



Risk Management Series

Primer for Design Professionals

Communicating with Owners and Managers of New Buildings on Earthquake Risk

January 2004



FEMA

RISK MANAGEMENT SERIES

Primer for Design
Professionals:
Communicating with Owners
and Managers of New
Buildings on Earthquake
Risk

PROVIDING PROTECTION TO PEOPLE AND BUILDINGS



FEMA

www.fema.gov

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES.....	vii
LIST OF TABLES.....	xi
1 INTRODUCTION.....	1-1
1.1 Impetus for Updating the Prior Documents in the FEMA Seismic Considerations Series	1-3
1.2 Objectives and Scope of this Document	1-5
1.3 Document Contents and Organization	1-6
1.4 Document Formatting and Icons	1-8
2 SEISMIC RISK MANAGEMENT.....	2-1
2.1 Seismic Risk: An Overview	2-1
2.2 Seismic Risk Management: A Holistic Approach for Reducing Earthquake Impacts	2-4
2.3 Evaluating Seismic Risk Consequences as a Basis for Developing a Risk Management Plan	2-6
2.4 First Cost or Design Strategies	2-9
2.5 Operating Cost or Business Strategies	2-13
2.6 Event Response Strategies	2-16
2.7 Choosing an Optimal Combination of Risk Reduction Strategies	2-18
2.8 Example Implementation of a Risk Management Program	2-21
2.9 Seismic Risk Management Advocacy	2-22
3 IDENTIFYING AND ASSESSING EARTHQUAKE- RELATED HAZARDS.....	3-1
3.1 Introduction	3-1
3.2 Earthquake Ground Shaking Hazard	3-1
3.3 Collateral Seismic Hazards	3-8
3.4 Other Collateral Hazards	3-10
3.5 Guidance for Assessing Earthquake-Related Hazards ..	3-16
3.6 References and Further Reading	3-21
4 PERFORMANCE-BASED ENGINEERING: AN EMERGING CONCEPT IN SEISMIC DESIGN.....	4-1
4.1 Seismic Design Provisions in Building Codes	4-1
4.2 Expected Performance when Designing to Current Codes	4-3
4.3 Current Specifications for Performance-Based Seismic Design	4-6
4.4 Impact of Performance-Based Strategies on Future Design Codes	4-18
4.5 Guidance for Design Professionals	4-23
4.6 References and Further Reading	4-24
5 IMPROVING PERFORMANCE TO REDUCE SEISMIC RISK.....	5-1
5.1 Introduction	5-1

5.2	Selection of Structural Materials and Systems	5-2
5.3	Selection of the Architectural Configuration	5-5
5.4	Consideration of Nonstructural Component Performance	5-6
5.5	Quantifying the Benefits of Improved Performance	5-11
5.6	Costs of Improved Performance	5-19
5.7	Case Studies of Cost and Performance Considerations	5-23
5.8	Quality Control During the Construction Process	5-30
5.9	Recommendations for Improving Seismic Performance	5-31
6	DESIGN AND PERFORMANCE ISSUES RELATING TO COMMERCIAL OFFICE BUILDINGS	6-1
6.1	Introduction	6-1
6.2	Ownership, Financing, and Procurement	6-2
6.3	Performance of Office Buildings in Past Earthquakes	6-2
6.4	Performance Expectations and Requirements	6-5
6.5	Seismic Design Issues	6-5
7	DESIGN AND PERFORMANCE ISSUES RELATING TO RETAIL COMMERCIAL FACILITIES	7-1
7.1	Introduction	7-1
7.2	Ownership, Financing, and Procurement	7-2
7.3	Performance of Commercial Retail Facilities in Past Earthquakes	7-3
7.4	Performance Expectations and Requirements	7-4
7.5	Seismic Design Issues	7-4
8	DESIGN AND PERFORMANCE ISSUES RELATING TO LIGHT MANUFACTURING FACILITIES	8-1
8.1	Introduction	8-1
8.2	Ownership, Financing and Procurement	8-2
8.3	Performance of light Manufacturing Facilities in Past Earthquakes	8-3
8.4	Performance Expectations and Requirements	8-4
8.5	Seismic Design Issues	8-4
9	DESIGN AND PERFORMANCE ISSUES RELATING TO HEALTHCARE FACILITIES	9-1
9.1	Introduction	9-1
9.2	Ownership, Financing, and Procurement	9-2
9.3	Performance of Healthcare Facilities in Past Earthquakes	9-3
9.4	Performance Expectations and Requirements	9-5
9.5	Seismic Design Issues	9-6
10	DESIGN AND PERFORMANCE ISSUES RELATING TO LOCAL SCHOOLS (K-12).....	10-1
10.1	Introduction	10-1
10.2	Ownership, Financing, and Procurement	10-2
10.3	Performance of Local Schools in Past Earthquakes	10-2

10.4 Performance Expectations and Requirements	10-3
10.5 Seismic Design Issues	10-4
11 DESIGN AND PERFORMANCE ISSUES RELATING TO HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES (UNIVERSITIES)	11-1
11.1 Introduction	11-1
11.2 Ownership, Financing, and Procurement	11-2
11.3 Performance of Higher Education Facilities (Universities) in Past Earthquakes	11-2
11.4 Performance Expectations and Requirements	11-4
11.5 Seismic Design Issues	11-5
12 RESPONSIBILITIES FOR SEISMIC CONSIDERATIONS WITHIN THE DESIGN TEAM	12-1
12.1 Responsibilities of the Structural Engineer, Architect, and MEP Engineer	12-1
12.2 Developing a Unified Approach Within the Design Team	12-1
12.3 Engineering Services for Added Value of Risk Management	12-2
12.4 Communicating Seismic Considerations Issues to the Building Owner	12-2
12.5 Design and Construction Quality Assurance	12-10
REFERENCES	13-1
PROJECT PARTICIPANTS	14-1

LIST OF FIGURES

2-1	Seismic risk, expressed graphically as a function of likelihood of damage and consequences given the occurrence of the damage.	2-3
2-2	Illustration of risk of experiencing catastrophic earthquake losses.	2-7
2-3	Illustration of reduction in risk of catastrophic earthquake losses.	2-8
2-4	Flow chart for identifying, evaluating, and selecting risk-reduction strategies to develop a risk management plan. ...	2-10
3-1	Six-story concrete-moment-frame medical building that was severely damaged by the magnitude-6.8 Northridge, California, earthquake of January 17, 1994	3-2
3-2	Eight-story reinforced-concrete-frame office building in Kobe, Japan that partially collapsed during the magnitude-7.8 earthquake of January 17, 1995.	3-2
3-3	Older five-story reinforced concrete frame building in Managua, Nicaragua, that had inadequate seismic resistance and collapsed during the magnitude-6.2 earthquake of December 23, 1972.....	3-3
3-4	Preseismic-code ten-story reinforced-concrete-frame building in Bucharest, Romania, that partially collapsed during the 1977 magnitude-7.2 earthquake approximately 65 miles north of Bucharest.	3-3
3-5	Typical acceleration time history of strong ground shaking... ..	3-4
3-6	Probabilistic seismic hazard maps showing ground shaking hazard zones in the contiguous United States	3-5
3-7	Hazard curves for selected U.S. cities.....	3-6
3-8	Example of surface fault rupture; 1971 San Fernando, California, earthquake (a thrust fault earthquake).....	3-9
3-9	Aerial view of leaning apartment houses resulting from soil liquefaction and the behavior of liquefiable soil foundations, Niigata, Japan, earthquake of June 16, 1964	3-10
3-10	Government Hill School, Anchorage, destroyed by landslide during the magnitude-8.4 Alaska earthquake of 1964.....	3-11
3-11	Overtaken lighthouse at Aonae, Okushiri, from the tsunami following the 1993 Hokkaido-Nansei-Oki earthquake.....	3-11
3-12	Photo showing damage caused by the pounding of a 10-story steel-frame building (with masonry infill walls) against a seven-story building. Most of the cracking damage to the piers of the taller building was at the roof line of the shorter building	3-13
3-13	Photo showing fallen parapets from an earthquake-damaged unreinforced masonry building.....	3-15

3-14	Photo showing the burning of the Tokyo Police Station following the magnitude-8.3 Tokyo/Kanto earthquake of 1923.	3-16
3-15	Site evaluation check list.	3-18
4-1	Photo of lights set into a fixed ceiling system that shook loose during an earthquake and are hanging from their conduits.	4-5
4-2	Photo of pipe flange failure caused by earthquake lateral forces.	4-6
4-3	Graphic illustration of Operational, Immediate Occupancy, Life-Safety, and Collapse Prevention Performance Levels.	4-11
4-4	Expected building performance.	4-22
5-1	Example design solutions for addressing soft story condition.	5-7
5-2	Elevation views of building with short columns between first and second floors.	5-10
5-3	Nonsymmetric loading of book stacks in library building.	5-11
5-4	Relationship between cost and performance for hypothetical example.	5-21
5-5	Site of facilities for computer graphics equipment maker in Salt Lake City, Utah.	5-23
5-7	Sample new school building design in Salt Lake City K-12 School District.	5-25
5-6	Sample existing school building in Salt Lake City K-12 School District.	5-25
5-8	Site hazard curve for Salt Lake City K-12 School District seismic risk study.	5-26
5-9	New bioengineering laboratory building designed for UC Berkeley campus.	5-29
5-10	Comparison of future losses for two different structural system options for new UC Berkeley laboratory building. ...	5-30
5-11	Comparison of benefit to cost of using a buckling restrained braced frame, instead of a conventional concentric braced frame, for new UC Berkeley laboratory building. Cost equals cost differential.	5-31
6-1	Typical earthquake damage to contents and nonstructural components in a modern office building.	6-3
6-2	Exterior view of medical office building severely damaged by the 1994 Northridge earthquake.	6-4
6-3	Partially collapsed end-wall in 5-story office building caused by severe earthquake ground shaking.	6-4
7-1	Severe damage to a department store severely shaken by the 1994 Northridge earthquake. Shear failure between the waffle slabs and columns caused the collapse of several floors.	7-3
8-1	Roof and wall collapse of tilt-up building during the 1994 Northridge earthquake.	8-3
9-1	Exterior view of Holy Cross Medical Center, which was evacuated after the 1994 Northridge earthquake due to damage to the HVAC system.	9-4

9-2	Aerial view of Olive View Hospital, which sustained no structural damage during the 1994 Northridge earthquake, but was closed for a short while after the earthquake because of water leakage from broken sprinklers and waterlines.	9-4
9-3	Sketch showing typical interstitial space for nonstructural components and systems in new hospitals.	9-7
10-1	Nonstructural damage at Northridge Junior High where lights fell onto desks during the 1994 Northridge earthquake.....	10-3
11-1	Fractured 4-inch-thick steel base plate, university building, Northridge, 1994.....	11-3
12-1	Checklist for seismic expectations	12-6
12-2	Checklist for Architect/Engineer Interaction	12-8
12-3	Checklist for defining project responsibilities	12-9
12-4	Example of completed checklist shown in Figure 12-3	12-11
12-5	Checklist for responsibility of nonstructural component design	12-12

LIST OF TABLES

4-1	Performance Objectives (Adapted from FEMA 356 (ASCE, 2000))	4-9
4-2	Target Building Performance Levels and Ranges (ASCE, 2000)	4-13
4-3	Structural Performance Levels and Damage—Horizontal Elements (From FEMA 356).....	4-14
4-4	Structural Performance Levels and Damage1 —Vertical Elements (from FEMA 356)	4-15
4-5	Nonstructural Performance Levels and Damage—Architectural Components (from FEMA 356)	4-19
4-6	Nonstructural Performance Levels and Damage—Mechanical, Electrical, and Plumbing Systems/Components (from FEMA 356).....	4-20
4-7	Nonstructural Performance Levels and Damage—Contents (from FEMA 356)	4-21
5-1	Seismic Performance of Structural Systems (adapted from Elsesser, 1992)	5-3
5-2	Structural Systems for Site Conditions and Occupancy Types (from Elsesser, 1992)	5-4
5-3	Vertical Irregularities, Resulting Failure Patterns, and Performance Implications	5-8
5-4	Plan Irregularities, Resulting Failure Patterns, and Performance Implications	5-9
5-5	Summary of Benefits and Costs for Hypothetical Manufacturing Facility Example.....	5-22
5-6	Comparison of Costs for Design to SBCCI and IBC Requirements	5-28

