



Unreinforced Masonry Buildings and Earthquakes

Developing Successful Risk
Reduction Programs

FEMA P-774 / October 2009



FEMA



The cover photos show significant damage to unreinforced masonry buildings that resulted from earthquakes occurring over the last century, across the country.

Front Cover Photo Credits (clockwise from top left):

1886, Charleston, South Carolina: *J. K. Hillers, U.S. Geological Survey*

2003, San Simeon, California: *Josh Marrow, Earthquake Engineering Research Institute Reconnaissance Team*

2001, Nisqually, Washington: *Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries*

1935, Helena, Montana: *L. H. Jorud, courtesy of Montana Historical Society and Montana Bureau of Mines & Geology*

1993, Klamath Falls, Oregon: *Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries*

2008, Wells, Nevada: *Craig dePolo, Wells Earthquake Portal, www.nbmng.unr.edu/WellsEQ/.*

Unreinforced Masonry Buildings and Earthquakes

Developing Successful Risk Reduction Programs

FEMA P-774/October 2009

Prepared for:
FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY (FEMA)
Cathleen Carlisle, Project Monitor
Washington, D.C.

Prepared by:
APPLIED TECHNOLOGY COUNCIL (ATC)
201 Redwood Shores Parkway, Suite 240
Redwood City, California

PRINCIPAL AUTHOR
Robert Reitherman

CONTRIBUTING AUTHOR
Sue C. Perry

PROJECT MANAGER
Thomas R. McLane

PROJECT REVIEW PANEL
Ronald P. Gallagher
Jon A. Heintz
William T. Holmes
Ugo Morelli
Lawrence D. Reaveley
Christopher Rojahn



FEMA

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.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
	Unreinforced Masonry Buildings and Earthquakes: Where in the United States are the Risks?	2
	Types of Earthquake Risks	3
2	Earthquake Performance of Unreinforced Masonry Buildings	7
	What is Unreinforced Masonry?	7
	Examples and Statistics from Past U.S. Earthquakes	10
3	Developing a Strategy for Implementing a URM Building Risk Reduction Program	15
	Occupancy and Ownership Factors: The People Who Own and Use the Buildings	16
	Historic and Architectural Character	16
	Cost Issues Related to Seismic Retrofits	17
	City Planning Factors	17
4	Examples of Successful Risk Reduction Programs	19
	Compiling an Inventory of Unreinforced Masonry Buildings	19
	Successful Programs Require Sustained Support and Leadership	20
	Utah: Engineering Inspections Triggered by Re-roofing Projects	20
	Utah: Statewide Inventory of Unreinforced Masonry Buildings	21
	State of California Unreinforced Masonry Building Law: Measuring the Problem and the Progress Toward Addressing It	22
	Seattle, Washington: Saving Historic Buildings	23
	Seattle, Washington: Combining Modernization with Seismic Retrofitting	23
	Oregon: A Statewide Inventory and Funding Approach for Schools and Essential Facilities	24
	Berkeley and Other California Cities: Financial Incentives for Retrofitting	24
	Public Schools in California: A Statewide Approach to a Special Kind of Facility	25
	Long Beach, California: A Pioneering Accomplishment	25
	Los Angeles, California: Evidence of the Effectiveness of Retrofits	26
	San Luis Obispo, California: Making the Effort to Communicate with Building Owners	27
5	Additional Technical Background on Unreinforced Masonry Construction	29
	How Do Unreinforced Masonry Buildings Behave in Earthquakes?	31
	How Are Unreinforced Masonry Buildings Seismically Retrofitted?	34
6	Sources of Information	39
	Publications for the General Public	39
	Historic Buildings and Seismic Retrofits	40
	Building Inventories and Evaluation of Existing Buildings	40
	Building Codes, Standards, Guidelines, and Laws Applicable to Existing Buildings	41
	Costs of Seismic Retrofits	42
7	End Notes and Cited References	43
8	Project Participants	47