



*Risk Management Series*

# Engineering Guideline for Incremental Seismic Rehabilitation

FEMA P-420 / May 2009



**FEMA**



**Cover Photo:** Courtesy of University of California, Berkeley.

Steel Braced Frames were added to Hildebrand Hall at the University of California, Berkeley as part of a seismic rehabilitation for this building, which houses the College of Chemistry. The University received funding through FEMA's Hazard Mitigation Grant Program to complete this and other seismic rehabilitation projects on the Berkeley campus.

# Engineering Guideline for Incremental Seismic Rehabilitation



# FEMA

Federal Emergency Management Agency  
[www.fema.gov](http://www.fema.gov)

---

Any opinions, findings, conclusions, or recommendations expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of FEMA. Additionally, neither FEMA or any of its employees makes any warrantee, expressed or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, product, or process included in this publication. Users of information from this publication assume all liability arising from such use.

## Acknowledgements



This document was prepared by the Applied Technology Council for the Federal Emergency Management Agency

### **Principal Authors:**

Frederick Krimgold, Virginia Tech Center for Disaster Risk Management, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Arlington, Virginia

Melvyn Green, Melvyn Green & Associates Inc., Torrance, California

David Hattis, Building Technology Inc., Silver Spring, Maryland

Barry Welliver, BHW Engineers, Draper, Utah

Jon A. Heintz, Applied Technology Council, Redwood City, California

### **Contributors:**

Edwin Dean, Nishkian Dean, Portland, Oregon

### **Reviewers:**

William T. Holmes, Rutherford & Chekene, San Francisco, California

Thomas R. McLane, Applied Technology Council, Arlington, Virginia

Ugo Morelli, FEMA (Retired), Washington, DC

Lawrence Reaveley, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah

Christopher Rojahn, Applied Technology Council, Redwood City, California

Charles Scawthorn, SPA Risk LLC, Denver, Colorado

### **FEMA Project Monitor:**

Cathleen M. Carlisle, Washington, DC

### **Production:**

Peter Mork, Applied Technology Council, Redwood City, California



# Contents

List of Figures.....	vii	
List of Tables.....	ix	
Foreword .....	xi	
Chapter 1	Introduction to Incremental Seismic Rehabilitation .....	1-1
1.1	Background.....	1-1
1.2	What is Incremental Seismic Rehabilitation? .....	1-1
1.3	Are Incremental Seismic Rehabilitation Approaches Currently Being Used? .....	1-2
1.4	The FEMA Incremental Seismic Rehabilitation Series.....	1-2
1.5	Scope, Organization, and Content .....	1-3
Chapter 2	Incremental Compared to Single-Stage Seismic Rehabilitation .....	2-1
2.1	Options for Seismic Risk Reduction.....	2-1
2.2	How Do the Benefits of Incremental and Single-Stage Seismic Rehabilitation Compare?.....	2-2
2.3	The Approach to Incremental Seismic Rehabilitation .....	2-4
2.3.1	Elements of an Incremental Seismic Rehabilitation Program .....	2-4
2.4	How do Engineering Services for Incremental Seismic Rehabilitation Differ from Typical Engineering Practice? .....	2-6

	2.4.1	Development of an Incremental Seismic Rehabilitation Plan .....	2-6
	2.4.2	Analysis and Design .....	2-6
	2.4.3	Special Design Considerations .....	2-7
	2.4.4	Preparation of Construction Documents .....	2-7
	2.4.5	Plan Check and Permitting.....	2-7
	2.4.6	Implementation of an Incremental Seismic Rehabilitation Plan over Time .....	2-8
	2.5	How Does Incremental Seismic Rehabilitation Affect Liability?.....	2-9
Chapter 3		Owner/Operator Perspectives on Incremental Seismic Rehabilitation.....	3-1
	3.1	Owner/Operator Objectives: Revenue Generation, Equity, and Service Delivery .....	3-1
	3.2	Hazard, Vulnerability, and Risk.....	3-2
	3.3	Overview of the Facility Management Process .....	3-3
	3.3.1	Integration of Incremental Seismic Rehabilitation Program Elements.....	3-5
	3.4	The “Educated Client” Perspective .....	3-6
	3.5	Communicating with Multiple Client Audiences .....	3-6
	3.5.1	Facility Managers .....	3-7
	3.5.2	Risk Managers .....	3-7
	3.5.3	Financial Managers.....	3-7
Chapter 4		Codes and Standards for Seismic Evaluation and Rehabilitation.....	4-1
	4.1	Seismic Rehabilitation in Building Codes and Standards.....	4-1
	4.1.1	Mandated Rehabilitation.....	4-2
	4.1.2	Triggered Rehabilitation .....	4-2
	4.1.3	Voluntary Rehabilitation .....	4-2
	4.2	Code Rationalizations for Incremental Seismic Rehabilitation.....	4-2
	4.2.1	Voluntary Changes to the Seismic-Force-Resisting System .....	4-3
	4.2.2	Repairs, Alterations, Additions, and Changes of Occupancy.....	4-3
	4.2.3	Pre-2000 Legacy Codes .....	4-4
Chapter 5		Incremental Seismic Rehabilitation Engineering Process.....	5-1
	5.1	Engineering Phases of an Incremental Seismic Rehabilitation Program.....	5-1



5.2	Engineering Resources Referenced in the FEMA ISR Series .....	5-2
5.3	Performance-Based Seismic Design .....	5-3
5.3.1	Performance-Based Design Process.....	5-4
5.4	Incremental Seismic Rehabilitation Basic Information .....	5-5
5.4.1	Building Type .....	5-5
5.4.2	Seismic Hazard Level .....	5-7
5.4.3	Performance Objectives .....	5-9
5.5	Due Diligence Analysis .....	5-10
5.6	Seismic Screening .....	5-10
5.7	Seismic Evaluation .....	5-13
5.8	Seismic Rehabilitation Planning for Specific Buildings .....	5-15
5.8.1	Incremental Seismic Rehabilitation Plan .....	5-15
5.8.2	Design of Rehabilitation Measures.....	5-16
5.8.3	Prioritization of Rehabilitation Measures.....	5-18
5.8.4	Identification of Integration Opportunities .....	5-22
5.8.5	Definition of Appropriate Rehabilitation Increments .....	5-23
5.9	Staging Seismic Rehabilitation Increments .....	5-24
5.9.1	Coordination with Tenant Work.....	5-24
5.10	Seismic Rehabilitation Project Management .....	5-24
Chapter 6	Incremental Seismic Rehabilitation Needs and Possibilities .....	6-1
6.1	Political, Social, and Economic Possibilities .....	6-1
6.2	How Can Incremental Seismic Rehabilitation Affect Decision-Making and Program Management? .....	6-2
6.3	What is needed to Further Promote Incremental Seismic Rehabilitation? .....	6-2
6.4	Summary and Conclusions .....	6-3
Appendix A	Case Study Example – Seattle Public Schools Incremental Seismic Rehabilitation Program .....	A-1
A.1	Introduction .....	A-1
A.2	Regulatory Context .....	A-2
A.3	Seismic Screening of the Building Inventory .....	A-2
A.4	Seismic Evaluation of Individual Buildings .....	A-3

- A.5 Seismic Rehabilitation Planning and Design..... A-4
- A.6 Staging of Seismic Rehabilitation Increments ..... A-5
  - A.6.1 Capital Levy Program (1982-1999)..... A-5
  - A.6.2 Buildings, Technology and Athletics Levy (1998-2004) ..... A-6
- A.7 Local Jurisdictional Issues..... A-7
- A.8 Legal/Liability Issues..... A-7
  
- Appendix B Case Study Example – Staging of Seismic Rehabilitation Increments ..... B-1
  - B.1 Building Description ..... B-1
  - B.2 Regulatory Context ..... B-2
  - B.3 Rehabilitation Measures..... B-3
  - B.4 Staging of Seismic Rehabilitation Increments ..... B-4
  
- Appendix C Other Existing Building Resource Documents ..... C-1
  - C.1 Relevant Resources from the FEMA Existing Buildings Program ..... C-1
  - C.2 Other Existing Building Resource Documents ..... C-2
  
- References ..... R-1