)_{\max} \omega_g^2}{a_0}$. The former displacements are necessary for the

design of the FPS devices and of the seismic deck-abutment joints, while the latter are important to evaluate the internal forces of the substructure (i.e., pier). According to [30], the response parameters are assumed to follow a lognormal distribution and can be probabilistically treated. Particularly, it can be computed the geometric mean GM together with the dispersion β of the generic response parameter D (i.e., $\psi_{d,\max}$ and $\psi_{p,\max}$) as follows:

$$GM(D) = \sqrt[N]{d_1 \cdot \dots \cdot d_N} \quad (7)$$

$$\beta(D) = \sigma_{\ln}(D) = \sqrt{\frac{(\ln d_1 - \ln[GM(D)])^2 + \dots + (\ln d_N - \ln[GM(D)])^2}{N-1}} \quad (8)$$

in which d_j is the j -th sample realization of D , and N represents the total number of samples (i.e., earthquake records). Then, the k -th percentile of the response parameter D is computed as:

$$d_k = GM(D) \exp[f(k)\beta(D)] \quad (9)$$

where $f(k)$ is equal to 0, 1 and -1 for k equal to the 50th, 16th and 84th percentile, respectively [60]. The lognormality assumption permits to estimate, with a limited number of samples, the response at different percentile levels, which is very useful for system reliability assessment and seismic risk analysis [61].

5. NUMERICAL RESULTS

This section illustrates the nondimensional response parameters $\psi_{d,\max}$ and $\psi_{p,\max}$ in terms of geometric mean and dispersion, as a function of both the peak value of the normalized friction coefficient Π_{μ}^* and the ratio between the deck and the ground motion period T_d / T_g , for some pier fundamental periods (i.e., $T_p = 0.05$ and 0.2 s) and mass ratios ($\lambda_p = 0.1, 0.15$ and 0.2).

Initially, the results obtained for the first set of the FF records are described. In detail, Figure 2, Figure 4, Figure 6, Figure 8 regard the normalized pier response $\psi_{p,\max}$ for the all FF records, FF records with high PGA/PGV ratio, FF records with medium PGA/PGV ratio and FF records with low PGA/PGV ratio, respectively. In general, $GM(\psi_{p,\max})$ increases for lower values of T_d / T_g , especially, for low Π_{μ}^* .




Figure 2 Geometric mean (a,b) and dispersion (c,d) of the peak nondimensional displacement of the pier top for all the FF records (the arrow indicates the increasing direction of $\lambda_p=0.1, 0.15, 0.2$).




Figure 3 Geometric mean (a,b) and dispersion (c,d) of the peak nondimensional displacement of the isolation level for all the FF records (the arrow indicates the increasing direction of $\lambda_p=0.1, 0.15, 0.2$).




Figure 4 Geometric mean (a,b) and dispersion (c,d) of the peak nondimensional displacement of the pier top for the FF records with high $PGA(g)/PGV$ ratio > 1.2 s/m (the arrow indicates the increasing direction of $\lambda_p = 0.1, 0.15, 0.2$).




Figure 5 Geometric mean (a,b) and dispersion (c,d) of the peak nondimensional displacement of the isolation level for the FF records with high $PGA(g)/PGV$ ratio > 1.2 s/m (the arrow indicates the increasing direction of $\lambda_p = 0.1, 0.15, 0.2$).




Figure 6 Geometric mean (a,b) and dispersion (c,d) of the peak nondimensional displacement of the pier top for the FF records with medium $PGA(g)/PGV$ ratio in the range 0.8 s/m -1.2 s/m (the arrow indicates the increasing direction of $\lambda_p=0.1, 0.15, 0.2$).




Figure 7 Geometric mean (a,b) and dispersion (c,d) of the peak nondimensional displacement of the isolation level for the FF records with medium $PGA(g)/PGV$ ratio in the range 0.8 s/m -1.2 s/m (the arrow indicates the increasing direction of $\lambda_p=0.1, 0.15, 0.2$).




Figure 8 Geometric mean (a,b) and dispersion (c,d) of the peak nondimensional displacement of the pier top for the FF records with low $PGA(g)/PGV$ ratio < 0.8 s/m (the arrow indicates the increasing direction of $\lambda_p=0.1, 0.15, 0.2$).




Figure 9 Geometric mean (a,b) and dispersion (c,d) of the peak nondimensional displacement of the isolation level for the FF records with low $PGA(g)/PGV$ ratio < 0.8 s/m (the arrow indicates the increasing direction of $\lambda_p=0.1, 0.15, 0.2$).




Figure 10 Geometric mean (a,b) and dispersion (c,d) of the peak nondimensional displacement of the pier top for the NF records (the arrow indicates the increasing direction of $\lambda_p=0.1, 0.15, 0.2$).




Figure 11 Geometric mean (a,b) and dispersion (c,d) of the peak nondimensional displacement of the isolation level for the NF records (the arrow indicates the increasing direction of $\lambda_p=0.1, 0.15, 0.2$).




Figure 12 Geometric mean (a,b) and dispersion (c,d) of the peak nondimensional displacement of the pier top for both the NF and FF records (the arrow indicates the increasing direction of $\lambda_p=0.1, 0.15, 0.2$).




Figure 13 Geometric mean (a,b) and dispersion (c,d) of the peak nondimensional displacement of the isolation level for both the NF and FF records (the arrow indicates the increasing direction of $\lambda_p=0.1, 0.15, 0.2$).

This happens because the lower is the period of the deck with respect to the ground motion period, the larger are the forces acting on the deck and thus transmitted to the pier. In addition, $GM(\psi_{p,max})$ increases for higher values of T_p whereas decreases for larger values of λ_p , since this growth causes a decrease in the forces transmitted from the deck to the pier. However, the influence of the mass

ratio is remarkable, especially, for low pier periods. Furthermore, there is a decrease followed by an increase in the response for increasing Π_μ^* values. This leads to highlight the existence of minimal values of $GM(\psi_{p,\max})$ for specific values of Π_μ^* , as also observed in [29]-[31].

The analysis of minimal values of $GM(\psi_{p,\max})$ for low Π_μ^* values is better explained in the next section. The response of the pier follows a trend that is similar in all the figures related to the different PGA/PGV ratios. The only difference is in the orders of magnitude, since large PGA/PGV ratios imply larger pier responses. In this last case and for high T_p values with very low T_d/T_g , the results show also a reduction of the response for very high values of Π_μ^* . The similarity in the trends of the results indicates that for a given combination of the structural parameters, the trends of the median responses are statistically not different if different PGA/PGV ratios are considered, confirming that the record selection does not strongly influence the response if $1/\omega_g$ is adopted as the time scale for the normalization [33]. As for the dispersion, $\beta(\psi_{p,\max})$, in general, decreases for higher values of Π_μ^* , remains almost constant for varying values of T_d/T_g and slightly increases for higher values of λ_p .

Figure 3, Figure 5, Figure 7, Figure 9 show the normalized deck response $\psi_{d,\max}$ for the all FF inputs and for three subsets of the FF records considered. It can be observed slight differences depending on the record selection also regarding the order of magnitude. The values of $GM(\psi_{d,\max})$ first increase with T_d/T_g and then decrease, especially, for low Π_μ^* . This trend is similar to the displacement response spectrum of an isolated mass with a low damping factor. Higher isolated deck periods improve the effectiveness of the isolation. In addition, $GM(\psi_{d,\max})$ is mainly influenced by Π_μ^* since the response decreases if this parameter increases due to the energy dissipation showing an hyperbolic trend as obtained in [30]. Regarding the dispersion, $\beta(\psi_{d,\max})$ is in general quite low, especially, in correspondence of the optimal friction coefficient values minimizing $GM(\psi_{p,\max})$ and strongly increases moving far from these values, since high-linearities are involved.

Similar results (i.e., GM and β of both $\psi_{p,\max}$ and $\psi_{d,\max}$) are presented considering the second set related to the NF records and, finally, to the two sets of NF and FF records considered together. Specifically, Figure 10 and Figure 12 illustrate the statistics of the pier top while Figure 11 and Figure 13 regard the isolation level. The trend of the responses both in terms of geometric mean and dispersion are very similar to the one obtained by considering the FF records, confirming that the choice of $\omega_g = PGA / PGV$ as the inverse of the time scale is a good indicator of the frequency content of the seismic input. The difference is in the order of magnitude. In fact, the responses of both pier top and isolation system are larger if the FF records are considered. This can appear in contrast with other studies [34]-[36],[62]-[63] that demonstrate how the NF records are more demanding since characterized by larger dominant pulses. On the other hand, the cyclic characteristic of the larger excitations in case of the FF inputs lead to larger displacement responses as also observed in [33],[56]. From the results, it is noteworthy that Figure 12(b) shows a reduction of the pier response for very high values of Π_μ^* combined with high T_p values and very low T_d/T_g as also noted in Figure 2(b) and Figure 4(b). This is due to the larger dissipation capacity given by the isolators. However, these high values of Π_μ^* lead also to very high dispersions of the isolation response. For this reason combined with the current FPS technology, the search of the optimal parameter Π_μ^* is focused in the range 0 - 0.5 in the following section.

6. OPTIMAL SLIDING FRICTION COEFFICIENTS

As already mentioned, the previous results indicate how it is possible to minimize the normalized response of the pier top for an optimal value of the normalized friction coefficient, denoted as $\Pi_{\mu,opt}^*$.




Figure 14 Geometric mean of the normalized response of the pier top with respect to Π_{μ}^* for the two sets of records, for $T_d/T_g=2.5$ and for: a) $\lambda_p=0.1$ and $T_p=0.05$ s; b) $\lambda_p=0.1$ and $T_p=0.15$ s; c) $\lambda_p=0.3$ and $T_p=0.05$ s; d) $\lambda_p=0.3$ and $T_p=0.15$ s.




Figure 15 Geometric mean of the normalized response of the pier top with respect to Π_{μ}^* for the two sets of records, for $T_d/T_g=8$ and for: a) $\lambda_p=0.1$ and $T_p=0.05$ s; b) $\lambda_p=0.1$ and $T_p=0.15$ s; c) $\lambda_p=0.3$ and $T_p=0.05$ s; d) $\lambda_p=0.3$ and $T_p=0.15$ s.

The existence of this optimum value, deeply discussed in literature [27]-[28],[35],[64]-[65], derives from the equilibrium between two counteracting results caused by increasing Π_{μ}^* values: on the one hand, there is an increase of the substructure response because higher modes participate and also due

to the increase of the isolator strength, determining higher equivalent stiffness [29] of the isolation system, and, thus of the forces transmitted to the pier; on the other hand, the substructure response decreases due to a larger energy dissipation.

Figure 14 and Figure 15 show the geometric mean of the peak normalized pier response as a function of the normalized friction coefficient for fixed values of the other structural parameters (i.e., T_d/T_g , λ_p and T_p). These figures confirm the observations explained in the previous section with respect to the influence of the PGA/PGV ratio values on the pier response. Moreover, as emphasized at the end of the previous section, the maximum normalized value of Π_μ^* assumed to search $\Pi_{\mu,opt}^*$ is set equal to 0.5. From the results, it is possible to observe that the orders of magnitude of the response parameter are different, as previously explained, but the optimum value of the normalized friction coefficient $\Pi_{\mu,opt}^*$ is essentially equal for all the sets and subsets of the records considered, demonstrating the effectiveness of the parameter $\omega_g = PGA/PGV$ within the proposed nondimensional approach. For this reason, the FF and NF records can be considered together in the following.




Figure 16 Optimal values of the normalized friction coefficient minimizing the 50th percentile of substructure response for fixed T_p and varying λ_p , for both the FF and NF records.

In Figure 16, Figure 17 and Figure 18, it is shown the optimum normalized friction coefficient $\Pi_{\mu,opt}^*$ as a function of the ratio T_d/T_g , for the four different values of the pier period (i.e., $T_p=0.05, 0.10, 0.15, 0.20$ s) and the three different values of the mass ratio (i.e., $\lambda_p=0.1, 0.15, 0.2$). Specifically, the results are presented considering both the FF and NF records with respect to the 50th, 84th and 16th percentiles, respectively. The optimum normalized friction coefficient decreases with larger T_d/T_g ratios, since the normalized response of the substructure is lower as a consequence of the isolation effectiveness.




Figure 17 Optimal values of the normalized friction coefficient minimizing the 84th percentile of substructure response for fixed T_p and varying λ_p , for both the FF and NF records.




Figure 18 Optimal values of the normalized friction coefficient minimizing the 16th percentile of substructure response for fixed T_p and varying λ_p , for both the FF and NF records.

Moreover, the values assumed by $\Pi_{\mu,opt}^*$ do not change significantly with the pier period or mass ratio for each percentile. Therefore, the results suggest the possibility of identifying a relationship between

$\Pi_{\mu,opt}^*$ and T_d/T_g without considering the other structural parameters, accounting for the 16th, 50th and 84th percentiles.

Thus, the linear regression expression in Eq.(10) has been defined as follows:

$$\Pi_{\mu,opt}^* = a_1 + a_2 \Pi_{\omega_g} \quad (10)$$

where the coefficients a_1 and a_2 together with the *R-squared* parameter (Table 5) are evaluated in Matlab [59]. High R-squared values (i.e., close to 1) are obtained, indicating the effectiveness of the formula in computing the optimum normalized friction coefficient. The graphical representation of the proposed linear regression formula is presented in Figure 19 depending on $T_d/T_g = 1/\Pi_{\omega_g}$.

Table 5: Linear regression coefficients for the optimum normalized friction coefficient.

	<i>R-squared</i>	a_1	a_2
16 th	0.9264	-0.0177	0.5374
50 th	0.9654	-0.0234	0.5699
84 th	0.9517	-0.0138	0.5774




Figure 19 Regression of the optimum normalized friction coefficient for both the FF and NF records related to a) the 50th percentile, b) the 16th percentile, c) the 84th percentile and d) all the percentiles.

In this way, knowing the seismic hazard of the site (i.e., knowing *PGA* and *PGV*) and defined the safety level (i.e., the percentile), $\Pi_{\mu,opt}^*$ can be computed through Eq.(10). Then, this result can be used to define the optimal friction coefficient at large velocities of the FPS devices to improve the seismic performance of an isolated multi-span continuous composite or RC deck bridge, through Eq.(11), according to the proposed nondimensionalization:

$$f_{\max,opt} = \Pi_{\mu,opt}^* PGA / g \quad (11)$$

Regarding the dimensions in plan of the FPS bearings as well as of the abutment-deck joints, the results illustrated in Figure 3, Figure 5, Figure 7, Figure 9 can be adopted to define the dimensional displacements.

Furthermore, on the basis of the results described in Section 5, a multivariate nonlinear regression analysis has been performed to compute each percentile of the normalized peak displacement of the pier top as a function of the above optimum normalized friction coefficient and of the other structural properties, as follows:

$$\psi_{p,\max}(\Pi_{\mu,opt}^*) = c_1 + c_2 \Pi_g + c_3 \Pi_p + c_4 \Pi_\lambda + c_5 \Pi_g \Pi_p + c_6 \Pi_g \Pi_{\lambda_p} + c_7 \Pi_p \Pi_\lambda + c_8 \Pi_g^2 + c_9 \Pi_p^2 + c_{10} \Pi_\lambda^2 \quad (12)$$

where the regression coefficients c_n ($n=1, \dots, 10$) are again obtained via Matlab [59] and are reported in Table 6-Table 9 for the different sets of records. In fact, differently from the optimal value of the friction coefficient, the normalized pier peak response depends on the selected records, as commented in the previous sections. In general, quite high *R-squared* values are obtained for the 16th, 50th and 84th percentile indicating a good estimation of the normalized peak substructure response. Similarly to Eq.(11) and according to the nondimensionalization including the *PGA/PGV* ratio, the results from this regression expression can be achieved in dimensional form as follows:

$$u_{p,\max} = \frac{\psi_{p,\max} PGA}{\omega_g^2} \quad (13)$$

Table 6: Regression coefficients for the normalized peak pier top displacement considering the FF records with high *PGA/PGV* ratio.

	<i>R-squared</i>	c_1	c_2	c_3	c_4	c_5	c_6	c_7	c_8	c_9	c_{10}
16 th	0.8238	0.0883	-0.0439	4.7266	-1.0243	-0.2112	0.0390	-1.776	0.0026	-7.0046	2.1065
50 th	0.7805	0.1798	-0.0666	5.3996	-1.0505	-0.2439	0.0178	4.1849	0.0039	-11.743	1.0663
84 th	0.7117	0.0268	-0.0704	6.2188	1.4000	-0.2709	-0.0461	8.5401	0.0045	-16.174	-6.2984

Table 7: Regression coefficients for the normalized peak pier top displacement considering the FF records with medium *PGA/PGV* ratio.

	<i>R-squared</i>	c_1	c_2	c_3	c_4	c_5	c_6	c_7	c_8	c_9	c_{10}
16 th	0.8838	0.0345	-0.0103	1.5704	-0.6654	-0.1352	0.0259	-2.4860	0.0008	2.5288	1.8654
50 th	0.9155	0.0559	-0.0150	2.1355	-0.9729	-0.1850	0.0352	-3.0752	0.0011	3.1803	2.6501
84 th	0.9302	0.0312	-0.0025	2.6361	-1.3887	-0.2381	0.0412	-4.5669	0.0005	5.8894	4.1816

Table 8: Regression coefficients for the normalized peak pier top displacement considering the FF records with low *PGA/PGV* ratio.

	<i>R-squared</i>	c_1	c_2	c_3	c_4	c_5	c_6	c_7	c_8	c_9	c_{10}
16 th	0.9094	0.0245	-0.0030	0.4780	-0.4384	-0.0327	0.0002	-2.0052	0.0003	1.2832	1.8503
50 th	0.9089	0.0194	-0.0096	0.7360	-0.1434	-0.0680	0.0228	-1.8481	0.0006	1.6322	0.2305
84 th	0.9016	0.0259	-0.0078	1.2774	-0.5507	-0.1050	0.0195	-3.8552	0.0006	2.9155	2.0023

Table 9: Regression coefficients for the normalized peak pier top displacement considering the NF records.

	<i>R-squared</i>	c_1	c_2	c_3	c_4	c_5	c_6	c_7	c_8	c_9	c_{10}
16 th	0.9256	0.0085	-0.0027	0.0842	-0.0132	-0.011	0.0148	-0.0207	0.0001	0.7299	-0.3325
50 th	0.9194	-0.0609	-0.0011	0.747	0.5680	-0.0308	-0.007	-3.276	0.0002	1.4395	-1.0878
84 th	0.8503	0.1372	-0.0185	0.5895	-1.2617	-0.0584	0.0776	0.5413	0.0006	2.7691	2.0480

Finally, it is necessary to highlight that the proposed results have been derived assuming only the seismic loads, but during the design or verification of bridges, other serviceability actions, such as thermal movements [66], have to be absolutely considered, especially, when high friction coefficients are required under strong earthquake events. In these cases, a global cost-effectiveness analysis is suggested to reduce the costs if the same safety level is assured. Additionally, for lifetime

assessments, the deterioration of the sliding surface of the isolators can be accounted for by means of the property modification factors [67].

7. CONCLUSIONS

This work is aimed at evaluating the optimal properties of single concave friction pendulum (FPS) bearings employed for the seismic isolation of multi-span continuous composite or RC deck bridges. The ground motion characteristics have been taken into account by means of both the peak ground acceleration (PGA) and parameter T_g expressed as a function of the peak ground acceleration-to-velocity (PGA/PGV) ratio (i.e., $T_g = 2\pi / \omega_g = 2\pi PGV / PGA$). These parameters have been employed as the length scale and time scale factors to develop a non-dimensional formulation to assess the normalized response of the six-degree-of-freedom structural model under different seismic events. Specifically, two different families of ground motions corresponding to the near-fault and far-field seismic records have been considered. The far-field events have been divided into three subsets depending on the PGA/PGV ratio. A wide set of natural records has been selected to take into account the record-to-record and event-to-event variability with respect to the simplified assumption of T_g . Furthermore, many bridge systems have been analyzed by varying: the pier fundamental period T_p , the ratio between the fundamental period of the isolated deck and the period of the ground motion T_d / T_g , the mass ratio λ_p and the normalized friction coefficient Π_μ^* . The results of the seismic analyses show that:

- the normalized response for both the isolation system and pier is strongly influenced by the ratio T_d / T_g . In detail, by increasing the ratio T_d / T_g , the geometric mean of the isolator normalized response first increases, until reaching a peak, and then decreases following the trend of a displacement response spectrum. On the other hand, the geometric mean of the substructure response decreases for increasing values of T_d / T_g ;
- the response for both the substructure and deck follows a very similar trend for the different sets of the records considered (i.e., PGA/PGV ratios). Different orders of magnitude are achieved, especially, for the pier response. Particularly, the far-field records, especially, with a high PGA/PGV ratio are more demanding since they are characterized by many pulses in a wider range of frequency. The similarity of the trends confirms that the choice of $1/\omega_g$ to define the time scale within the proposed nondimensionalization is very effective;
- the response of the isolation system is not particularly influenced by both the mass ratio and pier period;
- the optimum values of the normalized friction coefficient are defined to minimize the different percentiles of the normalized pier displacement. These optimum values are lower if larger T_d / T_g values are considered and are not significantly affected by the other bridge parameters. In addition, the optimal coefficients do not depend on the set of the records considered confirming the effectiveness of the PGA/PGV ratio.

All these considerations have led to propose a formula for the design of FPS bearings to calculate the normalized optimum friction coefficient depending only on the T_d / T_g ratio and, thus, on the seismic hazard of the reference site, through a linear regression expression. In addition, a multivariate nonlinear regression analysis is also presented to assess the different percentiles of the pier response, which depend on the T_d / T_g ratio, characteristics of the records set and bridge structural parameters.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work is part of the collaborative activity developed by the authors within the framework of the “PNRR”: VS3 “Earthquakes and Volcanos” - WP3.6 and SPOKE 7 “CCAM, Connected Networks and Smart Infrastructure” - WP4.

This work is also part of the collaborative activity developed by the authors within the research project "RELUIS - PONTI".

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Ghobarah, H.M. Ali, Seismic performance of highway bridges, *Eng Struct*, 10 (1988).
- [2] P. Tsopelas, M.C. Constantinou, S. Okamoto, S. Fujii, D. Ozaki, Experimental study of bridge seismic sliding isolation systems, *Eng Str*, 18 (4) (1996), pp. 301-310.
- [3] R.S. Jangid Seismic Response of Isolated Bridges *J Bridge Eng*, 9 (2) (2004), pp. 156-166.
- [4] M.C. Constantinou, A.S. Whittaker, D.M. Fenz and G. Apostolakis, Seismic isolation of bridges, Department of Civil, Structural and Environmental Engineering, University at Buffalo, State University of New York, Buffalo, NY 14260, 2007.
- [5] Tsiavos, A., Alexander, N.A., Diambra, A., ..Gonzalez-Buelga, A., Sextos, A., A sand-rubber deformable granular layer as a low-cost seismic isolation strategy in developing countries: Experimental investigation, *Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering*, 2019, 125, 105731.
- [6] Rele, R., Balmukund, R., Bhattacharya, S., Cui, L., Mitoulis, S.A., Application of controlled-rocking isolation with shape memory alloys for an overpass bridge, *Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering*, 2021, 149, 106827.
- [7] N.P. Tongaonkar, R.S. Jangid, Seismic response of isolated bridges with soil–structure interaction, *Soil Dyn Earthq Eng*, 23 (2003), pp. 287-302.
- [8] Zayas VA, Low SS, Mahin SA. A simple pendulum technique for achieving seismic isolation. *Earthquake Spectra*1990; 6(2):317–33.
- [9] L. Su, G. Ahmadi, I.G. Tadjbakhsh, Comparative study of base isolation systems, *J Eng Mech*, 115 (9) (1989), pp. 1976-1992.
- [10] A. Mokha, MC. Constantinou, AM. Reinhorn, Teflon Bearings in Base Isolation. I: Testing. *Journal of Structural Engineering* 1990; **116**(2):438-454.
- [11] MC. Constantinou, A. Mokha, AM. Reinhorn, Teflon Bearings in Base Isolation. II: Modeling. *Journal of Structural Engineering* 1990; **116**(2):455-474.
- [12] JL. Almazàn, JC. De la Llera, Physical model for dynamic analysis of structures with FPS isolators. *Earthquake Engineering and Structural Dynamics* 2003;**32**(8):1157–1184.
- [13] G. Mosqueda, AS. Whittaker, GL. Fenves, Characterization and modeling of Friction Pendulum bearings subjected to multiple components of excitation. *Journal of Structural Engineering* 2004; **130**(3):433-442.
- [14] R. S. Jangid, Computational numerical models for seismic response of structures isolated by sliding systems, *Structural Control and Health Monitoring* 2005; 12:117–137.
- [15] Jangid RS. Stochastic response of bridges seismically isolated by friction pendulum system. *J Bridge Eng*. 2008;13(4):319.
- [16] MC. Constantinou, AS. Whittaker, Y. Kalpakidis, DM. Fenz, GP. Warn, Performance of Seismic Isolation Hardware Under Service and Seismic Loading. *Technical Report MCEER-07-0012*, 2007.
- [17] N. Bonessio, G. Lomiento and G. Benzoni Damage identification procedure for seismically isolated bridges, *Structural Control and Health Monitoring* 2012; 19:565–578.

- [18] Tsiavos A., Vassiliou M.F., Mackie K.R., Stojadinovic B. Comparison of the inelastic response of base-isolated structures to near-fault and far-fault ground motions. In: VEESD 2013, Vienna congress on recent advances in earthquake engineering and structural dynamics & D-A-CH Tagung, Vienna, Austria, 28-30 August, 2013.
- [19] Tsiavos A., Schlatter D., Markic T., Stojadinovic B. Experimental and analytical investigation of the inelastic behavior of structures isolated using friction pendulum bearings. *Procedia engineering* 2017;199:465-70.
- [20] L. Landi, G. Grazi, P. Diotallevi, Comparison of different models for friction pendulum isolators in structures subjected to horizontal and vertical ground motions, *Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering* 2016;81:75-83.
- [21] Young-Suk Kim, Chung-Bang Yun, Seismic response characteristics of bridges using double concave friction pendulum bearings with tri-linear behaviour, *Eng Str*, 29 (2007), pp. 3082-3093.
- [22] Kunde MC, Jangid RS. Effects of pier and deck flexibility on the seismic response of isolated bridges. *J Bridge Eng.* 2006;11(1):109-121.
- [23] Meng, Dongliang, Menggang Yang, Ziqi Yang, and Nawawi Chouw. "Effect of Earthquake-induced Transverse Poundings on a 32 m Span Railway Bridge Isolated by Friction Pendulum Bearings." *Engineering Structures* 251 (2022): 113538.
- [24] Eröz, M., & DesRoches, R. (2013). The influence of design parameters on the response of bridges seismically isolated with the friction pendulum system (FPS). *Engineering structures*, 56, 585-599.
- [25] V.R. Panchal, R.S. Jangid and Bhargav B. Shobhana, Seismic performance of bridges with variable friction pendulum system, *International Journal of Structural Engineering*, 2021, Vol. 11(4), 342-363.
- [26] Castaldo, P., Amendola, G., Giordano, L., Miceli, E. (2022), "Seismic reliability assessment of isolated multi-span continuous deck bridges". *Ingegneria Sismica - International Journal of Earthquake Engineering*, Anno XXXIX - Num. 3.
- [27] Jangid RS. Optimum frictional elements in sliding isolation systems. *Computers and Structures* 2000;76(5):651–661. 10.
- [28] Jangid RS. Optimum friction pendulum system for near-fault motions. *Engineering Structures* 2005; 27(3):349–359.
- [29] Castaldo, P., Ripani, M., & Lo Piere, R. (2018). Influence of soil conditions on the optimal sliding friction coefficient for isolated bridges. *Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering*, 111, 131–148. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soildyn.2018.04.056>.
- [30] Castaldo, P., and Guglielmo Amendola. "Optimal Sliding Friction Coefficients for Isolated Viaducts and Bridges: A Comparison Study." *Structural Control and Health Monitoring*, 2021, 28(12), e2838, <https://doi.org/10.1002/stc.2838>.
- [31] Castaldo P., Amendola G. (2021) "Optimal DCFP bearing properties and seismic performance assessment in nondimensional form for isolated bridges", *Earthquake Engineering and Structural Dynamics*, 2021, 50(9), 2442-2461, DOI: 10.1002/eqe.3454.
- [32] Tsiavos A., Haladij P., Sextos A., Alexander N. A. Analytical investigation of the effect of a deformable sliding layer on the dynamic response of seismically isolated structures. *Structures* 2020; 27: 2426-2436.
- [33] Castaldo, P., and E. Tubaldi. "Influence of Ground Motion Characteristics on the Optimal Single Concave Sliding Bearing Properties for Base-isolated Structures." *Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering* (1984) 104 (2018): 346-64.
- [34] Liao WI, Loh CH, Lee BH. Comparison of dynamic response of isolated and nonisolated continuous girder bridges subjected to near-fault ground motions. *Eng Struct*

2004;26(14):2173–83.

- [35] Dicleli M, Buddaram S. Effect of isolator and ground motion characteristics on the performance of seismic-isolated bridges. *Earthq Eng Struct Dyn* 2006;35(2):233–50.
- [36] Hameed A, Koo MS, Dai Do T, Jeong JH. Effect of lead rubber bearing characteristics on the response of seismic-isolated bridges. *KSCE J Civil Eng* 2008;12(3):187–96.
- [37] Olmos BA, Jara JM, Roesset JM. Effects of isolation on the seismic response of bridges designed for two different soil types. *Bull EarthEng.* 2011;9(2):641–656.
- [38] Dehghanpoor A, Thambiratnam D, Taciroglu E, Chan T. Soil-pile-superstructure interaction effects in seismically isolated bridges under combined vertical and horizontal strong ground motions. *Soil Dyn Earthq Eng.* 2019;126:105753.
- [39] Dehghanpoor A, Thambiratnam D, Zhang W, Chan T, Taciroglu E. An extended probabilistic demand model with optimal intensity measures for seismic performance characterization of isolated bridges under coupled horizontal and vertical motions. *Bull Earthq Eng.* 2021;19(5):2291–2323.
- [40] Papadopoulos, S. P., and A. G. Sextos. 2018. Anti-symmetric mode excitation and seismic response of base-isolated bridges under asynchronous input motion. *Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering* 113: 148–61. doi: 10.1016/j. soildyn.2018.06.004.
- [41] Makris N, Black CJ. Dimensional analysis of inelastic structures subjected to near fault ground motions. Technical report: EERC 2003/05. Berkeley: Earthquake Engineering Research Center, University of California; 2003.
- [42] Makris N, Black CJ. Dimensional analysis of bilinear oscillators under pulse-type excitations. *J Eng Mech* 2004;130(9):1019–31.
- [43] Barenblatt, G. I. (1996). *Scaling, self-similarity, and intermediate asymptotics*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, U.K.
- [44] Langhaar, H. L. (1951). *Dimensional analysis and theory of models*, Wiley, New York.
- [45] H. Aslani, E. Miranda, Probability-based seismic response analysis. *Engineering Structures* 2005;27(8):1151–1163.
- [46] Porter KA. An overview of PEER’s performance-based earthquake engineering methodology. *Proceedings, Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Application of Statistics and Probability in Civil Engineering (ICASP9)*, San Francisco, California, 2003.
- [47] Shome, N., Cornell, C.A., Bazzurro, P., & Carballo, J.E. (1998). Earthquake, records, and nonlinear responses. *Earthquake Spectra*, 14(3), 469–500.
- [48] Pinto, P.E., Giannini, R., & Franchin, P. (2003). *Seismic Reliability Analysis of Structures*, IUSS Press, Pavia, Italy.
- [49] Luco, N., & Cornell, C.A. (2007). Structure-specific scalar intensity measures for near-source and ordinary earthquake ground motions. *Earthquake Spectra*, 23(2), 357–92.
- [50] Zhu, T.J., Tso, W.K., and Heidebrecht, A.C. (1988). “Effect of peak ground A/V ratio on structural damage.” *Journal of Structural Engineering*, Vol. 114, pp. 1019–1037.
- [51] Tso, W. K., Zhu, T. J., & Heidebrecht, A.C. (1992). Engineering implication of ground motion A/V ratio. *Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering*, 11(3), 133–144.
- [52] Palermo, M., Silvestri, S., Gasparini, G., Trombetti, T. “A Statistical Study on the Peak Ground Parameters and Amplification Factors for an Updated Design Displacement Spectrum and a Criterion for the Selection of Recorded Ground Motions.” *Engineering structures* 76 (2014): 163–176.
- [53] Sawada T, Hirao K, Yamamoto H, Tsujihara O. Relation between maximum amplitude ratio and spectral parameters of earthquake ground motion. In: *Proc. 10th world conf. on earthquake engineering*, vol. 2. 1992, p. 617–22.

- [54] F. Pavel & D. Lungu (2013) Correlations Between Frequency Content Indicators of Strong Ground Motions and PGV, *Journal of Earthquake Engineering*, 17:4, 543-559.
- [55] PEER Ground Motion Database Web Application Beta Version – October 1, 2010.
- [56] Chopra, A.K. and Chintanapakdee, C. (2001), Comparing response of SDF systems to near-fault and far-fault earthquake motions in the context of spectral regions. *Earthquake Engng. Struct. Dyn.*, 30: 1769-1789. <https://doi.org/10.1002/eqe.92>.
- [57] P., Palazzo, B., & Ferrentino, T. (2017b). Seismic reliability-based ductility demand evaluation for inelastic base-isolated structures with friction pendulum devices. *Earthquake Engineering and Structural Dynamics*, 46(8), 1245-1266. DOI: 10.1002/eqe.2854.
- [58] Ryan, K., Chopra, A. (2004). Estimation of Seismic Demands on Isolators Based on Nonlinear Analysis. *Journal of Structural Engineering*, 130(3), 392–402.
- [59] Math Works Inc. MATLAB-High Performance Numeric Computation and Visualization Software. User's Guide. Natick: MA, USA; 1997.
- [60] Ang AHS, Tang WH. *Probability Concepts in Engineering-Emphasis on Applications to Civil and Environmental Engineering*. John Wiley & Sons, New York, USA, 2007.
- [61] Cornell C, Jalayer F, Hamburger R, Foutch D. Probabilistic basis for 2000 SAC Federal Emergency Management Agency steel moment frame guidelines. *Journal of Structural Engineering* 2002; 128(4):526–533.
- [62] Jangid R. S., Kelly J. M. Base isolation for near-fault motions. *Earthquake Engineering and Structural Dynamics* 2001, 30:691-707.
- [63] Mazza F., Vulcano A. Nonlinear Response of RC Framed Buildings with Isolation and Supplemental Damping at the Base Subjected to Near-Fault Earthquakes. *Journal of Earthquake Engineering* 2009, 13(5):690-715.
- [64] Fragiaco, M., Rajgelj, S., & Cimadom, F. (2003). Design of bilinear hysteretic isolation systems. *Earthquake engineering & structural dynamics*, 32(9), 1333-1352.
- [65] Iemura H, Taghikhany T, Jain S. Optimum design of resilient sliding isolation system for seismic protection of equipments. *Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering* 2007; 5(1):85–103.
- [66] National Cooperative Highway Research. NCHR program report 276 Thermal effects in concrete bridge superstructures, 1985.
- [67] Warn Gordon P, Whittaker Andrew S. Property modification factors for seismically isolated bridges. *J Bridge Eng.* 2006;11(3):1084-0702.