

Response to reviewer

The following document describes the response to reviewer. All comments and questions were separated by topics thus point-by-point reviews are included.

In addition, this document includes a marked-up version of the manuscript with all changes made according to reviewers suggestions.

Reviewer 1

- Title: Please consider adding the part “application of the developed fragility curves” in your title

R: the title will be modified according to suggestions of both reviewers, for example: “Development and application of tsunami fragility curve of the 2015 tsunami in Coquimbo, Chile”.

- Abstract: Please also specify the earthquake magnitude of both the 2015 and future events as well as add a short explanation about the comparison of the developed curves against Dichato.

R: we added earthquake magnitudes and short description on the comparison with fragility curve of Dichato.

1.- Introduction:

-Please make sure that you use the same name, 2015 Illapel earthquake (same in Fig.1) throughout the paper.

R: The name of the 2015 Illapel earthquake will be modified and check throughout the text.

- In the last sentence of this section, your objective is only about two sentences. I would suggest to write them clearly using bullets and separate them from the literature review.

R: The introduction will be modified, such that we clearly write the objective in a separate paragraph from literature review. In addition, we added description of the sections of the paper.

- There are some recently published works about fragility curves and their application that should be mentioned: Song et al. (2017), Charvet et al. (2017), Macabuag et al. (2016), Suppasri et al. (2016), Fraser et al. (2014) and Wiebe and Cox (2014)

R: recent papers on fragility curves and damages estimation suggested by the reviewer were checked and included in both introduction and discussion.

2.- Study Area

- Please also clearly state the topographical characteristic of the study area, plain area similar to Sendai?

R: the paper includes a topographical description of the study area

3.- Developing fragility curve.

- What kind of the field data used as I can only see the recorded waveforms? Did you also measure inundation heights/depths from the field survey? If so why didn't you used them for your model verification in addition to the recorded waveforms?

R: We used both tsunami waveforms and inundation height measurements. As explained in the paper, the tsunami waveforms from a DART buoy and two tidegauges were used to select the best tsunami source model. Then, the tsunami inundation heights measurements were used to select an appropriate roughness coefficient in order to fit both inundation heights and inundation area. We explained better this methodology in the text in order to be sure the readers do not misunderstand it.

- 3.1 Data: What is the average numbers of stories of these 568 buildings, 1-2 stories?

R: The houses were 1-story buildings on average. some of them were of 2 stories and the typical configuration is the first floor of masonry and the second floor of wood. Since the flow depth was less than 3 m, and it did not exceed in height 1-story buildings, we thought to analyze all structures as the same type of buildings. It will be easier the comparison with Dichato.

- Please add the photo taken date for Fig. 2.

R: We will add the photo date in the Figure caption. All photos were taken on September 22nd of 2015, only 6 days after the event.

- What are structures for the two houses in Fig. 2c and 2d?

R: we added a description of the structures in Figure 2. Both structures in 2c and d were originally made of confined masonry. The structure in figure 2c was being repaired at the moment of the field survey with masonry made of concrete blocks.

- How did you confirm that the surveyed houses are the original damage condition or you evaluated the damage by asking all house owners? Was the almost damage from earthquake because of the retrofit/lesson from the 2010 event?

R: The field survey took place only 5 to 7 days after the event and just few of the structures were already under reconstruction, therefore, the damage observed was assumed to be the one caused by the tsunami. According to official reports, the damage to structures due to the earthquake was very limited in Coquimbo area. To confirm this, the authors had the opportunity to compare damage on inundated and non inundated houses in Coquimbo, in order to be sure that the structural damage to inundated houses was due to the tsunami. This is another reason why we used two-level damage scale. Doing this, we also wanted to avoid including light damage (possibly due to the earthquake) as tsunami damage. We will add some paragraphs to explain this procedure in the paper

- It was possible to developed fragility curves for more than two damage levels. In Suppasri et al. (2012), they developed the curves for four damage levels using less than 200 buildings.

R: Yes, it would have been possible. Unfortunately, when we made the field survey, the main goal was to develop the fragility curve to assess the damage in case of future event as well as to be compared with the existing fragility curve of another town in Chile, Dichato (Mas et al., 2012), which has only two damage levels. Therefore, we classified the structures according to two damage levels only. In addition, as explained above, since the earthquake generated no or light damage to structure, the use of two damage levels was to avoid the classification of light damage due to earthquake as tsunami damage.

- You may change the word from “surviving” to other words such as remaining, not destroyed, etc. Buildings are not living things, thus the word “survive” sounds not so suitable in my opinion.

R: The word “surviving” was changed by “not destroyed”

- Please add some photos of the buildings as example of your damage levels, destroyed and not destroyed. Washed away building should be also included in the “destroyed” damage level. No washed away buildings in this 2015 event?

R. We mentioned damage levels of the structures in figure 2. In addition, we included more pictures of complete damage and wased away.

- 3.2 Inundation depth: It is confusing if you used your measured inundation heights during the survey for your inundation simulation or just the recorded waveforms for the source verification? If you have

all surveyed inundation heights for each building, you can then develop fragility functions using the actual maximum flow depth from the field survey and maximum flow velocity and hydrodynamic force by making use of the numerical simulation.

R: Unfortunately, the surveyed inundation heights were not for each building. The measurements were taken in several places in order to interpolate the flow depth as it was made in the paper of Mas et al., (2012) on Dichato. However, due to the absence of the tsunami traces on the wetland and at locations of washed away houses, it was not possible to obtain a representative interpolated inundation area. Subsequently, we decided to run tsunami numerical simulations and validate the results by means of the K and kappa coefficients using our tsunami height measurements. We added a sentence in the manuscript to explain this methodology in order to avoid confusion to the readers.

- Please make clear about this in this section. Please use the original reference for K and Kappa (Aida, 1978).

R: we will use the proper reference as Aida 1978.

- 3.3 Fragility curves: Similar to section 3.2 that I would like to encourage the authors to used their simulated maximum flow velocity and hydrodynamic force to also develop the fragility curves as successfully made by previous studies (Koshimura et al, 2009, Suppasri et al., (2011) and Gokon et al., (2014)). These curves using flow velocity and hydrodynamic force can be used to explain in your section 3.4 why your study area have lower damage probability (far and protected by railway embankment). Even if the same flow depth, but you may be able to explain that the flow velocity and hydrodynamic force is much lower in your area.

R: As recommended by the reviewer, we added new fragility curves using flow velocity and hydrodynamic force. In addition, we also added a map of maximum flow velocity and hydrodynamic force in Coquimbo area in order to explain better the tsunami damage.

- 3.4 The title of the section is wrong? Should be Comparison of the developed fragility curves or something?

R: Yes, the title was wrong and it was changed to the correct one: "Comparison with existing fragility curves"

- I suggest to use bullets or subsection to compare your curves with 1) Dichato first, 2) then Okushiri and other part of Japan and 3) other parts of the world (Why didn't you also compare with Samoa and Thailand?)

R: Since we compare different types of curves, and a group of them was made considering only one damage level (Okushiri, Dichato, Banda Aceh, Thailnad and Samoa) we think it would be more confusing to compare by country. The focus is the structural type and topography.. Moreover, We added fragility curves of Samoa and Thailand in the new version of the draft.

- Can you spilt the data and develop another one or two curves for 1-story or 2-story only? Then you can show that the damage of the mix stories is lower than 1-story only or higher than 2-story only.

R: We agreed this analysis could be useful, unfortunately, we did not classify the structures according to the stories since they were very similar in size and material. In addition, we wanted to compare the results with the fragility curve of Dichato, which also considers one type of structure independently of the number of stories. Moreover, the main task of the paper was to develop a fragility function to assess

tsunami damage in case of possible event in the future. The comparison of several curves according to number of stories could be out of the scope of the paper.

- 4.1 Source model: Did the event in 1849 a tsunami earthquake? Why such event is not necessary to include in this study?

R: we added details on the 1849 event in the current draft, and this event is very important when segments of possible events were defined. Unfortunately there is no enough information about this event, thus a source model is defined.

- Please also write that you used earthquake magnitude (8.2-8.5) in the explanation not only in Fig. 9.

R: We will add the magnitudes of the possible events in the text and not only in the figure.

- 4.2 Proposed scenario: It will be very useful for readers if you could add one figure showing the comparison of the simulated flow depth of 2015 tsunami against the proposed scenario. May be the values shown in the map can be the difference between the proposed scenario and the 2015 tsunami (i.e. Fig. 10(center-S1) minus Fig. 7a). Then the readers can be easily seen that where we might expected greatly increase of the flow depth from the future event.

R: good idea. We will add a new figure to show results and the difference of 2015 event and the S1 event.

- Characteristics of the maximum flow velocity and hydrodynamic force can be also discussed and support your explanation at the end of this section

R: Yes, since we will include new fragility curves using velocities and hydrodynamic forces as well as maximum velocity field maps, we will add more discussion based on these results and existing literature.

4.3 Tsunami mitigation measures are deeply discussed by Strusinska-Correia. (2017) and Suppasri et al. (2016).

R: we added some sentence on the possible mitigation measures based on the literature suggested by the reviewer. We also added other references with local analysis after 2010 event.

Suggested references:

Agnieszka Strusinska-Correia. (2017) Tsunami mitigation in Japan after the 2011 Tohoku Tsunami. International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction 22, 397-411. Online publication date: 1-Jun-2017

Aida, I. (1978) Reliability of a tsunami source model derived from fault parameters, J. Phys. Earth, 26, 57–73.

Charvet, I., Macabuag, J., Rossetto, T. (2017) Estimating tsunami-induced building damage through fragility functions: Critical review and research needs, Front. Built Environ. 3:36.

Fraser, S. A., Power, W. L., Wang, X., Wallace, L. M., Mueller, C. & Johnston, D. M. [2014] “Tsunami inundation in Napier, New Zealand, due to local earthquake sources,” Nat. Hazards, 70(1), 415–445.

Macabuag, J., Rossetto, T., Ioannou, I., Suppasri, A., Sugawara, D., Adriano, B., Imamura, F. and Koshimura, S. (2016). A proposed methodology for deriving tsunami fragility functions for buildings using optimum intensity measures, Natural Hazards, 84 (2), 1257-1285

Wiebe, D. M. & Cox, D. T. [2014] “Application of fragility curves to estimate building damage and economic loss at a community scale: A case study of Seaside, Oregon,” Nat. Hazards 71(3), 2043–2061.

Song, J., De Risi, R. and Goda, K. (2017) Influence of Flow Velocity on Tsunami Loss Estimation, Geosciences 2017, 7(4), 114.

Reviewer 2

- Title should be '... fragility curve development...'

R: the title was modified according to suggestions of both reviewers, for example: "Development and application of tsunami fragility curve of the 2015 tsunami in Coquimbo, Chile".

- Please have a native English speaker correct the manuscript, as there are many small mistakes. For example, on line 17, "low damage" should be "light damage", and similar problems throughout the document.

R: the new draft was corrected by a native English speaker in order to avoid small mistakes.

- Page 2. Lines 17-18. You say that buildings in Sanriku experienced greater damage than those on the Sendai Plain. Is this just because the inundation was deeper in Sanriku? Or do you mean that for equal inundation depths, buildings in Sanriku experience more damage? Clarify this.

R: Since we added new fragility curves using velocity and hydrodynamic force as well as maximum velocity field, it helped clarifying why areas with equal inundation depth could have more damage. It is expected that plain areas have smaller velocities than ria coasts.

- Page 3 line 15. Tsunami height of 7 m. Does this mean the height offshore? The height at the coastline? Runup? Please be specific.

R: according to the references, it was 7 m inundation height. We were more specific in the manuscript.

- Page 4 line 13. "The most affected structures were adobe. " You mean structures most affected by the earthquake? Clarify this.

R: yes, we corrected the sentence by "the most affected structures by the earthquake were made of adobe..."

- Page 5 line 1. State DART buoy ID number.

R: The DART buoy is the 32402. We will add the ID number.

- Page 5, lines 10-15. State the source and publication numbers of the nautical charts used for bathymetry.

R: ok, we added the detail of the publication numbers of the nautical charts.

- Page 5 line 16. What is the DTM resolution? What is its source (LIDAR or land surveys)? Does the DTM show pre-earthquake or post-earthquake (subsided) topography? How much tectonic subsidence occurred here?

R: We add details on the DTM topography provided by the local authority. We will also add some comment of the subsidence due to the 2015 earthquake, which was in the order of 7-10 cm.

- Page 5 line 24. State the source (reference) of the JSCE guidelines.

R: we used the original reference (Aide 1978) as suggested by Referee 1.

- Page 6 line 6. $n=0.06$ seems small for medium density urban areas. Looking at Table 1 in Bricker et al (which you already reference), the recommended values for medium density urban areas range from 0.09 (based on Koshimura et al) to 0.12 (based on

Bunya et al). Therefore, you need to justify the value 0.06 you choose for medium density urban areas.
R: We used $n=0.06$ based on Kotani et al (1998) given in Table 1. We did not try larger values, since the larger the manning coefficient, the smaller the inundation. In addition, the best results was for $n=0.025$, therefore, there is no effect on the final result.

- Page 6 line 31. What are the units of the mean and std dev values shown?

R. The units are metres. It will be added to the paper.

- Page 7 lines 15-16. In addition to different building materials, could the difference in fragility curves have been due to the tsunami behavior? Bore vs. no bore? Flow speed? Impact of debris from the harbor? This section needs a little more discussion.

R: Since we added other fragility curves and compare the results with other places with plain-type or ria-type coasts, it is possible to explain different tsunami effect. This analysis was included in the new manuscript..

-Figure 8. "probability of occurrence" is not a good label for the y-axis, as it appears to show CDF's of inundation depth, which is not the case. The axis label should be "probability of damage" or similar.

R: Yes, the y-label is not appropriate. It will be changed to Damage probability.

- In some places in the text, you need to make superscripts for units (i.e., km²).

R: ok, it was checked throughout the text.

- Section 4.2. What topography is used? Subsided or non-subsided? How much subsidence is expected for a quake of this size?

R: We added a sentence with the subsidence of S1 scenario, which was already included in the inundation simulation.

- Figure 2. You should indicate what level of damage each photo corresponds to.

R: yes, it was added. In addition, as suggested by Referee 1, we will added photos of washed away, too.

- Fig 3. I don't understand what the red circles and yellow triangles in the figure on the right mean. You need a legend or a description in the caption.

R: We added a description in the caption. Triangles and circles are runup and inundation heights measurements, respectively.

- Fg 7c caption. Plot (of what)? Needs better description.

R: the plot of least-squares fit will be added as a description to the figure 7c. it is corrected in new figure 8b

- Fig 10. Left center right are columns, not rows.

R: it will be corrected in the figure caption

Fig 11. I don't understand what the blue shading colorscale means. You need to state this, or show a colorbar

R: the caption of the figure will be modified in order to explain better the inundation area due to the possible tsunami scenario as follows: Figure 11. a) Tsunami flow depth on structures. b) Damage probability of flooded structures. The light blue area represents the tsunami inundation area due to the possible future tsunami.

Development and application of Tsunami fragility curve using field data and numerical simulation of the 2015 tsunami in Coquimbo, Chile

Rafael Aránguiz^{1,2}, Luisa Urra³, Ryo Okuwaki⁴, Yuji Yagi⁵

5 ¹Department of Civil Engineering, Universidad Católica de la Santísima Concepción

²National Research Center for Integrated Natural Disaster Management CONICYT/FONDAP/1511007 (CIGIDEN)

³Laboratory of Remote Sensing and Geoinformatics for Disaster Management, International Research Institute of Disaster Science, Tohoku University, Japan

⁴Graduate School of Life and Environmental Sciences, University of Tsukuba, Japan

10 ⁵Faculty of Life and Environmental Sciences, University of Tsukuba, Japan

Correspondence to: Rafael Aránguiz (raranguiz@ucsc.cl)

Abstract. The last earthquake that affected the city of Coquimbo ~~took place~~ in September 2015 had a magnitude of Mw 8.3 and resulted in localized damage in low areas of the city. In addition, another seismic gap north of the 2015 earthquake rupture area has been identified; therefore, a significant earthquake (Mw 8.2 to 8.5) and tsunami could occur in the near future. The present paper develops the tsunami fragility curve for the city of Coquimbo based on field survey data and tsunami numerical simulations. The ~~inundation depth~~ tsunami intensity measures of the 2015 Chile tsunami in Coquimbo ~~was~~ were estimated by means of numerical simulation with the NEOWAVE model and 5 nested grids with a maximum grid resolution of 10 m. The fragility curve exhibited behavior similar to that of other curves in plains in Japan, where low damage was observed at relatively high inundation depths. In addition, it was observed that Coquimbo experienced less damage than Dichato (Chile); in fact, for
15 an inundation depth of 2 m, Dichato had a ~75% probability of damage, while Coquimbo proved to have only 20%. The new fragility curve was used to estimate the damage by possible future tsunamis in the area. The damage assessment showed that ~50% of the structures in the lower area of Coquimbo have a high probability of damage in case of a tsunami generated off the coast of the study area if the city is rebuilt with the same type of structures.

1 Introduction

25 On 16 September 2015 a Mw 8.3 earthquake took place off the coast of the Coquimbo Region (USGS: <http://earthquake.usgs.gov/earthquakes/eventpage/us20003k7a#executive>). The earthquake generated a tsunami that inundated low areas of the city of Coquimbo, with runup reaching up to 6.4 m and a penetration distance of up to 700 m (Aránguiz et al., 2016; Contreras-López et al., 2016), resulting in reports of significant damage to houses and public infrastructure (Contreras-López et al., 2016). This earthquake filled the seismic gap that had existed since at least the last significant earthquake along
30 the Coquimbo-Illapel seismic region in 1943 (Melgar et al., 2016; Ye et al. 2016)-. However, the region just north of the 2015

rupture area has not experienced significant seismic activity since the 1922 Mw 8.3 event (Melgar et al., 2016; Ye et al., 2016). Thus, it is recommended that reconstruction plans and new tsunami mitigation measures consider potential impacts due to possible future tsunamis generated north of the 2015 [Illapel](#) earthquake rupture zone.

With regard to the assessment of structural damage within the exposed area against potential tsunami hazard, two different approaches were identified. On one hand, damage can be estimated deterministically based on the forces acting on a single structure (Nandasena et al. 2012; Nistor et al. 2009; Shimozono & Sato, 2016; Wei et al., 2015). However, this analysis could be extremely time-consuming and impractical for [an entire](#) city due to the high-resolution numerical simulations (~2 m) that are required. On the other hand, the assessment of structural damage could be done probabilistically by means of fragility curves (Koshimura et al. 2009; Koshimura et al., 2009(1); Suppasri et al, 2011). Tsunami fragility curves represent the

probability of damage to structures in relation to ~~the hydrodynamic features of a tsunami~~ [a tsunami intensity measure](#), such as the [inundation flow](#) depth, current velocity and hydrodynamic force (Koshimura et al. 2009). However, a fully probabilistic approach may use a wide range of possible scenarios; thus, both hazard assessment and damage assessment are probabilistic (Park et al., 2017). [A classical approach uses linear models with ordinary least square methods and aggregated data. This methodology has been applied to obtain e](#)

Empirical tsunami fragility curves ~~were obtained~~ for Banda Aceh in Indonesia (Koshimura et al. 2009) and Thailand (Suppasri et al., 2011) after the 2004 Indian Ocean Tsunami. The same methodology was applied to areas affected by the 2009 Samoa tsunami (Gokon et al., 2014). In a similar manner, this method was applied in Japan after the 2011 Great East Japan tsunami, allowing several fragility curves that considered several damage levels and different building materials to be obtained (Suppasri et al., 2013). After the 2010 Chile tsunami, Mas et al. (2012) developed the first tsunami fragility curve in Chile for masonry and mixed structures in Dichato. [In recent years, new methodologies have](#)

[been proposed for development of tsunami fragility curves that use disaggregated data and different class of models such as the Generalized Linear Model, Generalized Additive Model and Non-Parametric Model](#) (Charvet et al. , 2017; Charvet et al., 2015; Macabuag et al., 2016). [These new methodologies propose more comprehensive analysis in order to select appropriate statistical models and identify which tsunami intensity measure gives the best representation of the observed damage data](#) (Macabuag et al., 2016). [Even though the use of different classes of models could provide an improvement over the ordinary](#)

[least square method, there is no quantifiable assessment of the effect of data aggregation and linear model assumption violation on model predictive power](#) (Macabuag et al., 2016). [For example, the](#) fragility curves developed by Suppasri et al. (2013) [have been applied to building damage estimation in Napier, New Zealand](#) (Fraser et al., 2014) [and both building damage and economic loss estimation in Seaside, Oregon](#) (Wiebe & Cox, 2014), [The former also applied the fragility curves of Dichato, Chile](#) (Mas et al., 2012), [and American Samoa](#) (Gokon et al., 2014).

Tsunami fragility curves are obtained for a given area under a given scenario; therefore, they may not be applicable when changing the areas of interest since the tsunami characteristics and building materials may differ (Koshimura et al. 2009; Suppasri et al., 2011). In fact, buildings along the Sanriku ria coast in Japan experienced greater damage than structures located in plain areas in Sendai (Suppasri et al., 2013; Suppasri et al., 2012). [On that ground, De Risi et al., \(2017\) analysed the influence of tsunami velocity on structural damage on ria-type and plain-type coasts. They found that flow velocity improves](#)

the fragility models, but the two coastal typologies should be considered separately when the velocity is included in the analysis. Moreover, Song et al. (2017) used a bivariate intensity measure to evaluate tsunami losses, such that both flow velocity and inundation depth are analysed. They found that flow velocity is important for buildings located less than 1 km from the coastline. In addition, they found that reinforced concrete buildings are the most sensitive to the effects of velocity, while wood structures are not.

Subsequently, the Coquimbo area provides a good opportunity to develop a fragility curve and assess potential tsunami impact since the tsunami in 2015 did not damage all structures and some of them have been repaired or rebuilt on their original sites. The present research develops an empirical fragility curve for the Coquimbo area using field survey data and numerical simulation of the 2015 Chile tsunami. In addition, we estimated the probability of structural damage for a deterministic tsunami scenario using the Coquimbo fragility curve. Section 2 gives a description of the study area with a short review of the local seismicity. Section 3 presents the methodology of the fragility curve development, which includes a comparison with existing tsunami fragility curves. In section four, an application of the fragility curves is presented. Finally, section 5 give the main conclusion of the present research.

2 Study Area

The city of Coquimbo is located on the southern shore of Coquimbo Bay (29.96°S). The Coquimbo area was mentioned by the conquistadors as a good place for a port and the location became important due to the natural protection it offered against south-west swell waves, which provided good conditions for its use as a port starting in the XIX century. Coquimbo Bay is open to the northwest and is characterized by a lowland topography with a long, flat, sandy beach (Aránguiz et al., 2016), similar to coastal plains of Sendai. Like all coastal cities in Chile, Coquimbo is located over the subduction zone of the Nazca Plate beneath the South American plate (18°- 44°S). The convergence rate of the plates is 68 mm/year along the Chile subduction zone and large seismic events take place every 10 years on average (Métois et al. 2016). In fact, 3 events over magnitude 8.0 have taken place in the last 6 years, namely the 2010 Maule (34-38°S) , the 2014 Iquique (19-20°S) and the 2015 Illapel (30-32°S) earthquakes.

Figure 1 shows the seismic events recorded in the Coquimbo area. The oldest record of a tsunami is from the 1730 event. This earthquake generated a destructive tsunami that destroyed Valparaíso and Concepción and flooded low areas in Japan (Cisternas et al., 2011). The tsunami destroyed several ranches on the shore of Coquimbo (Soloviev & Go, 1975). Although the 1880 and 1943 earthquakes are considered to be similar in size (Nishenko, 1985), it is observed that the behaviour of the tsunamis generated by these events seem to be different. While the former generated large columns of water that resulted in the anchor chain of a ship snapping in Coquimbo (Soloviev & Go, 1975) and a deep submarine cable breaking off the coast of the Limarí River (Lomnitz, 2004), the latter generated a minor tsunami that damaged fishing boats in Los Vilos and raised the water level by 80 cm in Valparaíso (Soloviev & Go, 1975), while no tsunami was reported in Coquimbo. Conversely, the 2015 tsunami reached up to 4.75 m at the Coquimbo tide gauge, with a runup of 6.4 m (Aránguiz et al., 2016; Contreras-López

et al., 2016). Moreover, a maximum tsunami amplitude of 2 m was observed at the Valparaiso tide gauge (Aránguiz et al., 2016). The main reason behind this is that the 1943 event broke the deepest portion of the subduction interface, while the 2015 [Illapel earthquake event](#) had a shallower rupture area and larger magnitude (Fuentes et al., 2016; Okuwaki et al., 2016), resulting in a larger initial tsunami amplitude (Aránguiz et al., 2016).

5 The largest tsunami ever recorded in Coquimbo took place in 1922. The tsunami arrived in Coquimbo two hours after the earthquake and three large waves were observed, the third of which was the largest, with a maximum ~~tsunami inundation~~ height of 7 m ~~above mean sea level~~ and an inland penetration of 2 km. The part of the city located on the southern shore of Coquimbo Bay was totally destroyed due to both the water and the tsunami debris (Soloviev & Go, 1975). In a similar manner, the tsunami reached [inundation heights of](#) up to 9 m at Chañaral and 6-7 m at Caldera. The tsunami was also observed in Japan,
10 with maximum amplitudes ranging from 60 to 70 cm (Carvajal et al., 2017; Soloviev & Go, 1975), which is similar to the amplitudes of the 2015 event (80 cm), but larger than those of the 1943 event, [which were](#) 10-25 cm (Beck et al., 1998). Another significant event was the 1849 earthquake, which generated a localized tsunami that mainly affected Coquimbo. The tsunami arrived 10 to 30 min after the earthquake, penetrated 300 m horizontally and rose 5 m above the high tide mark (Soloviev & Go, 1975).

15 **3 Development of the fragility curve**

The development of the fragility functions in the present work required three main steps: first, data collection of building damage levels in the Coquimbo area as well as tsunami inundation heights for numerical modeling validation; second, selection of a rupture model of the 2015 [Illapel](#) earthquake and validation of the tsunami inundation heights for estimation of tsunami inundation depth; and third, GIS analysis and statistical analysis for correlation between damage level and simulated
20 tsunami inundation depth.

3.1 Building damage and tsunami inundation data

~~Soon~~ [Only 5 to 7 days](#) after the 2015 event, a team surveyed the affected area and collected more than 40 inundation height, [inundation flow](#) depth and tsunami runup measurements in the Coquimbo inundation area. The field measurements followed established post-tsunami survey procedures (Dengler et al., 2003; Dominey-Howes et al., 2012; Synolakis & Okal, 2005) and
25 were corrected for tide level at the time of maximum inundation. At the same time, 585 structures within the inundation area were identified and classified as mixed structures made of wood and masonry (568), reinforced concrete buildings of eight or more stories (4) and very light structures that did not meet minimal building standards (13). The present analysis considered the mixed structures only; therefore, the reinforced concrete and light structures were removed from the fragility curve analysis. [Typical structures within the inundated area of Coquimbo have one story, made of masonry, though there are some two-story buildings made of both masonry \(the first floor\) and wood \(the second floor\). In order to facilitate the comparison with existing fragility curves \(e.g., Dichato\) all data were combined in a single category as mixed structures.](#) Figure 2 shows typical mixed
30

structures and marks of ~~inundation~~ depth surveyed in Coquimbo immediately after the 2015 tsunami. Figures 2a and b show masonry houses that were not damaged by the tsunami despite ~~inundation~~ depths that ranged from 1.5 to 2 m. Meanwhile, Figures 2c and d show houses with moderate to major damage, possibly to be used after major repairs. As a matter of fact, the house in Figure 2c was being repaired at the time of the field survey and the ~~gray~~ wall in the corner was built a few days earlier. Meanwhile, the house in Figure 2d was abandoned, since all interior walls, windows, doors and the roof were completely damaged and major repairs and retrofitting will be needed. Figure 2e shows a completely damaged structure with its interior walls and roof completely removed, while Figure 2f shows the remaining foundation of a washed-away structure. Even though the damage to ~~the~~ structure could be due to ~~the~~ earthquake and tsunami, it was observed that the damage due to the earthquake was limited (Candia et al., 2017) and the ~~structures~~ most affected by the earthquake were made of adobe (Fernández et al., 2017). In addition, the authors had the opportunity to compare damage to inundated and non-inundated houses in Coquimbo; in order to be sure that the structural damage to inundated houses was due to the tsunami. In order to avoid including light damage (due to the earthquake) as tsunami damage, we used a two-level damage scale. Therefore, the present work assumed that the damage to flooded structures was due only to the tsunami.

In addition, the two-level damage scale is used due to the small amount of inundated structures (568) and the comparison with the existing fragility curve of Dichato (Mas et al., 2012), which has only two damage levels, two damage levels were defined; thus, it was possible to obtain one fragility curve. The first level, called “~~surviving not destroyed~~,” included structures with no damage or minor to major damage, which correspond to levels 1, 2 and 3 given by Suppasri et al. (2013). These damage levels imply that there is slight to severe damage to non-structural components; therefore, it is possible to use the structures after moderate to major repairs (Figures 2a, b and c). The other damage level, called “destroyed,” included damage levels 4 to 6 according to Suppasri et al. (2013), i.e., structures that experienced severe damage to walls or columns or that had completely collapsed (Figures 2 d, e and f).

Previous works carried out damage inspections using satellite images and field surveys (Koshimura et al., 2009; Mas et al., 2012; Suppasri et al., 2011). However, the satellite image method assumes that buildings with intact roofs are “not destroyed” or “~~surviving~~” (Suppasri et al., 2011), but severe damage to columns or interior walls may not be observed (Mas et al., 2012), as in the case of the houses shown in Figures 2c and d. Therefore, the present work employed damage detection based on field surveys only. Figure 3a shows the surveyed buildings and the damage level assigned to the 568 mixed structures. The four reinforced concrete buildings (R.C.) and the 13 light structures (L.S.) that did not meet minimal building standards are also included in the figure. Figure 3b shows the inundation height and runup measurements recorded during the field survey. It is observed that the maximum inundation height was reached in the corner, where the coastal road and the railway converge. Most of the damaged structures were identified at that location as well.

3.2 Tsunami inundation depth

The tsunami inundation depth was estimated as the difference between tsunami inundation height and ground elevation. Since the inundation heights were measured at few locations across the inundation area and there is a lack of tsunami traces in the

~~wetland. interpolation of tsunami height may not be suitable. Therefore~~therefore, the tsunami heights were obtained from tsunami numerical simulation of the 2015 event. We tested four available finite-fault models, namely Li et al. (2016), Ruiz et al. (2016), Okuwaki et al. (2016) and Shrivastava et al. (2016), and the best fit was selected according to tide gauges in Coquimbo, Valparaiso and the ~~nearest~~DART buoy 32402. ~~Once the best slip model is selected, we used the field measurement~~
5 ~~of inundation height and runup to select an appropriate roughness coefficient on dry land~~. The model proposed by Li et al. (2016) is obtained from iterative modelling of teleseismic body waves as well as tsunami records at DART buoys. Since the magnitude of the proposed model is Mw 8.21, the slip distribution was multiplied by a factor of 1.38; thus, all events have the same magnitude: 8.3.

The tsunami initial condition was estimated to be equal to the seafloor displacement. In addition, the vertical displacement
10 from each subfault was computed using a kinematic solution of the planar fault model of Okada (Okada, 1985). The numerical simulations were carried out with the Non-hydrostatic Evolution of Ocean WAVES model (NEOWAVE) (Yamazaki et al. 2011; Yamazaki et al., 2009). This model is a staggered finite-difference model ~~which that~~ solves the nonlinear shallow water equation and ~~considers-uses~~ a vertical velocity term to account for weakly dispersive waves. The model generates the tsunami initial condition, propagation and inundation by means of several nested grids of different resolutions. Coseismic deformations
15 are including in the calculations and all grids are modified according to the subsidence or uplift. After the 2015 event, the subsidence in Coquimbo was estimated to be 7-10 cm (Aránguiz et al., 2016). The present research used 5 nested grids, as shown in Figure 4. The level-1 grid describes tsunami propagation from generation to the continental shelf and to the Pacific Ocean at a resolution of 2 arcmin (~3600m). This grid was generated from 30 arcmin GEBCO data. The level 2 and level 3 grids were built from nautical charts 4100, 4112 and 4113, ~~-data~~ and had a resolution of 30 and 6 arcsec, respectively. The
20 level-4 grid covered Coquimbo Bay and was ~~also~~-built from the nautical charts 4111 with a resolution of 1 arcsec (~30m). Finally, the level-5 grid had a resolution of 1/3 arcsec (~10m) and was built from bathymetry of nautical charts 4111 and topography from a ~~detailed~~-DTM with a resolution of 2 m provided by the Ministry of Public Works (MINVU) in Coquimbo. The topography used high-resolution data; thus, the most important features such as the coastal road embankment, railway, river and wetland are well represented (see Figure 4, grid 5). Numerical simulations in Valparaiso involved four nested grids
25 with a maximum grid resolution of 1 arcsec (~30 m).

The roughness coefficient was defined as $n=0.025$ at the seabed, as recommended for tsunamis (Bricker et al., 2015; Kotani et al., 1998). However, we tested several roughness coefficient values in coastal, wetland and urban areas (~~Bricker et al., 2015~~)
in order to obtain the best fit of tsunami inundation height. The validation of the numerical simulation was performed using the Root Mean Square Error and the parameters K and κ given by equations (1) and (2) (Aida, 1978) (~~Gokon et al., 2014;~~
30 ~~Suppasri et al., 2014~~). The variable K_i is defined as $K_i = x_i/y_i$, where x_i and y_i are recorded and computed tsunami heights, respectively. The Japan Society of Civil Engineering provides guidelines, which recommend that $0.95 < K < 1.05$ and $\kappa < 1.45$ for there to be “good agreement” (Aida, 1978; Gokon et al., 2014).

$$\log K = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \log K_i, \quad (1)$$

$$\log \kappa = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\log K_i)^2 - (\log K)^2}, \quad (2)$$

Figure 5 shows the tsunami initial conditions of the four slip models and the tsunami waveforms of an elapsed time of 4 hours at three selected gauges, namely, Coquimbo, Valparaiso and DART buoy 32402. Even though the modified Li et al., (2016) model overestimates the maximum amplitude at the DART buoy, the simulation exhibits a very good agreement with the tsunami record in Coquimbo. When the Mw 8.3 models proposed by Ruiz et al. (2016) and Shrivastava et al. (2016) were analysed, it was possible to observe a good agreement at the DART buoy and Valparaiso tide gauge; however, the amplitude in Coquimbo is underestimated by more than a meter. The Okuwaki et al. (2016) model overestimates both the DART buoy and Valparaiso tide gauge, despite the second tsunami wave reaching a similar amplitude in Coquimbo. Nevertheless, the maximum tsunami amplitude is underestimated. Therefore, the modified Li et al. (2016) model is selected to assess the suitable Manning roughness coefficient.

Figure 6 shows the inundation area and tsunami inundation height results obtained from the numerical simulations of the Li et al. (2016) model with four different roughness coefficients. The tested coefficients are $n=0.025$ for coastal and riverine areas, 0.04 and 0.05 for low-density urban areas and 0.06 for medium-density urban areas (Bricker et al., 2015; Kotani et al., 1998). From the figure, it is possible to observe that the best fit is obtained for $n=0.025$, which resulted in $K = 1.05$ and $\kappa < 1.45$, corresponding to “good agreement.” For higher roughness coefficients, the tsunami inundation heights are underestimated. In addition, the larger the coefficient, the smaller the inundation area. This behavior could be explained by the fact that a significant part of the flooded area is a wetland and the developed area is rather small, with a low-density residential distribution. Subsequently, the inundation depth is computed from the inundation area given by the modified Li et al. (2016) slip model, with a roughness coefficient of $n=0.025$.

3.3 Fragility curve

The construction of a fragility curve requires a correlation between the structural damage level and the hydrodynamic features of a tsunami tsunami intensity measure such as the inundation flow depth, current velocity or hydrodynamic force. To do this, we used the classical approach with aggregated data and a least square fit (Koshimura et al., 2009). Since the velocity is difficult to be measured during tsunami and validated by numerical models, we used the tsunami inundation depth to develop the fragility curve. To this end, a sample size is defined such that each range of the the interpolated inundation depth tsunami intensity measure includes the defined number of structures. Then the damage probability is calculated by counting the number of destroyed or not-destroyed surviving structures for each range of the intensity measure inundation depth. Finally, the fragility function is developed through the regression analysis of the discrete set of the damage probabilities and the tsunami intensity measure inundation depths. Therefore, it is assumed that the cumulative probability P of occurrence of damage follows the standardized normal or lognormal distribution function given in equation (3). Φ is the distribution function, x is the hydrodynamic feature of the tsunami inundation depth of the tsunami and μ and σ are the mean and standard deviation of

x , respectively. The values of μ and σ are calculated by means of least-squares fitting of x and the inverse of Φ , (Φ^{-1}) on normal paper given by equation (4).

$$P(x) = \Phi \left[\frac{x-\mu}{\sigma} \right], \quad (3)$$

$$x = \sigma \Phi^{-1} + \mu, \quad (4)$$

- 5 The hydrodynamic force per unit width (kN/m) acting on a structures is computed as the drag force given by equation (5), where the drag coefficient is assumed to be $C_D = 1.0$ for simplicity, ρ is the density of sea water ($1,025 \text{ kg/m}^3$), U is the flow velocity (m/s) and h is the inundation depth (m).

$$F = \frac{1}{2} C_D \rho h U^2 \quad (5)$$

10

Figure 7 shows the results of simulated tsunami intensity measures. It is possible to observe that the topography plays an important role in tsunami inundation, as maximum values of inundation depth (Figure 7 a) occur at the beach and wetland, while developed areas behind the railway and areas distant from the shore experienced low inundation depths. In a similar manner, high velocities occur close to rapid topographic changes (Figure 7 b), such as the lee side of the coastal road, while low velocities are observed within the developed area under analysis (<3 m/s). Since the hydrodynamic force is a combination of both inundation depth and flow velocity (Figure 7 c), the developed area behind the railway experiences low force as well.

15

Figure 87 shows the tsunami inundation depth and the results of the tsunami fragility curves of Coquimbo for flow inundation depth, flow velocity and hydrodynamic force. The sample size was defined to be 40 structures; thus, 15 inundation depth ranges were used. Figure 87ab shows the histogram, while Figure 87cd shows the relationship between damage probability and inundation depth (upper panel), flow velocity (central panel) and hydrodynamic force (lower panel) with the solid line being the best-fit curve of the plot. The fragility curves were was estimated by means of regression analysis, as shown in Figure 87be. The statistical parameters of the developed fragility functions are shown in Table 1. In Figure 87, iThe values of μ and σ were found to be 2.4395 and 0.5537, respectively, with a correlation factor $R^2 = 0.852$.

20

It is possible to observe that inundation flow depths lower than 1.5 m did not generate damage to the surveyed structures and the damage probability of the curve is lower less than 10%. Moreover, the fragility curve shows that flow-inundation depths higher than 4 m could result in a 100% probability of severe damage to mixed structures in Coquimbo. With regards to the flow velocity, it is observed that most of data have velocities smaller than 2.5 m/s, with a damage probability less than 40%. In a similar manner, a hydrodynamic force lower than 2.5 kN/m proves to have a damage probability of less than 20%.

25

Since the 2015 tsunami had a moderate impact with low inundation depths and flow velocities within the developed areas,

30

Thus, it becomes very important to assess the tsunami damage due to possible events taking place in the same rupture area as that of the 1922 earthquake, since large inundation depths were reported there (see section 2).

3.4 Comparison with existing fragility curves

This section compares the fragility curve obtained in Coquimbo with other curves obtained in other places after recent events. The statistical parameters of existing fragility curves are shown in Table 42. One curve is that of Okushiri, Japan, which was obtained for wooden structures after the 1993 tsunami event. The analysis included 523 houses and a range of approximately 50 structures (Suppasri et al., 2012). In a similar manner, the fragility curve of Dichato, Chile, involved 915 mixed-material structures and a range of 50 structures after the 2010 Chile tsunami (Mas et al., 2012). A more comprehensive analysis was conducted in Banda Aceh, Indonesia, after the Indian Ocean Tsunami (Koshimura et al., 2009). This case involved 48,910 structures made of wood, timber and lightly reinforced concrete constructions, with a range of 1,000 structures. The proposed curves were constructed for inundation depth, flow velocity and hydrodynamic force. After the 2009 Samoa event, Gokon et al. (2014) developed a fragility curve for mixed structures, which included wood, masonry and reinforced concrete. Similar to the previous case, the curves were developed for the same three tsunami-intensity measures. In a similar manner, the fragility curves of Thailand were developed for two provinces, namely, Phang Nga and Phuket, with 2508 and 1033 structures, respectively. In addition, all data were combined in order to develop a fragility curve for mixed-material structures and inundation depth (Suppasri et al., 2011). Figure 9a shows a comparison of the Coquimbo fragility curve with 2-level damage curves of Dichato, Okushiri, Banda Aceh, American Samoa and Thailand. The comparison with the Coquimbo fragility curve is shown in Figure 8a. It is seen that Coquimbo experienced less damage than Dichato and Okushiri for inundation depths lower than 3 m. In fact, for an inundation depth of 2 m, Dichato and Okushiri have a 68-75% probability of damage, while in Coquimbo it is only 20%. The high probability of damage in Dichato and Okushiri could be due to the large number of structures made of wood and lightweight materials that have little resistance to tsunami flows (Mas et al., 2012). Even though the building materials in Coquimbo are similar, it is observed in Figure 7 b believed that the distance from the shore and railway embankment decrease flow velocity and subsequently the can decrease tsunami energy (see Figure 3); thus, the same inundation depth generates less damage to structures. In a similar manner, the fragility curve for mixed-type material structures in Thailand shows a high probability of damage for an inundation depth of 2 m (~50%), but a 100% probability of damage is reached for inundation depths higher than 8 m. In the case Banda Aceh, the curve has a low probability of damage (<20%) for an inundation depth of 2 m, which is comparable to Coquimbo; however, the damage probability in Coquimbo increases rapidly as the inundation depth increases, reaching 100% for an inundation depth of only 4 m, which could be because most of the houses have only 1 or 2 stories (see Figure 2). In addition, it was observed in Banda Aceh that structures were significantly vulnerable when flow velocity exceeded 2.5 m/s with a damage probability of 60%, and a 100% probability of damage for velocities larger than 4 m/s (Koshimura et al., 2009). These results are in good agreement with the fragility curve of Coquimbo. Moreover, the topography of Banda Aceh is characterized by low land with an elevation of around 3m, which is also similar to Coquimbo. With regard to American Samoa, the curve shows a low probability of damage for inundation depths lower than 2 m; it begins to increase up to 80% when the inundation depth reaches 6 m. It is important to mention that the fragility curves of Samoa were developed from different types of structures including wood, bricks and reinforced concrete.

In addition, the fragility curve as a function of the flow velocity shows significant damage (~50%) for velocities of 2 m/s, and only 80% probability of damage for velocities as high as 8 m/s (Gokon et al., 2014). Since all types of structures are analysed in a single curve, it is believed that low velocities would easily generate damage to wooden structures, while reinforced concrete structures would require higher inundation depths and flow velocities to be damaged. The relatively high damage probability at low inundation depths could be also due to the ria-type coast of American Samoa (Gokon et al., 2014).

Figures 9b and c show the comparison of the Coquimbo fragility curve with the curves given by Suppasri et al. (2013) for wooden and mixed materials in Japan, respectively. The study considered more than 250,000 damaged buildings surveyed after the 2011 Great East Japan Tsunami and made it possible to analyse different damage levels and building materials. In general, it is seen that wooden and mixed structures in Japan have similar behaviour. If damage level 4 (complete damage) is analysed, the damage probability is higher than in Coquimbo at an inundation depth lower than 2 m. Similar to the cases of Dichato and Okushiri, it is observed that wooden and mixed structures in Japan have a relatively high probability of complete damage (level 4), ranging from 50 to 60%, while in Coquimbo it is only 20%.

Another group of fragility curves for wooden and mixed structures is shown in Figures 9d and e, respectively, which were obtained from survey data of the 2011 Japan tsunami in the Sendai and Ishinomaki plains (Suppasri et al., 2012). These curves show that structures located in flat areas are less impacted by tsunami despite large inundation depths, in contrast to what happened in areas with ria topography such as the Sanriku coast (Suppasri et al., 2013; Suppasri et al., 2012) and semi-closed bays such as Dichato (Mas et al., 2012). This behaviour is in good agreement with damage observed in the Coquimbo area, where the flat area and distance from shore could decrease tsunami impact. Thus, based on influence of inundation depth and flow velocity influence on tsunami damage, De Risi et al., (2017) proposed the development of vulnerability models related to specific topographic contexts, such as plain-type or ria-type coasts. They found that ria-type coasts experience greater damage probability than plain-type coast at the same inundation depth.

However, it is interesting to notice that, from Figure 8d, it is possible to observe that the Coquimbo fragility curve (destroyed or completely damaged) overlaps with the minor-damage-level curve for wood and mixed-material houses in flat areas in Japan (Figure 9d and e). A possible explanation is that houses in Japan are relatively new and built according to strict construction standards (Suppasri et al., 2012), in contrast to what was observed in Coquimbo, where old houses are found (See Figure 2), although, it could also be due to the local topographic features of Coquimbo. This finding suggests that topography as well as structure quality should be considered in tsunami damage estimation.

4 Application of fragility curve to tsunami damage estimation

This section presents an example of the use of fragility curves to estimate tsunami damage through a deterministic tsunami scenario in Coquimbo. We first define a tsunami scenario, then we run the numerical simulation to obtain the inundation depth and, finally, we estimate the tsunami damage in Coquimbo. Since earthquake damage in the Coquimbo Region was limited in 2015 (Candia et al., 2017; Fernández et al., 2017), it is assumed that the damage to structures is due exclusively to the tsunami.

4.1. Tsunami source model

Based on Figure 1, three possible segments can be defined, namely, the Copiapó-Coquimbo, Coquimbo-Illapel and Illapel-Constitución regions. However, events in the Illapel-Constitución region, including those of 1822 and 1906, have never generated a tsunami in Coquimbo (Soloviev & Go, 1975). Only the 1730 event, which ruptured the Coquimbo-Illapel segment, generated a tsunami in the area of interest (Cisternas et al., 2011). Therefore, possible tsunamis generated in the Valparaíso segment were not considered in the present analysis. In a similar manner, earthquakes on the Coquimbo-Illapel segment were not considered as the 2015 [Illapel earthquake event](#) filled the seismic gap that had existed since the last major earthquake in 1943 or earlier events (Ye et al., 2016); therefore, no significant earthquakes that generate significant tsunamis could take place there in the near future. Conversely, the northern segment has [shown-presented](#) no relevant seismic activity since 1922 (see Figure 1). Moreover, the previous significant event took place in 1819 (73 years before the 1922 event). Therefore, the Copiapó-Coquimbo segment is of particular interest regarding possible future earthquakes and tsunamis in Coquimbo.

It is important to note that the small event in 1849 (magnitude 7.5, according to Lomnitz (2004)) generated a 5-m tsunami in Coquimbo. [Despite the small earthquake magnitude and large tsunami runup of the event, there is no scientific evidence of the occurrence of a tsunami earthquake.](#) In addition, the 1922 Atacama event had a complex source of three [time-clustered](#) shocks (Beck et al., 1998). Therefore, it seemed reasonable to separate the northern segments into two different seismic regions, with one segment covering Copiapó to Punta Choros (Figure [9b10b](#)) and the second segment from Punta Choros to Ovalle (Figure [9a10a](#)), which [also](#) coincides with the estimated rupture length of the 1849 event (see Figure 1).

The tsunami hazard assessment and damage estimation could use either a probabilistic or deterministic approach. While the former takes into account many uncertainties related to generation, propagation and inundation (Cheung et al., 2011; Geist & Parsons, 2006; Heidarzadeh & Kijko, 2011; Horspool et al., 2014; Park & Cox, 2016), the latter uses credible worst-case scenarios based on historical events (Aránguiz et al., 2014; Mitsoudis et al., 2012; Wijetunge, 2012). However, the coupling coefficient could be used to assess the shape of possible future deterministic earthquakes (Métois et al., 2016; Pulido et al., 2015), since reasonable heterogeneous slip models could be predicted by the interseismic degree of locking (Calisto et al., 2016; Gonzalez-Carrasco et al., 2015). Thus, the slip distribution S at arbitrary space ξ is represented as given by equation (56):

$$S(\xi) = \int_{t_0}^{t_1} C(\xi, t)V(\xi)dt - \sum_j (s_j(\xi) + p_j(\xi)), \quad (56)$$

where C is the interseismic coupling, ranging from 0 to 1. The interseismic coupling model adopted in this study is from Métois et al., (2016), which is derived from inverting Global Positioning System (GPS) measurements along the Chilean margin (18–38°S) that have been conducted by international teams since the early 1990s (see Métois et al., (2016) and references therein). It provides a reasonable estimate of the degree of locking between the Nazca and the South American plates, indicating strong coupling along the scenario source regions (See Figures [109d](#) to f). V is the plate convergence rate at

ξ derived from the NNR-Nuvel1A model (DeMets et al., 1994) and t_0 and t_1 delimit the interseismic period for integration. s_j is the slip of the small event ($4.8 \leq M_w \leq 7.9$) at the j th location, which is listed in the Global Centroid Moment Tensor (GCMT) Catalog (<http://www.globalcmt.org/CMTsearch.html>, see Figure 109e), and p_j is the post-seismic slip following s_j . Each amount of slip s_j is calculated based on the seismic moment obtained by the GCMT and the empirical relationship between rupture area and the moment magnitude introduced by Wells & Coppersmith (1994). The rigidity modulus for the calculation of moment magnitude of each s_j is computed with the layered, near-source structure adopted in the source study by Okuwaki et al. (2016). We eliminated the Mw 8.3 2015 Illapel earthquake from the GCMT list and instead considered its contribution to the scenario source models with the inverted slip model by Okuwaki et al. (2016) in equation (56) (Fig. 109). The slip motion of S is assumed to be pure thrust against the subducting plate motion. Note that C is constant against time and the post-seismic slip p_j is not considered in the present analysis; thus, it is possible that the scenario source models will slightly overestimate S .

The variable slip distribution was obtained from the heterogeneous interseismic coupling C . Time intervals for the integral of equation (56) are assumed to be 94 years (1922 to 2016). Each segment is subdivided into 10 km x 10 km sub-space knots for 150 x 160 km^2 and 180 x 160 km^2 source areas for S1 and S2, respectively. While the magnitude of the event related to segment S1 is Mw 8.2, the magnitude of the S2 event is Mw 8.4. If both segments are considered together (S3=S1+S2), the total magnitude is Mw 8.5. The strike and dip angles for the scenario source geometry are assumed to be constant based on the subducting slab geometry of the Slab 1.0 model (Hayes et al., 2012): (Strike, Dip) = (2.7°, 15.0°) for S1 and (Strike, Dip) = (16.0°, 15.0°) for S2. The fault geometry and characteristic source parameters as well as complete model parameters for each scenario source model are available from the authors upon request.

4.2 Numerical simulation of proposed tsunami scenario

The computation covered an elapsed time of 6 hours with output intervals of 1 min. Figure 110 shows the main results and the three different combinations of tsunami scenarios. The upper row shows the results for segment S1 (Mw 8.2) and the central row shows the results for segment S2 (Mw 8.4), while the lower row shows the results for the combined scenario of S1 and S2 (Mw 8.5). In addition, the left column shows the vertical displacement of the seafloor, the central column shows the maximum inundation flow depth and the right column shows the tsunami wave form at the Coquimbo tide gauge during an elapsed time of 4 hours (240 min). It is observed that segment S2 (Mw 8.4) generated lower inundation depths than segment S1 (Mw 8.2), which can be explained by the fact that the strike angle and the coastal morphology make the tsunami propagate toward the north and not directly toward Coquimbo Bay. Meanwhile, the tsunami generated by segment S1, the second wave of which is the largest, propagates directly toward Coquimbo Bay. It is possible to observe that the maximum inundation depths reached up to 5m in developed areas and along the coastline. Moreover, it is interesting that the Mw 8.5 event, as a combination of S1 and S2 (lower row in Figure 110), generated lower inundation depths than segment S1 alone. This can be

explained by the fact that the maximum tsunami amplitude of each individual event does not take place at the same time; subsequently, the tsunami from segment S2 decreases the maximum amplitude of the tsunami from segment S1. Larger tsunami amplitudes could be obtained if there is a time difference between segments S1 and S2 such that the maximum tsunami waves coincide. Nevertheless, this analysis is beyond the scope of the present paper.

5

4.3 Damage to structures

The previous section demonstrated that the combination of S1 and S2 rupturing at the same time generated lower inundation heights than S1 alone. Therefore, the damage to structures is assessed for segment S1 only, i.e., a tsunami generated by a Mw 8.2 earthquake off the coast of Coquimbo, which generates inundation heights lower than 5 m. It is important to mention that this event would generate a subsidence of 20cm in Coquimbo, which is included in the simulations. Figure 12 shows the results for each tsunami intensity measure, namely, inundation depth, flow velocity and hydrodynamic force (upper row). In addition, the lower row in Figure 12 shows the difference of maximum tsunami intensity measures given by the S1 scenario and the simulated 2015 tsunami event (Figure 7). This figure allows areas with a higher increase in tsunami intensity measure and subsequently, higher damage probability, to be identified. It is observed that the highest increase in inundation depth takes place at the corner where the coastal road and railway converge. Similar situation is observed for the flow velocity and hydrodynamic force. Therefore, this area demonstrated to have the highest tsunami hazard.

-In order to determine a high or low probability of damage to a given structure, first, latitude and longitude coordinates are assigned to each structure within the inundation area, and the maximum inundation flow depths given by the tsunami numerical simulation at the location of each structure are exported to GIS. Second, the inundation flow depth database is divided into several ranges, with 40 samples in each range, and the mean value of each range is intersected with the fragility curve given in Figure 87c in order to define the damage probability for each range. For simplicity, and similar to previous studies (Fraser et al., 2014; Wiebe & Cox, 2014), we used the fragility curve as a function of the inundation depth only. Third, the damage probability given in the previous step is assumed to be equal to the percentage of structures with a high probability of damage within each range. To do this, the inundation depths for each range are arranged in descending order and the structures outside of that percentage (with the lowest inundation flow depth within the range) are assumed to have a low probability of damage. Figure 13+a shows the low area of the city of Coquimbo and the computed inundation flow depth given by the numerical simulation of scenario S1. 646 structures of mixed construction materials were identified within the inundation area, and they are coloured according to inundation flow depth level. Figure 13+b shows the result of the damage estimation. It was found that 321 structures, i.e., 49.6% of the flooded structures, have a high probability of damage, a figure that is much larger than the 20% surveyed right after the 2015 tsunami. As expected, the structures behind the railway embankment and wetland would experience less damage than structures located close to the shore.

Due to the high probability of damage to houses located close to the shore, it is recommended that any reconstruction plan or future tsunami mitigation measures consider the fact that high tsunami inundation depths (5-8 m) could be generated in this area. After the 2011 Japan tsunami, it has been demonstrated that comprehensive urban planning is the key point for avoiding future disasters, such that the best strategy to decrease tsunami risk is an integration of structural/non-structural means of coastal protection and land use management as a strategy with multiple lines of defence (Strusińska-Correia, 2017). -In addition, the most important lessons from the 2011 Japan tsunami include methods to strengthen coastal defence structures, evacuation buildings and coastal forests. (Suppasri et al., 2016). Thus, Coquimbo seems to be an interesting study case, since the coastal road, wetland and railway partly fulfil the structural requirements of a multilayer tsunami countermeasure. Therefore, it would be necessary to implement more comprehensive non-structural countermeasures in the future. In a local context, Khew et al., (2015) found that the tsunami countermeasures implemented in the Greater Concepcion area after the 2010 Chile tsunami, such as hard infrastructure, contributed positively to the recovery of economic and social resilience; however, it was found that new elevated housing decreased social resilience. Moreover, it is recommended that effective decentralization of governmental and business structures is applied, thus public opinion, be effectively incorporated into the design of hard- infrastructure for tsunami mitigation (Khew et al., 2015). Finally, it was also found that tsunami mitigation measures implemented in Dichato after the 2010 Chile tsunami did not decrease tsunami risk due to the fact that some vulnerability variables (housing conditions, low household incomes and limited knowledge of tsunami events) are still at the same level (Martínez et al., 2017). Subsequently, non-structural mitigation measures should play an important role in effectively decreasing tsunami risk in the future.

5 Conclusions

Numerical simulations of the 2015 Chile tsunami proved to be in good agreement with field survey data in Coquimbo. A Coquimbo fragility curve was developed with two-level classification of structural damage, namely, “not-destroyed surviving” and “destroyed.” The Coquimbo fragility curve shows a low probability of damage, 20%, at a relatively high inundation depth (2m), in contrast to what was observed in another Chilean town, Dichato, where a 68% probability of damage is obtained for the same inundation depth. This result is in good agreement with fragility curves in the Sendai and Ishinomaki plains in Japan, such that tsunami energy was decreased and less damage was observed. ~~Future research may include other hydrodynamic features such as velocity or hydrodynamic force, even the development of fragility surface.~~

The fragility curve may be used to estimate possible future tsunami damage in the Coquimbo and other places with similar topography and building materials. In Coquimbo, it was found that a Magnitude Mw 8.2 earthquake off the coast of Coquimbo could generate a destructive tsunami with inundation flow depths of up to 5 m. The assessment of tsunami damage with the fragility curve demonstrated that ~50% of the structures have a high probability of damage if the reconstruction is carried out

with the same types of structures, which is greater than the damage caused by the 2015 tsunami (20%). Therefore, tsunami mitigation measures and the reconstruction plan should consider the potential tsunami damage due to a future earthquake off the coast of Coquimbo. It is recommended that new land use policies be implemented in order to regulate the type of structures being built in the inundation area. [In addition, based on previous experience in Japan and Chile, new tsunami mitigation measures must consider a combination of both structural and non-structural tsunami countermeasures in order to effectively decrease tsunami risk in Coquimbo in the future.](#)

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank CONICYT (Chile) for its FONDAP 15110017 and FONDECYT 11140424 grants, as well as the Research and Innovation Department (Dirección de Investigación e Innovación) of the Universidad Católica Sma. Concepción. Special thanks to those who contributed to the collection of field data: Associate Professor Dr. Enrique Muñoz and students Evelyn Pedrero, Evans Aravena and Diego Espinoza. Thanks to the Ministry of Housing for providing us with topography data.

References

- Aida, I. (1978). Reliability of a tsunami source model derived from fault parameters. *Journal of Physics of the Earth*, 26(1), 57–73. <http://doi.org/10.4294/jpe1952.26.57>
- Aránguiz, R., González, G., González, J., Catalán, P., A., Cienfuegos, R., Yagi, Y., ... Rojas, C. (2016). The 16 September 2015 Chile Tsunami from the Post-Tsunami Survey and Numerical Modeling Perspectives. *Pure and Applied Geophysics*, 173(2), 333–348. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s00024-015-1225-4>
- Aránguiz, R., Shibayama, T., & Yamazaki, Y. (2014). Tsunamis from the Arica-Tocopilla source region and their effects on ports of Central Chile. *Natural Hazards*, 71(1), 175–202. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-013-0906-5>
- Beck, S., Barrientos, S., Kausel, E., & Reyes, S. (1998). Source characteristics of historic earthquakes along the central Chile subduction zone. *Journal of South American Earth Science*, 11(2), 115–129.
- Bricker, J. D., Gibson, S., Takagi, H., & Imamura, F. (2015). On the Need for Larger Manning' s Roughness Coefficients in Depth-Integrated Tsunami Inundation Models. *Coastal Engineering Journal*. <http://doi.org/10.1142/S0578563415500059>
- Calisto, I., Miller, M., & Constanzo, I. (2016). Comparison Between Tsunami Signals Generated by Different Source Models and the Observed Data of the Illapel 2015 Earthquake. *Pure and Applied Geophysics*, 173(4), 1051–1061. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s00024-016-1253-8>
- Candía, G., de Pascale, G. P., Montalva, G., & Ledezma, C. (2017). Geotechnical Aspects of the 2015 Mw 8.3 Illapel Megathrust Earthquake Sequence in Chile. *Earthquake Spectra*, 33(2), 709–728.

<http://doi.org/10.1193/031716EQS043M>

- Carvajal, M., Cisternas, M., Gubler, A., Catalán, P. A., Winckler, P., & Wesson, R. L. (2017). Reexamination of the magnitudes for the 1906 and 1922 Chilean earthquakes using Japanese tsunami amplitudes: Implications for source depth constraints. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth*, *122*(1), 4–17. <http://doi.org/10.1002/2016JB013269>
- 5 Charvet, I., Macabuag, J., & Rossetto, T. (2017). Estimating Tsunami-Induced Building Damage through Fragility Functions: Critical Review and Research Needs. *Frontiers in Built Environment*, *3*, 36. <http://doi.org/10.3389/fbuil.2017.00036>
- Charvet, I., Suppasri, A., Kimura, H., Sugawara, D., & Imamura, F. (2015). A multivariate generalized linear tsunami fragility model for Kesenuma City based on maximum flow depths, velocities and debris impact, with evaluation of predictive accuracy. *Natural Hazards*, *79*(3), 2073–2099. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-015-1947-8>
- 10 Cheung, K. F., Wei, Y., Yamazaki, Y., & Yim, S. C. S. (2011). Modeling of 500-year tsunamis for probabilistic design of coastal infrastructure in the Pacific Northwest. *Coastal Engineering*, *58*(10), 970–985. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.coastaleng.2011.05.003>
- Cisternas, M., Gorigoitia, N., Torrejón, F., & Urbina, X. (2011). Terremoto y tsunami de Chile central de 1730: ¿Un gigante o una serie de eventos menores? In *XXXI Congreso de Ciencias del Mar*.
- 15 Contreras-López, M., Winckler, P., Sepúlveda, I., Andaur-Álvarez, A., Cortés-Molina, F., Guerrero, C. J., ... Figueroa-Sterquel, R. (2016). Field Survey of the 2015 Chile Tsunami with Emphasis on Coastal Wetland and Conservation Areas. *Pure and Applied Geophysics*, *173*(2), 349–367. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s00024-015-1235-2>
- De Risi, R., Goda, K., Yasuda, T., & Mori, N. (2017). Is flow velocity important in tsunami empirical fragility modeling? *Earth-Science Reviews*, *166*, 64–82. <http://doi.org/10.1016/J.EARSCIREV.2016.12.015>
- 20 DeMets, C., Gordon, R. G., Argus, D. F., & Stein, S. (1994). Effect of recent revisions to the geomagnetic reversal time scale on estimates of current plate motions. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *21*(20), 2191–2194. <http://doi.org/10.1029/94GL02118>
- Dengler, L., Borrero, J., Gelfenbaum, G., Jaffe, B., Okal, E., Ortiz, M., ... Ocala, L. (2003). Tsunami. *Earthquake Spectra*, *19*(S1), 115–144. <http://doi.org/10.1193/1.1737247>
- 25 Dominey-Howes, D., Dengler, L., Dunbar, P., Kong, L., Fritz, H., Imamura, F., ... Yamamoto, M. (2012). *International tsunami survey team (ITST) post-tsunami survey field guide*. UNESCO-IOC, Paris.
- Fernández, J., Pastén, C., Ruiz, S., & Leyton, F. (2017). Estudio de efectos de sitio en la Región de Coquimbo durante el terremoto de Illapel Mw 8.3 de 2015. *Obras Y Proyectos*, (21), 20–28.
- Fraser, S. A., Power, W. L., Wang, X., Wallace, L. M., Mueller, C., & Johnston, D. M. (2014). Tsunami inundation in Napier, New Zealand, due to local earthquake sources. *Natural Hazards*, *70*(1), 415–445. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-013-0820-x>
- Fuentes, M. A., Riquelme, S., Hayes, G. P., Medina, M., Melgar, D., Vargas, G., ... Villalobos, A. (2016). A Study of the 2015 M w 8.3 Illapel Earthquake and Tsunami: Numerical and Analytical Approaches. *Pure and Applied Geophysics*. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s00024-016-1305-0>

- Geist, E. L., & Parsons, T. (2006). Probabilistic analysis of tsunami hazards. *Natural Hazards*, 37(3), 277–314.
- Gokon, H., Koshimura, S., Imai, K., Matsuoka, M., Namegaya, Y., & Nishimura, Y. (2014). Developing fragility functions for the areas affected by the 2009 Samoa earthquake and tsunami. *Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci.*, 14, 3231–3241. <http://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-14-3231-2014>
- 5 Gonzalez-Carrasco, J., Aránguiz, R., Dominguez, J., C., & Urra, L. (2015). Assessment of interseismic coupling models to estimate inundation and runup. In *Seismological Research Letters* (pp. 665–666).
- Hayes, G. P., Wald, D. J., & Johnson, R. L. (2012). Slab1.0: A three-dimensional model of global subduction zone geometries. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth*, 117(B1), n/a-n/a. <http://doi.org/10.1029/2011JB008524>
- Heidarzadeh, M., & Kijko, A. (2011). A probabilistic tsunami hazard assessment for the Makran subduction zone at the
10 northwestern Indian Ocean. *Natural Hazards*, 56(3), 577–593. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-010-9574-x>
- Horspool, N., Pranantyo, I., Griffin, J., Latief, H., Natawidjaja, D. H., Kongko, W., ... Thio, H. K. (2014). A probabilistic tsunami hazard assessment for Indonesia. *Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci.*, 14(11), 3105–3122. <http://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-14-3105-2014>
- Khew, Y. T. J., Jarzebski, M. P., Dyah, F., San Carlos, R., Gu, J., Esteban, M., ... Akiyama, T. (2015). Assessment of social
15 perception on the contribution of hard-infrastructure for tsunami mitigation to coastal community resilience after the 2010 tsunami: Greater Concepcion area, Chile. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 13, 324–333. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdr.2015.07.013>
- Koshimura, S., Namegaya, Y., & Yanagisawa, H. (2009). Tsunami fragility: A new measure to identify tsunami damage. *Journal of Disaster Research*, 4(6), 479–488. Retrieved from
20 <http://www.fujipress.jp/finder/xslt.php?mode=present&inputfile=DSSTR000400060013.xml>
- Koshimura, S., Oie, T., Yanagisawa, H., & Imamura, F. (2009). Developing Fragility Functions for Tsunami Damage Estimation Using Numerical Model and Post-Tsunami Data From Banda Aceh, Indonesia. *Coastal Engineering Journal*, 51(3), 243–273. <http://doi.org/10.1142/S0578563409002004>
- Kotani, M., Imamura, F., & Shuto, N. (1998). Tsunami runup simulation and damage estimation by using geographical
25 information system. In *Proceedings of Coastal Engineering JSCE* (p. vol 45 pp356-360).
- Li, L., Lay, T., Cheung, K. F., & Ye, L. (2016). Joint modeling of teleseismic and tsunami wave observations to constrain the 16 September 2015 Illapel, Chile Mw 8.3 earthquake rupture process. *Geophysical Research Letters*, (September 2015), 4303–4312. <http://doi.org/10.1002/2016GL068674>
- Lomnitz, C. (2004). Major Earthquakes of Chile: A Historical Survey, 1535-1960. *Seismological Research Letters*, 75(3),
30 368–378. <http://doi.org/10.1785/gssrl.75.3.368>
- Macabuag, J., Rossetto, T., Ioannou, I., Suppasri, A., Sugawara, D., Adriano, B., ... Koshimura, S. (2016). A proposed methodology for deriving tsunami fragility functions for buildings using optimum intensity measures. *Natural Hazards*, 84(2), 1257–1285. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-016-2485-8>
- Martínez, C., Rojas, O., Villagra, P., Aránguiz, R., & Sáez-Carrillo, K. (2017). Risk factors and perceived restoration in a town

- destroyed by the 2010 Chile tsunami. *Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences*, 17(5). <http://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-17-721-2017>
- Mas, E., Koshimura, S., Suppasri, A., Matsuoka, M., Matsuyama, M., Yoshii, T., ... Imamura, F. (2012). Developing Tsunami fragility curves using remote sensing and survey data of the 2010 Chilean Tsunami in Dichato. *Natural Hazards and Earth System Science*, 12(8), 2689–2697. <http://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-12-2689-2012>
- Melgar, D., Fan, W., Riquelme, S., Geng, J., Liang, C., Fuentes, M., ... Fielding, E. J. (2016). Slip segmentation and slow rupture to the trench during the 2015, Mw8.3 Illapel, Chile earthquake. *Geophysical Research Letters*. <http://doi.org/10.1002/2015GL067369>
- Métois, M., Vigny, C., & Socquet, A. (2016). Interseismic Coupling, Megathrust Earthquakes and Seismic Swarms Along the Chilean Subduction Zone (38°S–18°S). *Pure and Applied Geophysics*, 173(5), 1431–1449. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s00024-016-1280-5>
- Mitsoudis, D. A., Flouri, E. T., Chrysoulakis, N., Kamarianakis, Y., Okal, E. A., & Synolakis, C. E. (2012). Tsunami hazard in the southeast Aegean Sea. *Coastal Engineering*, 60(1), 136–148. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.coastaleng.2011.09.004>
- Nandasena, N. A. K., Sasaki, Y., & Tanaka, N. (2012). Modeling field observations of the 2011 Great East Japan tsunami: Efficacy of artificial and natural structures on tsunami mitigation. *Coastal Engineering*, 67, 1–13. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.coastaleng.2012.03.009>
- Nishenko, S. P. (1985). Seismic potential for large and great interplate earthquakes along the Chilean and Southern Peruvian Margins of South America: A quantitative reappraisal. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 90(B5), 3589–3615. <http://doi.org/10.1029/JB090iB05p03589>
- Nistor, I., Palermo, D., Nouri, Y., Murty, T., & Saatcioglu, M. (2009). Tsunami-Induced Forces on Structures. In C. Y. Kim (Ed.), *Handbook of Coastal and Ocean Engineering* (pp. 261–286). World Scientific. http://doi.org/10.1142/9789812819307_0011
- Okada, Y. (1985). Surface deformation due to shear and tensile faults in a half space. *Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America*, 75(4), 1135–1154.
- Okuwaki, R., Yagi, Y., Aránguiz, R., González, J., & González, G. (2016). Rupture Process During the 2015 Illapel, Chile Earthquake: Zigzag-Along-Dip Rupture Episodes. *Pure and Applied Geophysics*, 173(4), 1011–1020. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s00024-016-1271-6>
- Park, H., & Cox, D. T. (2016). Probabilistic assessment of near-field tsunami hazards: Inundation depth, velocity, momentum flux, arrival time, and duration applied to Seaside, Oregon. *Coastal Engineering*, 117, 79–96. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.coastaleng.2016.07.011>
- Park, H., Cox, D. T., & Barbosa, A. R. (2017). Comparison of inundation depth and momentum flux based fragilities for probabilistic tsunami damage assessment and uncertainty analysis. *Coastal Engineering*, 122, 10–26. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.coastaleng.2017.01.008>
- Pulido, N., Aguilar, Z., Tavera, H., Chlieh, M., Calderón, D., Sekiguchi, T., ... Yamazaki, F. (2015). Scenario Source Models

- and Strong Ground Motion for Future Mega-earthquakes: Application to Lima, Central Peru. *Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America*. Retrieved from <http://www.bssaonline.org/content/early/2015/01/06/0120140098.abstract>
- 5 Ruiz, S., Klein, E., DelCampo, F., Rivera, E., Poli, P., Metois, M., ... Fleitout, L. (2016). The Seismic Sequence of the 16 September 2015 Mw 8.3 Illapel, Chile, Earthquake. *Seismological Research Letters*, 87(July/August 2016), 789–799. <http://doi.org/10.1785/0220150281>
- Shimozono, T., & Sato, S. (2016). Coastal vulnerability analysis during tsunami-induced levee overflow and breaching by a high-resolution flood model. *Coastal Engineering*, 107, 116–126. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.coastaleng.2015.10.007>
- 10 Shrivastava, M. N., González, G., Moreno, M., Chlieh, M., Salazar, P., Reddy, C. D., ... delaLlera, J. C. (2016). Coseismic slip and afterslip of the 2015 Mw 8.3 Illapel (Chile) earthquake determined from continuous GPS data. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 43. <http://doi.org/10.1002/2016GL070684>
- Soloviev, S. L., & Go, C. N. (1975). *A Catalogue of Tsunamis on the Eastern Shore of the Pacific Ocean*. Moscow: Nauka Publishing House.
- 15 Song, J., De Risi, R., & Goda, K. (2017). Influence of Flow Velocity on Tsunami Loss Estimation. *Geosciences*, 7(4), 114. <http://doi.org/10.3390/geosciences7040114>
- Strusińska-Correia, A. (2017). Tsunami mitigation in Japan after the 2011 Tōhoku Tsunami. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 22, 397–411. <http://doi.org/10.1016/J.IJDRR.2017.02.001>
- 20 Suppasri, A., Koshimura, S., & Imamura, F. (2011). Developing tsunami fragility curves based on the satellite remote sensing and the numerical modeling of the 2004 Indian Ocean tsunami in Thailand. *Natural Hazards and Earth System Science*, 11(1), 173–189. <http://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-11-173-2011>
- Suppasri, A., Koshimura, S., Matsuoka, M., Gokon, H., & Kamthonkiat, D. (2012). Application of Remote Sensing for Tsunami Disaster. In *Remote Sensing of Planet Earth*. InTech.
- 25 Suppasri, A., Latcharote, P., Bricker, J. D., Leelawat, N., Hayashi, A., Yamashita, K., ... Imamura, F. (2016). Improvement of Tsunami Countermeasures Based on Lessons from The 2011 Great East Japan Earthquake and Tsunami — Situation After Five Years. *Coastal Engineering Journal*, 58(4), 1640011. <http://doi.org/10.1142/S0578563416400118>
- Suppasri, A., Mas, E., Charvet, I., Gunasekera, R., Imai, K., Fukutani, Y., ... Imamura, F. (2013). Building damage characteristics based on surveyed data and fragility curves of the 2011 Great East Japan tsunami. *Natural Hazards*, 66(2), 319–341. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-012-0487-8>
- 30 Suppasri, A., Mas, E., Koshimura, S., Imai, K., Harada, K., & Imamura, F. (2012). Developing Tsunami Fragility Curves From the Surveyed Data of the 2011 Great East Japan Tsunami in Sendai and Ishinomaki Plains. *Coastal Engineering Journal*, 54(116), 1–16. <http://doi.org/10.1142/S0578563412500088>
- Synolakis, C. E., & Okal, E. A. (2005). 1992–2002: Perspective on a Decade of Post-Tsunami Surveys BT - Tsunamis: Case Studies and Recent Developments. In K. Satake (Ed.) (pp. 1–29). Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands. http://doi.org/10.1007/1-4020-3331-1_1

- Wei, Z., Dalrymple, R. A., Hartzell, A., Bilotta, G., Rustico, E., & Yeh, H. (2015). SPH modeling of dynamic impact of tsunami bore on bridge piers. *Coastal Engineering*, *104*, 26–42. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.coastaleng.2015.06.008>
- Wells, D. L., & Coppersmith, K. J. (1994). New empirical relationships among magnitude, rupture length, rupture width, rupture area, and surface displacement. *Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America*, *84*(4), 974–1002. Retrieved from <http://www.bssaonline.org/content/84/4/974.abstract>
- Wiebe, D. M., & Cox, D. T. (2014). Application of fragility curves to estimate building damage and economic loss at a community scale: a case study of Seaside, Oregon. *Natural Hazards*, *71*(3), 2043–2061. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-013-0995-1>
- Wijetunge, J. J. (2012). Nearshore tsunami amplitudes off Sri Lanka due to probable worst-case seismic scenarios in the Indian Ocean. *Coastal Engineering*, *64*, 47–56. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.coastaleng.2012.02.005>
- Yamazaki, Y., Cheung, K. F., & Kowalik, Z. (2011). Depth-integrated, non-hydrostatic model with grid nesting for tsunami generation, propagation, and run-up. *International Journal for Numerical Methods in Fluids*, *67*(12), 2081–2107. <http://doi.org/10.1002/flid.2485>
- Yamazaki, Y., Kowalik, Z., & Cheung, K. F. (2009). Depth-integrated, non-hydrostatic model for wave breaking and run-up. *International Journal for Numerical Methods in Fluids*, *61*(5), 473–497. <http://doi.org/10.1002/flid.1952>
- Ye, L., Lay, T., Kanamori, H., & Koper, K. D. (2016). Rapidly Estimated Seismic Source Parameters for the 16 September 2015 Illapel, Chile Mw 8.3 Earthquake. *Pure and Applied Geophysics*, *173*(2), 321–332. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s00024-015-1202-y>


20 **Table 1. Statistical parameters for developed fragility curves obtained from a normal distribution.**

Tsunami Intensity measure	μ	σ	R^2
Inundation depth (m)	2.4395	0.5537	0.8524
Flow velocity (m/s)	2.5268	0.6421	0.8580
Hydrodynamic force (kN/m)	4.2564	1.7055	0.7512

25 **Table 12. Summary of statistical parameters and damage levels for empirical fragility curves (Mas et al., 2012; Suppasri et al., 2013; Suppasri et al., 2012) including the current Coquimbo case. μ and σ are statistical parameters for normal distribution, while μ' and σ' are the same parameters for lognormal distribution**

Event	Location	Structure type	Damage level	No. structures inspected	μ	σ	μ'	σ'	R^2
Chile (2015)	Coquimbo-Chile	Wood, masonry, mixed	Surviving/not destroyed/ destroyed	568	2.4395	0.5537			0.852

Chile (2010)	Dichato-Chile	Wood, masonry, mixed	<u>Not destroyed</u> <u>Surviving/Destroyed</u>	915			0.092	1.272	0.86
Japan (2011)	Okushiri-Japan	Wood	<u>Not destroyed</u> <u>Surviving/Destroyed</u>	523			0.216	0.736	0.82
Indian Ocean (2004)	Banda Aceh-Indonecia	Wood, timber, RC	<u>Not destroyed</u> <u>Surviving/destroyed</u>	48,910	2.985	1.117			0.99
Indian Ocean (2004)	Thailand	Mix type	<u>Not destroyed/destroyed</u>	3541			0.747	0.984	0.88
Samoa (2009)	American Samoa	Wood, bricks and RC.	<u>Not destroyed/destroyed</u>				1.17	0.69	0.89
Japan (2011)	Hokkaido, Aomori, Iwate, Miyagi, Fukushima, Ibaraki, Chiba	Wood	Level 1	251,000 (total)			-2.1216	1.2261	0.98
			Level 2				-0.9338	0.9144	0.98
			Level 3				-0.040	0.7276	0.98
			Level 4				0.6721	0.4985	0.98
			Level 5				0.7825	0.5559	0.98
			Level 6				1.2094	0.5247	0.97
Japan (2011)	Hokkaido, Aomori, Iwate, Miyagi, Fukushima, Ibaraki, Chiba	Mix	Level 1	251,000 (total)			-2.4562	1.4874	0.99
			Level 2				-1.1373	1.115	0.96
			Level 3				-0.0756	0.8277	0.97
			Level 4				0.5316	0.6235	0.91
			Level 5				0.8336	0.6077	0.97
			Level 6				1.2244	0.5723	0.98
Japan (2011)	Ishinomaki and Sendai plains	Wood	minor	150			2.4409	0.6409	0.95
			moderate				2.9028	0.6777	0.94
			major				3.8458	0.8516	0.95
			complete				4.2243	1.0159	0.80
Japan (2011)	Ishinomaki and Sendai plains	Mix	minor	189			2.4954	0.8249	0.81
			moderate				3.2550	1.0647	0.80
			major				4.4355	1.3068	0.83
			complete				5.0620	1.4872	0.84




5 **Figure 1: Seismicity of central Chile. Left: Space-time plot of large earthquakes along central Chile. Red bars are the events along the Copiapó-Coquimbo region and the red stars represent smaller seismic events. The blue bars are events along the Coquimbo-Illapel seismic region, while the black lines represent events along the Los Vilos-Constitución segment. The dashed line is the large event of 1730, which ruptured both the Los Vilos-Constitución and Coquimbo-Illapel segments. (Beck et al., 1998; Lomnitz, 2004; Métois et al., 2016; Nishenko, 1985). Right: Map showing the cities and towns mentioned in the text. The yellow star represents the epicenter of the 2015 Illapel Earthquake. The thin black lines are isobaths at water depths of 200, 1000 and 3000 m. The thick black line is the Peru-Chile trench.**





Figure 2: Photographs of surveyed masonry houses after by the September 16th 2015 tsunami in the Coquimbo area. The red letter d indicates the observed tsunami inundation flow depth. All photos were taken on September 22nd of 2015. a) and b) Houses with no damage. c) 2-story house with moderate damage. d) 1-story house with major damage. e) 1-story house with complete damage. f) Washed away structure.

5



5 **Figure 3. a) Surveyed damage to structures due to the 2015 tsunami; RC: reinforced concrete structures, L.S.: Light structures. b) Coquimbo Inundated area (Aránguiz et al., 2016) and survey data. Red circles represent inundation measures and yellow triangles tsunami runup.**




Figure 4. Model setting and nested computational grids for Coquimbo.




Figure 5. Tsunami initial conditions of four source models and comparison of tsunami records with simulated tsunami waveforms at DART 32402, Coquimbo and Valparaiso.




Figure 6. Tsunami inundation heights obtained with the modified Li et al. (2016) source model and four different Manning coefficients, $n=0.025, 0.04, 0.05, 0.06$. The parameters of root means square error, K and κ area also shown.

5








Figure 7. Results of tsunami numerical simulations of the 2015 event for each intensity measure. a) Inundation depth, b) flow velocity and c) Hydrodynamic force.

10







Figure 87. Developing the tsunami fragility curve. a) **Inundation depths from Numerical simulation.** b) Histogram of the number of destroyed and **surviving-not-destroyed** structures in terms of the **tsunami intensity measures** **inundation depth** within the inundation area. **be** Plot of data on normal probability paper and least-squares fit. **ce**) Fragility function for building damage in terms of **the tsunami intensity measures** **inundation depth**; the solid line is the best-fit curve of the plot (o: the distribution of damage probability).

5






Figure 89. Tsunami fragility curves for damage probability developed for other locations and different damage levels. a) Two levels of damage obtained for three-five different places cities in Chile, Japan, and Indonesia, Thailand and American Samoa. b) Six damage levels for wooden structures given by Suppasri et al., (2013). c) Six damage levels for mixed-material structures by Suppasri et al., (2013). d) Four damage levels for wooden houses given by Suppasri et al., (2012). e) Four damage levels for mixed-material structures given by Suppasri et al., (2012).

5





Figure 910. Upper panel: Slip distributions along scenario source models. The grey rectangles outline each scenario source segment. The moment magnitude for each scenario source model is denoted in the left-top of the corresponding panel. Lower panel: (left) the ISC model from the Métois et al., (2016), (center) GCMT solutions, and (right) the inverted slip model from Okuwaki et al., (2016),

10

which are considered for construction of scenario source models. The star denotes the epicenter of the 2015 Illapel earthquake determined by the Centro Sismológico Nacional (CSN). The blue contours delimit the inverted slip distribution every 2.08 m for the 2015 Illapel earthquake (Okuwaki et al., 2016)



5

Figure 4011. Results of tsunami numerical simulations for case 1 and the three scenarios, S1, S2 and S1+S2. Left **row/column**: vertical seafloor displacement. Central **column/row**: maximum inundation depth; the asterisk indicates the location of the tide gauge; **thin black lines represent the contour lines every 2 m**. Right **column/row**: tsunami wave form during an elapsed time of 4 h at the Coquimbo tide gauge G.

10




Figure 12. Results of tsunami numerical simulation of S1 event (Mw 8.2). a) Inundation depth b) Flow velocity, c) Hydrodynamic force, d) Difference of




Figure 13. a) Tsunami inundation map (blue shadow) and inundation flow depth on structures. b) Tsunami inundation map (blue shadow) and low and high probabilities of damage to the flooded structures.