

# DRAFT

## Status of the Unreinforced Masonry Building Law



**2003 Report to the Legislature**  
(Government Code Section 8875 et seq.)



**Seismic Safety Commission**  
SSC 2003-xx

**2003 Report to the Legislature**

**Status of California's**  
**Unreinforced Masonry Building Law**  
(Government Code Section 8875 *et seq.*)



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

SSC 2003-xx

# Seismic Safety Commission

Dr. Bruce R. Clark  
Commission Chairman  
*Geology*

Richard Alarcon  
Alternate: Chris Modrzejewski  
*State Senate*

Dr. Lucile M. Jones  
*Seismology*

Douglas E. Mochizuiki  
*Emergency Services*

Donald R. Parker  
*Fire Protection*

Jimmie Yee  
*Social Services*

Stan Y. Moy  
Commission Vice Chairman  
*Architectural Planning*

James Beall  
*County Government*

Lawrence Klein  
*Utilities*

Linden Nishinaga  
*Cities Government*

Dr. Ashok S. Patwardhan  
*Mechanical Engineer*

Andrew A. Adelman  
*Cities/Building Official*

Mark Church  
*Local Government*

Carol Liu  
Alternate: Don Manning  
*State Assembly*

Celestine Palmer  
*Insurance*

Daniel Shapiro  
*Structural Engineering*

# Seismic Safety Commission Staff

Richard J. McCarthy  
*Executive Director*

Karen Cogan

Bob Anderson

Henry Sepulveda

Fred Turner, SE  
*URM Program Manager*

Henry Reyes, SE

Abby Browning

Adam Myers

Kyshia Davis  
*URM Report Preparer*

Sue Celli

Kathy Goodell

Adopted **xxxxx** 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

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface.....	1
Introduction: 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 .....	7
2003 Recommendations .....	9
Conclusions .....	10
Acknowledgments.....	10
References .....	11
Table A: Statewide Summary of the URM Law Implementation .....	12
Appendix A.....	A1
Appendix B.....	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 96 percent of the 25,500 URM buildings now in loss reduction programs. But so far, only slightly more than half of the owners have reduced losses by retrofitting in accordance with a widely 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 adopted this biennial report to the State Legislature with its recommendations on improving this law in June 2003.

The Commission requests that the Legislature hold a hearing on the inequities resulting from this law.

## INTRODUCTION: URM BUILDINGS

Most unreinforced masonry (URM) buildings possess features that can threaten lives during earthquakes. These include unbraced parapets, and walls and roofs that are not well attached to each other. When earthquakes occur, inadequate connections can allow masonry to fall and floors and roofs to 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 366 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:

- Adopt mandatory strengthening programs by ordinance.
- Establish seismic retrofit standards.
- 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 a local balance of safety and economic issues (CSSC, 1995-05).

California's Seismic Safety Commission monitors local government efforts to comply with this law and reports biannually to the state's Legislature. This report updates the Commission's prior Year 2000 status report (SSC, 2000-02).

### 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 27 million people, or 75 percent 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 366 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 \$3 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, and social/economic issues you can 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 a last resort, and far more URM buildings statewide are being strengthened 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 only technical standards and has no administrative triggers for retrofitting other than the issuance of permits. Each local government usually defines triggers for compliance. A fair amount of retrofitting has been performed in accordance with standards preceding the UCBC and 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 a chapter of retrofit requirements for unreinforced masonry buildings. The State is in the process of selecting new model building codes and will be considering the adoption of the applicable portions of the 2003 IEBC later this year.

**Table 1. Types of URM Loss Reduction Programs ranked by general effectiveness from most to least (CSSC, 1995).**

Program Type	Summary
Mandatory Strengthening	<p>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 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.</p>
Voluntary Strengthening	<p>These programs establish seismic retrofit standards and require owners to evaluate the seismic risks in their buildings. Owners then write publicly available letters to the local governments indicating when they intend to retrofit (CSSC, 1990). This type of program is somewhat more effective than Notification Only.</p>
Notification Only	<p>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.</p>
Other	<p>Variations of the above with unique requirements and effectiveness. Some cities, for example, require owners to post placards on URM buildings that warn occupants and passersby of earthquake risks. In general, placarding has not proven to be an effective motivation for owners to retrofit. (CSSC, 1995)</p>

## Current Status of Implementing the URM Law

Every other year, the California Seismic Safety Commission contacts local governments affected by the URM Law and asks them to summarize their efforts to date. In the late fall of 2002 and early 2003, the Commission contacted the 286 jurisdictions in Seismic Zone 4 with URM buildings. As of February 2003, 184 jurisdictions responded to the survey. This corresponds to a response rate of 64%, which is one percent higher than the response rate in 2000.

**Table 2. City and County Responses to the URM Law in 2003**

<b>Cities &amp; Counties</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Population</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>URM's</b>	<b>Percent</b>
• with inventories not complete	9	2%	1,413,398	5%	114	<1%
• with inventories complete, but no URM programs	24	7%	705,782	3%	499	2%
• with no URM's	82	22%	2,909,296	10%	0	0
• with URM programs	251	69%	23,494,105	82%	24,902	97%
Totals	366	100%	28,522,581	100%	25,515	100%

The URM Law continues to gain effectiveness in 2003. There weren't dramatic changes from the 2000 data, but most of the changes still depict the continued efforts of local governments and owners to carry out the URM Law.

Among the noteworthy changes are the following:

- Cities and counties with inventories completed, but with loss reduction programs not established (as required by law) decreased from 27 to 24.

- The number of cities and counties with URM buildings in compliance with the law increased from 250 to 251.
- The number of URM buildings that are in communities that don't have earthquake loss reduction programs increased slightly from 568 to 613 (2.4% of those inventoried).
- The number of cities and counties with no URM buildings increased from 79 to 82.
- 1,054 URM buildings have been retrofitted since 2000 to bring the total to 13,228 or 52 % of those inventoried.
- 27 URM buildings have been demolished since 2000 to bring the total to 3,421 or 13% of those inventoried.

The size and numbers of each type of loss reduction program are summarized in Table 3. Most local governments chose to adopt more effective mandatory strengthening programs even though the state didn't require them. The remaining jurisdictions either don't have URM buildings or have yet to comply with the law.

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

<b>Type of Loss Reduction Programs</b>	<b>Entities</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Population</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>URM's</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Mandatory	130	52%	15,868,879	64%	19,112	77%
Voluntary	39	16%	2,664,065	11%	1,371	5%
Notification	45	18%	2,617,823	10%	1,599	6%
Other	37	14%	3,640,083	15%	2,878	12%
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>251</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>24,790,850</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>24,960</b>	<b>100%</b>

Since 2000, there has not been a significant change in the type of loss reduction programs. The number of jurisdictions with mandatory programs and other programs each increased by one. The number of jurisdictions with voluntary programs remained the same, while the number of jurisdictions with notification programs decreased by one. Overall, this fluctuation corresponds to a shift in the total number of jurisdictions with loss reduction programs from 250 to 251.

## 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 more than 13 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 building owner's situation is unique as well as each local government's. 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. These figures were taken from only those jurisdictions responding:

**Table 4. Average Rates of Retrofit in Substantial Compliance with the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1 and Average Rates of Demolition Based on Local Government Responses to the 2003 Survey.**

Type of Program	Mandatory	Voluntary	Notification	Other
Retrofitted	41%	14%	5%	14%
Demolished	12%	5%	2%	6%
Total Percent	53%	19%	7%	19%
Total No. URM's	18,078	937	958	2716
Entities Responding as of February 2003	98	30	27	29

Table 5 is a more complete summary of progress based on the responses from the 2003 survey as well as those others responding in 2000, 1997, and 1995. Table 5 includes those URM buildings retrofitted to standards other than UCBC.

**Table 5. Average Rates of Retrofit Average Rates of Demolition**

<b>Type of Program</b>	<b>Mandatory</b>	<b>Voluntary</b>	<b>Notification</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Number of Buildings</b>
Retrofitted to UCBC	42%	14%	5%	14%	8,610
Retrofitted to other than UCBC	24%	N/A	N/A	N/A	4,618
Demolished	15%	5%	2%	7%	3,421
Total Percent	81%	19%	7%	21%	16,550
Total No. URM's	19,112	1,371	1,599	2,878	24,960
Total Entities	130	39	45	37	

The presence of economic incentives coupled with URM programs seems to encourage owners in voluntary strengthening programs to retrofit. There is a 20% rate of UCBC retrofit for the nine cities with economic incentives and about a 12% rate for those thirty cities without them. Although data is limited, it appears that economic incentives may have helped encourage voluntary retrofits by owners albeit at a considerably slower pace than mandatory strengthening programs.

These observations about the relative effectiveness of program types and financial incentives should all be tempered with the particular characteristics that the state's URM Law confronts - relatively high cost retrofits on generally pre-1933 buildings in a high seismic region. Other types of retrofitting and incentives in other regions and for other building types will likely produce different results.

## COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 2003

The Legislature should hold a hearing to revisit the state's 1986 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 unstrengthened or partially strengthened. Actions to be considered should include but not be limited to:

- Developing and adopting legislation or other policy options to encourage local governments jurisdictions that have little or no retrofit progress to provide financial incentives to encourage owners to retrofit.
- Enacting similar legislation to establish retrofit standards and mitigation programs for other types of vulnerable buildings such as tiltups, soft-story apartments and non-ductile concrete frames.
- Adopting legislation to mandate the strengthening of all unreinforced masonry bearing buildings including state-owned buildings statewide in accordance with the state's model building code, currently the Uniform Code for Building Conservation, Appendix Chapter 1.
- The California Building Standards Commission should consider adopting the International Existing Building Code as the State's model building code for seismic retrofits, which should be triggered by future alterations to existing buildings.
- The Seismic Safety Commission should modify its survey questionnaire to more accurately assess the progress of each jurisdiction and clarify questions asked.

## CONCLUSIONS

Upon reviewing these results, the Seismic Safety Commission still recommends mandatory strengthening to local governments as the most effective URM loss reduction program.

Voluntary strengthening has not been as effective because current economic incentives are typically not sufficient to create a market-driven willingness to retrofit. The Commission has proposed additional retrofit incentives in its *California Earthquake Loss Reduction Plan* (CSSC, 1997). This new plans 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 33 remaining jurisdictions with 513 URM buildings that are not in compliance with the law.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Commission wishes to thank all of the local governments that responded to the 2003 URM Survey. Without their efforts, this report would not have been possible.

The Commission also wishes to acknowledge 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. "Status of the Unreinforced Masonry Building Law." SSC 2000-02, 2000.
- 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.
- 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.
- Los Angeles, City of. "Division 88 - Earthquake Hazard Reduction in Existing Buildings," February 13, 1981.
- Seismic Safety Commission, "Incentives to Improve California's Earthquake Safety: An 'Agenda in Waiting'", SSC 99-02.
- Earthquake Engineering Research Institute, "Incentives and Impediments to Improving the Seismic Safety Performance of Buildings," EERI, 1998.

**Table A**  
**2003 State Summary of the URM Law Implementation**

	Jurisdictions	Percentages	Population*	Percentages	URM's	Percentages
Cities without inventories started	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Cities with inventories not completed	8	2.0	1,395,234	5.0	108	<1.0
Cities with inventory completed—No mitigation program started	22	6.0	566,510	2.0	474	2.0
Cities with no URM's	77	21.0	2,392,340	8.0	0	0.0
Cities with mitigation programs	230	62.0	19,586,646	69.0	23,843	93.0
<b>Cities in Zone 4 affected by the URM Law</b>	<b>337</b>	<b>91.0%</b>	<b>23,940,730</b>	<b>84.0</b>	<b>24,425</b>	<b>95.0</b>
Counties without inventories started	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Counties with inventories not completed	1	<1.0	18,164	<1.0	6	<1.0
Counties with inventory completed—No mitigation program started	2	<1.0	139,272	<1.0	25	<1.0
Counties with no URM's	5	1.0	516,956	2.0	0	0.0
Counties with mitigation programs	21	6.0	3,907,459	14.0	1059	4.0
<b>Counties in Zone 4 affected by the URM Law</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>9.0%</b>	<b>4,581,851</b>	<b>16.0%</b>	<b>1090</b>	<b>4.0</b>
Cities and counties without inventories started	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Cities and counties with inventories not completed	9	2.0	1,413,398	5.0	114	<1.0
Cities and counties with inventory completed—No mitigation program started	24	7.0	705,782	3.0	499	2.0
Cities and counties with no URM's	82	22.0	2,909,296	10.0	0	0.0
Cities and counties with mitigation programs	251	69.0	23,494,105	82.0	24,902	98.0
<b>Total cities and counties in Zone 4</b>	<b>366</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>28,522,581</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>25,515</b>	<b>100.00%</b>
<b>Types of mitigation programs established</b>						
Mandatory Strengthening Program	130	52.0%	15,868,879	64.0%	19,112	77.0
Voluntary Strengthening Program	39	16.0	2,664,065	11.0	1,371	5.0
Notification Only	45	18.0	2,617,823	10.0	1,599	6.0
Other	37	14.0	3,640,083	15.0	2,878	12.0
Total cities and counties with mitigation programs	251	100.00%	24,790,850	100.00%	24,960	100.00%
Cities and Counties that replied to the 2003 URM Survey	194	53.0%	20,148,228	71.0%	22,828	89.0

\* Based on 2000 Census Data

Jurisdiction	Survey Results (numbers of URMs)
Inventory Completed	
Number of Historic URMs	
Number of Non-Historic URMs	
Mitigation Program Established	
Replied to 2003 Survey	
UCBC Compliance	

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URM)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URM	Number of Non-Historic URM	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2003 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted /Plancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

### Anaheim

Yes	0	16	Yes	Yes		13	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	16
-----	---	----	-----	-----	--	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**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.

### Antioch

Yes	0	25	No												
-----	---	----	----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**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.

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

**Progress and Remarks:** None.

### Arcadia

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

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

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

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Arcata

Yes	1	0	No	Yes	1										
-----	---	---	----	-----	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Arroyo Grande

Yes	1	25	Yes	Yes	2	23	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	26
-----	---	----	-----	-----	---	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**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.

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2003 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted /Plancheck /Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

### Artesia

Yes	0	4	Yes												
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**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:**

**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

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** SSC Model Ordinance

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Atherton

No	0	1	No	Yes		1									
----	---	---	----	-----	--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Avalon

Yes	0	19	Yes			2		2	3					12	
-----	---	----	-----	--	--	---	--	---	---	--	--	--	--	----	--

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

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

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Avenal

No	0	8	No												
----	---	---	----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**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 2003 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted /Plancheck /Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

### Azusa

Yes	1	27	Yes	Yes		12	3				11	2		0	28
-----	---	----	-----	-----	--	----	---	--	--	--	----	---	--	---	----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

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

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Bakersfield

Yes	0	191	Yes	Yes	6	74	24	0	26	6	25	0	0	30	191
-----	---	-----	-----	-----	---	----	----	---	----	---	----	---	---	----	-----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Partial Strengthening - Wall & Parapet Anchors only

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

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Baldwin Park

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

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**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												
-----	---	----	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:** Notices to owners

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** None

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Barstow

Yes	0	93	No	Yes	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	80	All
-----	---	----	----	-----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	-----

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:** 1997 Status : 1 Completely retrofitted (Harvey House-Historical), 1 Vacant, 3 demolitions of URM's, 8 determined not URM and removed from list, 80 URM's notified (total= 93)

### Beaumont

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

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** 1988 Edition of Division 88 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 2003 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted /Plancheck /Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

**Bell**

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

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

**Bell Gardens**

Yes	0	0	N/A												
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

**Bellflower**

Yes	0	22	Yes		0	13	2	0	2	0	1	4	0		22
-----	---	----	-----	--	---	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	--	----

**Mitigation Program Type:** 1

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

**Progress and Remarks:**

**Belmont**

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

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** 1987 Edition of the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1 as amended to reflect the 1990 State Historical Building Code and Draft Model Ordinance

**Progress and Remarks:**

**Belvedere**

Yes	0	0	N/A												
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

**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

**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 2003 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted /Plancheck /Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

### Berkeley

Yes	No data available	No data available	Yes	Yes		422	22	?	4		4	2	***	133 (Including #9)	587
-----	-------------------	-------------------	-----	-----	--	-----	----	---	---	--	---	---	-----	--------------------	-----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory, nonbearing walls and veneers.

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** City provides prescriptive standards for tall veneers, parapets and simple one or two story buildings. SEAOC/CALBO recommended retrofit provisions with modifications for bearing wall URMs.

**Progress and Remarks:** 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 Residential buildings with 5 or more units. Year 2002 reported: City established 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. \*\*\* We 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	Yes	95	95			1		4			0	95
-----	---	----	-----	-----	----	----	--	--	---	--	---	--	--	---	----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

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

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Big Bear Lake

No	0	24	No	Yes		6	0				9			34	
----	---	----	----	-----	--	---	---	--	--	--	---	--	--	----	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**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 through demolition, repair, and/or substantiation that the structures were not of un-reinforced masonry construction.

### Bishop

Yes	0	1	Yes	Yes							1				
-----	---	---	-----	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** 1988 UCBC State Historical Building Code

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Blue Lake

Yes	0	0	N/A												
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**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 2003 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted /Plancheck /Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

### Bradbury

Yes	0	0	N/A												
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Brawley

Yes	0	66	Yes			16								50	
-----	---	----	-----	--	--	----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	----	--

**Mitigation Program Type:** Notices to owners

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** None

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Brea

Yes	2	25	Yes	Yes	2	0	0	0	1	0	24	0	0	0	1
-----	---	----	-----	-----	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	---	---	---	---

**Mitigation Program Type:** Notices to owners

**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

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** UCBC Appendix Chapter 1

**Progress and Remarks:** City put together a funding program in 1992.

### Brisbane

Yes	0	4	Yes	Yes	0					2	1	1		0	4
-----	---	---	-----	-----	---	--	--	--	--	---	---	---	--	---	---

**Mitigation Program Type:** Voluntary Strengthening

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** 1985 UBC and the City of Los Angeles Division 88; for tilt up 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:** Mandatory Strengthening

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

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

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2003 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted /Plancheck /Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

### Burbank

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

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

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

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Burlingame

Yes	0	63	Yes	Yes	53		0		0		9			1	
-----	---	----	-----	-----	----	--	---	--	---	--	---	--	--	---	--

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** Similar to the February 1990 Edition of the SSC Model Ordinance

**Progress and Remarks:** Applicants are given the choice to update to UCBC or SSC Model Ordinance—all chose UCBC. 2 URMs with no progress have expired plan checks and 2 are in probate. Overall progress has been outstanding. Final deadline for compliance (completion of retrofit) is July 1, 1996. Anticipate problems in getting 2 (of the original 54 properties) to comply by deadline.

### Calexico

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

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

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** "LA Model Ordinance"

**Progress and Remarks:**

### California City

Yes	0	0	N/A												
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Calipatria

Yes	0	6	Yes												
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

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

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Calistoga

Yes	17	20	No	Yes	2	2*	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	33	37
-----	----	----	----	-----	---	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	----

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** The 37 URM's are potentially hazardous. \*Denotes that the two buildings in Substantial Compliance are the same as in compliance with 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 2003 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted /Plancheck /Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

### Camarillo

Yes	0	37	Yes	Yes		36	1		0						37
-----	---	----	-----	-----	--	----	---	--	---	--	--	--	--	--	----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** February 1990 SSC Model Ordinance

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Campbell

Yes	0	9	Yes	Yes	3	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	6	9
-----	---	---	-----	-----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

**Mitigation Program Type:** Voluntary Strengthening

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** Complete 1985 Edition of the UCBC including the Appendices

**Progress and Remarks:** An earlier 1989 program of mandatory Strengthening was relaxed in 1993.

### Capitola

Yes	0	1	Yes								1				
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:** Demolition

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Carlsbad

Yes	0	9	Yes	Yes	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	9
-----	---	---	-----	-----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**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 2003 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted /Plancheck /Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

### Carmel-by-the-Sea

Yes	1	25	Yes	Yes	0	21	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	25
-----	---	----	-----	-----	---	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Voluntary Strengthening

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** 1987 Edition of the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1 for URM Bldgs, 1973 Edition of the UCBC for Non-URM Buildings, 1985 UCBC

**Progress and Remarks:** 20 Bldgs were removed from the inventory after seismic hazard evaluation reports were submitted to the City June 17, 1991. 26 Bldgs URM, Pre-1935 with 100+ Occupants, Pre-1976 with 300+ Occupants

### Carpinteria

Yes	3	0	Yes	Yes	3						0			0	0
-----	---	---	-----	-----	---	--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	---	---

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** None Reported

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Carson

Yes	0	32	Yes	Yes		32									32
-----	---	----	-----	-----	--	----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

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

**Progress and Remarks:**

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2003 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted /Plancheck /Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

### Cathedral City

Yes	0	0	N/A								1	1			
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	---	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Cerritos

Yes	0	0	N/A												
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**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.

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

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Claremont

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

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**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 Seismic Program.

### Clayton

Yes	0	1	Yes			1									1
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---

**Mitigation Program Type:** Notification only

**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.

**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.

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2003 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted /Plancheck /Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

### Cloverdale

Yes	0	23	No		2								23		23
-----	---	----	----	--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	----	--	----

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** UCBC

**Progress and Remarks:** Ordinance being written in 1995.

### Coachella

Yes	0	1	Yes	Yes		1					1				
-----	---	---	-----	-----	--	---	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:** Demolition

**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:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Colma

Yes	0	0	N/A			0									0
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---

**Mitigation Program Type:** Notices to owners, seismic hazard evaluation reports required

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** None

**Progress and Remarks:** Reports indicate that none of the buildings have been determined to be hazardous. City is reviewing the engineering reports.

### Colton

Yes	0	20	Yes		0	5	0	0	0	0		1	0	14	20
-----	---	----	-----	--	---	---	---	---	---	---	--	---	---	----	----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Notices to Owners

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** None

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Commerce

Yes	0	9	Yes			4			0		3			1	
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	---	--	--	---	--	---	--	--	---	--

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

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

**Progress and Remarks:**

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2003 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted /Plancheck /Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

### Compton

Yes	17	1	Yes	Yes	4	8	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	
-----	----	---	-----	-----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Concord

Yes	2	12	Yes												
-----	---	----	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening within 5 years

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** UCBC Appendix Chapter 1

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Contra Costa County

Yes	0	48	Yes		0	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
-----	---	----	-----	--	---	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Notification only

**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.

### Corona

Yes	0	14	Yes	Yes		14	0	0	0	4	1	0	11	0	14
-----	---	----	-----	-----	--	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	---	----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**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

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** None

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Costa Mesa

Yes	0	0	N/A												
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**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 2003 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted /Plancheck /Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

### Daly City

Yes	0	3	Yes	Yes	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
-----	---	---	-----	-----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**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:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Danville

Yes	4	1	Yes	Yes											5
-----	---	---	-----	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---

**Mitigation Program Type:** Notices to Owners

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

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Del Rey Oaks

Yes	0	0	N/A												
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Delano

Yes	0	38	Yes		1		1							37	38
-----	---	----	-----	--	---	--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	----	----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Notices to Owners

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** None

**Progress and Remarks:**

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2003 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted /Plancheck /Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

### Desert Hot Springs

Yes	0	8	Yes	Yes			2		1		1	2	2		
-----	---	---	-----	-----	--	--	---	--	---	--	---	---	---	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:** Demolition

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** None

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Diamond Bar

Yes	0	0	N/A												
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Dixon

Yes	0	14	Yes	Yes	0	0	1			2				11	14
-----	---	----	-----	-----	---	---	---	--	--	---	--	--	--	----	----

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

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** UCBC Appendix Chapter 1

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Downey

Yes	0	14	Yes	Yes	0	12		0	0		2				14
-----	---	----	-----	-----	---	----	--	---	---	--	---	--	--	--	----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** 1985 Edition UCBC Appendix Chapter 1, 20% gravity for walls, 15 lb. wind load, 50% gravity for parapets, diaphragms 1/2 of current code.

**Progress and Remarks:** Inventory not complete. 14 Pre-1957 URM buildings except one and two family dwellings

### Duarte

Yes	0	0	N/A												
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Dublin

Yes	0	0	N/A												
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**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 2003 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted /Plancheck /Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

### East Palo Alto

Yes	0	0	N/A												
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**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.

**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 than the value of the structures. Estimated cost of compliance was approximately \$5,700,000 in 1993. 1989 Program: Owner notification. 1991 Program: Active/passive program based on occupancy.

### El Cerrito

Yes	0	32	Yes		0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	29	32
-----	---	----	-----	--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Voluntary Strengthening

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** 1985 Edition of the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1

**Progress and Remarks:** Owners in violation guilty of misdemeanor. No changes for 97 status.

### El Monte

Yes	0	25	Yes	Yes	24	24								1	25
-----	---	----	-----	-----	----	----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Analysis required under a facade improvement ordinance.

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** None

**Progress and Remarks:**

### El Segundo

Yes	0	14	Yes	Yes	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
-----	---	----	-----	-----	---	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	--

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**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.

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** Ordinance

**Progress and Remarks:** They noted no changes since the 1995 survey.

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2003 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted /Plancheck /Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

### Encinitas

Yes	0	20	Yes	Yes										20	20
-----	---	----	-----	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	----	----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Notification

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** Notification of Owners

**Progress and Remarks:** Completed

### Escondido

Yes	50	7	Yes	Yes	3		28							26	57
-----	----	---	-----	-----	---	--	----	--	--	--	--	--	--	----	----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Voluntary Strengthening

**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

### Eureka

Yes	0	27	Yes	Yes	12		1	2	1		1			10	27
-----	---	----	-----	-----	----	--	---	---	---	--	---	--	--	----	----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening, structural analysis, hardship time extensions

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

**Progress and Remarks:** Time extensions increased in September 1999. Ordinance amended 2/5/02 extending deadlines and requiring annual progress reports.

### Fairfax

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

**Mitigation Program Type:** Voluntary

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** UCBC Appendix Chapter 1

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

### Fairfield

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

**Mitigation Program Type:** Voluntary Strengthening, historical buildings are exempt.

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

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

### Ferndale

Yes	0	0	N/A												
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:** All except one URM building demolished after the 1906 EQ damaged them beyond repair. Last URM demolished after the April 1992 earthquakes.

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URM)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URM	Number of Non-Historic URM	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2003 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted /Plancheck /Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

### Fillmore

Yes	0	42	Yes		13				1		17			11	
-----	---	----	-----	--	----	--	--	--	---	--	----	--	--	----	--

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

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** UCBC as applicable to damaged buildings only

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Fontana

Yes	0	85	Yes	Yes							4			81	85
-----	---	----	-----	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	----	----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Notices to owners

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** None

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

### Fort Bragg

Yes	1	1	Yes	Yes	1	1	1						1		2
-----	---	---	-----	-----	---	---	---	--	--	--	--	--	---	--	---

**Mitigation Program Type:** Notice to owners

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** State Historical Building Code

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

### Fortuna

Yes	0	1	Yes								1				
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening, structural analysis, hardship time extensions.

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

**Progress and Remarks:** Building damaged in April 25, 1992, earthquake and subsequently demolished.

### Foster City

Yes	0	0	N/A												
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Fountain Valley

Yes	0	0	N/A												
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**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 2003 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted /Plancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

### Fremont

Yes	10	22	Yes	Yes	21		6				2	1		2	32
-----	----	----	-----	-----	----	--	---	--	--	--	---	---	--	---	----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**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.

### Fresno County

Yes	0	0	N/A												
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Fullerton

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

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** 1987 Edition of the SSC Model Ordinance for URM buildings, Certain 1988 UCBC sections referenced for tilt up construction.

**Progress and Remarks:** A separate ordinance requires retrofit of pre-1973 tilt up 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. Ordinance effecting 82 Nonhistoric URM, 43 historic URM, 220 Tilt up Concrete buildings.

### Garden Grove

Yes	0	12	Yes	Yes	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	11
-----	---	----	-----	-----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

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

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Gardena

Yes	0	19	Yes	Yes	8	8			1						10
-----	---	----	-----	-----	---	---	--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--	----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

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

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

### Gilroy

Yes	5	27	Yes		32	32	2								32
-----	---	----	-----	--	----	----	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Voluntary Strengthening

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

**Progress and Remarks:**

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2003 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted /Plancheck /Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

### Glendale

Yes	7	696	Yes	Yes	0	494	0	2	0	0	207	0	0	2	703
-----	---	-----	-----	-----	---	-----	---	---	---	---	-----	---	---	---	-----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** 13.3% Base Shear

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Glendora

Yes	0	9	Yes	Yes		8								1	9
-----	---	---	-----	-----	--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	---

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

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

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Gonzales

Yes	0	3	Yes	Yes								3			3
-----	---	---	-----	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	---

**Mitigation Program Type:** Voluntary Strengthening

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** 1988 (sic) Edition of the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1, 1985 UCBC

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Grand Terrace

Yes	0	0	N/A												
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Greenfield

Yes	0	14	Yes	Yes	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	14	14
-----	---	----	-----	-----	---	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	----	----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Voluntary Strengthening

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** 1988 (sic) Edition of the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1, 1985 UCBC

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Grover Beach

Yes	0	4	Yes	Yes	0	0					0		1	3	4
-----	---	---	-----	-----	---	---	--	--	--	--	---	--	---	---	---

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** 1991 Edition of the SSC Model Ordinance.

**Progress and Remarks:** Building for building replacement allowed without having to meet parking standards.

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2003 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted /Plancheck /Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated 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

**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

**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:**

**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.

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** 1990 SSC Model Ordinance

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Hayward

Yes	0	42	Yes	Yes		37	2	0	1		1	1		0	42
-----	---	----	-----	-----	--	----	---	---	---	--	---	---	--	---	----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** Similar to Division 88 City of Los Angeles Code, 1973 UBC for Tilt up Retrofits

**Progress and Remarks:** 46 URM 130 Tilt up  
 Status: Tiltups are all retrofitted  
 1 Board up- Vacant and not retrofitted, 6 mostly done and being actively retrofitted, 34 retrofitted, 1 tilt up building was on the inventory in error = 42

### Healdsburg

Yes	0	11	Yes	Yes		1	4		4	1	0	0	10	0	11
-----	---	----	-----	-----	--	---	---	--	---	---	---	---	----	---	----

**Mitigation Program Type:** 10/2/02 OrdNo. 968 City Ordinance #881: Advisory only with compliance voluntary until 1996.

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** UCBC 1991 edition and subsequent editions

**Progress and Remarks:** Mandatory measures will be enforced after 12:01 a.m. on 9/16/96



Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2003 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted /Plancheck /Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

### Hillsborough

Yes	0	0	N/A												
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Hollister

Yes	0	9	Yes	Yes	2	2								7	
-----	---	---	-----	-----	---	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

**Mitigation Program Type:** Notices to Owners

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** SSC Model Ordinance

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

### Holtville

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

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Humboldt County

Yes	0	7	Yes											6	1
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	---

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

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

### Huntington Beach

Yes	0	52	Yes	Yes	0	15	1	0	0	0	36	0	0	0	52
-----	---	----	-----	-----	---	----	---	---	---	---	----	---	---	---	----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

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

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

### Huntington Park

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

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** 1985 Edition of Division 88 Los Angeles City Code, and the Los Angeles' Rules for General Application RGA #1-87.

**Progress and Remarks:** As of March 1995, 5 URMs have not fully complied. As of October 30, 2002, 2 URM's have not fully complied & buildings are vacant.

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2003 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted /Plancheck /Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

### Imperial

Yes	0	0	No	Yes											
-----	---	---	----	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Imperial County

Yes	0	0	N/A											2	
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Indian Wells

Yes	0	0	N/A												
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Indio

Yes	0	48	Yes												48
-----	---	----	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Notices to Owners

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** None

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Industry

Yes	1	0	Yes	Yes					1*						1
-----	---	---	-----	-----	--	--	--	--	----	--	--	--	--	--	---

**Mitigation Program Type:** Other

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:** One historic building -plans submitted, plan check underway. \*Historic URM unoccupied

### Inglewood

Yes	0	56	Yes	Yes		50	2	0			4				
-----	---	----	-----	-----	--	----	---	---	--	--	---	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

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

**Progress and Remarks:** City reimburses up to \$3000 of the cost of engineering studies, 100% of plan check fees, permits, and taxes, using redevelopment money. 80% compliance.

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2003 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted /Plancheck /Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

### Inyo County

Yes	6	0	Yes	Yes	2	4*									6
-----	---	---	-----	-----	---	----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---

**Mitigation Program Type:** Other

**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 units with adobe fill. Three owners in Big Pine were not responsive and were multiunit residential. 4\*=reinforced, 2 reinforced to UCBC App. Chapter 1.

### Irvine

Yes	0	0	N/A												
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Irwindale

Yes	0	2	Yes	Yes	2	0			0						0
-----	---	---	-----	-----	---	---	--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--	---

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

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

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Kern County

Yes	0	143	Yes	Yes	1	132*	0	0	0	1	28	0	0	113	143
-----	---	-----	-----	-----	---	------	---	---	---	---	----	---	---	-----	-----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Notices to Owners

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** None

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

### King City

Yes		7	Yes	Yes	1						1			5	7
-----	--	---	-----	-----	---	--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	---	---

**Mitigation Program Type:** Voluntary Strengthening

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

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Kings County

Yes	0	0	N/A												
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**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 2003 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted /Plancheck /Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

### La Canada Flintridge

Yes	0	0	N/A												
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### La Habra

Yes	0	15	Yes	Yes		7					8				
-----	---	----	-----	-----	--	---	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** 1987 Edition SSC Model Ordinance

**Progress and Remarks:**

### La Habra Heights

Yes	0	0	No	Yes											
-----	---	---	----	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### La Mirada

Yes	0	0	N/A												
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:** Adopted with Los Angeles County

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### La Palma

Yes	0	0	N/A												
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:** Working with property owners on a voluntary compliance program for pre-1973 tilt up concrete buildings, but do not have any URM buildings.

### La Puente

Yes	0	21	Yes												
-----	---	----	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**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 2003 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted /Plancheck /Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

### La Quinta

Yes	7	0	Yes	Yes		5						1		1	7
-----	---	---	-----	-----	--	---	--	--	--	--	--	---	--	---	---

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** 1987 Edition SSC Model Ordinance

**Progress and Remarks:**

### La Verne

Yes	11	0	Yes	Yes	9	9					2			2	11
-----	----	---	-----	-----	---	---	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	---	----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening, Voluntary Posting

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

**Progress and Remarks:** City budgeted \$100,000 to fund facade / URM program for seismic retrofit in fiscal year 92/93 with goal of completing 2 URM buildings this next fiscal year. One building was completed in 90/91 (funded 92/93=1, 93/94=1) with agency funding leaving 9 URM buildings remaining.

### Lafayette

Yes	0	4	Yes			4									4
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---

**Mitigation Program Type:** Notification only

**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	Yes		29								0	
-----	---	----	-----	-----	--	----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**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.

**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			81					6				
-----	----	----	-----	--	--	----	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:** Notices to Owners

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** UCBC Appendix Chapter 1 as modified

**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 2003 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted /Plancheck /Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

### 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

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

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Lakewood

Yes	0	0	N/A												
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Lancaster

Yes	0	7	Yes	Yes	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0
-----	---	---	-----	-----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

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

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Larkspur

Yes	0	12	Yes	Yes	5	4	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	10
-----	---	----	-----	-----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**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

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

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Livermore

No	0	58	Yes	Yes	54	54	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	58
----	---	----	-----	-----	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** Modified 1990 SSC Model Ordinance

**Progress and Remarks:** 9 bldgs have completed an engineering analysis.

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2003 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted /Plancheck /Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

### Loma Linda

Yes	0	0	N/A		N/A										
-----	---	---	-----	--	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	--

**Mitigation Program Type:** Voluntary Strengthening

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** 1987 Edition of the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1 for URM Bldgs, 1973 Edition of the UBC for Non-URM Buildings, 1985 UBC

**Progress and Remarks:** 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 mitigation code 2 before the correction - voluntary Strengthening.

### City of Lomita

Yes	0	17	Yes	Yes		15					1	1			
-----	---	----	-----	-----	--	----	--	--	--	--	---	---	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

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

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Lompoc

Yes	0	21	Yes		14	1			2		1	1		2	21
-----	---	----	-----	--	----	---	--	--	---	--	---	---	--	---	----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** UCBC App. Ch. 1

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Long Beach

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

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** 1970 Edition of the UBC, proposed ordinance changes are based on the latest proposed ICBO code change for URM bldgs, and a base shear not to exceed 13 percent but varies with period, building type and occupant load.

**Progress and Remarks:** In 1959, the building official was given the authority to abate parapet and appendage falling hazards; in 1971 a mandatory Strengthening ordinance was passed, which was amended in 1976 and updated again in 1990. City created a special assessment district to issue bonds for seismic retrofit financing based on the 1911 Bond Act. 936 URM bearing and nonbearing wall bldgs all pre-1934.

### Los Alamitos

Yes	0	0	N/A												
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Los Altos

Yes	0	0	N/A			0							0	0	0
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	---	---

**Mitigation Program Type:** Notices to Owners, request for voluntary upgrades

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** None.

**Progress and Remarks:** Consideration is being given to a more restrictive mandatory Strengthening program. After further study, review of plans, and inspections, we have found only one building that may be a URM. The others have provided adequate proof that they do not have a URM or their building is not a URM. The placard posted on one URM has disappeared. 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 mitigation code 3, a notification only, before the recent correction.

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2003 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted /Plancheck /Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

### Los Altos Hills

Yes	0	0	N/A												
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Los Angeles

Yes	255	8953	Yes*		6065	6065	64	7	20	0	1902	35	0	1115	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.

**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: 193-exempted, 1903-demolished, 6018-retrofitted, 154- remain to be demolished or retrofitted.  
1132 Buildings have been identified with URM Infills: 5- have been retrofitted 1127- remain to be retrofitted. \*URM (Div 88)- 2/81, URM infills- 3/93

### Los Angeles County

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

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** 1992 Edition Chapter 96 of the Los Angeles County Code - similar to Division 88 of the Los Angeles City Code

**Progress and Remarks:** 278 non-historic URM, 3 historic URM all bearing wall

### Los Gatos

Yes	6	15	Yes	Yes		13	4							4	
-----	---	----	-----	-----	--	----	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** 1991 Edition of the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1, 75% of the 91 UBC for the repair of earthquake-damaged non-URM bldgs, Chapter 37 of the 91 UBC for chimney repair

**Progress and Remarks:** Revocation of occupancy for buildings that do not comply with deadline. City allows replacement of damaged buildings without providing more parking.

### Lynwood

No	0	15	No												
----	---	----	----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Mammoth Lakes

Yes	0	0	N/A												
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**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 2003 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted /Plancheck /Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

### Manhattan Beach

Yes	0	12	Yes	yes		12									
-----	---	----	-----	-----	--	----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

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

**Progress and Remarks:** All mandatory Strengthening was implemented and completed. 12 URM commercial one story buildings

### Maricopa

Yes		16	No											16	
-----	--	----	----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	----	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**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

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** None

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Marina

Yes	0	0	N/A												
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Martinez

Yes	0	58	Yes	Yes	6	8	9				2			33	58
-----	---	----	-----	-----	---	---	---	--	--	--	---	--	--	----	----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Notices to Owners

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** Standards are planned to be adopted.

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Maywood

Yes	0	25	Yes	Yes	13	13				0	12	0			25
-----	---	----	-----	-----	----	----	--	--	--	---	----	---	--	--	----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**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 2003 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted /Plancheck /Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

### Mcfarland

Yes	0	16	Yes		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	Yes
-----	---	----	-----	--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	-----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Notices to Owners

**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	8	Yes	Yes	0	Do not know at this time	Do not know at this time	0	0	0	0	0	0	Do not know at this time	0	8
-----	---	---	-----	-----	---	--------------------------	--------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	--------------------------	---	---

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory

**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.

### Menlo Park

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

**Mitigation Program Type:** Voluntary Strengthening

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

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Mill Valley

Yes	0	24	Yes	Yes	23	23	1								1	24
-----	---	----	-----	-----	----	----	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** 1987 Edition SSC Model Ordinance

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Millbrae

Yes	0	3	Yes	Yes	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
-----	---	---	-----	-----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

**Mitigation Program Type:** Voluntary Strengthening

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

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

### Milpitas

Yes	0	1	Yes								3					
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** 1987 Edition of the SSC Model Ordinance, 1988 Edition of the Uniform Code for the Abatement of Dangerous Buildings

**Progress and Remarks:** Strengthening deadline is negotiable depending on owner's financial situation. Only 1 building classified as URM left. This building is city owned, a complete seismic retrofit has been recently completed.

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2003 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted /Plancheck /Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

### Mission Viejo

Yes	0	0	N/A												
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Mono County

Yes		8	No	Yes		1								7	
-----	--	---	----	-----	--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Monrovia

Yes	0	75	Yes	Yes		75									75
-----	---	----	-----	-----	--	----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**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:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Monte Sereno

Yes	0	0	N/A												
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Montebello

Yes	0	20	Yes	Yes										20	
-----	---	----	-----	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	----	--

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

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

**Progress and Remarks:**

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2003 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted /Plancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

### Monterey

Yes	22	40	Yes	Yes	23		8		1		4	1		25	62
-----	----	----	-----	-----	----	--	---	--	---	--	---	---	--	----	----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Voluntary Strengthening, historical buildings are exempt.

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

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

### Monterey County

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

**Mitigation Program Type:** Demolition/retrofit

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** More

**Progress and Remarks:** Demolished - Historic Spreckels Building

### Monterey Park

Yes	0	26	Yes	Yes	2	18		2		2	4				26
-----	---	----	-----	-----	---	----	--	---	--	---	---	--	--	--	----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** Similar to 1987 Edition SSC Model Ordinance

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Moorpark

Yes	0	7	Yes	Yes		5					2				
-----	---	---	-----	-----	--	---	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Moraga

Yes	0	0	N/A												
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2003 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted /Plancheck /Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

### Morgan Hill

Yes	2	6	Yes	Yes		1					7				
-----	---	---	-----	-----	--	---	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** 1982 Edition of the Los Angeles City Code

**Progress and Remarks:** This emergency ordinance was passed to repair and retrofit earthquake damaged URM buildings.

### Morro Bay

Yes	0	16	Yes		1	1		2	6			1			16
-----	---	----	-----	--	---	---	--	---	---	--	--	---	--	--	----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening, being reconsidered (12/95)

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** 1991 UCBC

**Progress and Remarks:** 46 buildings were originally inventoried and 30 were found to be reinforced.

### Mountain View

Yes	0	25	Yes	Yes	25	25								0	25
-----	---	----	-----	-----	----	----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	----

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

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** UCBC Appendix Chapter 1

**Progress and Remarks:** 1992: Drafting an ordinance for late summer that will require mandatory evaluation and upgrade within defined time period to be approved by city council.

### Napa

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

**Mitigation Program Type:** Seismic Retrofit Reimbursement Program

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:** The City of Napa Community Redevelopment Agency 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 discussions with several property owners are likely to result in other seismic projects being underway during 2000.

### Napa County

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

**Mitigation Program Type:** Other

**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:**

**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 2003 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted /Plancheck /Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

### Newport Beach

Yes	3	124	Yes	Yes		125			0	0	1	1			127
-----	---	-----	-----	-----	--	-----	--	--	---	---	---	---	--	--	-----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**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									
-----	---	---	-----	-----	--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening Program

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** Based on Los Angeles, Division 88

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

### Norwalk

Yes	0	11	Yes	Yes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	11
-----	---	----	-----	-----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	----

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**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	Yes	1										
-----	---	---	----	-----	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

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

### Oakland

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

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

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** Bearing wall buildings: Mandatory standard - bolts plus tie roof and floors to exterior walls, brace parapets, remove or fix other exterior falling hazards; Voluntary standard - UCBC Appendix Chapter 1; Note - buildings complying with the mandatory standards only will remain on the list of potentially hazardous URM buildings until they are upgraded to comply with the voluntary standard. Frame structures with URM infill walls: Mandatory standard - Parapet plus brace parapets and remove or fix other exterior falling hazards. An earlier program notified owners.

**Progress and Remarks:** 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.

**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.

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2003 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted /Plancheck /Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

### Ojai

Yes	0	29	Yes			16	2		3					8	
-----	---	----	-----	--	--	----	---	--	---	--	--	--	--	---	--

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** Yes-type not reported

**Progress and Remarks:** A 1990 program notified owners.

### Ontario

Yes	42	13	No	Yes	2	0	1	0	0	1		0	0	48	
-----	----	----	----	-----	---	---	---	---	---	---	--	---	---	----	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:** The inventory of building is being rechecked and staff is drafting an ordinance for Voluntary Strengthening using the 1997 UCBC. The city building department is planning to propose a URM program to city council in the summer of 1995.

### Orange

Yes	43	35	Yes		29	29		49						49	78
-----	----	----	-----	--	----	----	--	----	--	--	--	--	--	----	----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Notices to Owners

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** URM ordinance 7-92

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Orange County

Yes	0	4	Yes	Yes	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
-----	---	---	-----	-----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	--

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** Division 88 City of Lost Angeles code

**Progress and Remarks:** 2 buildings to be sold, 2 buildings to be demolished, 3 buildings sold and no longer within Orange County jurisdiction. Of the 2 in partial compliance, 1 is being reinvestigated and 1 is partial demolition. Of the 4 with reduced occupancy, they are all sold. 3 additional fire stations previously owned are now owned by Orange County Fire Authority.

### Orinda

Yes	0	0	N/A												
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**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 mandatory Strengthening program or possibly a voluntary one.

### Oxnard

Yes	6	47	Yes	Yes	4		1F							49	Yes
-----	---	----	-----	-----	---	--	----	--	--	--	--	--	--	----	-----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Notification Only

**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.

Jurisdiction			Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2003 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted /Planches /Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Identified

**Mc Grove**

8	3	Yes	Yes	1	3						0		7	11
---	---	-----	-----	---	---	--	--	--	--	--	---	--	---	----

**Program Type:** Voluntary Strengthening, including all pre-1976 occupancy buildings

**Notes and Remarks:**

**Ca**

0	0	N/A												220
---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-----

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2003 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted /Plancheck /Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

### Palos Verdes Estates

Yes	0	2	Yes	Yes	2										2
-----	---	---	-----	-----	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** SSC Model Ordinance

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Paramount

Yes	0	7	Yes	Yes	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
-----	---	---	-----	-----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** Chapter 96 County of Los Angeles

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

### Pasadena

Yes	131	628	Yes	Yes	0	665	6	9	8	0	31	1	0	39	759
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---	-----	---	---	---	---	----	---	---	----	-----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Other

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** UCBC 1994 Edition

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

### Paso Robles

Yes	0	58	Yes		4	12	0	0	30	0	0	0	0	10	58
-----	---	----	-----	--	---	----	---	---	----	---	---	---	---	----	----

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Perris

Yes	1	16	Yes	Yes	0	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	
-----	---	----	-----	-----	---	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	--

**Mitigation Program Type:** Notification Only

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** Uniform Codes

**Progress and Remarks:** C.MC.#1069 Sec. 3

### Petaluma

Yes	32	62	Yes	Yes	48	18	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	27	98
-----	----	----	-----	-----	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Partial Strengthening—bolts only

**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 as of 12/11/89

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2003 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted /Plancheck /Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

### Pico Rivera

Yes	0	7	Yes	Yes	7	7									7
-----	---	---	-----	-----	---	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** UCBC Appendix Chapter 1, 1987 Edition

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Piedmont

Yes	0	0	N/A												
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Pinole

Yes	0	6	No	Yes	2					1	2			1* see	1
-----	---	---	----	-----	---	--	--	--	--	---	---	--	--	--------	---

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**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 Ordinance for adoption by the city council and will provide for mandatory Strengthening program. Owners "voluntarily notified" in 2002.

### Pismo Beach

Yes	0	39	Yes	Yes	14	14			0		1			24	39
-----	---	----	-----	-----	----	----	--	--	---	--	---	--	--	----	----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** UCBC Appendix Chapter 1

**Progress and Remarks:** Deadlines for Strengthening extended to July 11, 1995. The mitigation program was amended in early 1996 from a Mandatory to a Notification only system.

### Pittsburg

Yes	20	15	Yes								3				35
-----	----	----	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--	----

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Placentia

Yes	0	16	Yes	Yes	6	3		1			1			5	6
-----	---	----	-----	-----	---	---	--	---	--	--	---	--	--	---	---

**Mitigation Program Type:** Voluntary Strengthening, owner notification not specified. Seismic retrofit is mandatory upon change in use, application for any building permit or use permit, or development plan.

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** None

**Progress and Remarks:** City is requesting additional commercial rehabilitation loan funds.

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2003 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted /Plancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

### Pleasant Hill

Yes	0	0	N/A												
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Pleasanton

Yes	0	38	Yes		34	(34)	2 Both 80%	0	0	0	2		(36)	0	38
-----	---	----	-----	--	----	------	------------	---	---	---	---	--	------	---	----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**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.

### Point Arena

No			No												
----	--	--	----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:** Indicated inventory started but not completed in 1992 survey. No activity reported since.

### Pomona

Yes	2	90	Yes	Yes						1		1		90	
-----	---	----	-----	-----	--	--	--	--	--	---	--	---	--	----	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**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:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Portola Valley

Yes	0	0	N/A												
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**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 2003 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted /Plancheck /Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

### Poway

Yes	0	0	N/A												
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**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

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** 1982 Edition of Division 88 Los Angeles City Code, State Historical Building Code as modified

**Progress and Remarks:** A pamphlet was developed explaining various options and incentives, encourages Mills Act.

### Rancho Mirage

Yes	0	0	N/A												
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Rancho Palos Verdes

Yes	0	0	N/A												
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Redlands

Yes	11	75	Yes	Yes	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	70	
-----	----	----	-----	-----	---	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	--

**Mitigation Program Type:** Notices to Owners

**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	Yes	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
-----	---	----	-----	-----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**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 2003 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted /Plancheck /Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

### Redwood City

Yes	4	23	Yes	Yes	6	14	2	0	0	2	2	0		2	27
-----	---	----	-----	-----	---	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	--	---	----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Voluntary Strengthening

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** Similar to UCBC Appendix Chapter 1

**Progress and Remarks:** City encourages Mills Act agreements for historical buildings to preserve facades. \* City said that they were not responsible for enforcing the “warning placards”.

### Rialto

Yes	0	19	Yes	Yes	4	4	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	8	19
-----	---	----	-----	-----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** None

**Progress and Remarks:** Adoption of UCBC Appendix Chapter 1 considered in 1992.

### Richmond

Yes	0	70	Yes		4	4	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	
-----	---	----	-----	--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Ridgecrest

Yes	0	0	N/A												
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Rio Dell

Yes	0	0	N/A												
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:** No URM buildings have been identified. All structures in the city are wood frame construction.

### Rio Vista

Yes		10	No												
-----	--	----	----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**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 2003 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted /Plancheck /Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

### Riverside

Yes	92	143	Yes	Yes	Unkn	235									
-----	----	-----	-----	-----	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	-----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Voluntary Strengthening

**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	Yes	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4
-----	---	---	-----	-----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

**Mitigation Program Type:** Notices to owners. Retrofit plans required in 180 days.

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** None

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Rohnert Park

Yes	0	0	N/A												
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Rolling Hills

Yes	0	0	N/A												
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Rolling Hills Estates

Yes	0	0	N/A												
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Rosemead

Yes	0	6	Yes	Yes		3					1		3	1	5
-----	---	---	-----	-----	--	---	--	--	--	--	---	--	---	---	---

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

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

**Progress and Remarks:**

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2003 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted /Plancheck /Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

### Ross

Yes	0	1	Yes	Yes											
-----	---	---	-----	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** UCBC Appendix Chapter 1

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Saint Helena

Yes	32	1	Yes	Yes	17	17	3	0	5					8	All
-----	----	---	-----	-----	----	----	---	---	---	--	--	--	--	---	-----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory seismic retrofit ordinance adopted June 1998

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

**Progress and Remarks:** St. Helena's ordinance requires mandatory seismic retrofitting within 10 years of ordinance 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 Register 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		37	6				7	4		1	55
-----	---	----	-----	-----	--	----	---	--	--	--	---	---	--	---	----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**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	20									1	21
-----	---	----	-----	-----	----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**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	0	6
----	---	---	----	--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### San Bernardino

Yes	0	136	Yes	Yes	11	Un-known	2	0	0	7	9	0	Un-known	107	136
-----	---	-----	-----	-----	----	----------	---	---	---	---	---	---	----------	-----	-----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** UCBC Appendix Chapter 1, 1991 edition.

**Progress and Remarks:** 1990 ordinance required seismic hazard evaluations. The 1993 Retrofit Ordinance requires retrofits within 4 to 11 years starting on April 15, 1994. 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 compliance with the UCBC Code are in compliance 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 building.

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)												
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2003 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted /Plancheck /Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified	

### San Bernardino County

Yes	0	21	Yes												
-----	---	----	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:** Notices to Owners

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** None

**Progress and Remarks:**

### San Bruno

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

**Mitigation Program Type:** Voluntary Strengthening

**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	8			1			1	2			12
-----	---	----	-----	-----	---	--	--	---	--	--	---	---	--	--	----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Voluntary Strengthening

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** Division 88 Los Angeles City Code 1985 Edition, UCBC Appendix Chapter 1 is also allowed on a case by case basis.

**Progress and Remarks:** Three (3) remaining. Of the three, two are vacated and awaiting demolition. We issued a building permit for Strengthening per UCBC, Appendix Chapter 1, for the last building.

### San Clemente

Yes	0	2	No									2			2
-----	---	---	----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	---

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### San Diego

No			Yes												
----	--	--	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:** Parapet Strengthening

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:** Indicated inventory started prior to 1992 survey with no reports since. San Diego was in Seismic Zone 3 at the time of the enactment of the URM Law and is not strictly bound to comply with the law. Since then, San Diego's Seismic Zone has been revised to 4. They estimate they have 731 URM buildings.

### San Diego County

Yes	25	21	Yes		8	11	0	2	0	0	2	1	Unkn	22	38
-----	----	----	-----	--	---	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	------	----	----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** February 1990 Edition SSC Model Ordinance

**Progress and Remarks:** Now 4 URMs are incorporated in Solana Beach, which replied to 1995 survey.

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2003 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted /Plancheck /Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

### San Dimas

Yes	5	4	No	Yes	1					1	2			5	0
-----	---	---	----	-----	---	--	--	--	--	---	---	--	--	---	---

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### San Fernando

Yes	0	12	Yes			11		1							3
-----	---	----	-----	--	--	----	--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	---

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** 1985 Revised Edition of Division 88 City of Los Angeles Code with ABK Modifications

**Progress and Remarks:** Wall anchors and parapet repairs were required after the 1971 Sylmar Earthquake.

### San Francisco

Yes	516	1498	Yes	Yes		1134	337	64	116	0	58	0	Un-known	245	2014
-----	-----	------	-----	-----	--	------	-----	----	-----	---	----	---	----------	-----	------

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening for Bearing Wall Buildings per Earthquake Hazard Reduction Ordinance 225-92, which was incorporated as Chapters 14 and 15 of the 1992 San Francisco Building Code.

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** The URM building ordinance is based on the 1991 UCBC Appendix chapter 1 with modifications. The most significant change is the allowance of a seismic upgrade to "Bolts Plus" level for certain types of buildings: 1) Bolts-Plus Level; 2) Special Procedure (UCBC Appendix Chapter 1); 3) General Procedure (UCBC Appendix Chapter 1); 4) Retrofit for Essential & Hazardous Facilities; 5) Retrofit for Qualified Historical Buildings; 6) URM Buildings 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 ratio diaphragm check and an in-plane/shear check of the wall. There are eight requirements specified in Section 1509(b) exception 1 that must be satisfied before a building may be retrofitted to a "Bolts-Plus" level of upgrade. Qualified Historical Buildings may be upgraded to provisions of the State Historical Building Code. Essential and Hazardous Buildings: For these buildings, a modified form of General Procedure is used (I=1.25; V=1.25 X 1991 UBC force level). URMs requiring Section 104(f) upgrade are equal to 75% of the 1991 UBC level of design force.

**Progress and Remarks:** The URM retrofit program started on February 15, 1993. Buildings with risk level 1 are required to be retrofitted in 3 1/2 years from that date. Other buildings with risk levels 2, 3 and 4 respectively have 5, 11 and 13 years from February 15, 1993, to complete their hazard mitigation programs levels of upgrade. The Building Inspection Commission has allocated \$200,000 in next year's budget to conduct inventories of all buildings of frames with infill walls. A 1990 program notified owners of bearing wall buildings. ...1891 URM Bearing Wall, 176 URM nonbearing walls identified so far. General obligation bond program.

### San Gabriel

Yes	0	63	Yes												
-----	---	----	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

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

**Progress and Remarks:**

### San Jacinto

Yes	0	17	Yes	Yes	1		14				2				
-----	---	----	-----	-----	---	--	----	--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### San Joaquin County

Yes	0	0	N/A												
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**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 2003 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted /Plancheck /Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

### San Jose

Yes	74	72	Yes	Yes	103	31					12				146
-----	----	----	-----	-----	-----	----	--	--	--	--	----	--	--	--	-----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening.

**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 building or demolition. Warehouses were exempt. Program details are as follows: 103 Buildings retrofitted, 12 buildings demolished, 28 buildings vacant pending retrofit, 3 building exempt 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:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### San Juan Capistrano

Yes	16	3	Yes	Yes	19	19									19
-----	----	---	-----	-----	----	----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Voluntary Strengthening

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** None

**Progress and Remarks:**

### San Leandro

Yes	1	39	Yes	Yes	0	25	2	5	0	0	5*	3	0	0	40
-----	---	----	-----	-----	---	----	---	---	---	---	----	---	---	---	----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**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 building owners with retrofit costs.

\* Five buildings were demolished prior to the 2/93 program date.

### San Luis Obispo

Yes	37	89	Yes	Yes	15	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

**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 strengthened 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.

### San Luis Obispo County

Yes	2	27	Yes	Yes	32	0	0	2	2	4	1	1	0	0	29
-----	---	----	-----	-----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**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 2003 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted /Plancheck /Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified	

### San Marcos

Yes	0	0	N/A												
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**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	Yes	13										
-----	---	----	-----	-----	----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:** Notices to Owners, required engineering inspection, written report, City reserves right to impose standards.

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** SSC 1987 Model Ordinance

**Progress and Remarks:** Program consists of a resolution

### San Mateo

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

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** 1987 Edition SSC Model Ordinance

**Progress and Remarks:** Category II buildings are not yet required to submit. All category I buildings have achieved some level of compliance. Provides Grants and Loans.

### San Mateo County

Yes	4	3	Yes	Yes	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
-----	---	---	-----	-----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	--

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

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** 1985 Edition of Division 88, 1973 UBC for non bearing wall URM buildings, State Historical Building Code

**Progress and Remarks:** Program does not include an ordinance, recommends Strengthening within three years otherwise a mandatory Strengthening ordinance will be considered.

### San Pablo

No	0	60	Yes	Yes											60
----	---	----	-----	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	----

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** 1998 CA Code for 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."

### San Rafael

Yes	0	44	Yes	Yes		44									44
-----	---	----	-----	-----	--	----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Partial Mandatory Strengthening

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** 1990 Edition of the SSC Model Ordinance, partial compliance with the UCBC

**Progress and Remarks:** A 1990 ordinance was voluntary Strengthening.

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2003 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted /Plancheck /Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

### San Ramon

Yes	0	0	N/A												
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Sand City

Yes	0	0	N/A												
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Santa Ana

Yes	Unkn	209	Yes	Yes	86	59*	2	1	0	59	61		0		209
-----	------	-----	-----	-----	----	-----	---	---	---	----	----	--	---	--	-----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** Similar to Division 88, 1982 Edition Los Angeles City Code

**Progress and Remarks:** City used Marks Bond Act funds for historical buildings.\* Included in #2, Based upon our 1980 Ordinance. 59 Buildings have reduced occupancy and are in substantial compliance with the program

### Santa Barbara

Yes	80	183	Yes	Yes	255	255	0	0	0		13			1	256
-----	----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---	---	---	--	----	--	--	---	-----

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

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** UCBC Appendix Chapter 1

**Progress and Remarks:** Court action for non-compliance of (1) one structure.

### Santa Barbara County

Yes	2	21	Yes	Yes	22	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
-----	---	----	-----	-----	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening. Mitigation required based on occupant load and time frame established in UCBC.

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** UCBC

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

### 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.

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

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

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2003 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted /Plancheck /Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

### Santa Clara County

Yes	2	58	Yes	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.

**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	Yes	0	4									4
-----	---	---	-----	-----	---	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

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

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Santa Cruz

Yes	24	27	Yes												
-----	----	----	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** 1987 UCBC Appendix Chapter 1, 1970 UBC for non-URM buildings for the repair ordinance. These standards do not apply to undamaged URM buildings.

**Progress and Remarks:** Loma Prieta Earthquake damage prompted passage of two ordinances, a 1987 hazard reduction ordinance failed to pass.....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:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Santa Fe Springs

Yes	0	0	N/A												
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Santa Maria

Yes	0	25	Yes	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.

**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:**

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URM)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2003 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted /Planchek Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2003 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted /Plancheck /Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

### Seal Beach

Yes	0	4 (6)	No	Yes	2	2	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	
-----	---	-------	----	-----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	--

**Mitigation Program Type:** None.

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Seaside

Yes	0	25	Yes												
-----	---	----	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:** Voluntary Strengthening, Posting

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** Similar to the 1987 SSC Model Ordinance

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Sebastopol

Yes	1	27	Policy	Yes		27	0					1		0	28
-----	---	----	--------	-----	--	----	---	--	--	--	--	---	--	---	----

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

**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

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** None

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Sierra Madre

Yes	0	27	Yes	Yes	25						2				27
-----	---	----	-----	-----	----	--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--	----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**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. All 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:**

**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 2003 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted /Plancheck /Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

### Simi Valley

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

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** 1987 SSC Model Ordinance

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Solano County

Yes	0	2	Yes		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	
-----	---	---	-----	--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	--

**Mitigation Program Type:** Notification Only

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** None

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Soledad

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

**Mitigation Program Type:** Voluntary Strengthening

**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

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** None

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Sonoma

Yes	28	28	Yes	Yes	16	26	5	3	1	1	4	0	0	0	56
-----	----	----	-----	-----	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** Similar to the Santa Rosa Program or UCBC Appendix Chapter 1, or SHBC 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	7	314	4	0	0	0	0	2	0	301	314
-----	----	-----	-----	-----	---	-----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----	-----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Notices to Owners

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** UCBC Appendix Chapter 1

**Progress and Remarks:** Draft ordinance being reviewed.

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2003 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted /Plancheck /Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

### South El Monte

Yes	0	0	N/A												
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### South Gate

Yes	0	47	Yes	Yes	42	42	0	0	0	0	6	2	3		47
-----	---	----	-----	-----	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	--	----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**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

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

**Progress and Remarks:**

### South San Francisco

Yes	0	14	Yes	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.

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** UCBC Appendix Chapter 1

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Stanton

Yes	0	0	N/A												
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Suisun City

Yes	0	19	Yes												19
-----	---	----	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Notices to Owners

**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 2003 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted /Plancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

### 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.

**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.

### Taft

Yes	0	42	No									2	2	40	
-----	---	----	----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	---	----	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Tehachapi

Yes	0	9	No												
-----	---	---	----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Temple City

Yes	0	6	Yes												
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

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

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Thousand Oaks

Yes	0	0	N/A												
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Tiburon

Yes	0	1	No	Yes	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
-----	---	---	----	-----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**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 2003 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted /Plancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

### Torrance

Yes	0	50	Yes	Yes	0	43	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	50
-----	---	----	-----	-----	---	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

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

**Progress and Remarks:** City funded a subsidy to pay for the engineering analysis at \$0.50/Sq. Ft. Formed \$679,000 assessment district for owners who choose to join.

### Tustin

Yes	0	8	Yes	Yes		8									
-----	---	---	-----	-----	--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** 1990 SSC Model Ordinance

**Progress and Remarks:** Community Development Block Grants for up to \$2000 provided for engineering costs.

### Twentynine Palms

Yes	0	27	Yes	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.

**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.

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** State Historical Building Code

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

### Union City

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

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**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 2003 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted /Plancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

### Upland

Yes	0	58	Yes	Yes	24	24	0	0	0	0	Unkn	0	Unkn	34	58
-----	---	----	-----	-----	----	----	---	---	---	---	------	---	------	----	----

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

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** Latest Edition of Division 88 of the Los Angeles City Code, the 1973 UBC for non-URM buildings, and City Ordinance #1470 January 1990.

**Progress and Remarks:** \$2 million Commercial Rehabilitation Loan Program - loans at market rate, architectural engineering and loan packaging.....58 URM, Pre-1935 with 100 + Occupants and 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

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** None

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

### Vallejo

Yes	8	56	Yes		16	16		9	25					20	
-----	---	----	-----	--	----	----	--	---	----	--	--	--	--	----	--

**Mitigation Program Type:** Voluntary Strengthening

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** Similar to the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1

**Progress and Remarks:** \$40,000 per building maximum CDBG loan. 19 buildings removed from list.

### Ventura

Yes	11	134	Yes	Yes	3	139					4			3	145
-----	----	-----	-----	-----	---	-----	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	---	-----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory parapet Strengthening. Voluntary Strengthening to UCBC Seismic Zone 2B Compliance Recommended by City.

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** UCBC

**Progress and Remarks:** Environmental Impact Study done. 2 ordinances adopted and 1 policy resolution. Notice of non-compliance noted on deed to property.

### Ventura County

Yes	0	19	Yes		8	8					1	7		3	19
-----	---	----	-----	--	---	---	--	--	--	--	---	---	--	---	----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** February 1990 SSC Model Ordinance

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Vernon

Yes	0	105	Yes		8	Ordin	3	0	0	0	35	2	63	59	79
-----	---	-----	-----	--	---	-------	---	---	---	---	----	---	----	----	----

**Mitigation Program Type:** See attached Ordinance 1059

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** Appendix Chapter One of UCBC

**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.

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2003 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted /Plancheck /Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

### Victorville

Yes	0	37	Yes	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.

**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).

### Villa Park

Yes	0	0	N/A												
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Vista

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

**Mitigation Program Type:** Voluntary Strengthening

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** None reported

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Walnut

Yes	0	0	N/A												
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Walnut Creek

Yes	0	18	Yes	Yes	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
-----	---	----	-----	-----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**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	1	1	0	9	0
-----	---	----	-----	-----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

**Mitigation Program Type:** Notices to Owners

**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.

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URM's)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URM's	Number of Non-Historic URM's	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 2003 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted /Plancheck /Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

### Watsonville

Yes	0	60	Yes		16	0	2	0	1	0	4	0	0	27	
-----	---	----	-----	--	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** Adopted a Voluntary and Notification Only System (2 and 3) according to the 1997 Survey response.

**Progress and Remarks:** Inventory started, but not completed or reported to the Commission.

### West Covina

Yes	0	1	Yes	Yes	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
-----	---	---	-----	-----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

**Mitigation Program Type:** Notice to Owner, engineer's report

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** Not indicated

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

### West Hollywood

Yes	20	81	Yes												
-----	----	----	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** 1988 Edition of Chapter 96 of the Los Angeles County Code as modified, also accepts the 1984 ABK Methodology Report

**Progress and Remarks:** Amended the rent control program to allow rent increases, \$7100 per building Community Development Block Grant funds, housing rehabilitation program of \$10,000 per building, reduction or waiver of fees, zoning incentives.

### Westlake Village

Yes	0	0	N/A												
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Westminster

Yes	0	0	N/A												
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Westmorland

Yes	0	2	Yes												
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** 1988 Edition of 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 2003 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted /Plancheck /Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

### Whittier

Yes	0	12	Yes	Yes		10					2				12
-----	---	----	-----	-----	--	----	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--	----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening.

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** Draft Model Ordinance (Division 88)

**Progress and Remarks:** Notices served 5/92.

### Willits

Yes	2	7	Yes		1							1		5	7
-----	---	---	-----	--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--	---	---

**Mitigation Program Type:** Engineer's report, notices to owners, posting of buildings.

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Woodside

Yes	0	0	N/A												
-----	---	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:**

**Technical Mitigation Standards:**

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Yorba Linda

Yes	0	2	Yes	Yes	2										
-----	---	---	-----	-----	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening analysis required by structural engineer.

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** Similar to 1982 Edition of Division 88

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Yountville

Yes	5	5	Yes	Yes	2		4							4	10
-----	---	---	-----	-----	---	--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Notices to Owners

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** None

**Progress and Remarks:**

### Yucaipa

Yes	0	15	Yes	Yes		15	2	0	0	0	0	8	7	15	15
-----	---	----	-----	-----	--	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	----

**Mitigation Program Type:** Mandatory Strengthening requiring evaluations by June 1994

**Technical Mitigation Standards:** None

**Progress and Remarks:** Draft ordinance proposes adoption of UCBC Appendix Chapter 1 and a voluntary Strengthening plan. Ordinance adopted in 1992, requires mandatory Strengthening. They are now considering revising it to a voluntary program. 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-The URM Law (Full Text)**

### **Chapter 12.2 Building Earthquake Safety** (Chapter 12.2 was added by Stats. 1986, c.250, § 2.)

#### **§ 8875. Definitions**

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

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

#### **§ 8875.1**

Establishment of program; identification of potentially hazardous buildings; advisory report.

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

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

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

#### **§ 8875.2 Local building departments; participation in mitigation programs; reports.**

Local building departments shall do all of the following:

- (a) Identify all potentially hazardous buildings within their respective jurisdiction on or before

January 1, 1990. This identification shall include current building use and daily occupancy load. In regard to identifying and inventorying the buildings, the local building departments may establish a schedule of fees to recover the costs of identifying potentially hazardous buildings and carrying out this chapter.

- (b) Establish a mitigation program for potentially hazardous buildings to include notification to the legal owner that the building is considered to be one of a general type of structure that historically has exhibited little resistance to earthquake motion. The mitigation program may include the adoption by ordinance of a hazardous buildings program, measures to strengthen buildings, measures to change the use to acceptable occupancy levels or to demolish the building, tax incentives available for seismic rehabilitation, low-cost seismic rehabilitation loans available under Division 32 (commencing with Section 5500) of the Health and Safety Code, application of structural standards necessary to provide for life safety above current code requirements, and other incentives to repair the buildings which are available from federal, state, and local programs. Compliance with an adopted hazardous buildings ordinance or mitigation program shall be the responsibility of building owners.

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

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

#### **§ 8875.3 Local jurisdictions; immunity from liability**

Local jurisdictions undertaking inventories and providing structural evaluations of potentially hazardous buildings pursuant to this chapter shall have the same immunity from liability for action or inaction taken pursuant of this chapter as is provide 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 or Part 3 of Division 13 of the Health and Safety Code.

#### **§ 8875.4 Annual report**

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

**§ 8875.5 Coordination of responsibilities**

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

**§ 8875.6**

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

On and after January 1, 1993, the transferor, or his or her agent, of any unreinforced masonry building with wood frame floors or roofs, built before January 1, 1975, which is located within any county or city 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) Within three months of the effective date of the act amending this section, enacted at the 1991-92 Regular Session, any 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 5x7 the following statement, printed in not less than 30-point bold type:

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

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

**§ 8875.9**

Section 8875.8 shall not apply to unreinforced masonry construction if the walls are non-load bearing with steel or concrete frame.

**§ 8875.95**

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