

Australian Earthquake Engineering Society 2014 Conference, Nov 21-23, Lorne, Vic.

Deaggregating the differences between seismic hazard assessments at a single site.

M. Leonard, R. Hout, P. Somerville, G. Gibson, D. Sandiford, H. Goldsworthy, E. Lumantarna and S Spiliopoulos.

¹Geoscience Australia, ²The University of Melbourne, ³Risk Frontiers

E-Mail: M.leonard@ga.gov.au

ABSTRACT:

In the last few years there have been several probabilistic seismic hazard assessments (PSHA) of Adelaide. The resulting 500 year PGA obtained are 0.059, 0.067, 0.109 and 0.141. The differences between the first three are readily accounted for by choice of GMPE, how faults are included and differences in recurrence estimation, with each of these having a similar level of importance.

As no GMPEs exist for the Mt Lofty and Flinders Ranges the choices of GMPEs were all based on geological analogies. The choice of at what weighting to include low attenuation, that is a stable continental crust, GMPE was most important.

At a return period of 500 year the inclusion of faults was not necessarily significant. The choice of whether the faults behaved with Characteristic or Gutenberg-Richter recurrence statistics had the highest impact on the hazard with the choice of slip rate the next most important. A low slip rate Characteristic fault, while increasing the hazard for longer return periods (i.e. ≥ 2500 years), results in only a minor increase at 500 years.

The magnitude frequency distribution b-value for the four studies were 1.043, 0.88, 0.915 and 0.724. For the same activity in the magnitude range of 3.0 to 3.5, the activity level at M 6.0 is an order of magnitude higher for a b-value of 0.724 compared to a b-value of 1.043. This increase in activity rate of larger earthquakes significantly increases the hazard.

The average of the first three studies is 0.078 ± 0.022 (0.056 – 0.100) g. This range is reflecting the intrinsic uncertainty in calculating PSHAs where many of the inputs are poorly constrained. The results for the highest hazard level PSHA study (i.e. 0.141g) can be explained by their use of a low b-value (i.e. 0.724).

Introduction

The multiple probabilistic seismic hazard assessments (PSHA) of Adelaide over the last few years by Gibson et al. 2013, Somerville et al. 20013, Hout et al. 2013, and Leonard et al. 2014 have produced 500 year PGA values of 0.141, 0.067, 0.109, and 0.059g respectively. In these four studies 3 different source zonation models, 3 different fault source models, 4 different method-catalogue combinations to estimate recurrence statistics, 4 different combinations of

ground motion prediction equations (GMPE) and 3 different computer programs have been used to estimate the PSHA. Given this diverse range of inputs and the inherent uncertainties in each of the inputs a range is expected. However a range of 2.4 (0.141/0.059) is higher than would normally be expected. Here we investigate the sources of these differences. Table 1 summarizes the four recently published estimates of the 500 year PGA hazard in Adelaide. They range from 0.059 to 0.148g. These are not directly comparable as they all use different source models, fault models, ground motion models and site classes.

Table 1 summary of the four PSHAs of Adelaide undertaken in the last few years

Model	Authors	GMPE	Vs30 m/s	PGA (g)
AUS5	Gibson	Chiou and Young 2008 (CY08) 1.0	1000	0.148
AUS5	Hoult	CY08 0.5, AS08 0.25, CB08 0.25;	760	0.109
GA2013	Leonard	AB06 0.25 CY08 0.25 S09 0.25 A12 0.25	760	0.059
RF2013	Somerville	A12 0.3 S09 0.3 NGA-W 0.4	820-1000	0.062

Recurrence Statistics Estimation

Using GGCat we extract the earthquakes in the Kanmantoo (also known as the Mt Lofty Ranges) source zone and look at the effect of recurrence estimation. The recurrence was estimated using three techniques, Least Squared regression (LR), Maximum Likelihood (ML) and modified Least Squares (MLS). They all give an $A_{2.5}$ of 0.713. Their b is 0.724, 0.960 and 0.972 respectively. The AUS5 model used in the Royal Adelaide Hospital Study (RAHS), Figure 13, used a Least Squares regression and obtained $A_0 = 46.4$ and $b = 0.724$, which gives a $A_{2.5}=0.719$. Brown (2004) in the original AUS5 model used ML to obtain $A_0 = 113.0$ and $b = 0.880$, which gives a $A_{2.5}=0.719$, though b was estimated from the combined Kanmantoo, Kangaroo Island and Spencer zones.

At the magnitude of completeness of M2.5 all the techniques give identical results. However the variation in slope give activity rates at M5.5 of 480×10^{-5} , 165×10^{-5} , 94×10^{-5} and 87×10^{-5} , for $b = 0.724, 0.88, 0.96$ and 0.972 respectively. The AUS5 and GA13 models ($b = 0.724$ & 0.96 and $A_{5.6} = 406 \times 10^{-5}$ and 75×10^{-5}) give a hazard in Adelaide of 0.14 and 0.025 respectively. The factor of 5.4 difference in $A_{5.6}$ results in a difference in PGA of a factor of 5.5. This highlights the importance of accurate estimate of $A_{2.5}$ and particularly b , with a change of 0.1 in b typically changing the hazard by a factor of 2.

GMPE

The hazard level is sensitive to the choice of Ground Motion Prediction Equation (GMPE). The four PSHA analyses we are comparing all used different GMPE models with seven individual GMPEs being used. To measure the sensitivity to the hazard to selection of GMPE(s) we used the Kanmantoo zone, fixing the recurrences rates to $A_{3.5}=0.1$ and $b = 0.88$. The five individual GMPEs returned a 500 year PGA from 0.0296 to 0.0589 (Table 2), a factor of 2. As expected,

the four weighted combinations gave a smaller range of 0.304 to 0.0508, being a factor of 1.6. The average PGA of the four combinations is $0.04g \pm 0.01$ at 500 years and $0.138g \pm 0.005$ at 2500 years.

Table 2 the effect of GMPE on PGA

GMPE	PGA (g)		GMPEs	PGA (g)	
	500 yr	2500 yr		500 yr	2500 yr
Allen 2012	0.0304	0.1395	GA2013	0.0364	0.1318
AB06_BC	0.0296	0.1089	AUS4 Houlst	0.0508	0.1436
AS08	0.0589	0.1741	RF2013	0.0304	0.1395
CB08	0.0531	0.1443	AUS5 Gibson	0.0407	0.1388
S09_NC	0.0387	0.1223			

Fault Models

Over the last 30 years there have been extensive discussions on how faults should be incorporated into PSHA. The idea that the statistics describing faults behavior is better described as Characteristic rather than Gutenberg-Richter has been around for 30 years (Aki 1983, Schwartz and Coppersmith 1984, Young and Coppersmith 1985). In this model faults tend to rupture in large earthquakes which occupy 50% to 100% of the fault length, with very few small earthquakes occurring on the fault. The approach is mostly used to combine historical seismicity in the region with geologically derived slip-rates and/or recurrence intervals on individual faults. In a review paper Ben-Zion (2003) cites 20 studies covering many different regions which all fitted a Characteristic rather than a Gutenberg-Richter MFD. The evidence is not clear cut with various papers arguing that many particular faults/earthquakes do not fit the Characteristic model (e.g. Kagan et al. 2012). One of the main objections to the Characteristic model is that it has, apparently, lead to researchers dividing long faults into subsections and so excluding the possibility of multiple segments rupturing in a single large earthquake (e.g. 2011 Tohoku Kagan and Jackson 2013). Hecker et al. (2013) using a composite global data set of paleoseismic observations found that the data is more consistent with a Characteristic than a Gutenberg-Richter model.

In several studies of the Flinders Ranges in recent years (Love 2013, Pilia et al. 2013) no correlation between instrumental seismicity and mapped faults has been identified. Similarly no clear relation between the faults in East Gippsland and seismicity has been identified (Sandiford et al. 2012; Brown and Gibson 2004) and there is little correlation between local seismicity and either the Darling Fault or the Lapstone Monocline (e.g. Leonard 2008). This is consistent with the Characteristic model rather than a Gutenberg-Richter model of fault seismicity. In PSHA the common practice is to combine Characteristic faults with G-R zone sources (e.g. California: Field et al., 2009, 2014, Working Group on California Earthquake Probabilities, 1995, 2003;

Italy: Romeo, 2005; Central and Eastern US: Petersen et al., 2008, 2014). For both the Meers fault in Oklahoma and the Cheraw Fault in eastern Colorado a Characteristic fault model is adopted for the US NSHM (Petersen et al. 2014). Based on this evidence we conclude that a Characteristic fault model is more appropriate to Australia than a Gutenberg-Richter model. To test the impact of including faults in a PSHA for Adelaide, a set of faults was adopted and the Characteristic and Gutenberg-Richter models tested. The Fault models adopted were initially based on the faults used in the NRAH PSHA report and then modified slightly based on the latest version of the Geoscience Australia Neotectonics Features database (Clark et al. 2014). None of the faults in the Mt Lofty Ranges are well constrained. Complications include, how long the faults have been active at the current rate, their dip, statistical sampling of random processes, whether the Active~Quiescent fault model (Crone and Machette, 1997; Crone et al., 1997; Crone et al. 2003, Clark et al. 2014) applies here and if so in which phase the fault is currently in.

The current stress field is thought to have been in place since 3-4 Ma (Hillis et al. 2003, Sandiford et al. 2005) when the Olong plateau collided with the Australian plate. However, we consider it open to speculation as to whether this distant event that is orthogonal to the stress field in the Mt Lofty Ranges (Hillis et al. 2003, Clark and Leonard 2003) had a significant effect on the stress field in the Mt Lofty Ranges. In this case the contemporary stress field in the Mt Lofty ranges could be older but how much older is unknown. We have adopted 4 Ma. It is thought that the faults in the Mt Lofty and Flinders Ranges are steeply dipping and we adopt 55°. As there is inadequate data to statistically sample the event rate or where in a, possible, Active~Quiescent fault model any the faults lie we have assumed that our estimate of the slip-rate is the current rate.

Constraining slip-rates

The Milendella and Willunga are the best constrained of the identified faults. The Willunga has 7 ± 1 m vertical in 0.12 Ma, 139 m in 1.7 Ma and 240 m in 15 Ma. This gives fault slip-rates of 70, 100 and 20 m/Ma respectively. These rates are not easily reconciled. Assuming 70 m/Ma for 4 Ma would require negative slip in the previous 11 Ma. One interpretation of the data, which implicitly assumes that there was a major change in the local stress field at 4 Ma, is to take the values of 45 m/Ma for 4 Ma and 5.5 m/Ma for 11 Ma. Another is to adopt the Active~Quiescent model and assume 200 m/Ma for 50 ka and a longterm average slip rate of 15 m/Ma

The Milendella Fault has 30 m in 0.78 Ma and 160 m in 16 Ma. This gives fault slip-rates of 45 and 12 m/Ma respectively. One interpretation of this data is to take the values of 35 m/Ma for 4 Ma and 2.0 m/Ma for 12 Ma. Another is to adopt the Active~Quiescent model and assume 200 m/Ma for 50 ka and a long-term average slip rate of 10 m/Ma. In both cases this leads to a high slip-rate result and a low slip-rate result, with the low slip-rate result being similar to the AUS5 model (Brown 2004, Brown and Gibson 2004) and the NRAH PSHA report.

Based on the work of Sandiford et al 2005 and Clark and McPherson 2011, the most widely accepted model for faults in the Mt Lofty Ranges is that the range bounding faults are slipping more rapidly than the intra-range faults. We have assumed that the range bounding faults are slipping about four times faster than the intra-range faults. Table 3 summarizes faults and gives the high, low and AUS5 slip-rates on the various faults. The EQRM software uses the formulation of Young and Coppersmith (1985) to generate the MFD, from the slip rate, Mmax and Mmin provided. For the zone source model, the Mmax in the Mt Lofty Ranges were reduced from 7.5 to 7.0. For the fault source model, the Mmax is calculated from the full fault length using the scaling relation of Leonard (2014) and Mmin is varied.

Using the Kanmantoo source zone, with $b=0.88$, as the single background source zone we undertook two tests. The first compared various modes of including the high slip-rate characteristic fault source to the source zone. The second included the two fault slip rates as both Characteristic and Gutenberg-Richter faults using a single mode. Table 4 summarizes the results for these tests. The source zone alone produces a PGA of 0.0413 and adding the faults with Mmin set to 4.5, adds 0.0445 for a total PGA of 0.0857(g). Adding the faults with Mmin set to Mmax-1.5 adds 0.010 for a total of 0.0517(g) and increase of 20%. This highlights that even using the Characteristic model, at short return periods the hazard is still dominated by earthquakes in the range M4.5–5.9. In the second test the Fault Mmin was set to 5.3 and Mmax of the Zone was set to 7.0, with the four permutations of high and low slip rate and Characteristic versus G_R tested. The Gutenberg-Richter faults always give much higher hazard levels than Characteristic faults and the hazard level is approximately linear with the slip-rate. In this case the high slip-rate Characteristic model gives a level similar to that of the low slip-rate G-R model.

Table 3 the properties of the faults in the Mt Lofty Ranges.

	Leonard		Slip (m/Myr)		AUS5		
	Length	Mmax	High	Low	Length	Mmax	Slip
Alma	89	7.5	20	4	-	-	-
Bremer	50	7.15	30	5	90	7.5	5
Clarendon	33/45	6.85	30	8	45	7.3	5
Clarendon Cent	20				19	6.6	5
Eden-Burnside Nth	33	6.85	30	8			
Eden-Burns Sth	30	6.78	50	10			
Eden-Burnside					46	7.3	5
Eden-Burnside Cent	30	6.9			19	6.9	5
Encounter Bay	65	7.34	-	-	34	7.1	3
Meadows	51	7.16	-	-	52	7.4	3
Milendella	58	7.26	40	5	-	-	-
Palmer	40	6.99	30	5	99	7.5	5
Para	44/54	7.1	40	9	54	7.5	4

Para Cent.	27				27	6.9	5
Tarlee/Williamstown	38	6.95	20	4	-		-
Willunga	58/82	7.26	40	6	82	7.5	3
Willunga Cent.	35	7.1			35	7.1	4

Table 4 sensitivity of model to Fault and Zone parameters.

Model	PGA Hazard (g)		Model	PGA Hazard (g)	
	500	2500		500	2500
Zone only, Mmax 7.0	0.0413	0.1407	L S/R Ch. Mmin 5.3	0.0433	0.1548
Fault Mmin =4.5	0.0857	0.2753	L S/R GR Mmin 5.3	0.0558	0.2025
Fault Mmin =Mmax-1.5	0.0517	0.1981	H S/R Ch. Mmin 5.3	0.0513	0.2031
Fault Mmin =Mmax-1.0	0.0449	0.1674	H S/R GR Mmin 5.3	0.1186	0.3469

Discussion

Despite the quality of the catalogue in the Adelaide region, recurrence statistics, particularly the b , are subject to significant uncertainties (.e.g. ± 0.1) that results in variations in hazard of a factor of 2. Similarly there is no strong ground motion data from the Flinders and Mt Lofty Ranges with which to constrain or even quantitatively weigh GMPEs. The current selection GMPEs give variations in hazard of a factor of 1.3. This is likely a conservative estimate and if the current “expert opinion” that the Mt Lofty Ranges earthquakes and crust are approximately like California proves to be incorrect then this uncertainty could be higher. Uncertainty in slip-rate can lead to a variation in hazard of a factor of 5 and uncertainty in model type leads to a variation in hazard of 7. Even assuming that the Characteristic model is correct still leaves an uncertainty of 5. These ranges are per source or GMPE or fault. However the hazard in Adelaide has contributions for multiple sources, multiple GMPEs are generally used as are multiple faults. For random noise the error reduces by the \sqrt{n} , where n is the number of samples, in which case an increase by 2 in the number of inputs would reduce the uncertainty by a factor of 1.4. However none of the sources of uncertainty are likely random so applying these simple is unlikely to be fully valid.

~~The relative importance of each for a source only hazard of 0.07(0.05-0.09) g for Adelaide then the fault models add about 0.03(0.01-0.06) for a total of 0.1±0.036g or 0.064-0.136 g.~~

Assuming that the total hazard function is of the form: $Z = SZ*GMPE + FZ*GMPE$, where SZ is the Zone Recurrence Model, FZ is the Fault Recurrence Model and Z is the Total Hazard. Using the standard formula for combining errors (Table 4) requires the error contribution of the two products be evaluated first then the errors combined. Rearranging gives Equation 1 and substituting the various estimates of hazard discussed above (ΔSR , ΔFR and $\Delta GMPE$) and assuming a \sqrt{n} reduction in them, give a total hazard and uncertainty of 0.08 ± 0.08 (g). This is likely a significant over estimate of the uncertainty.

$$\Delta Z^2 = Z^2 \left(SZ^2 \left(\left(\frac{\Delta SR}{SR} \right)^2 + \left(\frac{\Delta GMPE}{GMPE} \right)^2 \right) + FZ^2 \left(\left(\frac{\Delta FR}{FR} \right)^2 + \left(\frac{\Delta GMPE}{GMPE} \right)^2 \right) \right) \quad 1$$

Table 5

Function	Combining Errors
$a = b \cdot c \cdot d$	$\left(\frac{\Delta a}{a} \right)^2 = \left(\frac{\Delta b}{b} \right)^2 + \left(\frac{\Delta c}{c} \right)^2 + \left(\frac{\Delta d}{d} \right)^2$
$a = b + c + d$	$(\Delta a)^2 = (\Delta b)^2 + (\Delta c)^2 + (\Delta d)^2$

Conclusion

Even in Adelaide, which has amongst the best earthquake catalogues and probably the best constrained active faults in Australia, the earthquake hazard is subject to high uncertainties. The four PSHAs undertaken for Adelaide in recent years give a range of 0.059–0.148 g for PGA at 500 year ARP, which gives 0.095 ± 0.04 . The higher of these is now thought to perhaps overestimate the hazard from the faults. The average of the lower three studies is 0.078 ± 0.022 (0.056 –0.100) g. These ranges are reflecting the intrinsic uncertainty in calculating PSHAs where many of the inputs are poorly constrained. In this paper we have shown that the recurrence statistics, selection of GMPEs and fault models all have significant uncertainties. Our attempt to quantify these uncertainties gives results higher (i.e. 0.08 ± 0.08 g) than that suggested by the ranges encompassing the three or four studies.

References

Aki, K. (1984). Asperities, barriers, characteristic earthquakes and strong motion prediction. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth* (1978–2012), 89(B7), 5867-5872.

Clark D. and McPherson A. (2011) Large earthquake recurrence in the Adelaide region: a palaeoseismological perspective *Australian Earthquake Engineering Society* 2011 Conference, 18-20 November, Barossa Valley, South Australia

- Clark, D., McPherson, A. & Allen, T. 2014. Intraplate earthquakes in Australia. *In*: Talwani, P. 697 (ed.) *Intraplate Earthquakes*. Cambridge University Press, New York, 8-49.
- Clark, D., McPherson, A., & Van Dissen, R. (2012). Long-term behaviour of Australian stable continental region (SCR) faults. *Tectonophysics*, 566, 1-30.
- Clark, D., McPherson, A., Cupper, M., Collins, C. & Nelson, G. 2014. The Cadell Fault: a record of temporally clustered morphogenic seismicity in a low-strain intraplate region, south-eastern Australia. *In*: Landgraaf, A. (ed). “*Seismicity, Fault Rupture and Earthquake Hazards in Slowly Deforming Regions*”. Geological Society of London Special Publication XX, In Press.
- Brown, A. and G. Gibson (2004). A multi-tiered earthquake hazard model for Australia. *Tectonophysics* 390, 25-43.
- Ben-Zion, Y. (2008). Collective behavior of earthquakes and faults: Continuum-discrete transitions, progressive evolutionary changes, and different dynamic regimes. *Reviews of Geophysics*, 46(4).
- Ben-Zion, Y., & Sammis, C. G. (2003). Characterization of fault zones. *Pure and Applied Geophysics*, 160(3-4), 677-715
- Crone, A.J., Machette, M.N., 1997. The temporal variability of surface-faulting earthquakes in stable continental regions; a challenge to seismic-hazard assessments. *Abstracts with Programs — Geological Society of America* 29, 71.
- Crone, A.J., Machette, M.N., Bowman, J.R., 1997. Episodic nature of earthquake activity in stable continental regions revealed by palaeoseismicity studies of Australian and North American Quaternary faults. *Australian Journal of Earth Sciences* 44, 203–214.
- Crone, A.J., de Martini, P.M., Machette, M.N., Okumura, K., Prescott, J.R., 2003. Paleoseismicity of two historically quiescent faults in Australia: implications for fault behavior in stable continental regions. *Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America* 93, 1913–1934.
- Field, E. H., Dawson, T. E., Felzer, K. R., Frankel, A. D., Gupta, V., Jordan, T. H., ... & Wills, C. J. (2009). Uniform California earthquake rupture forecast, version 2 (UCERF 2). *Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America*, 99(4), 2053-2107.
- Gibson G. and Dimas V-A. (2013) New Royal Adelaide Hospital Seismic Hazard assessment. Report.
- Gibson G. and Dimas V-A. (2012) New Royal Adelaide Hospital Seismic Hazard assessment. . *Australian Earthquake Engineering Society* 2012 Conference, 18-20 November, Barossa Valley, South Australia

Hall, L., F. Dimer and P. Somerville (2007). A Spatially Distributed Earthquake Source Model for Australia. Proceedings of the Australian Earthquake Engineering Society Conference.

Hecker, S., Abrahamson, N. A., & Wooddell, K. E. (2013). Variability of Displacement at a Point: Implications for Earthquake-Size Distribution and Rupture Hazard on Faults. *Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America*, 103(2A), 651-674.

Kagan Y.Y., Jackson D.D., and Geller R.J. 2012 Characteristic Earthquake Model, 1884–2011, R.I.P. *Seismological Research Letters*, 83, 951-953.

Kagan, Y. Y., & Jackson, D. D. (2013). Tohoku earthquake: A surprise?. *Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America*, 103(2B), 1181-1194

Love D. 2013 Do earthquakes occur on fault-lines? 2013 Proceedings of the Australian Earthquake Engineering Society Conference, 15–17 November, Hobart

Ninis, D. and G. Gibson (2006). Developing a seismotectonic model using neotectonic setting and historical seismicity – application to central NSW Proceedings of the Australian Earthquake Engineering Society Conference, Canberra, 24-26 November.

Petersen, M. D., Frankel, A. D., Harmsen, S. C., Mueller, C. S., Haller, K. M., Wheeler, R. L., ... & Rukstales, K. S. (2008). *Documentation for the 2008 update of the United States national seismic hazard maps*.

Quigley, M.C., Cupper, M.L., Sandiford, M., 2006. Quaternary faults of south-central Australia: palaeoseismicity, slip rates and origin. *Australian Journal of Earth Sciences* 53, 285–301.

Quigley, M., Sandiford, M., Fifield, K., Alimanovic, A., 2007b. Bedrock erosion and relief production in the northern Flinders Ranges, Australia. *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms* 32, 929–944.

Quigley, M.C., Sandiford, M., Cupper, M.L., 2007c. Distinguishing tectonic from climatic controls on range-front sedimentation, Flinders Ranges, South Australia. *Basin Research*.

Quigley, M., Clark, D., Sandiford, M., 2010. Late Cenozoic tectonic geomorphology of Australia. *Geological Society of London Special Publication* 346, 243–265.

Romeo, R. W. (2005). Earthquake hazard in Italy, 2001–2030. *Natural hazards*, 36(3), 383-405.

Sandiford, M., 2003b. Neotectonics of southeastern Australia: linking the Quaternary faulting record with seismicity and in situ stress. In: Hillis, R.R., Müller, D. (Eds.), *Evolution and dynamics of the Australian Plate*: Geological Society of Australia Special Publication, 22, pp. 101–113.

Sandiford, D., Gibson, G., & Rawling, T. (2012, December 11, 2012). The 2012 Moe/Thorpdale earthquake: Preliminary investigation. Paper presented at the Australian Earthquake Engineering Society 2012 Conference, Gold Coast, QLD.

Schwartz, D. P., & Coppersmith, K. J. (1984). Fault behavior and characteristic earthquakes: Examples from the Wasatch and San Andreas fault zones. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth (1978–2012)*, 89(B7), 5681-5698

Somerville, P., Quijada, P., Thio, H.-K., Sandiford, M., Quigley, M., 2008. Contribution of identified active faults to near fault seismic hazard in the Flinders Ranges. Proceedings of the Australian Earthquake Engineering Society Conference, 21–23 November 2008, Ballarat

Youngs, R. R., & Coppersmith, K. J. (1985). Implications of fault slip rates and earthquake recurrence models to probabilistic seismic hazard estimates. *Bulletin of the Seismological society of America*, 75(4), 939-964.