

# PACIFIC EARTHQUAKE ENGINEERING RESEARCH CENTER

## Probabilistic Tsunami Hazard in California

**Hong Kie Thio**  
**Paul Somerville**

URS Corporation  
Pasadena, California

**Jascha Polet**  
California State Polytechnic University  
Pomona

# **Probabilistic Tsunami Hazard in California**

**Hong Kie Thio**

**Paul Somerville**

URS Corporation  
Pasadena, California

**Jascha Polet**

Department of Geology  
California State Polytechnic University  
Pomona, California

PEER Report 2010/108  
Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center  
College of Engineering  
University of California, Berkeley

October 2010



## **ABSTRACT**

Tsunami hazard maps are used to compute the tsunami inundation hazard for California using a hybrid approach of numerical tsunami simulations and probabilistic integration of the hazard. The earthquake sources include large subduction zone sources around the Pacific Rim. Our method uses a two-step process: the first consists of the computation of probabilistic offshore waveheights based on several thousands of scenario calculations that include both epistemic uncertainty through the use of logic trees as well as aleatory variability, by applying a standard deviation ( $\sigma$ ) to the probabilistic waveheights and tidal fluctuations by convolving the tsunami time series with tidal records. We used these offshore waveheights, and the source disaggregation, to develop sets of fully nonlinear tsunami simulations, including inundation, that span the range of probabilistic offshore waveheights.

The current resolution of the inundation maps amounts to 150 m. In the next phase of this study, where we will include local sources and tidal fluctuations, we will extend the grid resolution down to 10 m.

## **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

This study was sponsored by the Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center's Program of Applied Earthquake Engineering Research of Lifelines supported by the California Department of Transportation and the Pacific Gas and Electric Company. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the sponsoring agencies.

We would like to thank Norm Abrahamson and Stu Nishenko, of Pacific Gas and Electric Company, for their advice and comments.

# CONTENTS

<b>ABSTRACT .....</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .....</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS .....</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>LIST OF FIGURES .....</b>	<b>ix</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLES .....</b>	<b>xi</b>
<b>1 INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2 TSUNAMI MODELING.....</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1 Tsunami Sources .....	3
2.2 Tsunami Propagation Model .....	3
2.2.1 General Linear Gravity Wave .....	4
2.2.2 Nonlinear Gravity Waves and Shallow Water Waves .....	6
2.2.3 Numerical Computation .....	8
2.2.4 Variable Grid Finite Difference .....	9
<b>3 PROBABILISTIC TSUNAMI HAZARD .....</b>	<b>11</b>
3.1 Overview .....	11
3.2 Probabilistic Offshore Waveheight Hazard .....	12
3.2.1 Overview .....	12
3.2.2 Green's Function Summation .....	13
<b>4 UNCERTAINTIES.....</b>	<b>17</b>
4.1 Aleatory Uncertainties .....	17
4.1.1 Modeling Uncertainty .....	17
4.1.2 Dip Uncertainty .....	20
4.1.3 Slip Variability .....	20
4.1.4 Total Sigma and Epsilon Truncation.....	21
4.2 Epistemic Uncertainties .....	22
4.2.1 Sources .....	23
4.2.2 Logic Trees .....	24
<b>5 INUNDATION HAZARD.....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>6 BATHYMETRY .....</b>	<b>27</b>

6.1	Bathymetry Sources .....	27
6.2	Global and Regional Models.....	27
6.2.1	ETOPO2v2.....	27
6.2.2	NOAA/NGDC.....	28
6.3	High-Resolution Local Models.....	28
6.3.1	Crescent City.....	28
6.3.2	Humboldt Bay .....	28
6.3.3	San Francisco Bay.....	28
6.3.4	Monterey Bay.....	29
6.3.5	Central Coast.....	29
6.3.6	Santa Barbara Channel, Los Angeles, and San Diego .....	29
<b>7</b>	<b>SOURCE MODELS .....</b>	<b>31</b>
7.1	Overview .....	31
7.2	Earthquake Recurrence Rates .....	32
7.3	Geologic Evidence for Multi-Branch Magnitude Recurrence .....	34
7.4	Distant Sources .....	35
7.4.1	Alaska-Aleutian .....	35
7.4.2	Kamchatka-Kuriles .....	36
7.4.3	Izu-Bonin-Marianas .....	38
7.4.4	Ryukyu .....	38
7.4.5	Philippines.....	38
7.4.6	Solomon, Vanuatu.....	38
7.4.7	Chile .....	39
7.4.8	Peru .....	39
7.4.9	Central America .....	39
<b>8</b>	<b>RESULTS.....</b>	<b>41</b>
8.1	Offshore Hazard Maps .....	41
8.2	Inundation Hazard.....	50
8.3	Flow Velocity.....	55
<b>9</b>	<b>DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS .....</b>	<b>59</b>
	<b>REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>61</b>

**APPENDIX A: OFFSHORE TSUNAMI HAZARD CURVE**

**APPENDIX B: SOURCE AND MAGNITUDE DISAGGREGATION**

**APPENDIX C: SUBFAULT DISAGGREGATION**

## LIST OF FIGURES

Fig. 1.1	Finite difference calculation of the tsunami wavefield for the 2004 Sumatra earthquake .....	2
Fig. 2.1	Bathymetric model of California showing the extent of the intermediate (blue boxes) and finest (red boxes) grids .....	10
Fig. 3.1	Example of the rupture parameterization using subfaults.....	13
Fig. 3.2	Summation of Green's functions. Wavefield for an individual subfault (left). Summation of several subfault Green's functions to compute tsunami response (red line) from a compound rupture .....	14
Fig. 3.3	Map of the Pacific Ocean showing the source regions used in this study .....	15
Fig. 4.1	Misfit of tsunami simulation with observed data for a coarse grid (top) and a fine grid (bottom) .....	19
Fig. 4.2	Variability of tsunami amplitudes due to source slip distributions.....	21
Fig. 4.3	Effect of epsilon truncation on hazard curves.....	22
Fig. 4.4	Effect of different sources of uncertainty on the hazard curves at two locations. ....	23
Fig. 7.1	Seismic coupling coefficients .....	33
Fig. 7.2	Segmentation model for the Alaska-Aleutian subduction zone.....	35
Fig. 7.3	Segmentation model for the Kuril-Kamchatka subduction zone.....	37
Fig. 8.1	Offshore exceedance waveheight for a 72 yr return period .....	42
Fig. 8.2	Offshore exceedance waveheights for a 475 yr return period.....	43
Fig. 8.3	Offshore exceedance waveheight for a 975 yr return period .....	44
Fig. 8.4	Offshore exceedance waveheight for a 2500 yr return period .....	45
Fig. 8.5	Rupture segment disaggregation for offshore San Diego, 475 yr ARP .....	46
Fig. 8.6	Rupture segment disaggregation for Santa Monica, 475 yr ARP .....	47
Fig. 8.7	Rupture segment disaggregation for Port San Luis (Avila Beach), 475 yr ARP .....	48
Fig. 8.8	Rupture segment disaggregation for the Golden Gate (offshore, Pacific side), 475 yr ARP.....	49
Fig. 8.9	Probabilistic inundation map for the San Francisco Bay Area .....	51
Fig. 8.10	Probabilistic inundation map of southern Monterey Bay .....	52

Fig. 8.11 Probabilistic inundation map for Morro Bay .....	52
Fig. 8.12 Probabilistic inundation map for Pismo Beach.....	53
Fig. 8.13 Probabilistic inundation map for the Ventura region.....	54
Fig. 8.14 Probabilistic inundation map for Port of Los Angeles to Orange County .....	54
Fig. 8.15 Relationship between flow velocity and water column height in inundated areas .....	56
Fig. 8.16 Distribution of the ratio between water column height and flow velocity.....	57

## LIST OF TABLES


Table 2.1	Grids used in the finite difference computations .....	9
Table 7.1	Recurrence parameters for major subduction zone earthquakes.....	32
Table 7.2	Recurrence model for the Alaska - Aleutian subduction zone .....	36
Table 7.3	Recurrence model for the Kamchatka-Kurile subduction zone.....	36



# 1 Introduction

The tsunami disaster caused by the 2004 Sumatra-Andaman earthquake (Fig. 1.1) (Ammon et al. 2005) has focused our attention on the hazard posed by tsunamis generated by large subduction zone earthquakes. Even before this destructive event, a significant amount of work was carried out in this field, primarily through deterministic modeling of tsunami scenarios (e.g., Borrero et al. 2005). Such studies often address worst-case scenarios or some type of maximum credible event. In order to put these types of studies on a firm basis, it is necessary to conduct a comprehensive review of tsunamigenic sources that can affect a certain locality and to determine the probabilistic hazard level based on this set of sources. Also, notwithstanding the great usefulness of individual scenario maps, in order to assess the hazard for a certain region, it may be more appropriate to start with a map of the tsunami hazard, analogous to the seismic hazard maps that are published by government agencies such as the United States Geological Survey and statewide agencies in the U.S., or the Global Seismic Hazard Assessment Program. Even though events like the Sumatra-Andaman earthquake and tsunami are rare, the very large loss of life ( $> 200,000$  dead or missing) and tremendous material destruction over large geographical areas warrant a significant effort towards the mitigation of the tsunami hazard worldwide. In recent years, the tsunami risk posed to United States coastal communities from a variety of sources has also become apparent with the need for a comprehensive and consistent methodology to evaluate this aspect of earthquake risk that so far has been neglected. On the other hand, where there is concern about tsunami damage, the lack of a consistent framework to evaluate this hazard has given rise to unnecessarily conservative estimates, which can result in an economic barrier to development of coastal communities and facilities.

**2004 December 26 (Mw 9.15) Sumatra-Andaman Is.**  
Peak wave heights within 4 hours



**Fig. 1.1** Finite difference calculation of the tsunami wavefield for the 2004 Sumatra earthquake.

Given the maturity and widespread acceptance of probabilistic seismic hazard analysis (PSHA) in seismic hazard mitigation, we believe it would be most beneficial to cast our methodology for tsunami hazard mitigation in a similar framework. Exploiting the commonality between tsunami and seismic hazard models, such as the earthquake recurrence models, could assure maximum consistency across the two disciplines, which facilitates the evaluation of the combined hazard posed to coastal communities, facilities, and infrastructure.

## **2 Tsunami Modeling**

### **2.1 TSUNAMI SOURCES**

In this study we have limited our source model to earthquake sources, which dominate the hazard at shorter return periods. The tsunami excitation by earthquake sources is modeled by translating the vertical deformation field of the earthquake source (surface faulting) into a vertical displacement of the water column. This method is commonly used in tsunami studies (e.g., Titov and Synolakis 1996; Satake 1995). The static displacement fields were computed using a frequency-wave-number integration technique (FK) using a simple layered crustal model (Wang et al. 2003, 2006).


### **2.2 TSUNAMI PROPAGATION MODEL**

In this report we take a Eulerian approach to describe the particle motion of the fluid. Only the velocity changes of the fluid are described at some point and instant rather than describing its absolute displacement. We consider a wave that is a propagating disturbance from an equilibrium state. Gravity waves occur when the only restoring force is gravity. When the horizontal scale of motion is much larger than the water depth, then the vertical acceleration of water is much smaller than the gravity acceleration and thus negligible. This means that the whole water mass from the bottom to the surface is assumed to move uniformly in a horizontal direction. This kind of gravity wave is also known as a “long wave.” Long-wave approximations are appropriate when the water depth of lakes and oceans ( $< 5$  km) is much smaller than the length of the disturbance (fault lengths  $\sim 10$ – $1000$  km). This approximation gives an accurate description of tsunami wave propagation in the open ocean. In order to also model the propagation of tsunami

waves in coastal areas, we use an approximation to the wave equation where the low-amplitude linear long-wave requirements are relaxed, as shown in the following sections.

### 2.2.1 General Linear Gravity Wave

The following is a derivation of the general case of gravity waves for two dimensions where  $x$  is the horizontal direction and  $z$  is vertical direction. We start from the Euler's equation of motion that considers the conservation of momentum on a volume of water. The Newton equations can be simplified as (Eq. 2.1):



$$\frac{d}{dt}V = g - \frac{1}{\rho}\nabla\rho \quad (2.1)$$

where  $d/dt$  is the total and  $\partial/\partial t$  is the partial derivative with respect to time,  $g$  is the gravitational acceleration,  $V = (u, w)$  are the depth averaged velocities in the  $x$  and  $z$  directions,  $\rho$  is the density, and  $p$  is the fluid pressure. The accompanying figure shows that  $h$  is the tsunami waveheight and  $d$  is the water depth. We next consider the conservation of mass to derive the equation of continuity,

$$\frac{\partial\rho}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (\rho V) = 0$$

and for incompressible fluid becomes

$$\nabla \cdot V = 0.$$

From the Euler's equation of motion the horizontal and vertical acceleration components are

$$\frac{du}{dt} = \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial p}{\partial x}$$

$$\frac{dw}{dt} = -g - \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial p}{\partial z}$$

The relationship between  $h$  and  $p$  is related through the hydrostatic pressure equation,

$$p = -\rho g(h - z) + p_0$$

where  $h$  is the waveheight,  $z$  is the water depth, and  $p_0$  is the pressure of one atmosphere at  $z = 0$  and  $h = 0$ . The horizontal and vertical pressure gradients given from the slope of the water surface,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x} p = \rho g \frac{\partial h}{\partial x}$$

$$\frac{d}{dz} p = -\rho g$$

are combined with the Euler's equation to give the horizontal and vertical components,

$$\frac{du}{dt} = -g \frac{\partial h}{\partial x}$$

$$\frac{dw}{dt} = 0$$

For ocean tsunamis, the nonlinear advective term is small and can be ignored; therefore the equation of motion is

$$\frac{du}{dt} = \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + u \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} \approx \frac{\partial u}{\partial t}$$

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = -g \frac{\partial h}{\partial x}$$

We next consider the conservation of mass for a region with a small length  $dx$ . Since the volume change per unit of time must be equal to the flow rate of water going out of this region, therefore

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \{(h + d)dx\} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \{u(h + d)\}dx$$

$$\frac{\partial h}{\partial t} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \{u(h + d)\}$$

$$\frac{\partial h}{\partial t} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial x} (du)$$

which is the simplified equation of continuity when the amplitude of the wave is small compared to the water depth. The so-called small-amplitude linear long-wave assumption is valid for most of the tsunami propagation paths except near coasts.

### 2.2.2 Nonlinear Gravity Waves and Shallow Water Waves

Without a viscous force to dissipate wave energy, the water motion will continue forever. In order to include the viscous effect, we can add a term for viscous stress to the equation of motion. We consider only a shear stress at the water bottom; the normal stress is already included and equal to the pressure. The shear stress is experimentally estimated as

$$\tau_x^b \approx C_f v_x \sqrt{v_x^2 + v_y^2}$$

and the frictional force is

$$F_x^b = C_f \frac{v_x \sqrt{v_x^2 + v_y^2}}{d + h}$$

Satake (1995) adopted two types of frictional coefficients from engineering hydrodynamics for including bottom friction for tsunamis: the De Chezy ( $C$ ) and Mannings's roughness ( $n$ ) coefficients. These have different dimensions and therefore a non-dimensional frictional coefficient  $C_f$  is related to these two coefficients by

$$C_f^2 = \frac{g}{C^2}$$

and

$$C_f = \frac{gn^2}{(d + h)^{1/3}}$$

The Manning's roughness coefficient  $n$  is used for a uniform turbulent flow on a rough surface. It indicates that the bottom friction varies with water depth. We use an  $n$  of  $0.03 \text{ m}^{-1/3} \text{ s}$ , typical for coastal waters. If  $n$  is translated to  $C_f$ , then  $n$  becomes  $2.3 \times 10^{-3}$  for a total depth of 50 m and  $1 \times 10^{-2}$  for a total depth of 0.6 m, which agree well with observational values of tidal flow and run-up of solitary waves [see Satake (1995)].

Since the earth is rotating, there is a force apparently acting on a body of water. In an inertial reference frame (fixed on the rotating earth), this force is called the Coriolis force. The derivation of this term is beyond the scope of this report and the reader is referred to textbooks on analytical mechanics. The vertical component of the Coriolis force is much smaller than

gravity (3 cm/s<sup>2</sup> compared to 980 cm/s<sup>2</sup> at 4000 m depth). In a local Cartesian coordinate system, the horizontal components are given by

$$F_x^{cor} = -fv_y$$

$$F_y^{cor} = -fv_x$$

where  $f$  is the Coriolis parameter, and this force always acts to the right-hand side of the motion in the northern hemisphere. The Coriolis force is significant only for long propagation times and distances along lines of latitude near the equator.

We derive the equations for general gravity waves without making the small-amplitude linear long-wave approximation appropriate when the waveheight is much smaller than the water depth ( $h \ll d$ ). If we expand the hyperbolic tangent function using the Taylor series expansion and include the first- and second-order terms then the corresponding equation of motion becomes

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = -g \frac{\partial h}{\partial x} + \frac{1}{3} d^2 \frac{\partial^3 u}{\partial x^2 \partial t}$$

which is also known as the Boussinesq equation. After relaxing the small-amplitude assumption, the equation of motion and continuity are given as

$$\frac{du}{dt} + u \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} = -g \frac{\partial h}{\partial x}$$

$$\frac{\partial h}{\partial t} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \{u(h + d)\}$$

These equations are for the finite-amplitude shallow water waves. For the linear case, the phase velocity is given by the following Taylor series expansion of the hyperbolic tangent function,

$$c = \sqrt{gd} \left\{ 1 - \frac{2\pi^2}{3} \left( \frac{d}{\lambda} \right)^2 \right\}$$

,

where  $\lambda$  is the wavelength. In the nonlinear case the  $d$ -term in the phase velocity is replaced by the total height of the water column ( $d+h$ ) which gives a phase velocity of the form

$$c \sim \sqrt{g(d + h)}$$

Note that in the nonlinear case a phenomenon of amplitude dispersion occurs: the larger the amplitude, the faster the wave speed. As a consequence, peaks of a wave catch up with troughs in front of them, and the forward facing portion of the wave continues to get steeper. This wave will eventually break. Including the bottom friction and Coriolis force, the equation of motion for shallow water waves can be written for a two-dimensional case as follows:

$$\frac{\partial U}{\partial t} + U \frac{\partial U}{\partial x} + V \frac{\partial U}{\partial y} = -fV - g \frac{\partial h}{\partial x} - C_f \frac{U\sqrt{U^2 + V^2}}{d + h}$$

$$\frac{\partial V}{\partial t} + U \frac{\partial V}{\partial x} + V \frac{\partial V}{\partial y} = -fU - g \frac{\partial h}{\partial y} - C_f \frac{V\sqrt{U^2 + V^2}}{d + h}$$

and the equation of continuity is

$$\frac{\partial h}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \{U(h + d)\} + \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \{V(h + d)\} = 0$$

where the coordinate system is  $x$ =east  $y$ =south,  $f$  is the Coriolis parameter,  $C_f$  is a non-dimensional frictional coefficient, and  $U$  and  $V$  are the average velocities in the  $x$  and the  $y$  direction, respectively. The first term on the left-hand side is the local acceleration term, the second and third terms on the left-hand side are the advection terms, the first term on the right-hand side is the Coriolis force, the second term on the right-hand side is the restoring force from gravitation acceleration, and the third term on the right-hand side is the bottom friction force.

### 2.2.3 Numerical Computation

The equations of motion and the equation of continuity are converted from Cartesian to a spherical coordinate system  $(x, y, z) \rightarrow (r, \theta, \phi)$  with the origin at the earth's center, but  $r$  is constant and equal to the earth's radius  $R$ . Note that  $\theta$  is the co-latitude and measured southward from the North Pole and  $\phi$  corresponds to longitude measured eastward from the Greenwich meridian. These equations are solved by finite-difference method using the staggered leapfrog method (e.g., Satake 1995). For the advection terms, the upwind difference scheme is used (e.g., Press et al. 1992). The land-sea boundary condition in the linear computation is total reflection and in the nonlinear case there is a moving boundary condition and run-up is considered. The time step of




computation is determined to satisfy the stability condition (Courant condition) of the linear, and by trial and error for the nonlinear finite-difference computations.

## 2.2.4 Variable Grid Finite Difference

The variable grid setup consists of a master grid with a coarse grid spacing and a number of nested finer grids with decreasing grid sizes around areas of interest. Our code allows for more than one area with decreased grid size, which was used for the smallest grids, as shown in Figure 2.1. In this model, the deep ocean part is sampled at 120 arcsec. Because of the very long wavelength of the tsunami waves in the deep ocean, such a sampling is sufficient for accurate results and reduces the computation time and memory requirements considerably. Closer to shore, we used several nested grids stepping down to 4.8 arcsec (approx 150 m). The original sources of these grids are tabulated in Table 2.1. The timestep for these runs is 0.2 sec. Currently, our code uses a fixed timestep, which generally is controlled by the finest gridsize.

**Table 2.1 Grids used in the finite difference computations.**

Grid #	Cell-size (arcsec)	Longitude range	Latitude range	Provenance
0	120	120.0 – -70.0	-58.0 – 62.0	ETOPO2v2
1	24	-136.0 - -116.0	31.0 – 43.0	NOAA
2	4.8	-124.5 - -124.0	40.2 – 42.5	NOAA/CICORE
3	4.8	-124.2 - -123.6	38.7 – 40.0	NOAA
4	4.8	-123.2 - -122.0	37.1 – 38.4	NOAA
5	4.8	-122.5 - -121.6	36.1 – 37.0	USGS
6	4.8	-121.5 - -120.3	34.6 – 35.9	NOAA-TGP
7	4.8	-120.2 - -119.0	33.8 – 34.5	NOAA-TGP
8	4.8	-118.9 - -117.0	32.5 - 34.1	NOAA



**Fig. 2.1 Bathymetric model of California showing the extent of the intermediate (blue boxes) and finest (red boxes) grids.**

## 3 Probabilistic Tsunami Hazard

### 3.1 OVERVIEW

Probabilistic seismic hazard analysis (PSHA) has become standard practice in the evaluation and mitigation of seismic hazard to populations, in particular with respect to structures, infrastructure, and lifelines. Its ability to condense the complexities and variability of seismic activity into a manageable set of parameters greatly facilitates the design of effective seismic resistant buildings but also the planning of infrastructure projects. Probabilistic tsunami hazard analysis (PTHA) achieves the same goal for hazards posed by tsunami. Although this field is not very developed yet, this method offers great advantages for evaluating the total risk (seismic and tsunami) to coastal communities, facilities, and infrastructure.

Previous work on PTHA includes Downes and Stirling (2001), who proposed to use an empirical attenuation relation similar to ground motion attenuation relations. Although they recognize that such attenuation relations would have to be source and site specific, it is doubtful whether enough data would ever be available for such attenuation relations to be derived consistently. On the other hand, Geist and Parsons (2005) developed a method that uses the full linear calculations for a limited number of scenarios for earthquakes near the site. The main difference with their work is that through the Green's function summation, many more fault scenarios can be generated and at arbitrary distances including teleseismic, which allows us to run full probabilistic analyses over a much wider area (Burbidge et al. 2008). Also, our method is very efficient for the analysis of many sites simultaneously, which allows us to quickly identify areas at elevated risk. Such information is indispensable for the effective allocation of funds for tsunami hazard mitigation work.

The method that we have developed is based on the traditional PSHA and therefore completely consistent with standard seismic hazard practice. It provides an overview of the

tsunami hazard along entire coastlines, and helps identify the specific tsunami source regions for which a particular site on the coastline is sensitive to.

## **3.2 PROBABILISTIC OFFSHORE WAVEHEIGHT HAZARD**


### **3.2.1 Overview**

The methodology behind PSHA is well known (e.g., McGuire 2004) and here we will only briefly describe the adaptations that are made for PTHA. Whereas in PSHA we are usually interested in the exceedance of some ground motion measure such as peak ground acceleration (PGA) or spectral acceleration (SA), in PTHA a parameter of interest (not necessarily the only one) is the maximum tsunami height that is expected to be exceeded at sites along the coast. The statistical earthquake model behind the two methods is the same, the only difference being that in PTHA we are not concerned with earthquakes that are completely inland. The difference between the two methods lies in the part that in PSHA is referred to as attenuation relations. These relate a certain moment release on a fault (or an area) to the ground motion parameters as a function of distance. Because of the strong laterally varying nature of tsunami propagation, we have adopted a waveform excitation and propagation approach instead of trying to develop analogous tsunami attenuation relations. In fact, current developments in traditional PSHA include the replacement of the attenuation relations with ensembles of numerically generated ground motions, which is entirely analogous to the approach proposed here.


The excitation and propagation of tsunamis in deeper water can be modeled using the shallow water wave approximation, which for amplitudes that are significantly smaller than the water depth are linear (Satake 1995). We can solve the equation of motion numerically using a finite-difference method (Fig. 1.1), which has been validated to produce accurate tsunami heights for propagation through the oceans, although for very shallow water the amplitudes may become too large, and more sophisticated nonlinear methods are required to model the details of the run-up accurately. Nevertheless, the linear approach provides a very good first approximation of tsunami propagation, taking into account the effects of lateral variations in seafloor depth.

### 3.2.2 Green's Function Summation

The underlying principle for this approach is the validity of the linear behavior of tsunami waves. This enables us to deconstruct a tsunami that is generated by an earthquake into a sum of individual tsunami waveforms (Green's functions) from a set of subfaults that adequately describe the earthquake rupture (Fig. 3.1). By pre-computing and storing the tsunami waveforms at points along the coast generated by each subfault for a unit slip, we can efficiently synthesize tsunami waveforms for any slip distribution by summing the individual subfault tsunami waveforms (weighted by their slip) (Fig. 3.2). The same principle is used in the inversion of tsunami waves for earthquake rupture (e.g., Satake 1995). This efficiency makes it feasible to use Green's function summation in lieu of attenuation relations to provide very accurate estimates of tsunami height for probabilistic calculations, where one typically needs to compute thousands of earthquake scenarios. For instance, in the example below the probabilistic tsunami heights results are based on more than 10,000 scenarios that were computed (using the Green's functions summation) on a 30-node cluster computer.




**Fig. 3.1** Example of the rupture parameterization using subfaults.



**Fig. 3.2 Summation of Green's functions. Wavefield for an individual subfault (left). Summation of several subfault Green's functions to compute tsunami response (red line) from a compound rupture.**

The assumption of linearity is not valid for tsunamis where the amplitudes are comparable to the water depth. Also, the detailed bathymetry near the shoreline is important to estimate the final run-up heights. For these cases, a nonlinear method is necessary to compute the run-up heights correctly. However, several authors have proposed simple corrections that can be applied to the tsunami heights calculated with a linear code. Our first concern will be in computing the tsunami response from a number of sources (Fig. 3.3) to a particular depth contour (e.g., 15 m) off the California coastline (Fig. 2.1).





**Fig. 3.3** Map of the Pacific Ocean showing the source regions used in this study.

## 4 Uncertainties

An inherent part of a probabilistic hazard analysis is the inclusion of uncertainties in the underlying models (both source and propagation) into the final result itself. We distinguish between two types of uncertainties: aleatory and epistemic.

### 4.1 ALEATORY UNCERTAINTIES



Aleatory uncertainties, in a strict sense, reflect the inability to predict the outcome of a process due to its random nature. Whether or not an uncertainty in the outcome of a process is a true aleatory uncertainty, i.e., caused by the random behavior of nature rather than a limited understanding of the process itself, is not always clear. In practice, this distinction is not important. Aleatory uncertainties are typically accounted for by the use of distribution functions rather than a single mean or median values to express the outcome of a process. The probability of an outcome being in a certain range is then given by the area under the probability density (or distribution) function. In our analysis we have identified three main contributions to the aleatory uncertainty: modeling uncertainty ( $\sigma_A$ ), uncertainty in dip ( $\sigma_D$ ), and uncertainty to random slip distribution ( $\sigma_S$ ).

#### 4.1.1 Modeling Uncertainty

Under modeling uncertainty we include the mismatch, given known source parameters, between observed and computed tsunami waveforms. Several different sources contribute to this modeling uncertainty, the two most important being errors from the numerical implementation (i.e., our finite difference scheme) and errors from shortcomings in the bathymetric model (either errors in the model, or insufficient resolution). We have estimated this uncertainty by modeling



several large and well-constrained tsunamis along the California coast, including the 1960 Chile, 1964 Alaska, and 2006 Kurile events, and by comparing the observed and computed maximum waveheights or run-ups. The results are summarized in Figure 4.1, where we show the combined misfit data (after removal of bias) for simulations using a coarse grid (2 km) and a fine grid (90 m). Since the fine grid computations were confined to smaller areas, the dataset is much smaller, but it is nevertheless clear that the fine grid computations show a significantly smaller standard deviation than the coarse grid computations. The standard deviations ( $\sigma_A$ ) for the coarse and fine grids are 0.595 and 0.345 (natural log), respectively. The bias in the fine grid computations is negligible, and for the individual events distributed around zero. For the coarse grid, there is a positive bias in all simulations, but this will be eliminated once we compute the inundation hazard using the fine grids.




**Fig. 4.1** Misfit of tsunami simulation with observed data for a coarse grid (top) and a fine grid (bottom).

### 4.1.2 Dip Uncertainty

Since the variations in dip have a direct impact on the vertical deformation of the seafloor and thus the height of the resulting tsunami, we have included this as a separate term in our analysis. Also, since our offshore waveheight hazard is based on pre-computed Green's functions, which have a fixed dip at the source, we include here uncertainties in the overall dip of the source, which would normally be included as an epistemic uncertainty. That approach would necessitate the computation of a multitude of Green's functions over the current set, which would make this analysis too expensive in terms of computation time and storage. Rather, we have chosen to determine a single distribution function that represents the effects of dip variation by modeling scenario waveforms for a distribution of the dip angles around a mean (10 degree dip, with a standard deviation of 5 degrees). This results in a standard deviation ( $\sigma_D$ ) of 0.292.

### 4.1.3 Slip Variability

We computed  $\sigma_S$  in the same way as the contribution from the dip variations, by iterating over a large number of different slip distributions with equal magnitude. Although our Green's function approach allows us to include slip variability directly into the hazard computations, we have chosen to include this effect as a sigma term, since (a) the slip variability is really an aleatory uncertainty and (b) in order to sample the distribution sufficiently, we would probably have to iterate over a large number of slip distributions for every single source in our event set. The results are shown in Figure 4.2, with a  $\sigma_S$  of 0.256.



**Fig. 4.2 Variability of tsunami amplitudes due to source slip distributions.**

#### 4.1.4 Total Sigma and Epsilon Truncation


Based on the aforementioned sigma terms we compute a total sigma using:

$$\sigma_{total} = \sqrt{\sigma_A^2 + \sigma_D^2 + \sigma_S^2}.$$

The offshore waveheight is computed using a coarse grid and it would therefore follow that the coarse grid version of  $\sigma_A$  should be used to compute the total standard deviation. However, as we will be using the offshore waveheights only as an intermediate step to compute the final waveheight and inundation using the fine grids, using the fine-grid sigma seems more appropriate. The total sigma is therefore 0.519.

Because of the unbounded nature of the normal distribution it is common in seismic hazard analysis to truncate the distribution at a certain number of standard deviations (epsilon). A typical value for epsilon truncation is 3, i.e., we don't allow for ground motions (or in our case waveheights) that are more than three times the standard deviation away from the mean. In Figure 4.3 we present a comparison between hazard curves for different truncation levels (2, 3, and 4). It is clear that in this range of probabilities the difference between epsilon 3 and 4 are

very small, whereas there are some differences between 2 and 3. We therefore decided to use an epsilon of 3 for truncation of the maximum waveheights in the probabilistic analysis.



**Fig. 4.3 Effect of epsilon truncation on hazard curves.**

## 4.2 EPISTEMIC UNCERTAINTIES


As already mentioned, uncertainties due to an incomplete understanding of natural processes are called epistemic uncertainties, and the way these uncertainties are incorporated is fundamentally different than the way aleatory uncertainties are included. In our analysis, the following uncertainties are deemed epistemic:

- Fault segmentation (single or multi-segment ruptures)
- Slip rate (actual slip rate or fraction of slip seismogenic slip rate)
- Recurrence model (use maximum magnitude or Gutenberg-Richter model, slip rate based versus direct earthquake recurrence rate)

A comprehensive account of the different elements will be given in the next section.

### 4.2.1 Sources

Crucial elements in PTHA are the estimation of the maximum magnitude and its probability, for any source region. Due to the very short historic record for mega-thrusts and other large earthquakes in relation to their recurrence times, it is not possible to base any such constraint on the directly observed seismicity. We therefore need to resort to models that are at least partly based on earthquake mechanics, which can be as simple as magnitude/area relations but can also include physics-based constraints in addition to empirical data such as earthquake locations. Uncertainties in source parameters, such as maximum earthquake and slip rate, are included using logic tree analysis. Other approaches toward PTHA often use a limited range of deterministic scenarios with associated probabilities or return periods, sometimes in combination with historical tsunami records (Berryman 2006; Imamura et al. 2006; Geist and Parsons 2006).



**Fig. 4.4** Effect of different sources of uncertainty on the hazard curves at two locations.

### 4.2.2 Logic Trees

The discrete nature of the epistemic uncertainties is expressed through the use of logic trees, where all the different manifestations of a process are represented as a branch of a logic tree.

Uncertainties in the model parameters are generally incorporated using a logic-tree approach, where different alternatives are represented as weighted branches. These include variations in slip-rate, magnitude range and distribution, fault geometry, as well as rake. As already mentioned, dip variations would normally also be considered under the epistemic uncertainties, but because these would require a new set of Green's functions, we have added them as an aleatory uncertainty (Fig. 4.4).

In the Green's function approach, it is convenient to divide these uncertainties into two groups: parameter variations that act on the Green's function level (e.g., fault geometry) and parameters that do not influence the Green's functions, such as the recurrence parameters and magnitude scaling relations. In the latter case, the logic tree branches are easily added without major computational requirements, but for the former, the question is whether any extra branch in the logic tree, such as a variation in slip, would require an entire set of Green's functions. From some simple numerical experiments, we conclude that in many cases, especially at large distances, these variations can accurately be taken into account by perturbing the Green's functions using a constant scaling factor rather than re-computing them. For example, a change in rake, readily translates into a change of the vertical seafloor displacement, which in turn directly translate to differences in waveheight.

At shorter distances, i.e., local faults, this approach is less accurate, and in these situations (particularly for dip-slip events) we will have to resort to complete re-computation of the Green's functions. However, since these sources are relatively scarce, and require less computing time due to the short distances, this is far less of a burden than having to re-compute tele-tsunami Green's functions.

## 5 Inundation Hazard

In order to extend the offshore waveheight hazard to inundation hazard, we chose to use a numerical approach rather than existing empirical approaches because of the limitation in accuracy of the latter. We used the source disaggregation for several regions along the California coast to select the source regions, and magnitudes that contribute the most to the hazard. Invariably, apart from the contribution of the Cascadia subduction zone on the Cascadia hazard, only three other regions are very significant: Alaska, Kamchatka-Kurile, and Chile. All subsequent scenarios were therefore done for these regions. Just using the disaggregation to select the scenarios is not sufficient, since this would not include the aleatory uncertainties in the offshore waveheight. We therefore computed a suite of scenarios with increasing amplification factors (i.e., we multiplied the slip by increasing factors) and for every region and return period chose the scenarios that yielded waveheights that bracket the probabilistic offshore waveheights. This matching is carried out using the coarse grid from the nonlinear runs (which is similar to the coarse grid from the probabilistic offshore hazard calculations) so that differences in bias between the fine and coarse grids are taken into account.

The inundation from that particular source region can then be determined by taking the weighted average of the two scenario runs that bracket the offshore waveheight. This way, we only need to compute a limited number of fully nonlinear scenarios but still retain the directional (i.e., source region specific) character and probabilistic nature of the hazard. The line of inundation can then be determined by specifying that it borders an area that is inundated by tsunami waves from all the different major source zones for that particular return period. In addition, we can also compute the local inundation level (height of the water column) exceedance for different return periods.



## **6 Bathymetry**

### **6.1 BATHYMETRY SOURCES**

Because of the large range of grid resolutions and large geographic areas involved, we have used a varied set of data sources for modeling the tsunami waveforms. This potentially poses a problem of continuity, but in the case of North America this is not as severe as most bathymetry models, including the global models, which are based on NOAA's 90 m nearshore bathymetry. The grid setup used in the inundation hazard analysis is shown in Figure 2.1.

Current high-resolution mapping efforts are under way by NOAA of several areas along the West Coast for tsunami inundation purposes. The resolution is 1/3 arcsec, or about 30 m, and we have used these models as far as they were available at the time of modeling (Monterey Bay, Port San Luis).

### **6.2 GLOBAL AND REGIONAL MODELS**

#### **6.2.1 ETOPO2v2**

A global model published by the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Agency (NOAA) is based on a combination of gravity-derived bathymetry, bathymetric surveys (including GEBCO) and the NOAA nearshore model. At a resolution of 2 arcsec (approx. 4 km), this model is suitable for deep ocean propagation. In general, its accuracy in nearshore areas is rather poor but for the United States, since it used the NOAA nearshore database, the model is adequate at the resolution used.

### **6.2.2 NOAA/NGDC**

NOAA has released a 9 arcsec grid of all the nearshore areas of the United States (Divins and Metzger 2007). These grids are regularly updated, and the version used in this analysis was released in 2007. The model is based on shiptrack data and soundings and is generally quite accurate for nearshore areas. However, at the shoreline, the accuracy is not as high, which requires us to use local elevation models for the actual inundation modeling.

## **6.3 HIGH-RESOLUTION LOCAL MODELS**

These grids are shown as subgrids in Figure 2.1. They were derived from a variety of sources which are described below.

### **6.3.1 Crescent City**

30 m bathymetry from NOAA was made available to us courtesy of Dr. B. Uslu (University of Southern California, now at NOAA).

### **6.3.2 Humboldt Bay**

Detailed bathymetry of Humboldt Bay has been made available by the CICORE project (5 m resolution) based on LIDAR and other methods.

### **6.3.3 San Francisco Bay**

The USGS <http://sfbay.wr.usgs.gov/sediment/sfbay/index.html> provided this high-resolution data, used for marine studies of the San Francisco Bay at a resolution of 100 m for the entire Bay, and 50 m for several areas inside the Bay.

#### **6.3.4 Monterey Bay**

This area has been mapped extensively by the Monterey Bay Aquarium Research Institute (MBARI), whose model is included in the Monterey Bay grid (1/3 arcsec) of the NOAA Tsunami Gridding Project.

#### **6.3.5 Central Coast**

This area is covered by the NOAA Tsunami Gridding Project (Port San Luis grid) with some additional outlying parts derived directly from the NOAA nearshore grid.

#### **6.3.6 Santa Barbara Channel, Los Angeles and San Diego**

For these areas the best models available are the NOAA nearshore grid.

## 7 Source Models

### 7.1 OVERVIEW

In probabilistic analyses, the rate of occurrence of earthquakes is of prime importance for the computation of the hazard. Constraints for these occurrence rates typically come from the observed seismicity record, and from tectonic considerations such as average deformation rates along plate boundaries.

The recurrence models used for the seismic hazard maps tend to favor the recurrence of earthquakes in individual fault segments, which limits the maximum magnitude to that allowable by the dimensions of the segments. The segmentation models are based on the slip distribution of historical earthquakes. A drawback of this approach is that the historical record may be too short to sample very large earthquakes that rupture entire subduction zones, or at least multiple segments, since they occur rarely. This may not be a very significant problem in shaking hazard, since the high-frequency ground motions tend to saturate for larger magnitudes. For tsunamis however, amplitudes continue to grow with magnitude even for very large earthquakes, and we therefore need to address the possibility of these events. Until the occurrence of the 2004 Sumatra earthquake, the prevailing scientific opinion regarding very large subduction zone earthquakes was that they occur only where young oceanic crust is being subducted at high rates. The Sumatra-Andaman subduction zone did not fall into that category, and the devastating 2004 event upended this common wisdom. Since then, geologic evidence from several parts of the world have shown that in some subduction zones, the major stress release takes place both through  $M=8$  events on individual segments, at relatively short intervals ( $\sim 100$  yrs), as well as through very large multi-segment events with much longer recurrence times ( $\sim 500$ – $1000$  yr) that have not been observed historically. Statistical considerations also indicate that our current view

is biased toward these M=8 events, since they occur more frequently and that we currently cannot rule out very large events that break entire subduction interfaces.

Our logic trees usually consist of two main branches, one where the plate boundary breaks in smaller, single-segment events as often has been observed in the historical record, and a branch where the maximum sized earthquake (based on fault dimensions) is considered. In Table 7.1 we present the predicted maximum magnitudes and the historically observed largest magnitudes for all large subduction zones.

**Table 7.1 Recurrence parameters for major subduction zone earthquakes**


Subduction zone	Convergence rate (McCafrey)	M <sub>max</sub> predicted	M <sub>max</sub> obs
Alaska – Aleutian <sup>1</sup>	18-76	9.5	9.3
Kamchatka-Kuriles <sup>2</sup>	69-84	9.1	9.0
Izu-Bonin-Marianas	31-70	9.2	7.2
Ryukyu	74-92	9.2	8.1
Philippines	95-113	9.4	8.0
Solomon	86-105	9.5	8.1
Vanuatu	57-175	9.1	8.1
Chile	63-75	9.5	9.5
Peru	58-70	9.5	9.2

<sup>1</sup> Details in Table 7.2, <sup>2</sup> details in Table 7.3

## 7.2 EARTHQUAKE RECURRENCE RATES

To estimate the recurrence rates of subduction zone earthquakes, we typically rely on two lines of evidence, which are both in their own way quite imperfect. The most direct evidence would be the actual historical record of tsunamis, or at least subduction zone earthquakes. The problem here, as in seismic hazard, is that the historical record is very short compared to the recurrence time of large earthquakes, especially the very large subduction zone events. Geological studies of tsunami deposits can extend this record extensively (e.g., Atwater and Moore 1992; Satake et al. 1996; Sieh, et al. 2003; Nanayama et al. 2003; Pinegina et al. 2003; Cisternas et al. 2005) but currently the geographical extent of these studies is rather limited. The 2004 Sumatra earthquake and tsunami have given a fresh impetus to studies of the geological record of tsunamis, and some interesting results have already been found regarding previous events along the same structure (Jankaew et al. 2008).

Alternatively, we can estimate recurrence rates by using convergence rates from plate models and by assuming that convergence is primarily accommodated by seismic release. This is regular practice for crustal faults in seismic hazard analysis, but it appears that in subduction zones only a fraction of the total convergence rate is released in earthquakes. The seismic coupling coefficient, which is the ratio between the seismic slip rate and the total slip rate, has been the subject of several studies. Pacheco et al. (1993) computed coupling coefficients for all subduction zones and found that the coupling coefficient, based on 90 years of observations, is very low for most subduction zones (Fig. 7.1). A low coupling coefficient could simply be the result of the return time being much longer than 90 years, but McCaffrey (1997) concluded, on the basis of a statistical analysis that the observed earthquake recurrences can be explained, on a worldwide basis, with a single coupling coefficient of 0.3. In our models, we have used larger coupling coefficient in some cases where we believe the historical record warrants it. However, this area of the analysis remains poorly constrained.



**Fig. 7.1 Seismic coupling coefficients.**

### 7.3 GEOLOGIC EVIDENCE FOR MULTI-BRANCH MAGNITUDE RECURRENCE

One of the most vexing problems in probabilistic hazard analysis is the correct identification of the event recurrence. In this report we used two main types of recurrence relations, truncated Gutenberg-Richter (G-R) and maximum magnitude. The distribution function for the Gutenberg-Richter relations shows an exponential decay of number of events with magnitude, whereas the maximum magnitude model is represented by a normal distribution around the Maximum Magnitude. For large fault systems, especially at subduction zone interfaces, the maximum magnitude is often used, e.g., Annaka et al. 2007; Geist 2008. Even if globally the distribution of earthquakes for very large magnitudes follows a G-R relation, this does not imply that a GR relation would be appropriate for recurrence relations on a single interface. The global GR relation could be a manifestation of a size distribution of subduction zone interfaces, which at a local level would be consistent with a maximum magnitude distribution.


$M_{\text{Max}}$ , and thus the maximum slip that can occur, affect the probabilistic tsunami hazard in two opposite ways; larger slip will result in longer recurrence, since it will take more time to accumulate the amount of slip, and tsunami waveheight is proportional to the vertical deformation and thus the slip of an event. The latter is not true in seismic hazard where the ground motions tend to saturate with large magnitudes, so that the probabilistic shaking hazard actually declines with increasing  $M_{\text{Max}}$ .

Geologic evidence points to subduction zone earthquakes occurring on quite different scales, as either rupturing single segments or multiple segments. Along the Kuriles, Nanayama et al. (2003) inferred historic ruptures along the Kurile subduction zone that spanned multiple segments (in this case, at least the Tokachi-Oki and Nemuro-Oki segments). Similarly, along the Alaska subduction zone Shannen et al. (2009) found that the previous ruptures along the 1964 segment also included rupture of the neighboring Yakutat segment. Schwarz (1999) argued on the basis of seismological analysis of several large subduction zone earthquakes that their repeated ruptures are complex and not characteristic, with subsequent earthquakes re-rupturing sections of previous large events. Other observations of multiple segment ruptures are presented below with the individual source descriptions.

## 7.4 DISTANT SOURCES

### 7.4.1 Alaska-Aleutian

The Alaska-Aleutian subduction zone marks the boundary between the Pacific and North American plates, and has a strong curvature resulting in very different convergence rates between the eastern and central segments with convergence rates on the order of 60–70 mm/yr and the western segments, where the movement becomes predominantly strike-slip. The historical record of events yields a seismic slip rate that is significantly smaller than that, which is reflected in the recurrence times in the USGS hazard map for Alaska. The USGS model is strongly segmented based on historical evidence (Fig. 7.2, Table 7.2). This limits the maximum magnitude, which we feel is not warranted based on the short history (in comparison to return periods of very large earthquakes) and recent studies (Shannen et al. 2009). We therefore decided to introduce several logic-tree branches for the fault segmentation and this maximum magnitude.



**Fig. 7.2 Segmentation model for the Alaska-Aleutian subduction zone.**



**Table 7.2 Recurrence model for the Alaska - Aleutian subduction zone.**

Model	Segment	Length	Rate	Mmax	Lon. range	Recur
USGS	All			7-8	-195.0 - -144.0	G-R
	Yakataga			7 – 8.1	-145.5 - -139.5	G-R
	East			9.2	-154.5 - -144.0	Max
	Kodiak			8.8	-154.5 - -149.0	Max
	Semidi			8 – 8.5	-158.0 - -154.0	G-R
	Shumagin			-	-	-
	Western			8-9.2	-190.0 - -163.0	G-R
	Komandorski			8 – 8.2	-195.0 - -190.0	G-R
McCafrey	Alaska	1489	55-66	9.5	--144 - -164	Max
	East Aleutian	1092	64-76	9.3	-164 - -180	Max
	Western Aleutian	1244	69-80	9.3	-180 - --195	Max


#### 7.4.2 Kamchatka-Kuriles

The Kamchatka-Kuriles system stretches from the Aleutian trench to the north end of Honshu, and has experienced some of the largest earthquakes observed worldwide. The historical and geological tsunami record for Hokkaido is quite extensive, and contains evidence for single segment as well as multi-segment ruptures. As in Alaska, we used the existing recurrence models but added a second logic tree branch that incorporates multi-segment ruptures (Table 7.3, Fig. 7.3).

**Table 7.3 Recurrence model for the Kamchatka-Kurile subduction zone.**

	Mmax	ARP
J1 - Japan trench	8.2	72
K1 - Tokachi-oki	7.9	72
K2 - Nemuro-oki	7.8	72
K3 - Shikotanto-oki	8.2	72
K4 - Etorofuto-oki	8.2	72
K5	8.3	*
K6 - “2006”	8.5	*
K7	8.6	*
K8 - “1952”	9.2	*
K9	8.0	*
K10	8.0	*

\* - recurrence from convergence rate



**Fig. 7.3** Segmentation model for the Kuril-Kamchatka subduction zone.

### **7.4.3 Izu-Bonin Marianas**

The boundary between the Pacific plate and the Philippines Sea plate shows a large variation in convergence rate, from 50 mm/yr in the north to 0 in the south, because the PA-PS rotation pole is located almost on the plate boundary. Very few large earthquakes have occurred along this plate boundary, which has been interpreted as being due to very weak coupling between the plates (Kanamori 1977). We have chosen a coupling coefficient of .25 for this boundary with a maximum magnitude of 8.6 for the dominant branch (85%) and 9.2 for the second branch.

### **7.4.4 Ryukyu**

The northern end of the Ryukyu system is included in the Japanese National maps and consists of the Tonankai, Nankaido, and Tokai earthquake zones, which have a relatively well-documented history of rupturing, both in single segments as well as multiple segments. We followed the Japanese National Map for the recurrence model, which has maximum magnitudes ranging from 8.1 for the single Tonankai segment to 8.5 for the joint segments.

### **7.4.5 Philippines**

The Philippines trench has a history of large earthquakes with recurrence times of less than a century, but no very large interface events that have generated significant tsunamis at teleseismic distances. Our model uses a convergence rate of 60 mm/yr and a coupling coefficient of .5. For the maximum magnitudes we used two equally weighted branches, with 8.0 based on historical seismicity and 9.4 based on the total extent of the subduction zone (McCaffrey 2009).

### **7.4.6 Solomon, Vanuatu**

These subduction zones are not thought to have a significant impact on the West Coast of North America. We modeled them using convergence rates of 80–100 mm/yr and coupling coefficients of .5. Maximum magnitudes are 8.2 and 9.1 for the Solomon Islands and 8.5 and 9.4 for the Tonga-Kermadec trench.

#### **7.4.7 Chile**

The 1960 Chile earthquake ( $M_w=9.5$ ) still ranks as the largest recorded earthquake and caused significant tsunamis along the California coast, in particular at Crescent City. Geologic evidence suggests that this interface does not always break in very large events, nor in smaller events (Cisternas et al. 2005). We therefore chose equal weighted branches with magnitudes of 8.9 and 9.5. The convergence rate is 80 mm/yr, and in this case we have chosen a large coupling coefficient of .8, since this plate interface has shown extensive activity over the last few centuries (Cisternas et al. 2005).

#### **7.4.8 Peru**

Along the Peru trench, Okal et al. (2006) found recurrence rates of large earthquakes around Pisco in the 50–100 year range, with the subduction of the Nazca ridge seemingly limiting the extent of the earthquake ruptures by acting as a barrier. However, they also concluded that a very large earthquake that occurred in 1868 probably broke through the barrier. They estimate a recurrence time for such a large event ( $M=9.4$ ) to be on the order of 500 years, with a recurrence on the order of 100–250 years for smaller events ( $M=8.5$ ) that do not break through the barrier.

#### **7.4.9 Central America**


The contribution from the Middle America trench zone to the observed tsunami record in California is low due to the geometry of the subduction zone relative to California as well as the lack of very large earthquakes along this boundary. The largest recorded events are the 1932 and 1995 Jalisco earthquakes ( $M_s=8.1$  and  $M_w=8.0$ , respectively) and the 1985 Michoacán earthquake ( $M_w=8.1$ ), and in general the interface tends to break in smaller earthquakes ( $7 < M < 8$ ). Recently however, Suárez and Albin (2009) presented evidence for a very large ( $M=8.6$ ) earthquake that occurred in 1787 in southern Mexico and ruptured at least four previously identified asperities. Whereas the single asperity event have return times on the order of a century or less, it appears that the time scale of the very large earthquakes, given the fact that only one has been observed along the entire trench over the last three centuries, is probably more on the order of 500–1000 years.

## 8 Results

### 8.1 OFFSHORE HAZARD MAPS

We have computed probabilistic tsunami waveheights (offshore) for the coast of California based on subduction zone sources around the Pacific Ocean. These results are shown in Figures 8.1–8.4, for typical return periods used in engineering. It should be noted that the hazard off the Cascadia subduction zone is not accurate due to the simplifications used for the Cascadia subduction zone, although the contribution of the Cascadia subduction zone to the rest of the state is consistent with the other tsunami sources. Since these are offshore waveheights, it is difficult to interpret their impact directly, since it strongly depends on the run-up properties from the offshore location (around the 15 m bathymetry contour) to the shoreline and beyond, which are heavily dependent on the local bathymetry/topography. However, we can identify some systematic changes of the tsunami hazard along the coast. The waveheight patterns show relatively high hazard levels along the north and central coast, which are directly exposed to the Pacific Ocean, and lower levels elsewhere along the coast of Southern California, which are due to blockage by the Continental borderland. This pattern is particularly clear at the longer return periods.

72 yr return period



**Fig. 8.1** Offshore exceedance waveheight for a 72 yr return period.

475 yr return period





Fig. 8.2 Offshore exceedance waveheights for a 475 yr return period.


975 yr return period



**Fig. 8.3 Offshore exceedance waveheight for a 975 yr return period.**



2500 yr return period



**Fig. 8.4 Offshore exceedance waveheight for a 2500 yr return period.**

The value of these maps is as input to the next stage of our analysis, the inundation mapping. They serve both as a reference waveheight level, which the inundation mapping has to match, as well as a screening tool, by showing us the significant source contributions to the hazard along the coast. For this end we are showing disaggregation maps in Figure 8.5–8.8, for

selected locations and return periods. From these maps, it is clear that the Alaska subduction zone dominates the hazard along the California coast south of Cape Mendocino. Other significant sources are the Kurile-Kamchatka subduction zone and the Chilean subduction zone.

### San Diego-475yr






Fig. 8.5 Rupture segment disaggregation for offshore San Diego, 475 yr ARP.

## Santa\_Monica-475yr




**Fig. 8.6 Rupture segment disaggregation for Santa Monica, 475 yr ARP.**

## Port\_San\_Luis-475yr



**Fig. 8.7 Rupture segment disaggregation for Port San Luis (Avila Beach), 475 yr ARP.**

## Golden\_Gate-475yr




**Fig. 8.8 Rupture segment disaggregation for the Golden Gate (offshore, Pacific side), 475 yr ARP.**


## 8.2 INUNDATION HAZARD

The probabilistic waveheights are very useful tools in assessing the hazard posed by tsunamis. However, as mentioned before, the current approach that allows computation of thousands of scenario tsunamis efficiently is not suited for detailed (nonlinear) inundation studies. In contrast to earlier modeling efforts, in which scenarios represented some loosely defined maximum credible event, these scenarios are firmly based on a probabilistic analysis, and represent an event with a specific hazard level.


Using the aforementioned source disaggregation and offshore waveheight matching, we have been able to compute probabilistic inundation maps (Figs. 8.9–8.14). These maps show for different return periods the extent of flooding due to tsunamis. The maps show inundation for very long return periods, but we consider that these results are valid for return periods of up to 2500 years with the current set of sources. At the resolution of these maps (approximately 150 m) the inundation does not appear very significant in these maps for the shorter return periods, with the exception of the some low-lying coastal areas in and around wetlands. At 2500 year ARP, however, we find more significant inundation along the coast in Central California (Fig. 8.12), Ventura County (Fig. 8.13) and Orange County (Fig. 8.14) with inundation distances of several hundred meters to several kilometers.



**Fig. 8.9 Probabilistic inundation map for the San Francisco Bay Area.**




**Fig. 8.10 Probabilistic inundation map of southern Monterey Bay**




**Fig. 8.11 Probabilistic inundation map for Morro Bay.**






**Fig. 8.12 Probabilistic inundation map for Pismo Beach.**




**Fig. 8.13 Probabilistic inundation map for the Ventura region.**




**Fig. 8.14 Probabilistic inundation map for Port of Los Angeles to Orange County.**

### 8.3 FLOW VELOCITY

Our main concern in this study has been the determination of waveheight hazard, and in particular inundation hazard. This may be the most important parameter in terms of life safety, but for engineering purposes the effects on structures and foundations are strongly dependent on flow velocity as well. How the two parameters combine to affect a structure probably depends on the type of damage that occurs. One can imagine that the impact on an exposed structure such as a wall or column depends on the total local momentum of the tsunami, which is a combination of water column height and flow velocity, is important, whereas in other cases, such as scouring around foundations, just the flow velocity is probably most important. The relationship between flow velocity and waveheight is not straightforward, but generally speaking at any point in the model the maxima in waveheight and flow velocity do not occur at the same time. In order to evaluate the interplay of flow velocity and water height we have plotted these two parameters for a large number of grid points and times against each other (Fig. 8.15). Here, we see that the numerical values of water height (in meters) and flow velocity (m/sec) are of the same magnitude. There is a large spread between the ratios (also seen in Fig. 8.16) but the values are confined in a limited area. Note that these results are strictly for inundation areas, not for general tsunami waves in the open ocean. The average ratio between water column height and flow velocity is 4.82 (Fig. 8.16), which means that the numerical value of velocity is roughly 20% of the water height. The velocity seldom exceeds the water height and the ratio is clearly truncated at high velocities (10 times the water height) and less so at the low velocities, which is as expected.



**Fig. 8.15** Relationship between flow velocity and water column height in inundated areas.



**Fig. 8.16** Distribution of the ratio between water column height and flow velocity.

## 9 Discussion and Conclusions

We have developed probabilistic tsunami inundation maps for California based on tele-tsunami sources. These maps, to our knowledge, represent the first probabilistic analysis of the tsunami hazard in the state, and show localized significant inundation hazard for return periods of up to 2500 years. These maps are based on a hybrid method that matches results from a fully probabilistic offshore waveheight analysis with deterministic inundation modeling. Both aleatory and epistemic uncertainties are included in the analysis and are carried over into the inundation maps.

Although we present inundation maps up to 5000 years ARP, we believe that these results are complete up to 2500 years. Also, along the northern coast of California, north of Cape Mendocino, the results are not accurate, since the proximity of the Cascadia subduction zone requires a more comprehensive integration over source variability, rather than including it in an aleatory component, as well as a consideration of vertical movements of the coastline. At return periods longer than 2500 years, we believe that in the rest of the state local offshore faults may also contribute (e.g., Borrero et al. 2004), even if most of them are of a strike-slip nature. Therefore, we have decided that the local sources such as the Cascadia subduction zone will be analyzed in a follow-up study. Beyond the current return periods, it is likely that submarine landslides need to be addressed as well (e.g., Watts 2004; Locat et al. 2004), which is outside the scope of the present study.

Note: The appendices that supplement this report can be found at the link for this report at the PEER publications website at [http://peer.berkeley.edu/publications/peer\\_reports/reports\\_2010/reports\\_2010.html](http://peer.berkeley.edu/publications/peer_reports/reports_2010/reports_2010.html)

## REFERENCES

- Annaka, T, K Satake, N Shuto, T Sakakiyama, K Yanagisawa, 2004. Logic-tree Approach for Probabilistic Tsunami Hazard Analysis and its Applications to the Japanese Coasts, Abstract: 2004 Fall AGU meeting.
- Atwater, B.F., and Moore, A.L., 1992, A tsunami about 1000 years ago in Puget Sound, Washington: *Science*, v. 258, p. 1614–1617.
- Bird, P., 2003. An updated digital model of plate boundaries, *Geochemistry Geophysics Geosystems*, 4(3), 1027, doi:10.1029/2001GC000252
- Borrero J. C., M. R. Legg, C. E. Synolakis, 2004. Tsunami sources in the southern California bight, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 31, L13211, doi:10.1029/2004GL020078.
- Borrero, J., Cho, S., Moore, J.E., Richardson, H.W., and C. Synolakis, 2005. Could it happen here? *Civil Eng.*, 75, 54–65.
- Burbidge, D., P.R. Cummins, R. Mleczko and H.K. Thio, 2008. Probabilistic tsunami hazard analysis for Western Australia, *Pageoph*, 165, 2059–2088.
- Cisternas, M., B. F. Atwater, F. Torrejo'n, Y. Sawai, G. Machuca, M. Lagos, A. Eipert, C. Youlton, I. Salgado, T. Kamataki, M. Shishikura, C. P. Rajendran, J. K. Malik, Y. Rizal and M. Husni, 2005. Predecessors of the giant 1960 Chile earthquake, *Nature* 437, 404–407.
- Divins, D.L., and D. Metzger, NGDC Coastal Relief Model, Retrieved 10/2007, <http://www.ngdc.noaa.gov/mgg/coastal/coastal.html>
- Earthquake Research Committee (ERC), 2005. National Seismic Hazard Maps for Japan (2005), 158 pp.,
- Frohlich, Cliff, and Laura Reiser Wetzel (2007), Comparison of seismic moment release rates along different types of plate boundaries, *Geophys J Int*, 171(2), 909.
- Geist, E.L., and Parsons, T., 2006, Probabilistic analysis of tsunami hazards: *Natural Hazards*, v. 37, p. 277–314
- Gica, E., M.H. Teng, P.L.-F. Liu, V. Titov, and H. Zhou, 2007. Sensitivity Analysis of Source Parameters for Earthquake-Generated Distant Tsunamis, *J. Waterway, Port, Coastal, Ocean Eng.* ASCE, doi: 10.1061/(ASCE)0733-950X(2007)133:6(429).
- Hyndman, 2007. The seismogenic zone of subduction thrusts faults, in *The seismogenic zone of subduction thrust faults*, Dixon, T.H. and J.C. Moore, eds., 15–40.
- Jankaew, K., B. F. Atwater, Y. Sawai, M. Choowong, T. Charoentitirat, M. E. Martin and A. Prendergast, 2008. Medieval forewarning of the 2004 Indian Ocean tsunami in Thailand, *Nature* 455, 1228–1231.
- Locat, J., H.J. Lee, P. Locat and J. Imran, 2004. Numerical analysis of the mobility of the Palos Verdes debris avalanche in California, and its implication for the generation of tsunamis. *Marine Geol.*, 203, 269–280.
- McCaffrey, R., 1997. Statistical significance of the seismic coupling coefficient, *Bull. Seismol. Soc. Am.*, 87, 1069–1073.
- McCaffrey, R., 2008. Global frequency of magnitude 9 earthquakes, *Geology*, 36, 263–266.
- Nanayama, F., K. Satake, R. Furukawa, K. Shimokawa, B.F Atwater, K. Shigeno, and S. Yamaki, 2003. Unusually large earthquakes inferred from tsunami deposits along the Kuril trench, *Nature*, 424, 660–663.

- National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), National Geophysical Data Center, 2006. 2-minute Gridded Global Relief Data (ETOPO2v2)
- Nishenko, S.P. (1985). Seismic potential for large interplate earthquakes along the Chilean and southern Peruvian margins of South America: a quantitative appraisal. *Journal of Geophysical Research* 90, 3589–3615.
- Okal, E.A., J.C. Borrero, and C.E. Synolakis, 2006. Evaluation of Tsunami Risk from Regional Earthquakes at Pisco, Peru, *Bull. Seismol. Soc. of Am.* 96, 1634–1648.
- Okal, E.A., and C.E. Synolakis, 2003. Theoretical comparison of tsunamis from dislocations and landslides, *Pure Appl. Geophys.*, 160, 2177–2188.
- Pacheco, J. F., L. R. Sykes, and C. H. Scholz, 1993. Nature of Seismic Coupling Along Simple Plate Boundaries of the Subduction Type, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 98(B8), 14,133–14,159.
- Pinegina, T.K., Bourgeois, J., Bazanova, L.I. et al. 2003. A millennial-scale record of Holocene tsunamis on the Kronotskiy bay coast, Kamchatka, Russia. *Quaternary Research* 59: 36–47.
- Satake, K., 1995. Linear and Nonlinear Computations of the 1992 Nicaragua earthquake tsunami, *PAGEOH*, 144, 455–470.
- Satake, Kenji, and Brian F. Atwater, 2007. Long-Term Perspectives on Giant Earthquakes and Tsunamis at Subduction Zones, *Ann. Rev Earth Planet Sci*, 35(1), 349.
- Satake, K., K. Shimazaki, Y. Tsuji and K. Ueda, 1996. Time and size of a giant earthquake in Cascadia inferred from Japanese tsunami records of January 1700, *Nature*, 379, 246–249.
- Sawai, Y., Kamataki, T., Shishikura, M., Nasu, H., Okamura, Y., Satake, K., Thomson, K.H., Matsumoto, D., Fujii, Y., Komatsubara, J., Aung, T.T. (2008): Aperiodic recurrence of geologically recorded tsunamis during the past 5500 years in eastern Hokkaido, Japan. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, doi:10.1029/2007JB005503.
- Scholz, C. H., and J. Campos (1995), On the mechanism of seismic decoupling and back arc spreading at subduction zones, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 100(B11), 22,103–22,115.
- Schwarz, S., 1999. Noncharacteristic behavior and complex recurrence of large subduction zone earthquakes, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 204, 23,111–23,125.
- Shennan, I., Gruhn, R. and G. Plafker, 2009. Multi-segment earthquakes and tsunami potential of the Aleutian megathrust, *Quat. Sc. Rev.*, 28, 7–13.
- Sieh, K., Natawidjaja, D. H., Meltzner, A. J., Shen, C.-C., Cheng, H., Li, K.-S., Suwargadi, B. W., Galetzka, J., Philipposian, B., and Edwards, R. L., 2008. Earthquake Supercycles Inferred from Sea-Level Changes Recorded in the Corals of West Sumatra, *Science* 322, 1674–1678, doi: 10.1126/science.1163589.
- Stein, S. and E. Okal, 2007. Ultralong period seismic study of the December 2004 Indian Ocean earthquake and implications for regional tectonics and the subduction process, *Bull. Seismol. Soc. Am.*, 97, S279–S295.
- Suarez, G., A., Paola, 2009. Evidence for Great Tsunamigenic Earthquakes (M 8.6) along the Mexican Subduction Zone, *Bull. Seismol. Soc. Am.* 99, 892–896.
- Taylor, L.A., B.W. Eakins, K.S. Carignan, R.R. Warnken, D.C. Schoolcraft, G.F. Sharman, 2008. Digital Elevation Model Of Port San Luis, California: Procedures, Data Sources And Analysis, NOAA Technical Memorandum NESDIS NGDC-3.




- Taylor, L.A., B.W. Eakins, K.S. Carignan, R.R. Warnken, T. Sazonova, and D.C. Schoolcraft, 2008. Digital Elevation Model for Monterey, California: Procedures, Data Sources and Analysis, Prepared for the Pacific Marine Environmental Laboratory (PMEL) NOAA Center for Tsunami Research by the NOAA National Geophysical Data Center (NGDC).
- Thatcher, W. (1990), Order and Diversity in the Modes of Circum-Pacific Earthquake Recurrence, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 95(B3), 2609–2623.
- Thio, H.K., P. Somerville and Gene Ichinose (2007). Probabilistic Analysis of Strong Ground Motion and Tsunami Hazards in Southeast Asia. *Journal of Earthquake and Tsunami*, 1, No. 2., p. 119–137.
- Titov, V.V., and C.E. Synolakis, 1996. Numerical modeling of 3-D long wave run-up using VTCS-3. In *Long Wave Run-up Models*, P. Liu, H. Yeh, and C. Synolakis (eds.), World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd., Singapore, 242–248.
- Titov, V.V. and F. Gonzalez, 1997. Implementation and testing of the method of splitting tsunami (MOST) model, NOAA Technical Memorandum ERL PMEL-112.
- Wang, R, F. Lorenzo-Martín and F. Roth, 2003. Computation of deformation induced by earthquakes in a multi-layered elastic crust—FORTRAN programs EDGRN/EDCMP, *Computers & Geosciences*, 29, 195–207.
- Wang, R, F. Lorenzo-Martín and F. Roth, 2006. Erratum to: “Computation of deformation induced by earthquakes in a multi-layered elastic crust—FORTRAN programs EDGRN/EDCMP”, *Computers & Geosciences*, 32, 1817.
- Watts, P., 2004, Probabilistic predictions of landslide tsunamis off southern California: *Marine Geology*, v. 203, p. 281–301.


## **Appendix A. Offshore Tsunami Hazard Curves**

Each plot shows that hazard curve without aleatory uncertainty (red line) and with aleatory uncertainty included (blue line).


# Cape\_Mendocino - 235.585/40.383/45.000




# Crescent\_City - 235.713/41.750/23.000




# Dana\_Point - 242.255/33.483/41.000




# DCPP - 239.150/35.185/35.000



# Fort\_Bragg - 236.174/39.483/27.000




# Golden\_Gate - 237.350/37.800/23.000







# Half\_Moon\_Bay - 237.522/37.350/37.000




# Humboldt\_Bay - 235.717/40.779/43.000




# Klamath - 235.834/41.517/27.000




La\_Jolla - 242.700/32.783/27.000




# Monterey - 238.049/36.550/35.000




# Morro\_Bay - 239.115/35.350/33.000



# Newport\_Beach - 241.983/33.633/27.000




# Oceanside - 242.617/33.134/41.000







Orick - 235.834/41.250/27.000




# Oxnard - 240.083/34.418/29.000




# Pacifica - 237.426/37.583/33.000




# Pismo\_Beach - 239.284/35.121/35.000




# Point\_Arena - 236.237/38.950/39.000




# Port\_San\_Luis - 239.239/35.150/23.000



# Redondo\_Beach - 241.583/33.825/27.000




# San\_Clemente - 242.343/33.417/17.000







# San\_Diego - 242.800/32.550/27.000




# San\_Pedro - 241.817/33.717/19.000




# Santa\_Barbara - 240.750/34.137/17.000




# Santa\_Cruz - 237.983/36.962/17.000



# Santa\_Monica - 241.483/33.987/27.000




# Venice - 241.455/34.017/21.000




## **Appendix B.      Source and Magnitude Disaggregation**

# Cape\_Mendocino-72yr







# Cape\_Mendocino-475yr




# Cape\_Mendocino-975yr




# Cape\_Mendocino-2475yr




# Crescent\_City-72yr




Crescent\_City-475yr




Crescent\_City-975yr



Crescent\_City-2475yr




# Dana\_Point-72yr







# Dana\_Point-475yr




# Dana\_Point-975yr




# Dana\_Point-2475yr




# DCPP-72yr




# DCPP-475yr




# DCPP-975yr



DCPP-2475yr




# Fort\_Bragg-72yr







# Fort\_Bragg-475yr




Fort\_Bragg-975yr




Fort\_Bragg-2475yr




# Golden\_Gate-72yr




# Golden\_Gate-475yr




# Golden\_Gate-975yr



# Golden\_Gate-2475yr




# Half\_Moon\_Bay-72yr







# Half\_Moon\_Bay-475yr




# Half\_Moon\_Bay-975yr




# Half\_Moon\_Bay-2475yr




# Humboldt\_Bay-72yr




# Humboldt\_Bay-475yr




# Humboldt\_Bay-975yr



# Humboldt\_Bay-2475yr




Klamath-72yr







# Klamath-475yr




# Klamath-975yr




# Klamath-2475yr




# La\_Jolla-72yr




# La\_Jolla-475yr




# La\_Jolla-975yr



# La\_Jolla-2475yr




# Monterey-72yr







# Monterey-475yr




# Monterey-975yr




# Monterey-2475yr




Morro\_Bay-72yr




# Morro\_Bay-475yr




# Morro\_Bay-975yr



# Morro\_Bay-2475yr




# Newport\_Beach-72yr







# Newport\_Beach-475yr




# Newport\_Beach-975yr




# Newport\_Beach-2475yr




# Oceanside-72yr




# Oceanside-475yr




# Oceanside-975yr



# Oceanside-2475yr




# Orick-72yr







# Orick-475yr




# Orick-975yr




# Orick-2475yr




# Oxnard-72yr




# Oxnard-475yr




# Oxnard-975yr



# Oxnard-2475yr




# Pacifica-72yr







# Pacifica-475yr




# Pacifica-975yr




# Pacifica-2475yr




# Pismo\_Beach-72yr




# Pismo\_Beach-475yr




# Pismo\_Beach-975yr



# Pismo\_Beach-2475yr




Point\_Arena-72yr







# Point\_Arena-475yr




# Point\_Arena-975yr




# Point\_Arena-2475yr




# Port\_San\_Luis-72yr




# Port\_San\_Luis-475yr




# Port\_San\_Luis-975yr



# Port\_San\_Luis-2475yr




Redondo\_Beach-72yr







Redondo\_Beach-475yr




Redondo\_Beach-975yr




# Redondo\_Beach-2475yr




# San\_Clemente-72yr




# San\_Clemente-475yr




# San\_Clemente-975yr



# San\_Clemente-2475yr




San\_Diego-72yr







San\_Diego-475yr




San\_Diego-975yr




# San\_Diego-2475yr




# San\_Pedro-72yr




# San\_Pedro-475yr




# San\_Pedro-975yr



San\_Pedro-2475yr




# Santa\_Barbara-72yr







# Santa\_Barbara-475yr




# Santa\_Barbara-975yr




# Santa\_Barbara-2475yr




# Santa\_Cruz-72yr




# Santa\_Cruz-475yr




# Santa\_Cruz-975yr



# Santa\_Cruz-2475yr




# Santa\_Monica-72yr







# Santa\_Monica-475yr




# Santa\_Monica-975yr




Santa\_Monica-2475yr




# Venice-72yr




Venice-475yr



Venice-975yr




# Venice-2475yr




## Appendix C. Subfault Disaggregation




## Cape\_Mendocino - 72 yr disaggregation




## Cape\_Mendocino - 475 yr disaggregation




## Cape\_Mendocino - 975 yr disaggregation




# Cape\_Mendocino - 2475 yr disaggregation




Crescent\_City - 72 yr disaggregation




## Crescent\_City - 475 yr disaggregation



# Crescent\_City - 975 yr disaggregation




Crescent\_City - 2475 yr disaggregation







## Dana\_Point - 72 yr disaggregation




## Dana\_Point - 475 yr disaggregation




# Dana\_Point - 975 yr disaggregation




Dana\_Point - 2475 yr disaggregation




## DCPP - 72 yr disaggregation




## DCPP - 475 yr disaggregation



# DCPP - 975 yr disaggregation




# DCPP - 2475 yr disaggregation







Fort\_Bragg - 72 yr disaggregation




## Fort\_Bragg - 475 yr disaggregation




# Fort\_Bragg - 975 yr disaggregation




# Fort\_Bragg - 2475 yr disaggregation




## Golden\_Gate - 72 yr disaggregation




# Golden\_Gate - 475 yr disaggregation



# Golden\_Gate - 975 yr disaggregation




# Golden\_Gate - 2475 yr disaggregation







## Half\_Moon\_Bay - 72 yr disaggregation




## Half\_Moon\_Bay - 475 yr disaggregation




## Half\_Moon\_Bay - 975 yr disaggregation




# Half\_Moon\_Bay - 2475 yr disaggregation




## Humboldt\_Bay - 72 yr disaggregation




## Humboldt\_Bay - 475 yr disaggregation



# Humboldt\_Bay - 975 yr disaggregation




# Humboldt\_Bay - 2475 yr disaggregation







# Klamath - 72 yr disaggregation




# Klamath - 475 yr disaggregation




# Klamath - 975 yr disaggregation




# Klamath - 2475 yr disaggregation




## La\_Jolla - 72 yr disaggregation




## La\_Jolla - 475 yr disaggregation



## La\_Jolla - 975 yr disaggregation




## La\_Jolla - 2475 yr disaggregation







## Monterey - 72 yr disaggregation




## Monterey - 475 yr disaggregation




## Monterey - 975 yr disaggregation




# Monterey - 2475 yr disaggregation




## Morro\_Bay - 72 yr disaggregation




# Morro\_Bay - 475 yr disaggregation



# Morro\_Bay - 975 yr disaggregation




# Morro\_Bay - 2475 yr disaggregation







# Newport\_Beach - 72 yr disaggregation




# Newport\_Beach - 475 yr disaggregation




## Newport\_Beach - 975 yr disaggregation




# Newport\_Beach - 2475 yr disaggregation




## Oceanside - 72 yr disaggregation




## Oceanside - 475 yr disaggregation



## Oceanside - 975 yr disaggregation




## Oceanside - 2475 yr disaggregation







## Orick - 72 yr disaggregation




## Orick - 475 yr disaggregation




## Orick - 975 yr disaggregation




## Orick - 2475 yr disaggregation




## Oxnard - 72 yr disaggregation




## Oxnard - 475 yr disaggregation



## Oxnard - 975 yr disaggregation




# Oxnard - 2475 yr disaggregation







## Pacifica - 72 yr disaggregation




## Pacifica - 475 yr disaggregation




## Pacifica - 975 yr disaggregation




## Pacifica - 2475 yr disaggregation




# Pismo\_Beach - 72 yr disaggregation




# Pismo\_Beach - 475 yr disaggregation



# Pismo\_Beach - 975 yr disaggregation




# Pismo\_Beach - 2475 yr disaggregation







## Point\_Arena - 72 yr disaggregation




# Point\_Arena - 475 yr disaggregation




# Point\_Arena - 975 yr disaggregation




# Point\_Arena - 2475 yr disaggregation




# Port\_San\_Luis - 72 yr disaggregation




# Port\_San\_Luis - 475 yr disaggregation



# Port\_San\_Luis - 975 yr disaggregation




# Port\_San\_Luis - 2475 yr disaggregation







Redondo\_Beach - 72 yr disaggregation




## Redondo\_Beach - 475 yr disaggregation




## Redondo\_Beach - 975 yr disaggregation




# Redondo\_Beach - 2475 yr disaggregation




## San\_Clemente - 72 yr disaggregation




# San\_Clemente - 475 yr disaggregation



## San\_Clemente - 975 yr disaggregation




# San\_Clemente - 2475 yr disaggregation







## San\_Diego - 72 yr disaggregation




## San\_Diego - 475 yr disaggregation




## San\_Diego - 975 yr disaggregation




# San\_Diego - 2475 yr disaggregation




## San\_Pedro - 72 yr disaggregation




## San\_Pedro - 475 yr disaggregation



## San\_Pedro - 975 yr disaggregation




# San\_Pedro - 2475 yr disaggregation







## Santa\_Barbara - 72 yr disaggregation




# Santa\_Barbara - 475 yr disaggregation




## Santa\_Barbara - 975 yr disaggregation




## Santa\_Barbara - 2475 yr disaggregation




## Santa\_Cruz - 72 yr disaggregation




## Santa\_Cruz - 475 yr disaggregation



# Santa\_Cruz - 975 yr disaggregation




Santa\_Cruz - 2475 yr disaggregation







Santa\_Monica - 72 yr disaggregation




Santa\_Monica - 475 yr disaggregation




Santa\_Monica - 975 yr disaggregation




# Santa\_Monica - 2475 yr disaggregation




## Venice - 72 yr disaggregation




## Venice - 475 yr disaggregation



## Venice - 975 yr disaggregation



## Venice - 2475 yr disaggregation





## PEER REPORTS

PEER reports are available individually or by yearly subscription. PEER reports can be ordered at [http://peer.berkeley.edu/publications/peer\\_reports.html](http://peer.berkeley.edu/publications/peer_reports.html) or by contacting the Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center, 1301 South 46<sup>th</sup> Street, Richmond, CA 94804-4698. Tel.: (510) 665-3448; Fax: (510) 665-3456; Email: [peer\\_editor@berkeley.edu](mailto:peer_editor@berkeley.edu)

- PEER 2010/04** *Application Guide for the Design of Flexible and Rigid Bus Connections between Substation Equipment Subjected to Earthquakes.* Jean-Bernard Dastous and Armen Der Kiureghian. September 2010.
- PEER 2010/03** *Shear Wave Velocity as a Statistical Function of Standard Penetration Test Resistance and Vertical Effective Stress at Caltrans Bridge Sites.* Scott J. Brandenburg, Naresh Bellana, and Thomas Shantz. June 2010.
- PEER 2010/02** *Stochastic Modeling and Simulation of Ground Motions for Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering.* Sanaz Rezaeian and Armen Der Kiureghian. June 2010.
- PEER 2010/01** *Structural Response and Cost Characterization of Bridge Construction Using Seismic Performance Enhancement Strategies.* Ady Aviram, Božidar Stojadinović, Gustavo J. Parra-Montesinos, and Kevin R. Mackie. March 2010.
- PEER 2009/03** *The Integration of Experimental and Simulation Data in the Study of Reinforced Concrete Bridge Systems Including Soil-Foundation-Structure Interaction.* Matthew Dryden and Gregory L. Fenves. November 2009.
- PEER 2009/02** *Improving Earthquake Mitigation through Innovations and Applications in Seismic Science, Engineering, Communication, and Response. Proceedings of a U.S.-Iran Seismic Workshop.* October 2009.
- PEER 2009/01** *Evaluation of Ground Motion Selection and Modification Methods: Predicting Median Interstory Drift Response of Buildings.* Curt B. Haselton, Ed. June 2009.
- PEER 2008/10** *Technical Manual for Strata.* Albert R. Kottke and Ellen M. Rathje. February 2009.
- PEER 2008/09** *NGA Model for Average Horizontal Component of Peak Ground Motion and Response Spectra.* Brian S.-J. Chiou and Robert R. Youngs. November 2008.
- PEER 2008/08** *Toward Earthquake-Resistant Design of Concentrically Braced Steel Structures.* Patxi Uriz and Stephen A. Mahin. November 2008.
- PEER 2008/07** *Using OpenSees for Performance-Based Evaluation of Bridges on Liquefiable Soils.* Stephen L. Kramer, Pedro Arduino, and HyungSuk Shin. November 2008.
- PEER 2008/06** *Shaking Table Tests and Numerical Investigation of Self-Centering Reinforced Concrete Bridge Columns.* Hyung IL Jeong, Junichi Sakai, and Stephen A. Mahin. September 2008.
- PEER 2008/05** *Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering Design Evaluation Procedure for Bridge Foundations Undergoing Liquefaction-Induced Lateral Ground Displacement.* Christian A. Ledezma and Jonathan D. Bray. August 2008.
- PEER 2008/04** *Benchmarking of Nonlinear Geotechnical Ground Response Analysis Procedures.* Jonathan P. Stewart, Annie On-Lei Kwok, Youssef M. A. Hashash, Neven Matasovic, Robert Pyke, Zhiliang Wang, and Zhaohui Yang. August 2008.
- PEER 2008/03** *Guidelines for Nonlinear Analysis of Bridge Structures in California.* Ady Aviram, Kevin R. Mackie, and Božidar Stojadinović. August 2008.
- PEER 2008/02** *Treatment of Uncertainties in Seismic-Risk Analysis of Transportation Systems.* Evangelos Stergiou and Anne S. Kiremidjian. July 2008.
- PEER 2008/01** *Seismic Performance Objectives for Tall Buildings.* William T. Holmes, Charles Kircher, William Petak, and Nabih Youssef. August 2008.
- PEER 2007/12** *An Assessment to Benchmark the Seismic Performance of a Code-Conforming Reinforced Concrete Moment-Frame Building.* Curt Haselton, Christine A. Goulet, Judith Mitrani-Reiser, James L. Beck, Gregory G. Deierlein, Keith A. Porter, Jonathan P. Stewart, and Ertugrul Taciroglu. August 2008.
- PEER 2007/11** *Bar Buckling in Reinforced Concrete Bridge Columns.* Wayne A. Brown, Dawn E. Lehman, and John F. Stanton. February 2008.
- PEER 2007/10** *Computational Modeling of Progressive Collapse in Reinforced Concrete Frame Structures.* Mohamed M. Talaat and Khalid M. Mosalam. May 2008.
- PEER 2007/09** *Integrated Probabilistic Performance-Based Evaluation of Benchmark Reinforced Concrete Bridges.* Kevin R. Mackie, John-Michael Wong, and Božidar Stojadinović. January 2008.
- PEER 2007/08** *Assessing Seismic Collapse Safety of Modern Reinforced Concrete Moment-Frame Buildings.* Curt B. Haselton and Gregory G. Deierlein. February 2008.

- PEER 2007/07** *Performance Modeling Strategies for Modern Reinforced Concrete Bridge Columns.* Michael P. Berry and Marc O. Eberhard. April 2008.
- PEER 2007/06** *Development of Improved Procedures for Seismic Design of Buried and Partially Buried Structures.* Linda Al Atik and Nicholas Sitar. June 2007.
- PEER 2007/05** *Uncertainty and Correlation in Seismic Risk Assessment of Transportation Systems.* Renee G. Lee and Anne S. Kiremidjian. July 2007.
- PEER 2007/04** *Numerical Models for Analysis and Performance-Based Design of Shallow Foundations Subjected to Seismic Loading.* Sivapalan Gajan, Tara C. Hutchinson, Bruce L. Kutter, Prishati Raychowdhury, José A. Ugalde, and Jonathan P. Stewart. May 2008.
- PEER 2007/03** *Beam-Column Element Model Calibrated for Predicting Flexural Response Leading to Global Collapse of RC Frame Buildings.* Curt B. Haselton, Abbie B. Liel, Sarah Taylor Lange, and Gregory G. Deierlein. May 2008.
- PEER 2007/02** *Campbell-Bozorgnia NGA Ground Motion Relations for the Geometric Mean Horizontal Component of Peak and Spectral Ground Motion Parameters.* Kenneth W. Campbell and Yousef Bozorgnia. May 2007.
- PEER 2007/01** *Boore-Atkinson NGA Ground Motion Relations for the Geometric Mean Horizontal Component of Peak and Spectral Ground Motion Parameters.* David M. Boore and Gail M. Atkinson. May. May 2007.
- PEER 2006/12** *Societal Implications of Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering.* Peter J. May. May 2007.
- PEER 2006/11** *Probabilistic Seismic Demand Analysis Using Advanced Ground Motion Intensity Measures, Attenuation Relationships, and Near-Fault Effects.* Polsak Tothong and C. Allin Cornell. March 2007.
- PEER 2006/10** *Application of the PEER PBEE Methodology to the I-880 Viaduct.* Sashi Kunnath. February 2007.
- PEER 2006/09** *Quantifying Economic Losses from Travel Forgone Following a Large Metropolitan Earthquake.* James Moore, Sungbin Cho, Yue Yue Fan, and Stuart Werner. November 2006.
- PEER 2006/08** *Vector-Valued Ground Motion Intensity Measures for Probabilistic Seismic Demand Analysis.* Jack W. Baker and C. Allin Cornell. October 2006.
- PEER 2006/07** *Analytical Modeling of Reinforced Concrete Walls for Predicting Flexural and Coupled-Shear-Flexural Responses.* Kutay Orakcal, Leonardo M. Massone, and John W. Wallace. October 2006.
- PEER 2006/06** *Nonlinear Analysis of a Soil-Drilled Pier System under Static and Dynamic Axial Loading.* Gang Wang and Nicholas Sitar. November 2006.
- PEER 2006/05** *Advanced Seismic Assessment Guidelines.* Paolo Bazzurro, C. Allin Cornell, Charles Menun, Maziar Motahari, and Nicolas Luco. September 2006.
- PEER 2006/04** *Probabilistic Seismic Evaluation of Reinforced Concrete Structural Components and Systems.* Tae Hyung Lee and Khalid M. Mosalam. August 2006.
- PEER 2006/03** *Performance of Lifelines Subjected to Lateral Spreading.* Scott A. Ashford and Teerawut Juirnarongrit. July 2006.
- PEER 2006/02** *Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center Highway Demonstration Project.* Anne Kiremidjian, James Moore, Yue Yue Fan, Nesrin Basoz, Ozgur Yazali, and Meredith Williams. April 2006.
- PEER 2006/01** *Bracing Berkeley. A Guide to Seismic Safety on the UC Berkeley Campus.* Mary C. Comerio, Stephen Tobriner, and Ariane Fehrenkamp. January 2006.
- PEER 2005/16** *Seismic Response and Reliability of Electrical Substation Equipment and Systems.* Junho Song, Armen Der Kiureghian, and Jerome L. Sackman. April 2006.
- PEER 2005/15** *CPT-Based Probabilistic Assessment of Seismic Soil Liquefaction Initiation.* R. E. S. Moss, R. B. Seed, R. E. Kayen, J. P. Stewart, and A. Der Kiureghian. April 2006.
- PEER 2005/14** *Workshop on Modeling of Nonlinear Cyclic Load-Deformation Behavior of Shallow Foundations.* Bruce L. Kutter, Geoffrey Martin, Tara Hutchinson, Chad Harden, Sivapalan Gajan, and Justin Phalen. March 2006.
- PEER 2005/13** *Stochastic Characterization and Decision Bases under Time-Dependent Aftershock Risk in Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering.* Gee Liek Yeo and C. Allin Cornell. July 2005.
- PEER 2005/12** *PEER Testbed Study on a Laboratory Building: Exercising Seismic Performance Assessment.* Mary C. Comerio, editor. November 2005.
- PEER 2005/11** *Van Nuys Hotel Building Testbed Report: Exercising Seismic Performance Assessment.* Helmut Krawinkler, editor. October 2005.
- PEER 2005/10** *First NEES/E-Defense Workshop on Collapse Simulation of Reinforced Concrete Building Structures.* September 2005.

- PEER 2005/09** *Test Applications of Advanced Seismic Assessment Guidelines.* Joe Maffei, Karl Telleen, Danya Mohr, William Holmes, and Yuki Nakayama. August 2006.
- PEER 2005/08** *Damage Accumulation in Lightly Confined Reinforced Concrete Bridge Columns.* R. Tyler Ranf, Jared M. Nelson, Zach Price, Marc O. Eberhard, and John F. Stanton. April 2006.
- PEER 2005/07** *Experimental and Analytical Studies on the Seismic Response of Freestanding and Anchored Laboratory Equipment.* Dimitrios Konstantinidis and Nicos Makris. January 2005.
- PEER 2005/06** *Global Collapse of Frame Structures under Seismic Excitations.* Luis F. Ibarra and Helmut Krawinkler. September 2005.
- PEER 2005/05** *Performance Characterization of Bench- and Shelf-Mounted Equipment.* Samit Ray Chaudhuri and Tara C. Hutchinson. May 2006.
- PEER 2005/04** *Numerical Modeling of the Nonlinear Cyclic Response of Shallow Foundations.* Chad Harden, Tara Hutchinson, Geoffrey R. Martin, and Bruce L. Kutter. August 2005.
- PEER 2005/03** *A Taxonomy of Building Components for Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering.* Keith A. Porter. September 2005.
- PEER 2005/02** *Fragility Basis for California Highway Overpass Bridge Seismic Decision Making.* Kevin R. Mackie and Božidar Stojadinović. June 2005.
- PEER 2005/01** *Empirical Characterization of Site Conditions on Strong Ground Motion.* Jonathan P. Stewart, Yoojoong Choi, and Robert W. Graves. June 2005.
- PEER 2004/09** *Electrical Substation Equipment Interaction: Experimental Rigid Conductor Studies.* Christopher Stearns and André Filiatrault. February 2005.
- PEER 2004/08** *Seismic Qualification and Fragility Testing of Line Break 550-kV Disconnect Switches.* Shakhzod M. Takhirov, Gregory L. Fenves, and Eric Fujisaki. January 2005.
- PEER 2004/07** *Ground Motions for Earthquake Simulator Qualification of Electrical Substation Equipment.* Shakhzod M. Takhirov, Gregory L. Fenves, Eric Fujisaki, and Don Clyde. January 2005.
- PEER 2004/06** *Performance-Based Regulation and Regulatory Regimes.* Peter J. May and Chris Koski. September 2004.
- PEER 2004/05** *Performance-Based Seismic Design Concepts and Implementation: Proceedings of an International Workshop.* Peter Fajfar and Helmut Krawinkler, editors. September 2004.
- PEER 2004/04** *Seismic Performance of an Instrumented Tilt-up Wall Building.* James C. Anderson and Vitelmo V. Bertero. July 2004.
- PEER 2004/03** *Evaluation and Application of Concrete Tilt-up Assessment Methodologies.* Timothy Graf and James O. Malley. October 2004.
- PEER 2004/02** *Analytical Investigations of New Methods for Reducing Residual Displacements of Reinforced Concrete Bridge Columns.* Junichi Sakai and Stephen A. Mahin. August 2004.
- PEER 2004/01** *Seismic Performance of Masonry Buildings and Design Implications.* Kerri Anne Taeko Tokoro, James C. Anderson, and Vitelmo V. Bertero. February 2004.
- PEER 2003/18** *Performance Models for Flexural Damage in Reinforced Concrete Columns.* Michael Berry and Marc Eberhard. August 2003.
- PEER 2003/17** *Predicting Earthquake Damage in Older Reinforced Concrete Beam-Column Joints.* Catherine Pagni and Laura Lowes. October 2004.
- PEER 2003/16** *Seismic Demands for Performance-Based Design of Bridges.* Kevin Mackie and Božidar Stojadinović. August 2003.
- PEER 2003/15** *Seismic Demands for Nondeteriorating Frame Structures and Their Dependence on Ground Motions.* Ricardo Antonio Medina and Helmut Krawinkler. May 2004.
- PEER 2003/14** *Finite Element Reliability and Sensitivity Methods for Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering.* Terje Haukaas and Armen Der Kiureghian. April 2004.
- PEER 2003/13** *Effects of Connection Hysteretic Degradation on the Seismic Behavior of Steel Moment-Resisting Frames.* Janise E. Rodgers and Stephen A. Mahin. March 2004.
- PEER 2003/12** *Implementation Manual for the Seismic Protection of Laboratory Contents: Format and Case Studies.* William T. Holmes and Mary C. Comerio. October 2003.
- PEER 2003/11** *Fifth U.S.-Japan Workshop on Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering Methodology for Reinforced Concrete Building Structures.* February 2004.

- PEER 2003/10** *A Beam-Column Joint Model for Simulating the Earthquake Response of Reinforced Concrete Frames.* Laura N. Lowes, Nilanjan Mitra, and Arash Altoontash. February 2004.
- PEER 2003/09** *Sequencing Repairs after an Earthquake: An Economic Approach.* Marco Casari and Simon J. Wilkie. April 2004.
- PEER 2003/08** *A Technical Framework for Probability-Based Demand and Capacity Factor Design (DCFD) Seismic Formats.* Fatemeh Jalayer and C. Allin Cornell. November 2003.
- PEER 2003/07** *Uncertainty Specification and Propagation for Loss Estimation Using FOSM Methods.* Jack W. Baker and C. Allin Cornell. September 2003.
- PEER 2003/06** *Performance of Circular Reinforced Concrete Bridge Columns under Bidirectional Earthquake Loading.* Mahmoud M. Hachem, Stephen A. Mahin, and Jack P. Moehle. February 2003.
- PEER 2003/05** *Response Assessment for Building-Specific Loss Estimation.* Eduardo Miranda and Shahram Taghavi. September 2003.
- PEER 2003/04** *Experimental Assessment of Columns with Short Lap Splices Subjected to Cyclic Loads.* Murat Melek, John W. Wallace, and Joel Conte. April 2003.
- PEER 2003/03** *Probabilistic Response Assessment for Building-Specific Loss Estimation.* Eduardo Miranda and Hesameddin Aslani. September 2003.
- PEER 2003/02** *Software Framework for Collaborative Development of Nonlinear Dynamic Analysis Program.* Jun Peng and Kincho H. Law. September 2003.
- PEER 2003/01** *Shake Table Tests and Analytical Studies on the Gravity Load Collapse of Reinforced Concrete Frames.* Kenneth John Elwood and Jack P. Moehle. November 2003.
- PEER 2002/24** *Performance of Beam to Column Bridge Joints Subjected to a Large Velocity Pulse.* Natalie Gibson, André Filiatrault, and Scott A. Ashford. April 2002.
- PEER 2002/23** *Effects of Large Velocity Pulses on Reinforced Concrete Bridge Columns.* Greg L. Orozco and Scott A. Ashford. April 2002.
- PEER 2002/22** *Characterization of Large Velocity Pulses for Laboratory Testing.* Kenneth E. Cox and Scott A. Ashford. April 2002.
- PEER 2002/21** *Fourth U.S.-Japan Workshop on Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering Methodology for Reinforced Concrete Building Structures.* December 2002.
- PEER 2002/20** *Barriers to Adoption and Implementation of PBEE Innovations.* Peter J. May. August 2002.
- PEER 2002/19** *Economic-Engineered Integrated Models for Earthquakes: Socioeconomic Impacts.* Peter Gordon, James E. Moore II, and Harry W. Richardson. July 2002.
- PEER 2002/18** *Assessment of Reinforced Concrete Building Exterior Joints with Substandard Details.* Chris P. Pantelides, Jon Hansen, Justin Nadauld, and Lawrence D. Reaveley. May 2002.
- PEER 2002/17** *Structural Characterization and Seismic Response Analysis of a Highway Overcrossing Equipped with Elastomeric Bearings and Fluid Dampers: A Case Study.* Nicos Makris and Jian Zhang. November 2002.
- PEER 2002/16** *Estimation of Uncertainty in Geotechnical Properties for Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering.* Allen L. Jones, Steven L. Kramer, and Pedro Arduino. December 2002.
- PEER 2002/15** *Seismic Behavior of Bridge Columns Subjected to Various Loading Patterns.* Asadollah Esmaeily-Gh. and Yan Xiao. December 2002.
- PEER 2002/14** *Inelastic Seismic Response of Extended Pile Shaft Supported Bridge Structures.* T.C. Hutchinson, R.W. Boulanger, Y.H. Chai, and I.M. Idriss. December 2002.
- PEER 2002/13** *Probabilistic Models and Fragility Estimates for Bridge Components and Systems.* Paolo Gardoni, Armen Der Kiureghian, and Khalid M. Mosalam. June 2002.
- PEER 2002/12** *Effects of Fault Dip and Slip Rake on Near-Source Ground Motions: Why Chi-Chi Was a Relatively Mild M7.6 Earthquake.* Brad T. Aagaard, John F. Hall, and Thomas H. Heaton. December 2002.
- PEER 2002/11** *Analytical and Experimental Study of Fiber-Reinforced Strip Isolators.* James M. Kelly and Shakhzod M. Takhirov. September 2002.
- PEER 2002/10** *Centrifuge Modeling of Settlement and Lateral Spreading with Comparisons to Numerical Analyses.* Sivapalan Gajan and Bruce L. Kutter. January 2003.
- PEER 2002/09** *Documentation and Analysis of Field Case Histories of Seismic Compression during the 1994 Northridge, California, Earthquake.* Jonathan P. Stewart, Patrick M. Smith, Daniel H. Whang, and Jonathan D. Bray. October 2002.

- PEER 2002/08** *Component Testing, Stability Analysis and Characterization of Buckling-Restrained Unbonded Braces™*. Cameron Black, Nicos Makris, and Ian Aiken. September 2002.
- PEER 2002/07** *Seismic Performance of Pile-Wharf Connections*. Charles W. Roeder, Robert Graff, Jennifer Soderstrom, and Jun Han Yoo. December 2001.
- PEER 2002/06** *The Use of Benefit-Cost Analysis for Evaluation of Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering Decisions*. Richard O. Zerbe and Anthony Falit-Baiamonte. September 2001.
- PEER 2002/05** *Guidelines, Specifications, and Seismic Performance Characterization of Nonstructural Building Components and Equipment*. André Filiatrault, Constantin Christopoulos, and Christopher Stearns. September 2001.
- PEER 2002/04** *Consortium of Organizations for Strong-Motion Observation Systems and the Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center Lifelines Program: Invited Workshop on Archiving and Web Dissemination of Geotechnical Data, 4–5 October 2001*. September 2002.
- PEER 2002/03** *Investigation of Sensitivity of Building Loss Estimates to Major Uncertain Variables for the Van Nuys Testbed*. Keith A. Porter, James L. Beck, and Rustem V. Shaikhutdinov. August 2002.
- PEER 2002/02** *The Third U.S.-Japan Workshop on Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering Methodology for Reinforced Concrete Building Structures*. July 2002.
- PEER 2002/01** *Nonstructural Loss Estimation: The UC Berkeley Case Study*. Mary C. Comerio and John C. Stallmeyer. December 2001.
- PEER 2001/16** *Statistics of SDF-System Estimate of Roof Displacement for Pushover Analysis of Buildings*. Anil K. Chopra, Rakesh K. Goel, and Chatpan Chintanapakdee. December 2001.
- PEER 2001/15** *Damage to Bridges during the 2001 Nisqually Earthquake*. R. Tyler Ranf, Marc O. Eberhard, and Michael P. Berry. November 2001.
- PEER 2001/14** *Rocking Response of Equipment Anchored to a Base Foundation*. Nicos Makris and Cameron J. Black. September 2001.
- PEER 2001/13** *Modeling Soil Liquefaction Hazards for Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering*. Steven L. Kramer and Ahmed-W. Elgamal. February 2001.
- PEER 2001/12** *Development of Geotechnical Capabilities in OpenSees*. Boris Jeremi . September 2001.
- PEER 2001/11** *Analytical and Experimental Study of Fiber-Reinforced Elastomeric Isolators*. James M. Kelly and Shakhzod M. Takhirov. September 2001.
- PEER 2001/10** *Amplification Factors for Spectral Acceleration in Active Regions*. Jonathan P. Stewart, Andrew H. Liu, Yoojoong Choi, and Mehmet B. Baturay. December 2001.
- PEER 2001/09** *Ground Motion Evaluation Procedures for Performance-Based Design*. Jonathan P. Stewart, Shyh-Jeng Chiou, Jonathan D. Bray, Robert W. Graves, Paul G. Somerville, and Norman A. Abrahamson. September 2001.
- PEER 2001/08** *Experimental and Computational Evaluation of Reinforced Concrete Bridge Beam-Column Connections for Seismic Performance*. Clay J. Naito, Jack P. Moehle, and Khalid M. Mosalam. November 2001.
- PEER 2001/07** *The Rocking Spectrum and the Shortcomings of Design Guidelines*. Nicos Makris and Dimitrios Konstantinidis. August 2001.
- PEER 2001/06** *Development of an Electrical Substation Equipment Performance Database for Evaluation of Equipment Fragilities*. Thalia Agnanos. April 1999.
- PEER 2001/05** *Stiffness Analysis of Fiber-Reinforced Elastomeric Isolators*. Hsiang-Chuan Tsai and James M. Kelly. May 2001.
- PEER 2001/04** *Organizational and Societal Considerations for Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering*. Peter J. May. April 2001.
- PEER 2001/03** *A Modal Pushover Analysis Procedure to Estimate Seismic Demands for Buildings: Theory and Preliminary Evaluation*. Anil K. Chopra and Rakesh K. Goel. January 2001.
- PEER 2001/02** *Seismic Response Analysis of Highway Overcrossings Including Soil-Structure Interaction*. Jian Zhang and Nicos Makris. March 2001.
- PEER 2001/01** *Experimental Study of Large Seismic Steel Beam-to-Column Connections*. Egor P. Popov and Shakhzod M. Takhirov. November 2000.
- PEER 2000/10** *The Second U.S.-Japan Workshop on Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering Methodology for Reinforced Concrete Building Structures*. March 2000.

- PEER 2000/09** *Structural Engineering Reconnaissance of the August 17, 1999 Earthquake: Kocaeli (Izmit), Turkey.* Halil Sezen, Kenneth J. Elwood, Andrew S. Whittaker, Khalid Mosalam, John J. Wallace, and John F. Stanton. December 2000.
- PEER 2000/08** *Behavior of Reinforced Concrete Bridge Columns Having Varying Aspect Ratios and Varying Lengths of Confinement.* Anthony J. Calderone, Dawn E. Lehman, and Jack P. Moehle. January 2001.
- PEER 2000/07** *Cover-Plate and Flange-Plate Reinforced Steel Moment-Resisting Connections.* Taejin Kim, Andrew S. Whittaker, Amir S. Gilani, Vitelmo V. Bertero, and Shakhzod M. Takhirov. September 2000.
- PEER 2000/06** *Seismic Evaluation and Analysis of 230-kV Disconnect Switches.* Amir S. J. Gilani, Andrew S. Whittaker, Gregory L. Fenves, Chun-Hao Chen, Henry Ho, and Eric Fujisaki. July 2000.
- PEER 2000/05** *Performance-Based Evaluation of Exterior Reinforced Concrete Building Joints for Seismic Excitation.* Chandra Clyde, Chris P. Pantelides, and Lawrence D. Reaveley. July 2000.
- PEER 2000/04** *An Evaluation of Seismic Energy Demand: An Attenuation Approach.* Chung-Che Chou and Chia-Ming Uang. July 1999.
- PEER 2000/03** *Framing Earthquake Retrofitting Decisions: The Case of Hillside Homes in Los Angeles.* Detlof von Winterfeldt, Nels Roselund, and Alicia Kitsuse. March 2000.
- PEER 2000/02** *U.S.-Japan Workshop on the Effects of Near-Field Earthquake Shaking.* Andrew Whittaker, ed. July 2000.
- PEER 2000/01** *Further Studies on Seismic Interaction in Interconnected Electrical Substation Equipment.* Armen Der Kiureghian, Kee-Jeung Hong, and Jerome L. Sackman. November 1999.
- PEER 1999/14** *Seismic Evaluation and Retrofit of 230-kV Porcelain Transformer Bushings.* Amir S. Gilani, Andrew S. Whittaker, Gregory L. Fenves, and Eric Fujisaki. December 1999.
- PEER 1999/13** *Building Vulnerability Studies: Modeling and Evaluation of Tilt-up and Steel Reinforced Concrete Buildings.* John W. Wallace, Jonathan P. Stewart, and Andrew S. Whittaker, editors. December 1999.
- PEER 1999/12** *Rehabilitation of Nonductile RC Frame Building Using Encasement Plates and Energy-Dissipating Devices.* Mehrdad Sasani, Vitelmo V. Bertero, James C. Anderson. December 1999.
- PEER 1999/11** *Performance Evaluation Database for Concrete Bridge Components and Systems under Simulated Seismic Loads.* Yael D. Hose and Frieder Seible. November 1999.
- PEER 1999/10** *U.S.-Japan Workshop on Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering Methodology for Reinforced Concrete Building Structures.* December 1999.
- PEER 1999/09** *Performance Improvement of Long Period Building Structures Subjected to Severe Pulse-Type Ground Motions.* James C. Anderson, Vitelmo V. Bertero, and Raul Bertero. October 1999.
- PEER 1999/08** *Envelopes for Seismic Response Vectors.* Charles Menun and Armen Der Kiureghian. July 1999.
- PEER 1999/07** *Documentation of Strengths and Weaknesses of Current Computer Analysis Methods for Seismic Performance of Reinforced Concrete Members.* William F. Cofer. November 1999.
- PEER 1999/06** *Rocking Response and Overturning of Anchored Equipment under Seismic Excitations.* Nicos Makris and Jian Zhang. November 1999.
- PEER 1999/05** *Seismic Evaluation of 550 kV Porcelain Transformer Bushings.* Amir S. Gilani, Andrew S. Whittaker, Gregory L. Fenves, and Eric Fujisaki. October 1999.
- PEER 1999/04** *Adoption and Enforcement of Earthquake Risk-Reduction Measures.* Peter J. May, Raymond J. Burby, T. Jens Feeley, and Robert Wood.
- PEER 1999/03** *Task 3 Characterization of Site Response General Site Categories.* Adrian Rodriguez-Marek, Jonathan D. Bray, and Norman Abrahamson. February 1999.
- PEER 1999/02** *Capacity-Demand-Diagram Methods for Estimating Seismic Deformation of Inelastic Structures: SDF Systems.* Anil K. Chopra and Rakesh Goel. April 1999.
- PEER 1999/01** *Interaction in Interconnected Electrical Substation Equipment Subjected to Earthquake Ground Motions.* Armen Der Kiureghian, Jerome L. Sackman, and Kee-Jeung Hong. February 1999.
- PEER 1998/08** *Behavior and Failure Analysis of a Multiple-Frame Highway Bridge in the 1994 Northridge Earthquake.* Gregory L. Fenves and Michael Ellery. December 1998.
- PEER 1998/07** *Empirical Evaluation of Inertial Soil-Structure Interaction Effects.* Jonathan P. Stewart, Raymond B. Seed, and Gregory L. Fenves. November 1998.
- PEER 1998/06** *Effect of Damping Mechanisms on the Response of Seismic Isolated Structures.* Nicos Makris and Shih-Po Chang. November 1998.

- PEER 1998/05** *Rocking Response and Overturning of Equipment under Horizontal Pulse-Type Motions.* Nicos Makris and Yiannis Roussos. October 1998.
- PEER 1998/04** *Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Invitational Workshop Proceedings, May 14–15, 1998: Defining the Links between Planning, Policy Analysis, Economics and Earthquake Engineering.* Mary Comerio and Peter Gordon. September 1998.
- PEER 1998/03** *Repair/Upgrade Procedures for Welded Beam to Column Connections.* James C. Anderson and Xiaojing Duan. May 1998.
- PEER 1998/02** *Seismic Evaluation of 196 kV Porcelain Transformer Bushings.* Amir S. Gilani, Juan W. Chavez, Gregory L. Fenves, and Andrew S. Whittaker. May 1998.
- PEER 1998/01** *Seismic Performance of Well-Confined Concrete Bridge Columns.* Dawn E. Lehman and Jack P. Moehle. December 2000.

## ONLINE REPORTS

The following PEER reports are available by Internet only at [http://peer.berkeley.edu/publications/peer\\_reports.html](http://peer.berkeley.edu/publications/peer_reports.html)

- PEER 2010/111** *Modeling and Acceptance Criteria for Seismic Design and Analysis of Tall Buildings.* October 2010.
- PEER 2010/110** *Seismic Performance Assessment and Probabilistic Repair Cost Analysis of Precast Concrete Cladding Systems for Multistory Buildings.* Jeffrey P. Hunt and Božidar Stojadinovic. November 2010.
- PEER 2010/109** *Report of the Seventh Joint Planning Meeting of NEES/E-Defense Collaboration on Earthquake Engineering. Held at the E-Defense, Miki, and Shin-Kobe, Japan, September 18–19, 2009.* August 2010.
- PEER 2010/108** *Probabilistic Tsunami Hazard in California.* Hong Kie Thio, Paul Somerville, Jascha Polet, preparers. October 2010.
- PEER 2010/107** *Performance and Reliability of Exposed Column Base Plate Connections for Steel Moment-Resisting Frames.* Ady Aviram, Božidar Stojadinovic, and Armen Der Kiureghian. August 2010.
- PEER 2010/106** *Verification of Probabilistic Seismic Hazard Analysis Computer Programs.* Patricia Thomas, Ivan Wong, and Norman Abrahamson. May 2010.
- PEER 2010/105** *Structural Engineering Reconnaissance of the April 6, 2009, Abruzzo, Italy, Earthquake, and Lessons Learned.* M. Selim Güney and Khalid M. Mosalam. April 2010.
- PEER 2010/104** *Simulating the Inelastic Seismic Behavior of Steel Braced Frames, Including the Effects of Low-Cycle Fatigue.* Yuli Huang and Stephen A. Mahin. April 2010.
- PEER 2010/103** *Post-Earthquake Traffic Capacity of Modern Bridges in California.* Vesna Terzic and Božidar Stojadinović. March 2010.
- PEER 2010/102** *Analysis of Cumulative Absolute Velocity (CAV) and JMA Instrumental Seismic Intensity ( $I_{JMA}$ ) Using the PEER–NGA Strong Motion Database.* Kenneth W. Campbell and Yousef Bozorgnia. February 2010.
- PEER 2010/101** *Rocking Response of Bridges on Shallow Foundations.* Jose A. Ugalde, Bruce L. Kutter, Boris Jeremic
- PEER 2009/109** *Simulation and Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering Assessment of Self-Centering Post-Tensioned Concrete Bridge Systems.* Won K. Lee and Sarah L. Billington. December 2009.
- PEER 2009/108** *PEER Lifelines Geotechnical Virtual Data Center.* J. Carl Stepp, Daniel J. Ponti, Loren L. Turner, Jennifer N. Swift, Sean Devlin, Yang Zhu, Jean Benoit, and John Bobbitt. September 2009.
- PEER 2009/107** *Experimental and Computational Evaluation of Current and Innovative In-Span Hinge Details in Reinforced Concrete Box-Girder Bridges: Part 2: Post-Test Analysis and Design Recommendations.* Matias A. Hube and Khalid M. Mosalam. December 2009.
- PEER 2009/106** *Shear Strength Models of Exterior Beam-Column Joints without Transverse Reinforcement.* Sangjoon Park and Khalid M. Mosalam. November 2009.
- PEER 2009/105** *Reduced Uncertainty of Ground Motion Prediction Equations through Bayesian Variance Analysis.* Robb Eric S. Moss. November 2009.
- PEER 2009/104** *Advanced Implementation of Hybrid Simulation.* Andreas H. Schellenberg, Stephen A. Mahin, Gregory L. Fenves. November 2009.
- PEER 2009/103** *Performance Evaluation of Innovative Steel Braced Frames.* T. Y. Yang, Jack P. Moehle, and Božidar Stojadinovic. August 2009.
- PEER 2009/102** *Reinvestigation of Liquefaction and Nonliquefaction Case Histories from the 1976 Tangshan Earthquake.* Robb Eric Moss, Robert E. Kayen, Liyuan Tong, Songyu Liu, Guojun Cai, and Jiaer Wu. August 2009.
- PEER 2009/101** *Report of the First Joint Planning Meeting for the Second Phase of NEES/E-Defense Collaborative Research on Earthquake Engineering.* Stephen A. Mahin et al. July 2009.
- PEER 2008/104** *Experimental and Analytical Study of the Seismic Performance of Retaining Structures.* Linda Al Atik and Nicholas Sitar. January 2009.
- PEER 2008/103** *Experimental and Computational Evaluation of Current and Innovative In-Span Hinge Details in Reinforced Concrete Box-Girder Bridges. Part 1: Experimental Findings and Pre-Test Analysis.* Matias A. Hube and Khalid M. Mosalam. January 2009.
- PEER 2008/102** *Modeling of Unreinforced Masonry Infill Walls Considering In-Plane and Out-of-Plane Interaction.* Stephen Kadsiewicz and Khalid M. Mosalam. January 2009.



- PEER 2008/101** *Seismic Performance Objectives for Tall Buildings.* William T. Holmes, Charles Kircher, William Petak, and Nabih Youssef. August 2008.
- PEER 2007/101** *Generalized Hybrid Simulation Framework for Structural Systems Subjected to Seismic Loading.* Tarek Elkhoraibi and Khalid M. Mosalam. July 2007.
- PEER 2007/100** *Seismic Evaluation of Reinforced Concrete Buildings Including Effects of Masonry Infill Walls.* Alidad Hashemi and Khalid M. Mosalam. July 2007.