




How to Build and Teach with QuakeCaster, an Earthquake Demonstration and Exploration Tool

Kelsey Linton, Menlo High School, Atherton, CA 94027
kelsey.linton@menloschool.org

Ross S. Stein, U.S. Geological Survey, Menlo Park, CA 94025
rstein@usgs.gov

Open-File Report 2011-1158
Version 1.0
2011



U.S. Department of the Interior
U.S. Geological Survey

U.S. Department of the Interior
KEN SALAZAR, Secretary

U.S. Geological Survey
Marcia K. McNutt, Director

U.S. Geological Survey, Reston, Virginia

For product and ordering information:

World Wide Web: <http://www.usgs.gov/pubprod>

Telephone: 1-888-ASK-USGS

For more information on the USGS—the Federal source for science about the Earth, its natural and living resources, natural hazards, and the environment: World Wide Web: <http://www.usgs.gov>

Telephone: 1-888-ASK-USGS

Suggested citation: Linton, K., and Stein. R.S., 2011, How to build and teach with QuakeCaster, an earthquake physics demonstration and exploration tool: U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 2011-XXXX, version 1.0, 30 p. [<http://pubs.usgs.gov/of/2011/XXXX/>].

Any use of trade, product, or firm names is for descriptive purposes only and does not imply endorsement by the U.S. Government.

Although this report is in the public domain, permission must be secured from the individual copyright owners to reproduce any copyrighted material contained within this report.

Contents

Abstract.....	1
QuakeCaster design and purpose.....	2
Demonstrating earthquake principles and testing hypotheses with QuakeCaster.....	2
Coulomb failure, stress triggering, and earthquake interaction.....	4
Examples of QuakeCaster experiments.....	6
QuakeCaster relates to the Parkfield section of the San Andreas Fault.....	10
Measuring the fault friction in QuakeCaster.....	13
Measuring the elasticity of earth’s crust in QuakeCaster.....	13
Audience participation in QuakeCaster experiments.....	13
Conclusion.....	15
Acknowledgments.....	16
References.....	16
Appendix: How to Build QuakeCaster and Parts Buying Guide.....	18
How to teach with QuakeCaster.....	28
Glossary.....	32

How to Build and Teach with QuakeCaster, an Earthquake Demonstration and Exploration Tool

By Kelsey Linton¹ and Ross S. Stein²

¹Menlo High School, Atherton, CA 94027 kelsey.linton@menloschool.org

²U.S. Geological Survey, Menlo Park, CA 94025 rstein@usgs.gov

Abstract

QuakeCaster is an interactive, hands-on teaching model that simulates earthquakes and their interactions along a plate-boundary fault. QuakeCaster contains the minimum number of physical processes needed to demonstrate most observable earthquake features. A winch to steadily reel in a line simulates the steady plate tectonic motions far from the plate boundaries. A granite slider in frictional contact with a porcelain rock-like surface simulates a fault at a plate boundary. A rubber band connecting the line to the slider simulates the elastic character of the earth's crust. By stacking and unstacking sliders and cranking in the winch, one can see the results of changing the shear stress and the clamping stress on a fault. By placing sliders in series with rubber bands between them, one can simulate the interaction of earthquakes along a fault, such as cascading or toggling shocks. By inserting a load scale into the line, one can measure the stress acting on the fault throughout the earthquake cycle. As observed for real earthquakes, QuakeCaster events are neither periodic, time-predictable, or slip-predictable. QuakeCaster produces rare but unreliable 'foreshocks.' When fault gauge builds up, the friction goes to zero and fault creep is seen without large quakes. QuakeCaster events produce very small amounts of fault gouge that strongly alter its behavior, resulting in smaller, more frequent shocks as the gouge accumulates. QuakeCaster is designed so that students or audience members can operate it and record its output. With a stopwatch and ruler one can measure and plot the timing, slip distance, and force results of simulated earthquakes. People of all ages can use the QuakeCaster model to explore hypotheses about earthquake occurrence. QuakeCaster takes several days and about \$500 in materials to build.

QuakeCaster Design and Purpose

QuakeCaster is composed of a 4-foot long porcelain tile with a fishing reel attached at one end. We used a porcelain faux-rock tile rather than granite due to its high friction, much lighter weight, greater durability, and higher fracture toughness. One to three granite blocks, called "sliders," are placed at the opposite end of the tile. The sliders are joined by a rubber band. The fishing line, made of Spectra, is reeled in steadily to the opposite end of the tile and a rubber band joins the line with the first slider. This super-low stretch Spectra line is essentially inelastic at these small loads. The rubber band represents the elasticity of the earth's crust. The fishing reel is oriented so that the force acting on the sliders is horizontal, which means that the line exerts only shear stress on the slider/plate boundary fault system. When the fishing reel is cranked at a constant rate, simulating constant tectonic plate velocity, stress will accumulate due to the friction between the sliders and the porcelain tile. This represents the stress buildup on faults.

Students and the audience can be actively involved in the earthquake experiments. They are able to measure the time between events, the slip distance (which represents earthquake size), force before an event occurs, and force after an event occurs. Despite being a relatively simple model, QuakeCaster is remarkably true to observed earthquake behavior. Thus, students will get a memorable hands-on look at fault stress and fault rupture in the laboratory, and they will understand why it is so difficult to predict

earthquakes in the real world. The size of an earthquake is measured by the seismic moment, which is the fault contact area (here, the 4 x 4" slider surface), times the elastic stiffness (here the stiffness of the rubber band), times the amount of slip (which can be measured in the experiments). The magnitude of an earthquake is proportional to the logarithm of the seismic moment.

Demonstrating Earthquake Principles and Testing Hypotheses with QuakeCaster

A fundamental riddle of earthquake occurrence is that at plate interiors, the tectonic motions are steady, changing only subtly over millions of years. But at plate-boundary faults, the plates are stuck for hundreds of years and then suddenly jerk forward in earthquakes. Why does this happen? The answer, as formulated by Harry F. Reid in 1910 (Reid, 1910) is that the earth's crust is elastic—behaving like a very stiff slab of rubber sliding over a substrate of 'honey.' The crust near the plate-boundary fault is deformed by the plate motion until the stress acting on the fault overcomes the frictional resistance and the fault suddenly slips. For the past century, scientists have sought ways to use this knowledge to predict earthquakes. The four leading earthquake prediction hypotheses, which trend from the most uniform and regular fault behavior to the most irregular and unpredictable, can all be tested with QuakeCaster.

Hypothesis 1: Earthquakes are periodic. This means that the same amount of fault slip is separated by the same amount of time. There is some evidence for this, particularly in the study of the data of very small earthquakes on creeping faults (Schwartz and Coppersmith, 1984) (fig. 1A)

Hypothesis 2: Earthquakes are time-predictable. This means that the larger the amount of fault slip in the last earthquake, the longer the time until the next earthquake. (Shimazaki and Nakata, 1980). (fig. 1B). Another way of stating this hypothesis is that earthquakes occur when the failure stress is reached. This means that when a certain amount of stress accumulates along a fault, an earthquake will occur. (fig. 2A)

Hypothesis 3: Earthquakes are slip-predictable. This means that the longer the time stress accumulates, the greater the amount of fault slip in the next earthquake (fig. 1C). Another way of stating this hypothesis is that earthquakes decrease the amount of stress along a fault to a fixed minimum or to a background amount (Bufe and others, 1977) (fig. 2B)

Hypothesis 4: Earthquakes occur randomly in time and have randomly varying size. This 'Poisson' hypothesis is also widely used, particularly when little information about a fault and its past earthquakes is available (Campbell, 1982).




Figure 1. Expected behavior under three earthquake hypotheses. *A* The top chart illustrates what we would expect to see if earthquakes were periodic. *B* The middle chart illustrates what we would expect to see if earthquakes were time-predictable. *C* The bottom chart illustrates what we would expect to see if earthquakes were slip-predictable. Blue dashed line represents best fit with slip-predictable hypothesis. Red dashed line represents best fit with time-predictable hypothesis.




Figure 2. Failure and minimum stress hypotheses are variations of the slip-predictable and time-predictable hypotheses, but they are stated in terms of fault stress rather than in fault slip. The slope of the diagonal lines is the fault stressing rate; these lines are imperfectly parallel because hand-cranking results in slight variations in fault stress loading rate. *A* QuakeCaster data similar to this record would suggest that the minimum stress is the best indicator of earthquakes because failure stress is too variable. *B* QuakeCaster data similar to this record would suggest that the minimum stress is the best indicator of earthquakes because failure stress is too variable.

Coulomb Failure Criteria, Stress Triggering of Earthquakes, and Earthquake Interaction

QuakeCaster can demonstrate Coulomb failure criteria, which holds that when a fault is close to failure, either increasing the shear stress (by reeling in a bit more line) or decreasing friction by reducing fault clamping (often termed “normal”) stress will promote fault failure. To demonstrate increasing the shear stress, stack two sliders, and reel in the line until the two sliders are on the verge of slipping. Now crank a bit more to trigger an earthquake. To demonstrate reducing fault clamping, reel in the line again until the slider is on the verge of slipping, and lift the top slider. Again it will trigger an earthquake. If the static friction coefficient of the fault is about 0.5, then increasing the shear stress will have twice the impact as unclamping the fault in triggering an earthquake. The Coulomb hypothesis and the concept of stress triggering of earthquakes is explained in plain English in Stein (2003).

QuakeCaster can also demonstrate how earthquakes interact by the transfer of stress along a fault (fig. 3A). We define shear stress as the force divided by the surface area. In QuakeCaster, when the force builds up to 1000 grams, one 4" x 4" slider has a shear stress of roughly 0.96 kPA. With the QuakeCaster model, since the surface area is constant, we can look at force alone. One QuakeCaster experiment that demonstrates stress triggering, involves adding a second slider behind the first. The sliders are joined by a rubber band. When stress overcomes the frictional resistance on the fault, the first slider moves forward, which increases the stress on the second slider. Eventually, the second slider moves forward, and this reduces the restraining force on the first slider, and the first slider moves forward again. We ask the audience to predict which slider will move first, second, third, and fourth. Observers are almost always surprised by the outcome (which changes somewhat from one trial to the next). By making a prediction of their own, they become invested in the outcome and more curious about earthquake interaction along a fault.

Additional accessories can be used to enhance the audience's understanding of earthquake behavior. A ruler can be used to measure the amount of fault slip during earthquakes, a lap-timer stopwatch can measure the time between earthquakes, and a fish-scale (a small dial scale) can be used to measure the force buildup on a fault (fig. 3B).




Figure 3. *A* Attaching sliders in series demonstrates how earthquakes converse with each other through the transfer of stress, sometimes promoting earthquakes and sometimes inhibiting earthquakes. *B* By inserting a small dial scale, students can measure the force buildup on a fault and look at failure stress and minimum stress.

Examples of QuakeCaster Experiments

We ran experiments using QuakeCaster to test the four earthquake hypotheses. First, we performed three trials to measure both the time (in tenths of seconds) between events and to measure the slip distance (in centimeters). This required a minimum of three people. We placed a piece of white electrical tape along the entire length of the side of the porcelain tile. Then, one person reeled at a constant rate (which simulates constant plate motion). One person used a Sharpie pen to mark the slip distance after each event (earthquake). Another person held the stopwatch and recorded the time of each event.

After one trial, we measured the distance between events. We repeated this two more times. The three trial results are shown in figure 4.

For each trial, we calculated the root mean square (RMS) misfit value for each hypothesis (slip-predictable and time-predictable) in order to see how the QuakeCaster data compared to the hypotheses. (To calculate RMS misfit, we first subtracted the predicted slip distance from the observed slip distance for each data point. We squared each result, add all the results together, divided this total amount by the number of data points, and took the square root.) As shown in figure 1, Trial 1 suggests that earthquakes are best predicted by the time-predictable hypothesis. At first glance, the earthquakes in Trial 1 appear to fit the periodic hypothesis. However, the RMS misfit values suggest differently. The RMS misfit value for the slip-predictable hypothesis is 1.70 cm, but the RMS misfit value for the time-predictable hypothesis is 1.40 cm. In contrast, Trial 2 suggests that earthquakes are best predicted by the slip-predictable hypothesis. The RMS misfit for the slip-predictable hypothesis is 1.86 cm and for the time-predictable hypothesis the RMS misfit value is 3.06 cm. Trial 3 suggests, like Trial 1, that earthquakes are best predicted by the time-predictable hypothesis. The RMS misfit value for the slip-predictable hypothesis is 3.18 cm and for the time-predictable hypothesis the RMS misfit value is 2.45 cm. Thus, none of the three trials perfectly matches the slip-predictable, the time-predictable, or the periodic hypotheses. These tests show how difficult it is to accurately predict earthquakes: even when we grossly simplify the likely complexity and variability in the earth, we still do not get regular, predictable earthquakes.




Figure 4. Test trials of the slip-predictable and time-predictable hypotheses. The hypothesis in bold indicates the better agreement with the observations in a given trial. We do not count the time to the first earthquake because the spring starts fully unloaded. *A* Trial 1 data indicate that the time-predictable hypothesis is a better predictor of earthquakes than the slip-predictable hypothesis. *B* Trial 2 data indicate that the slip-predictable hypothesis is a more reliable predictor. *C* Trial 3 data also fit the time-predictable hypothesis. The same slider and the same rubber band were used in each trial. The same person attempted to crank the reel at a constant speed in each trial, while another person marked the fault slip distance and one recorded the times. Any fault gouge (light dusting on the tile) we could see was brushed off after each trial. Then, we calculated the root mean square (RMS) misfit value to determine the best fit of the QuakeCaster data to a hypothesis.

After the testing of the slip- and time-predictability hypotheses, we tested whether failure stress is an accurate predictor of earthquakes. We measured the force with the dial

scale just before an earthquake occurred (failure stress) and measured the force just after an earthquake occurred (minimum stress). This required four people in order to ensure the most accurate data possible. One person turned the reel at a constant rate, one held the stopwatch and recorded the time of each event, one recorded the force just before an event, and one recorded the force immediately after an event. We performed three trials, and the results are shown in figure 5.

For each trial, we calculated the RMS misfit value for the slip- and time-predictable hypotheses in order to see how the QuakeCaster data compared to having a constant failure stress (equivalent to time-predictable) or to having a constant minimum stress (equivalent to slip-predictable). Figure 5 suggests that there is no identifiable failure stress; in all three trials, earthquakes did not occur at the same level of stress. Surprisingly, the trials indicate that the minimum stress is a better predictor of earthquakes than the failure stress. In Trial 1, the force-after RMS misfit value is 80 grams, whereas the force-before value is 210 grams. Again in Trial 2, the RMS misfit value is lower for the force after an earthquake. The RMS misfit value is 55 grams and the force-before value is 198 grams. In Trial 3, the force-after RMS misfit value is 76 grams and the force-before value is 110 grams. However, none of these trials perfectly fit either failure stress hypothesis. It is also surprising that the size of the shocks, as well as the failure and minimum stress, decreased markedly from Trial 1 to Trial 3. We have no good explanation for this, with the possible exception of minute quantities of naturally occurring fault gouge (granite dust) that one can see form on the sliding surface asperities (local high spots), which may reduce frictional properties.

The results of Trial 1 (from Test Trials of Constant Minimum and Failure Stress Hypotheses) are shown in figure 6A, together laboratory data for Westerly granite (D.A. Lockner, in prep) that give comparable results (fig. 6B).




Figure 5. The hypothesis in bold indicates the better agreement with the observations in a given trial. *A* Trial 1 data suggest that minimum stress is a better earthquake predictor than failure stress. *B* Trial 2 data also suggest that minimum stress is a better predictor. *C* In contrast, Trial 3 data suggest that failure stress is a more reliable predictor of earthquakes. The same slider and the same rubber band were used in each trial. The same person attempted to crank the reel at a constant speed in each trial, while one person recorded the force on the spring (grams) before an event, one recorded the force on the spring (grams) after, and one recorded the time. Then, we calculated the root mean square (RMS) misfit value to determine the best fit of the QuakeCaster data to a hypothesis.




Figure 6. Comparison between QuakeCaster and a laboratory experiment on failure stress. *A* QuakeCaster suggests that minimum stress might be a better earthquake predictor than failure stress. *B* A 3-inch diameter cylinder of Westerly granite with a 30 degree saw-cut and 600-grit abrasive lapping of fault surfaces, sheared under constant confining pressure of 50 MPa and a constant loading rate of 0.1 micron/s (D. Lockner, in prep). Here, neither a constant failure stress nor a minimum stress forecasts future laboratory earthquakes. For stress conversion, 1,000 KPa = 1 MPa = 10 bar.

QuakeCaster Relates to the Parkfield Section of the San Andreas Fault

The Parkfield section of the San Andreas Fault is the best documented and the most periodic earthquake sequence known on the planet, but its event sequence is neither time- nor slip-predictable. The Parkfield fault section data, at first glance, appear to be roughly periodic, with magnitude 6 earthquakes roughly every 20-30 years. Christopher Scholz (2002) assessed Parkfield data from an earlier time period, 1850-1988. However, Scholz points out that the 1934 Parkfield earthquake occurred roughly a decade earlier than the average interval, and since his work, we now know that the 2004 Parkfield earthquake struck about 1-2 decades late (fig. 7B). This data emphasizes the fact that even the most predictable earthquakes deviate from slip- or time- dependent hypotheses. Also, Murray and Segall (2002) found that the Parkfield magnitude 6 earthquake is not

time-predictable. Based on the 1850-1966 inter-event times, the most recent earthquake after 1966 should have occurred sometime between 1973 and 1987, but it did not strike until 2004, about 1-2 decades late, and it was also somewhat larger than its recent predecessors. This record emphasizes that even the most predictable earthquakes deviate from slip- or time- dependent hypotheses. If these hypotheses do not fit a simple, seemingly periodic fault, then how can they apply to a larger and more complex fault?

Even though the $M=6$ earthquakes are neither periodic nor the same size and location from one to the next, there is a class of very small shocks ($M=1-3$), known as repeaters. Because their seismic waveforms are so similar, repeaters must occur in the same spot and have the same size and slip. Are these periodic, time-predictable, or slip-predictable? Rubinstein and others (2011) show that they are neither time- nor slip-predictable. Rubinstein and others also show the time history for Parkfield repeating earthquake sequence #1 (fig. 7C). Rubinstein found that these earthquakes failed both the time- and slip- predictable hypotheses, even though they are roughly periodic. It's worth noting that the magnitude of QuakeCaster earthquakes are closer in magnitude to the Parkfield low magnitude repeaters than the repeaters are to the Parkfield magnitude 6 shocks.

A comparison of QuakeCaster Trial 1 (from Test Trials of the Slip-Predictable and Time-Predictable Hypotheses), Parkfield $M\sim 6$ shocks, and Parkfield $M=1-3$ repeaters is shown in figure 7.




Figure 7. Time- and slip-predictability in QuakeCaster and at Parkfield. *A* For QuakeCaster, the hypothesis in bold indicates better agreement with the observations for this trial. *B* The M~6 shocks are neither time- nor slip-predictable. *C* The Parkfield, California repeating M=1-3 earthquakes, known as repeaters, appear to be more periodic. Estimated best-fit lines (blue and red) are drawn in to see how the data compares to slip- and time- predictable hypotheses. The Parkfield section of the San Andreas Fault is one of the most periodic earthquake sequences known, but the Parkfield earthquake sequence is still neither time- nor slip- predictable. Inset map of Parkfield shows location of the San Andreas Fault in the vicinity of Parkfield, California. The red dot is the San Andreas Fault Observatory at Depth drill site.



Figure 8. A student turns the fishing reel at a constant rate, which simulates constant tectonic-plate motion, in order to observe the behavior of a large earthquake, represented by two stacked granite sliders. The granite slider is in frictional contact with the porcelain tile, which represents friction in a fault. The rubber band that joins the slider and the fishing reel simulates the earth's elastic crust. In one experiment, students test expectations for the behavior of large and small earthquakes. Students can observe the earthquake behavior of two sliders compared to the earthquake behavior of just one slider.

Measuring the Fault Friction in QuakeCaster

After running QuakeCaster just once, a light dusting, which represents fault gouge, is visible on the porcelain tile. Fault gouge forms along real faults as a result of friction between fault faces when they slide past each other, grinding rocks into a pulverized powder. After assessing rock samples, Moore and Rymer (2007) found Saponite and talc, in fault gouge within the San Andreas Fault at the SAFOD (San Andreas Fault Observatory at Depth) drill site. These minerals decrease friction within faults and could therefore be responsible for fault creep at shallower (Saponite) and greater (talc) depths along the San Andreas (Moore and Rymer, 2007). Byerlee (1978) also determined that gouge decreases friction. He explains the adhesion theory of friction, which states that surfaces touch at asperities and a great amount of shear stress is needed to overcome their contact.

Rock materials, when dry, have a coefficient of friction of about 0.65 when dry. For wet samples and for samples with fault gouge, the coefficient of friction can be much lower, perhaps as low as 0.2. Using QuakeCaster, students can calculate the coefficient of friction one of two ways. One option is to divide the force before an event by the weight of the slider. Another option is to slowly tilt the porcelain tile until the sliders begin to move down the slanted tile, and then measure the angle between the table and the tile. The tangent of this angle is the coefficient of friction. Our tests have shown a friction of coefficient of about 0.5. However, the coefficient of friction can change during the experiment. For example, if fault gouge accumulates over multiple trials, the coefficient of friction will most likely decrease. After running additional trials, we found evidence of decreased friction due to observed fault gouge. As figure 5 shows, the amount of force necessary to overcome friction decreased over multiple trials.

Measuring the Elasticity of Earth's Crust in QuakeCaster

To determine if the elasticity of the rubber band behaved linearly over the range of forces it was subjected to in QuakeCaster experiments, we calculated the rubber band's stiffness. We did this by attaching a fishing scale to the rubber band, and then hanging weight from the scale. Then we measured how far the rubber band had stretched. If two times the weight is added to the rubber band, the rubber band should also double in length. The elasticity can be determined by dividing the increment in force by the increment in length change.

Audience Participation in QuakeCaster Experiments

Because the audience becomes involved in the earthquake prediction process during experiments, it is easy for them to see why it is so difficult to predict earthquakes. When teaching with QuakeCaster, members of the audience will be asked to predict events based on force and time (fig. 8, 9, 10). For example, audience members will observe the time between events and then will state whether or not they believe the same amount of time passed between these events. Observations are crucial to their understanding of earthquake behavior. Then, audience members will time the actual amount of time between events, which will either confirm or negate their observations. We have used QuakeCaster with college students, middle-school students, and the general public. People have been quite vocal and eager to share their observations and predictions. In some instances, however, audience members have hesitated to share their thoughts for fear of being wrong. The beauty of QuakeCaster, though, is that there is no wrong answer! Observations are part of the prediction process in laboratory and real-life settings.



Figure 9. *A* One student uses the fish scale to record the force before an event and the force immediately after an event, while a second student turns the fishing reel. In this trial, the first student is also timing when each event occurs. However, it is easier to have a third person hold the lap timer, because it becomes difficult for one person to record the force and time. This experiment allows students to see if minimum stress or failure stress is a reliable predictor of earthquakes, as shown in figures 2 and 4. *B* One student marks the rupture length for each event while a second student turns the fishing reel. A piece of white electrical tape was placed along the edge of the porcelain tile. The first student marks the slider's front edge after each event. After marking rupture lengths, students use a ruler to measure the distance between events. That data can be plotted and graphed, as shown in figures 1 and 3.




Figure 10. By attaching a rubber band between two sliders, students can see how earthquakes “converse” with one another through the transfer of stress along a fault. One student can turn the fishing reel, while the other students can observe and record the sliders’ interactions.

Conclusion

We have found that QuakeCaster speaks to middle school students, graduate students, the public, insurance executives, and research seismologists. The QuakeCaster model illuminates earth processes and encourages experimentation while making learning fun. People have been vocal and eager to share their observations, traits that are crucial to scientific inquiry and discovery. By involving audience members in experiments, QuakeCaster makes it easy to see why it is so difficult to predict earthquakes.

The results of QuakeCaster suggest that time- and slip- predictable hypotheses are not always reliable predictors of earthquakes. By carrying out QuakeCaster experiments, students can understand the difficulty scientists have in predicting earthquakes. The earth’s behavior is not uniform, and earthquake occurrences don’t always follow patterns. While we have only run a few tests using QuakeCaster, the model demonstrates how challenging it is to warn the public of the likelihood of an earthquake in a specific time period.

Acknowledgments

We thank Volkan Sevilgen, Jacob DeAngelo, Brian Kilgore, and Benjamin Hankin, and Patty McCrory for advice, innovations, and assistance while we designed, prototyped, and tested QuakeCaster. We thank David Lockner, Diane Moore, and Menlo Middle School science teacher Tammy Cook for perceptive reviews. We are also grateful to Jacob for coming up with its name!

References

Bakun, W.H., and McEvilly, T.V., (1984) Recurrence models and Parkfield, California earthquakes: *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 89, 3051-3058.

- Bufe, C.G., Harsh, P.W., and Burford, R.O., (1977) Steady-state seismic slip -- a precise recurrence model: *Geophysical Research Letters*, 4, 91-94, doi:10.1029/GL004i002p00091.
- Byerlee, J., (1978) Friction of Rocks: *Pure and Applied Geophysics*, v. 116, p. 615-626.
- Campbell, K.W., (1982) Bayesian analysis of extreme earthquake occurrences. Part I. Probabilistic hazard model: *Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America*, v. 72, 5, 1689-705.
- Lockner, D.A., Morrow, D., Moore, D., and Hickman, S.H., (2011) Low strength of deep San Andreas fault gouge from SAFOD core: *Nature*, v. 472, 82-85.
- Moore, Diane E., and Rymer, Michael J., (2007) Talc-bearing serpentinite and the creeping section of the San Andreas fault: *Nature*, v. 448, 795-797.
- Murray, J., and Segall, P., (2002) Testing time-predictable earthquake recurrence by direct measure of strain accumulation and release: *Nature*, v. 419, 287-291, doi:10.1038/nature00984.
- Reid, H.F., (1910) The mechanics of the earthquake, in *Lawson, A.C. ed., The California Earthquake of April 18, 1906: Report of the State Earthquake Investigation Commission*, v. 2, 192.
- Rubinstein, J.L., Ellsworth, W.L., Chen, K.H., and Uchida, N., (2011) The Time and Slip Predictable Models Cannot be Dependably Used to Predict Earthquake Behavior 1: Repeating Earthquakes, manuscript in preparation for *Journal of Geophysical Research*.
- Rubinstein, J.L., Ellsworth, W.L., Beeler, N., Kilgore, B.D., Lockner, D., and Savage, H., (2011) The Time- and Slip-Predictable Models Cannot be Dependably Used to Predict Earthquake Behavior 2: Laboratory Earthquakes, manuscript in preparation for *Journal of Geophysical Research*.
- Scholz, C.H., (2002) *The mechanics of earthquakes and faulting* (2ed.): Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 473.
- Schwartz, D.P. and Coppersmith, K.J., (1984) Fault behavior and characteristic earthquakes: examples from the Wasatch and San Andreas fault zones: *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 89, 5681-5698, doi:10.1029/JB089iB07p05681.
- Shimazaki, K., and Nakata, T., (1980), Time-predictable recurrence model for large earthquakes: *Geophysical Research Letters*, 7, 279-282.
- Stein, R.S., (2003) Earthquake conversations: *Scientific American*, v. 288, 1, 72-79.

Appendix: How to Build QuakeCaster, and Parts Buying Guide

Parts and Equipment:

- 2-3 granite sliders
- 48 x 6 inches porcelain tile
- Sandpaper
- 4-6 photo clips
- Ruler
- Masking tape
- 3M 4200 Marine Adhesive Sealant
- Corvalus 300 casting reel
- Custom 7 3/4 inch handle to replace Corvalus handle
- Drill, screws
- Ronstan Series 19 Slide with Jib Sheet Fairlead and Spring-Loaded Track Stop, C-Track Traveler System, and Plastic End Cap
- 2 small pieces of rubber
- 2 pulleys
- Thin metal wire
- 1 keychain ring
- Layer of cork
- Exacto knife
- Spray-on adhesive
- Size 64 rubber bands
- Force (stress gauge)
- Stopwatch
- Small brush
- White electrical tape
- Marker
- Pelican case
- Extra foam for Pelican case

Step 1:

- Gather materials.
 - Obtain at least 2 granite sliders. Each should be approximately 4 x 4 inches in length and width and between 1 and 1 1/2 inches thick.

Step 2:

- Cut porcelain tile to desired length. This must be done by a tile-cutting company. In this experiment the tile is 48 x 6 inches. Tile should be at least 24 inches long in order to see the full experiment.

Step 3:

- Prepare the sliders for use.
 - Using sandpaper, roughen the backs of 2 photo clips.
 - Using a ruler, mark the center of one side of a slider. Also mark the center of the opposite side.
 - Use a big dollop of 3M 4200 Marine Adhesive Sealant on the back of one photo clip. Attach it to the center of one slider's side. Let dry. Repeat for second photo clip and opposite side.
 - Repeat previous step for second slider.



Photo clip attached to side of granite slider.



Granite sliders. Each slider is 4 x 4 inches.

Step 4:

- Prepare the casting reel for use as a crank.
 - Remove the handle of the Corvalus 300 reel. Replace with the longer custom handle. This will lessen the weight you feel when turning the handle during the experiment, and it will decrease the amount of times you have to turn the handle to produce an earthquake. For this model, the handle is $7\frac{3}{4}$ in. long.



Custom 7¾ inch handle replaces Corvalus handle.

- Unscrew the handle on the *Ronstan Series 19 Slide*.
- Place reel on slide. Drill holes through reel's base in alignment with the slide's holes. Choose small screws to hold reel in place on slide. The screws cannot be too tall because it will be difficult to screw them in.
- Attach the reel to the slide.



Ronstan Series 19 spring-loaded track stop. Remove the handle.



Ronstan Series 19 Slide with Jib Sheet Fairlead and Spring-Loaded Track Stop. Handle is removed.

Step 5:

- Attach fishing reel to porcelain tile.
 - Tape over the top of the *Ronstan 19 Series Track* with a piece of masking tape. This will prevent glue from protruding through the holes.
 - Mark off one end of the track in order to leave one hole completely clear of glue. This will help when attaching the reel to the track.
 - Measure the farthest distance the reel can be placed from the tile's edge. Mark this point; the middle of the track will be placed here.
 - Place the middle of the track at this point. Using masking tape, tape around the edges of the track on the tile. This will provide a box for where to glue the track onto the tile.
 - Using a fair amount of West Marine's 4200 Marine Adhesive Sealant, glue over the bottom of the track. Do NOT put glue behind the marked end. One hole needs to remain open in order for the reel to attach to the track.
 - Glue the track onto the tile. Make sure the track is placed where the reel's handle has space to turn.



Front side of track.

Step 6

- After the glue has cured and the track is securely in place, put a piece of rubber under each side of the reel to prevent it from wobbling.
 - Slide the reel (now screwed onto the slider) onto the track (now adhered to the porcelain tile) and lock it into place.



Place rubber underneath the sides of the reel.

Step 7

- Set up a pulley system in order to alleviate the weight you feel when turning the handle.
 - Bend a thin metal wire at the bottom of the reel/slider to create an outline of a square. The metal wire can be attached to the front screw.
 - Before fully attaching the wire to the screw, add a pulley to the wire. Thread the spectra through the pulley. The spectra is a low-stretch line. It is a trademark of Honeywell Int. It is braided filaments of high-modulus material used in sailing and fishing lines. Spectra can be bought online.



Spectra and pulley system.

- Continue to thread the Spectra line through a second pulley, bring the spectra back towards the reel, and then back towards the front pulley. Tie the Spectra to the front pulley.



Pulley system reduces the weight you feel when turning the handle.




Front pulley.

Step 8

- Add a layer of cork to the bottom of the porcelain tile.
- Lay out cork over bottom of porcelain tile and cut, using an exacto knife, around the edges.
- Spray one side of the cork with Home Depot's spray-on adhesive and attach the cork to bottom of porcelain tile. Let dry.

Step 9

- Prepare the QuakeCaster for use.
 - Attach a size 64 rubber band to a photo clip on a granite slider.
 - Attach the *Ohaus* scale to the other end of the rubber band.
 - Link the scale with the pulley.



Pulley attached to Ohaus scale, which is attached to granite slider.



Stopwatch used to time QuakeCaster earthquakes. Can store as many quake times in hundredths of sec (both the earthquake interval, top number, and the cumulative times, middle number) as desired, and then these times can be scrolled through or downloaded to a PC.

Transport of QuakeCaster



We used a Pelican case 1750 that is designed for a shotgun, but QuakeCaster fits perfectly. The case has integral rollers (left side of case) and an end handle (right side of case), which is great for transport. With all gear inside, the case weighs 38 lb. We put small carabiners in the metal holes in the case latches to make sure the case latches do not come open in transit.



Foam recesses protect the QuakeCaster components during airline baggage handling and airport security inspections. We carry a few Sharpie marker pens, scissors, tape, lots of extra rubber bands, and extra carabiners, in the case. We also carry a small shoe brush (far right) to remove the granite dust (fault gouge) that forms on the sliding surface.

Parts and costs for QuakeCaster

This guide is based on products we used from the San Francisco Bay Area, but most parts can be ordered online and most cities offer the same services that we used, with suggested ways to find them. The total cost of parts for us was ~ \$600.

48" x 12" sliding surface

'Packstone Arena' Porcelain Tile (from Roca Tile 48" x 12" high-friction rock-like tile, manufactured in Spain) - \$48.00

Any dealer for Roca Tile will ship you the 48" tile. You could use a different tile, but high-friction 48" tiles are uncommon. Tel: 305-357-6101. Website:

<http://www.rocatilegroup.com>

Cutting the sliding surface to make it 48" x 6"

Porcelain Tile Cutting - \$20.00 (to cut the tile down to 48" x 6")

Any company that can cut a 48" long, 1/4" thick porcelain tile will do. You do not need a "bullnose" (rounded) cut. (We used Bullnosing By Craftsman, in Martinez, CA. Tel: 925-595-3273.)

Granite sliders

Granite Samples - Free

Granite samples in different sizes are available from most tile and marble outlets. We were given them for free and had them all cut to 4" x 4".

Cutting granite sliders to 4" x 4"

Granite Cutting - \$30.00

Any granite cutting company can cut the 4 x 4" sliders.

Casting reel and marine adhesive sealant

Corvalus 300 casting reel - \$90.00

3M 4200 Marine Adhesive Sealant - \$13.00

We used the boating store, West Marine, which is located in most cities and one can order online. Website: <http://www.westmarine.com>. Alternatives are fishing websites. We tested several reels, and found this kind of casting reel to be perfect.

Ronstan Series 19 Slide with Jib Sheet Fairlead and Spring-Loaded Track Stop, C-Track Traveler System, and Plastic End Cap

Ronstan Series 19 Plastic End Cap (RC81980) - \$3.21

Ronstan Series 19 Slide with Jib Sheet Fairlead and Spring-Loaded Track Stop (RC81944) - \$60.00

Ronstan Series 19 C-Track Traveler System (RC8190-0.3) - \$15.00

We used Ronstan International Inc. U.S. Tel: 1-401-293-0596. Website:

<http://www.ronstan.com/>

The goal here is to simply and easily attach and detach the reel to the tile. This sailing track and car system proved to be, by far, the easiest and most reliable approach.

Pelican Case

Pelican 1750 Long Case - \$220.00

We used Pelican Products, Inc. because very few other hard cases are sufficiently baggage-handler-proof. Tel: 310-326-4700. Website: <http://www.pelican.com/>

Extra foam for Pelican case

Extra foam for Pelican case \$14.00

We bought a 50.5" x 13.5" x 1.75" foam inset and then cut out holes to inset the QuakCaster components. You can buy foam locally.

Spring Scale

Spring scale with clock face

Any spring scale will do, but it is helpful to have an easy-to-read scale. After testing a half dozen digital fishing or luggage scales, we found that this inexpensive Ohaus spring scale was by far the best. Most digital scales have a delay, which defeats the measurements needed. Tel: 800-672-7722. Website: <http://us.ohaus.com>

Cork, spray-on adhesive, white electrical tape

Cork glued to base of tile - \$10.00

Adhesive - \$10.00

White electrical tape - \$4.00

Any building supply store, such as Home Depot, Lowes, and Michaels will have these materials.

Rubber bands, photo clips

Size 64 rubber bands - \$5.00

Photo clips - \$4.00

Any office supply store, such as Office Depot, Staples, and Office Max will have these materials.

Stopwatch for recording a succession of quake times

Ultrak 499 stopwatch (can connect to a PC) \$68.75

Although any multiple lap-timer stopwatch will do, we found that an Ultrak stopwatch worked best and was easy for people to operate. Website:

<http://www.stopwatchcentral.com>

How to teach with QuakeCaster: A lesson plan for middle school classes, or an approach for high school or college classes

If you do all of these experiments, the session will likely span 2-3 classes.
But you can do only the bulleted sections, you can do it in one class.

• **Tectonic Plates**

- Show students a world map with labeled tectonic plates. Discuss plate motion.
- Explain what occurs at plate boundaries.
- Plates are stuck for hundreds of years and then suddenly jerk forward in earthquakes. Why does this happen? The answer, as formulated by Harry F. Reid in 1910 is that the earth's crust is elastic -- behaving like a very stiff slab of rubber sliding over a substrate of "honey"-like asthenosphere. The crust near the fault is deformed by the plate motion until the stress acting on the fault overcomes the frictional resistance and suddenly slips.

• **Earthquake Occurrence Hypotheses**

- Explain the four leading hypotheses that are used to try to predict earthquakes. Draw rough diagrams on the board.
- **Earthquakes are periodic.** This means that the same amount of fault slip is separated by the same amount of time. There is some evidence for this, particularly in the study of the data of very small earthquakes on creeping faults.
- **Earthquakes are time-predictable.** This means that the larger the amount of fault slip in the last earthquake, the longer the time until the next earthquake.
- **Earthquakes are slip-predictable.** This means that the longer the time stress accumulates, the greater the amount of fault slip in the next earthquake.
- **Earthquakes occur randomly in time and have randomly varying size.** This 'Poisson' hypothesis is also widely used, particularly when little information about a fault and its past earthquakes is available.

- Explain what it means to draw in best-fit lines for slip- and time-predictability. This can be done by eye or mathematically with the help of Google Documents.

- What does the slope represent? The longterm slip rate on the fault.

• **How QuakeCaster Elements Relate to Actual Faults and Earthquakes**

Show students QuakeCaster. Explain what each part of QuakeCaster represents in an actual fault.

Fishing reel that steadily pulls in a line to simulate the steady plate tectonic motions far from the plate boundaries.

Granite slider(s) in frictional contact with a porcelain surface to simulate a fault at a plate boundary.

Rubber band connecting the line and the slider to simulate the elastic character of the earth's crust.

Fault friction. Have students feel the texture of the granite sliders and porcelain tiles.

• **Shear and Clamping Stress**

Explain what happens when you change shear and clamping stress on a fault, when the fault is close to failure (the slider is just about ready to slide). Demonstrate this using QuakeCaster.

To demonstrate changing the shear stress, reel in QuakeCaster until slider is on the verge of slipping. Now pull on the rubber band to trigger an earthquake.

To demonstrate changing the clamping stress, reel in QuakeCaster until two stacked sliders are on the verge of slipping. Now lift one slider to trigger an earthquake.

Both of these forces tend to bring the slider closer to failure. The higher the fault friction, the more important unclamping stress becomes.

• **Two Stacked-Slider Earthquakes**

Ask students to observe the slider behavior during the upcoming trials. Let students make predictions about the slider behavior. Have students run QuakeCaster using two stacked sliders.

- Then ask for conclusions.

Did the slider behavior match students' predictions?

Were the earthquakes regular in time and size? (probably not) Did the sliders slip the same amount each time? (probably not).

If the highly simplified QuakeCaster is not regular and periodic, the Earth must be even less so. This is what makes earthquake prediction so difficult.

One-Slider Earthquakes

Ask students to predict, when only one slider is used but one reels at the same speed as before, whether earthquakes will be more or less frequent than the two-stacked-slider experiment? (probably twice as frequent) Will they be larger or smaller? (probably half the slip)

Did the slider behavior match students' predictions? Explain that smaller and more frequent makes sense given the force balance the controls failure: The force resisting motion is now half what it was before.

Were the earthquakes regular in time and size? (probably not) Did the slider slip the same amount each time? (probably not)

Explain that therefore the same fault, such as the San Andreas, can produce both "one-slider" (small) and "two-slider" (large) earthquakes even through the slip rate and friction are about the same.

• **Foreshocks**

Explain foreshocks as the infrequent "short hops" before the actual large earthquake. Ask them if they see any foreshocks (perhaps they will do so rarely, about 1 in 5-10 quakes)

Comment that foreshocks are not reliable predictors of earthquakes because they don't

always occur. In retrospect, about 2-5% of earthquakes are preceded by some kind of “foreshocks,” but they cannot be distinguished in advance.

• **Fault Gouge and Fault Friction**

Explain fault gouge, which will appear as a light dusting on the porcelain tile after running QuakeCaster a few times. Let students feel the gouge with their fingers.

The minerals Saponite and talc have been found in fault gouge within the San Andreas Fault at the SAFOD drill site at the depth at which earthquakes occur.

These minerals decrease friction within faults and could therefore be responsible for fault creep at shallower (saponite) and greater (talc) depths along the San Andreas.

Ask students to predict what would happen if fault gouge accumulated on the porcelain tile.

Would earthquakes be more or less frequent? (more) Bigger or smaller earthquakes? (smaller). The creeping section of the San Andreas produces the highest rate of very small earthquakes ($M < 2$) anywhere on the fault.

Set up QuakeCaster with granite sliders flipped over, so the smooth sides are in contact with the porcelain tile. Ask students to predict what will happen. (much lower friction means more frequent and smaller quakes; it will almost appear to be fault creep)

Would earthquakes be more less frequent? Bigger or smaller earthquakes?

Calculating the Coefficient of Friction

Students can calculate the coefficient of friction one of two ways.

One option is to divide the force just before an event by the weight of the slider.

A second option is to slowly tilt the porcelain tile until the sliders begin to move down the slanted tile, and then measure the angle between the table and the tile.

The tangent of this angle is the coefficient of friction.

See if these two methods agree.

• **Sliders in Series**

Set up QuakeCaster with three sliders in series, representing a long fault with many sections. Ask students to wager which slider will slip first, second, third, and fourth.

Have students run QuakeCaster.

Then ask for conclusions.

Did the sliders' behavior match students' predictions?

Were the earthquakes regular in time and size? Did the sliders slip the same amount each time?

Give example of the North Anatolian sequence.

Tests Trials of Slip- and Time-Predictable Hypotheses

Set up QuakeCaster with two stacked sliders. Place a piece of white electrical tape along the side of the porcelain tile. During this trial, one student reels at a constant rate (to simulate constant plate motion), one uses a Sharpie pen to mark on the tape the slip distance after each earthquake, and one holds the stopwatch and records the time of each earthquake.

Plotting Results

Transcribe the observations to a computer and plot the results. Then, project the results onto a whiteboard and annotate them. Here's how to plot them using Google

Documents:

1. Open Google Documents.
2. Create new spreadsheet.
3. Label one column, "Time (sec)" and another column "Cumulative Slip (cm)."

These will be the x- and y-axis labels.

4. Choose "insert chart" and select "scatter plot."
5. Project the image on whiteboard.
6. Using a whiteboard pen, draw in stair-step diagram to connect dots.
7. Eyeball and then draw in best-fit lines for slip- and time-predictability (or these could be done using the PC), and let people assess them."

Assessing Results

Look at the slopes for slip- and time-predictability.

Which slope appears to be a better fit?

What does the slope represent? Look at the x- and y- axes for help. (the slope is the fault slip rate)

Students can see why it is so difficult to accurately predict earthquakes.

Calculating the RMS Misfit Value

For each trial we calculated the root mean square (RMS) misfit value for each hypothesis, slip- and time-predictable, in order to see how the data compared to the hypotheses. Here's how to calculate the RMS misfit:

For each point, subtract the predicted slip distance from the observed slip distance.

Square each result.

Add all results together.

Divide total amount by the number of data points.

Take the square root of the result.

Test Trials of Constant Minimum and Constant Failure Stress

Set up QuakeCaster with two stacked sliders and attach a scale. Run QuakeCaster and let a few students come up to watch the dial. Run QuakeCaster again and let students predict at what force an earthquake will occur. Comment that there is only partial stress drop after an earthquake. The force never goes to zero. This is also true in almost all real quakes; the stress drop is 10-50% of the total stress.

During these trials, one student reels at a constant rate (to simulate constant plate motion), one records the force just before an earthquake, one records the force immediately after an earthquake, and one holds the stopwatch and records the time of each earthquake.

These results can also be plotted using a PC.

Glossary

Aftershock - Earthquakes that follow a mainshock and have the attribute that their frequency decreases roughly inversely proportional to time (referred to as Omori's law). Aftershocks may occur on the slipped fault or far from it.

Asperities - Rough, uneven surfaces in frictional contact along a fault. Asperities can be thought of as the stuck patches of a fault.

Cascading Shocks - One earthquake transfers its stress further down a fault and promotes more earthquakes. See stress triggering.

Clamping Stress - (Also termed 'normal' stress.) A force that acts perpendicular to a plane. This element of stress compresses the plane.

Coefficient of Friction - The influence of unclamping stress relative to shear stress in triggering an earthquake. It is generally held to range between 0.0 and 0.8. Using QuakeCaster, there are two ways to calculate the coefficient of friction. One option is to divide the force just before an event by the weight of the slider. Another option is to slowly tilt the porcelain tile until the sliders begin to move down the slanted tile, and then measure the angle between the table and the tile. The tangent of this angle is the coefficient of friction.

Coulomb Failure Criteria - When a fault is on the verge of slipping, either increasing the shear stress or decreasing the clamping ('normal') stress, will promote an earthquake.

Earthquake Magnitude - A measure of the amount of energy released by an earthquake; used to size earthquakes. The magnitude is proportional to the logarithm of the seismic moment. Strictly, the Richter magnitude is the deflection of a Wood-Anderson seismometer needle, in cm, for an earthquake 100 km away.

Fault Creep - The slow continuous movement of fault faces as they slide past each other due to constant stress acting along the fault.

Fault Friction - The force which must be overcome for the slippage of fault surfaces.

Fault Gouge - A pulverized powder that forms along faults as a result of friction between fault faces when they slide past each other and grind down rocks. As gouge accumulates, fault friction decreases.

Fault System - Two or more adjoining faults.

(Fixed) Failure Stress - When a certain amount of stress accumulates along a fault, an earthquake will occur.

Force - An influence that causes an object to change its motion.

Foreshock - A small earthquake that sometimes precedes a larger earthquake by any amount of time (seconds, days, weeks) and occurs near larger earthquake. Invariably, the term 'foreshock' is used retrospectively; there are no known attributes of foreshocks that distinguishes them from other shocks.

Friction - The opposing force encountered when one object moves relative to another object, to which it is in contact.

kPa Unit - Kilopascal; a unit of measure of stress (1 kPa = 1000 Pascals = 10 bar).

Load - A small force or a small amount of tension.

Loading Rate - In this experiment, loading rate is how quickly force builds up. Stress is the force divided by the surface area. In QuakeCaster, when the force builds up to 1000 grams, one 10 x 10 cm slider has a shear stress of roughly 0.96 kPa. With the QuakeCaster model, since the surface area is constant, we can look at force alone.

(Fixed) Minimum Stress - After an earthquake, the amount of stress along a fault decreases to this amount.

North Anatolian Fault - A continental transform fault located in Turkey that experienced the most spectacular 'falling-domino' sequence of large earthquakes ever recorded--12 earthquakes ruptured along this fault since the 1939 Erzincan M=7.9 earthquake through the 1999 M=7.4 and M=7.1 Izmit-Düzce shocks. This sequence has been used to argue for earthquake interaction by stress triggering - one earthquake transfers its stress further down a fault and causes another earthquake.

Parallel Fault System - Two or more parallel faults. Examples include the San Andreas and Hayward faults in northern California, or the San Andreas and San Jacinto faults in southern California.

Periodic Hypothesis - This earthquake prediction hypothesis states that the same amount of fault slip is separated by the same amount of time. There is some evidence for this, particularly in the study of the data of very small earthquakes on creeping faults.

Poisson Hypothesis - This earthquake prediction hypothesis states that earthquakes occur randomly in time and have randomly varying size. This hypothesis is widely used, particularly when little information about a fault and its past earthquakes is available.

Root mean square (RMS) Misfit Value - It is the square root of the means of the squares of the values. Used in statistics, it reveals how well data fit hypotheses. To calculate the RMS misfit, subtract the predicted value from the observed value, square each result, add all the results together, divide this total amount by the number of data points, and take the square root.

Seismic Moment - A measure of an earthquake's size. With QuakeCaster, the moment is the fault contact area (here a 10 x 10 cm slider surface), multiplied by the elastic stiffness (the stiffness of the rubber band), multiplied by the amount of slip (measured in cm).

Shear - A deformation that occurs as a result of stress causing two fault faces to slide parallel to each other.

Shear Stress - A force that acts parallel to a fault plane. This element of stress causes slippage along the plane.

Slip-predictable Hypothesis - This earthquake prediction hypothesis states that the longer the time stress accumulates, the greater the amount of fault slip in the next earthquake. Another way of framing this hypothesis is that earthquakes drop the amount of stress along a fault to a fixed minimum or to a background amount.

Stress - The force acting on an object divided by the surface area.

Stress Buildup - The stress that accumulates within a fault due to friction between fault faces. When the stress acting on the fault overcomes the frictional resistance, the fault will slip.

Stress Shadow - When earthquakes have been inhibited because the Coulomb stress acting on faults has decreased. Stress shadows can be caused by decreasing shear stress or by increasing clamping ('normal') stress. One earthquake can cause a stress shadow further down a fault, thus minimizing the likelihood of another earthquake.

Stress Triggering - When one earthquake transfers its stress further down a fault and causes another earthquake. Stress can be transferred by increasing shear stress or by decreasing clamping ('normal') stress.

Tectonic Plates - Giant slabs of lithosphere, part of the earth's crust. There are 8 primary plates, which are made of continental and oceanic rocks and minerals. These materials cause the plates to slide, float, and interact over the asthenosphere. The plates' interactions are responsible for earthquakes and for the earth's surface features.

Time-predictable Hypothesis - This earthquake prediction hypothesis states that the larger the amount of fault slip in the last earthquake, the longer the time until the next earthquake. Another way of framing this hypothesis is that earthquakes occur when a failure threshold stress is reached.

Toggling Shocks - One earthquake can either inhibit or promote another earthquake.