

Table A.2. Indications of Implied Risk to Life and Implied Seismic Damageability

Rating Level ^{1,5}	Historic Risk Ratings of ^{6,7}		Implied Risk to Life ³	Implied Seismic Damageability ⁴
	DSA/SSC ⁷	UC ⁶		
I	I		Negligible	0% to 10%
II	II		Insignificant	0% to 15%
III	III	Good	Slight	5% to 20%
IV	IV	Fair	Small	10% to 30%
V	V	Poor	Serious	20% to 50%
VI	VI	Very Poor	Severe	40% to 100%
VII	VII	Very Poor	Dangerous	100%

Notes:

1. Earthquake damageability levels are indicated by Roman numerals I through VII. Assignments are to be made following a professional assessment of the building’s expected seismic performance as measured by the referenced technical standard and earthquake ground motions. Equivalent Arabic numerals, fractional values, or plus or minus values are not to be used. These assignments were prepared by a task force of state agency technical personnel, including the California State University, the University of California, the California Department of General Services, the Division of the State Architect, and the Administrative Office of the Courts. The ratings apply to structural and non-structural elements of the building as contained in Chapter 34, CBC requirements. These definitions replace those previously used by these agencies.
2. Chapter 34 of the California Building Code, current edition, regulates existing buildings. It uses and references the American Society of Civil Engineers Standard *Seismic Rehabilitation of Existing Buildings, ASCE-41*. All earthquake ground motion criteria are specific to the site of the evaluated building. The CBC definitions for earthquake ground motions to be assessed are paraphrased below for convenience:

 BSE-2, the 2,475-year return period earthquake ground motion, or 150% of the Maximum Considered Earthquake ground motion for the site.
 BSE-C, the 975-year return period earthquake ground motion.
 BSE-1, two-thirds of the BSE-2, nominally, the 475-year return period earthquake ground motion.
 BSE-R, the 225-year return period earthquake ground motion.

Occupancy Category is defined in the CBC Table 1604A.5. The occupancy category sets the level of required seismic building performance under the CBC. Occupancy Category IV includes acute care hospitals, fire, rescue and police stations and emergency vehicle garages, designated emergency shelters, emergency operations centers, and structures containing highly toxic materials where the quantities exceed the maximum allowed quantities, among others. Occupancy categories I-III includes all other building uses that include most state owned buildings.
3. Implied Risk to Life is a subjective measure of the threat of a life threatening injury or death that is expected to occur in an average building in each rank following the indicated technical requirements. The terms negligible through dangerous are not specifically defined, but are linguistic indications of the relative degree of hazard posed to an individual occupant.
4. Implied Damageability is the level of damage expected to the average building in each rank following the indicated technical requirements when a BSE-1 level earthquake occurs. The damage includes both the structural and non-structural systems, but does not consider furnishing and tenant contents. Damage is measured as the ratio of the cost to repair the building divided by the current cost to reconstruct the building from scratch. Such assessments are to be completed to the requirements of ASTM E-2026 at ASTM Level 1 or higher in order to be considered appropriate, where the damage ratio is the Scenario Expected Loss (SEL) in the BSE-1 earthquake ground motion evaluated. ASTM E2026 is the standard for evaluating the seismic damageability of buildings for financial transactions.
5. In those cases where the engineer making the assessment using the requirements for a given Rating Level concludes that the expected seismic performance is consistent with a one-level higher or lower rating, this alternative Rating Level may be assigned if and only if an independent technical peer reviewer concurs in the evaluation. The peer review must be completed consistent with the requirements of Chapter 34 of the CBC. It is

anticipated that most projects that are independently peer reviewed from the initiation of the evaluation and/or design process will qualify for a higher Rating than those buildings, which have not been so reviewed at all. The second column under Peer Review the Ratings have been assigned when this occurs. Note that peer review is unlikely to improve buildings rated as VI or VII because they have fundamental seismic system flaws. The ratings for I and II are not changed because the performance increment between levels is so large.

6. Historically the University of California has used the terms good, fair, poor and very poor to distinguish the relative seismic performance of buildings. The concordance of values in the table above is approximate. The former rating procedures did not provide specific performance levels as is done herein, but were sentence fragments for qualitative performance and are recalled below for historical purposes only:

A *Good* seismic performance rating would apply to buildings and other structures whose performance during a major seismic disturbance is anticipated to result in some structural and/or nonstructural damage and/or falling hazards that would not /significantly/ jeopardize life. Buildings and other structures with a *Good* rating would have a level of seismic resistance such that funds need not be spent to improve their seismic resistance to gain greater life safety, and would represent an acceptable level of earthquake safety.

A *Fair* seismic performance rating would apply to buildings and other structures whose performance during a major seismic disturbance is anticipated to result in structural and nonstructural damage and/or falling hazards that would represent /low/ life hazards. Buildings and other structures with a *Fair* seismic performance rating would be given a low priority for expenditures to improve their seismic resistance and/or to reduce falling hazards so that the building could be reclassified *Good*.

A *Poor* seismic performance rating would apply to buildings and other structures whose performance during a major seismic disturbance is anticipated to result in significant structural and nonstructural damage and/or falling hazards that would represent appreciable life hazards. Such buildings or structures either would be given a high priority for expenditures to improve their seismic resistance and/or to reduce falling hazards so that the building could be reclassified as *Good*, or would be considered for other abatement programs, such as reduction of occupancy.

A *Very Poor* seismic performance rating would apply to buildings and other structures whose performance during a major seismic disturbance is anticipated to result in /extensive/ structural and nonstructural damage, potential structural collapse, and/or falling hazards that would represent /high/ life hazards. Such buildings or structures either would be given the highest priority for expenditures to improve their seismic resistance and/or to reduce falling hazards so that the building could be reclassified *Good*, or would be considered for other abatement programs such as reduction of occupancy.

7. For reference, the historically used Division of the State Architect and Seismic Safety Commission levels corresponds approximately to the new Performance Level numerical values in this table.