Estimation of topographical effects at Narni ridge (Central Italy): comparisons between experimental results and numerical modelling
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Abstract
In the present work the seismic site response of Narni ridge (central Italy) is evaluated by comparing experimental results and numerical simulations. The inhabited village of Narni is located in the central Italian Apennines at the top of a steep massive limestone ridge. From March to September 2009 the site was instrumented with 10 weak-motion stations, 3 of which located at the base of the ridge and 7 at the top. The velocimetric network recorded 642 events of M_L up to 5.3 and hypocentral distance up to about 100 km. The great amount of data are related to the April 2009 L’Aquila sequence. The site response was analyzed using both reference (SSR, Standard Spectral Ratio) and non reference spectral techniques (HVSR, Horizontal to Vertical Spectral Ratio). Moreover directional analyses were performed in order to evaluate the influence of the ridge orientation with respect to the selected source-site paths. In general the experimental results show amplification factors for frequencies between 4 and 5 Hz for almost all stations installed along the crest. The SSR technique provides amplification factors up to 4.5 detected considering directions perpendicular to the main elongation of the ridge. The results obtained from the monitoring activity were used as a target for bidimensional and tridimensional numerical simulations, performed using a hybrid finite-boundary element method for 2D and a boundary element method for 3D analyses respectively. In general, the results obtained through numerical simulation fit well the experimental data in terms of range of amplified frequencies, but they underestimate by a factor of about 2 the related amplification factors with respect to the observations.
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Introduction
Macroseismic observations of damages after destructive earthquakes near topographic irregularities suggest that a morphological irregularity plays a significant role in the propagation of seismic waves. The focusing of seismic waves near the crest of a hill due to the reflection on free surface and the interaction between incident and diffraction waves (Bard, 1982) or the resonance of the whole relief with the incident seismic-field in the case where the wavelength is comparable with the horizontal width of the mountain (Faccioli et al., 2002) are examples of physical
phenomena that cause the spatial variability of seismic waves when they encounter an isolated relief. In the last years, amplifications at the top of mountains were discussed and well documented both through experimental studies (i.e. Spudich et al., 1996; Le Brun et al.,1999; Massa et al., 2004 and 2010; Buech et al., 2010; Marzorati et al., 2010; Pischiutta et al., 2010) and 2D and/or 3D numerical modeling (i.e. Boore, 1972; Geli et al., 1988; Bard and Tucker, 1985; Sanchez-Sesma, 1990; Sanchez-Sesma and Campillo, 1991; Chavez-Garcia et al., 1996; Komatitsch and Vilotte, 1998; Paolucci, 1999; Paolucci, 2002, Kamalian at al., 2006 and 2007).

In this case, different approaches used to investigate the same issue allow to evaluate possible discrepancies between the results obtained by numerical simulations with respect to those obtained by experimental methods. Concerning the latter ones, the main causes of uncertainties concerning the interpretation of the results are represented by the difficulty both to select a relief characterized by a massive geological formation without relevant anisotropy (able to modify the wavefield during its propagation path) and by the possibility to install at the base a reference station located on the same geological formation that characterizes the whole morphological body. Only in this way it is possible to evaluate the actual effect due to the topography and isolate it from other causes of amplification such as stratigraphic or near fault effects (Le Brun et al., 1999; Paolucci et al., 1999; Rovelli et al., 2002).

Concerning the numerical modelling, besides the difficult to solve in many cases complex geometric configurations, the main problem is often represented by the lack of geological and geotechnical information related to the investigated site. The methods more widely used are the finite difference method (Boore, 1972; Zahradnik and Urban, 1984), the finite element method (Smith, 1975), the integral equation method (Sills, 1978), the boundary element methods (Sanchez-Sesma et al., 1982), the discrete wave-number methods (Bouchon, 1973; Bard, 1982) and the spectral element methods (Faccioli et al., 1997; Komatitsch D. and Vilotte J.P.,1998). In general the common result of modelling, if compared with experimental one, is the underestimation of the amplification factors if compared to those obtained by experimental data. The main cause is generally attributed to simplified 2D or 3D geometries of topographic reliefs (coupled to non homogeneous soil conditions and simplified plane wave input assumptions) that are not able to well reproduce the complexity of real cases.

In the framework of the 2007-2009 agreement between INGV (Italian National Institute for Geophysics and Volcanology) and DPC (Italian Civil Protection), the S4-Project founded the installation of 7 velocimetric station from March to September 2009 in correspondence of Narni ridge (Central Italy) with the aim to detect possible seismic amplifications due to the topography. Since 1974, in correspondence of this site, a strong-motion station (named NRN, see http://itaca.mi.ingv.it) belonging to the Italian Accelerometric Network (RAN) is installed. As a matter of fact, topographic irregularities are a common feature of many sites of installation of strong motion stations included in the ITACA database (Pacor et al., 2010, this issue), thus
deserving a specific care for their seismic characterization. Preliminary analyses on the experimental data are described in Massa et al. (2010). This paper is especially focused on the comparison between the experimental results, obtained applying both the single station technique (Horizontal to Vertical Spectral Ratio, HVSR, Lermo and Chavez-Garcia, 1993) and the reference station technique (Standard Spectral Ratio, SSR, Borcherdt, 1970) and those coming from numerical modelling. The simulations were performed both in 2D configurations, using the code based on hybrid finite-boundary element method (Kamalian et al., 2003) and in 3D configurations, using the BEMSA code (Sohrabi et al., 2009) based on the boundary element method.

The Narni field experiment

Narni is a little village built at the top of a morphological ridge located in the central Italian Apennines (inset in the bottom panel of figure 1). The studied ridge, oriented N31°W and approximately 1.3 km long, is characterized by a difference of quota between the top and the base ranging from 100 in correspondence of the NW edge (close to NRN9 station) to 220 m in correspondence of the NRN4 station (Figure 1, bottom panel). The width of the ridge ranges from about 450 m, in the Northwestern part, to about 850 m in the Southeastern one (Figure 1, bottom panel). The transverse section of the hill is characterized by an evident asymmetry, being the West slope 35° steep and East slope 22° steep. From a geological point of view, the site is characterized by a massive limestone formation (Figure 1, bottom panel), with a negligible level of fracturation (Geological Map of Italy, 1:100.000, sheet 138; Amanti et al., 2002).

According to the new Italian technical rules for building (NTC, 2008) Narni might be included in a topographic category that falls between T3 (the Eastern slope has the width at the top smaller than the width at the base and the slope is between 15° and 30°) and in T4 (the Western side has the width at the top smaller than the width at the base and the slope is greater than 30°).

With the aim to evaluate possible seismic ground motion amplification due to the morphological setting of the investigated site, from March 2009 to September 2009 a temporary velocimetric network (Table 1) was installed in Narni and surroundings. During this period 7 seismic stations were employed in order to monitor a total of 10 different sites. The stations NRN2, NRN3 and NRN5 were installed at the base of the ridge, the stations NRN9, NR10, NRN6, NRN7, NRN8 and NRN4 (from Northwest to Southeast) were installed along the top of the ridge and the NRN1 station were installed along the flank of East slope (Figure 1, bottom panel). All stations were equipped with Lennartz LE3D-5s sensors coupled with 24 bits data loggers (Reftek 130/01 and Lennartz MarsLite). During the period of installation a dataset of 642 earthquakes, characterized by local magnitude (M_L) between 1.5 and 5.8 and maximum epicentral distance from Narni of about 100 Km, was collected. It is worth noting that the great amount of data (about 90%) are related to the April 2009 L’Aquila sequence (Ameri et al., 2009). The left panel of Figure 2 shows the location of all recorded events while in the right panel the distribution of magnitude versus hypocentral
distance, divided according to the azimuth direction, is reported. In both panels of Figure 2, the dashed inset indicates the earthquakes with $M_L$ from 1.5 to 3.6 occurred at an epicentral distance from Narni lower than 50 km.

**Experimental results**

The data collected during the field experiment were analyzed by single station analysis (HVSR) and reference site approach (SSR). In the last case NRN2 station (Figure 1, bottom panel), installed on limestone outcropping at the base of the ridge, was selected as a reference. During the analyses different sub sets of events were selected in order to consider different portion of signal (S-phase and coda) and different ranges of epicentral distance and source to site azimuths. In all cases, directional analyses (rotation of north-south component clockwise from 0° to 175°, with angular step of 5°) were computed in order to investigate if the ground motion recorded at relevant stations installed along the crest undergone polarization effects. The signals were processed by removing the mean and the linear trend and by applying an acausal 4-pole Butterworth band-pass filter in the range 0.2 - 25 Hz. Before calculating the spectral ratios, all Fourier spectra were smoothed by applying a Konno-Omachi window ($b=20$). It is worth noting that in this paper only the meaningful experimental results, in particular those concerning NRN7 and NRN4 (the two stations located in correspondence of the two modelled profiles P1 and P2, see bottom panel of figure 1) are presented. A more comprehensive description of experimental analyses, concerning all stations, is available in Massa et al. (2010).

In figure 3 the directional HVSRs obtained considering 27 events ($M_L$ from 1.5 and 3.6) with epicentral distance from Narni up to 30 Km (Figure 2) are shown. In the top panels of figure 3 the results for the reference station (NRN2), located at the base of the ridge, and for NRN1, installed at the middle of East slope (average slope of about 22°), are presented: for both stations no clear amplification peaks were detected. In the bottom panels of the same figure the results for two stations installed at the top of the ridge are shown: NRN7, located at the break of the west-side slope (average slope of about 35°) and NRN4, located at the highest point of Narni ridge. In this case the directional HVSRs show amplification around 4 Hz for NRN7 and between 4 and 6 Hz for NRN4. For both stations, clear polarization effects are present for directions between 60° and 100° (see legend in the figure). Considering that the ridge is oriented N-30°W this means that the highest amplifications were detected for directions perpendicular to the main elongation of the hill.

Concerning the directional SSRs, the results are presented for NRN7 (left panels) and for NRN4 (right panels) stations in figure 4. In the left panels the influence of the analysed portion of signal is highlighted. For NRN7 the same events selected for HVSRs ($M_L$ from 1.5 and 3.6 and epicentral distance up to 30 Km) were considered. In the top-left the results obtained by analysing 10 s of S-phase are shown: in this case two amplification peak are evident, the first around 2 Hz and the second in the range 4-5 Hz, both clearly polarized in the direction 60°-100°. The SSRs presented...
in the bottom-left, obtained considering 10 s of coda, show again the amplification peak around 4.5 Hz due to the topography. On the contrary the amplification peak at 2 Hz disappears, pointing out a different origin of this peak, probably due to source effects of small events occurred very close to the ridge (the great amount of selected events have distances lower than 15 km).

Right panels of figure 4 show comparisons between SSRs calculated for NRN4 station, considering at first all 27 events (top-right panel) and then a sub set of 14 events with source to site azimuths with directions perpendicular to the main elongation of the ridge (bottom-right panel). Even if in both cases the results show amplification peaks between 3.5 and 5.5 Hz (polarized in the direction 60°-100°), in the bottom panel higher amplifications are detected.

In figure 5 some results of vertical SSRs computed considering both weak motion (black lines), recorded in near field and strong motion (April 2009 L’Aquila sequence) recorded in far field (red lines) are presented. Even for vertical component non negligible amplification are present for the stations installed at the top of the hill: with the exception of NRN1, where no amplification peak are detected, the other analysed stations (NRN7 in the left top panel, NRN4 in the right top panel and NR10 in the left bottom panel) show amplification factors between 3 and 4 involving frequencies between 3 and 6 Hz. Only for NRN4 amplifications also at higher frequencies (up to 10 Hz) are present.

**Numerical modelling: theoretical background**

The numerical simulations were executed using the well known time domain Boundary Element Method (BEM), based on 2D and 3D elastodynamic equations. The governing relation for an elastic, isotropic and homogeneous body, with a small amplitude displacement field, is

\[
(c_1^2 - c_2^2) \cdot u_{j,j} (x,t) + c_2^2 \cdot u_{ii,j} (x,t) + b_j (x,t) - \ddot{u}(x,t) = 0
\]

(1)

where \(c_1\) and \(c_2\) are the propagation velocities for the longitudinal and transverse waves respectively, \(u\) denote the displacement vector and \(b_i\) denotes the body force vector. The term \(c_1\) is given by

\[
c_1^2 = (\lambda + 2\mu) / \rho
\]

(2)

while the term \(c_2\) is given by

\[
c_2^2 = \mu / \rho
\]

(3)
In equations (2) and (3) $\lambda$ and $\mu$ are the Lamé constants and $\rho$ is the density. The corresponding governing boundary integral equation for an elastic, isotropic and homogeneous body can be obtained using the well known weighted residual method (Brebbia and Dominguez, 1989), written in the form

\[
c_y(\xi) \cdot u_i(\xi,t) = \int_{\Gamma} \left((G_y * t_i(x,t)) - (F_y * u_i(x,t))\right) d\Gamma
\]

(4)

where $c_y$ denotes the discontinuity term resulting from the singularity of the $F_y$ fundamental solutions, $u_i$ is the displacement vector, $G_y$ and $F_y$ are the transient displacement and traction fundamental solutions respectively. They represent displacements and tractions at a point $x$ and at time $t$ due to a unit point force applied at point $\xi$ at previous time $t = \tau$. The terms $G_y * t_i$ and $F_y * u_i$ are the Riemann convolution integrals and $t_i$ represents the traction at the boundary. In the equation 4, the contributions due to the initial conditions and to the body forces are neglected. The implementation of the boundary integral equation needs approximation in both temporal and spatial variations of field variables. A detailed introduction of BEM, implemented in the numerical codes used in this study, can be found in Kamalian et al. (2003).

In the case of a topographic irregularity, the frequency response at the surface of a 3D body can be expressed in the form

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
O_1^k(f) \\
O_2^k(f) \\
O_3^k(f)
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
H_{11}^k(f) & H_{12}^k(f) & H_{13}^k(f) \\
H_{21}^k(f) & H_{22}^k(f) & H_{23}^k(f) \\
H_{31}^k(f) & H_{32}^k(f) & H_{33}^k(f)
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
I_1(f) \\
I_2(f) \\
I_3(f)
\end{bmatrix}
\]

(5)

In equation (5), the term $O_i^k$ denotes the $i_{th}$ component of ground motion at a generic point $k$ located on the free surface of the topography, $I_i$ is the corresponding ground motion at the base of the topography (reference site) and $H_{ij}^k$ is the transfer function for a point $k$ in the $i_{th}$ direction due to an incident harmonic motion, with unit amplitude, oriented along $j_{th}$ direction (Paolucci, 1999). The non diagonal elements in the $H$ matrix of equation 5 represent the cross-coupling term (Paolucci 1999). For 2D simulations the equation is simplified, because it does not consider the terms referring to the third direction (e.g. $O_3^k(f)$ etc.).

In order to calculate the transfer functions, three independent 3D numerical simulations were performed in time domain. For each analysis, the input consisted of a vertically incident plane wave of the Ricker type directed along one of the three spatial directions. For instance, once the model is excited by vertically propagating S-waves (X-polarization and Y-polarization) independently, the
$H_{11}$, $H_{21}$, $H_{31}$, and $H_{12}$, $H_{22}$, $H_{32}$ can be evaluated, respectively. Then the model will be impinged by vertically incidence of P-waves in order to extract $H_{13}$, $H_{23}$ and $H_{33}$.

For deriving 2D transfer function components, the aforementioned time domain analysis will be limited to simply two independent P-SV analyses. For example, in order to determine $H_{21}^K(f)$, a time domain analysis was performed using the input motion oriented along x-axis, e.g. SV wave, then the Fourier transform of the response at $k^{th}$ receiver point along y-axis ($O_2^k(f)$) would be determined, and the spectral ratio $H_{21}^K(f)=O_2^k(f)/I_1(f)$ would be easily calculated.

Once the $H_y^k$ functions for each receiver point are available, it is possible to obtain the site response for the receiver points in the linear range for some real seismograms as input motion.

In this way, the SSR and the HVSR, for 3D simulation, can be easily derived using the following equations

$$SSR_y^k (f) = \left| \frac{O_y^k (f)}{I_y^k (f)} \right| = \left| \frac{H_{11}^k (f) \cdot I_1 (f) + H_{12}^k (f) \cdot I_2 (f) + H_{13}^k (f) \cdot I_3 (f)}{I_y^k (f)} \right|$$  \hspace{1cm} (6)

$$HV_y^k (f) = \left| \frac{O_y^k (f)}{O_y^k (f)} \right| = \left| \frac{H_{11}^k (f) \cdot I_1 (f) + H_{12}^k (f) \cdot I_2 (f) + H_{13}^k (f) \cdot I_3 (f)}{[H_{53}^k (f) \cdot I_1 (f) + H_{52}^k (f) \cdot I_2 (f) + H_{53}^k (f) \cdot I_3 (f)]} \right|$$  \hspace{1cm} (7)

As noted before, for 2D simulations equations 6 and 7 can be rewritten by ignoring the terms related to the third direction (e.g. $H_{13}$, $H_{31}$ etc).

**2D site response : results**

In this work the 2D simulations were performed by using the HYBRID code, developed by Kamalian et al. (2003) and already tested for several examples of site response concerning canyons and hills (Kamalian et al. 2006; 2007). To further verify the capability of HYBRID, we investigated the response of Narni ridge in correspondence of two transversal profiles (P1 and P2, see figure 1) that crossed the two stations (NRN7 and NRN4 respectively), showing the highest experimental amplification values.

The models of the two transverse profile, 1050 m long for P1 and 1670 m long for P2, were discretized using 499 nodes spaced in average 14 m (in the neighbourhood of the topography) for P1 and 20 m for P2. In both cases the models were characterized by 249 quadratic boundary elements. The half space, around the profiles, crossing Narni ridge, was discretized up to eight times the profiles length with a gradual increase in element dimensions. The profiles were modelled considering a shear wave velocity of 1000 m/s, a Poisson’s ratio of 0.37 and a density of 2.3 t/m$^3$. The information about the material properties comes from a down-hole test (Regione
Umbria, 2000) performed in correspondence of a massive limestone formation outcropping about 5 km South-West of Narni.

The simulations were performed by exciting the profiles by vertically incident in-plane P-SV Ricker wavelets (according to z and x-directions respectively) defined by equation 8:

\[
f(t) = A_{\text{max}} \cdot \left[1 - 2 \cdot (\pi \cdot f_p (t-t_0))^2 \right] \exp \left(-\pi^2 f_p (t-t_0)^2\right)
\]  

(8)

The terms \( A_{\text{max}} \), \( f_p \) and \( t_0 \) denote the maximum amplitude of the time history, the predominant frequency and the time shift. In the current work, \( A_{\text{max}} \), \( f_p \) and \( t_0 \) were set to 0.001 m, 3 Hz, and 0.7 s, respectively. In this way it is possible to investigate the frequency range 1-8 Hz.

**Seismic response of profile 1**

Figure 6 (top panel) shows the general pattern of amplification ratio (in term of transfer functions \( H_{11} \)) detected for all receivers located along P1 (crossing the NRN7 station, middle panel of figure 6) subjected to vertically propagating SV-Ricker wavelets. From the top panel of figure 6 it can be deduced that the fundamental vibration mode of the hill, involving in-phase motion of the whole topography is around 1 Hz, in agreement with the observation that the crest/base spectral ratios exhibit a first maximum for wavelengths close to the mountain width (Geli and Bard, 1988; Paolucci, 2002). The only experimental evidence of amplification peak around 1 Hz was found analyzing the 16th December 2000, \( M_L \) 4.1, earthquake, occurred at a epicentral distance of 5 km East of Narni ridge (Massa et al. 2010).

However, as shown in the same figure, the peak of the amplification function is for a higher mode, around 4-5 Hz. The maximum amplification at such frequency is at the crest and rapidly decays towards the bases, involving deamplification effects at mid-height of the hill. Figure 6 (bottom panel) depicts the time domain response for horizontal component for the profile P1 subjected to a vertically propagating incident SV wave. The pattern of diffraction and refraction can be clearly seen. The maximum amplitude occurred at the top of the hill due to focusing of energy and interference between the incident and diffracted waves.

As explained before, P-SV analyses were carried out for deriving transfer functions useful to study the hill response under multi-component excitation By calculating different components of transfer function matrix for the receiver points and carrying out convolution analysis, different spectral ratios were extracted using equations 6 and 7. In these equations \( I_1 \), \( I_2 \) and \( I_3 \) (i.e. \( I_1 \) and \( I_2 \) for 2D simulation) represent the seismograms recorded by the station used as a reference in the experimental analyses (NRN2). Both SSR and HVSR were calculated considering two sub sets of events: the first data set is composed by 27 weak motions with 1.5 \( \leq M_L \leq 3.6 \) and epicentral distance lower than 50 km, while the second data set includes the strong motion recordings.
collected during the 2009 L’Aquila sequence (7 earthquakes with $M_L \geq 4.5$ and epicentral distance around 70 km).

Considering both sub sets of events, the average SSR and HVSR curves, related to the receiver point that represents NRN7 in the model, were shown in figure 7. In all panels of figure 7 the red dotted lines represent the experimental results (the highest amplification function, among all rotations, is indicated) obtained considering the same data sets. As shown in the left panels of figure 7, the SSRs numerically calculated for both data-sets are similar, showing a very negligible scattering in the results. In this case the simulations point out amplifications for frequencies around 4-5 Hz, in agreement to the experimental results, but with amplitudes that are underestimated by numerical simulations. The HVSR curves, shown in the right panels of figure 7, presents similar discrepancies. The HVSR curves calculated for near field data-set (top right panel) show a peak around 4 Hz, in agreement with the experimental results, while the HVSRs obtained from strong motion (bottom right panel) show more scattered results (slight amplification in the frequency ranges 1-2 Hz and 5-6 Hz. In all cases the amplification factors obtained from the simulation underestimate those obtained from the experimental analyses.

Seismic response of profile 2

Figure 8 (top panel) shows the general pattern of amplification and deamplification (in terms of transfer functions $H_{11}$) detected for all receivers located along P2 (NRN4 station, middle panel of figure 8) subjected to vertically propagating SV-Ricker wavelets. The highest amplification occurs around the crest for frequencies in the range 3-6 Hz. As for P1, the bottom panel of figure 8 depicts the time domain response for horizontal component for the profile P2 subjected to a vertically propagating incident SV wave. As expected, the maximum amplitude occurred at the top of the hill. As explained before, even for P2, SSR and HVSR curves (considering the same data used for P1) were calculated by equations 6 and 7 and presented in figure 9. In all panels of figure 9 the red dotted lines represent the experimental results obtained considering the same data sets.

In the left panels of figures 9 the average SSR curves are shown. In the top panel they refer to the weak motion data set (27 events with $1.5 \leq M_L \leq 3.6$ and epicentral distance lower than 50 km), while in the bottom panel the results for strong motion data are reported. In both cases the results are very similar: they show amplification for frequencies in the range 3-5 Hz, in agreement with the experimental results. However, as for P1 the amplification factors obtained from the simulation underestimate those obtained from the experimental analyses.

3D site response: results

To evaluate whether the previously illustrated lower amplification (with respect to the experimental results) from numerical simulations could be explained by the limits of the 2D modelling, we also explored the performance of 3D simulations. For this purpose the BEMSA code (Sohrabi et al.,
based on boundary element method (BEM), was used. The geometry of the hill and surroundings was modelled using 1224 eight-nodes quadrilateral boundary elements (3729 nodes) and 448 eight-nodes quadrilateral enclosing elements (1289 nodes). The average element size is about 150 m in the neighbourhood of the ridge. The material properties of the model are the same in the 2D model. The layout of the model is shown in figure 10. The accuracy and stability of the results obtained in the time-domain by BEM depend on the combination of space and time discretizations, which is characterized by the dimensionless parameter $\beta$ (Frangi, 1999), expressed as

$$\beta = \frac{C \cdot \Delta t}{\Delta l}$$ (9)

where $C$, $\Delta t$ and $\Delta l$ denote the shear wave velocity, the time step and the effective size of the elements respectively. For dynamic analyses of elastic media, accurate and stable results are obtained in the range of $0.2 < \beta < 0.6$ (Von Estorff et al., 2006; Frangi, 1999). In order to satisfy the above criteria, the effective size of the element ($\Delta l$) was assumed to be 75 m on average in the neighbourhood of the topographic irregularity. The value of $C$ was set like 2D modelling (i.e. 1000 m/s) and $\Delta T$ was considered as 0.025 s. The half space around the topography was discretized up to eight time of the feature dimension, with a gradual increase of spacing between elements. Three independent numerical analyses were performed using incident Ricker wavelets ($A_{\text{max}} f_0$ and $t_0$ set to 0.001 m, 3 Hz, and 0.7 s) polarized in X, Y and Z direction. In this way it was possible to derive different components of transfer functions performing a simple convolution analysis as indicated in equation 5. Once the transfer functions were derived, both HVSR and SSR analyses were performed by using equations 6 and 7. Also in this case the obtained transfer functions were convolved by the real seismograms recorded at the reference station NRN2. As for 2D site response, the computations were performed considering both a near field dataset ($M_L \leq 3.6$ and epicentral distance lower than 30 km) and a far field dataset (L’Aquila strong-motion data set, see red circles in the left panel of figure 2). The results are presented in figure 11 and 12 for the stations NRN7 and NRN4 respectively, that have a similar format as figures 7 and 9. As in the 2D case, the range of frequencies where amplification occurs is rather well captured, but the 3D model turns out not to be sufficient to explain the large observed amplification values. Significant features of the seismic response of the hill can be captured from figure 13, where the simulated amplification values with respect to an ideal outcropping bedrock are shown. Two frequencies are considered, namely 1 Hz and 4 Hz, close to the fundamental frequency of the hill and to the frequency where experimental amplification factors are larger, respectively. The in-phase response of the hill at 1 Hz is quite evident, while at a larger frequency such as 4 Hz the peak amplification tends to be clearly delimited along the ridge of the topographic irregularity.
Conclusions
In this paper the results obtained from SSRs and HVSRs computed on experimental data recorded at Narni ridge (central Italy) were compared to those provided by 2D and 3D numerical simulations. The experimental data were recorded in the period March - September 2009 and allowed us to collect a data set including about 700 events with $1.5 \leq M_L \leq 5.3$ and epicentral distance up to 100 km. The analyses computed both using the single station technique (HVSR) and the reference station technique (SSR) highlighted, for the stations installed along the crest (figure 1), the presence of topographic site effects mainly in the frequencies between 3 and 5 Hz. The amplification peaks, clearly polarized in the directions perpendicular to the main elongation of the ridge (figure 3 and 4), were detected both considering weak motions data ($M_L$ up to 3.6) recorded in near field (up to 30 km) and strong motions data ($4.5 \leq M_L \leq 5.3$) recorded in far field. The amplification functions obtained by SSRs calculated for the stations located at the top of the hill reach, in average, values between 4 and 5, with the exception of considering a subset of events characterized by source to site azimuth perpendicular to the main elongation of the ridge: in this case the amplification functions reach values up to 8 (bottom right panel of figure 4). Finally, as shown in figure 5, also vertical amplifications (up to 3.5) were detected close to the crest (see top panels of figure 5). More details about the experimental results are available in Massa et al. (2010).
Considering as a target the experimental results, the performance of 2D (profile P1 and P2, bottom panel of figure 1) and 3D (figure 10) numerical modelling was verified. In this case the ridge was considered as an homogeneous and isotropic body and was modelled by using the boundary element method, implemented for 2D and 3D simulations in the codes HYBRID (Kamalian et al., 2003) and BEMSA (Sohrabi et al., 2009) respectively. As highlighted in figures 7 and 9, for 2D analyses, and 11 and 12, for 3D analyses, the results of numerical modelling well agree with those obtained from the experimental data in terms of frequency range where peak amplification occurs, but in general the amplifications are underestimated by a factor up to about 2. For the case of Narni, having the ridge a clear bidimensional behaviour, the 3D approach, very expensive in terms of time of calculations, does not show particular improvement if compared to 2D results.
The missing improvement of numerical results from 2D to 3D homogeneous models of the Narni hill, suggests that the observed amplification in the 3-5 Hz frequency range may not be due to topography effects alone, but more likely to coupling of topography and stratigraphy effects. This confirms the quantitative disagreement between theoretical and observed amplification at topographic features, first noted by Géli et al. (1988) but confirmed by subsequent observations (Spudich et al., 1996; Bouchon and Barker, 1996; Le Brun et al., 1998). Bouchon and Barker (1996) estimated that a 3D homogeneous numerical model of the well-known Tarzana hill site could explain only 30-40% of the observed amplification, while Paolucci et al. (1999) reached a similar conclusion for the Matsuzaki hill site. In the latter case, in-situ investigations revealed that
the site with maximum amplification was characterized by a 15-20 m thick surface layer of strongly weathered rocks. The introduction of such layer in the numerical calculations was sufficient to explain the observed amplifications.

In the case of Narni hill, consisting of massive limestone with a limited degree of fracturation, the importance of such rock weathering modifying the local seismic wave velocities, should be further investigated.

Moreover, as pointed out by the afore-mentioned figures, no particular differences, both in terms of SSRs and HVSRs, were detected considering separately weak and strong motion data sets, since the observed levels of ground motion are not expected to produce any non-linear behaviour in rock materials. At the same time, since both path and source effects were not considered in the model, no distinctions between far-field and near-field data set are expected in terms of results. Moreover, the use of a simple model leads to a very negligible scatter in SSRs, as shown in the left panels of figures 7, 9, 11 and 12. In all cases a little contribution of the cross-coupling terms (the non diagonal elements in the matrix of transfer functions, see equation 5) is found also in reason of the vertical incidence assumption, and so the results are practically insensitive to different input motions. On the contrary, HVSRs (right panels of figures 7, 9, 11 and 12), involving two different components (vertical and horizontal) of motion for a single receiver, show higher scatter in final solutions.
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Captions

Figure 1 - top panel: wide shot of the Western slope of Narni ridge. Bottom panel: Geological map of the investigated site (Geological Map of Italy, sheet 138, Amanti et al., 2002). Circles indicate the temporary network (in red the stations installed at the base, in blue those installed at the top and in green the just one installed at the middle of the Easter slope). P1 and P2 represent the two transversal profiles (see also the bottom-right inset) considered for 2D modelling.

Figure 2 - Left panel: epicentral location of the earthquakes recorded from 25th March to 7th September 2009. The dimension of circles are related to different $M_L$. The dotted inset indicates the events with epicentral distance lower than 30 km. Right panel: collected dataset in terms of hypocentral distance versus $M_L$. Different colours indicate different source to site azimuths.

Figure 3 - Directional HVSRs for stations NRN1 (middle of the slope), NRN2 (base), NRN7 (top) and NRN8 (top) computed considering 10s of S-phase related to 27 earthquakes ($1.5 \leq M_L \leq 3.6$)
with epicentral distance lower than 30 km. Different colours indicate averaged amplification functions obtained by the ratio between the Fourier spectrum of each single NS rotated component (36 rotations with step of 5° between 0° and 175°) and the Fourier spectrum of the vertical one.

**Figure 4** - Left panels: directional SSRs for stations NRN7. In the top panel the results obtained considering portions of S-phase windows for 27 earthquakes with epicentral distance up to 30 km and $M_L$ up to 3.6 are presented. In the bottom panel the analysis performed on the same data set, but considering 10 s of coda are presented. Right: directional SSRs for stations NRN4. In the top panel the directional SSRs (calculated on S-phase) considering the same 27 events, as selected for NRN7, are shown, while in the bottom panel the results obtained considering a sub-set of 14 events with source to site azimuths perpendicular to the main elongation of the ridge are reported.

**Figure 5** - Vertical standard spectral ratio performed considering events with epicentral distance lower than 15 km. For stations 10 and 4 records coming from the L'Aquila sequence ($M_L > 4.5$) are not available. NRN2 represents the reference site.

**Figure 6** - Top panel: Amplification and deamplification pattern of horizontal component for frequencies ranging from 0.5 to 8 Hz for vertically SV Ricker wavelet. Middle panel: location of the receivers along the profile P1; the black triangle indicates the location of NRN7 station. Bottom panel: synthetic seismograms for horizontal component of motion, obtained for the receivers shown in the middle panel.

**Figure 7** - Left: mean SSRs (thick black lines) and the associated standard deviation (thin lines) calculated by the 2D numerical modelling for the receiver corresponding to NRN7 station (profile 1). In the top panel the results obtained applying the synthetic transfer functions (see eq. 5) to 27 near field earthquake (epicentral distance up to 30 km and $M_L$ up to 3.6) are presented. In the bottom the results obtained considering a sub set of strong motion events ($M_L > 4.5$) recorded during the April 2009 L'Aquila sequence (epicentral distance around 70 km) are shown. Right: mean HVSRs (thick black lines) and associated standard deviation (thin line) calculated by the numerical modelling for the receiver corresponding to NRN7 station (profile 1). The results are presented for the same data sets as explained for SSRs. In all panel the dotted red lines indicate the maxima amplification functions obtained from the experimental analyses.

**Figure 8** - The same as in figure 6, but for profile 2. The black triangle in the middle panel indicate NRN4 station.
**Figure 9** - The same as in figure 7, but considering the receiver that corresponds to NRN4 station (profile 2).

**Figure 10** - 3D-model configuration. The triangles indicate the stations installed on the ridge during the field experiment: in red the stations at the base, in black those on the crest and in blue the station installed in the middle of the East slope.

**Figure 11** - The same as in figure 7, but obtained by 3D numerical modelling: the results are presented for the receiver that corresponds to NRN7 station.

**Figure 12** - The same as in figure 7, but obtained by 3D numerical modelling: the results are presented for the receiver that corresponds to NRN4 station.

**Figure 13** – Amplification values of Narni hill-top at 1 Hz and 4 Hz obtained by 3D numerical modelling.

**Table 1** - Characteristic of the seismic stations employed during the field experiment.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Quota (m a.s.l.)</th>
<th>Sensor</th>
<th>Data logger</th>
<th>Working period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NRN1</td>
<td>middle</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>Lennartz 5s</td>
<td>Reftek-130</td>
<td>25/03/2009-08/06/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRN2</td>
<td>base</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Lennartz 5s</td>
<td>MarsLite</td>
<td>25/03/2009 - 07/09/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRN3</td>
<td>base</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Lennartz 5s</td>
<td>Reftek-130</td>
<td>25/03/2009 - 07/09/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRN4</td>
<td>top</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>Lennartz 5s</td>
<td>MarsLite</td>
<td>25/03/2009 - 07/09/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRN5</td>
<td>base</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Lennartz 5s</td>
<td>Reftek-130</td>
<td>25/03/2009-08/06/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRN6</td>
<td>top</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>Lennartz 5s</td>
<td>Reftek-130</td>
<td>25/03/2009-08/06/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRN7</td>
<td>top</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>Lennartz 5s</td>
<td>Reftek-130</td>
<td>25/03/2009-07/09/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRN8</td>
<td>top</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>Lennartz 5s</td>
<td>Reftek-130</td>
<td>15/07/2009 - 07/09/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRN9</td>
<td>top</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>Lennartz 5s</td>
<td>Reftek-130</td>
<td>15/07/2009 - 07/09/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR10</td>
<td>top</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>Lennartz 5s</td>
<td>Reftek-130</td>
<td>15/07/2009 - 07/09/2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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