Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Complete	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1995 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction's Program	Partial Compliance/ Uncer Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/ Plancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Bellflower 26 URM															
Yes	0	26	Yes	No											
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1985 Edition Chapter 96 of the Los Angeles County Code															
Progress and Remarks:															
Belmont 2 URM															
Yes	0	2	Yes	Yes				1	1						2
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1987 Edition of the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1 as amended to reflect the 1990 SHBC Draft Model Ordinance															
Progress and Remarks:															
Belvedere															
Yes	0	0	N/A	No											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Benicia 21 Non-historic URM 18 Historic URM															
Yes	18	21	Yes	No											
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners Historic building owners were Not Notified, Notices to tenants, semiannual progress reports by building official															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks:															
Berkeley 587 Buildings, All Pre-1976 Assembly, Business, Educational, Hazardous, and Resident with 5 or more units															
Yes	0	587	Yes	No											
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory, Nonbearing walls and veneers.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: City provides prescriptive standards for tall veneers, parapets and simple one or two story buildings. SEAOC/CALBO recommended retrofit provisions with modifications for bearing wall URMs.															
Progress and Remarks: City established a one-time fee of $22 on all business licenses to recover city's program startup costs. City directed its staff to develop a hazards evaluation ordinance to be followed by a mandatory strengthening ordinance pending the availability of state and federal financing.															
Beverly Hills 99 URM															
Yes	0	99	Yes	Yes	47	47	6	2	8		1	1		36	99
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Similar to the 1991 edition of the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Complete	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1995 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction's Program	Partial Compliance/ Uncer Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/ Plancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Big Bear Lake 31 URM															
No	0	31	No	Yes			1				8			41	
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks: 6 damaged commercial buildings and 2 damaged fire stations have been demolished after the 1992 quake, 33 are left and some of those are residential, 5 are commercial.															
Bishop 1 URM															
Yes	0	1	Yes	No											
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory Strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1988 UCBC State Historical Building Code															
Progress and Remarks:															
Blue Lake															
Yes	0	0	N/A	Yes											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Bradbury															
Yes	0	0	N/A	Yes											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Brawley 66 URM															
Yes	0	66	Yes	No		16								50	
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks:															
Brea 25 Non-historic URM, 2 Historic URM															
Yes	2	25	Yes	Yes	2	2				2	15	8			27
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks:															
Brentwood 7 URM															
Yes	0	7	Yes	Yes	2	7			1				5	5	5
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1															
Progress and Remarks: City put together a funding program in 1992.															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Complete	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1995 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction's Program	Partial Compliance/ Uncer Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/ Plancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Brisbane 4 URM															
Yes	0	4	Yes	Yes	2					2		2		2	4
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1985 UBC and the City of Los Angeles Division 88; for tiltup concrete buildings Section 2314 of the 1973 UBC upon major alterations, additions, or changes of use.															
Progress and Remarks: Ordinance also covers tiltup buildings.															
Buena Park 5 URM															
Yes	0	5	Yes	No											
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1988 Edition of the City of Los Angeles Division 88															
Progress and Remarks:															
Burbank 53 URM															
Yes	0	53	Yes	Yes		24	2	3	1	1	17	1	1	5	5
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1982 Edition of Division 88 Los Angeles City Code															
Progress and Remarks:															
Burlingame 63 URM															
Yes	0	63	Yes	Yes	17		9		20		2			6	
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Similar to the February 1990 Edition of the SSC Model Ordinance															
Progress and Remarks: Applicants are given the choice to update to UCBC or SSC Model Ordinance—all chose UCBC. 2 URMs with No progress have expired plan checks and 2 are in probate. Overall progress has been outstanding. Final deadline for compliance (completion of retrofit) is July 1, 1996. Anticipate problems in getting 2 (of the original 54 properties) to comply by deadline.															
Calexico 84 URM															
Yes	0	84	Yes	Yes		17	5	2	1		3			11	19
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners, structural reports, wall anchors, and demolition.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: "LA Model Ordinance"															
Progress and Remarks:															
California City															
Yes	0	0	N/A	No											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Complete	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1995 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction's Program	Partial Compliance/ Uncer Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/ Plancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Calipatria 6 URM															
Yes	0	6	Yes	No											
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1988 Edition of the County of Los Angeles Chapter 96															
Progress and Remarks:															
Calistoga 30 URM															
No	0	30	No	No										30	
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Camarillo 37 URM															
Yes	0	37	Yes	Yes		18			1					18	37
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: February 1990 SSC Model Ordinance															
Progress and Remarks:															
Campbell 9 URM															
Yes	0	9	Yes	No	2									7	
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Complete 1985 Edition of the UCBC including the Appendices															
Progress and Remarks: An earlier 1989 program of mandatory strengthening was realxed in 1993.															
Capitola 1 URM															
Yes	0	1	Yes	Yes							1				
Mitigation Program Type: Demolition															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Carlsbad 8 URM															
Yes	0	8	Yes	Yes			1	5	2					1	8
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Complete	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1995 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction's Program	Partial Compliance/ Uncer Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/ Plancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Carmel-by-the-Sea 26 Bldgs URM, Pre-1935 with 100+ Occupants Pre-1976 with 300+ Occupants															
No	0	26	N/a	No											
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary Strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1987 Edition of the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1 for URM Bldgs, 1973 Edition of the UCBC for Non-URM Buildings, 1985 UCBC															
Progress and Remarks: 20 Bldgs were removed from the inventory after seismic hazard evaluation reports were submitted to the City June 17, 1991.															
Carpinteria 3 URM															
Yes	0	3	Yes	Yes	2						1			2	1
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None Reported															
Progress and Remarks:															
Carson 32 URM															
Yes	0	32	Yes	No		22	10								
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory Strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1985 Edition Chapter 96 of the Los Angeles County Code															
Progress and Remarks:															
Cathedral City															
Yes	0	0	N/A	Yes							1	1			
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Cerritos															
Yes	0	0	N/A	Yes											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
ChiNo 27 URM															
Yes	0	27	Yes	Yes	24	24					3	3	24		24
Mitigation Program Type: Posting, however most buildings will be demolished due to downtown redevelopment.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1991 Edition of the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Complete	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1995 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction's Program	Partial Compliance / Uncer Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted / Plancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Claremont 30 historic URM, 1 Non-historic URM															
Yes	30	1	Yes	Yes	3	19		2			2	5			
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Parapets and wall anchors only															
Progress and Remarks: In volunteer strengthening phase until August 1992.															
Clayton 1 URM															
Yes	0	1	Yes	No											1
Mitigation Program Type: Notification only															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks: Contracts with Contra Costa County															
Clearlake 4 Non-historic URM 1 historic URM															
Yes	1	4	Yes	Yes		4									4
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening, historic buildings are exempt.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1, modified, SHBC															
Progress and Remarks: Seismic evaluation reports, posting, bracing of parapets and veneer, full strengthening required at time of major remodel or repairs.															
Cloverdale 23 URM															
Yes	0	23	No	Yes	2								23		23
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC															
Progress and Remarks: Ordinance being written in 1995.															
Coachella 1 URM															
Yes	0	1	No	Yes		1					1				
Mitigation Program Type: None															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks: Originally inventoried 14 URMs but metal detectors found 13 reinforced. The remaining single URM was destroyed in a fire in 1994.															
Coalinga 66															
Yes	0	66	No	Yes	2						64				
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Complete	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1995 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction's Program	Partial Compliance/ Uncer Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/ Plancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Colma 4 URM															
Yes	0	4	Yes	Yes		4									4
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners, seismic hazard evaluation reports required															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks: Reports indicate that None of the buildings have been determined to be hazardous. City is reviewing the engineering reports.															
Colton 20 URM															
Yes	0	20	Yes	No											20
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks:															
Commerce 9 URM															
Yes	0	9	Yes	No		3			1					5	
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1985 Edition Chapter 96 of the Los Angeles County Code															
Progress and Remarks:															
Compton 18 URM															
Yes	0	18	No	No											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Concord 12 Nonhistoric URM, 2 historic URM															
Yes	2	12	Yes	No											
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening within 5 years															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1															
Progress and Remarks:															
Contra Costa County 66 URM															
Yes	0	66	Yes	No											66
Mitigation Program Type: Notification only															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks: A draft ordinance is being proposed for adoption in 1995.															
Corona 14 URM															
Yes	0	14	Yes	Yes		12	2			4	1		11		14
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1987 Edition of the SSC Model Ordinance															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Complete	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1995 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction's Program	Partial Compliance/ Uncer Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/ Plancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Corte Madera 3 URM															
Yes	0	3	Yes	No											
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to Owners															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks:															
Costa Mesa															
Yes	0	0	N/A	Yes											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Cotati															
Yes	0	0	N/A	Yes											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Covina 75 URM															
Yes	0	75	Yes	Yes	4	60			2			4		15	75
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to Owners															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks:															
Cudahy															
Yes	0	0	N/A	Yes											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Culver City 65 URM															
Yes	0	65	Yes	Yes	61	61	2			3		2		4	65
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1982 Edition of Division 88 Los Angeles City Code															
Progress and Remarks:															
CupertiNo 1 URM															
Yes	0	1	Yes	Yes	1										
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1990 Edition SSC Model Ordinance															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Complete	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1995 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction's Program	Partial Compliance/ Uncer Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/ Plancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Cypress															
Yes	0	0	N/A	No											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Daly City 3 URM															
Yes	0	3	Yes	Yes	1									2	3
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1987 Edition of the SSC Model Ordinance															
Progress and Remarks:															
Dana Point															
Yes	0	0	N/A	Yes											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Danville 1 Non-historic 4 Historic URM, all retrofits are underway,															
Yes	4	1	Yes	No											5
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None reported															
Progress and Remarks: A mandatory strengthening program was considered for adoption in May 1991.															
Davis															
Yes	0	0	N/A	No											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Del Rey Oaks															
Yes	0	0	N/A	Yes											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
DelaNo 38 URM															
Yes	0	38	Yes	Yes	1		1							37	38
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Complete	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1995 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction's Program	Partial Compliance / Uncer Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted / Plancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Desert Hot Springs 1 URM															
Yes	0	1	Yes	No							1				
Mitigation Program Type: Demolition															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks:															
Diamond Bar															
Yes	0	0	N/A	No											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Dixon 14 URM															
Yes	0	14	Yes	Yes	1		1							12	14
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners, seismic retrofits are triggered upon sale or alterations.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1															
Progress and Remarks:															
Downey 14 Pre-1957 URM buildings except one and two family dwellings															
Yes	0	14	Yes	Yes	10	10		1	1		2				
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1985 Edition UCBC Appendix Chapter 1, 20% gravity for walls, 15 lb. wind load, 50% gravity for parapets, diaphragms 1/2 of current code.															
Progress and Remarks: Inventory Not complete.															
Duarte															
Yes	0	0	N/A	Yes											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Dublin															
Yes	0	0	N/A	Yes											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
East Palo Alto															
Yes	0	0	N/A	No											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Complete	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1995 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction's Program	Partial Compliance/ Uncer Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/ Plancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
El Centro 70 URM															
Yes	0	70	Yes	Yes	1		4	1			2	13			70
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory parapet bracing, additional strengthening at the time of remodel.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1991 Edition of the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1															
Progress and Remarks: Progress is slow, difficult to obtain financing. Construction cost is more that the value of the structures. Estimated cost of compliance was approximately $5,700,000 in 1993. 1989 Program: Owner Notification. 1991 Program: Active/passive program based on occupancy.															
El Cerrito 32 URM															
Yes	0	32	Yes	No											
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1985 Edition of the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1															
Progress and Remarks: Owners in violation guilty of misdemeaNor.															
El Monte 25 URM															
Yes	0	25	Yes	Yes	23	23								2	2
Mitigation Program Type: Analysis required under a facade improvement ordinance.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks:															
El Segundo 14 URM															
Yes	0	14	Yes	No											
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1987 Edition SSC Model Ordinance															
Progress and Remarks:															
Emeryville 101 URM															
Yes	0	101	Yes	Yes	20	30	8	2	3	2	12	3		19	101
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory Strengthening, Structural analysis and report and mitigation by 8/93.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Ordinance															
Progress and Remarks:															
Encinitas 20 URM															
Yes	0	20	No	Yes										20	20
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Complete	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1995 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction's Program	Partial Compliance/ Uncer Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/ Plancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Escondido 57 URM															
Yes	0	57	No	Yes	3		26							28	57
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Floor to wall & roof to wall ties, parapet bracing.Section 502, 1991 UBC is being utilized to require retrofits on changes of occupancy															
Progress and Remarks: 1995 proposed program: Voluntary with sunset date of 2015, incentives such as Mills Act & Fee Waivers															
Eureka 27 URM															
Yes	0	27	Yes	Yes	3		2		15					7	27
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening, structural analysis, hardship time extensions															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1987 Edition of the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1 as modified															
Progress and Remarks: Buildings were removed from the inventory 12/20/90.															
Fairfax 4 URM															
Yes	0	4	Yes	Yes		4							1		4
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1															
Progress and Remarks:															
Fairfield 5 URM, Pre-1935 with 100+ Occupants Pre-1976 with 300+ Occupants															
Yes	0	5	Yes	Yes		2	1							2	5
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening, historical buildings are exempt.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None included in the ordinance, although Division 88 is referenced in the report to the Commission.															
Progress and Remarks:															
Ferndale															
Yes	0	0	N/A	No											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks: All except one URM building demolished after the 1906 EQ damaged them beyond repair. Last URM demolished after the April 1992 earthquakes.															
Fillmore 64 URM															
Yes	0	64	Yes	Yes	5				6		10			43	43
Mitigation Program Type: Partial: only URM buildings damaged in the 1/17/94 earthquake, some buildings remain vacant with future unkNown															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC as applicable to damaged buildings only															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Complete	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1995 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction's Program	Partial Compliance/ Uncer Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/ Plancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Fontana 45 Bearing Wall URM, 32 Nonbearing Wall URM															
Yes	0	85	Yes	Yes											85
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks:															
Fort Bragg 1 historic URM, 1 Non-historic															
Yes	1	1	Yes	Yes	1	1	1						1		2
Mitigation Program Type: Notice to owners															
Technical Mitigation Standards: State Historical Building Code															
Progress and Remarks: Contracts with MendociNo County for code enforcement.															
Fortuna 1 URM															
Yes	0	1	Yes	No							1				
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening, structural analysis, hardship time extensions.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1987 Edition of the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1 as modified.															
Progress and Remarks: Building damaged in April 25, 1992, earthquake and subsequently demolished.															
Foster City															
Yes	0	0	N/A	Yes											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Fountain Valley															
Yes	0	0	N/A	No											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Fremont 32 URM															
Yes	0	32	Yes	Yes	2						2			28	32
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1991 UCBC Appendix Chapter 1 and subsequent additions.															
Progress and Remarks: 1990 program Notified owners.															
FresNo County															
Yes	0	0	N/A	Yes											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Complete	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1995 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction's Program	Partial Compliance/ Uncer Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/ Plancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Fullerton 82 Nonhistoric URM 43 historic URM 220 Tiltup Concrete															
Yes	43	82	Yes	Yes		4	3	3	44					71	
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1987 Edition of the SSC Model Ordinance for URM buildings, Certain 1988 UCBC sections referenced for tiltup construction.															
Progress and Remarks: A separate ordinance requires retrofit of pre-1973 tiltup buildings. A grant and deferred loan program was created with redevelopment funds - up to $100,000 loans due on sale with No interest.															
Garden Grove 12 URM															
Yes	0	12	Yes	Yes										11	11
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1, State Model Ordinance															
Progress and Remarks:															
Gardena 19 URM, 1 accessory garage to 2-resident units Not under mandatory mitigation program, deleted from list.															
Yes	0	19	Yes	Yes	8	8			1						10
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Latest UCBC and/or 1990 SSC model ordinance															
Progress and Remarks:															
Gilroy 30 URM															
Yes	0	35	Yes	Yes	34	34	16								34
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1985 Edition of the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1, flat base shear of 10% g, ABK Method.															
Progress and Remarks:															
Glendale 548 URM															
Yes	0	548	Yes	No		184			57		167			140	
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 13.3% Base Shear															
Progress and Remarks:															
Glendora 5 URM															
Yes	0	5	Yes	No		3								2	
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Similar to Division 88 City of Los Angeles code															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Complete	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1995 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction's Program	Partial Compliance/ Uncer Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/ Plancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Gonzales 3 URM															
Yes	0	3	Yes	No											
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1988 (sic) Edition of the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1, 1985 UCBC															
Progress and Remarks:															
Grand Terrace															
Yes	0	0	N/A	No											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Greenfield 14 URM															
Yes	0	14	Yes	No											
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1988 (sic) Edition of the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1, 1985 UCBC															
Progress and Remarks:															
Grover Beach 4 URM															
Yes	0	4	Yes	Yes	1	1					1			4	4
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1991 Edition of the SSC Model Ordinance.															
Progress and Remarks: Building for building replacement allowed without having to meet parking standards.															
Guadalupe 40 URM															
Yes	0	40	Yes	Yes	1	1	2		5			1		19	27
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1															
Progress and Remarks: An earlier 1989 program Notified owners.															
Half Moon Bay 2 URM															
Yes	0	2	Yes	Yes	1	1									1
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1987 Edition of the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1, 1985 UCBC															
Progress and Remarks: Owners were Notified by 6/90. All work complete November 1993.															
Hawaiian Gardens															
Yes	0	0	N/A	Yes											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Complete	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1995 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction's Program	Partial Compliance/ Uncer Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/ Plancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Hawthorne 4 URM															
Yes	0	4	Yes	No											
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners, seismic retrofits triggered only upon change of use or alterations.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1990 SSC Model Ordinance															
Progress and Remarks:															
Hayward 46 URM 130 Tiltup															
Yes	0	46	Yes	Yes	12	12	12	7	12		2	1			46
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Similar to Division 88 City of Los Angeles Code, 1973 UBC for Tiltup Retrofits															
Progress and Remarks:															
Healdsburg 26 URM															
Yes	0	26	Yes	Yes	10		1			1			26		26
Mitigation Program Type: City Ordinance #881: Advisory only with compliance voluntary until 1996.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC 1991 edition and subsequent editions															
Progress and Remarks: Mandatory measures will be enforced after 12:01 a.m. on 9/16/96															
Hemet 70 URM															
Yes	0	70	No	No											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks: Adoption of a Mandatory program considered 3/92.															
Hercules 3 URM															
Yes	0	3	Yes	Yes								2		1	3
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks: 2 bldgs are slated for demolition before the end of May 1995.															
Hermosa Beach 66 URM															
Yes	0	66	Yes	Yes	6	6	3		6					35	50
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1															
Progress and Remarks: An earlier ordinance in 1989 Notified owners.															
Hesperia 2 URM - historical															
Yes	2	0	Yes	Yes											2
Mitigation Program Type: Discussions with owners															
Technical Mitigation Standards: State Historical Building Code															
Progress and Remarks: City plans to develop a Historical Structure/Site Ordinance.															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Complete	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1995 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction's Program	Partial Compliance/ Uncer Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/ Plancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Hidden Hills															
Yes	0	0	N/A	Yes											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Highland 12 URM, Pre-1935															
Yes	0	12	Yes	Yes			2	1	2			4		10	12
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1987 Edition of the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1 for URM Bldgs, 1973 Edition of the UCBC for Non-URM Buildings, 1985 UCBC															
Progress and Remarks: The original count of 35 units was lowered to 12 URMs all pre-1935 dwellings															
Hillsborough															
Yes	0	0	N/A	Yes											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Hollister 9 URM															
Yes	0	9	Yes	Yes	2	2								7	
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to Owners															
Technical Mitigation Standards: SSC Model Ordinance															
Progress and Remarks:															
Holtville 4 URM															
Yes	0	4	No	No											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Humboldt County 7 URM															
Yes	0	7	Yes	Yes										6	1
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks: Earthquake damaged URM buildings shall be repaired and retrofitted to comply with UCBC. Some progress on one URM.															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Complete	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1995 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction's Program	Partial Compliance/ Uncer Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/ Plancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Huntington Beach 51 URM															
Yes	0	51	Yes	Yes		9			1		33			7	
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1976 UCBC, with modified allowable stresses for existing materials															
Progress and Remarks: Majority of structures attained compliance through demolition.															
Huntington Park 132 URM															
Yes	0	132	Yes	Yes	125	125	2			1	1	1	1	3	132
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1985 Edition of Division 88 Los Angeles City Code, and the Los Angeles' Rules for General Application RGA #1-87.															
Progress and Remarks: As of March 1995, 5 URMs have Not fully complied.															
Imperial 2 URM															
Yes	0	2	No	No											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Imperial County															
Yes	0	0	N/A	No											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Indian Wells															
Yes	0	0	N/A	Yes											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Indio 48 URM															
Yes	0	48	Yes	No											48
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks:															
Industry 1 URM															
Yes	0	1	Yes	Yes											1
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Complete	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1995 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction's Program	Partial Compliance/ Uncer Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/ Plancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Inglewood 54 URM															
Yes	0	54	Yes	Yes		50	2	3	3		4	1			
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Similar to Division 88 City of Los Angeles Code															
Progress and Remarks: City reimburses up to $3000 of the cost of engineering studies, 100% of plan check fees, permits, and taxes, using redevelopment money. 80% compliance.															
Inyo County 20 URM															
No	0	20	No	No											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Irvine															
Yes	0	0	N/A	Yes											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Irwindale 2 URM															
Yes	0	2	Yes	Yes		1			1						2
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1985 Edition Chapter 96 of the Los Angeles County Code															
Progress and Remarks:															
Kern County 155 URM															
Yes	0	155	Yes	Yes	1					2	3			149	155
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks: County staff is available to provide guidance concerning measures to retrofit buildings.															
King City 6 URM															
Yes	0	6	Yes	Yes		6								6	6
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1991 Edition of the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1															
Progress and Remarks:															
Kings County															
Yes	0	0	N/A	Yes											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Complete	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1995 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction's Program	Partial Compliance/ Uncer Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/ Plancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
La Canada Flintridge															
Yes	0	0	N/A	No											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
La Habra 15 URM															
Yes	0	15	Yes	Yes		4					8			3	
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1987 Edition SSC Model Ordinance															
Progress and Remarks:															
La Habra Heights 15															
Yes	0	15	No	No		6					9				
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
La Mirada															
Yes	0	0	N/A	Yes											
Mitigation Program Type: Adopted with Los Angeles County															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
La Palma															
Yes	0	0	N/A	Yes											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks: Working with property owners on a voluntary compliance program for pre-1973 tiltup concrete buildings, but do Not have any URM buildings.															
La Puente 21 URM															
Yes	0	21	Yes	No											
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
La Quinta 5 Non-historic URM 2 Historic URM															
Yes	2	5	Yes	Yes	3	3			3			1			7
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1987 Edition SSC Model Ordinance															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Complete	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1995 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction's Program	Partial Compliance/ Uncer Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/ Plancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
La Verne 10 URM															
Yes	0	10	Yes	Yes	3	3					2			6	
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening, Voluntary Posting															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1985 Edition Chapter 96 of the Los Angeles County Code															
Progress and Remarks: City budgeted $100,000 to fund facade / URM program for seismic retrofit in fiscal year 92/93 with goal of completing 2 URM buildings this next fiscal year. One building was completed in 90/91 (funded 92/93=1, 93/94=1) with agency funding leaving 9 URM buildings remaining.															
Lafayette 6 URM															
Yes	0	6	Yes	No											6
Mitigation Program Type: Notification only															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks: Contracts with Contra Costa County. A draft ordinance is being proposed in 1995.															
Laguna Beach 29 URM															
Yes	0	29	Yes	Yes	20	20		1	2					6	
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Similar to Division 88 City of Los Angeles Code															
Progress and Remarks:															
Lake County 11 URM															
Yes		11	Yes	Yes	9	10	1			1			1		2
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening, historic buildings are exempt.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1 as modified, latest edition of the Uniform Building Code, seismic evaluation reports, posting, bracing of parapets and veneer, full strengthening required at time of major remodel or repairs.															
Progress and Remarks: Of the eleven inventoried, 1 URM was exempted since it is historic. 6 URMs were found to be reinforced.															
Lake ElsiNore 54 Non-historic URM 33 historic URM															
Yes	33	54	Yes	No											
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1 as modified															
Progress and Remarks:															
Lakeport 33 URM															
Yes	0	33	Yes	Yes	1	27	2	1					33	2	33
Mitigation Program Type: Seismic evaluation reports, posting, bracing of parapets and veneer, full strengthening required at time of major remodel or repairs, historic buildings are exempt															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBBC Appendix Chapter 1 as modified, 1985 UBC															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Complete	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1995 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction's Program	Partial Compliance / Uncer Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted / Plancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Lakewood															
Yes	0	0	N/A	Yes											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Lancaster 7 URM															
Yes	0	7	Yes	No										7	
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1985 Edition Chapter 96 of the Los Angeles County Code															
Progress and Remarks:															
Larkspur 12 URM															
Yes	0	12	Yes	Yes	4										10
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1															
Progress and Remarks:															
Lawndale 3 URM															
Yes	0	3	Yes	Yes	3	3						1		1	4
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1985 Edition Chapter 96 of the Los Angeles County Code															
Progress and Remarks:															
Livermore 48 URM															
Yes	0	48	Yes	Yes		17			4		1			35	57
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Modified 1990 SSC Model Ordinance															
Progress and Remarks: 9 bldgs have completed an engineering analysis.															
Loma Linda 8 Non-historic URM, 50 Historic URM Pre-1935 with 100+ Occupants Pre-1976 with 300+ Occupants															
Yes	50	8	Yes	No											
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1987 Edition of the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1 for URM Bldgs, 1973 Edition of the UBC for Non-URM Buildings, 1985 UBC															
Progress and Remarks:															
Lomita 17 URM															
Yes	0	17	Yes	No		7		4	1					5	
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1985 Edition Chapter 96 of the Los Angeles County Code															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Complete	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1995 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction's Program	Partial Compliance/ Uncer Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/ Plancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Lompoc 21 URM															
Yes	0	21	No	No											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Long Beach 936 URM bearing and Nonbearing wall bldgs all pre-1934															
Yes	0	936	Yes	Yes		523	27	5	9		361	7			4
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1970 Edition of the UBC, proposed ordinance changes are based on the latest proposed ICBO code change for URM bldgs, and a base shear Not to exceed 13 percent but varies with period, building type and occupant load.															
Progress and Remarks: In 1959, the building official was given the authority to abate parapet and appendage falling hazards; in 1971 a mandatory strengthening ordinance was passed, which was amended in 1976 and updated again in 1990. City created a special assessment district to issue bonds for seismic retrofit financing based on the 1911 Bond Act.															
Los Alamitos															
Yes	0	0	N/A	Yes											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Los Altos 35 URM															
Yes	0	35	Yes	Yes		6							1	1	1
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners, request for voluntary upgrades															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks: Consideration is being given to a more restrictive mandatory strengthening program. After further study, review of plans, and inspections, we have found only one building that may be a URM. The others have provided adequate proof that they do Not have a URM or their building is Not a URM. The placard posted on one URM has disappeared.															
Los Altos Hills															
Yes	0	0	N/A	Yes											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Los Angeles 8239 total URM bldgs, (these numbers are Not wrong: 8222 bearing wall buildings, 1132 Non-bearing wall URM buildings) Of those 140 bearing wall URM buildings are historic and 115 Non-bearing wall URM buildings are historic.															
Yes	255	9,009	Yes	Yes	5817	5832	144	24	23	310	1697	310		1763	9483
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening for bearing wall URM bldgs, Notices to owners for Non-bearing wall URM bldgs ,and development of seismic retrofit guidelines for voluntary rehabilitating of buildings.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1988 edition of Division 88, City of Los Angeles Code with technical amendments which require parts of the ABK Method, in particular demand/capacity and displacement checks for roof diaphragms, Rules for General Application RGA#1-87 are also allowed (based on the ABK Method).															
Progress and Remarks: A mandatory strengthening program for Non-bearing wall URM buildings is anticipated in 1993-94. 151 buildings are exempt. CAO is concerned about ecoNomy so they are holding the tiltup and Nonbearing-wall buildings.															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Complete	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1995 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction's Program	Partial Compliance / Uncer Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted / Plancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Los Angeles County 278 Non-historic URM, 3 historic URM all bearing wall															
Yes	3	278	Yes	Yes	248	248	21	2	2		16	11		14	283
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1992 Edition Chapter 96 of the Los Angeles County Code - similar to Division 88 of the Los Angeles City Code															
Progress and Remarks:															
Los Gatos 15 Non-historic URM 6 historic URM															
Yes	6	15	Yes	No		13	4							4	
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1991 Edition of the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1, 75% of the 91 UBC for the repair of earthquake-damaged Non-URM bldgs, Chapter 37 of the 91 UBC for chimney repair															
Progress and Remarks: Revocation of occupancy for buildings that do Not comply with deadline. City allows replacement of damaged buildings without providing more parking.															
Lynwood 15 URM															
No	0	15	No	No											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Mammoth Lakes															
Yes	0	0	N/A	Yes											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Manhattan Beach 12 URM commercial one story buildings															
Yes	0	12	Yes	Yes		12									
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Similar to Division 88 Los Angeles City Code															
Progress and Remarks: All mandatory strengthening was implemented and completed															
Maricopa 16 URM															
Yes		16	No	Yes										16	
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Complete	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1995 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction's Program	Partial Compliance/ Uncer Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/ Plancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Marin County 1 URM															
Yes	0	1	Yes	Yes				1							
Mitigation Program Type: Notice to owner with an order to strengthen or demolish															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks:															
Marina															
Yes	0	0	N/A	Yes											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Martinez 58 URM															
Yes	0	58	Yes	Yes	6	8	14							30	58
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Standards are planned to be adopted.															
Progress and Remarks:															
Maywood 25 URM															
Yes	0	25	Yes	Yes	19	18				1	9	1			18
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Similar to 1982 Edition of Division 88 of the Los Angeles City Code															
Progress and Remarks:															
McFarland 16 URM															
Yes	0	16	No	No											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
MendociNo County 5 URM															
Yes	0	5	No	No											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Menlo Park 2 Nonhistoric URM															
Yes	0	2	Yes	Yes							1			1	1
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1985 UCBC Appendix Chapter 1, State Historical Building Code															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Complete	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1995 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction's Program	Partial Compliance/ Uncer Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/ Plancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Mill Valley 18 URM															
Yes	0	18	Yes	Yes	14	14	1								18
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1987 Edition SSC Model Ordinance															
Progress and Remarks:															
Millbrae 3 URM															
Yes	0	3	Yes	Yes	3	3									
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1985 Edition of Division 88 of the Los Angeles City Code as modified, 1985 UBC															
Progress and Remarks:															
Milpitas 1 URM															
Yes	0	1	Yes	Yes							3				
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1987 Edition of the SSC Model Ordinance, 1988 Edition of the Uniform Code for the Abatement of Dangerous Buildings															
Progress and Remarks: Strengthening deadline is negotiable depending on owner's financial situation. Only 1 building classified as URM left. This building is city owned, a complete seismic retrofit has been recently completed.															
Mission Viejo															
Yes	0	0	N/A	Yes											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
MoNo County 8 URM															
Yes	0	8	No	No											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Monrovia 75 URM															
Yes	0	75	Yes	Yes		73			2					2	2
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Wall anchorage, parapet bracing and height to thickness requirements only.															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Complete	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1995 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction's Program	Partial Compliance/ Uncer Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/ Plancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Montclair															
Yes	0	0	N/A	Yes											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Monte SereNo															
Yes	0	0	N/A	No											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Montebello 20 URM															
Yes	0	20	Yes	No											
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Similar to the 1985 Edition of Chapter 96 of the Los Angeles County Code															
Progress and Remarks:															
Monterey 42 URM															
Yes	0	42	Yes	Yes	5	29	4		2			2		13	42
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening, historical buildings are exempt.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Similar to the 1987 Edition of the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1, 1988 UBC for base shear.															
Progress and Remarks:															
Monterey County 2 URM															
Yes	0	2	Yes	Yes					1		1		2		
Mitigation Program Type: Demolition/retrofit															
Technical Mitigation Standards: More															
Progress and Remarks: Demolished - Historic Spreckels Building															
Monterey Park 26 URM															
Yes	0	26	Yes	Yes	18	18		2		1	3			2	
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Similar to 1987 Edition SSC Model Ordinance															
Progress and Remarks:															
Moorpark 7 URM															
Yes	0	7	Yes	Yes		5	1								1
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory?															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Complete	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1995 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction's Program	Partial Compliance/ Uncer Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/ Plancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Moraga															
Yes	0	0	N/A	Yes											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks: Contracts with Countra Costa County for code enforcement.															
MoreNo Valley															
Yes	0	0	N/A	Yes											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Morgan Hill 6 Non-historic URM, 2 historic URM															
Yes	2	12	Yes	Yes		7	1				6				
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1982 Edition of the Los Angeles City Code															
Progress and Remarks: This emergency ordinance was passed to repair and retrofit earthquake damaged URM buildings.															
Morro Bay 16 URM															
Yes	0	16	Yes	Yes	1	1		2	6			1			16
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Similar to 1987 Edition SSC Model Ordinance															
Progress and Remarks: 46 buildings were originally inventoried and 30 were found to be reinforced.															
Mountain View 25 Non-historic URM															
Yes	0	25	Yes	No										25	
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners, retrofits are triggered upon remodel or reNovation.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1															
Progress and Remarks: 1992: Drafting an ordinance for late summer that will require mandatory evaluation and upgrade within defined time period to be approved by city council.															
Napa 45 URM															
Yes	0	45	No	No											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Napa County 7 URM															
Yes	0	7	Yes	Yes	1		1			1				6	7
Mitigation Program Type: Other															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Ch I for occupancy changes and structural upgrades.															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Complete	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1995 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction's Program	Partial Compliance/ Uncer Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/ Plancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Newark															
Yes	0	0	N/A	Yes											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Newport Beach 124 Non-historic URM, 3 historic URM															
Yes	3	124	Yes	Yes		121		1	1	2	1	1			
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Current Edition of the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1															
Progress and Remarks:															
Norco 3 URM															
Yes	0	3	No	No											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Norwalk 11 URM															
Yes	0	11	No	No											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Novato 1 URM															
Yes	0	1	No	Yes					1	1			1		
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks: Retrofit proposal was rejected due to local historical design review issues.															
Oakland 1110 bearing wall type and 373 frame structures with URM infill walls															
Yes	0	1,483	Yes	Yes	102	129	171	26	10		28	15		1129	1483
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory exterior falling hazard mitigation program. Voluntary structural upgrade program.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Bearing wall buildings: Mandatory standard - bolts plus tie roof and floors to exterior walls, brace parapets, remove or fix other exterior falling hazards; Voluntary standard - UCBC Appendix Chapter 1; Note - buildings complying with the mandatory standards only will remain on the list of potentially hazardous URM buildings until they are upgraded to comply with the voluntary standard. Frame structures with URM infill walls: Mandatory standard - Parapet plus brace parapets and remove or fix other exterior falling hazards. An earlier program Notified owners.															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Complete	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1995 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction's Program	Partial Compliance/ Uncer Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/ Plancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Oceanside 70 Non-historic URM 2 historic URM															
Yes	2	70	Yes	Yes	9		3							69	72
Mitigation Program Type: Parapet bracing & wall anchorage; time limit 11 years from effective date of ordinance, or when remodeling occurs exceeding 50% of the value of the building.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1, February 1991 Edition, SSC Model Ordinance, State Historic Building Code															
Progress and Remarks: Services of order to be sent to all URMs per revised ordinance. Mitigation adoption: 5/24/91 mandatory strengthening; 8/12/92 revised timelines; 3/1/95 revised mandatory strengthening ordinance to require only parapet bracing & wall anchorage.															
Ojai 29 URM															
Yes	0	29	Yes	No		16	2		3					8	
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Yes-type Not reported															
Progress and Remarks: A 1990 program Notified owners.															
Ontario 65 URM															
Yes	0	65	No	No										65	
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks: The city building department is planning to propose a URM program to city council in the summer of 1995.															
Orange 35 Non-historic URM 43 Historic URM															
Yes	43	35	Yes	Yes	29	29		49						49	78
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners															
Technical Mitigation Standards: URM ordinance 7-92															
Progress and Remarks:															
Orange County 13 URM															
Yes	0	13	Yes	Yes					5	3		3		2	
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Division 88 City of Lost Angeles code															
Progress and Remarks: $2 million set aside for analyses, 5 fire stations to be retrofitted by May 1996, 1 fire station to be demolished, 2 building reevaluated as Not a URM or Not in jurisdiction, 3 relocations.															
Orinda															
Yes	0	0	N/A	Yes											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks: Contracts with Contra Costa County for code enforcement.															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Complete	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1995 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction's Program	Partial Compliance/ Uncer Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/ Plancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Oxnard 53 URM															
Yes	0	53	No	No										53	
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks: City is in the process of developing the URM ordinance and conducting public hearings. No enforcement at this time other than to Notify owners.															
Pacific Grove 8 historic URM 3 Non-historic URM															
Yes	8	3	Yes	Yes	1	1						1		10	11
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening, including all pre-1976 occupancy buildings															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Division 88 City of Los Angeles Code															
Progress and Remarks:															
Pacifica															
Yes	0	0	N/A	Yes											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Palm Desert 3 URMs															
Yes	0	3	Yes	Yes	3										
Mitigation Program Type: Other, UnkNown															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1															
Progress and Remarks:															
Palm Springs 11 Non-historic URM 15 historic URM															
Yes	15	11	Yes	Yes		11	1	10	1	1	2				26
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Modified 1987 Edition of the SSC Model Ordinance															
Progress and Remarks:															
Palmdale															
Yes	0	0	N/A	Yes											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Palo Alto 49 URM, 28 Pre-1935 bldgs with 100 or more occupants, 21 pre-76 bldgs with 300 or more occupants															
Yes	0	49	Yes	No											
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1 for URM buildings, 1973 UBC for Non-URM buildings															
Progress and Remarks: Additions to strengthened buildings are allowed, parking requirements are waived.															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Complete	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1995 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction's Program	Partial Compliance/ Uncer Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/ Plancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Palos Verdes Estates 2 URM															
Yes	0	2	Yes	Yes	2										2
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: SSC Model Ordinance															
Progress and Remarks:															
Paramount 7 URM															
No	0	7	N/a	No											7
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Chapter 96 County of Los Angeles															
Progress and Remarks: An earlier 1990 program provided Notices to owners.															
Pasadena 410 URM															
Yes	0	410	Yes	No											
Mitigation Program Type: Other															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC 1991 Edition															
Progress and Remarks: This program will become mandatory once a "city financing plan" is in place															
Paso Robles 58 URM															
Yes	0	58	No	Yes		3								55	58
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Perris 17 URM															
Yes	0	17	No	No											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Petaluma 62 Non-historic URM 32 Historic URM 5 pre-1934 concrete bldgs 12/11/89															
Yes	32	62	Yes	Yes		11	5								98
Mitigation Program Type: Partial strengthening—bolts only															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks: A 1989 program Notified owners and tenants.															
Pico Rivera 7 URM															
Yes	0	7	Yes	Yes	5	5			1						1
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1, 1987 Edition															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Complete	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1995 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction's Program	Partial Compliance/ Uncer Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/ Plancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Piedmont															
Yes	0	0	N/A	No											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
PiNole 6 URM															
Yes	0	6	No	Yes	1				1	1	1				
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Pismo Beach 39 URM															
Yes	0	39	Yes	Yes	11	11			2		1				15
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1															
Progress and Remarks: Deadlines for strengthening extended to July 11, 1995.															
Pittsburg 38 URM															
Yes	0	38	No	No											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Placentia 16 URM															
Yes	0	16	Yes	Yes	6	3		1							6
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening, owner Notification Not specified. Seismic retrofit is mandatory upon change in use, application for any building permit or use permit, or development plan.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks: City is requesting additional commercial rehabilitation loan funds .															
Pleasant Hill															
Yes	0	0	N/A	No											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Pleasanton 37 URM															
Yes	0	37	Yes	Yes	25	25	1	2	3			2	37	3	37
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC, Appendix Chapter 1															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Complete	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1995 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction's Program	Partial Compliance/ Uncer Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/ Plancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Point Arena Not Reported															
No			No	No											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks: Indicated inventory started but Not completed in 1992 survey. No activity reported since.															
Pomona 96 URM															
Yes	0	96	No	Yes	6	6	3				1	1		86	
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks: Proposed summer 1992 ordinance will be tied into a special assessment district or similar financing.															
Port Hueneme															
Yes	0	0	N/A	No											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Portola Valley															
Yes	0	0	N/A	No											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Poway															
Yes	0	0	N/A	Yes											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Rancho Cucamonga 4 Non-historic, 18 historic, URM															
Yes	18	4	Yes	Yes		12	1	1			3	7		6	22
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1982 Edition of Division 88 Los Angeles City Code, State Historical Building Code as modified															
Progress and Remarks: A pamphlet was developed explaining various options and incentives, encourages Mills Act.															
Rancho Mirage															
Yes	0	0	N/A	Yes											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Complete	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1995 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction's Program	Partial Compliance/ Uncer Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/ Plancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Rancho Palos Verdes															
Yes	0	0	N/A	Yes											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Redlands 86 Non-historic URM 11 historic URM															
Yes	11	86	Yes	Yes											
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks:															
Redondo Beach 20 URM															
Yes	0	20	Yes	No		5	2	1	4					8	
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1987 SSC Model Ordinance															
Progress and Remarks:															
Redwood City 29 Non-historic URM 4 historic URM															
Yes	4	25	Yes	No		22	5							2	
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Similar to UCBC Appendix Chapter 1															
Progress and Remarks: City encourages Mills Act agreements for historical buildings to preserve facades.															
Rialto 19 URM															
Yes	0	19	Yes	No						7			19		19
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks: Adoption of UCBC Appendix Chapter 1 considered in 1992.															
Richmond 70 URM															
Yes	0	70	No	No											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Ridgecrest															
Yes	0	0	N/A	No											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Complete	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1995 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction's Program	Partial Compliance/ Uncer Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/ Plancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Rio Dell															
Yes	0	0	N/A	Yes											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks: No URM buildings have been identified. All structures in the city are wood frame contruction.															
Rio Vista 10 URM															
Yes	0	10	No	No											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Riverside 244 URM															
Yes	0	244	Yes	Yes		6								238	244
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Similar to 1991 UCBC															
Progress and Remarks:															
Riverside County 3 URM															
Yes	0	3	Yes	Yes											3
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners. Retrofit plans required in 180 days.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks:															
Rohnert Park															
Yes	0	0	N/A	Yes											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Rolling Hills															
Yes	0	0	N/A	No											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Rolling Hills Estates															
Yes	0	0	N/A	No											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Complete	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1995 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction's Program	Partial Compliance/ Uncer Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/ Plancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Rosemead 6 URM															
Yes	0	6	Yes	Yes		3					1		3	1	5
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1985 Edition of Chapter 96 Los Angeles County															
Progress and Remarks:															
Ross 1 URM															
Yes	0	1	Yes	No											
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1															
Progress and Remarks:															
Saint Helena 28 Historic URM															
Yes	28	0	Yes	Yes											
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks: City hired two consultants to survey URMs in 1995.															
Salinas 57 URM															
Yes	0	57	Yes	Yes	8	8	5		20		2	1		21	57
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 199 Edition of the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1															
Progress and Remarks: The City Council is considering options to relax their URM program particularly since it triggers compliance with federal American with Disabilities Act requirements.															
San Anselmo 21 URM															
Yes	0	21	Yes	No		1	1		1					18	
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1, State Historical Building Code															
Progress and Remarks:															
San Benito County 6 URM															
No	0	6	No	No											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Complete	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1995 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction's Program	Partial Compliance/ Uncer Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/ Plancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
San BernardiNo 137 URM															
Yes	0	137	Yes	Yes	5	5	1		2	7	4	7		120	137
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1, 1991 edition.															
Progress and Remarks: 1990 ordinance required seismic hazard evaluations. The 1993 Retrofit Ordinance requires retrofits within 4 to 11 years starting on April 15, 1994.															
San BernardiNo County 21 URM															
Yes	0	21	Yes	No											
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks:															
San BruNo 5 URM															
Yes	0	5	Yes	Yes		4									1
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Similar to UCBC Appendix Chapter 1															
Progress and Remarks:															
San Carlos 10 URM															
Yes	0	10	Yes	Yes	1	1	1		4			2		3	10
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Division 88 Los Angeles City Code 1985 Edition, UCBC Appendix Chapter 1 is also allowed on a case by case basis.															
Progress and Remarks:															
San Clemente 2 URM															
Yes	0	2	No	Yes											2
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
San Diego Not reported															
No			N/A	No											
Mitigation Program Type: Parapet strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks: Indicated inventory started prior to 1992 survey with No reports since. San Diego was in Seismic Zone 3 at the time of the enactment of the URM Law and is Not strictly bound to comply with the law. Since then, San Diego's Seismic Zone has been revised to 4.															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Complete	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1995 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction's Program	Partial Compliance/ Uncer Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/ Plancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
San Diego County 34 Nonhistoric URM 4 historic URM															
Yes	4	34	Yes	Yes	3	3	4							22	38
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: February 1990 Edition SSC Model Ordinance															
Progress and Remarks: Now 4 URMs are incorporated in SolaNo Beach, which replied to 1995 survey.															
San Dimas 8 URM															
Yes	0	8	No	No											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
San Fernando 12 URM Non-historic															
Yes	0	12	Yes	Yes		9			1		8			1	3
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1985 Revised Edition of Division 88 City of Los Angeles Code with ABK Modifications															
Progress and Remarks: Wall anchors and parapet repairs were required after the 1971 Sylmar Earthquake.															
San Francisco 1967 URM Bearing Wall, 119 URM Nonbearing walls identified so far.															
No	0	1,967	Yes	Yes		81	118	118	75		51			62	1967
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory Strengthening for Bearing Wall Buildings per Earthquake Hazard Reduction Ordinance 225-92, which was incorporated as Chapters 14 and 15 of the 1992 San Francisco Building Code.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: The URM building ordinance is based on the 1991 UCBC Appendix chapter 1 with modifications. The most significant change is the allowance of a seismic upgrade to "Bolts Plus" level for certain types of buidings: 1) Bolts-Plus Level; 2) Special Procedure (UCBC Appendix Chapter 1; 3) General Porcedure (UCBC Appendix Chapter 1); 4) Retrofit for Essential & Hazardous Facilities; 5) Retrofit for Qualified Historical Buildings; 6) URM Builidngs requiring Sections 104(f) and 2303(h) upgrade of the 1992 San Francisco Building Code. The Bolts-plus procedure is essentially a Special Procedure upgrade without a demand capacity ration diaphragm check and an in-plane/shear check of the wall. There are eight requirements specified in Section 1509(b) exception 1 that must be satisfied before a building may be retrofitted to a "Bolts-Plus" level of upgrade. Qualified Historical Buildings may be upgraded to provisions of the State Historical Building Code. Essential and Hazardous Buildings: For these buildings, a modified form of General Procedure is used (I=1.25; V=1.25 X 1991 UBC force level). URMs requiring Section 104(f) upgrade are equal to 75% of the 1991 UBC level of design force.															
Progress and Remarks: The URM retrofit program started on February 15, 1993. Buildings with risk level 1 are required to be retrofitted in 3 1/2 years from that date. Other buildings with risk levels 2, 3 and 4 respectively have 5, 11 and 13 years from February 15, 1993, to complete their hazard mitigation programs levels of upgrade. The Building Inspection Commission has allocated $200,000 in next year's budget to conduct inventories of all buildings of frames with infill walls. A 1990 program Notified owners of bearing wall buildings.															
San Gabriel 63 URM															
Yes	0	63	Yes	No											
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1985 Edition of Division 88 Los Angeles City Code															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Complete	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1995 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction's Program	Partial Compliance/ Uncer Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/ Plancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
San Jacinto 17 URM															
Yes	0	17	No	No											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
San Joaquin County															
Yes	0	0	N/A	Yes											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
San Jose 146 URM															
Yes	74	72	Yes	Yes	51	146	20	41	16		4	15			146
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: The 1991 Ordinance is similar to the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1, 1991 Edition. The 1985 UBC is also referenced. Earlier ordinance specified 25 percent of the 1973 UBC for earthquakes of varying magnitude.															
Progress and Remarks: City has redevelopment fund grants for engineering design work. 47 URM buildings have already been retrofitted according to the earlier ordinance or they have or will be demolished. City proposed in 1995 to extend the compliance deadlines approximately 2 1/2 years. A 1989 ordinance required a structural report, and allowed the City to abate dangerous buildings or otherwise cause hazards to be reduced.															
San Juan Bautista 13 URM															
Yes	0	13	No	No											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
San Juan CapistraNo 19 URM															
Yes	0	19	Yes	No											
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks:															
San Leandro 59 URM															
Yes	0	59	Yes	Yes		12	12	8	1		3	3		1	
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1988 Edition of Division 88 City of Los Angeles Code															
Progress and Remarks: Arranging for loans and waiving loan fees, hiring a financial consultant, $165,000 financing program to pay for initial hazard evaluation of private buildings, reduced permit fees, and expedited reviews . City is considering a project management program to hire a single design professional for a group of buildings.															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Complete	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1995 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction's Program	Partial Compliance/ Uncer Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/ Plancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
San Luis Obispo 126 URM															
Yes	0	126	Yes	Yes	4	122	5	1	3		4			6	126
Mitigation Program Type: Other - Structural report required by 11/4/94. Strengthening required when alterations exceed 50% of building value or if change of occupancy classification.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1															
Progress and Remarks: Will consider changes to the URM mitigation program during 1995-96 fiscal period; may include mandatory strengthening in conjunction with financial incentives.															
San Luis Obispo County 65 URM															
Yes	0	65	Yes	No		2								63	
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC, Appendix Chapter 1															
Progress and Remarks:															
San Marcos 1 URM															
Yes	0	1	No	No											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
San MariNo 13 URM															
Yes	0	13	Yes	Yes	13										
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners, required engineering inspection, written report, City reserves right to impose standards.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: SSC 1987 Model Ordinance															
Progress and Remarks: Program consists of a resolution															
San Mateo 28 URM															
Yes	0	28	Yes	Yes		1	5	12	10						
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1987 Edition SSC Model Ordinance															
Progress and Remarks: Category II buildings are Not yet required to submit. All category I buildings have achieved some level of compliance.															
San Mateo County 3 Non-historic URM 4 historic URM															
Yes	4	3	Yes	No											
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening, engineer's structural report, Notices to owners, change of use/occupancy, demolition															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1985 Edition of Division 88, 1973 UBC for Non bearing wall URM buildings, State Historical Building Code															
Progress and Remarks: Program does Not include an ordinance, recommends strengthening within three years otherwise a mandatory strengthening ordinance will be considered.															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Complete	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1995 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction's Program	Partial Compliance/ Uncer Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/ Plancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
San Pablo 6 URM															
No	0	6	No	No											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
San Rafael 50 URM															
Yes	0	50	Yes	Yes		27	6		3			2		5	43
Mitigation Program Type: Partial mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1990 Edition of the SSC Model Ordinance, partial compliance with the UCBC															
Progress and Remarks: A 1990 ordinance was voluntary strengthening.															
San Ramon															
Yes	0	0	N/A	Yes											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Sand City															
Yes	0	0	N/A	No											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Santa Ana 207 URM															
Yes	0	207	Yes	Yes	139	139					51	17			17
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Similar to Division 88, 1982 Edition Los Angeles City Code															
Progress and Remarks: City used Marks Bond Act funds for historical buildings.															
Santa Barbara 256 URM															
Yes	0	256	Yes	No	168	168	15	2	18		6				256
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening, implemented in a district by district manner.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1															
Progress and Remarks: Seminars for contractors and building inspectors.															
Santa Barbara County 20 Non-historic URM 2 Historic URM															
Yes	2	20	Yes	Yes	12	12	1			1	1	1		8	22
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners, mitigation required based on occupant load and time frame established in UCBC.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC															
Progress and Remarks: The county porposed a mandatory strengthening ordinance based on the 1991 UCBC. Hearings were scheduled for July 1992.															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Complete	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1995 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction's Program	Partial Compliance/ Uncer Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/ Plancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Santa Clara 24 URM															
Yes	0	24	Yes	No		3	1		6		2			12	
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening - first of three phases.															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks: 3% interest loans to fund engineering analysis with a 5 year payback.															
Santa Clara County 59 URM															
Yes	0	59	Yes	Yes		28	4		4			11		17	59
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening, except for owners of more than two buildings who may set their own time frames for compliance.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1987 SSC Model Ordinance															
Progress and Remarks: Exception was made for Stanford University which can establish its own time frames for compliance. 7 retrofits are currently under design.															
Santa Clarita 4 URM															
Yes	0	4	Yes	Yes	4	4									
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1985 Edition Chapter 96 Los Angeles County Code															
Progress and Remarks:															
Santa Cruz 24 Historic URM, 22 Non-historic URM were demolished, 5 others were severely damaged in Loma Prieta Earthquake.															
Yes	24	27	Yes	No											
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners of undamaged buildings, a second ordinance established standards for repair of damaged URM buildings.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1987 UCBC Appendix Chapter 1, 1970 UBC for Non-URM buildings for the repair ordinance. These standards do Not apply to undamaged URM buildings.															
Progress and Remarks: Loma Prieta Earthquake damage prompted passage of two ordinances, a 1987 hazard reduction ordinance failed to pass.															
Santa Cruz County															
Yes	0	0	N/A	No											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Santa Fe Springs															
Yes	0	0	N/A	No											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Complete	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1995 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction's Program	Partial Compliance/ Uncer Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/ Plancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Santa Maria 27 Nonhistoric URM															
Yes	0	27	Yes	Yes		3			7			1		16	27
Mitigation Program Type: Partial mandatory strengthening. originally only applicable to a certain district of the city, affecting 8 buildings, of those 6 were retrofitted.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1989 Ordinance is based on the 1987 Edition of the SSC Model Ordinance Original ordinance specified 75% of Division 88 City of Los Angeles Code Design Forces															
Progress and Remarks:															
Santa Monica 256 total city URM's id/Noticed - 6 voided as Non URM buildings, 27 demolished for redevelopment, 14 demolished from 1/94 earthquake damage. 209 remaining city URMs (144 upgrade work done, 65 upgrade work Not done). Note: Repair and upgrade work is in progress on 12 of the city's URM buildings. Over 60 had major damage from the 1/94 EQ and 5-7 are still pending demolition.															
Yes	0	209	Yes	Yes	144	154	10	15		2	41	5	100	45	209
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory Strengthening for all URMs															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1 standards by ordinance 1992. Wall anchors required by 1981 ordinance per 1915/21 Santa Monica codes. Upgrades for termination of the 1978 city recorded potentially hazardous building Notices per UCBC standards.															
Progress and Remarks: URM inventory was done in 1977 and Notice of potentially hazardous buildings recorded all URMs in 1978. Wall anchor certification required by ordinance in 1981. Engineer's seismic evaluation report ordinance in 1989. As of 1/1/95 about 80% of Santa Monica's total 1978 URM inventory has been resolved per ordinances. The majority of the remaining URMs will be retrofitted by 1996/97. Currently 20+ are in the retrofit process. All owner/public opposition to this city URM upgrade program ended with the clear significant "lucky" effects of the Northridge EQ on the city's URMs. Mitigation program process: 1975-78, Inv and recorded "Notice potentially hazardous building"; 1981, required anchors ordinance; 1989, required SE report ordinance; 1992, mandatory strengthening ordinance.															
Santa Paula 112 Non-historic URM, 3 historic URM															
Yes	3	112	Yes	Yes		11								105	
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Owners may analyze URM buildings according to 1991 UCBC Appendix Chapter 1															
Progress and Remarks: City is seeking an EQ Hazard Mitigation Grant															
Santa Rosa 69 URM															
Yes	0	69	Yes	Yes	43	43			1	1	8	2		14	69
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening, required preliminary review, property owner review, retrofit or demolition.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1955 UBC															
Progress and Remarks:															
Saratoga															
Yes	0	0	N/A	Yes	2										
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Complete	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1995 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction's Program	Partial Compliance/ Uncer Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/ Plancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Sausalito 35 URM															
Yes	0	35	No	No		1	1							8	
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Scotts Valley															
Yes	0	0	N/A	Yes											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Seal Beach 10 URM															
Yes	0	10	No	Yes	2	2									
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Seaside 25 URM															
Yes	0	25	Yes	No											
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening, Posting															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Similar to the 1987 SSC Model Ordinance															
Progress and Remarks:															
Sebastopol 25 URM															
Yes	0	25	Yes	No		20	2							3	
Mitigation Program Type: Council Policy 11A Lottery for building owners															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Shafter 27 URM															
Yes	0	27	Yes	Yes		27						1	26		27
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners & posts signs															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks:															
Sierra Madre 51 URM															
Yes	0	51	Yes	No		2	2	2	4		6			35	
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Division 88 1985 Edition															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Complete	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1995 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction's Program	Partial Compliance/ Uncer Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/ Plancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Signal Hill															
Yes	0	0	N/A	Yes											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Simi Valley 2 URM - both historic															
Yes	2	0	Yes	Yes						1	1	1	2		2
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1987 SSC Model Ordinance															
Progress and Remarks:															
SolaNo County 2 URM															
Yes	0	2	Yes	Yes											
Mitigation Program Type: Notification Only															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks:															
Soledad 4 URM															
Yes	0	4	Yes	Yes						1			4	4	4
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1 1987 Edition															
Progress and Remarks:															
Solvang 3 URM															
Yes	0	3	Yes	Yes			1							3	3
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks:															
SoNoma 28 Historic URM , 27 Non-historic URM															
Yes	28	27	Yes	Yes	8	10	5	5	4	1	1	1		2	55
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Similar to the Santa Rosa Program or UCBC Appendix Chapter 1															
Progress and Remarks: $2 per square foot reimbursement to owner for cost of developing upgrading plans. Community redevelopment agency pays for cost of URM upgrading permits.															
SoNoma County 174 URM															
Yes	0	174	Yes	No											
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1															
Progress and Remarks: Draft ordinance being reviewed.															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Complete	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1995 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction's Program	Partial Compliance/ Uncer Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/ Plancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
South El Monte															
Yes	0	0	N/A	Yes											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
South Gate 47 URM															
Yes	0	47	Yes	Yes	39	39					6	8	47		47
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1987 Edition of SSC Model Ordinance															
Progress and Remarks:															
South Pasadena 32 URM															
Yes	0	32	Yes	Yes	26	26	4		3		1			7	32
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1982 Edition of Division 88 City of Los Angeles Code															
Progress and Remarks:															
South San Francisco 15 URM															
Yes	0	15	Yes	Yes	5		2		1		1	1		14	15
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory Strengthening, Complete retrofit within 7 years or at time of sale, whichever comes first.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1															
Progress and Remarks:															
Stanton															
Yes	0	0	N/A	Yes											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Suisun City 19 URM															
Yes	0	19	Yes	Yes											19
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Sunnyvale 86 URM															
Yes	0	86	Yes	Yes											86
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners, educational material, voluntary engineering reports, review by city after one year.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks: Staff proposed to present the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1 for adoption by the City Council in June 1992.															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Complete	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1995 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction's Program	Partial Compliance/ Uncer Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/ Plancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Taft 42 URM															
Yes	0	42	No	No										42	
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Tehachapi 9 URM															
Yes	0	9	No	No											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Temple City 6 URM															
Yes	0	6	Yes	No											
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Chapter 96 of the Los Angeles County Code 1985 Edition															
Progress and Remarks:															
Thousand Oaks															
Yes	0	0	N/A	Yes											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Tiburon 1 URM															
Yes	0	1	No	No		1									
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Torrance 50 URM															
Yes	0	50	Yes	Yes		43					7				
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1982 Edition of Division 88 Los Angeles City Code															
Progress and Remarks: City funded a subsidy to pay for the engineering analysis at $0.50/Sq. Ft. Formed $679,000 assessment district for owners who choose to join.															
Tulare Not Reported															
No			No	No											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks: Indicated inventory started but Not completed prior to 1992 survey with No reports since.															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Complete	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1995 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction's Program	Partial Compliance/ Uncer Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/ Plancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Tustin 8 URM															
Yes	0	8	Yes	Yes		6	1	1							
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1990 SSC Model Ordinance															
Progress and Remarks: Community Development Block Grants for up to $2000 provided for engineering costs.															
Twentynine Palms 27 URM															
Yes	0	27	Yes	Yes											
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening, engineer's structural report, letters of intent, demolition for unsatisfactory progress, historical buildings are exempt.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1985 Edition of Division 88 as modified for URM buildings, 1973 UBC for Non-URM bearing wall buildings															
Progress and Remarks:															
Ukiah 48 Non-historic URM, No historic URM															
Yes	0	48	Yes	Yes		48							40	48	48
Mitigation Program Type: Engineer's structural report, posting, structural upgrade if voluntary structural work exceeds 50% of building value on any one permit.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: State Historical Building Code															
Progress and Remarks: Earlier loan program is No longer available.															
Union City 7 URM															
Yes	0	7	No	No											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Upland 58 URM, Pre-1935 with 100 + Occupants Pre-1976 with 300 + Occupants															
Yes	0	58	Yes	No		10	4	4	6					34	
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening requires engineering reports, and letters of intent.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Latest Edition of Division 88 of the Los Angeles City Code, the 1973 UBC for Non-URM buildings, and City Ordinance #1470 January 1990.															
Progress and Remarks: $2 million Commercial Rehabilitation Loan Program - loans at market rate, architectural engineering and loan packaging.															
Vacaville 21 URM															
Yes	14	7	Yes	Yes		21	5							16	21
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to Owners															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks: 3% redevelopment matching loan program over 25 years for retrofits.															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Complete	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1995 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction's Program	Partial Compliance/ Uncer Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/ Plancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Vallejo 56 Non-historic URM 8 Historic URM															
Yes	8	56	Yes	No		16		9	25					20	
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Similar to the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1															
Progress and Remarks: $40,000 per building maximum CDBG loan. 19 buildings removed from list.															
Ventura 145 URM															
Yes	0	145	Yes	Yes	3	98		18	5		2			19	145
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory parapet strengthening. Voluntary Strengthening to UCBC Seismic Zone 2B Compliance Recommended by City.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC															
Progress and Remarks: Environmental Impact Study done. 2 ordinances adopted and 1 policy resolution.															
Ventura County 19 URM															
Yes	0	19	Yes	Yes	8	8					1	7		3	19
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: February 1990 SSC Model Ordinance															
Progress and Remarks:															
VerNon 126 URM															
No	0	126	No	No											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Victorville 37 URM															
Yes	0	37	Yes	Yes			4		11						40
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners, owners are requested to voluntarily upgrade their buildings upon changes of occupancy or No later than 2 years.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1															
Progress and Remarks: 11 buildings have been contracted out to architects/engineers for seismic retrofit design.															
Villa Park															
Yes	0	0	N/A	No											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Complete	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1995 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction's Program	Partial Compliance/ Uncer Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/ Plancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Vista 2 URM															
Yes	0	2	Yes	No	1	1								1	
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None reported															
Progress and Remarks:															
Walnut															
Yes	0	0	N/A	No											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Walnut Creek 12 URM															
Yes	0	12	Yes	Yes	9	9	2		1						12
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Modified Version of the 1987 SSC Model Ordinance. Also allows the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1, 1991 version.															
Progress and Remarks:															
Wasco 27 URM															
Yes	0	27	Yes	Yes							1				27
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks:															
Watsonville 60 URM															
No	0	60	No	No											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks: Inventory started, but Not completed or reported to the Commission.															
West Covina 1 URM															
Yes	0	1	Yes	Yes					1				1		1
Mitigation Program Type: Notice to owner, engineer's report															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Not indicated															
Progress and Remarks: Plans were prepared in 1992 and were being reviewed. Costs were being looked at.															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Complete	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1995 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction's Program	Partial Compliance/ Uncer Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/ Plancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
West Hollywood 81 Non-historic URM 20 Historic URM															
Yes	20	81	Yes	No											
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1988 Edition of Chapter 96 of the Los Angeles County Code as modified, also accepts the 1984 ABK Methodology Report															
Progress and Remarks: Amended the rent control program to allow rent increases, $7100 per building Community Development Block Grant funds, housing rehabilitation program of $10,000 per building, reduction or waiver of fees, zoning incentives.															
Westlake Village															
Yes	0	0	N/A	No											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Westminster															
Yes	0	0	N/A	Yes											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Westmorland 2 URM															
Yes	0	2	Yes	No											
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1988 Edition of Chapter 96 of the Los Angeles County Code															
Progress and Remarks:															
Whittier 12 URM															
Yes	0	12	Yes	Yes	8	8					2		4	4	12
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Draft Model Ordinance (Division 88)															
Progress and Remarks: Notices served 5/92.															
Willits 7 Non-historic URM 2 Historic URM															
Yes	2	7	Yes	Yes	1							1		5	7
Mitigation Program Type: Engineer's report, Notices to owners, posting of buildings.															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Complete	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1995 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction's Program	Partial Compliance/ Uncer Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted / Plancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Woodside															
Yes	0	0	N/A	No											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Yorba Linda 2 URM															
Yes	0	2	Yes	Yes	2										
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening analysis required by structural engineer.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Similar to 1982 Edition of Division 88															
Progress and Remarks:															
Yountville 9 URM															
Yes	0	9	Yes	No											
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks:															
Yucaipa 45 URM															
Yes	0	45	Yes	No	17									28	28
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening requiring evaluations by June 1994															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks: Draft ordinance proposes adoption of UCBC Appendix Chapter 1 and a voluntary strengthening plan. Ordinance adopted in 1992, requires mandatory strengthening.They are Now considering revising it to a voluntary program.															

Appendix B—1992 Survey of Uses for URM Buildings (Based on 110 Jursidictions)

Primary Use	No. of Bldgs	Percentage	*Adjusted Percentage
Retail	2299	17.1%	44.5%
Office	793	5.9%	15.4%
Residential	238	1.8%	4.6%
Pre-School	16	<0.1%	<0.1%
K-12	40	0.3%	0.1%
College	10	<0.1%	<0.1%
Hotel	95	0.7%	1.8%
Retaurant	380	2.8%	7.4%
Theatre	87	0.6%	1.7%
Industrial	258	1.9%	5.0%
Warehouse	214	1.6%	4.1%
Garage	141	1.0%	2.7%
Public Utility	37	0.3%	0.7%
Hopsital	28	0.2%	0.5%
Police Department	4	<0.1%	<0.1%
Fire Department	29	.02%	0.6%
Jail	6	<0.1%	<0.1%
Church	155	1.2%	3.0%
Other	334	2.5%	6.5%
Undefined	8271	61.6%	
Total		13436	5164

Structure	No. of Bldgs	Percentage	*Adjusted Percentage
Bearing Walls	11618	86.5%	90.8%
Steel Frame	16	0.1%	0.1%
Concrete Frame	150	1.1%	1.2%
Other	1016	7.6%	7.9%
Undefined	635	4.7%	
Total		13436	12800

*"Adjusted Percentage" is based on total URM buildings minus the "Undefined" number of buildings.

Appendix C—1988 to 1992 Status of Compliance Statistics

1988 Table of Compliance

	Number in Zone 4	Inventory Started	Inventory Completed	Ordinance Adopted	No URMs
Cities	325	105	60	20	60
Counties	29	12	5	1	0
Total	354	117	65	21	60

1989 Table of Compliance

Cities & Counties in Zone 4 With:	Zone 4 City and County Participation		Zone 4 Unreinforced Masonry Buildings	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Mitigation Programs Established				
Post-URM Law Mandatory Strengthening Porgram	20	5	1,602	5
Pre-URM Law Programs	9	2	8,744	25
Miscellaneous Programs	2	1	52	0
Subtotals	31	8	10,398	30
Inventory Progress				
Complete—No URMs	56	15	0	0
Complete—No Program Established	27	7	3,781	11
In Progress	*124	*34	*9,000	*26
Subtotals	*207	*57	12,781	*37
Jurisdictions Implementing Law	*238	*65	*23,179	*66
No Knows Progress	*127	*35	*11,821	*34
Zone 4 Totals	365	100	35,000	100

*Projections based on partial data.

1990 Table of Compliance

	Jurisdictions	Percentages	Populaton	Percentages
Total Cities	336	92%	18,158,290	80%
Cities without inventories started	7	2	137,210	1
Cities with inventory started	48	13	1,934,675	8
Cities with inventory completed—No mitigation program	70	19	2,923,425	13
Cities with no URMs	68	19	1,683,064	7
Cities with mitigation programs	143	39	11,479,916	50
Total counties	29	8	4,603,800	20
Counties without inventories started	1	0	100,400	0
Counties with inventory started	5	1	766,900	3
Counties with inventory completed—No mitigation program	8	2	917,650	4
Counties with no URMs	4	1	360,450	2
Counties with mitigation programs	11	3	2,458,400	11
Total cities and counties	365	100	22,762,090	100
Cities and counties without inventories started	8	2	237,610	1
Cities and counties with inventory started	53	15	27,011,575	12
Cities and counties with inventory completed—No mitigation program	78	21	3,841,075	17
Cities and counties with no URMs	72	20	2,043,514	9
Cities and counties with mitigation programs	154	42%	13,938,316	61%

1991 Table of Compliance

	Jurisdictions	Percentages	Population	Percentages	URMs	Percentages
Cities in Zone 4 affected by the URM Law	336	92%	18,158,290	80%	24,267	100%
Cities without inventories started	5	1	109,210	0	55	0
Cities with inventory started	33	9	989,880	4	901	4
Cities with inventory completed—No mitigation program	55	15	223,2130	10	2,220	9
Cities with no URMs	71	19	1,791,864	8	0	0
Cities with mitigation programs	172	47	13,035,206	57	21,091	87
Counties in Zone 4 affected by the URM Law	29	8	4,603,800	20	1,044	100
Counties without inventories started	1	0	100,400	0	2	0
Counties with inventory started	4	1	393,600	2	61	6
Counties with inventory completed—No mitigation program	6	2	698,450	3	128	12
Counties with no URMs	5	1	489,050	2	0	0
Counties with mitigation programs	13	4	2,922,300	13	853	82
Total cities and counties in Zone 4	365	100	22,762,090	100	25,311	100
Cities and counties without inventories started	6	2	209,610	1	57	0
Cities and counties with inventory started	37	10	1,383,480	6	962	4
Cities and counties with inventory completed—No mitigation program	61	17	2,930,580	13	2,348	9
Cities and counties with no URMs	76	21	2,280,914	10	0	0
Cities and counties with mitigation programs	185	51	159,57,506	70	21,944	87
Types of mitigation programs established						
Mandatory Program	94	51	10,736,462	67	14,067	64
Voluntary Program	30	16	1,080,220	7	1,005	5
Notification Only	42	23	2,776,274	17	4,054	18
Other	19	10	1,364,550	9	2,818	13
Total cities and counties with mitigation programs	185	100%	1,5957,506	100%	21,944	100%

1992 Table of Compliance

	Jurisdictions	Percentages	Population	Percentages	URMs	Percentages
Cities in Zone 4 affected by the URM Law	336	92%	18,158,290	80%	24772	100%
Cities without inventories started	1	0	1,240	0	0	0
Cities with inventory started	20	5	368,660	2	415	2
Cities with inventory completed—No mitigation program	49	13	1,813,395	8	1,489	6
Cities with no URMs	72	20	1,794,774	8	0	0
Cities with mitigation programs	194	53	14,180,221	62	22,868	92
Counties in Zone 4 affected by the URM Law	29	8	4,603,800	20	1,012	100
Counties without inventories started	0	0				
Counties with inventory started	2	1	29,500	0	26	3
Counties with inventory completed—No mitigation program	7	2	732,450	3	116	11
Counties with no URMs	5	1	489,050	2	0	0
Counties with mitigation programs	15	4	3,352,800	15	870	86
Total cities and counties in Zone 4	365	100	2,2762,090	100	25,784	100
Cities and counties without inventories started	1	0				
Cities and counties with inventory started	22	6	398,160	2	441	2
Cities and counties with inventory completed—No mitigation program	56	15	2,545,845	11	1,605	6
Cities and counties with no URMs	77	21	2,283,824	10	0	0
Cities and counties with mitigation programs	209	57	17,533,021	77	23,738	92
Types of mitigation programs established						
Mandatory Program	110	56	1,1448,387	65	15,439	65
Voluntary Program	34	16	1,439,920	8	1,315	6
Notification Only	42	20	3,166,734	18	3,848	16
Other	22	11	1,455,780	8	3,108	13
Total cities and counties with mitigation programs	209	100%	1,7510,821	100%	23,710	100%

Appendix D—The URM Law (full text)

Chapter 12.2 Building Earthquake Safety

Chapter 12.2 was added by Stats. 1986, c. 250, § 2.

§ 8875. Definitions

Unless the context otherwise requires, the following definitions shall govern the construction of this chapter:

(a) "Potentially hazardous building" means any building constructed prior to the adoption of local building codes requiring earthquake resistant design of buildings and constructed of unreinforced masonry wall construction. "Potentially hazardous building" includes all buildings of this type, including, but not limited to, public and private schools, theaters, places of public assembly, apartment buildings, hotels, motels, fire stations, police stations, and buildings housing emergency services, equipment, or supplies, such as government buildings, disaster relief centers, communications facilities, hospitals, blood banks, pharmaceutical supply warehouses, plants, and retail outlets. "Potentially hazardous building" does not include any building having five living units or less. "Potentially hazardous buildings" does not include, for purposes of subdivision (a) of Section 8877, any building which qualifies as "historical property" as determined by an appropriate governmental agency under Section 37602 of the Health and Safety Code.

(b) "Local building department" means a department or agency of a city or county charged with the responsibility for the enforcement of local building codes.

§ 8875.1 Establishment of program; identification of potentially hazardous buildings; advisory report

A program is hereby established within all cities, both general law and chartered, and all counties and portions thereof located within seismic zone 4, as defined and illustrated in Chapter 2-23 of Part 2 of Title 24 of the California Administrative Code, to identify all potentially hazardous buildings and to establish a program for mitigation of identified potentially hazardous buildings.

By September 1, 1987, the Seismic Safety Commission, in cooperation with the League of California cities, the County Supervisors Association of California and California building officials, shall prepare an advisory report for local jurisdictions containing criteria and procedures for purposes of Section 8875.2.

(Formerly § 8876, added by Stats. 1986, c. 250, § 2. Renumbered § 8875.1 and amended by Stats. 1987, c 56, § 62.)

§8875.2 Local building departments; participation in mitigation programs; reports

Local building departments shall do all of the following:

(a) Identify all potentially hazardous buildings within their respective jurisdiction on or before January 1, 1990. This identification shall include current building use and daily occupancy load. In regard to identifying and inventorying the buildings, the local building departments may establish a schedule of fees to recover the costs of identifying potentially hazardous buildings and carrying out this chapter.

(b) Establish a mitigation program for potentially hazardous buildings to include notification to the legal owner that the building is considered to be one of a general type of structure that historically has exhibited little resistance to earthquake motion. The mitigation program may include the adoption by ordinance of a hazardous buildings program, measures to strengthen buildings, measures to change the use to acceptable occupancy levels or to demolish the building, tax incentives available for seismic rehabilitation, low-cost seismic rehabilitation loans available under Division 32 (commencing with Section 5500)

of the Health and Safety Code, application of structural standards necessary to provide for life safety above current code requirements, and other incentives to repair the buildings which are available from federal, state, and local programs. Compliance with an adopted hazardous buildings ordinance or mitigation program shall be the responsibility of building owners.

Nothing in this chapter makes any state building subject to a local building mitigation program or makes the state or any local government responsible for paying the cost of strengthening a privately owned structure, reducing the occupancy, demolishing a structure, preparing engineering or architectural analysis, investigation, or design, or other costs associated with compliance of locally adopted mitigation programs.

(c) By January 1, 1990, all information regarding potentially hazardous buildings and all hazardous building mitigation programs shall be reported to the appropriate legislative body of a city or county and filed with the Seismic Safety Commission.

§ 8875.3 Local jurisdictions; immunity from liability

Local jurisdictions undertaking inventories and providing structural evaluations of potentially hazardous buildings pursuant to this chapter shall have the same immunity from liability for action or inaction taken pursuant of this chapter as is provided by Section 19167 of the Health and Safety Code for action or failure to take any action pursuant to Article 4 (commencing with Section 19160) of Chapter 2 of Part 3 of Division 13 of the Health and Safety Code.

§ 8875.4 Annual report

The Seismic Safety Commission shall report annually, commencing on or before June 30, 1987, to the Legislature on the filing of mitigation programs from local jurisdiction. The annual report required by this section shall review and assess the effectiveness of building reconstruction standards adopted by cities and counties pursuant to this article and shall supersede the reporting requirement pursuant to this article and shall supersede the reporting requirement pursuant to Section 19169 of the Health and Safety Code.

§ 8875.5 Coordination of responsibilities

The Seismic Safety Commission shall coordinate the earthquake-related responsibilities of government agencies imposed by this chapter to ensure compliance with the purposes of this chapter.

§ 8875.6 Transfer of unreinforced masonry building with wood frame floors or roofs; duty to deliver to purchaser earthquake safety guide

On and after january 1, 1993, the transferor, or his or her agent, of any unreinforced masonry building with wood frame floors or roofs, built before January 1, 1975, which is located within any county or city whall, as soon as practicable before the sale, transfer, or exchange, deliver to the purchaser a copy of the *Commercial Property Owner's Guide to Earthquake Safety* described in Section 10147 of the Business and Professions Code. <u>This section shall not apply to any transfer described in Section 8893.3.</u>

§ 8875.7

If the transferee has received notice pursuant to Section 8875.8, and has not brought the building or structure into compliance within five years of that date, the owner shall not receive payment from any state assistance program for earthquake repqirs resulting from damage during an earthquake until all other applicants have been paid.

§ 8875.8

(a) Whithin three months of the effective date of the act amending this section, enacted at the 1991192 Regualr Session, any owner who has received actual or constructive notice that a buildng located in seismic zone 4 is constructed of unreinforced masonry shall post in a conspicuous place at the entrance of the building, on a sign not less than 5 X 7

the following statement, printed in not less than 30-point bold type:

> This is an unreinforced masonry building. Unreinforced masonry buildings may be unsafe in the event of a major earthquake.

(b) Notice of the obligation to post a sign, as required by subdivision (a), shall be included in the Commercial Property Owner's Guide to Earthquake Safety.

§ 8875.9

Section 8875.8 shall not apply to unreiforced masonry construction if the walls are nonload bearing with steel or concrete frame.

§ 8875.95

No transfer of title shall be invalidated on the basis of failure to comply with this chapter.

Appendix E—Glossary of Descriptive Terms for Buildings

Potentially hazardous building—a building that is one of a type that has historically performed poorly in earthquakes and can pose a significant threat of death or injury from total collapse, partial collapse, falling hazards, blocked entrances or exits, or the release of hazardous materials in the event of a major earthquake.

Hazardous building—a building that a qualified professional has determined to have a high likelihood of posing a significant threat of death or injury from total collapse, partial collapse, falling hazards, blocked entrances or exits, or the release of hazardous materials in the event of a major earthquake. Hazardous buildings are not so unsafe that the government precludes occupancy. However, the owner must consider the prudence of remedial actions or precluding occupancy.

Unsafe or dangerous building—a building that has conditions or defects described in Section 203 of the 1988 edition of the UBC: structurally unsafe or not provided with adequate egress or constituting a fire hazard, or otherwise dangerous to human life. Dangerous buildings are further defined in Section 302 of the Uniform Code for Abatement of Dangerous Buildings. These buildings are unsafe to occupy.

Vulnerable building—a building that could be included in any of the above categories.

Appendix F—References

Applied Technology Council, 1992. "Evaluation of the Performance of Seismically Retrofitted Buildings," ATC-31.

Arnold, Chris, 1989. "Establishing Programs tne Priorities for the Seismic Rehabilitation of Existing Buildings," February, 1989.

Barzel, Darragh, 1992. "Seismic Retrofit Incentive Programs: a Handbook for Local Governments," by the Association of Bay Area Governments staff, Fall 1992.

Cronin, Timothy G., 1991. "Applicability of URM Law to Historical Buildings," Seismic Safety Commission staff legal opinion, Jan. 22, 1991.

Gregory, Bion M., 1988. Legislative Counsel of California Opinion "Earthquake Safety - #22390" Definition of "Potentially Hazardous Building" and discussion of "Government" Anchors.

Herman, Russell, Scott, and Sharpe, 1990. "Earthquake Hazard Identification and Voluntary Mitigation: Palo Alto's City Ordinance," December 1990. Seismic Safety Commission. SSC 90-05

Russell, James E., 1988. "SB 547: Identification and Mitigation of Unreinforced Masonry Buildings - Implementation Issues, Obstacles and Opportunities Facing Local Governments," Feb. 1988.

Rutherford and Chekene, 1990. "Damage to Unreinforced Masonry Buildings in the Loma Prieta Earthquake of October 17, 1989," SSC 90-07.

Seismic Safety Commission, 1985. "Building Code Requirements for Seismic Safety: A Report to the California Legislature on the Effectiveness of SB 445 Statutes of 1979, Chapter 510," November, 1985.

Seismic Safety Commission, 1985. "Rehabilitating Hazardous Masonry Buildings: A Draft Model Ordinance," SSC 85-06.

Seismic Safety Commission, 1987. "Financial and Social Impacts of Unreinforced Masonry Building Rehabilitation," including edited transcripts of hearings before the Seismic Safety Commission December 1986 through March 1987, SSC 87-02.

Seismic Safety Commission, 1987. "Guidebook and Appendix to Identify and Mitigation Seismic Hazards in Buildings," SSC 87-03.

Seismic Safety Commission, 1988. "California at Risk: Steps to Earthquake Safety for Local Governments," SSC 88-01.

Seismic Safety Commission, 1988. "Status of California's Unreinforced Masonry Building Law," June 30, 1988. SSC 88-03.

Seismic Safety Commission, 1989. "The URM Bulletin," Spring 1989, Number 1.

Seismic Safety Commission, 1989. "Status of California's Unreinforced Masonry Building Law," June 30, 1989. SSC 89-01.

Seismic Safety Commission, 1990. "A Draft Model Ordinance for the Seismic Retrofit of Hazardous Unreinforced Masonry Buildings," SSC 90-01.

Seismic Safety Commission, 1990. "Status of California's Unreinforced Masonry Building Law," June 30, 1989. SSC 90-03.

Seismic Safety Commission, 1990. "The URM Bulletin," Winter 1990, Number 2.

Seismic Safety Commission, 1991. "Policy on Acceptable Levels of Earthquake Risk in State Buildings," January 1991, SSC 91-01.

Seismic Safety Commission, 1991. "Recommended Model Ordinance for the Seismic Retrofit of Hazardous Unreinforced Masonry Buildings," SSC 91-03.

Seismic Safety Commission, 1991. "Status of California's Unreinforced Masonry Building Law," June 30, 1989. SSC 91-04.

Seismic Safety Commission, 1991. "California at Risk: Reducing Earthquake Hazards 1992-1996," SSC 91-08.

Seismic Safety Commission, 1991. "The URM Bulletin," Winter 1991, Number 3.

Seismic Safety Commission, 1992. "Status of California's Unreinforced Masonry Building Law," June 30, 1989. SSC 92-01.

Seismic Safety Commission, 1992. "The Right to Know: Disclosure of Seismic Hazards in Buildings," a Report of the Posting Committee, June 11, 1992, SSC 92-03.

Seismic Safety Commission, 1992. "Architectural Practice and Earthquake Hazards," A report of the Committee on the Architect's Role in Earthquake Hazard Mitigation, SSC 91-10.

Seismic Safety Commission, 1993. "The Commercial Property Owner's Guide to Earthquake Safety," SSC 93-01.

Seismic Safety Commission, 1993. "The Homeowner's Guide to Earthquake Safety," SSC 92-02.

Seismic Safety Commission, 1994. "California at Risk: Reducing Earthquake Hazards 1992-1996: 1994 Status Report," SSC 94-01.

Seismic Safety Commission, 1995. "Northridge Earthquake: Turning Loss to Gain," SSC 94-09.

Seismic Safety Commission, 1995. "1995 Recommended Model Ordinance for the Seismic Retrofit of Hazardous Unreinforced Masonry Buildings," SSC 95-12???.

Thiel, Willsea, and Singh, 1991. "Breaking the Pattern: a Research and Development Plan to Improve Seismic Retrofit Practices for Government Buildings," June 1991, SSC 91-05.

Tierney, Kathleen J., 1985. "Report on the Coalinga Earthquake of May 2, 1983," September 1985, SSC 85-01.

Tobin, L. Thomas, 1990. "Senate Bill 547: A Political History," September 1990.

Appendix G—1995 Recommended Model Ordinance for the Seismic Retrofit of Hazardous Unreinforced Masonry Bearing Wall Buildings

1995

Recommended Model Ordinance

for the

Seismic Retrofit

of Hazardous Unreinforced Masonry

Bearing Wall Buildings

A Report
by the
Seismic Safety Commission

State of California
Seismic Safety Commission
Report No. SSC 95-04
May 1995

Preface

The Seismic Safety Commission recommends this Model Ordinance to local governments statewide as an effective earthquake hazard mitigation program for buildings with bearing wall unreinforced masonry construction. Compliance with this ordinance will reduce the risk of damage, death or injury that may result from the effects of earthquakes on existing unreinforced masonry buildings, but compliance will not necessarily prevent loss of life or injury, nor prevent earthquake damage. This ordinance is intended for use by engineers and architects who are developing designs for the seismic retrofit of existing unreinforced masonry buildings, including historical buildings.

Part 1 of the ordinance consists of Appendix Chapter 1 of the 1994 Edition of the Uniform Code for Building Conservation that is published and available from the International Conference of Building Officials and approved by the Structural Engineers Association of California. Because of copyright laws, it is not reproduced here.

Part 2 of the ordinance was prepared in cooperation with the California Building Officials and is recommended administrative language for a mandatory hazard mitigation program that requires building owners to retrofit their buildings from between 3 and 7 years of receiving an order to comply with the ordinance. Local governments can adopt this Model Ordinance and make revisions to reflect their administrative provisions and retrofit priorities. The Commission recommends that historical buildings with unreinforced masonry bearing wall construction comply with this ordinance, in addition to the State Historical Building Code.

This ordinance supersedes three earlier Draft Model Ordinances - the first which was published in 1985 and based on the City of Los Angeles Division 88, and the second and third which were published in February of 1990 & 1991 after a consensus was reached on major revisions to Division 88 by the Structural Engineers Association of California and the California Building Officials. The Commission now recommends that design professionals and building officials purchase and apply Appendix Chapter 1 of the 1994 Edition of the Uniform Code for Building Conservation. Subsequent editions of the Uniform Code for Building Conservation will supersede Part 1 of this Model Ordinance.

The Commission recommends that an acceptable level of earthquake risk can also be achieved for URM buildings by complying with Part 1 upon sale, transfer of ownership, or upon major additions, alterations, repairs, or increases in occupancy.

PART 1

1994 EDITION AND SUBSEQUENT EDITIONS

OF THE

UNIFORM CODE FOR BUILDING CONSERVATION

APPENDIX CHAPTER 1

PUBLISHED BY THE

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE OF BUILDING OFFICIALS

SEISMIC STRENGTHENING PROVISIONS FOR

UNREINFORCED MASONRY BEARING WALL BUILDINGS

Copies of this document can be purchased from the International Conference of Building Officials (ICBO) by calling 1-800-423-6587 or by writing ICBO at 5360 South Workman Mill Road, Whittier, California 90601.

PART 2

THE FOLLOWING ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS AND TABLES A1-G AND A1-H ARE NOT PART OF APPENDIX CHAPTER 1 OF THE UNIFORM CODE FOR BUILDING CONSERVATION. WITH THE EXCEPTION OF SUBSECTION A115.4, THESE PROVISIONS HAVE BEEN DEVELOPED BY THE CALIFORNIA BUILDING OFFICIALS. SUBSECTION A115.4 HAS BEEN RECOMMENDED BY THE SEISMIC SAFETY COMMISSION.

SECTION A115 — ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

A115.1 Definitions. For the purposes of this chapter, the meaning of certain terms shall be as set forth below, and the applicable definitions in the Building Code shall also apply.

High-Risk Building is any building, other than an essential or hazardous building, having an occupant load of 100 occupants or more as determined by Section 1002 of the Building Code.

Exception: A high-risk building shall not include the following:

1. Any building having exterior walls braced with frame crosswalls spaced less than 40 feet apart in each story. Crosswalls shall be full-story height with a minimum length of 1 1/2 times the story height.
2. Any building used for its intended purpose, as determined by the building official, for less than 20 hours per week.

Low-Risk Building is any building, not classified as a high-risk building or an essential or hazardous facility, having an occupant load of 20 occupants or more as determined by Section 1002 of the Building Code.

Medium-Risk Building is any building, not classified as a high-risk building or an essential or hazardous facility, having an occupant load of 20 occupants or more as determined by Section 1002 of the Building Code.

A115.2 Rating Classifications. The rating classifications identified in Table No. A-1-J are hereby established, and each building within the scope of this chapter shall be placed in one such rating classification by the building official. The total occupant load of the entire building at determined by Section 1002 of the Building Code shall be used to determine the rating classification.

Exception: For purposes of this chapter, portions of buildings constructed to act independently when resisting seismic forces, and having required exists with independent travel paths, may be placed in separate rating classifications.

A115.3 Compliance Requirements.

A115.3.1 The owner of each building within the scope of this chapter shall, upon service of an order and within the timelimits set forth in this chapter, cause a structural analysis to be made of the building by an engineer or architect licensed by the state to practice as such and, if the building does not comply with earthquake standards specified in this chapter, the owner shall cause it to be structurally altered to conform to such standards or shall cause the building to be demolished.

A115.3.2 The owner of a building within the scope of this chapter shall comply with the requirements set forth above by submitting to the building official for review within the stated time limits:

1. Within 270 days after service of the order, a structural analysis, which is subject to approval by the building official and which shall demonstrate that the building meets the minimum requirements of this chapter; or
2. Within 270 days after service of the order, the structural analysis and plans for structural alteration of the building to comply with this chapter; or

3. Within 120 days after service of the order, plans for the installation of wall anchors in accordance with the requirements specified in Section A113 ; or
4. Within 270 days after service of the order, plans for the demolition of the building.

A115.3.3 After plans are submitted and approved by the building official, the owner shall obtain a building permit and then commence and complete the required construction or demolition within the time limits set forth in Table No. A-1-H. These time limits shall begin to run from the date the order is served in accordance with Section A115.3.2, except that the time limit to commence structural alteration or demolition shall begin to run from the date the building permit is issued.

A115.3.4 Owners elected to comply with Item 3 of subsection A115.3.2 are also required to comply with Item 2 or 4 of this subsection provided, however, that the 270-day period provided for in Item 3 or 4 and the time limits for obtaining a building permit and to complete structural alterations or building demolition set forth in Table No. A-1-H shall be extended in accordance with Table No. A-1-I. Each such extended time limit shall begin to run from the date the order is served in accordance with Section A115.3.2, except that the time limit to commence structural alterations or demolition shall begin to run from the date the building permit is issued.

A115.4 Historical Buildings. Alterations or repairs to qualified historical buildings, as defined by Section 18955 of the Health and Safety Code of the State of California and as regulated by Sections 18950 to 18961 of that Code, as designated on official national, state, or local historical registers or inventories shall comply with the State Historical Building Code (Title 24, Building Standards, Part 8), in addition to this chapter.

A115.5 Administration.

A115.5.1 Order -- service.

A115.5.1.1 The building official shall, in accordance with the priorities set forth in Table No. A-1-I, issue an order as provided in this section to the owner of each building within the scope of this chapter.

A115.5.1.2 Prior to the service of an order as set forth in Table No. A-1-I a bulletin may be issued to the owner as shown upon the last equalized assessment roll or to the person in apparent charge or control of a building considered by the building official to be within the scope of this chapter. The bulletin may contain information the building official deems appropriate. The bulletin may be issued by mail or in person.

A115.5.2 Order - priority of service. Priorities for the service of the order for buildings within the scope of this chapter shall be in accordance with the rating classification as shown on Table No. A-1-I. Within each separate rating classification, the priority of the order shall normally be based upon the occupant load of the building. The owners of the buildings housing the largest occupant loads shall be served first. The minimum time period prior to the service of the order as shown on Table No. A-1-I shall be measured from the effective date of this chapter. The building official may, upon receipt of a written request from the owner, order such owner to bring the building into compliance with this chapter prior to the normal service date for such building set forth in this chapter.

A115.5.3 Order - contents. The order shall be in writing and shall be served either personally or by certified or registered mail upon the owner as shown on the last equalized assessment roll, and upon the person, if any, in apparent charge or control of the building. The order shall specify that the building has been determined by the building official to be within the scope of this chapter and, therefore, is required to meet the minimum seismic standards of this chapter. The order shall specify the rating classification of the building and shall be accompanied by a copy of Section A115.3, which sets forth the owner's alternatives and time limits for compliance.

A115.5.4 Appeal from order. The owner of the building may appeal the building official's initial determination that the building is within the scope of this chapter to the Board of Appeals established by Section 105 of the Building Code. Such appeal shall be filed with the Board within 60 days from the service date of the order described in Section A115.5.3. Any such appeal shall be decided by the Board no later than 90 days after writing and the grounds thereof shall be stated clearly and concisely. Appeals or requests for modifications from any other determinations, orders or actions by the building official pursuant to the chapter shall be made in accordance with the procedures established in Sections 104.2.7 and 104.2.8 of the Building Code.

A115.5.5 Recordation. At the time that the building official serves the aforementioned order, the building official shall also file with the office of the county recorder a certificate stating that the subject building is within the scope of this chapter and is a potentially earthquake hazardous building. The certificate shall also state that the owner thereof has been ordered to structurally analyze the building and to structurally alter or demolish it where compliance with this chapter has not been demonstrated.

If the building is either demolished, found not to be within the scope of this chapter or is structurally capable of resisting minimum seismic forces required by this chapter as a result of structural alterations or an analysis, the building official shall file with the office of the county recorder a form terminating the status of the subject building as being classified within the scope of this chapter.

A115.5.6 Enforcement. If the owner in charge or control of the subject building fails to comply with any order issued by the building official pursuant to this chapter within any of the time limits set forth in Section A115, the building official shall verify that the record owner of this building has been properly served. If the order has been served on the record owner, then the building official shall order that the entire building be vacated and that the building remain vacated until such order has been complied with. If compliance with such order has not been accomplished within 90 days after the date the building has been ordered vacated or such additional time as may have been granted by the Board of Appeals, the building official may order its demolition in accordance with the provisions of Section 102 of the Building Code.

TABLE NO. A-1-H—TIME LIMITS FOR COMPLIANCE[3]

REQUIRED ACTION BY OWNER	OBTAIN BUILDING PERMIT WITHIN	COMMENCE CONSTRUCTION WITHIN	COMPLETE CONSTRUCTION WITHIN
Structural Alterations or Building Demolition	1 year[2]	180 days[1]	3 years[2]
Wall Anchors	180 days[2]	270 days[2]	1 year[2]

[1]Measured from date of building permit issuance.
[2]Measured from date of service of order.
[3]This table is not part of the Uniform Code for Building Conservation, but is recommended by the California Building Officials.

TABLE NO. A-1-I—EXTENSIONS OF TIME AND SERVICE PRIORITIES[1]

RATING CLASSIFICATION	OCCUPANT LOAD	EXTENSION OF TIME IF WALL ANCHORS ARE INSTALLED	PERIODS FOR SERVICE OF ORDER
I (highest priority)	N/A	N/A	N/A
II	100 or more	1 year	180 days
III-A	100 or more	1 year	1 year
III-B	More than 50 but less than 100	1 year	2 years
III-C	More than 19 but less than 51	1 year	3 years
IV (lowest priority)	Less than 20	1 year	5 years

[1]This table is not part of the Uniform Code for Building Conservation, but is recommended by the California Building Officials.

TABLE NO. A-1-J—RATING CLASSIFICATION[2]

TYPE OF BUILDING	CLASSIFICATION
Essential Building[1]	I
Hazardous Building[1]	I
High-Risk Building	II
Medium-Risk Building	III
Low-Risk Building	IV

[1]See Sections A102 and A115 for the application of this chapter to essential and hazardous buildings.

[2]This table is not part of the Uniform Code for Building Conservation, but is recommended by the California Building Officials.