Status of the

Unreinforced Masonry Building Law

Draft 2004 Report to the Legislature

Seismic Safety Commission
SSC 2005-01

Seismic Safety Commission

Dr. Lucile M. Jones
Commission Chairman
Seismology

Richard Alarcon
Alternate: Chris Modrzejewski
State Senate

Lawrence Klein
Utilities

Linden Nishinaga
Cities Government

Jimmie Yee
Social Services

Donald R. Parker
Commission Vice Chairman
Fire Protection

Mark Church
Local Government

Carol Liu
Alternate: Don Manning
State Assembly

Celestine Palmer
Insurance

Andrew A. Adelman
Cities/Building Official

Dr. Bruce R. Clark
Geology

Stan Y. Moy
Architectural Planning

Daniel Shapiro
Structural Engineering

Seismic Safety Commission Staff

Richard J. McCarthy
Executive Director

Bob Anderson

Karen Cogan

Henry Sepulveda

Kyshia Davis
URM Report Staff

Henry Reyes

Fred Turner
URM Program Manager

Sue Celli

Rebecca Romo

Adopted _____, 2005 by the
California Seismic Safety Commission
1755 Creekside Oaks Dr., Suite 100
Sacramento, CA 95833

© California Seismic Safety Commission
All Rights Reserved

Cover Photos Provided By former Commissioner Patricia Snyder

2004 Report to the Legislature

Status of the Unreinforced Masonry Building Law

California Seismic Safety Commission
1755 Creekside Oaks Dr., Suite 100
Sacramento, CA 95833

SSC 2005-01

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface 1

Introduction: Unreinforced Masonry (URM) Buildings 2

- **The URM Law** 2
- **The Scope of the URM Law** 2

Measures of Implementation 3

- **Types of Programs** 3
- **Standards for Retrofitting** 3
- **Current Status of Implementing the URM Law** 5
- **Loss Reduction Program Effectiveness** 6

Effectiveness of Incentives in Voluntary Strengthening Programs. 8

New State Laws Effecting URM Buildings 8

Conclusions 9

Commission Recommendations 9

Acknowledgments 10

References 11

Table A: Statewide Summary of the URM Law Implementation ... 12

Appendix A – Survey of City and County Mitigation Efforts A1

Appendix B – Selected State Laws Relevant to URM Buildings B1

STATUS OF CALIFORNIA'S
UNREINFORCED MASONRY BUILDING LAW

PREFACE

In 1986, California enacted a law that required local governments in Seismic Zone 4 to inventory unreinforced masonry (URM) buildings, to establish a URM loss reduction program and report progress to the state by 1990. Each local government was allowed to tailor their program to their own specifications.

On the surface, the level of compliance with this law has been quite high with about 98 percent of the 25,400 URM buildings now in loss reduction programs. But so far, a little over two thirds of the owners have reduced earthquake risk by retrofitting in accordance with a recognized building code or by other means. Significant progress has occurred, yet many URM programs are ineffective in reducing future earthquake losses.

What lessons can be drawn from California's experience with URM buildings and how can they be applied to future loss reduction efforts? This report summarizes the status of local government and building owner efforts to comply with this law. The Seismic Safety Commission **is considering adopting**/adopted this report to the State Legislature with its recommendations on improving this law.

INTRODUCTION: URM BUILDINGS

Most unreinforced masonry (URM) buildings possess features that can threaten lives during earthquakes. These include unbraced parapets, walls and roofs that are not well attached to each other. When earthquakes occur, inadequate connections in these buildings can allow masonry to fall. Floors and roofs will collapse leaving occupants and passers-by in harm's way. These risks to life can be significantly reduced with seismic retrofits.

The URM Law

California's main effort to reduce these earthquake losses is the URM Law. Passed in 1986, this state law requires 365 local governments in the highest Seismic Zone 4 (ICBO, 1985) to do three things:

- Inventory URM buildings within each jurisdiction
- Establish loss reduction programs for URM buildings by 1990
- Report progress to the California Seismic Safety Commission

In addition, the law recommends that local governments:

- Establish seismic retrofit standards
- Adopt mandatory strengthening programs
- Enact measures to reduce the number of occupants in URM buildings.

This law can be found in Section 8875 *et seq,* of California's Government Code (CA, 1986). It allows each local government to choose its own type of loss reduction program. This leeway is, in part, intended to allow for each jurisdiction to take political, economic, and social priorities into account. The evidence suggests that individual communities pursued earthquake loss reduction programs best suited to their own local priorities reflecting the local balance of safety versus economy (CSSC, 1995-05).

California's Seismic Safety Commission monitors local government efforts to comply with this law and reports to the state's Legislature. This report updates the Commission's prior Year 2003 status report (SSC, 2003-03).

The Scope of the URM Law

Seismic Hazard Zone 4 is a region defined in the California Building Code nearest historically active faults. In 1986, it included the major metropolitan areas of Los Angeles and San Francisco, roughly 28 million people, or more than three fourths of the state's population. When the law was passed, the city of San Diego was not considered to be in Zone 4 (ICBO, 1985). Since then, San Diego has been added to Zone 4 and has now voluntarily adopted a URM loss reduction program (ICBO, 1997).

Approximately 25,400 URM buildings with an average size of 10,000 square feet have been inventoried in Zone 4's 365 jurisdictions. This is a relatively small percentage of California's

total building stock of 12 million or so buildings, but this law impacts many cultural icons and historical resources in older parts of the state.

In the 1980's, it was estimated that the URM Law would result in roughly $4 billion in retrofit expenditures with activity well into the new century. This cost, although large, pales in comparison with several hundred billion dollars in anticipated damage from one major urban earthquake in California. Average expected losses from earthquakes in California are approximately $4 billion per year. Future earthquake losses can be greatly reduced by carrying out effective URM programs.

For more information about the pioneering efforts before the passage of the URM Law, early progress, social and economic issues, refer to a earlier status report (CSSC, 1995-05).

MEASURES OF IMPLEMENTATION

Types of Programs

There are four basic types of URM programs that cities and counties have adopted. They are explained below in Table 1. Later in this report, their popularity and relative effectiveness is further described.

Few jurisdictions rely on demolition to eliminate their relatively few hazardous buildings. Most local governments regard demolition as a last resort, and far more URM buildings statewide are being retrofitted rather than torn down.

Standards for Retrofitting

California requires all jurisdictions to enforce the 1997 Uniform Code for Building Conservation Appendix Chapter 1 (UCBC) as a model building code although local governments may adopt amendments under certain circumstances (ICBO, 2001). For historical buildings, the California Historical Building Code also refers to the UCBC (ICBO, 2001). The UCBC contains technical standards that are intended to significantly reduce but not necessarily eliminate the risk to life from collapse. The statewide standards contain no administrative or retroactive triggers for retrofitting other than the issuance of permits. Each local government can tailor its own triggers for compliance. A significant amount of retrofitting was performed in accordance with local ordinances that preceded the UCBC. These earlier retrofits may only partially comply with the latest UCBC.

Since the International Conference of Building Officials (ICBO) merged with other model code organizations to form the International Code Council (ICC), the UCBC is no longer being maintained and updated. ICC has since published the first edition of the International Existing Building Code (IEBC), which contains an updated chapter of retrofit requirements for unreinforced masonry buildings. The State's Building Standards Commission is in the process of adopting new model building codes and may soon consider the adoption of the applicable portions of the IEBC.

Table 1. Types of URM Loss Reduction Programs Ranked by General Effectiveness from Most to Least (CSSC, 1995).

Program Type	Summary
Mandatory Strengthening	These programs require owners to strengthen or otherwise reduce risks in their buildings within times prescribed by each local government. Time schedules vary and generally depend on the number of occupants. Programs are based upon the City of Los Angeles' Division 88 ordinance (LA, 1981) which is also the historic basis for the Uniform Code For Building Conservation (UCBC) Appendix Chapter 1 (ICBO, 2001) and the Seismic Safety Commission's Recommended Model Ordinance (CSSC, 1995). Triggers for the Model Ordinance were developed in 1991 in cooperation with the California Building Officials. This is the most effective program type.
Voluntary Strengthening	These programs establish seismic retrofit standards and require owners to evaluate the seismic risks in their buildings. Owners then write publicly available letters to their local governments indicating when they intend to retrofit (CSSC, 1990). This type of program is somewhat more effective than Notification Only.
Other Types	Variations of the other program types with unique requirements and ranges of effectiveness. (CSSC, 1995)
Notification Only	Local governments write letters to owners stating that their building type has been known to perform poorly in earthquakes. This is typically the least effective type of program. Most jurisdictions have adopted more comprehensive measures than this.

Current Status of Implementing the URM Law

The California Seismic Safety Commission periodically contacts local governments affected by the URM Law and asks them to summarize their efforts to date. In the summer of 2004, the Commission contacted the 283 jurisdictions in Seismic Zone 4 with URM buildings. As of December 2004, 106 jurisdictions responded to the survey. This corresponds to a response rate of 37 percent, which is about half of the response rate in 2003.

Table 2. Status of Compliance with the URM Law in 2004

Cities & Counties	Number	Percent	Population	Percent	URM's	Percent
• with inventories not complete	6	2%	115,789	<1%	55	<1%
• with inventories complete, but no URM programs	21	6%	664,021	2%	445	2%
• with no URM buildings	82	22%	2,937,420	10%	0	0%
• with URM programs	256	70%	24,660,426	87%	24,913	98%
Totals	365	100%	28,377,656	100%	25,413	100%

The URM Law continues to gain effectiveness in 2004. While there weren't dramatic changes from the 2003 data, most of the changes depict the continued efforts of local governments and owners to carry out the URM Law. 69 percent of the buildings have been mitigated so far.

In the past three years:

- Three more cities have completed their inventories of URM buildings.
- The number of cities and counties with URM buildings in compliance with the law increased from 251 to 256.
- The number of URM buildings that are in communities that don't have earthquake loss reduction programs decreased slightly from 613 to 500 (2 percent of those inventoried).
- 560 more URM buildings were reported by local governments as retrofitted since 2003 to bring the total to 13,863 or 55 percent of those inventoried.
- 108 more URM buildings have been demolished since 2003 to bring the total to 3,566 or 14 percent of those inventoried.

The numbers of each type of loss reduction program are summarized in Table 3. Most local governments chose to adopt mandatory strengthening programs that are more effective than other types even though the state didn't require them. The remaining jurisdictions not included in this Table 3 either do not have URM buildings or have yet to comply with the law. For more information on them see Table A on Page 12.

Table 3. Number and Scope of URM Loss Reduction Programs in California's Zone 4 as of June 2003

Type of Loss Reduction Programs	Entities	Percent	Population	Percent	URM's	Percent
Mandatory	132	51%	15,751,701	64%	19,123	77%
Voluntary	41	16%	2,710,553	11%	1,318	5%
Notification Only	44	17%	2,590,091	10%	1,553	6%
Other	39	15%	3,608,081	15%	2,919	12%
TOTALS	256	100%	24,660,426	100%	24,913	100%

Since 2003, there has not been a significant change in the types of loss reduction programs. The numbers of jurisdictions with mandatory, voluntary and other programs each increased by two, while the number of jurisdictions with notification programs decreased by one. Overall, this fluctuation corresponds to an increase in the total number of jurisdictions with loss reduction programs from 251 to 256.

Loss Reduction Program Effectiveness

Several simplifying assumptions were made to monitor the relative effectiveness of different types of mitigation programs. Tables 4 and 5 below are predicated on the assumption that most loss reduction programs have had sufficient time to cause substantial retrofit activity. Most programs were initiated around 1990 and have had about 15 years of seismic evaluation and retrofit activity. However, there are major exceptions to this assumption. Some programs are still just getting started and others were completed years ago. So the data may be subject to other interpretations, particularly since some programs are still in progress.

In many ways, each jurisdiction's as well as each building owner's situations are unique. The Commission has attempted to generalize with simplistic interpretations and statewide averages of the data below. Appendix A summarizes the significant variations in progress among jurisdictions.

Readers should note that many strengthening programs have unique time schedules for compliance and that local economies vary widely from those with high property and rental rates

to others facing high vacancy rates, low rents and property values. These variations are not captured by the information below.

Nevertheless, one way to gauge the effectiveness of different types of programs is by comparing average rates of retrofit and demolition. Table 4 shows percentages of buildings retrofitted in substantial compliance of Appendix Chapter 1 of the UCBC or demolished since their original inventories. This information is based on the partial responses from the 2004 survey as well as responses in prior years from other jurisdictions that did not respond in 2004. It is interesting to note that jurisdictions with URM Notification Only Programs currently have lower retrofit and demolition rates than jurisdictions that have not established URM programs.

Table 4. Average Rates of URM Retrofit and Demolition

Type of Program	**Mandatory**	**Voluntary**	**Notification Only**	**Other**	**Numbers and Rates for URM Buildings Within Programs**	**Numbers and Rates for URM Buildings Not In Programs**	**Total Numbers and Rates for URM Buildings In Zone 4**
Retrofitted to meet the UCBC or an equivalent	50%	14%	6%	13%	10198 41%	15 3%	10,213 40%
Retrofitted to different local standards than the UCBC	19%	N/A	N/A	N/A	3,650 15%	N/A	3,650 14%
Total Retrofit Rates	69%	14%	6%	13%	13,848 56%	15 3%	13,863 **55%**
Demolition Rates	16%	7%	4%	7%	3,464 14%	102 20%	3,566 **14%**
Retrofit Plus Demolition Rates	85%	21%	10%	21%	17,312 70%	117 23%	**17,429** **69%**
Total Number of URMs	19,123	1,318	1,553	2,919	24,913	500	**25,413**
Cities and Counties	132	41	44	39	256	27	283

Effectiveness of Incentives in Voluntary Strengthening Programs

Although data is limited, it appears that economic incentives may encourage voluntary retrofits by owners albeit at a slower pace than Mandatory Strengthening Programs. Nine cities with voluntary programs and economic incentives have an average 20% rate for retrofits compared to an 11% rate for the 32 cities without incentives. So it appears that economic incentives coupled with URM programs seem to encourage owners in Voluntary Strengthening Programs to retrofit. These observations about the relative effectiveness of program types and financial incentives should be tempered with the unique characteristics that the state's URM Law confronts - relatively high cost retrofits on buildings constructed before the mid 1930's in a high seismic region. Other types of retrofit and incentive programs will produce different results. (EERI, 1998)

New State Laws Effecting URM Buildings

In 2004, three new laws were enacted that effect unreinforced masonry buildings. AB 2533 (Salinas), Chapter 659 of the 2004 Statutes, adds teeth to the state's existing law that requires warning placards to be posted at the entrances to URM buildings. Prior to January 1, 2004, the state's placard law had no enforcement mechanism. Jurisdictions reported that owners of only 276 buildings had posted warning placards – about one percent of those inventoried. After January 1, 2004 new signs are required to be a somewhat larger 8" x 10". New penalties and civil action can be pursued against owners that do not post signs. Many new signs have been installed in recent months. They state:

Earthquake Warning.

This is an
unreinforced masonry building.
You may not be safe inside or near
unreinforced masonry buildings
during an earthquake.

AB 3032 (Yee), Chapter 308 of the 2004 Statutes, allows owners to take down the warning placards once they have retrofitted. In that event, jurisdictions may authorize such owners to erect a different sign:

This building has been
improved in accordance
with the seismic safety
standards of a local building
ordinance that is applicable
to unreinforced masonry.

AB 3033 (Yee), Chapter 308 of the 2004 Statutes, prohibits local governments from imposing additional building or site conditions such as parking, onsite offsite requirements or fees on or before the issuance of a building permit for seismic retrofits. The Seismic Safety Commission is required to evaluate the impact and effectiveness of this new law by 2007.

CONCLUSIONS

98 percent of the 25, 413 unreinforced masonry buildings are now in mitigation programs in California's highest seismic region as a result of the state's laws. A little over two thirds or 17,429 of these buildings have either been retrofitted or demolished. The great majority of the remaining third of these buildings are still at significant risk of collapse and life loss because of ineffective local mitigation programs and a lack of economic incentives. 85 percent of the unreinforced masonry buildings in Mandatory Strengthening Programs have either been retrofitted or demolished compared to 10 to 21 percent in other program types. These differences in rates demonstrate that Mandatory Strengthening Programs are considerably more effective than other program types.

Voluntary Strengthening Programs have not been as effective because current economic incentives are typically not sufficient to create market-driven willingness to retrofit. The Commission has proposed additional retrofit incentives in its *California Earthquake Loss Reduction Plan* (CSSC, 2002). That plan recommends that state and local governments "encourage economic incentives, such as improved mortgage terms, reduced insurance rates, and positive tax benefits, for upgrading structural and non-structural elements in buildings."

Still much remains to be done with respect to the URM Law. For example, California has 27 remaining jurisdictions with 500 URM buildings that are not in compliance with the law.

DRAFT COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

The Legislature should revisit the state's Unreinforced Masonry (URM) Law and consider appropriate actions to address the inequities and the public's continuing exposure to risk that have resulted from the failure of a significant number of local governments to comply with the intent of the law, such that approximately one third of the state's URM buildings in Seismic Zone 4 remain unretrofitted or partially retrofitted. Actions to be considered should include:

- Developing legislation or other policy options to encourage local governments with little or no retrofit progress to provide incentives to encourage owners to retrofit.

- Adopting legislation to mandate the strengthening of all unreinforced masonry bearing buildings including state-owned buildings in accordance with the state's model building code.

- Adopting the International Existing Building Code as the State's model building code so that future alterations to existing buildings trigger seismic retrofits to the latest standards.

- Enacting legislation to establish retrofit standards and mitigation programs for other types of collapse-risk buildings such as soft-story apartments, tiltups and older concrete buildings.

Since the development of new local URM programs and retrofit progress has slowed, future surveys of local government can be undertaken less frequently.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Commission wishes to thank all of the local governments that responded to the 2004 URM Survey. Without their efforts, this report would not have been possible.

The Commission also acknowledges the efforts of Kyshia Davis in compiling the data in this report.

REFERENCES

California Legislature. "The URM Law," Section 8875 *et. seq.,* Government Code, California Statutes of 1986, see Appendix B.

California Seismic Safety Commission. "California Earthquake Loss Reduction Plan." SSC 2002-02, 2002.

California Seismic Safety Commission, "Incentives to Improve California's Earthquake Safety: An 'Agenda in Waiting'", SSC 99-02.

California Seismic Safety Commission. "Status of the Unreinforced Masonry Building Law." SSC 2003-03, 2003.

California Seismic Safety Commission. "Status of the Unreinforced Masonry Building Law." SSC 1995-05, 1995.

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

International Conference of Building Officials. "Uniform Building Code," 1985 Edition, Seismic Zone Map in effect at the time of the passage of the 1986 URM Law.

International Conference of Building Officials. "Uniform Code for Building Conservation, Appendix Chapter 1," 1997 Edition, California Building Standards Commission, Part 10, Title 24, "California Code for Building Conservation," California Code of Regulations, 2001.

International Conference of Building Officials. "California Historical Building Code," 2001, California Building Standards Commission, Part 8, Title 24, California Code of Regulations, 2001.

International Conference of Building Officials. "Uniform Building Code," 1997 Edition, California Building Standards Commission, California Building Code, Part 2, Title 24, California Code of Regulations, 2001.

Los Angeles, City of. "Division 88 - Earthquake Hazard Reduction in Existing Buildings," February 13, 1981.

Earthquake Engineering Research Institute, "Incentives and Impediments to Improving the Seismic Safety Performance of Buildings," EERI, 1998.

Table A
2004 State Summary of the URM Law Implementation

	Jurisdictions	Percentages	Population*	Percentages	URM's	Percentages
Cities without inventories started	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Cities with inventories not completed	5	1%	97,625	<1%	49	<1%
Cities with inventory completed—No mitigation program started	19	5%	524,749	2%	420	2%
Cities with no URMs	77	21%	2,420,464	8%	0	0%
Cities with mitigation programs	235	64%	20,752,967	73%	23,851	94%
Cities in Zone 4 affected by the URM Law	336	92%	23,795,805	84%	24,320	96%
Counties without inventories started	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Counties with inventories not completed	1	<1%	18,164	<1%	6	<1%
Counties with inventory completed—No mitigation program started	2	<1%	139,272	<1%	25	<1%
Counties with no URMs	5	1%	516,956	2%	0	0%
Counties with mitigation programs	21	6%	3,907,459	14%	1062	4%
Counties in Zone 4 affected by the URM Law	29	8%	4,581,851	16%	1093	4%
Cities and counties without inventories started	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Cities and counties with inventories not completed	6	2%	115,789	<1%	55	<1%
Cities and counties with inventory completed—No mitigation program started	21	6%	664,021	2%	445	2%
Cities and counties with no URMs	82	22%	2,937,420	10%	0	0%
Cities and counties with mitigation programs	256	70%	24,660,426	87%	24,913	98%
Total cities and counties in Zone 4	365	100%	28,377,656	100%	25,413	100%
Types of mitigation programs established						
Mandatory Strengthening Program	132	51%	15,751,701	64%	19,123	77%
Voluntary Strengthening Program	41	16%	2,701,553	11%	1,318	5%
Notification Only	44	17%	2,590,091	10%	1,553	6%
Other	39	15%	3,608,081	15%	2,919	12%
Total cities and counties with mitigation programs	256	100%	24,660,426	100%	24,913	100%
Cities and Counties that replied to the 2003 URM Survey	105	37%	8,820,817	35%	7,305	29%

* Based on 2000 Census Data

Appendix A

2004 Survey of City and County Mitigation Efforts in Seismic Zone 4

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (Numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Adelanto															
Yes	0	12	No		1					1	10				
Mitigation Program Type:										**Mitigation Rate:** 92 percent					
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Agoura Hills															
Yes	1	0	Yes	Yes	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mitigation Program Type: City completed strengthening of the historic.										**Mitigation Rate:** 100 percent					
Technical Mitigation Standards: State Historic Building Code															
Progress and Remarks:															
Alameda															
Yes	24	50	Yes		2	59	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	9	74
Mitigation Program Type: Parapet, wall anchorage, and wall slenderness limits only.										**Mitigation Rate:** 7 percent					
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1985 Seismic Safety Commission (SSC) Model Ordinance partially referenced.															
Progress and Remarks:															
Alameda County															
Yes	0	17	No		Unknown	n/a	unkown	0	0	0	1	0	unknown	17	17
Mitigation Program Type:										**Mitigation Rate:** 6 percent					
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Albany															
Yes	0	37	Yes	Yes			4	0	0	0	0			33	37
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory Strengthening										**Mitigation Rate:** 0 percent					
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1 adopted 1/95.															
Progress and Remarks: The 1997 survey said that there were no significant changes since 1995. 1999 survey reported change of staff. Unable to verify no. of URMs in compliance with UCBC. No mitigation code was adopted. No. of URM slated for demolition unknown. No. of URM with posted warnings unknown.															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (Numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

Alhambra

Yes	6	164	Yes	Yes	150	150	8		5		4			3	170

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening **Mitigation Rate:** 91 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: 1985 Edition of Chapter 96 of the Los Angeles County Code.

Progress and Remarks:

Anaheim

Yes	0	16	Yes	yes	13	13	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	16

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening **Mitigation Rate:** 100 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: 1987 Edition of the SSC Model Ordinance

Progress and Remarks: In 1988, the city believed that they only had 1 URM which was demolished, subsequent inventories identified more buildings. The City's mitigation program was in full compliance with the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1.

Antioch

Yes	0	25	No												

Mitigation Program Type: **Mitigation Rate:** 0 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks: Requested a copy of the model ordinance in 1995.

Apple Valley

Yes	0	14	Yes	Yes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners, retrofits triggered upon alterations or additions. **Mitigation Rate:** 0 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: 1987 Edition of the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1

Progress and Remarks: None.

Arcadia

Yes	0	22	Yes		0	19	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	22

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening **Mitigation Rate:** 100 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: 1987 Edition of the SSC Model Ordinance

Progress and Remarks:

Arcata

Yes	1	0	Yes	Yes	1										

Mitigation Program Type: **Mitigation Rate:** 100 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: 1973 UBC with 1975 Amendments

Progress and Remarks: The URM was retrofitted in 1977. There is no need to establish a formal mitigation program.

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (Numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

Arroyo Grande

Yes	1	25	Yes	yes	25	25	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	26

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening **Mitigation Rate:** 96 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: 1987 Edition of the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1

Progress and Remarks: Reduced permit fees, extended time limits, and non-conforming building use permitted.

Artesia

Yes	0	4	Yes												

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening **Mitigation Rate:** 0 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: 1985 Edition of Chapter 96 of the Los Angeles County Code

Progress and Remarks:

Arvin

Yes	0	16	yes		0	0	0	0	0	3	3	1	0	12	19

Mitigation Program Type: **Mitigation Rate:** 19 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: uniform code for building conservation

Progress and Remarks: The building official will bring a draft mitigation program to the City Council for its consideration in October 1997.

Atascadero

Yes	2	26	Yes	Yes	9						1			18	28

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening **Mitigation Rate:** 36 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: SSC Model Ordinance

Progress and Remarks:

Atherton

No	0	1	No												

Mitigation Program Type: **Mitigation Rate:** 0 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

Avalon

Yes	0	19	Yes			2		2	3					12	

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening **Mitigation Rate:** 11 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: 1985 Edition Chapter 96 of the Los Angeles County Code

Progress and Remarks:

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (Numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Avenal															
No	0	8	No												
Mitigation Program Type:									**Mitigation Rate:** 0 percent						
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Azusa															
Yes	1	27	Yes	Yes	14	14			2		11	1		0	28
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening									**Mitigation Rate:** 89 percent						
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1982 Edition of Division 88 Los Angeles City Code															
Progress and Remarks:															
Bakersfield															
Yes	0	191	Yes	Yes	6	115	0	0	2	8	30	0	0	30	191
Mitigation Program Type: Partial Strengthening - Wall & Parpet Anchors only									**Mitigation Rate:** 19 percent						
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1991 Edition of the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1															
Progress and Remarks:															
Baldwin Park															
Yes	0	5	Yes	yes	4	4					1				
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening									**Mitigation Rate:** 100 percent						
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1982 Edition of Division 88 Los Angeles City Code															
Progress and Remarks: 1955 program of parapet bracing and wall anchors															
Banning															
Yes	0	49	Yes	yes	29	29	0	0	0	4	14	2	0	0	49
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory Strengthening									**Mitigation Rate:** 88 percent						
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks:															
Barstow															
Yes	0	93	No		1	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	80	All
Mitigation Program Type:									**Mitigation Rate:** 4 percent						
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks: 1997 Status : 1 Completely retrofitted (Harvey House-Hist.), 1 Vacant, 3 demolitions of URM's, 8 determined not URM and removed from list, 80 URM's notified (ttl. 93)															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (Numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

Beaumont

Yes	0	37	Yes		16	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening **Mitigation Rate:** 46 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: 1988 Edition of Division 88 Los Angeles City Code

Progress and Remarks:

Bell

Yes	0	56	Yes		41		0	1	1		1	1		12	56

Mitigation Program Type: **Mitigation Rate:** 75 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

Bell Gardens

Yes	0	0	N/A												

Mitigation Program Type: **Mitigation Rate:** N/A

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

Bellflower

Yes	0	22	Yes	Yes	18	18	0	0	0	0	4	0	0		22

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory Strengthening **Mitigation Rate:** 100 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: 1985 Edition Chapter 96 of the Los Angeles County Code

Progress and Remarks:

Belmont

Yes	0	2	Yes		0	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening **Mitigation Rate:** 100 percent

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												

Mitigation Program Type: **Mitigation Rate:** N/A

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (Numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

Benicia

Yes	18	21	Yes												

Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners Historic building owners were not notified, notices to tenants, semiannual progress reports by building official

Mitigation Rate: 0 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: None

Progress and Remarks:

Berkeley

Yes	No data available	No data available	Yes	Yes	497	497	23	No Data Available	12		1	4	37	50	587

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory, nonbearing walls and veneers. Ordinance requires posting until building is retrofit.

Mitigation Rate: 85 percent

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. Local standards are UCBC with some amendments to that standards exceed UCBC.

Progress and Remarks: Year 2000 reported: 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. 587 Buildings, All Pre-1976 Assembly, Business, Educational, Hazardous, and Resident with 5 or more units. Year 2002 reported: City establishe compliance project and updated ordinance in January, 2001 including adopting 1997 UCBC Appendix Chapter 1 with certain amendments to maintain standards at least as strong as originally adopted. The city will be surveying buildings still on the list to determine numbers with posted placards. As part of compliance project, owners were sent self-stick signs.

Beverly Hills

Yes	0	95	Yes		95	95			1		4			0	95

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening

Mitigation Rate: 100 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: Similar to the 1991 edition of the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1

Progress and Remarks:

Big Bear Lake

No	0	24	No			6	0				9			34	

Mitigation Program Type:

Mitigation Rate: 38 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks: In year 2000, 7 damaged commercial buildings and 2 damaged fire stations have been demolished after the 1992 quake, 33 are left and some of those are residential, 4 are commercial. In year 2002, reported that all buildings previously identified as URM structures have been abated in compliance with state law applicable to URM structures trhough demolition, repair, and/or substantiation that the structures were no of un-reinforced masonry construction.

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (Numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Bishop															
Yes	0	1	Yes								1				
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory Strengthening										**Mitigation Rate:** 100 percent					
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1988 UCBC State Historical Building Code															
Progress and Remarks:															
Blue Lake															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:										**Mitigation Rate:** N/A					
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Bradbury															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:										**Mitigation Rate:** N/A					
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Brawley															
Yes	0	66	Yes			16								50	
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners										**Mitigation Rate:** 0 percent					
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks:															
Brea															
Yes	1	2	Yes		2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners										**Mitigation Rate:** 67 percent					
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks:															
Brentwood															
Yes	0	7	Yes	yes	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	7
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening										**Mitigation Rate:** 57 percent					
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 Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

Brisbane

Yes	0	4	Yes		0					2	1	1		0	4

Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening

Mitigation Rate: 25 percent

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

Yes	0	0	N/A												

Mitigation Program Type:

Mitigation Rate: N/A

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks: The latest survey as of 11-17-99 indicates that none of the 5 buildings orginally inventoried were URM.

Burbank

Yes	0	53	Yes			31	1	1	0	0	22	0	0	0	53

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening

Mitigation Rate: 100 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: 1982 Edition of Division 88 Los Angeles City Code

Progress and Remarks:

Burlingame

Yes	0	63	Yes	Yes	54		0		0		9			0	

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening

Mitigation Rate: 100 percent

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

Yes	0	19	Yes			2	5	0	0	0	2	1	0	9	19

Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners, structural reports, wall anchors, and demolition.

Mitigation Rate: 11 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: "LA Model Ordinance"

Progress and Remarks:

California City

Yes	0	0	N/A												

Mitigation Program Type:

Mitigation Rate: N/A

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (Numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Calipatria															
Yes	0	6	Yes												
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening									**Mitigation Rate:** 0 percent						
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1988 Edition of the County of Los Angeles Chapter 96															
Progress and Remarks:															
Calistoga															
Yes	17	20	No		2	2*	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	33	37
Mitigation Program Type:									**Mitigation Rate:** 5 percent						
Technical Mitigation Standards: The 37 URM's are potentially hazardous. *Denotes that the two buildings in Substantial Compliance are the same as in Chapter 1.															
Progress and Remarks:															
Camarillo															
Yes	0	37	Yes	Yes	37	37	0		0						37
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening									**Mitigation Rate:** 100 percent						
Technical Mitigation Standards: February 1990 SSC Model Ordinance															
Progress and Remarks:															
Campbell															
Yes	0	9	Yes		3	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	6	9
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening									**Mitigation Rate:** 33 percent						
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															
Yes	0	1	Yes								1				
Mitigation Program Type: Demolition									**Mitigation Rate:** 100 percent						
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Carlsbad															
Yes	0	9	Yes	Yes	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	9
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening									**Mitigation Rate:** 100 percent						
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (Numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Carmel-by-the-Sea															
Yes	1	25	Yes	Yes	0	6	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	18	25
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary Strengthening									**Mitigation Rate:** 0 percent						
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, 1991.26 Bldgs URM, Pre-1935 with 100+ Occupants Pre-1976 with 300+ Occupants															
Carpinteria															
Yes	3	0	Yes		3						0			0	0
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening									**Mitigation Rate:** 100 percent						
Technical Mitigation Standards: None Reported															
Progress and Remarks:															
Carson															
Yes	0	32	Yes			32									32
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory Strengthening									**Mitigation Rate:** 100 percent						
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1985 Edition Chapter 96 of the Los Angeles County Code															
Progress and Remarks:															
Cathedral City															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:									**Mitigation Rate:** N/A						
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Cerritos															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:									**Mitigation Rate:** N/A						
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Chino															
Yes	2	25	Yes			12					13	0	12		24
Mitigation Program Type: Posting, however most buildings will be demolished due to downtown redevelopment.									**Mitigation Rate:** 48 percent						
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1991 Edition of the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (Numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

Claremont

Yes	32*	1	Yes		5*	21	0	0	0	0	2	5	0	0	

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening

Mitigation Rate: 21 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: Parapets and wall anchors only.

Progress and Remarks: In volunteer strengthening phase until August 1992. *City Hall full compliance with FEMA matching grant funds for strengthening as essential service facility. All of the private sector is in full compliance with Seiesmic Program.

Clayton

Yes	0	1	Yes	Yes		1									1

Mitigation Program Type: Notification only

Mitigation Rate: 0 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks: A draft ordinance, which will include adoption of UCBC Appendix Chapter 1 with a three year period for compliance, is being proposed for adoption in 1995. Contra Costa County contracts for Clayton, Lafayette, Moraga and Orinda.

Clearlake

Yes	1	4	Yes			4									4

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening, historic buildings are exempt.

Mitigation Rate: 0 percent

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

Yes	0	1	No	Yes									0	1	1

Mitigation Program Type:

Mitigation Rate: 0 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC

Progress and Remarks: Ordinance being written in 1995.

Coachella

Yes	0	1	yes			1					1				

Mitigation Program Type: Demolition

Mitigation Rate: 100 percent

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

Yes	0	66	No		2						64				

Mitigation Program Type:

Mitigation Rate: 100 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (Numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Colma															
yes	0	0	N/A			0									0
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners, seismic hazard evaluation reports required									**Mitigation Rate:** N/A						
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks: Reports indicate that none of the buildings initially inventoried have been determined to be hazardous. City is reviewing the engineering reports.															
Colton															
Yes	0	20	Yes		0	5	0	0	0	0		1	0	14	20
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners									**Mitigation Rate:** 0 percent						
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks:															
Commerce															
Yes	0	9	Yes	Yes	4	4			0		3			1	
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening									**Mitigation Rate:** 78 percent						
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1985 Edition Chapter 96 of the Los Angeles County Code															
Progress and Remarks:															
Compton															
Yes	0	18	Yes		4	8	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory Strengthening									**Mitigation Rate:** 56 percent						
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Concord															
Yes	2	12	Yes	Yes	9						2			3	
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening within 5 years									**Mitigation Rate:** 79 percent						
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1															
Progress and Remarks: The remaining 3 URM's may not be URM's. Design of existing masonry block walls is being investigated as of 8/04.															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (Numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

Contra Costa County

Yes	0	55	Yes	Yes	6	46	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	55

Mitigation Program Type: Notification only

Mitigation Rate: 16 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: none

Progress and Remarks: A draft ordinance, which will include adoption of UCBC Appendix Chapter 1 with a three year period for compliance, is being proposed for adoption in 1995. Contra Costa County contracts for Clayton, Lafayette, Moraga and Orinda. Previous updates inadvertently dropped the original building count as retrofits and/or demolitions occurred. This 2004 status report corrects these changes in order to maintain an accurate accounting on future reports.

Corona

Yes	0	14	Yes			13	0	0	0		1	0	11	0	14

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening

Mitigation Rate: 100 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: 1987 Edition of the SSC Model Ordinance

Progress and Remarks:

Corte Madera

Yes	0	3	Yes												

Mitigation Program Type: Notices to Owners

Mitigation Rate: 0 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: None

Progress and Remarks:

Costa Mesa

Yes	0	0	N/A												

Mitigation Program Type:

Mitigation Rate: N/A

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

Cotati

Yes	0	0	N/A												

Mitigation Program Type:

Mitigation Rate: N/A

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

Covina

Yes	0	74	Yes	Yes	4	45	8				1	4		12	74

Mitigation Program Type: Notices to Owners and Voluntary Strengthening Program

Mitigation Rate: 7 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: None

Progress and Remarks:

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (Numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Cudahy															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:										**Mitigation Rate:** N/A					
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Culver City															
Yes	0	65	Yes		0	65	0			0		0		0	65
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening										**Mitigation Rate:** 100 percent					
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1982 Edition of Division 88 Los Angeles City Code															
Progress and Remarks:															
Cupertino															
Yes	0	1	Yes		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening										**Mitigation Rate:** 100 percent					
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1990 Edition SSC Model Ordinance															
Progress and Remarks:															
Cypress															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:										**Mitigation Rate:** N/A					
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Daly City															
Yes	0	3	Yes		3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening										**Mitigation Rate:** 100 percent					
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1987 Edition of the SSC Model Ordinance															
Progress and Remarks: Technical mitigation standard updated to the current edition of the Uniform Code for Building Conservation, Appendix Chapter 1.															
Dana Point															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:										**Mitigation Rate:** N/A					
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (Numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

Danville

Yes	4	1	Yes												5

Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners **Mitigation Rate:** 0 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: City of Los Angeles building code. 1985 Edition, Division 88, "Earthquake Hazard Reduction in Exsisting Buildings"

Progress and Remarks: A mandatory strengthening program was adopted in May 1991.1 Non-historic 4 Historic URM, all retrofits are completed

Davis

Yes	0	0	N/A												

Mitigation Program Type: **Mitigation Rate:** N/A

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

Del Rey Oaks

Yes	0	0	N/A												

Mitigation Program Type: **Mitigation Rate:** N/A

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

Delano

Yes	0	38	Yes		1		1							37	38

Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners **Mitigation Rate:** 3 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: None

Progress and Remarks:

Desert Hot Springs

Yes	0	8	Yes	Yes			2		1		3	0	2		

Mitigation Program Type: Demolition **Mitigation Rate:** 38 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: None

Progress and Remarks:

Diamond Bar

Yes	0	0	N/A												

Mitigation Program Type: **Mitigation Rate:** N/A

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (Numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

Dixon

Yes	0	14	Yes		0	0	1			2				11	14

Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners, seismic retrofits are triggered upon alteration or change of occupancy.

Mitigation Rate: 0 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1

Progress and Remarks:

Downey

Yes	0	14	Yes		0	12		0	0		2				14

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening

Mitigation Rate: 100 percent

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.14 Pre-1957 URM buildings except one and two family dwellings

Duarte

Yes	0	0	N/A												

Mitigation Program Type:

Mitigation Rate: N/A

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

Dublin

Yes	0	0	N/A												

Mitigation Program Type:

Mitigation Rate: N/A

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

East Palo Alto

Yes	0	0	N/A												

Mitigation Program Type:

Mitigation Rate: N/A

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

El Centro

Yes	0	55	Yes	Yes	5	7	15	0	0	0	4	6	0	18	55

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory parapet bracing, additional strengthening at the time of remodel.

Mitigation Rate: 16 percent

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.

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (Numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
El Cerrito															
Yes	0	32	Yes		0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	29	32
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening									**Mitigation Rate:** 3 percent						
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1985 Edition of the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1															
Progress and Remarks: Owners in violation guilty of misdemeanor. No changes for 97 status.															
El Monte															
Yes	0	25	Yes		24	24								1	25
Mitigation Program Type: Analysis required under a facade improvement ordinance.									**Mitigation Rate:** 96 percent						
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks:															
El Segundo															
Yes	0	14	Yes		0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening									**Mitigation Rate:** 100 percent						
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1987 Edition SSC Model Ordinance															
Progress and Remarks:															
Emeryville															
Yes	0	101	Yes		26	24	8	2	3	2	12	3		19	101
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory Strengthening, Structural analysis and report and mitigation by 8/93.									**Mitigation Rate:** 38 percent						
Technical Mitigation Standards: Ordinance															
Progress and Remarks: They noted no changes since the 1995 survey.															
Encinitas															
Yes	0	20	yes											20	20
Mitigation Program Type: Notification									**Mitigation Rate:** 0 percent						
Technical Mitigation Standards: Notification of Owners															
Progress and Remarks: Completed															
Escondido															
Yes	50	7	Yes	Yes	3		28	0	0	0	0	0		26	57
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary Strengthening									**Mitigation Rate:** 5 percent						
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: Voluntary with sunset date of 2015, incentives such as Mills Act & Fee Waivers															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (Numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

Eureka

Yes	6	21	Yes	Yes	15						2			10	27

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening, structural analysis, hardship time extensions

Mitigation Rate: 63 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: 1987 Edition of the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1 as modified

Progress and Remarks: Time extensions increased in September 1999. Ordinance amended 2/5/02 extending deadlines and requiring annual progress reports. A workshop is proposed for 11/04 to evaluate progress.

Fairfax

Yes	0	4	Yes			4							1		4

Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary

Mitigation Rate: 0 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1

Progress and Remarks: All four of the URM's have been sieismically strengthened.

Fairfield

Yes	0	5	Yes			4								1	5

Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening, historical buildings are exempt.

Mitigation Rate: 0 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: None included in the ordinance, although Division 88 is referenced in the report to the Commission.

Progress and Remarks: 5 URM, Pre-1935 with 100+ Occupants Pre-1976 with 300+ Occupants

Ferndale

Yes	0	1	Yes								1				

Mitigation Program Type: Demolition After Earthquake Damage

Mitigation Rate: 100 percent

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

Yes	1	51	Yes	Yes	13				3		18	2		16	

Mitigation Program Type: Partial: only URM buildings damaged in the 1/17/94 earthquake, some buildings remain vacant with future unknown

Mitigation Rate: 60 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC as applicable to damaged buildings only

Progress and Remarks: List of surveyed structures re-evaluated and totals corrected in 2004 resulting in additional structures that must be addressed.

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (Numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

Fontana

Yes	0	85	Yes								4			81	85

Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners **Mitigation Rate:** 5 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: None

Progress and Remarks: 45 Bearing Wall URM, 32 Nonbearing Wall URM

Fort Bragg

Yes	1	1	Yes		1	1	1						1		2

Mitigation Program Type: Notice to owners **Mitigation Rate:** 50 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: State Historical Building Code

Progress and Remarks: Contracts with Mendocino County for code enforcement.

Fortuna

Yes	0	1	Yes	Yes							1				

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening, structural analysis, hardship time extensions. **Mitigation Rate:** 100 percent

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												

Mitigation Program Type: **Mitigation Rate:** N/A

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

Fountain Valley

Yes	0	0	N/A												

Mitigation Program Type: **Mitigation Rate:** N/A

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

Fremont

Yes	7	21	Yes	Yes	26		1					1			28

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening **Mitigation Rate:** 93 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: 1991 UCBC Appendix Chapter 1 and subsequent additions.

Progress and Remarks: 1990 program notified owners. Fremont adopted a voluntary retrofit ordinance #2363 for soft story apartments in November 1999. Fremont created a loan program to assist owners with retrofits.

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (Numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

Fresno County

Yes	0	0	N/A												

Mitigation Program Type: **Mitigation Rate:** N/A

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

Fullerton

Yes	43	82	Yes			124	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	125 (all)

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening **Mitigation Rate:** 99 percent

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. The 1997 survey says that they are 99 percent done and will be presenting to the City Council a pre '73 masonry building.82 Nonhistoric URM 43 historic URM 220 Tiltup Concrete

Garden Grove

Yes	0	11	Yes	yes	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	11

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening **Mitigation Rate:** 18 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1, State Model Ordinance

Progress and Remarks:

Gardena

Yes	0	19	Yes		8	8			1						10

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening **Mitigation Rate:** 42 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: Latest UCBC and/or 1990 SSC model ordinance

Progress and Remarks: 19 URM, 1 accessory garage to 2-resident units not under mandatory mitigation program, deleted from list.

Gilroy

Yes	6	28	Yes	Yes	5	34	1			Unknown	1			27	34

Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening **Mitigation Rate:** 18 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: 1985 Edition of the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1, flat base shear of 10% g, ABK Method.

Progress and Remarks:

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (Numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Glendale															
Yes	7	696	Yes		0	494	0	2	0	0	207	0	0	2	703
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening									**Mitigation Rate:** 99 percent						
Technical Mitigation Standards: 13.3% Base Shear															
Progress and Remarks:															
Glendora															
Yes	0	9	Yes			8								1	9
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening									**Mitigation Rate:** 89 percent						
Technical Mitigation Standards: Similar to Division 88 City of Los Angeles code															
Progress and Remarks:															
Gonzales															
Yes	0	3	Yes	Yes						1		1	1	1	3
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening									**Mitigation Rate:** 0 percent						
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1988 (sic) Edition of the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1, 1985 UCBC															
Progress and Remarks:															
Grand Terrace															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:									**Mitigation Rate:** N/A						
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Greenfield															
Yes	0	14	Yes	Yes	3	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	14	14
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening									**Mitigation Rate:** 21 percent						
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1988 (sic) Edition of the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1, 1985 UCBC															
Progress and Remarks:															
Grover Beach															
Yes	0	2	Yes	Yes	0	0			1		0	1	2	0	2
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening									**Mitigation Rate:** 0 percent						
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1991 Edition of the SSC Model Ordinance.															
Progress and Remarks: Building for building replacement allowed without having to meet parking standards. One of the buildings was previously subdivided into three units and reported as three buildings on previous surveys, but is truly a single structure.															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (Numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Guadalupe															
Yes	0	40	Yes		1	1	2		5			1		19	27
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening									**Mitigation Rate:** 3 percent						
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1															
Progress and Remarks: An earlier 1989 program notified owners.															
Half Moon Bay															
Yes	0	2	Yes		1	1									1
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening									**Mitigation Rate:** 50 percent						
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												
Mitigation Program Type:									**Mitigation Rate:** N/A						
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Hawthorne															
Yes	0	4	Yes												
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners, seismic retrofits triggered only upon change of use or alterations.									**Mitigation Rate:** 0 percent						
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1990 SSC Model Ordinance															
Progress and Remarks:															
Hayward															
Yes	0	48	Yes	Yes	31	46	2	0	0		15	0		0	48
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening									**Mitigation Rate:** 96 percent						
Technical Mitigation Standards: Similar to Division 88 City of Los Angeles Code, 1973 UBC for Tiltup Retrofits															
Progress and Remarks: 48 URM 130 Tiltup Status: Tiltups are all retrofitted															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (Numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

Healdsburg

Yes	1	10	Yes	Yes	8	8	4	1	0	1	0	0	10	0	11

Mitigation Program Type: As of 7/6/04: City Ordinance #968, adopted 10/2/02, requires that plans be submitted, a seismic retrofit permit issued by September 21, 2002, and the work completed by September 21, 2004

Mitigation Rate: 73 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC 1991 edition and subsequent editions

Progress and Remarks: There were ten buildings on the URM list at the time of the adoption of the ordinance. 112 Matheson (Healdsburg Inn on the Plaza) was added to the list after the adoption of the ordinance. The following eleven buildings were subject to the seismic retrofit requirements of the ordinance. 243 Center St. 310-316 Center St. 225 Healdsburg Ave. 328/330 Healdsburg Ave. 420 Hudson Street 412 Healdsburg Ave. 425 Healdsburg Ave. 845 Healdsburg Ave. 107 Plaza St. 112 Matheson St 107 Plaza St. 112 Matheson St Since the adoption of the ordinance, four buildings have had an engineer's analysis performed, which showed that they did not fall within the scope of the ordinance: (225, 412 and 425 Healdsburg Avenue and 310 Center Street). 845 Healdsburg Avenue (Gallo Building) was declared a storage warehouse due to its current use and infrequent occupancy and was determined not be within the scope of the ordinance. 107 Plaza (Cubby House) and 420 Hudson Street (Old Roma Station) have completed seismic retrofits and have been taken off the URM list. There are three buildings that remain on the URM list. These are: 243 Center Street: Seismic retrofit permit issued August 28, 2003. This permit was for an occupancy change from a B (Office Use) Occupancy Classification to an R-3 (Residence). By converting this building to a residence, the owners are not required to seismically retrofit. The building is being used as a residence at this time, however the work authorized by the permit has not started. The final date for compliance (September 21, 2004) is still in effect for this project. 328 - 330 Healdsburg Ave: Seismic retrofit permit issued June 2, 2003. The owners began the retrofit construction process on June 2, 2003. The owners are currently in the process of revising the approved plans for a different construction method. As of this date, revised plans have not been submitted and the final date for compliance (September 21, 2004) is still in effect for this project. 112 Matheson Street: Seismic retrofit permit was issued on November 7, 2003 and construction has began. **This building was identified as URM after the ordinance was adopted, therefore the final date for compliance (September 21, 2004) will be extended for this project.

Hemet

Yes	3	9	Yes		0	0	0	0	10	0	2	Unknown	0	2	12

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory- City paid for engineering and pland for 10 buildings.

Mitigation Rate: 17 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1

Progress and Remarks: Adoption of a Mandatory program considered 3/92.

Hercules

Yes	0	2	Yes	Yes								2		1	3

Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners

Mitigation Rate: 0 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: None

Progress and Remarks: Two bldgs are slated for demolition. One is unoccupied and fenced off.

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (Numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

Hermosa Beach

Yes	0	66	Yes		65	65	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	66

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening **Mitigation Rate:** 100 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1

Progress and Remarks: Program now complete. An earlier ordinance in 1989 notified owners.

Hesperia

Yes	1	0	Yes												1

Mitigation Program Type: Discussions with owners **Mitigation Rate:** 0 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: State Historical Building Code

Progress and Remarks: City plans to develop a Historical Structure/Site Ordinance.

Hidden Hills

Yes	0	0	N/A												

Mitigation Program Type: **Mitigation Rate:** N/A

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

Highland

Yes	0	12	Yes	Yes	3	3	0	0	0	4	0	5	0	0	12

Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening **Mitigation Rate:** 25 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: 1997 Edition of the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1 for URM Bldgs, 1973 Edition of the UBC 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												

Mitigation Program Type: **Mitigation Rate:** N/A

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

Hollister

Yes	0	9	Yes		2	2								7	

Mitigation Program Type: Notices to Owners **Mitigation Rate:** 22 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: SSC Model Ordinance

Progress and Remarks: Status for all categories remains unchanged. Council will not mandate upgrade of structures.

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (Numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

Holtville

Yes	0	4	No	Yes	0	0	0	0	0		3	1	0	0	

Mitigation Program Type:

Mitigation Rate: 75 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

Humboldt County

Yes	0	7	Yes											6	1

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening

Mitigation Rate: 0 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks: Earthquake damaged URM buildings shall be repaired and retrofitted to comply with UCBC. Some progress on one URM.

Huntington Beach

Yes	0	52	Yes	Yes	0	16	0	0	0	0	36	0	0	0	52

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening

Mitigation Rate: 100 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: 1976 UBC, with modified allowable stresses for existing materials

Progress and Remarks: Majority of structures attained compliance through demolition.

Huntington Park

Yes	0	132	Yes	Yes	130	130	0			2	0	2	0	2	132

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening

Mitigation Rate: 98 percent

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. As of October 30, 2002, 2 URM's have not fully complied & buildings are vacant.

Imperial

Yes	0	0	N/A												

Mitigation Program Type:

Mitigation Rate: N/A

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (Numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

Imperial County

Yes	0	0	N/A											2	

Mitigation Program Type: **Mitigation Rate:** N/A

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

Indian Wells

Yes	0	0	N/A												

Mitigation Program Type: **Mitigation Rate:** N/A

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

Indio

Yes	0	48	Yes												48

Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners **Mitigation Rate:** 0 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: None

Progress and Remarks:

Industry

Yes	1	0	Yes	Yes				1					1		1

Mitigation Program Type: Other **Mitigation Rate:** 0 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks: One historic building, unoccupied, permit issued, out to bid as of July 2004

Inglewood

Yes	0	56	Yes	Yes	51	51	1	0			4				

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening **Mitigation Rate:** 98 percent

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

Yes	6	0	yes	Yes	2	4									6

Mitigation Program Type: Other **Mitigation Rate:** 33 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: Uniform Building Code (Deep Springs College). Title 24 Part 2-12

Progress and Remarks: Furnace Creek and Ranch indicated that there was reinforcing of concrete masonry unit with adobe fill. Three owners in Big pine were not responsive and were multiunit residential. 4 were reinforced to an unspecified level, 2 were reinforced to the UCBC App. Ch1

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (Numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

Irvine

Yes	0	0	N/A												

Mitigation Program Type: **Mitigation Rate:** N/A

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

Irwindale

Yes	0	2	Yes		2	0			0						0

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening **Mitigation Rate:** 100 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: 1985 Edition Chapter 96 of the Los Angeles County Code

Progress and Remarks:

Kern County

Yes	0	143	Yes		1	132*	0	0	0	1	11	0	0	130	143

Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners **Mitigation Rate:** 8 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: None

Progress and Remarks: * Kern County mitigation program was notification only. Alll have been notified. County staff is available to provide guidance concerning measures to retrofit buildings.

King City

Yes		7	Yes		1						1			5	7

Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening **Mitigation Rate:** 29 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: 1991 Edition of the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1

Progress and Remarks:

Kings County

Yes	0	0	N/A												

Mitigation Program Type: **Mitigation Rate:** N/A

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

La Canada Flintridge

Yes	0	0	N/A												

Mitigation Program Type: **Mitigation Rate:** N/A

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

La Habra

Yes	0	15	Yes			7					8				

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening **Mitigation Rate:** 100 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: 1987 Edition SSC Model Ordinance

Progress and Remarks:

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (Numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

La Habra Heights

Yes	0	0	N/A												

Mitigation Program Type: **Mitigation Rate:** N/A

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

La Mirada

Yes	0	0	N/A												

Mitigation Program Type: Adopted with Los Angeles County **Mitigation Rate:** N/A

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

La Palma

Yes	0	0	N/A												

Mitigation Program Type: **Mitigation Rate:** N/A

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

Yes	0	21	Yes												

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening **Mitigation Rate:** 0 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

La Quinta

Yes	7	0	Yes			5						1		1	7

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening **Mitigation Rate:** 71 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: 1987 Edition SSC Model Ordinance

Progress and Remarks:

La Verne

Yes	11	0	Yes		9	9					2			2	11

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening, Voluntary Posting **Mitigation Rate:** 100 percent

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.

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (Numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

Lafayette

Yes	0	5	Yes	Yes		4					1				5

Mitigation Program Type: Notification only

Mitigation Rate: 20 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks: A draft ordinance, which will include adoption of UCBC Appendix Chapter 1 with a three year period for compliance, is being considered. Contra Costa County contracts for Clayton, Lafayette, Moraga and Orinda.

Laguna Beach

Yes	0	29	Yes			29								0	

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening

Mitigation Rate: 100 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: Similar to Division 88 City of Los Angeles Code

Progress and Remarks: All known URM in the city have been strengthened per the city's mandatory strengthening ordinance.

Lake County

Yes		11	Yes		9	10	1			1			1		2

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening, historic buildings are exempt.

Mitigation Rate: 82 percent

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

Yes	33	54	Yes	Yes		81					6				

Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners

Mitigation Rate: 7 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1 as modified

Progress and Remarks:

Lakeport

Yes	0	33	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

Mitigation Rate: 3 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1 as modified, 1985 UBC

Progress and Remarks:

Lakewood

Yes	0	0	N/A												

Mitigation Program Type:

Mitigation Rate: N/A

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (Numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

Lancaster

Yes	0	0	N/A												

Mitigation Program Type: **Mitigation Rate:** N/A

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

Larkspur

Yes	0	12	Yes	Yes	5	5	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	12

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening **Mitigation Rate:** 42 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1

Progress and Remarks:

Lawndale

Yes	0	3	Yes		3	3						1		1	4

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening **Mitigation Rate:** 100 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: 1985 Edition Chapter 96 of the Los Angeles County Code

Progress and Remarks:

Livermore

Yes	30	18	Yes	Yes	37	48	0	2	0	0	9	2	0	0	48

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening **Mitigation Rate:** 96 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: Modified 1990 SSC Model Ordinance

Progress and Remarks: Two remaining buildings are vacant and therefore in compliance with the city's ordinance.

Loma Linda

Yes	0	0													

Mitigation Program Type: **Mitigation Rate:** N/A

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks: All of these were residential : 8 Non-historic URM, 50 Historic URM Pre-1935 with 100+ Occupants Pre-1976 with 300+ Occupants.The 1997 Survey response said that there were no non-residential URM's in the City of Loma Linda. Had a Voluntary Strenghening Program before the correction -.

Lomita

Yes	0	17	Yes			15					1	1			

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening **Mitigation Rate:** 94 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: 1985 Edition Chapter 96 of the Los Angeles County Code

Progress and Remarks:

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (Numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

Lompoc

Yes	0	21	Yes		14	1			2		1	1		2	21

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory Strenghtening **Mitigation Rate:** 71 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC App. Ch. 1

Progress and Remarks:

Long Beach

Yes	49	887	Yes			559	3	0	2	0	370	2	0	0	936

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening **Mitigation Rate:** 99 percent

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.936 URM bearing and nonbearing wall bldgs all pre-1934

Los Alamitos

Yes	0	0	N/A												

Mitigation Program Type: **Mitigation Rate:** N/A

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

Los Altos

Yes	0	0	N/A			0							0	0	0

Mitigation Program Type: **Mitigation Rate:** N/A

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks: 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. The 1997 survey said that the recent inspections have revealed no URM's in the city due to verified steel reinforcements in the walls. They had a Notification Only Program, before the recent correction.

Los Altos Hills

Yes	0	0	N/A												

Mitigation Program Type: **Mitigation Rate:** N/A

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (Numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

Los Angeles

Yes	255	8953	Yes		6140	6140	4	0	20	0	1939	2	0	1123	9208

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 steel frame with URM infill buildings. Div. 95 was passed on 8-30-96 for the voluntary strengthening of non-ductile concrete buildings, including URM infill.

Mitigation Rate: 88 percent

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: 8268 Buildings have been identified as subject to Division 88: 194 exempted, 1939 demolished, 6124 retrofitted, 6 remain to be demolished or retrofitted. 1132 Buildings have been identified with URM Infills: 11 have been retrofitted 1121 remain to be retrofitted. URM Bearing Wall Ordinance Division 88 February 1981. URM Infill Ordinance March 1993.

Los Angeles County

Yes	3	294	Yes		0	261	0	0	0	0	18	0	0	18	297

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening

Mitigation Rate: 94 percent

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: 278 non-historic URM, 3 historic URM all bearing wall

Los Gatos

Yes	6	15	Yes	Yes	14	14	2					1		4	21

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening

Mitigation Rate: 67 percent

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

No	0	15	No												

Mitigation Program Type:

Mitigation Rate: 0 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

Mammoth Lakes

Yes	0	0	N/A												

Mitigation Program Type:

Mitigation Rate: N/A

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (Numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Manhattan Beach															
Yes	0	12	Yes			12									
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening									**Mitigation Rate:** 100 percent						
Technical Mitigation Standards: Similar to Division 88 Los Angeles City Code															
Progress and Remarks: All mandatory strengthening was implemented and completed12 URM commercial one story buildings															
Maricopa															
Yes		14	No											14	
Mitigation Program Type:									**Mitigation Rate:** 0 percent						
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Marin County															
Yes	0	1	Yes	yes		1									
Mitigation Program Type: Notice to owner with an order to strengthen or demolish.									**Mitigation Rate:** 0 percent						
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks:															
Marina															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:									**Mitigation Rate:** N/A						
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Martinez															
Yes	0	58	Yes	No	6	8	9				2			33	58
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners									**Mitigation Rate:** 14 percent						
Technical Mitigation Standards: Standards are planned to be adopted.															
Progress and Remarks:															
Maywood															
Yes	0	25	Yes		13	13				0	12	0			25
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening									**Mitigation Rate:** 100 percent						
Technical Mitigation Standards: Similar to 1982 Edition of Division 88 of the Los Angeles City Code															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (Numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

McFarland

Yes	0	16	Yes		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	Yes

Mitigation Program Type: Notices to Owners **Mitigation Rate:** 0 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: None

Progress and Remarks: City contracts with Kern County for code enforcement. Kern County notified the owners and states it is available to provide guidance concerning measures to retrofit buildings.

Mendocino County

Yes	0	7	Yes	Yes	0			0	0	1	0	0		7	8

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory **Mitigation Rate:** 0 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: California Historical Building Code

Progress and Remarks: Section 18.30.060 (B) Mitigation Program When the valuation of any modification, alteration, repair, improvement, conversions, remodel or addition to the potentially hazardous building exceeds twenty-five percent (25%) of the current assessed value of the building, the potentially hazardous building shall be brought into compliance with the structural provisions of the State Historical Code. The collective valuation of multiple applications for permits submitted within any three-year period on the effective date of this ordinance shall be considered when determining if the valuation exceeds twenty-five percent (25%) of the assessed value of the building. August 2004 - Sent letters to owners requiring warning placards per Ordinance 4088 effective March 2002.

Menlo Park

Yes	0	2	Yes			1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening **Mitigation Rate:** 0 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: 1985 UCBC Appendix Chapter 1, State Historical Building Code

Progress and Remarks:

Mill Valley

Yes	0	24	Yes		23	23	1							1	24

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening **Mitigation Rate:** 96 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: 1987 Edition SSC Model Ordinance

Progress and Remarks:

Millbrae

Yes	0	3	Yes		3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening **Mitigation Rate:** 100 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: 1985 Edition of Division 88 of the Los Angeles City Code as modified, 1985 UBC

Progress and Remarks: All buildings upgraded. No further actions needed.

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (Numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

Milpitas

Yes	0	3	Yes								3				

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening

Mitigation Rate: 100 percent

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												

Mitigation Program Type:

Mitigation Rate: N/A

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

Mono County

Yes		8	No	Yes		1								7	

Mitigation Program Type:

Mitigation Rate: 0 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks: Building Official reported trying to establish a mitigation program in August 2003

Monrovia

Yes	0	75	Yes			75									75

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening

Mitigation Rate: 0 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: Wall anchorage, parapet bracing and height to thickness requirements only.

Progress and Remarks:

Montclair

Yes	0	0	N/A												

Mitigation Program Type:

Mitigation Rate: N/A

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

Monte Sereno

Yes	0	0	N/A												

Mitigation Program Type:

Mitigation Rate: N/A

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (Numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

Montebello

Yes	0	20	Yes											20	

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening **Mitigation Rate:** 0 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: Similar to the 1985 Edition of Chapter 96 of the Los Angeles County Code

Progress and Remarks:

Monterey

Yes	22	40	Yes		23		8		1		4	1		25	62

Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening, historical buildings are exempt. **Mitigation Rate:** 44 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: Similar to the 1987 Edition of the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1, 1988 UBC for base shear.

Progress and Remarks: Of the historic buildings, 4 have been completely retrofitted, 1 partially retrofitted, 1 plan checks underway, and 16 have no progress. 1/21/03 FMT

Monterey County

Yes	0	2	Yes						1		1		2		

Mitigation Program Type: Demolition/retrofit **Mitigation Rate:** 50 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: More

Progress and Remarks: Demolished - Historic Spreckels Building

Monterey Park

Yes	0	26	Yes		2	18		2		2	4				26

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening **Mitigation Rate:** 85 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: Similar to 1987 Edition SSC Model Ordinance

Progress and Remarks:

Moorpark

Yes	0	7	Yes			5					2				

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory? **Mitigation Rate:** 100 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

Moraga

Yes	0	0	N/A												

Mitigation Program Type: **Mitigation Rate:** N/A

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (Numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

Moreno Valley

Yes	0	0	N/A												

Mitigation Program Type: **Mitigation Rate:** N/A

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

Morgan Hill

Yes	2	6	Yes	Yes		1					7				

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening **Mitigation Rate:** 100 percent

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

Yes	0	13	Yes	Yes	2		2	2	6		1	0	0	8	13

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening, being reconsidered (12/95) **Mitigation Rate:** 23 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: 1991 UCBC

Progress and Remarks: 46 buildings were originally inventoried and 33 were found to be reinforced.

Mountain View

Yes	0	25	Yes			25								0	25

Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners, retrofits are triggered upon remodel or renovation. **Mitigation Rate:** 0 percent

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

Yes	10	25	Yes		11		2	1	3			1	4	24	35

Mitigation Program Type: Seismic Retrofit Reimbursement Program **Mitigation Rate:** 31 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks: The City of Napa Community Redevelopment Afency offers a reimbursement incentive program for the preparation of seismic retrofit architectural and engineering plans. Since the initial inventory of 46 URM structures, 11 have completed seismic retrofit projects and have been removed from the city's URM inventory. Currently, five properties are in the process of seismic retrofit efforts. Preliminary discussioons with several property owners are likely to result in other seimic projects being underway during 2000.

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (Numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

Napa County

Yes	1	6	Yes		3	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	7

Mitigation Program Type: Other **Mitigation Rate:** 43 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Ch I for occupancy changes and structural upgrades.

Progress and Remarks:

Newark

Yes	0	0	N/A												

Mitigation Program Type: **Mitigation Rate:** N/A

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

Newport Beach

Yes	3	124	Yes			125			0	0	1	1			127

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening **Mitigation Rate:** 99 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: Current Edition of the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1

Progress and Remarks: Of the Retrofit permits issued, building permits have since expired and retrofit work has not been started. The 1 building slated for demolition is reported unoccupied.

Norco

Yes	0	3	Yes	yes	3						0				3

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory Strengthening Program **Mitigation Rate:** 100 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: Based on Los Angeles, Division 88

Progress and Remarks: All buildings (3) have been retrofitted.

Norwalk

Yes	0	11	Yes		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	11

Mitigation Program Type: **Mitigation Rate:** 0 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: LA County's Chapter 96 was adopted on Dec 5, 1989, and again in 1992. In 1995, the City adopted the California's Uniform Code for Building Conservation, Appendix Chapter 1.

Progress and Remarks: Owners have been notified. Building official is preparing a legal notice to record against the respective titles and is planning to pursue enforcing mandatory strengthening via the UCBC appendix Chapter 1 as of 8//27/97.

Novato

Yes	0	1	No		1										

Mitigation Program Type: **Mitigation Rate:** 100 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks: Retrofit proposal was rejected due to local historical design review issues.

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (Numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

Oakland

Yes	277	1335	Yes		222	1107	121	3	1		106	2		50	1612

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory exterior falling hazard mitigation program. Voluntary structural upgrade program.

Mitigation Rate: 20 percent

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: Included a list of updates on the deadlines for completing URM upgrade work. Priority B1 - 2/1/97; B2 - 2/1/97; B3 - 2/1/98; N1-2/1/99; N2 - 2/1/2000; N3 - 2/1/2001.....1182 bearing wall type and 435 frame structures with URM infill walls

Oceanside

Yes	3	68	Yes		9	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	69	71

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.

Mitigation Rate: 14 percent

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

Yes	0	29	Yes			16	2		3					8	

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening

Mitigation Rate: 55 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: Yes-type not reported

Progress and Remarks: A 1990 program notified owners.

Ontario

Yes	45	13	No	Yes	2	0	1	0	0	1	4	0	0	50	58

Mitigation Program Type: Notification Only

Mitigation Rate: 10 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: CA Historical Building Code and UCBC

Progress and Remarks: The inventory of building is being rechecked

Orange

Yes	43	35	Yes		29	29		49						49	78

Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners

Mitigation Rate: 37 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: URM ordinance 7-92

Progress and Remarks:

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (Numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

Orange County

Yes	1	4	Yes	Yes	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening **Mitigation Rate:** 0 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: Division 88 City of Los Angeles code

Progress and Remarks:

Orinda

Yes	0	0	N/A												

Mitigation Program Type: **Mitigation Rate:** N/A

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks: A draft ordinance, which will include adoption of UCBC Appendix Chapter 1 with a three year period for compliance, is being proposed for adoption in 1995. Contra Costa County contracts for Clayton, Lafayette, Moraga and Orinda. (4/97) The city is exploring a manditory strengthening program or possibky a voluntary one.

Oxnard

Yes	6	47	Yes		4		1F							49	Yes

Mitigation Program Type: Notification Only **Mitigation Rate:** 8 percent

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

Yes	8	3	Yes		1	3						0		7	11

Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening, including all pre-1976 occupancy buildings **Mitigation Rate:** 9 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: Division 88 City of Los Angeles Code

Progress and Remarks:

Pacifica

Yes	0	0	N/A												

Mitigation Program Type: **Mitigation Rate:** N/A

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

Palm Desert

Yes	0	3	Yes		3										

Mitigation Program Type: Other, Unknown **Mitigation Rate:** 100 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1

Progress and Remarks:

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (Numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

Palm Springs

Yes	15	11	Yes	Yes	23	23	0	0	0	1	2				26

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening **Mitigation Rate:** 96 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: Modified 1987 Edition of the SSC Model Ordinance

Progress and Remarks:

Palmdale

Yes	0	0	N/A												

Mitigation Program Type: **Mitigation Rate:** N/A

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

Palo Alto

Yes	4	43	Yes	Yes	20	47	4	0	2		9	1		26	47

Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening **Mitigation Rate:** 62 percent

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. According to the 1997 Survey : -All buildings have a structural evaluation report on file which is required by ordinance, the "reduced occupancy" is vacated due to collapse potential, "and "warning placards" are not enforced by this department.....47 URM, 28 Pre-1935 bldgs with 100 or more occupants, 21 pre-76 bldgs with 300 or more occupants

Palos Verdes Estates

Yes	0	2	Yes		2										2

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening **Mitigation Rate:** 100 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: SSC Model Ordinance

Progress and Remarks:

Paramount

Yes	0	7	Yes		7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening **Mitigation Rate:** 100 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: Chapter 96 County of Los Angeles

Progress and Remarks: An earlier 1990 program provided notices to owners. Inventory not officially completed.

Pasadena

Yes	131	628	Yes	Yes	675	675	15	12	4	0	31	2	0	20	759

Mitigation Program Type: Other **Mitigation Rate:** 93 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC 1994 Edition

Progress and Remarks: 125 URM's are possibly elegible for the "Historic" label.

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (Numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Paso Robles															
Yes	0	58	Yes	Yes	4	12	2	1	13	0	4	0	0	22	58
Mitigation Program Type:									**Mitigation Rate:** 34 percent						
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Perris															
Yes	1	16	Yes	Yes	2	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	0	17
Mitigation Program Type: Notification Only									**Mitigation Rate:** 12 percent						
Technical Mitigation Standards: Uniform Codes															
Progress and Remarks: C.MC.#1069 Sec. 3 Mitigation occurs when ownership or occupancy changes. Two buildings have plans underway.															
Petaluma															
Yes	32	66	Yes	Yes	48	28	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	15	98
Mitigation Program Type: Partial strengthening-bolts only									**Mitigation Rate:** 49 percent						
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks: A 1989 program notified owners and tenants....62 Non-historic URM 32 Historic URM 5 pre-1934 concrete bldgs 12/11/89															
Pico Rivera															
Yes	0	7	Yes		7	7									7
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening									**Mitigation Rate:** 100 percent						
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1, 1987 Edition															
Progress and Remarks:															
Piedmont															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:									**Mitigation Rate:** N/A						
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Pinole															
Yes	0	6	No		2					1	2			1* see remarks	1
Mitigation Program Type:									**Mitigation Rate:** 67 percent						
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks: * Voluntary Notification. Engineering has been done and retrofit will be completed in 2003. The City of Pinole is as of January 2000 drafting a Seismic Ordinace for adoption by the city council and will provide for mandatory strengthening program. Owners "voluntarily notified" in 2002.															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (Numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Pismo Beach															
Yes	0	39	Yes		14	14			0		1			24	39
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening										**Mitigation Rate:** 38 percent					
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1															
Progress and Remarks: Deadlines for strengthening extended to July 11, 1995.The mitigation program was ammended in early 1996 from a Manditory to a Notification only system.															
Pittsburg															
Yes	20	15	Yes								3				35
Mitigation Program Type:										**Mitigation Rate:** 9 percent					
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Placentia															
Yes	0	16	Yes	yes	6	3		1			1			5	16
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.										**Mitigation Rate:** 44 percent					
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks: City is requesting additional commercial rehabilitation loan funds .															
Pleasant Hill															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:										**Mitigation Rate:** N/A					
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Pleasanton															
Yes	0	38	Yes		34	(34)	2 Both 80% comp-lete	0	0	0	2		(36)	0	38
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening										**Mitigation Rate:** 95 percent					
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC, Appendix Chapter 1															
Progress and Remarks: (1999) Of the original 38 URM's, 34 have been retrofitted and completed. Two (2) buildings have been demolished. Two (2) buildings are under construction and one about 80% complete. When the two (2) partially completed buildings are completed all of the identified URM's will be complete.															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (Numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Point Arena															
No			No												
Mitigation Program Type:									**Mitigation Rate:** 0 percent						
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks: Indicated inventory started but not completed in 1992 survey. No activity reported since.															
Pomona															
Yes	2	90	Yes							1		1		90	
Mitigation Program Type:									**Mitigation Rate:** 0 percent						
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks: 1992 ordinance tied into a special assessment district or similar financing.															
Port Hueneme															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:									**Mitigation Rate:** N/A						
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Portola Valley															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:									**Mitigation Rate:** N/A						
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Poway															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:									**Mitigation Rate:** N/A						
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Rancho Cucamonga															
Yes	18	4	Yes	Yes		17	0	0			3	0		2	22
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening									**Mitigation Rate:** 91 percent						
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.															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (Numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Rancho Mirage															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:										**Mitigation Rate:** N/A					
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Rancho Palos Verdes															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:										**Mitigation Rate:** N/A					
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Redlands															
Yes	10	67	Yes	Yes	0	20	2	0	0	1	0	1	0	54	
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners										**Mitigation Rate:** 0 percent					
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks: Changed mitigation code from (3) to (2) or from Notification Only to a Voluntary Strengthening Program.															
Redondo Beach															
Yes	0	20	Yes		20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening										**Mitigation Rate:** 100 percent					
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1987 SSC Model Ordinance															
Progress and Remarks:															
Redwood City															
Yes	4	23	Yes		6	14	2	0	0	2	2	0		2	27
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening										**Mitigation Rate:** 30 percent					
Technical Mitigation Standards: Similar to UCBC Appendix Chapter 1															
Progress and Remarks: City encourages Mills Act agreements for historical buildings to preserve facades. * City said that they were not responsible for enforcement on the "warning placards".															
Rialto															
Yes	0	19	Yes		4	4	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	8	19
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory										**Mitigation Rate:** 21 percent					
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks: Adoption of UCBC Appendix Chapter 1 considered in 1992.															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (Numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Richmond															
Yes	0	70	Yes		4	4	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	
Mitigation Program Type:									**Mitigation Rate:** 7 percent						
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Ridgecrest															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:									**Mitigation Rate:** N/A						
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Rio Dell															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:									**Mitigation Rate:** N/A						
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks: No URM buildings have been identified. All structures in the city are wood frame contruction.															
Rio Vista															
yes		10	No	Yes					1	1				8	0
Mitigation Program Type:									**Mitigation Rate:** 0 percent						
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Riverside															
Yes	82	118	Yes	Yes	unknown	13	unknown	unknown	unknown	unknown	23	unknown	unkown	unknown	200
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening									**Mitigation Rate:** 12 percent						
Technical Mitigation Standards: Similar to 1991 UCBC															
Progress and Remarks: Building Official does not know the status of the inquired URMs.															
Riverside County															
Yes	0	4	Yes		0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners. Retrofit plans required in 180 days.									**Mitigation Rate:** 0 percent						
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (Numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Rohnert Park															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:										**Mitigation Rate:** N/A					
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Rolling Hills															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:										**Mitigation Rate:** N/A					
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Rolling Hills Estates															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:										**Mitigation Rate:** N/A					
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Rosemead															
Yes	0	7	Yes	Yes	5	5					2		3		7
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening										**Mitigation Rate:** 100 percent					
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1985 Edition of Chapter 96 Los Angeles County															
Progress and Remarks: All URM structures in Rosemead have been strengthened or demolished. One structure from the original list had been incorrectly classified as a URM and was removed 1-19-2005.															
Ross															
Yes	0	1	Yes	Yes	1										
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening										**Mitigation Rate:** 100 percent					
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (Numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

Saint Helena

Yes	32	1	Yes	Yes	18	18	4	0	3					8	All

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory seismic retrofit ordinance adopted June 1998

Mitigation Rate: 55 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: 1998 California Code for Building Conservation, Appendix Chapter 1 with local ammendments.

Progress and Remarks: St. Helena's ordinace requires mandatory seismic retrofitting within 10 years of ordinace adoption. An incentive program was incorporated to encourage commencement of structural upgrades within the first 3 years of the program. As of January 2000, we are 1-1/2 years into the program with half of our URM buildings are in some stage of retrofitting. Incentives include A&E rebates, building permit fee waivers, creation of a National Registrar Historic District that allows owners to take advantage of a 20% federal tax credit for certified work, adoption of the Mills Act, permit renewal extensions, and a streamlined design review process.

Salinas

Yes	0	55	Yes	Yes	43	43					7	4		1	55

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening

Mitigation Rate: 91 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: 1997 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

Yes	0	21	Yes	Yes	21									0	21

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening

Mitigation Rate: 100 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1, State Historical Building Code

Progress and Remarks:

San Benito County

No	0	6	No		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	

Mitigation Program Type:

Mitigation Rate: 0 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (Numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

San Bernardino

Yes	0	136	Yes	Yes	11	unknowns	2	0	1	7	19	16	unknowns	80	136

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening **Mitigation Rate:** 22 percent

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. In September 1996, the City Council adopted an ordinance which provides a three year extension to prior deadlines for compliance. Notification by the City has not been effective. Compliance is very low due to the lack of an enforcement mechanism in Government Code 8875. The (11) means that the eleven buildings in substantial complience with the UCBC Code are in complience with the entity program, for they are the same. The ordinance requiring mandatory strengthening was repealed in August 1999. The current ordinance only requires voluntary posting of warning signs on each builiding.

San Bernardino County

Yes	0	21	Yes												

Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners **Mitigation Rate:** 0 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: None

Progress and Remarks:

San Bruno

Yes	0	5	Yes			4									1

Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening **Mitigation Rate:** 0 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: Similar to UCBC Appendix Chapter 1

Progress and Remarks: Update of status in process. New building official (Thomas Leonard) will start 3-6-00.

San Carlos

Yes	0	12	Yes	Yes	10							2			12

Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening **Mitigation Rate:** 83 percent

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: Three (3) remaing. Of the three, two are vacated and awaiting demolition. We issued a building permit for strengthening per UCBC, Appendiz Chapter 1, for the last building.

San Clemente

Yes	0	2	No	Yes										2	2

Mitigation Program Type: **Mitigation Rate:** 0 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks: Building Owners have been recontacted by the City. Continued communication with owners will continue until responses from building owners are received.

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (Numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

San Diego

No			Yes												

Mitigation Program Type: Parapet strengthening **Mitigation Rate:** 0 percent

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. They estimate they have 731 URM buildings.

San Diego County

Yes	24	17	Yes	Yes	8	4	0		0	0	2	2	unknown	25	38

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening **Mitigation Rate:** 24 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: February 1990 Edition SSC Model Ordinance

Progress and Remarks: Now 4 URMs are incorporated in Solana Beach, which replied to 1995 survey. 5 buildings were removed from the inventory because they were found to be outside the scope of the ordinance (i.e. reinforced).

San Dimas

Yes	3	4	No		1					1	0			5	0

Mitigation Program Type: **Mitigation Rate:** 14 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

San Fernando

Yes	0	12	Yes			11		1							3

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening **Mitigation Rate:** 92 percent

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.

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (Numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
San Francisco															
Yes	516	1460	Yes	yes		1302	230	131	155	0	117	0	unknown	41	1976

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.

Mitigation Rate: 72 percent

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. In 1992 insurance of $350 million in bods was authorized to make loans available to URM building owners.

San Gabriel															
Yes	0	72	Yes		22						5				

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening

Mitigation Rate: 38 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: 1985 Edition of Division 88 Los Angeles City Code

Progress and Remarks:

San Jacinto															
Yes	0	17	Yes		1		14				2				

Mitigation Program Type:

Mitigation Rate: 18 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

San Joaquin County															
Yes	0	0	N/A												

Mitigation Program Type:

Mitigation Rate: N/A

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (Numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

San Jose

Yes	74	72	Yes	Yes	109	22				3	12				146

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening. **Mitigation Rate:** 83 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: 1997 UBC or newer.

Progress and Remarks: 100% of the 146 identified buildings are in compliance with the 1991 San Jose Ordinance. Compliance options included: retrofit, vacating the builiding or demolition. Warehouses were exempt. Program details are as follows: 103 Buildings retrofitted, 12 buildings demolished, 28 buildings vacant pending retrofit, 3 building sexempt as warehouse use. Financial assistance for retrofit continues to be available through the City's Redevelopment Agency.

San Juan Bautista

Yes	0	13	No												

Mitigation Program Type: **Mitigation Rate:** 0 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

San Juan Capistrano

Yes	16	3	Yes		19	19									19

Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary **Mitigation Rate:** 100 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: None

Progress and Remarks:

San Leandro

Yes	1	39	Yes	Yes	0	27	1	0	1	0	11	0	0	0	40

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening **Mitigation Rate:** 95 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: Similar to UCBC Appendix Chapter 1

Progress and Remarks: The 1997 Survey said that the City has formed an assessment district to fund a low interest loan program to assist b uilding owners with retrofit costs. Five buildings were demolished prior to the 2/93 program date. Three buildings previously retrofitted have since been demolished. Owner renotification in progress as of 1/2005 subsequent to changes in state placard laws.

San Luis Obispo

Yes	37	89	Yes	Yes	17	83	15	1	1	1	9	1	?	0	127

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. Strengthening at roof level required as condition of reroof. All buildings to be fully strengthened by 2017 **Mitigation Rate:** 21 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1

Progress and Remarks: 2 buildings in the city are subject to county program. New mitigation requires that all URM's be strenghthened by 1/1/2017. Financial incentives offered to owners to strengthen as soon as possible, including grant up to $25,000, and waiver of permit fees. $5000 offered toward retrofits to owners from a City fund. Free downtown parking for contractors.

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (Numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

San Luis Obispo County

Yes	2	27	Yes	Yes	8	0	0	2	2	4	6	1	0	0	29

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory **Mitigation Rate:** 48 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC, Appendix Chapter 1

Progress and Remarks:

San Marcos

Yes	0	0	N/A												

Mitigation Program Type: **Mitigation Rate:** N/A

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks: An earlier survey tentatively identified 1 Concrete Masonry Unit building that was later found to be reinforced.

San Marino

Yes	0	13	Yes		13										

Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners, required engineering inspection, written report, City reserves right to impose standards. **Mitigation Rate:** 100 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: SSC 1987 Model Ordinance

Progress and Remarks: Program consists of a resolution

San Mateo

Yes	7	14	Yes		0	17	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	21

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening **Mitigation Rate:** 81 percent

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. Provides Grants and Loans.

San Mateo County

Yes	4	3	Yes	Yes	3	5	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	

Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening, engineer's structural report, notices to owners, change of use/occupancy, demolition **Mitigation Rate:** 57 percent

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.

San Pablo

Yes	0	60	Yes	Yes										60	60

Mitigation Program Type: Notification Only **Mitigation Rate:** 0 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: 1998 CA Building Conservation

Progress and Remarks: 60 Owners have been notified by mail 3rd quarter of 2002. We are not monitoring the number of URM buildings in substantial compliance with the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1. A Mitigation program is "in progress." The new Building Official plans to review this program.

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (Numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

San Rafael

Yes	0	44	Yes	Yes		44									44

Mitigation Program Type: Partial mandatory strengthening

Mitigation Rate: 0 percent

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												

Mitigation Program Type:

Mitigation Rate: N/A

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

Sand City

Yes	0	0	N/A												

Mitigation Program Type:

Mitigation Rate: N/A

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

Santa Ana

Yes	unknown	211	Yes	Yes	86	59*	1	0	0	59	61		0	4	209

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening

Mitigation Rate: 70 percent

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.* Included in #2, Based upon our 1980 Ordinance. 59 Buildings have reduced occupancy and are in substantial compliance with the program . Two buildings are discovered to be URM in 2004.

Santa Barbara

Yes	80	183	Yes		249	262	0	0	0		13			1	256

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening, implemented in a district by district manner.

Mitigation Rate: 99 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1

Progress and Remarks: City lent $25 million to more than 25 properties through a bond program. Court action for non-compliance of (1) one structure.

Santa Barbara County

Yes	2	21	Yes		23	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners, mitigation required based on occupant load and time frame established in UCBC.

Mitigation Rate: 100 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC

Progress and Remarks: The county passed a mandatory strengthening ordinance based on the 1991 UCBC.

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (Numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

Santa Clara

Yes	0	24	Yes	Yes	0	10	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	6	

Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening - first of three phases. **Mitigation Rate:** 33 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks: 3% interest loans to fund engineering analysis with a 5 year payback.

Santa Clara County

Yes	2	58	Yes			60									60

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening, except for owners of more than two buildings who may set their own time frames for compliance. **Mitigation Rate:** 100 percent

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

Yes	0	4	Yes		0	4									4

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening **Mitigation Rate:** 100 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: 1985 Edition Chapter 96 Los Angeles County Code

Progress and Remarks:

Santa Cruz

Yes	24	27	Yes								22				

Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners of undamaged buildings, a second ordinance established standards for repair of damaged URM buildings. **Mitigation Rate:** 43 percent

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.....24 Historic URM, 22 Non-historic URM were demolished, 5 others were severely damaged in Loma Prieta Earthquake.

Santa Cruz County

Yes	0	0	N/A												

Mitigation Program Type: **Mitigation Rate:** N/A

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (Numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

Santa Fe Springs

Yes	0	0	N/A												

Mitigation Program Type: **Mitigation Rate:** N/A

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

Santa Maria

Yes	0	25	Yes			10	1			12	1	1			25

Mitigation Program Type: Partial mandatory strengthening. originally only applicable to a certain district of the city, affecting 8 buildings, of those 6 were retrofitted.

Mitigation Rate: 44 percent

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

Yes	0	414	Yes		144	195	0	4	0	0	10	0	0	61	414

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory Strengthening for all URMs

Mitigation Rate: 84 percent

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....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.

Santa Paula

Yes	2	109	Yes	yes	106	106	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	111

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening

Mitigation Rate: 96 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: Owners may analyze URM buildings according to 2001 California UCBC Appendix Chapter 1.

Progress and Remarks: OES Hazard Mitigation Grant is in progress.

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (Numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

Santa Rosa

Yes	0	70	Yes		46	46	2	0	0	1	13	0	0	8	70

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening, required preliminary review, property owner review, retrofit or demolition.

Mitigation Rate: 84 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: 1955 UBC

Progress and Remarks: Dave Martinez became the Building Official in 1999 (end of year). Mike Enright is the Supervising Plan Check Engineer. He started 5/01 with the city. 70 URM were reported in 1997 and 1999 on previous updates 70 is the number of buildings identified on the next page.

Saratoga

Yes	0	0	N/A												

Mitigation Program Type:

Mitigation Rate: N/A

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

Sausalito

Yes	9	3	No		1	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Mitigation Program Type: Other-Building owners are required to perform an Earthquake Hazard Analysis of their building. Compliance with 1997 UCBC Appendix 1 is required when additions, alterations or repairs are made, the cost of which exceeds 50% of the replacement value of the building (Ord 1079).

Mitigation Rate: 8 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: 1997 Uniform Code for Building Conservation Appendix Chapter 1

Progress and Remarks: To date one building has been retrofit (731 Brideway). Two building owners have yet to comply with the seismic risk evaluation requirements of Ord 1079 by performing an Earthquake Hazard Analysis: 675 Bridgeway- Bijan Petri, and 667/669 Bridgeway--Scott & Judith Hanson.

Scotts Valley

Yes	0	0	N/A												

Mitigation Program Type:

Mitigation Rate: N/A

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

Seal Beach

Yes	0	10	No		2	2	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	

Mitigation Program Type: None.

Mitigation Rate: 80 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (Numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

Seaside

Yes	0	25	Yes												

Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening, Posting **Mitigation Rate:** 0 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: Similar to the 1987 SSC Model Ordinance

Progress and Remarks:

Sebastopol

Yes	1	27	Yes			27	0					1		0	28

Mitigation Program Type: Council Policy 11A Lottery for building owners **Mitigation Rate:** 96 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks: Retrofit program completed. All buildings required to be in compliance with policy 11-A have been retrofit.

Shafter

Yes	0	26	Yes	Yes	1	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	25		25

Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners & posts signs **Mitigation Rate:** 8 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: None

Progress and Remarks:

Sierra Madre

Yes	0	27	Yes		25						2				27

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening **Mitigation Rate:** 100 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: Division 88 1985 Edition

Progress and Remarks: Please be advised that 27 of the original 51 notified property owners were determined to be URM buildings. Two of the twenty were demolished. Alll of the remaining 25 URM buildings have been retrofitted in compliance with the Division 88 adopted standards.

Signal Hill

Yes	0	0	N/A												

Mitigation Program Type: **Mitigation Rate:** N/A

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

Simi Valley

Yes	2	0	Yes	Yes	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening **Mitigation Rate:** 100 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: 1987 SSC Model Ordinance

Progress and Remarks:

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (Numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Solano County															
Yes	0	2	Yes	Yes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	
Mitigation Program Type: Notification Only									**Mitigation Rate:** 0 percent						
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks:															
Soledad															
Yes	0	4	Yes							1			4	4	4
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening									**Mitigation Rate:** 0 percent						
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1 1987 Edition															
Progress and Remarks:															
Solvang															
Yes	0	3	Yes	Yes										3	3
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners									**Mitigation Rate:** 0 percent						
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks: There is a draft ordinance being written, and the City Council will be updated on our URM buildings.															
Sonoma															
Yes	28	28	Yes	Yes	48	32	2	0	1	1	4	0	0	0	56
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening									**Mitigation Rate:** 93 percent						
Technical Mitigation Standards: Similar to the Santa Rosa Program or UCBC Appendix Chapter 1, or SHBL if applicable.															
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															
Yes	14	300	Yes	Yes	8	314	1	0	1	0	2	2	0	300	314
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners									**Mitigation Rate:** 3 percent						
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1															
Progress and Remarks: Draft ordinance being reviewed.															
South El Monte															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:									**Mitigation Rate:** N/A						
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (Numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
South Gate															
Yes	0	47	Yes		41	41	0	0	0	0	6	2	3		47
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening									**Mitigation Rate:** 100 percent						
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1987 Edition of SSC Model Ordinance															
Progress and Remarks:															
South Pasadena															
Yes	3	38	Yes		32	32	2		3		1			3	32
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening									**Mitigation Rate:** 80 percent						
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1982 Edition of Division 88 City of Los Angeles Code															
Progress and Remarks:															
South San Francisco															
Yes	0	14	Yes		10		0		0		1	0		3	14
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory Strengthening, Complete retrofit within 7 years or at time of sale, whichever comes first.									**Mitigation Rate:** 79 percent						
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1															
Progress and Remarks:															
Stanton															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:									**Mitigation Rate:** N/A						
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Suisun City															
Yes	0	19	Yes												19
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners									**Mitigation Rate:** 0 percent						
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Sunnyvale															
Yes	10	0	Yes	yes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	10
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners, educational material, voluntary engineering reports, review by city after one year.									**Mitigation Rate:** 0 percent						
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. An earlier survey listed 86 bldgs and 10 were found to be URM.															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (Numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Taft															
Yes	0	40	No	Yes								2	2	40	
Mitigation Program Type:										**Mitigation Rate:** 0 percent					
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Tehachapi															
Yes	0	9	No												
Mitigation Program Type:										**Mitigation Rate:** 0 percent					
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Temple City															
Yes	0	6	Yes												
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening										**Mitigation Rate:** 0 percent					
Technical Mitigation Standards: Chapter 96 of the Los Angeles County Code 1985 Edition															
Progress and Remarks:															
Thousand Oaks															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:										**Mitigation Rate:** N/A					
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Tiburon															
Yes	0	1	Yes	Yes	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mitigation Program Type: Notification Only										**Mitigation Rate:** 0 percent					
Technical Mitigation Standards: 0															
Progress and Remarks: Owner retrofitted in 1991 to a standard not recorded.															
Torrance															
Yes	0	50	Yes		0	43	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	50
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening										**Mitigation Rate:** 100 percent					
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.															
Tustin															
Yes	0	8	Yes			8									
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening										**Mitigation Rate:** 100 percent					
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1990 SSC Model Ordinance															
Progress and Remarks: Community Development Block Grants for up to $2000 provided for engineering costs.															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (Numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

Twentynine Palms

Yes	0	27	Yes			2					1	8	9	7	

Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening, engineer's structural report, letters of intent, demolition for unsatisfactory progress, historical buildings are exempt.

Mitigation Rate: 4 percent

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

Yes	0	48	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.

Mitigation Rate: 0 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: State Historical Building Code

Progress and Remarks: Earlier loan program is no longer available.

Union City

Yes	0	5	Yes		0	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	5

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory Strengthening

Mitigation Rate: 100 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

Upland

Yes	0	58	Yes		24	24	0	0	0	0	unknown	0	unknown	34	58

Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening requires engineering reports, and letters of intent.

Mitigation Rate: 41 percent

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.....58 URM, Pre-1935 with 100 + Occupants Pre-1976 with 300 + Occupants

Vacaville

Yes	14	7	Yes	yes		21	6	0	0	0	1	1	0	13	21

Mitigation Program Type: Notices to Owners

Mitigation Rate: 5 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: Complete load paths with current code loads applied.

Progress and Remarks: 3% redevelopment matching loan program over 25 years for retrofits. Offers facade loans.

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (Numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Vallejo															
Yes	8	56	Yes		16	16		9	25					20	
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening									**Mitigation Rate:** 25 percent						
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															
Yes	11	134	Yes		3	135					6			1	145
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory parapet strengthening. Voluntary Strengthening to UCBC Seismic Zone 2B Compliance Recommended by City.									**Mitigation Rate:** 6 percent						
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC															
Progress and Remarks: Environmental Impact Study done. 2 ordinances adopted and 1 policy resolution. Notice of non-compliance noted on deed to property.															
Ventura County															
Yes	0	20	Yes	Yes	7	0					2	7		11	10
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening									**Mitigation Rate:** 45 percent						
Technical Mitigation Standards: February 1990 SSC Model Ordinance															
Progress and Remarks:															
Vernon															
Yes	0	105	Yes		8	Ordinance refers to UCBC	3	0	0	0	35	2	63	59	79
Mitigation Program Type: See attached Ordinance 1059									**Mitigation Rate:** 41 percent						
Technical Mitigation Standards: Appendix chapter One of U.C.B.C.															
Progress and Remarks: The number of URM buildings that were originally reported in 1995 was incorrect. The actual number of URM buildings was 105. Since 1995 there have been 35 URM buildings demolished leaving a total of 70 remaining URM buildings.															
Victorville															
Yes	0	37	Yes		8	0	0	0	6	2	3	3	0	13	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.									**Mitigation Rate:** 30 percent						
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1															
Progress and Remarks: 14 buildings have been contracted out to architects/engineers for seismic retrofit design. Building reduction is a result of further investigation of the structural elements and as a result they are no longer classified as URM (15 total).															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (Numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Villa Park															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:										**Mitigation Rate:** N/A					
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Vista															
Yes	0	2	Yes	Yes		1								1	
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening										**Mitigation Rate:** 0 percent					
Technical Mitigation Standards: None reported															
Progress and Remarks:															
Walnut															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:										**Mitigation Rate:** N/A					
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Walnut Creek															
Yes	0	18	Yes		18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory Strengthening										**Mitigation Rate:** 100 percent					
Technical Mitigation Standards: Modified Version of the 1987 SSC Model Ordinance used for administrative requirements. UCBC Appendix Chapter 1, 1997 edition used for structural requirements.															
Progress and Remarks:															
Wasco															
Yes	0	11	Yes	Yes	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	9	11
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners										**Mitigation Rate:** 18 percent					
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks: In May of 2000, we hired Mark Maxey (Original surveyor) to resurvey URM Buildings. Eleven were found URM, out of the eleven, one was demolished and one is pending demolition.															
Watsonville															
Yes	0	60	Yes		16	0	2	0	1	0	4	0	0	27	
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary Strengthening										**Mitigation Rate:** 33 percent					
Technical Mitigation Standards: Adopted a Voluntary and Notification Program according to the 1997 Survey response.															
Progress and Remarks: Inventory started, but not completed or reported to the Commission.															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (Numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

West Covina

Yes	0	1	Yes		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Mitigation Program Type: Notice to owner, engineer's report **Mitigation Rate:** 100 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: Not indicated

Progress and Remarks: Plans were prepared in 1992 and were being reviewed. Costs were being looked at.

West Hollywood

Yes	20	81	Yes												

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening **Mitigation Rate:** 0 percent

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												

Mitigation Program Type: **Mitigation Rate:** N/A

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

Westminster

Yes	0	0	N/A												

Mitigation Program Type: **Mitigation Rate:** N/A

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

Westmorland

Yes	0	2	Yes												

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening **Mitigation Rate:** 0 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: 1988 Edition of Chapter 96 of the Los Angeles County Code

Progress and Remarks:

Whittier

Yes	0	12	Yes			10					2				12

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening. **Mitigation Rate:** 100 percent

Technical Mitigation Standards: Draft Model Ordinance (Division 88)

Progress and Remarks: Notices served 5/92.

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (Numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2004 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Willits															
Yes	2	7	Yes	Yes	1				1			1		5	7
Mitigation Program Type: Engineer's report, notices to owners, posting of buildings.									**Mitigation Rate:** 11 percent						
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Woodside															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:									**Mitigation Rate:** N/A						
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Yorba Linda															
Yes	0	2	Yes		2										
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening analysis required by structural engineer.									**Mitigation Rate:** 100 percent						
Technical Mitigation Standards: Similar to 1982 Edition of Division 88															
Progress and Remarks:															
Yountville															
Yes	5	5	Yes		2		4							4	10
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners									**Mitigation Rate:** 20 percent						
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks:															
Yucaipa															
Yes	0	15	Yes	Yes		15	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	0	15
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening requiring evaluations by June 1994									**Mitigation Rate:** 0 percent						
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. Original surveys identified 45 buildings, 30 of which were later determined to be reinforced and were removed from the inventory. 15 URM's remain in Yucaipa.															

Appendix B -Selected State Laws Relevant to URM Buildings

Selected State Laws in the Government Code Relating to URM Buildings – The URM Law and Placard Laws:

8875**.** 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 warehouses or similar structures not used for human habitation, except for warehouses or structures housing emergency services equipment or supplies. "Potentially hazardous building" does not include any building having five living units or less. "Potentially hazardous building" does not include, for purposes of subdivision (a) of Section 8875.2, 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. 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.

8875.2. Local building departments shall do all of the following:

(a) Identify all potentially hazardous buildings within their respective jurisdictions 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 55000) 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 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 to 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. The Seismic Safety Commission shall report annually to the Legislature on the filing of mitigation programs from local jurisdictions. 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, commencing on or before January 1, 2007, include an evaluation of the impact and effectiveness of Section 8875.10.

8875.5. 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. 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 shall, 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. This section shall not apply to any transfer described in Section 8893.3.

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 repairs resulting from damage during an earthquake until all other applicants have been paid.

8875.8. (a) An owner who has received actual or constructive notice that a building 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) Notwithstanding subdivision (a), unless the owner of a building subject to subdivision (a) is in compliance with that subdivision on and after December 31, 2004, an owner who has received actual or constructive notice that a building located in seismic zone 4 is constructed of unreinforced masonry and has not been retrofitted in accordance with an adopted hazardous building ordinance or mitigation program shall post in a conspicuous place at the entrance of the building, on a sign not less than 8 X 10 the following statement, with the first two words printed in 50-point bold type and the remaining words in at least 30-point type:

> "Earthquake Warning. This is an unreinforced masonry building. You may not be safe inside or near unreinforced masonry buildings during an earthquake."

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

(d) Every rental or lease agreement entered into after January 1, 2005, involving a building subject to the requirements of subdivision (b) shall contain the following statement: This building, which you are renting or leasing, is an unreinforced masonry building. Unreinforced masonry buildings have proven to be unsafe in the event of an earthquake. Owners of unreinforced masonry buildings are required to post in a conspicuous place at the entrance of the building, the following statement: "Earthquake Warning. This is an unreinforced masonry building. You may not be safe inside or near an unreinforced masonry building during an earthquake."

(e) An owner who is subject to subdivision (b) and who does not comply with subdivision (a) may be subject to an administrative fine of two hundred fifty dollars ($250) to be levied by the local building department no sooner than 15 days after the local building department notifies the owner that the owner is subject to the administrative fine. If the owner does not comply with the requirements of that subdivision within 30 days of the first administrative fine, the owner may be subject to an additional administrative fine of one thousand dollars ($1,000).

(f) If an owner who is subject to subdivision (b) does not comply with subdivision (b), any person may bring a civil action for injunctive relief if all of the following have been met:

> (1) He or she has made a request to an appropriate authority for administrative enforcement of this section at least 90 days prior to the action.
>
> (2) An administrative fine has not been levied since the request was made pursuant to paragraph (1).

(3) At least 15 days prior to the filing of the action, the person has served on each proposed defendant a notice containing the following statement:

"You are receiving this notice because you are alleged to be in violation of Section 8875.8 of the Government Code, which requires that the owner of an unreinforced masonry building post a sign, not less than 8 X 10, in a conspicuous place at the entrance of the building with the following statement, with the first two words printed in 50-point boldface type and the remaining words in at least 30-point type:

"Earthquake Warning. This is an unreinforced masonry building. You may not be safe inside or near unreinforced masonry buildings during an earthquake.

Failure to post the sign in compliance with subdivision (b) of Section 8875.8 within 15 days of receipt of this notice entitles the sender of the notice to file an action against you in a court of law for injunctive relief.'"

(4) The owner has failed to post the sign in accordance with the requirements of subdivision (b) within 15 days of receipt of the notice served pursuant to this subdivision.

(g) The prohibitions and sanctions imposed pursuant to this section are in addition to any other prohibitions and sanctions imposed by law. A civil action for injunctive relief pursuant to this section shall be independent of any other rights and remedies.

8875.9. Section 8875.8 shall not apply to either one of the following: (a) Unreinforced masonry construction if the walls are nonload bearing with steel or concrete frame. (b) A building that has been retrofitted in accordance with an adopted hazardous buildings ordinance or mitigation program, in which case the local jurisdiction may authorize the owner to 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 building has been improved in accordance with the seismic safety standards of a local building ordinance that is applicable to unreinforced masonry buildings."

8875.95. No transfer of title shall be invalidated on the basis of a failure to comply with this chapter.

8875.10. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a city or county may not impose any additional building or site conditions including, but not limited to, parking or other onsite or offsite requirements, fees, or exactions, on or before the issuance of a building permit that is necessary for the owner of a potentially hazardous building to conduct seismic-related improvements to that building in order for that building to meet the requirements of a mitigation program established pursuant to Section 8875.1 and adopted pursuant to Section 8875.2, if the building or site conditions do not relate to, or further the purpose of, seismic improvements to the building and the improvements comply with applicable building codes and meet or exceeds the requirements of state and federal law and regulations that would otherwise apply.

(b) This section shall not apply to any changes in use, design, or other building features that are unrelated to the seismic improvements. This section shall also not apply to a request for other entitlements for the project, including, but not limited to, a general plan amendment, zone change, or approval pursuant to the Subdivision Map Act.

(c) This section shall remain in effect only until January 1, 2009, and as of that date is repealed, unless a later enacted statute, that is enacted before January 1, 2009, deletes or extends that date.

Selected State Housing Laws in the Health and Safety Code Relating to URM Buildings

17922. (a) Except as otherwise specifically provided by law, the building standards adopted and submitted by the department for approval pursuant to Chapter 4 (commencing with Section 18935) of Part 2.5, and the other rules and regulations that are contained in Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations, as adopted, amended, or repealed from time to time pursuant to this chapter shall be adopted by reference, except that the building standards and rules and regulations shall include any additions or deletions made by the department. The building standards and rules and regulations shall impose substantially the same requirements as are contained in the most recent editions of the following uniform industry Codes as adopted by the organizations specified:

(1) The Uniform Housing Code of the International Conference of Building Officials, except its definition of "substandard building."

(2) The Uniform Building Code of the International Conference of Building Officials.

(3) The Uniform Plumbing Code of the International Association of Plumbing and Mechanical Officials.

(4) The Uniform Mechanical Code of the International Conference of Building Officials and the International Association of Plumbing and Mechanical Officials.

(5) The National Electrical Code of the National Fire Protection Association.

(6) Appendix Chapter 1 of the Uniform Code for Building Conservation of the International Conference of Building Officials.

(b) In adopting building standards for approval pursuant to Chapter 4 (commencing with Section 18935) of Part 2.5 for publication in the California Building Standards Code and in adopting other regulations, the department shall consider local conditions and any amendments to the uniform Codes referred to in this section. Except as provided in Part 2.5 (commencing with Section 18901), in the absence of adoption by regulation, the most recent editions of the uniform Codes referred to in this section shall be considered to be adopted one year after the date of publication of the uniform Codes.

(c) Except as provided in Section 17959.5, local use zone requirements, local fire zones, building setback, side and rear yard requirements, and property line requirements are hereby

specifically and entirely reserved to the local jurisdictions notwithstanding any requirements found or set forth in this part.

(d) Regulations other than building standards which are adopted, amended, or repealed by the department, and building standards adopted and submitted by the department for approval pursuant to Chapter 4 (commencing with Section 18935) of Part 2.5, governing alteration and repair of existing buildings and moving of apartment houses and dwellings shall permit the replacement, retention, and extension of original materials and the continued use of original methods of construction as long as the hotel, lodginghouse, motel, apartment house, or dwelling, or portions thereof, or building and structure accessory thereto, complies with the provisions published in the California Building Standards Code and the other rules and regulations of the department or alternative local standards adopted pursuant to subdivision (b) of Section 13143.2 or Section 17958.5 and does not become or continue to be a substandard building. Building additions or alterations which increase the area, volume, or size of an existing building, and foundations for apartment houses and dwellings moved, shall comply with the requirements for new buildings or structures specified in this part, or in building standards published in the California Building Standards Code, or in the other rules and regulations adopted pursuant to this part. However, the additions and alterations shall not cause the building to exceed area or height limitations applicable to new construction.

(e) Regulations other than building standards which are adopted by the department and building standards adopted and submitted by the department for approval pursuant to Chapter 4 (commencing with Section 18935) of Part 2.5 governing alteration and repair of existing buildings shall permit the use of alternate materials, appliances, installations, devices, arrangements, or methods of construction if the material, appliance, installation, device, arrangement, or method is, for the purpose intended, at least the equivalent of that prescribed in this part, the building standards published in the California Building Standards Code, and the rules and regulations promulgated pursuant to the provisions of this part in performance, safety, and for the protection of life and health. Regulations governing abatement of substandard buildings shall permit those conditions prescribed by Section 17920.3 which do not endanger the life, limb, health, property, safety, or welfare of the public or the occupant thereof.

(f) A local enforcement agency may not prohibit the use of materials, appliances, installations, devices, arrangements, or methods of construction specifically permitted by the department to be used in the alteration or repair of existing buildings, but those materials, appliances, installations, devices, arrangements, or methods of construction may be specifically prohibited by local ordinance as provided pursuant to Section 17958.5.

(g) A local ordinance may not permit any action or proceeding to abate violations of regulations governing maintenance of existing buildings, unless the building is a substandard building or the violation is a misdemeanor.

17922.1. Notwithstanding Section 17922, local agencies may modify or change the requirements published in the State Building Standards Code or contained in other regulations adopted by the department pursuant to Section 17922 if they make a finding that temporary housing is required for use in conjunction with a filed mining claim on federally owned

property located within the local jurisdiction and that the modification or change would be in the public interest and consistent with the intent of the so-called Federal Mining Act of 1872 (see 30 U.S.C., Sec. 22, et seq.), relating to the development of mining resources of the United States.

17922.2. (a) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this part, ordinances and programs adopted on or before January 1, 1993, that contain standards to strengthen potentially hazardous buildings pursuant to subdivision (b) of Section 8875.2 of the Government Code, shall incorporate the building standards in Appendix Chapter 1 of the Uniform Code for Building Conservation of the International Conference of Building Officials published in the California Building Standards Code, except for standards found by local ordinance to be inapplicable based on local conditions, as defined in subdivision (b), or based on an approved study pursuant to subdivision (c), or both. Ordinances and programs shall be updated in a timely manner to reflect changes in the model Code, and more frequently if deemed necessary by local jurisdictions.

(b) For the purpose of subdivision (a), and notwithstanding the meaning of "local conditions" as used elsewhere in this part and in Part 2.5 (commencing with Section 18901), the term "local conditions" shall be limited to those conditions that affect the implementation of seismic strengthening standards on the following only:

(1) The preservation of qualified historic structures as governed by the State Historical Building Code (Part 2.7 (commencing with Section 18950)).

(2) Historic preservation programs, including, but not limited to, the California Mainstreet Program.

(3) The preservation of affordable housing.

(c) Any ordinance or program adopted on or before January 1, 1993, may include exceptions for local conditions not defined in subdivision (b) if the jurisdiction has approved a study on or before January 1, 1993, describing the effects of the exceptions. The study shall include socioeconomic impacts, a seismic hazards assessment, seismic retrofit cost comparisons, and earthquake damage estimates for a major earthquake, including the differences in costs, deaths, and injuries between full compliance with Appendix Chapter 1 of the Uniform Code for Building Conservation or the Uniform Building Code and the ordinance or program. No study shall be required pursuant to this subdivision if the exceptions for local conditions not defined in subdivision (b) result in standards or requirements that are more stringent than those in Appendix Chapter 1 of the Uniform Code for Building Conservation.

(d) Ordinances and programs adopted pursuant to this section shall conclusively be presumed to comply with the requirements of Chapter 173 of the Statutes of 1991.

Selected State Building Safety Laws in the Health and Safety Code Relating to URM's

18938. (a) Building standards shall be filed with the Secretary of State and codified only after they have been approved by the (Building Standards) Commission and shall not be published in any other title of the California Code of Regulations. Emergency building standards shall be filed with the Secretary of State and shall take effect only after they have been approved by the commission as required by Section 18937. The filing of building standards adopted or approved pursuant to this part, or any certification with respect thereto, with the Secretary of State, or elsewhere as required by law, shall be done solely by the commission.

(b) The building standards contained in the Uniform Fire Code of the International Conference of Building Officials and the Western Fire Chiefs Association, Inc., the Uniform Building Code of the International Conference of Building Officials, **Appendix Chapter 1 of the Uniform Code for Building Conservation of the International Conference of Building Officials**, the Uniform Plumbing Code of the International Association of Plumbing and Mechanical Officials, the National Electrical Code of the National Fire Protection Association, and the Uniform Mechanical Code of the International Conference of Building Officials and the International Association of Plumbing and Mechanical Officials, as referenced in the California Building Standards Code, shall apply to all occupancies throughout the state and shall become effective 180 days after publication in the California Building Standards **Code** by the California Building Standards Commission or at a later date after publication established by the commission.

19160. The Legislature finds and declares that:

(a) Because of the generally acknowledged fact that California will experience moderate to severe earthquakes in the foreseeable future, increased efforts to reduce earthquake hazards should be encouraged and supported.

(b) Tens of thousands of buildings subject to severe earthquake hazards continue to be a serious danger to the life and safety of hundreds of thousands of Californians who live and work in them in the event of an earthquake.

(c) Improvement of safety to life is the primary goal of building reconstruction to reduce earthquake hazards.

(d) In order to make building reconstruction economically feasible for, and to provide improvement of the safety of life in, seismically hazardous buildings, building standards enacted by local government for building reconstruction may differ from building standards which govern new building construction.

19161. (a) Each city, city and county, or county, may assess the earthquake hazard in its jurisdiction and identify buildings subject to its jurisdiction as being hazardous to life in the event of an earthquake if those buildings were constructed prior to the adoption of local building codes requiring earthquake resistant design of buildings, are constructed of unreinforced masonry wall construction, and exhibit any of the following characteristics:

(1) Exterior parapets or ornamentation that may fall.

(2) Exterior walls that are not anchored to the floors or roof.

(3) Lacks an effective system to resist seismic forces.

(b) Structural evaluations made pursuant to this section shall be made by an architect as defined in Section 5500 of the Business and Professions Code, or a civil or structural engineer registered pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 7 (commencing with Section 6700) of Division 3 of the Business and Professions Code, or a building inspector of the enforcing agency, as described in Section 17960, supervised by an architect or civil or structural engineer authorized by this subdivision to make the structural evaluations.

19162. Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 19100 or 19150 or any other provision of law, the governing body of any city, city and county, or county may, by ordinance, establish building reconstruction standards applicable to the reconstruction of any buildings identified by the city, city and county, or county as being hazardous to life in the event of an earthquake, pursuant to Section 19161. Such building reconstruction standards may be applied uniformly throughout the city, city and county, or county, or may be applied in specific areas designated by the city, city and county, or county.

19163. Any local ordinance adopted pursuant to Section 19162 shall require that:

(a) Any reconstruction of any building identified as being hazardous to life in the event of an earthquake shall provide for the reasonable adequacy of:

(1) Unreinforced masonry walls to resist normal and in-plane seismic forces,

(2) The anchorage and stability of exterior parapets and ornamentation,

(3) The anchorage of unreinforced masonry walls to the floors and roof,

(4) Floor and roof diaphragms,

(5) The development of a complete bracing system to resist earthquake forces.

(b) Reconstruction of any building or portions of any building shall be designed to resist and withstand the seismic forces from any direction as set forth in the building reconstruction standards using the allowable working stresses adopted pursuant to this article.

(c) The governing board of any city, city and county, or county may establish, by ordinance, standards and procedures to fulfill the intent of paragraph (2) of subdivision (a) without regard to the remainder of the requirements specified above. 19163.5. Except as otherwise provided in Chapter 1 (commencing with Section 15000) of Division 12.5, an ordinance adopted by a city, city and county, or county pursuant to Section 19163, may establish higher standards for the reconstruction of those structures or buildings which are needed for emergency purposes

after an earthquake in order to preserve the peace, health, and safety of the general public, including but not limited to, hospitals and other medical facilities having surgery or emergency treatment areas, fire and police stations, government disaster operations centers, and public utility and communication buildings deemed vital in emergencies.

19164. Any city, city and county, or county may assign allowable working stresses to existing materials based on substantiating research data or engineering judgment. Such allowable working stresses shall be limited by a safety factor which is reasonably commensurate with the importance of the element in which the material is used. In the event the local jurisdiction does not have the ability to assign such allowable working stresses, it may employ as a consultant the office of the State Architect. Allowable working stresses prepared by the office of the State Architect for any city, city and county, or county shall be subject to approval by the Seismic Safety Commission.

19165. Any city, city and county, or county adopting an ordinance establishing seismically hazardous building reconstruction standards applicable to the reconstruction of buildings identified as being hazardous to life in the event of an earthquake, shall file for informational purposes with the Department of Housing and Community Development a copy of such standards and all subsequent amendments.

19166. Any building identified as being a seismic hazard to life and reconstructed in compliance with building reconstruction standards adopted pursuant to this article and properly maintained, shall not, within a period of 15 years, be identified as a seismic hazard to life pursuant to any local building standards adopted after the date of the building reconstruction unless such building no longer meets the seismically hazardous building reconstruction standards under which it was reconstructed.

19167. No city, city and county, or county, nor any employee of any such entity, shall be liable for damages for injury to persons or property, resulting from an earthquake or otherwise, on the basis of any assessment or evaluation performed, any ordinance adopted, or any other action taken pursuant to this article, irrespective of whether such action complies with the terms of this article, or on the basis of failure to take any action authorized by this article. The immunity from liability provided herein is in addition to all other immunities of the city, city and county, or county provided by law.

19168. Nothing in this article shall apply to those buildings and structures governed by the provisions of Chapter 1 (commencing with Section 15000) of Division 12.5 of this code or Article 3 (commencing with Section 39140) of Chapter 2 of Part 23 of the Education Code or Article 7 (commencing with Section 81130) of Chapter 1 of Part 49 of the Education Code or any state-owned buildings or structures located in any city, city and county, or county.