Field, E. H., Jordan, T. H., Page, M. T., Milner, K. R., Shaw, B. E., Dawson, T. E., Biasi, G. P., Parsons, T., Hardebeck, J. L., van der Elst, N., Michael, A. J., Weldon, II, R. J., Powers, P. M., Johnson, K. M., Zeng, Y., Bird, P., Felzer, K. R., van der Elst, N., Madden, C., ... Jackson, D. D. (2017). A Synoptic View of the Third Uniform California Earthquake Rupture Forecast (UCERF3). *Seismological Research Letters*, 88(5), 1259-1267. <https://doi.org/10.1785/0220170045>

Peer reviewed version

Link to published version (if available):
[10.1785/0220170045](https://doi.org/10.1785/0220170045)

[Link to publication record in Explore Bristol Research](#)
PDF-document

This is the author accepted manuscript (AAM). The final published version (version of record) is available online via Seismological Society of America at <http://srl.geoscienceworld.org/content/early/2017/07/07/0220170045>. Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.

University of Bristol - Explore Bristol Research

General rights

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the reference above. Full terms of use are available:
<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/red/research-policy/pure/user-guides/ebr-terms/>

A Synoptic View of the Third Uniform California Earthquake Rupture Forecast (UCERF3)

Edward H. Field, Thomas H. Jordan, Morgan T. Page, Kevin R. Milner, Bruce E. Shaw, Timothy E. Dawson, Glenn P. Biasi, Tom Parsons, Jeanne L. Hardebeck, Andrew J. Michael, Ray J. Weldon II, Peter M. Powers, Kaj M. Johnson, Yuehua Zeng, Peter Bird, Karen R. Felzer, Nicholas van der Elst, Christopher Madden, Ramon Arrowsmith, Maximilian J. Werner, Wayne R. Thatcher, and David D. Jackson

Resubmitted to SRL

Abstract

Probabilistic forecasting of earthquake-producing fault ruptures informs all major decisions aimed at reducing seismic risk and improving earthquake resilience. Earthquake forecasting models rely on two scales of hazard evolution: long-term (decades to centuries) probabilities of fault rupture, constrained by stress renewal statistics, and short-term (hours to years) probabilities of distributed seismicity, constrained by earthquake clustering statistics. Comprehensive datasets on both hazard scales have been integrated into the Uniform California Earthquake Rupture Forecast, Version 3. UCERF3 is the first model to provide self-consistent rupture probabilities over forecasting intervals from less than an hour to more than a century, and the first capable of evaluating the short-term hazards due to multi-event sequences of complex faulting. This paper gives an overview of UCERF3, illustrates the short-term probabilities with aftershock scenarios, and draws some valuable scientific conclusions from the modeling results. In particular, seismic, geologic, and geodetic data, when combined in the UCERF3 framework, reject two types of fault-based models: long-term forecasts constrained to have local Gutenberg-Richter scaling and short-term forecasts that lack stress relaxation by elastic rebound.

* *USGS Peer Review DISCLAIMER:* This draft manuscript is distributed solely for purposes of scientific peer review. Its content is deliberative and predecisional, so it must not be disclosed or released by reviewers. Because the manuscript has not yet been approved for publication by the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), it does not represent any official USGS finding or policy.

26

27

Introduction

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

More than a century of searching has failed to identify diagnostic precursory signals that can reliably predict the occurrence of large earthquakes (Jordan et al., 2011). However, observed seismic activity can constrain the probabilities of future earthquakes at two scales of hazard evolution, the short-term decay of aftershocks caused by abrupt stress perturbations during rupture (e.g., Reasenbergs and Jones, 1989), and the long-term delay needed to reload fault stress after elastic rebound (e.g., WGCEP, 1988). Consistent modeling across both scales of stress evolution is a key requirement for operational earthquake forecasting in seismically active regions (Jordan et al., 2011). The societal need for such models has been underscored by the extensive damage and loss of life resulting from multi-event sequences in Japan, New Zealand, and Italy during the last year alone.

The tectonic reloading of stress by steady block motion, originally postulated by H. F. Reid in his elastic rebound theory (Reid, 1911) and later explained by plate tectonics, has been the basis for a series of fault-specific rupture forecasts developed by the Working Group on California Earthquake Probabilities (e.g., WGCEP, 1988, 2003). California's San Andreas fault system releases most of the plate-boundary strain in strike-slip earthquakes with moment magnitudes M greater than 7.5 and recurrence intervals of a century or more. WGCEP has represented successive large ruptures of a fault by a renewal process with a distribution of inter-event times calibrated against historic and paleoseismic data, using the date of the last event, where it is known, to condition the probability of the next event.

The preceding WGCEP model, UCERF2, restricted fault slip events to full ruptures of predefined fault segments and some contiguous combinations (Field et al., 2009). Moreover, it

generally excluded the possibility of ruptures jumping from one fault to another nearby fault, a phenomenon observed in California and other highly interconnected fault systems (e.g., Wesnousky, 2006). UCERF2 also over-predicted the rate of $6.5 \leq M \leq 7.0$ earthquakes relative to historical seismicity. This “intermediate-magnitude bulge” was reduced relative to previous California models (Frankel et al., 2002), but a discrepancy remained, which WGCEP hypothesized to be an artifact of the segmentation assumptions restricting multi-fault ruptures (Field et al., 2009).

A different class of models, based on aftershock statistics, has been developed for assessing short-term changes in seismic hazard. Examples include the Reasenbergs-Jones model (Reasenbergs and Jones, 1988, 1994), the Short-Term Earthquake Probability (STEP) model (Gerstenberger et al., 2005), and Epidemic-Type Aftershock Sequence (ETAS) models (Ogata, 1988; Helmstetter and Sorenette, 2002). Earthquake activity is represented as a stochastic point process that obeys the observed power-law scaling of aftershock excitation with mainshock size and aftershock decay in space and time (Omori-Utsu statistics). Each event is marked by a moment magnitude M independently drawn from a fixed magnitude-frequency distribution (MFD), usually in the Gutenberg-Richter (GR) form: $\log N = a - bM$, where N is the expected number of events and $b \approx 1$. STEP uses the Reasenbergs-Jones model to forecast average aftershock rate from pre-identified mainshocks, whereas ETAS models aftershocks via Monte Carlo simulations, in which every earthquake is a mainshock with its own aftershocks, explicitly accounting for multiple generations of triggered seismicity (“epidemics”). In both types of models, aftershocks can be larger than the mainshock.

These aftershock models ignore proximity to known faults when specifying the probability of triggering large earthquakes. In addition, aftershock decay and stress-renewal delay exhibit

opposing statistical behaviors with conflicting hazard implications. According to Omori-Utsu clustering, the most likely place for the next event is the location of the most recent one; according to Reid renewal, the least likely fault to rupture is the one that ruptured most recently. Omori-Utsu sequences of aftershocks are more clustered than a Poisson process, whereas Reid sequences of elastic rebounds are more periodic. The new forecasting framework represented in UCERF3 merges these opposing behaviors into a consistent multiscale model by conditioning the short-term ETAS forecast on the long-term Reid forecast.

Uniform California Earthquake Rupture Forecast, Version 3 (UCERF3)

The model comprises three levels of forecasting: a time-independent model, UCERF3-TI (Field et al., 2014); a long-term, time-dependent refinement based on Reid-renewal statistics, UCERF3-TD (Field et al., 2015); and a short-term clustering model, based on ETAS statistics, UCERF3-ETAS (Field et al., 2017). The model is hierarchical in the sense that the TD probabilities are conditioned on the TI model, and the ETAS probabilities are conditioned on the TD model (Figure 1).

UCERF3-TI gives the long-term rates of all earthquakes with $M \geq 2.5$ throughout the California region. Target earthquakes are of two types: “supraseismogenic” ruptures on modeled faults with $M \geq M_{ss}$, where M_{ss} the minimum magnitude of a rupture spanning the seismogenic layer, and “gridded seismicity” from MFDs assigned on a $0.1^\circ \times 0.1^\circ$ geographic mesh. All faults were divided into small subsections with along-strike lengths of about half the down dip width, typically ~ 7 km (Figure 1a). Fault-based ruptures were defined by sets of two or more contiguous subsections, corresponding to $M_{ss} \approx 6.3$. We omitted ruptures that jumped fault gaps exceeding 5 km, a value consistent with the limited observations (Wesnousky, 2006) and supported by rupture simulations (e.g., Harris et al., 1991), and we excluded those that failed a

stress-compatibility test. The number of fault-based ruptures in UCERF3 is ~250,000 compared to ~8,000 in UCERF2. The magnitude of each rupture was computed from empirical scaling relations that relate moment magnitude to rupture area.

A system-wide “grand inversion” simultaneously determined the rates of all ruptures by minimizing a quadratic objective function measuring the model’s misfit to fault slip rates, paleoseismic event rates, and observed seismicity. This underdetermined problem was regularized by smoothness conditions and solved by simulated annealing under appropriate positivity constraints (Page et al., 2014). The inversion approach was less prescriptive than previous methodologies; e.g., it determined the range of MFDs most consistent with available data, rather than assuming a functional form. As expected, relaxing fault segmentation and allowing multi-fault ruptures eliminated the intermediate-magnitude over-prediction (bulge) evident in UCERF2; the consequent transfer of moment release to larger magnitudes increased the 30-year, statewide probability of a $M \geq 8$ earthquake from 4.7% to 7.0%. Other improvements included a revised, more extensive model of active California faults and the inclusion of kinematically consistent deformation models that assimilated both geodetic and geologic data in estimating fault slip rates (Parsons et al., 2013). UCERF3-TI implies that about two thirds of deformation not attributed to defined faults goes into permanent strain not described by purely elastic behavior.

The model was evaluated by applying quantitative and visual measures of its fit to independent data subsets, which were then assessed by expert panels. Expert opinion was also elicited in weighting the 1440 branches of the logic tree used to represent the UCERF3-TI epistemic uncertainties. The hazard obtained by combining the UCERF3-TI model with ground-

117 motion prediction equations has been incorporated into the 2014 revisions of the National
118 Seismic Hazard Maps (Petersen et al., 2014).

119 UCERF3-TD was built by augmenting UCERF3-TI with a composite Reid renewal model
120 that conditioned the rupture probabilities on the “open interval”, defined as the time since a fault
121 subsection last participated in a supraseismogenic event. In UCERF2, the renewal model could
122 be enforced at the fault-segment level, and the probabilities were balanced to approximate slip
123 rates on a fault-by-fault basis (Field et al., 2009). To relax segmentation and include multi-fault
124 ruptures, it was necessary to enforce the UCERF3 renewal statistics at the fault-subsection level
125 and to balance the probabilities at the fault-system level. This was accomplished by a system-
126 wide averaging algorithm that accounted for the variability of the recurrence and open intervals
127 among the fault subsections involved in a specified rupture. On many faults, the date of the last
128 supraseismogenic event is unknown. It is unlikely, however, that such events could have
129 occurred in California without detection after 1875; hence, a 140-year “historic open interval”
130 was used as a lower bound on the date-of-last-event, allowing time-dependent probabilities to be
131 cast for all fault-based ruptures. The renewal model also incorporated magnitude-dependent
132 aperiodicity factors that adjusted the inter-event times of smaller events to be more variable than
133 that of larger ones. Epistemic uncertainties were represented by four levels of temporal
134 predictability specified by aperiodicity factors of a Brownian passage time model (WGCEP,
135 2003) ranging from 0.4 to 1.0.

136 Compared to the TI model, TD probabilities are relatively low on faults where a large event
137 has recently occurred and relatively high where the time since last event exceeds the average
138 recurrence interval (Figure 1b). Places where the rupture probabilities are high compared to the
139 time-independent model include the San Andreas Fault in southern California and the Hayward-

Rogers Creek Fault in northern California, which both show probability gains of about a factor of two.

UCERF3-ETAS represents spatiotemporal clustering, including aftershocks and other triggered earthquake activity, discretized onto a ~ 2 -km mesh. The forecasting statistics for an interval $0 < t \leq T$ are computed from large sets of $M \geq 2.5$ catalogs simulated within the TD framework. Each simulation is initialized at $t = 0$ with an observed or hypothetical $M \geq 2.5$ catalog of past earthquakes. Every earthquake, observed or simulated, is allowed to trigger a set of first-generation aftershocks by Monte Carlo sampling from an ETAS model that has spatial and temporal kernels calibrated to California seismicity (Hardebeck, 2013); they in turn trigger second-generation aftershocks, and so-on for all subsequent generations up to time T .

Earthquakes that occur spontaneously according to UCERF3-TD probabilities, typically $\sim 30\%$ of the total, also trigger aftershocks.

In UCERF3-ETAS, the probabilities of all fault-based supraseismogenic ruptures, including aftershocks, are conditioned by Reid renewal statistics that evolve during the seismic sequence; i.e., the probability of a fault subsection participating in a future event is reduced if that subsection has already participated in a previous event of the sequence. The explicit inclusion of elastic rebound in modeling earthquake sequences is essential to the stability of the UCERF3-ETAS model, as discussed below.

The probabilities of large aftershocks ($M \geq 6.7$) in the week following a scenario $M7$ rupture of the Mojave section of the San Andreas Fault are mapped in Figure 1c as probability gains relative to UCERF3-TD. Relatively high gains (up to ~ 100) extend spatially along nearby faults, not just the high-rate San Andreas but also low-rate faults such as the Cucamonga and Garlock.

A wide variety of metrics for forecasting hazard and loss can be derived from UCERF3-ETAS model, including the likelihood of large earthquakes during multi-event sequences of complex faulting. The number of Monte Carlo simulations needed to obtain stable forecast estimates depends on the metric of interest. Estimates in this paper were derived from ensembles of 10^4 to 4×10^5 catalogs.

Figure 2 shows the UCERF3-ETAS aftershock forecast following a $M6.1$ earthquake on the Parkfield section of the San Andreas Fault and compares it with an equivalent one from an ETAS model that lacks faults. Aftershock nucleation in the former extends along the major faults of the San Andreas system, unlike the smooth, isotropic distribution forecast by the ETAS point-process model. This scenario is particularly interesting because a $M6.1$ foreshock is known to have occurred near Parkfield about two hours before the 1857 Fort Tejon earthquake, an $M7.8$ rupture that propagated down the San Andreas from Parkfield to Cajon Pass (Sieh, 1978; Meltzner and Wald, 1999). According to UCERF3-ETAS, in the first week following the $M6.1$ initial event, the average probability of a $M \geq 7.8$ rupture extending southeastward along the San Andreas to the Mojave South section is 5.8×10^{-3} . In contrast, the probability of a $M \geq 7.8$ rupture extending northwestward through the creeping section to the Peninsula section is 4.0×10^{-4} , more than an order of magnitude lower. The isotropic probability of a $M \geq 7.8$ aftershock from the no-fault ETAS model is 1.2×10^{-3} .

The hierarchical UCERF3 model is complex, and its substantial epistemic uncertainties have yet to be fully investigated. We can nevertheless identify two types of forecasting models within the UCERF3 framework that are rejected by the UCERF3 datasets: long-term models with local GR scaling and short-term models without stress relaxation (elastic rebound).

Inadequacy of Local Gutenberg-Richter Scaling

Below some outer scale $M_{\max}$, the total seismicity of a region as large as northern or southern California can be well described by a Gutenberg-Richter magnitude-frequency distribution (GR-MFD) with a b -value near unity (Felzer, 2013). There has been considerable debate, however, about whether a GR-MFD applies in small regions of high-rate faulting (Ishibe and Shimazaki, 2012; Kagan et al., 2012). An alternative is the “characteristic MFD” hypothesis, stating that the rate of supraseismogenic ruptures on major faults such as the San Andreas is elevated above the GR extrapolation of the small-magnitude seismicity (Youngs and Coppersmith, 1985).

We tested these competing hypotheses by inverting the earthquake-rate data with and without local GR-MFD constraints. Unconstrained inversions obtain acceptable models in which the MFDs of some faults are characteristic while others are “anti-characteristic”; i.e., depleted in large earthquakes relative to the GR extrapolation (e.g. Figure 3a). This behavior can be measured by a characteristic factor, C_M , defined as the cumulative rate of ruptures above some supraseismogenic magnitude $M \geq M_{ss}$, here taken to be 7.0, divided by the extrapolated GR rate. The empirical distribution of C_7 across all subsections has a mean value of 2.18 and a standard deviation of 2.21. More subsections are strongly characteristic (37% with $C_7 > 2.0$) than strongly anti-characteristic (20% with $C_7 < 0.5$). The C_7 values show a positive correlation with moment release; weighting subsections by their moment rates increases the C_7 mean to 3.20. No model with a narrow distribution of C_7 about unity, as required by the local GR hypothesis, produced acceptable fits to the observed fault slip rates and regional event rates (Field et al., 2014).

The UCERF3-TI dataset thus strongly favors the characteristic-MFD hypothesis over the local GR hypothesis. The model corrects for the aseismic creep rate measured locally across

faults (Weldon et al., 2013), as well as the aseismic deformation derived from the geodetic and geologic modeling (Parsons et al., 2013). The corrected slip rates require, on average, significantly higher rates of large earthquakes than predicted by local GR scaling. Explaining the discrepancy in terms of aseismic slip would require a 50% reduction in the average seismic slip rate or a 50% over-prediction of the regional seismicity rates. The former was rejected as a viable alternative by the UCERF3 expert review panel (Field et al., 2014); the latter was rejected by a one-sided test against the empirical MFD for California at the 97.5% confidence level (Felzer, 2013).

In Figure 3, we compare aftershocks in the week following a $M4.8$ mainshock near the southern end of the Coachella section of the San Andreas Fault (characteristic MFD, $C_7 = 5.8$) with those from a $M 4.8$ mainshock on the Borrego segment of the San Jacinto Fault (anti-characteristic MFD, $C_7 = 0.25$). The corresponding probabilities that these events will trigger one or more $M \geq 7.0$ aftershocks are 1.7×10^{-3} and 7.4×10^{-5} , respectively, compared to a GR probability of 3.3×10^{-4} . The probability gains relative to GR, 5.1 and 0.22, directly reflect the characteristic factors. In general, the magnitude distribution of short-term aftershocks from a small mainshock near an active fault is governed by that fault's long-term magnitude probability distribution (Michael, 2012).

For both examples in Figure 3, the UCERF3-TD characteristic factors deviate from unity by more than the UCERF3-TI characteristic factors ($C_7 = 2.1$ and 0.41), illustrating the direct effect of the long-term renewal model on the short-term probabilities. For the Coachella section, where the last large earthquake occurred over 300 years ago, the gain is significant even at small magnitudes; i.e., the one-week probability of one or more $M \geq 4.8$ aftershocks is 0.091,

compared to the standard GR value of 0.05 often used as a seismological rule-of-thumb (Reasenberg and Jones, 1994).

The Need for Elastic Rebound

The applicability of elastic rebound in earthquake forecasting remains controversial (Kagan et al., 2012; Tormann et al., 2015; Bürgmann et al., 2016; Mulargia et al., 2016). In UCERF3-TD, elastic rebound is modeled as a Reid renewal process in which rupture of a fault subsection instantaneously reduces the probability of that subsection participating in a future rupture. If we do not include this elastic rebound in UCERF3-ETAS, the model does not produce realistic earthquake sequences. The ETAS probability density of triggering a new rupture increases with proximity to an old rupture; hence, without a renewal mechanism for lowering the rupture probability, the most likely subsection to rupture is one that has just ruptured. Sequences are then dominated by recurring re-ruptures of the same fault area, which is not observed in nature (Field et al., 2017). Motivated by earlier assertions of this issue (Field, 2011), van der Elst and Shaw (2015) subsequently found that aftershocks larger than the main shock tend to nucleate in the outer regions of the parent aftershock zone, which they interpreted as the inhibition of re-rupturing by stress relaxation.

In UCERF3 simulations, elastic rebound is required to inhibit re-ruptures of faults with characteristic factors as low as unity (i.e., with GR MFDs). Moreover, aftershock sequences near faults with even moderately characteristic MFDs can become unstable without it. Hardebeck's (2013) calibration of ETAS parameters using regional California earthquake catalogs yields an effective branching ratio near its critical value of unity; on average, each event eventually spawns about one other event over infinite time, which implies that almost all events are triggered and very few are spontaneous. When these regional statistics are applied in the vicinity

of faults with high characteristic factors, the local branching ratio exceeds unity, and the sequences exhibit explosive exponential growth. The application of elastic rebound tames this unrealistic growth by lowering the characteristic factor after a rupture.

Figure 4 illustrates the average one-week aftershock nucleation frequencies in the Los Angeles region following a $M7.0$ scenario on the Mojave section of the San Andreas Fault and in the San Francisco region for a $M7.1$ scenario on the Hayward Fault. The former is the same as in Figure 1c, and the latter is similar to the scenario used by the U.S. Geological Survey in its “Haywired” preparedness study (https://www2.usgs.gov/natural_hazards/safrr/projects/haywired.asp, last accessed on April 27, 2017). The aftershock distributions are again extended along the major faults. The aftershock MFDs show probability gains of up to more than two orders of magnitude relative to UCERF3-TD, and their shape differences reflect the characteristic factors and open intervals of the nearby faults.

Figure 4 also illustrates the influence of one important uncertainty—the extent to which smaller aftershocks occurring on the mainshock rupture surface can trigger large fault ruptures. The darker colored bands in Figures 3 and 4 show the range bracketed by the two end-member hypotheses (triggering allowed, or not). The difference can be up to an order of magnitude for the $M7$ Mojave scenario. Limited observations suggest that such triggering is suppressed on recently ruptured faults (van der Elst and Shaw, 2015), but the evidence is far from conclusive with respect to larger ruptures. We have therefore equally weighted these two possibilities to obtain the mean values (solid lines) in Figures 3 and 4.

273

Discussion

274

275

276

277

278

279

280

281

282

283

284

285

286

287

288

289

290

291

292

293

294

295

The hierarchical and modular structure of UCERF3 provides a self-consistent framework for earthquake forecasting across the complete range of temporal and spatial scales, from aftershocks during the first hours following small, spatially distributed events to the largest earthquakes expected on the San Andreas fault system over intervals of many decades.

Relaxation of fault segmentation and allowance of multi-fault ruptures substantially increases the complexity and multiplicity of possible ruptures, reducing the characteristic factors near faults and improving agreement with observed seismicity.

Previous fault-based models have not included aftershocks and other manifestations of earthquake clustering, and ETAS point-process models have not accounted for known faults or stress relaxation during rupture. The novel coupling of Omori-Utsu clustering statistics to Reid renewal statistics permits the estimation of earthquake triggering probabilities conditioned by the proximity of events to active faults, and the resulting model is capable of representing the short-term hazards due to multi-event sequences of complex faulting. The model can be updated with observed seismicity to capture the static or dynamic triggering effects that play out during a particular sequence. The multiscale framework is adaptable to many other continental fault systems, and the short-term component should be applicable to the forecasting of induced seismicity.

UCERF3 is under evaluation by the U. S. Geological Survey as a prototype component of an operational earthquake forecasting system (Field et al., 2016). Proposed validation steps include prospective testing of UCERF3 in the Collaboratory for the Study of Earthquake Predictability (Zecher et al., 2010), evaluation of its consistency with earthquake sequences observed in similar tectonic environments, and comparison of its forecasts with those derived from physics-based

earthquake simulators. Figure 5 shows an example application to the southeastern end of the San Andreas Fault, where the occurrence of small earthquakes in 2009 and 2016 prompted alerts by the California Office of Emergency Services (Jordan and Jones, 2010). The UCERF3-ETAS probability gains decay rapidly, dropping from two orders of magnitude in the first hour to one order of magnitude over the first week for the 2009 event, which raises the question of model valuation. Earthquake forecasts possess no intrinsic societal value; rather, they acquire value through their ability to influence decisions made by the public and decision-makers seeking to mitigate seismic risk (Jordan et al., 2011). The value of the UCERF3 short-term forecasts will need to be ascertained in the context of specific applications.

Data and Resources

All simulation data presented in this paper are available from <http://www.WGCEP.org/UCERF3-ETAS> (last accessed March 2017) and all calculations were made using OpenSHA (<http://www.OpenSHA.org>; last accessed March 2017), which in turn utilizes Generic Mapping Tools (<http://gmt.soest.hawaii.edu> ; last accessed January 2012) and JFree-Chart (<http://www.jfree.org/jfreechart/> ; last accessed March 2012) for making plots.

Acknowledgments

UCERF3 development was supported by the California Earthquake Authority, U. S. Geological Survey, USGS-SCEC Cooperative Agreement G12AC20038, and NSF-SCEC Cooperative Agreement EAR-1033462. Calculations were performed at the Texas Advanced Computing Center and the USC Center for High-Performance Computing and Communications. We thank the USGS Powell Center for Analysis and Synthesis for supporting workshops on UCERF3-ETAS development. We also thank Michael Blanpied, Matt Gerstenberger, and an

anonymous individual for constructive review comments. The Southern California Earthquake Center contribution number for this paper is 7165.

References

- Bürgmann, R., Uchide, N., Hu, Y., Matsuzawa, T. (2016). Tohoku rupture reloaded?, *Nat. Geosci.* **9**, 183-184.
- Felzer, K. R. (2013). Appendix K: The UCERF3 earthquake catalog, *U.S. Geol. Surv. Open-File Rept. 2013-1165-K*, and *California Geol. Surv. Special Rept. 228-K*.
- Field, E. H., T. E. Dawson, K. R. Felzer, A. D. Frankel, V. Gupta, T. H. Jordan, T. Parsons, M. D. Petersen, R. S. Stein, R. J. Weldon II and C. J. Wills (2009). Uniform California Earthquake Rupture Forecast, Version 2 (UCERF 2), *Bull. Seismol. Soc. Am.*, **99**, 2053-2107, doi:10.1785/0120080049.
- Field, E.H. (2011). Aftershock Statistics Constitute the Strongest Evidence for Elastic Rebound in Large Earthquakes, *Abstract S22B-08 presented at 2011 Fall Meeting, AGU*, San Francisco, CA, 5-9 Dec.
- Field, E. H., R. J. Arrowsmith, G. P. Biasi, P. Bird, T. E. Dawson, K. R. Felzer, D. D. Jackson, K. M. Johnson, T. H. Jordan, C. Madden, A. J. Michael, K. R. Milner, M. T. Page, T. Parsons, P. M. Powers, B. E. Shaw, W. R. Thatcher, R. J. Weldon, and Y. Zeng (2014). Uniform California Earthquake Rupture Forecast, version 3 (UCERF3)—The time-independent model, *Bull. Seism. Soc. Am.*, **104**, 1122-1180, doi: 10.1785/0120130164.
- Field, E. H., R. J. Arrowsmith, G. P. Biasi, P. Bird, T. E. Dawson, K. R. Felzer, D. D. Jackson, K. M. Johnson, T. H. Jordan, C. Madden, A. J. Michael, K. R. Milner, M. T. Page, T. Parsons, P. M. Powers, B. E. Shaw, W. R. Thatcher, R. J. Weldon, and Y. Zeng (2015). Long-Term, Time-Dependent Probabilities for the Third Uniform California Earthquake Rupture Forecast (UCERF3), *Bull. Seism. Soc. Am.* **105**, 511–543, doi: 10.1785/0120140093.
- Field, E. H. T. H. Jordan, L. M. Jones, A. J. Michael, M.I L. Blanpied, and Other Workshop Participants (2016). The Potential uses of Operational Earthquake Forecasting, *Seismol. Res. Lett.* **80**, 1-10. doi: 10.1785/0220150174.
- Field, E. H., K. R. Milner, J. L. Hardebeck, M. T. Page, N. van der Elst, T. H. Jordan, A. J. Michael, B. E. Shaw, and M. J. Werner (2017). A Spatiotemporal Clustering Model for the Third Uniform California Earthquake Rupture Forecast (UCERF3-ETAS): Toward an Operational Earthquake Forecast, *Bull. Seism. Soc. Am.* **107**, ???-???, doi: 10.1785/0120160173.
- Frankel, A. D., M. D. Petersen, C. S. Mueller, K. M. Haller, R. L. Wheeler, E. V. Leyendecker, R. L. Wesson, S. C. Harmsen, C. H. Cramer, D. M. Perkins, K. S. Rukstales (2002). Documentation for the 2002 update of the national seismic hazard map, *U.S. Geol. Surv. Open-file Report 2002-420*.
- Gerstenberger, M., S. Wiemer, L. M. Jones, and P. A. Reasenber (2005), Real-time forecasts of tomorrow's earthquakes in California, *Nature*, **435**, 328-331.
- Hardebeck, J. L. (2013). Appendix S: Constraining Epidemic Type Aftershock Sequence (ETAS) Parameters from the Uniform California Earthquake Rupture Forecast, Version 3 Catalog and

361 Validating the ETAS Model for Magnitude 6.5 or Greater Earthquakes, *U.S. Geol. Surv. Open-*
362 *File Rept. 2013-1165-S*, and *California Geol. Surv. Special Rept. 228-S*.

363 Harris, R.A., R.J. Archuleta, and S.M. Day (1991). Fault steps and the dynamic rupture process: 2-D
364 numerical simulations of a spontaneously propagating shear fracture, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, **18**,
365 893-896.

366
367 Helmstetter, A., D. Sornette (2002). Sub-critical and supercritical regimes in epidemic models of
368 earthquake aftershocks, *J. Geophys. Res.*, **107**, 2237.

369
370 Ishibe, T., K. Shimazaki (2-12). Characteristic earthquake model and seismicity around late Quaternary
371 active faults in Japan, *Bull. Seismol. Soc. Am.*, **102**, 1041-1058.

372
373 Jordan, T. H., and L. M. Jones (2010). Operational earthquake forecasting: some thoughts on why and
374 how, *Seism. Res. Lett.* **81** (4), 571–574.

375 Jordan, T. H., Y.-T. Chen, P. Gasparini, R. Madariaga, I. Main, W. Marzocchi, G. Papadopoulos, G.
376 Sobolev, K. Yamaoka, and J. Zschau (2011). Operational earthquake forecasting: state of
377 knowledge and guidelines for implementation, final report of the International Commission on
378 Earthquake Forecasting for Civil Protection, *Annals Geophys.*, **54**(4), 315-391, doi:10.4401/ag-
379 5350.

380 Kagan, Y. Y., D. D. Jackson, and R. J. Geller (2012). Characteristic earthquake model, 1884–2011, RIP,
381 *Seismol. Res. Lett.* **83**, 951–953, doi: 10.1785/0220120107.

382 Meltzner, A. J. and D. J. Wald (1999). Foreshocks and aftershocks of the great 1857 California
383 earthquake, *Bull. Seismol. Soc. Am.* **89**, 1109–1120

384 Michael, A. J. (2012a). Fundamental questions of earthquake statistics and estimation of earthquake
385 probabilities from possible forecshocks, *Bull. Seism. Soc. Am.* **102**, 2547-2562, doi:
386 10.1785/0120090184.

387 Mulargia, F., P. B. Stark, R. J. Geller, s (2016). Why is Probabilistic Seismic Hazard Analysis (PSHA)
388 Still Used?, *Phys. Earth Planet. Int.*, in pres.

389 Newcombe, R. G. (1998). Two-sided confidence intervals for the single proportion: comparison of seven
390 methods, *Statistics in Medicine* **17**, 857-872.

391 Ogata, Y. (1988). Statistical models of point occurrences and residual analysis for point processes, *J. Am.*
392 *Stat. Assoc.* **83**, 9-27.

393 Page, M. T., E. H. Field, K. R. Milner, and P. M. Powers (2014). The UCERF3 Grand Inversion: Solving
394 for the Long-Term Rate of Ruptures in a Fault System, *Bull. Seismol. Soc. Am.* **104**, 1181–1204,
395 doi: 10.1785/0120130180.

396
397 Parsons, T., K. M. Johnson, P. Bird, J. M. Bormann, T. E. Dawson, E. H. Field, W. C. Hammond, T. A.
398 Herring, R. McCaffrey, Z.-K. Shen, W. R. Thatcher, R. J. Weldon, II, and Y. Zeng (2013).
399 Appendix C: Deformation models for UCERF3.3, *U.S. Geol. Surv. Open-File Rept. 2013-1165-*
400 *C*, and *California Geol. Surv. Special Rept. 228-C*.

401
402 Petersen, M. D. (2014). Documentation for the 2014 Update of the United States National Seismic Hazard
403 Maps, *et al.*, *U. S. Geol. Surv. Open-File Report 2014-1091* (2014), 243 pp.

- Reasenber, P. A., and L. M. Jones (1989). Earthquake hazard after a mainshock in California, *Science* **243**, 1173-1176.
- Reasenber, P., and L. Jones (1994). Earthquake aftershocks: update, *Science* **265**, 1251-1252.
- Reid, H. F. (1911). The elastic-rebound theory of earthquakes, *Univ. Calif. Pub. Bull. Dept. Geol. Sci.*, **6**, 413-444.
- Sieh, K. E. (1978). Central California foreshocks of the great 1857 earthquake, *Bull. Seismol. Soc. Am.* **68**, 1731-1749.
- Tormann, T., Enescu, B., Woessner, J., Wiemer, S., 2015. Randomness of megathrust earthquakes implied by rapid stress recovery after the Japan earthquake. *Nat. Geosci.* **8**, 152-158.
- van der Elst, N. J., and B. E. Shaw (2015). Larger aftershocks happen farther away: Nonseparability of magnitude and spatial distributions of aftershocks, *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **42**, 5771-5778, DOI: 10.1002/2015GL064734.
- Weldon II, R. J., D. A. Schmidt, L. J. Austin, E. M. Weldon, and T. E. Dawson (2013b). Appendix D: Compilation of creep rate data for California faults and calculation of moment reduction due to creep.
- Wesnousky, S. G. (2006). Predicting the endpoints of earthquake ruptures, *Nature* **444**, 358-360, doi:10.1038/nature05275.
- Working Group on California Earthquake Probabilities (1988). Probabilities of large earthquakes occurring in California on the San Andreas fault, *U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report*, p. 62.
- Working Group on California Earthquake Probabilities (2003). Earthquake Probabilities in the San Francisco Bay Region: 2002-2031, *USGS Open-File Report 2003-214*.
- Youngs, R. R., K. J. Coppersmith (1985). Implications of fault slip rates and earthquake recurrence models to probabilistic seismic hazard estimates, *Bull. Seismol. Soc. Am.* **75**, 939-964.
- Zechar, J. D., D. Schorlemmer, M. Liukis, J. Yu, F. Euchner, P. J. Maechling, and T. H. Jordan (2010). The Collaboratory for the Study of Earthquake Predictability perspectives on computational earth science, *Concurrency Computat. Pract. Exper.* **22**, 1836-1847, doi: 10.1002/cpe.1519.

Author Mailing Addresses

Edward H. Field
 U.S. Geological Survey, Denver Federal Center
 PO Box 25046, MS 966
 Denver, CO 80225-0046

Thomas H. Jordan
 University of Southern California
 Southern California Earthquake Center

443 3651 Trousdale Parkway #169
444 Los Angeles, California, 90089-0742
445
446 Morgan T. Page
447 U.S. Geological Survey
448 525 S. Wilson Avenue
449 Pasadena, CA 91106
450
451 Kevin R. Milner
452 University of Southern California
453 Southern California Earthquake Center
454 3651 Trousdale Parkway #169
455 Los Angeles, California, 90089-0742
456
457 Bruce E. Shaw
458 Lamont Doherty Earth Observatory
459 Columbia University
460 Palisades, NY 10964
461
462 Timothy E. Dawson
463 California Geological Survey
464 345 Middlefield Road MS 520
465 Menlo Park, CA 94025
466
467 Glenn P. Biasi
468 University of Nevada Reno
469 Nevada Seismological Laboratory MS-174
470 1664 N. Virginia St.
471 Reno, NV 89557
472
473 Tom Parsons
474 U.S. Geological Survey MS 999
475 345 Middlefield Road
476 Menlo Park, CA 94025
477
478 Jeanne L. Hardebeck
479 U.S. Geological Survey MS 977
480 345 Middlefield Road
481 Menlo Park, CA 94025
482
483 Andrew J. Michael
484 U.S. Geological Survey MS 977
485 345 Middlefield Road
486 Menlo Park, CA 94025
487
488 Ray J. Weldon, II

489 Department of Geological Sciences
490 University of Oregon
491 Eugene, OR 97403-1272
492
493 Peter M. Powers
494 U.S. Geological Survey, Denver Federal Center
495 PO Box 25046, MS 966
496 Denver, CO 80225-0046
497
498 Kaj M. Johnson
499 Department of Geological Sciences
500 Indiana University
501 1001 E. 10th St.
502 Bloomington, IN 47405
503
504 Yuehua Zeng
505 U.S. Geological Survey, Denver Federal Center
506 PO Box 25046, MS 966
507 Denver, CO 80225-0046
508
509 Peter Bird
510 Department of Earth, Planetary, & Space Sciences
511 University of California
512 Los Angeles, CA 90095-1567
513
514 Karen R. Felzer
515 U.S. Geological Survey
516 525 S. Wilson Avenue
517 Pasadena, CA 91106
518
519 Nicholas van der Elst
520 U.S. Geological Survey
521 525 S. Wilson Avenue
522 Pasadena, CA 91106
523
524 Christopher Madden
525 College of Earth, Ocean, and Atmospheric Sciences
526 Oregon State University
527 104 CEOAS Administration Building
528 Corvallis, OR 97331-5503
529
530 Ramon J. Arrowsmith
531 Arizona State University
532 School of Earth and Space Exploration
533 PO Box 876004
534 Tempe, AZ 85287-6004

535
536 Maximilian J. Werner
537 School of Earth Sciences and Cabot Institute
538 University of Bristol
539 Wills Memorial Building, Queen's Road
540 Bristol, BS8 1RJ, United Kingdom
541
542 Wayne R. Thatcher
543 U.S. Geological Survey MS 977
544 345 Middlefield Road
545 Menlo Park, CA 94025
546
547 David D. Jackson
548 Department of Earth, Planetary, & Space Sciences
549 University of California
550 Los Angeles, CA 90095-1567
551

552

Figures

Figure 1. (a) TI probabilities that locations in greater California will participate in one or more $M \geq 6.7$ earthquake ruptures during a 30-year interval. Modeled fault subsections are depicted as black-outlined parallelograms. (b) TD participation probability gains relative to TI for $M \geq 6.7$ fault ruptures during the next 30-year interval. (c) ETAS probability gains relative to TI for $M \geq 6.7$ earthquakes during a 7-day interval immediately following a $M7$ scenario on the Mojave section of the San Andreas Fault. Main shock rupture area is outlined in white.

Figure 2. (a) Aftershock nucleation rates following a $M6.1$ earthquake on the Parkfield section of the San Andreas Fault, based on 2×10^5 UCERF3-ETAS simulations. Map shows the average number of $M \geq 2.5$ earthquakes nucleating in $0.02^\circ \times 0.02^\circ$ cells over a 7-day period immediately following the mainshock rupture, which is plotted as a white line. (b) Aftershock nucleation rates following the same $M6.1$ mainshock computed from an equivalent ETAS model with no faults.

Figure 3. (a) Cumulative, long-term magnitude-frequency distributions for a point near the Coachella section of the San Andreas Fault (red) and the Borrego section of the San Jacinto Fault (blue), compared with the regional GR distribution (black). Distributions for the mean TI model (dotted) and mean TD model (solid colored) are averages of the nearby MFDs weighted by the spatial ETAS kernels centered on the events shown in (B). The shaded bands represent the modeling uncertainties. (b) Faults (colored lines) and locations of the M 4.8 mainshock scenarios (red and blue circles). The Coachella hypocenter is offset about 4 km from the fault terminus to mimic the 03/24/09 Bombay Beach event. (c) Expected number of aftershocks forecast during the first week following the M 4.8 Coachella and Borrego scenarios (red and blue, respectively), compared to the regional GR model (black line). The dark and light shaded bounds represent modeling and sampling uncertainties, respectively; the latter are from a Wilson score interval with continuity correction (Newcombe, 1998).

583

584 **Figure 4 (a)** Aftershock nucleation rates following a $M7$ earthquake on the Mojave section of the San Andreas Fault
 585 based on 2×10^5 UCERF3-ETAS simulations. Map shows the average number of $M \geq 2.5$ earthquakes nucleating in
 586 $0.02^\circ \times 0.02^\circ$ cells over a 7-day period immediately following the mainshock (white line). **Inset graph:** MFD for
 587 ruptures with some part inside the dashed box defining the greater Los Angeles area. Red line is the average 7-day
 588 aftershock MFD, where the red shading represents the modeling uncertainty and the gray shading represents
 589 sampling uncertainty. Corresponding 7-day MFDs for UCERF3-TI and UCERF3-TD are black and blue lines,
 590 respectively. **(b)** Same as (a), but for a $M7.1$ mainshock on the Hayward Fault; inset graph pertains to the dashed
 591 box defining the San Francisco Bay Area.

592

594

595 **Figure 5.** Probability of one or more $M \geq 6.7$ earthquakes on the Coachella section of the San Andreas Fault versus
 596 forecast timespan for UCERF3-TI (black line) and UCERF3-TD (blue line). UCERF3-ETAS probabilities following
 597 the $M4.8$ Bombay Beach event of Figure 2 are shown in red, and those following a 2016 swarm are shown in
 598 magenta. The latter start time at 08:30 (local time) on 9/27/2016.

599