

SCHOOL HAZARD IDENTIFICATION & RISK MANAGEMENT IN ALASKA

Laura W Kelly, PE

US Coast Guard, Civil Engineer, Kodiak, AK – 2000-2013 USCG D17 Supervisory Engineer, CEU Juneau, AK – 2015-Present Alaska Seismic Hazards Safety Commission, School Committee Chair, 2005-Present e-mail: Laura.W.Kelly@uscg.mil



Alaska's Next Big Earthquake and Tsunami: Mitigating Impacts Workshop Anchorage, AK - May 09, 2017

Timeline

Year	US Coast Guard (USCG)	Kodiak Island Borough (KIB)	Alaska Seismic Hazards Safety Commission (ASHSC)
1999	LKelly moves to Kodiak, experiences first earthquake. Mw 7.0, 2 pm, Dec. 6th (weekday, school in session).		
2000	(Local ground forces greater than 1964 earthquake.)		
2000	Federal Employee. Largest USCG Base with 75 commercial		
	facilites, 2000 residents, water/wastewater/steam		
	plants/hangars/piers.		
2001	Meet with Gary Carver, & invite him to present to USCG		
2002	USCG contracts Gary Carver for Hazard Identification Project.	Carver/Kelly notify Borough of Peterson Elementary findings.	House Bill 53 Establishes ASHSC.
	(Ground shaking, active faults, liquefiable soils, slope and ground	(Carver discovers LKelly rec'd Alaska PE, and encourages proactive	
	tailure, tsunami indundation.) Completed Spring 2003. Numerous	involvement.) Carver meets regularly with Borough, PTA, and	
	problems ruentined. Nov. 5, 2002 benañ eartiquake, wr.o	School Boards with Ekery attending critical meetings.	
2003	New active fault identified at Spruce Cape LORAN site	LKelly volunteers in High School earth science classes. Meet with	
	near State Rocket Launch Facility.	students to discuss seismic risk, careers associated with risk	
2004		Local bond narrowly passes by 11 votes to evaluate schools for	
		seismic risk. Staffing and PDM applications made with Legislative	
2005		Approval, 2004-2006.	Official appointment of 0 members to ASHSC by Coy, Murkowski, First meeting
2005		Associates, G&E Engineering (John Eidinger) and Goettel & Assoc.	October, 2005. Original members include 3 from Kodiak (Carver, Kelly, and
		(Ken Goettel)	Kodiak City Mngr-Freed).
2006	RVS for all USCG structures (non-residential) in Kodiak.	RFP for Seismic Upgrades (Kodiak Middle School and High School),	ASHSC extended to 2012, added language to include tsunamis, added two more members (11 total) - funding remains \$10K per year. Standing committees
	incorporated with mission bependency indexing.		include focus on schools. Write white paper on School Seismic Safety
	All waterlines now being replaced with HDPE to improve		Legislation.
2007	performance in event of an earthquake.		Draft Map - At-Risk Schools in Alaska.
			Presentation "Successful Implementaiton of Seismic Mitigation for Schools,
2008		Potorron Elementary retrofitted	Sept., 2007"
2008		reterson Elementary retrontted.	Develoment (ADEED). Request appointment of representative (Sam Kito III) to
			ASHSC. Year of May 12, 2008 Sichuan China Mw 7.9 earthquake.
2009	LKelly, USCG Engineer of the Year; award includes recognition for seismic vulnerability studies and serving on the ASHSC.	KIBSD receives WSSPC Overall Award in Excellence for seismic mitigation of schools. Eeb., 2009.	Utah State Office of Education, School Finance Director, Larry Newton – Jan 7, 2008 (presents Legislation model)
			Kito, ADEED, joins ASHSC School Committee. Obtain data base of schools and
			Senate Education and Finance Committees, Junueau, AK. Map discussed.
2010		New police station construction completed. Old fire station remains concern	Collaboration with ADEED results in developing new capital improvement
			period.
			Yumei Wang, Oregon DOGAMI, presents information on Oregon's Seismic
			Publish map of Public Schools and Earthquake Hazards in Alaska in ASHSC
			Annual Report, Feb., 2010.
2011	USCG supports Kelly participation in revision of	Bud Cassidy, KIB, joins ASHSC.	Revise annual report map of schools to include policy recommendations.
2012	FEMA 154 RVS as part of working group/review panel. 2012-2013.		Theodoropoulos, Univ. of Oregon speaks to ASHSC about Oregon's
	Final release ATC-71, Fall, 2014.		achievements regarding seismic risk mitigation for schools and emergency
			facilities.
			Meet with Alaska PTA.
			Kite leaves ADEED
2013	USCG supports LKelly transfer to Juneau. In close proximity to		Apply for HMPG funding for RVS of schools funding cut. PTA adds concern to
	other USCG engineers, ADEED, Prof. Engineering organizations,		Legislative Issues, stating their support for structurally sound school buildings
	and Legislature.		throughout the state of Alaska, for the safety of our children, parents, teachers
2014	Seismic awareness in Kodiak results in complete retrofit of 4		ASHSC extended to 2020. Kito joins AK House of Representatives.
	Barracks buildings, an RFP for retrofitting the most critical building		
	on base (Comsta), and backlog of other mitigation projects - improperly braced overhead steam pipes in Hangars, replace cast		Working with EERI on pilot program for RVS screening of Alaska schools. Modeling Utah's "Schools at Risk" RVS program.
	iron waterline crossings, strengthen piers, etc. Bowling alley		
	structurally retrofitted during energy upgrade.		Suggest policy recommendation to incorporate RVS into Univ. of Alaska
	Promoted to Supervisory Engineer - D17 Design & Construction		Fairbanks Next Big EQ Workshop, Nov, 2015. Presentation on Schools.
			Matanuska-Susitna School RVS Feb 6, 2015.
2015	USCG initiates and completes draft study for all hazards based on		Kenai Borough Schools RVS - Dec 1, 2015 Awarded contract to screen Fairbanks schools
2016	Kodiak work		
2017	May 1, 2017 two EQ M6.1-M6.2 Haines Hwy.		June 1, final RVS due for Fairbanks North Star Borough Schools.

Kodiak Region Seismicity



Magnitude 3.0 - 6.9 , 1973 - 2002; Magnitude 7.0 +, 1900 - 2002

Summer 1999, LKelly moves to Kodiak, & soon experiences first earthquake. Mw 7.1, 2 pm, Dec. 6th, **1999**, weekday, school in session. (Local ground forces greater than 1964 earthquake.) Start working for USCG Facilities Engineering Division, Feb., **2000**.

2001-2003,

Dr. Gary Carver, paleo-seismologist/ geologist works with USCG to identify local seismic hazards.



Figure 7. Hydraulic fill (dashed red lines) at the upper end of Womens Bay.

Hydraulic Fill Area, USCG Base Kodiak

(Hazard analysis reveals that recent seismic retrofits did not take liquefiable soils into consideration)



Historical Panoramic Photograph of Womens Bay, Kodiak, June 1940.

2003 Report to USCG

Gary Carver/William Lettis & Associates formally identify active fault at LORAN Station, Narrow Cape, Kodiak Island (Fault changes predicted ground motions in IBC).



Photo 2. Oblique aerial view of Kodiak LORAN Station and trenches excavated across scarps 1 and 2. Trench 3, located immediately northeast (left) of Trench 1, was excavated after the aerial reconnaissance of the site.

Lettis & Associates later become involved with school hazard identification in Kodiak. Revised ground forces from LORAN project quantified and incorporated into school analysis.



Figure 14. Plan and elevation designs for Kodiak LORAN guy and radial array and anchor system showing location of the Bison fault (scarp 1). Based on paleoseismic trenching of scarp 1, the maximum lateral component of slip (A) assuming a lateral-to-vertical slip ratio of 3:1 is 0.90 m. The maximum vertical component of slip (B) expected is 0.30 m (Table 3). (Information excerpted from report to USCG, **2003**. Structural Engineer later examines Navy drawings of 1952 school, and identifies flaws in wood ledger board connecting concrete walls to roof. Formal meeting held to notify school board and PTA, after confirming lack of retrofit with Borough Engineer.)



Peterson Elementary: 280 Students, 40 Staff

(Approx. 200 occupants are USCG family members.)



Peterson Elementary (Borough Property)

Age - This building was constructed by the Navy in the 1950s, and modified by 1966/1993/1998 additions which did not address structural rehabilitation of the original structure that comprises 45% of the total square footage of the building.

Tsunami is a minor threat with a foundation elevation of 48 feet. It was not inundated in 1964.



"Earthquake risk mitigation means more than just stockpiling supplies, knowing what to do when the ground shakes, and conducting preparedness drills," Aho said. "It means taking measures ahead of time to reduce vulnerability to damage and loss of life, like identifying areas at highest risk from earthquakes and tsunamis, using effective land-use and construction practices, and strengthening existing structures." Pop. 735,000 25% under age 18

49th State. 1959

2006: Formal RVS of all USCG critical structures.

Liquefiable soils and tsunami inundation lines clearly mapped.

2014 USCG Base Kodiak has retrofitted 4 Barracks, demolished one and is rebuilding another.

Bowling Alley mitigated as part of energy retrofit.

An RFP has been issued for retrofit of its most mission critical Communication Station structure for Electronic Support Unit.

Piers have been strengthened.

Non-structural issues have been identified in the Hangars, including improperly supported overhead steam lines.



2004-2009

KIBSD Seismically Retrofits Five Schools

2009 Kodiak Island Borough receives WSSPC Overall Award in Excellence for seismic retrofit of schools.

Life Safety Risk						
Hazard Deaths per Statistical Average 1,000,000 Deaths Per Year people						
Vehicle Accident	186	1000				
Middle School	469	0.100				
Peterson School	400	0.021				
Ouzinkie School	293	0.010				
KHS Library	238	0.053				
KHS Gym	30	0.001				

Similar risk correlation to be added to revised FEMA 154 RVS (ATC-71, Fall 2014)

Hazard	US Deaths per Year	Deaths per 1,000,000 people	Middle school (old wir Earthquake Life Safety	ngs) Risk
Tornado	44	0.18	School day occupancy	213
Lightning	90	0.36	Statistical Deaths per Year	0.099
Flood	97	0.39	Deaths per 1,000,000	469
Assault by knife	2,074	8		_
Fire	3,380	14		
Assault by firearn	11,829	47	About 2.5 times vehicle deat	th rate
Falls	16,257	65	A CONTRACTOR OF A CONTRACTOR	
Vehicle Accident	46,466	186		

Life Safety Risk

"Kodiak has done a truly exceptional job for a small community, from funding the bond to doing the risk assessment to developing a robust hazard mitigation plan, identifying the schools as a priority and then going forth and fixing the major problems - all in an exceptionally short time. I don't know of any community, of any size, that has done a better job and certainly none that has done more or even anywhere near as much on a per capita basis."

-Ken Goettel, Goettel & Associates, Inc., Oct. 10, 2008



213 0.0998

Key Findings

School	Cost	Benefits	BCR
Middle	\$1,192,000	\$8,010,000	6.72
Ouzinkie	\$149,000	\$975,000	7.55
Peterson	\$509,000	\$1,862,000	3.66
HS Library	\$465,000	\$4,453,000	9.59
HS Gym	\$410,000	\$417,000	1.02
Non-Structural	\$363,000	÷	
Total	\$3,088,000	\$15,717,000	5.09

Why Identify and Mitigate????

Proof that Modern Seismic Codes in Schools Can Save Lives: 2008 China Sichuan Earthquake, Mw 7.9 (69,000 deaths, 7,000 schools collapsed) These two modern school buildings performed well. All occupants survived.

Fault Surface Rupture

(Note buildings in background collapsed into rubble.)

> Diligence Building – almost intact (5-10 year old construction)



Learning Building – basically intact (10-15 year old construction)





2010 Map of Schools and Earthquake Hazards appear in ASHSC Annual Report. Presented to members of Legislature by John Aho (ASHSC) and Sam Kito (ADEED)



 \mathcal{O}

DETAILS OF REGION WITH HIGHEST SEISMIC HAZARDS, AND ASHSC PLAN FORWARD

Recognition of Problem

ASHSC Alaska Seismic Hazards Safety Commission

- Identification of Structures at Risk
- Prioritization of Mitigation
- Final Determination of Remediation Projects

Communities with Highest Potential Peak Ground Acceleration & Educational Facilities Built Prior to 1976



Spring 2011 Mw 9.0 Earthquake and Tsunami in Japan



"High dwellings are the peace and harmony of our descendants," the stone slab reads. "Remember the calamity of the great tsunamis. Do not build any homes below this point." - 600+ year old marker, ANEYOSHI, JAPAN

Through history, this community elected to not allow construction below this marker. Consequently, their homes were spared by the March 11, 2011 tsunami.

In a neighboring community, a school had been constructed 500 feet from the ocean's edge... the children attending that school were not found.

NOTE: In some communities these markers were submerged.

2012 – After trial period, ADEED officially incorporates seismic work as a line item for school improvement projects. (Result of partnership of ASHSC/ADEED from 2009-2012)

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development



Application for Funding Capital Improvement Project by Grant



State Aid for Debt Retirement

For each funding request submit one original and three complete copies of this application and two copies of each attachment.

For instructions on completing this application, please refer to the department's Capital Project Information and References website at:

http://education.alaska.gov/facilities/FacilitiesCIP.html

**(Note: The department will only score ten projects from each district during a single rating period) ** School District

Ochoor District.			
Community:	-		
School Name:			
Project Name:			

TYPE OF PROJECT AND FUNDING REQUEST

Type of funding requested (Choose only one funding source.)
 Grant Funding
 Aid for Debt Retire

Aid for Debt Retirement (Bonding)

2a. Primary purpose of project (Choose only one category, per AS 14.11.013 for grant projects, or AS 14.11.100(j)(4) for debt retirement projects). The department will change a project category as necessary to reflect the primary purpose of the project.¹

School Construction:	Major Maintenance:	
 Health and life-safety (Category A, this	Protection of structure (Category C, this	
category is not available for debt	category is not available for debt	
retirement)	retirement)	
Unhoused students (Category B;	Building code deficiencies (Category D;	
Category A for debt retirement)	Category B for debt retirement)	
F; Category D for debt retirement)	Achieve operating cost savings (Category E; Category C for debt retirement)	

b. Phases of project to be covered by this funding request (Indicate all applicable phases) Planning (Phase I) Design (Phase II) Construction (Phase III)

¹ The department's authority to assign a project to its correct category is established in AS 14.11.013(c)(1) and in AS 14.11.013(a)(1) under its obligation to verify a project meets the criteria established by the Bond Reimbursement & Grant Review Committee under AS 14.11.014(b)

Form # 05-14-033 Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

FY 2016 CIP Application Page 1 of 12

Alaska Department of Education & Early Development

COST ESTIMATES

 Complete the following tables using the Department of Education & Early Development's 13th Edition Cost Model or an equivalent cost estimate. Completion of the tables is mandatory. (30 points possible)

(Percentages are based on construction cost. See Appendix C for additional information. If your project exceeds the recommended percentages, you must provide a detailed justification for each item exceeding the percentage. The total of all additive percentages should not exceed 130%, if the additive percentages exceed 130% a detailed explanation must be provided or the department will adjust the percentages to meet the individual and overall percentage guidelines)

	Table 1. T	OTAL PROJECT	COST ESTI	MATE	
Project Budget Category	Maximum % without justification	l Prior AS 14.11 Funding	II Current Project Request	III % of Total Construction Cost	IV Project Total
CM - By Consultant ¹ Land ²	2 - 4%	1			
Site Investigation ²		j		0.	
Seismic Hazard 7	(in	·		X	N
Design Services Construction ³	6 - 10%	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
Equipment & Technology ^{2,5}	up to 10%				
District Administrative Overhead ⁴	up to 9%				
Art ⁶	0.5% or 1%		(1	1
Project Contingency	5%	5		4	5 - Sec
Project Total		1		1	

 Percentage is established by AS 14.11.020(c) for consultant contracts (Maximum allowed percentage by total project cost: \$0-\$500,000 – 4%; 500,001- \$5,000,000 – 3%; over \$5,000,000 – 2%).

 Include only if necessary for completion of this project. Amounts included for Land and Site Investigation costs need to be supported in the Project Description (Question 17), and supporting documentation should be provided in the attachments.

- 3. Attach detailed construction cost estimate and life cycle cost if new-in-lieu-of-renovation.
- Includes district/municipal/borough administrative costs necessary for the administration of this project; This budget line will also include any in-house construction management cost.
- 5. Equipment and technology costs should be calculated based on the number of students to be served by the project. See the department's publication, Guidelines for School Equipment Purchases for calculation methodology (2005). The department will accept a 5% per year inflation rate (from the base year of 2005) added to the amounts provided in the Guideline. Technology is included with Equipment.
- Only required for renovation and construction projects over \$250,000 that require an Educational Specification (AS 35.27.020(d))

 Costs associated with assessment, design, design review, and special construction inspection services associated with seismic hazard mitigation of a school facility. This amount needs to be provided by a design consultant, and should not be estimated based on project percentage.



Government Hill Elementary School after the 1964 Earthquake

Summer 2014

Alaska Seismic Hazards Safety Commission- Pilot Program: Rapid Visual Screening of Alaska School Buildings

Alaska Seismic Hazards Safety Commission		Earthquake Engineering Research Inst.	
Address:	PO Box 25517 Juneau, AK 99802	Address:	499 14th St, Suite 220 Oakland, CA 94612-1934
Contact:	Laura W. Kelly, PE	Contact:	Jay Berger, Executive Director
Phone:	(907) 463-2424	Phone:	(510) 451-0905
E-Mail:	Laura.W.Kelly@uscg.mil	E-Mail:	JBerger@eeri.org

Project Name:	ASHSC Pilot Program: Rapid V	sual Screening of Alaska	a School Buildings
Effective:	6/2/2014	Ending:	1/2/2015
Description: ASHSC links Scinif Rusch	The Alaska Seismic Hazards Safe Earthquake Engineering Researc Alaska PE license to set up and ir Visual Screenings (RVS) of Alask pilot study, identify and work with AK, and screen as many at-risk s allotted budget. Develop protoco results. Make recommendations potentially at the state-wide level.	ety Commission (ASHSC) in h Institute (EERI) to hire a nplement a pilot program f a schools using FEMA 154 a supportive school distric chools as feasible (approxi for collecting, managing, for implementing on a distr	respectfully requests the consultant with an or conducting Rapid I/ROVER. As part of a t in or near Anchorage, mately 5-10) within and reporting final ict-by-district basis, and

Project Scope/Deliverables

- 1. Work with the ASHSC to identify a school district willing to participate in a RVS pilot study. The school district must be located in Anchorage or on the adjoining road system in order to minimize travel & per diem costs. Though not required, it is preferred that as-built drawings for the school buildings be available in advance, to improve speed and reliability of screening. Upon request, the ASHSC can provide a map of Alaska school districts and seismic hazards, student attendance numbers, and database of school building information sorted by local peak ground motions, and year of construction.
- Purchase a laptop and/or mobile device for installation, operation, collection and management of FEMA 154/ROVER software/data. Provide to ASHSC upon completion of pilot study for future use and data collection/management. FEMA ROVER software is free of cost. Upon request, the ASHSC can provide information describing ROVER software applications.
- Perform RVS of approximately 5-10 schools considered at-risk. If schools are newly constructed and meet modern seismic code, do not screen. Screener shall have an Alaska Professional Engineering license and a strong background in structural and earthquake resistant design. Experience with RVS/ROVER preferred.
- 4. Compile results in a final report. Final product shall serve as a Proof of Concept, and establish protocols and a cost basis for future work. Refer to the Utah Seismic Safety Commission's pilot test in Salt Lake City as a model. Intent is to utilize final product as an example for justifying and performing RVS in other Alaska school districts. Final report may also be used to persuade state legislators to fund a RVS program on a state-wide basis, or to obtain future grant funding. See Attachment 1, "Utah Students at Risk" by the Utah Seismic Safety Commission.

Estimated Budget	Terms	Cost
ConsutIting (including travel & per diem)	40 hours @ \$150/hr	\$6,000
Hardware (laptop computer/portable device/setup)	1 lump sum	\$1,000
Software (ROVER) - Free from FEMA	No Cost	\$0
Final Report	5 Hard Copies, 1 Digital CD	\$500

Total Cost: \$7,500

6/3/2014

1

ASHSC Alaska Seismic Hazards Safety Commission

Pilot RVS – Mat-Su School District (14% of Alaska's student base)





February 2015

Cost of this Study:

The total cost of this study was approximately \$18,500. Of this, BBFM Engineers was paid \$8,500 for this study, resulting in a donated effort of approximately \$10,000. Of this, \$4,275 was spent on setting up the server and becoming acquainted with the software. Another \$8,145 was spent reviewing drawings, visiting the schools, and entering data into the server. Finally, a little over \$6,000 was spent preparing this report.

Pilot study proved that an RVS for a school structure in Alaska could be performed for approximately \$600 to \$800 per original structure or addition, plus costs associated with transportation.

At the same time, this study also quickly and cost-effectively identified many other structures that may perform poorly during a major earthquake. The schools appear to pose a significant risk to students in the Matanuska-Susitna School District and to the communities they serve. Of the seventeen original buildings and additions, nine are indicated to pose unacceptable risks requiring further structural attention. In other words, 53% of the structures reviewed in this study pose an unacceptable risk of collapse during a major earthquake. The three largest contributors to a

Dennis L. Berry, PE	Troy J. Feller, PE	Colin Maynard, PE	Scott M. Gruhn, PE
BBFM Engineers	Earthquake Danger to Al	aska's Students and Schools	Page 8

 \mathcal{O}

The method used by FEMA P-154 to evaluate a building is quite straightforward. It establishes an initial score for each type of structural system (wood shear walls, steel braced frame, and so forth), with a higher score indicating greater reliability. A given building's initial score is then modified (up or down) based on other factors, including the number of stories, vertical structural irregularities, plan structural irregularities, probable soil type, whether it was designed and constructed before codes were generally enforced, and whether it was designed and constructed under substantially modern codes. The user enters the building information, adding and subtracting from the initial score to obtain the final score. FEMA carefully selected the scores and modifications so the final score could carry some readily understandable information. The Third Edition of FEMA 154 notes, in section 5.2:

Fundamentally, the final S score is an estimate of the probability (as described in Chapter 1) if an earthquake occurs with ground motions called the risk-targeted maximum considered earthquake, MCE_R, as described in Chapter 2... A final score, S, of 3 implies there is a chance of 1 in 10³, or 1 in 1,000, that the building will collapse if such ground motions occur. A final score, S, of 2 implies

there is a chance of 1 in 10², or 1 in 100, that the building will collapse if such ground motions occur.

BBFM Engineers makes no statement about these probabilities except to note FEMA's intent in developing the scoring process. Typically a final score below 2.0 is taken as indication that a more detailed investigation is warranted, although that value can be adjusted at the outset of an evaluation project as desired by the owner of the facilities.

Importantly, these scores and risks do not take into account actual member strengths or actual connection reliability, only what is common for similar structural types of similar age. Therefore, the actual building safety may be substantially different from what the scores may indicate. Accordingly, buildings with low scores are noted as requiring further structural investigation to determine whether structural upgrade is warranted. These scores can be used appropriately to identify and rank buildings for their vulnerability to earthquake damage.

Updates to Seismicity Regions



		Model Building Seismic Design Provisions				
	FEMA Building Type	National Building Code/ Standard Building Code	Uniform Building Code	International Building Code		
W1	Light wood frame single- or multiple- family dwellings of one or more stories in height	1993	1976	2000		
W1A	Light wood frame multi-unit, multi- story residential buildings with plan areas on each floor of greater than 3.000 square feet	ī	1997	2000		
W2	Wood frame commercial and industrial buildings with a floor area larger than 5,000 square feet	1995	1976	2000		
S1	Steel moment-resisting frame buildings	1	1994 ²	2000		
\$2	Braced steel frame buildings	T	1997	2000		
\$3	Light metal buildings	1	1	2000		
\$4	Steel frame buildings with concrete shear walls	1993	1994	2000		
S5	Steel frame buildings with unreinforced masonry infill walls	1	3	2000		
C1	Concrete moment-resisting frame buildings	1993	1994	2000		
C2	Concrete shear wall buildings	1993	1994	2000		
C5	Concrete frame buildings with unreinforced masonry infill walls			2000		
PC1	Tilt-up buildings	1	1997	2000		
PC2	Precast concrete frame buildings	1	1	2000		
RM1	Reinforced masonry buildings with flexible floor and roof diaphragms	1	1997	2000		
RM2	Reinforced masonry buildings with rigid floor and roof diaphragms	1993	1994	2000		
URM	Unreinforced masonry bearing wall buildings	1	(1)	n.		
MH	Manufactured housing	ŝ	8	8		

No benchmark year.

² Steel moment-resisting frame shall comply with the 1994 UBC Emergency Provisions, published September/October 1994.

³ The model building codes in this table do not apply to manufactured housing. In California, relevant requirements appeared in the Mobile home Parks Act, the California Health and Safety Code, and the California Code of Regulations. They evolved between 1985 and 1994; the year 1995 is recommended here as the benchmark year for California. In other states, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development's Installation Standards required tie-downs after October 2008. The year 2009 is recommended here as the benchmark year for states other than California.

Updates to Seismicity Regions



2: Planning and Managing A Successful Rapid Visual Screening Program

ASHSC Alaska Seismic Hazards Safety Commission

2015 RVS – Kenai Peninsula Borough School District (7% of Alaska's student base)



October, 2015

Cost of this Study:

The total cost of this study was \$21,250, at a cost of performed for just \$500 to \$700 per structure.

Schools located in Anchor Point, Cooper Landing, Homer, Kenai, Moose Pass, Nikolaevsk, Ninilchik, Homer, Kenai, Seward, Soldotna, Sterling, Seldovia, Kasilof.

In total, we reviewed 15 schools comprised of 47 structures, including original construction and additions. Nineteen of the 47 warrant a more detailed evaluation, while further review of the remaining 28 schools is not indicated. In other words, 40% of the structures reviewed in this study may pose an unacceptable risk of at least partial collapse during a major earthquake.

ASHSC Alaska Seismic Hazards Safety Commission Borough School District (133,000 students -10.5% of Alaska's student base)



May, 2017 (draft)

Cost of this Study:

The total cost of this study was \$21,250, at a cost of performed for just \$500 to \$1200 per structure.

Barnette Elementary Hunter Elementary Hutchison Career Center Joy Elementary Lathrop High School North Pole Elementary North Pole Middle School Tanana Middle School West Valley High School Woodriver Elementary

In total, we reviewed 10 schools comprised of 20 structures, including original construction and additions. All 20 warrant a more detailed evaluation. In other words, 100% of the structures reviewed in this study may pose an unacceptable risk of at least partial collapse during a major earthquake with a 7 of the schools having 10% or higher risk of significant structural damage.

ASHSC Alaska Seismic Hazards Safety Commission

What CA school retrofits prevented during a M6 EQ.



Sept. 2014



Napa earthquake damage to a building without seismic retrofit

Recent example of a successful school retrofit program was demonstrated during the magnitude 6 earthquake that struck Napa, California in 2014, producing peak ground accelerations of 60% to 100% as strong as the acceleration due to gravity. The earthquake and its aftershocks injured 90 people and caused approximately \$1 billion of damage.

Engineering News-Record reported on September 3, 2014:

The epicenter of the American Canyon quake was at the heart of the Napa school district's 30 campuses. Subsequently, three architectural and engineering teams assessed "every room in every school" and observed no structural damage following the quake, says Mark Quattrocchi, principal of Kwok Quattrocchi Architects and one of the survey team members... The schools performed so well because they are built or retrofitted according to much stricter seismic codes than commercial and residential buildings.

"There was no structural damage to any school in the district, even the ones built to older codes in the 1940s, 1950s and 1960s," says Quattrocchi. "Part of this is because seismic upgrades at the schools are treated the same as building an entirely new facility," he adds. Schools fared well for three reasons: seismic building codes that are more stringent than those for commercial buildings, methodical reviews by the Division of the State Architect and "full-time" state inspection on school construction sites, Quattrocchi says."



ALASKA IS BEHIND -

IDENTIFICATION

- Recognition of Problem
- Identification of Structures at Risk
- Prioritization of Mitigation
- Final Determination of Remediation Project

Updates to Seismicity Regions



From: eeri-sesi-network@googlegroups.com [mailto:eeri-sesi-network@googlegroups.com] On Behalf Of zoe@eeri.org Sent: Wednesday, May 03, 2017 3:47 PM To: EERI SESI Network Subject: [EERI SESI Network] **\$125 million in grants have been awarded to Oregon schools**

Hello all,

A quick update on school earthquake safety in Oregon:

The Oregon seismic retrofit grants for schools were awarded on April 21st with \$125 million in total.

* 100% state funding for projects up to \$1.5 million, with districts providing matching funds for projects above \$1.5 million

* 100 projects funded for 55 school districts.



LESSONS LEARNED:

Earthquakes remain our greatest teacher and exert the most influence. Human nature allows us to rapidly forget; natural disasters spur short periods of action. Clearly document information & efforts – easy to forget.

Hidden seismic hazards exist, many of which have yet to be identified – especially in Alaska.

Foster and maintain professional relationships. Encourage professional development and dialog. Encourage inter-agency and cross-state communication.

The average US citizen thinks they don't need to worry about the next earthquake – they assume our codes and engineers have already made everything safe.

Do not underestimate the ability of others to help (or occasionally hinder). Educators, eager students and proactive PTA members are great allies. Understand that some upper-level leaders will cite concerns over widespread alarm and unfunded mandates. Partner with the Departments of Education and School Districts.

The path to success is not always upward or linear. Anticipate sudden successes, unforeseen set-backs, and seeming lack of progress. Be persistent; a worthy idea will succeed over time.





IDENTIFICATION

- Recognition of Problem
- Identification of Structures at Risk
- Prioritization of Mitigation
- Final Determination of Remediation Project





FUNDING

• Federal

- FEMA Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP) - Post Disaster

Federal HMGP funds made available following a disaster can provide a federal share of up to 75% of the costs of an approved project.

The remaining 25% must be met through non-federal funds such as local government funds, community development block grants, etc.

- FEMA Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program (PDM)
 - » Mitigation planning: \$1M cap on Federal share, not to exceed 3 years
 - » Mitigation projects: \$3M cap on Federal share, not to exceed 3 years
 - » Information dissemination activities not to exceed 10%, must directly relate to planning or project sub-application
 - » Applicant management costs not to exceed 10%
 - » Sub-applicant management costs not to exceed 5%
- US Senators
- US Representatives

State

- School Facilities Capital Improvement Project Grant (Dept. of Education)
- State Capital Projects
 - » State Senators
 - » State Representatives
- Governor
- Local
- Bonds
- Maintenance
- Special Capital Projects/Special Funds (Sale of Shuyak Island)
- General Fund (Mill Rate/Property Taxes/Severance Taxes/Intergovernmental Sources)
- Local Government Representatives
- Local Government Employees
- Private (In-Kind Donations)
 - Services
 - Materials/Supplies
 - Benefactors



STAFFING

•

- Local Government
 - Credentials
 - Time Commitment
 - Specialized Hire Considerations
 - Points of Contact
 - » Finance
 - » Record drawings (digital?)
 - » Building Access
 - » Public Meetings & Outreach
 - » Project Management (Identification, Mitigation Grants, Construction)

Municipal/School Building Managers

- Engineers (Large Districts)
- Architects (Large Districts)
- Finance
- Maintenance

Private Contract

- Evaluation
 - » Geologic
 - » Geotechnical
 - » Structural
- Grant Application
- Design
- Construction
- Inspection

PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

- Seismic Only
- Combined
 - Maintenance Upgrade (Roof, Mechanical, Electrical)
 - Energy Efficiency
 - Expansion
- Phased/Unphased
- **Unanticipated Issues**
 - **Existing Conditions**
 - Lead (paint, plumbing, etc.) »
 - Asbestos (flooring, insulation, roofing, » etc.)
 - Non-Code Compliant Electric, Plumbing, » Fire, Fuel/Heat
 - **Unknown Existing Conditions** » (Structural/Non-Structural)
 - **Funding Difficulties**
 - Long Stretches of Time between » Identification & Construction
 - Multiple Agencies »
 - **Rising Construction Costs** »
 - Unaccounted Local Cost Factors »

Kodiak Island Borough AGENDA STATEMENT Special Meeting of June 26, 2007 Upgrades to the Kodiak Middle School. Kodiak Island 3.16.020 "Limitation on Manager's Authority" states that a contract exceeding \$25,000 requires Assembly approval. This Contract is for work at the Kodiak Middle School shown on the construction are available for review on the KIB website. The work will be phased over two (2) years. The Project is funded in part by monies from a FEMA PDM-c Grant; Bond Projects for Additional funding sources are to be identified. Bids received in response to KIB's Invitation to Bid dated April 2007 are: Base Bid Alt Bid 1 Total Phase 1 Phase 2 Brechan Enterprises \$2,340,000 \$3,175,000 \$5,515,000 F & W Construction \$2,469,667 \$3,011,917 \$5,481,584 Engineers Estimate \$3,465,000 % Difference 58% Over The E/F Department has reviewed the bids and, as both bids received are substantially higher than the engineers estimate, recommends that a Contract for Seismic Upgrades at the Kodiak Middle School be awarded to Brechan Enterprises, Inc. in an amount not to exceed \$2,340,000 for Phase 1 work only. Phase 2 is to be re-bid at a later date. Fiscal Notes: n/a Acct No.



Recommended motion: Move to authorize the manager to execute Contract No. FY2007-50 with Brechan Enterprises, Inc of Kodiak in an amount not to exceed \$2,340,000.

Item No. 3.B

Contract No. FY2007-50

Authorizing the Manager to Execute Contract No. FY2008-01 for Phase I of the Seismic

documents prepared by Jensen Yorba Lott, Inc. titled "Kodiak Middle School Seismic Upgrade", dated April 27, 2007, and includes structural, mechanical, electrical, and architectural work. The construction documents, bid documents and associated addendum

Floor Covering Replacement and KHS/KMS Roof Upgrade; and Legislative funds.

Thank You!





Artwork by

Eustace Ziegler (1881-1969), Alaskan Frontier Artist

(*My great grandfather's brother.*)

Note: Numerous pieces of his artwork were lost in the 1964 Valdez tsunami. Some of his surviving works can be seen at the Anchorage Museum and the State Capitol Building and State Museum in Juneau.

Questions? E-mail: Laura.W.Kelly@uscg.mil