

**GUIDANCE
FOR
CALIFORNIA
ACCIDENTAL RELEASE PREVENTION (CalARP) PROGRAM
SEISMIC ASSESSMENTS**

Prepared for the

**ADMINISTERING AGENCY (AA) SUBCOMMITTEE
REGION I LOCAL EMERGENCY PLANNING COMMITTEE (LEPC)**

Prepared by the

CalARP PROGRAM SEISMIC GUIDANCE COMMITTEE

December 2013

Approved by Region I LEPC on March 12, 2014

CalARP PROGRAM SEISMIC GUIDANCE COMMITTEE

CONSULTANTS

Robert Bachman	R. E. Bachman, Consulting Structural Engineer– Committee Chair
Brian Hopper	Hopper Engineering Associates
Gayle Johnson	Simpson Gumpertz & Heger
Guzhao Li	MMI Engineering, Inc.
Krishna Nand	Environmental Management Professionals
Kenneth Saunders	Argos Engineers, Inc. – Secretary
Paul Summers	MMI Engineering, Inc.
Darius Vitkus	Gekko Engineering, Inc.
Derrick Watkins	Tobolski Watkins Engineering, Inc.
Curtis Yokoyama	Fluor Enterprises, Inc.
Farzin Zareian	University of California - Irvine

INDUSTRY REPRESENTATIVES

Paul Beswick	Metropolitan Water District of Southern California - LEPC AA Member
Vincent Borov	Chevron ETC. – San Ramon
Winston Chai	Metropolitan Water District of Southern California
Ronald Orantes	Los Angeles Department of Water and Power
Andrew Mitchell	Chevron/Enova
Rocco Serrato	Chevron - El Segundo

AGENCY REPRESENTATIVES

Richard Clark	Los Angeles County Fire Department
Mashid Harrell	Los Angeles County Fire Department
Richard Kallman	Santa Fe Springs Fire Department
Jerrick Torres	City of Vernon - Health & Environmental Control Department

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
Title Page	i
Guidance Committee Members	ii
Table of Contents	iii
1.0 Introduction	1
2.0 Determination of Seismic Hazards	6
3.0 Walkdown Considerations	11
4.0 Evaluation of Ground Supported Building and Nonbuilding Structures	12
5.0 Evaluation of Equipment and Nonstructural Components	15
6.0 Evaluation of Ground Supported Storage Tanks	16
7.0 Evaluation of Piping Systems	21
8.0 Strengthening Criteria	25
9.0 Recommended Report Contents	27
10.0 References	31
Table 1 Ductility-Based Reduction Factors (Q) for Existing Structures and Systems	34
Figure 1 Former Standard Ductile Moment Connection Detail	40
Attachment A Recommended Geotechnical Report Contents	41
Attachment B Walkdown Forms for Equipment and Piping	43

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The objective of a California Accidental Release Prevention (CalARP) Program seismic assessment is to provide reasonable assurance that a release of Regulated Substances (RS) as listed in California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 19 Division 2 Chapter 4.5 (Reference 1) having offsite consequences (caused by a loss of containment or pressure boundary integrity) would not occur as a result of an earthquake. Since 1998, the seismic assessment study has been part of the mandated State's CalARP program. The purpose of this document is to provide guidance regarding criteria to be used in such assessments. This guidance document is an update of the CalARP seismic document published in September of 2009 (Reference 2). The guidance provided is applicable to structural systems and components whose failure could result in the release of sufficient quantities of RS to be of concern.

The guidance given in this document provides for a deterministic evaluation of structural systems and components. This deterministic evaluation should be performed considering an earthquake which has a low probability of occurrence (code Design Earthquake level as defined in ASCE/SEI 7-10 (Reference 4)). The seismic capacity of structures and components to withstand this level of earthquake should be calculated using realistic criteria and assumptions.

An acceptable alternate approach is to perform a probabilistic risk assessment which provides estimates and insights on the relative risks and vulnerabilities of different systems and components from the impact of an earthquake. These risks should be compatible with accepted practices for similar civil and industrial facilities. When a probabilistic risk assessment approach is planned, the owner/operator should consult with the local Authority(ies) Having Jurisdiction (AHJ) to describe why this approach is being planned and explain differences between this approach and the deterministic method.

The AHJ is usually State Unified Program Agencies (UPAs), also referred to as Administering Agencies (AA), that enforce CalARP program regulations; and may also include city or county Building & Safety Departments that approve plans and issue permits for renovation and/or construction/installation of structural systems/components.

The CalARP regulation states in Section 2760.2 (b): "The owner or operator shall work closely with AAs in deciding which PHA [Process Hazard Analysis] methodology is best suited to determine the hazards of the process being analyzed." Thus, prior to the beginning of any seismic assessment, the owner/operator needs to consult closely with the AHJ to obtain mutual understanding and agreement on the scope of the assessment, the general approach proposed by the Responsible Engineer (see Section 1.5) and the schedule for the assessment.

1.1 Limitations – Conformance to this document does not guarantee or assure that a RS release will not occur in the event of strong earthquake ground motions. Rather, the guidance provided is intended to reduce the likelihood of release of RS.

1.2 Evaluation Scope – The owner/operator, in consultation with the AHJ and Responsible Engineer (see Section 1.5), should always identify the systems to be evaluated in accordance with this guidance. The systems are expected to fall into three categories. These are:

- 1) Covered processes as defined by CalARP Program regulations.
- 2) Adjacent facilities whose structural failure or excessive displacement could result in the significant release of RS.
- 3) Onsite utility systems and emergency systems which would be required to operate following an earthquake for emergency reaction or to maintain the facility in a safe condition, (e.g., emergency power, leak detectors, pressure relief valves, battery racks, release treatment systems including scrubbers or water diffusers, firewater pumps and their fuel tanks, cooling water, room ventilation, etc.).

1.3 Performance Criteria – In order to achieve the overall objective of preventing releases of RS, individual equipment items, structures, and systems (e.g., power, water, etc.) may need to achieve varied performance criteria. These criteria may include one or more of the following:

- 1) Maintain structural integrity
- 2) Maintain position
- 3) Maintain containment of material
- 4) Function immediately following an earthquake

Note that an owner/operator may choose to set more stringent performance requirements dealing with continued function of the facilities both during and after an earthquake. These are individual business decisions and are not required for compliance with the CalARP Program.

From January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2013, all new facilities in California should have been designed in accordance with the 2007 California Building Code (CBC) which references the 2006 International Building Code (IBC) seismic requirements or the 2010 CBC which references the 2009 IBC. Both the 2006 IBC and the 2009 IBC in turn reference American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) Standard ASCE/SEI 7-05 for their seismic load provisions. Starting on January 1, 2014, all new facilities in California are to be designed in accordance with the 2013 CBC (Reference 22) which references the 2012 IBC (Reference 19) seismic requirements. The 2012 IBC in turn references American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) Standard ASCE/SEI 7-10 (Reference 4) for its seismic load provisions. It is the consensus of this Committee that RS systems and components designed and properly constructed in accordance with the 1997 UBC (Reference 3) or ASCE/SEI 7-05 (or later) provisions provide reasonable assurance of withstanding design/evaluation basis earthquake effects without either structural failure or a release of RS having offsite consequences. It is also the consensus of this Committee that RS systems and components that were designed and constructed in

accordance with the 1988, 1991 or 1994 UBC also provide reasonable assurance of withstanding design/evaluation basis earthquake effects without either structural failure or a release of RS (caused by a loss of containment or pressure boundary integrity) provided that the facility in which the systems and components are contained is not located in the near field of an active earthquake fault or on a soft soil site. It should be noted that design earthquake terminology changed between the UBC and ASCE/SEI 7-05 and between ASCE/SEI 7-05 and ASCE/SEI 7-10. The design earthquake ground motion level in the UBC is called the “design basis earthquake” while in ASCE/SEI 7-05 and ASCE/SEI 7-10, it is called “design earthquake” (DE). Also, the maximum earthquake ground motion considered in ASCE/SEI 7-05 was called the “Maximum Considered Earthquake” (MCE) while the maximum earthquake ground motion considered in ASCE/SEI 7-10 is called the “Risk-Targeted Maximum Considered Earthquake” (MCE_R).

State and national policies have generally established performance objectives for new facilities that are more restrictive than those for existing facilities. This guidance document recognizes this to be appropriate. However, it should be recognized that any regular inspection and repair of systems containing RS should make them significantly safer than similar systems for which these steps are not taken.

1.4 Extent of Seismic Evaluations Required – All equipment and components identified in Section 1.2 are subject to the seismic assessment guidelines of this document. However, the extent of these evaluations may be limited or expanded depending on the situation. Each owner/operator will have different conditions at their facility and should consult with the AHJ to determine which of the following subsections apply to their facility.

1.4.1 Existing Facilities Which Have Not Had Previous CalARP Seismic Assessments

1) Constructed to 1985 UBC and Earlier

There is considerable uncertainty about the capacity of nonbuilding structures and nonstructural components designed and constructed prior to the 1988 UBC. This is because there were no specific seismic code requirements for nonbuilding structures and nonstructural components in heavy industrial applications and they were rarely reviewed and inspected by building departments. Starting with the 1988 UBC, seismic code requirements were provided and designs were much more consistent. Therefore, pre-1988 UBC nonbuilding structure and nonstructural component designs should always be considered suspect and subject to CalARP type evaluations if they are in the evaluation scope (Section 1.2).

2) Constructed to 1988 UBC and Later

Existing facilities which are subject to the CalARP requirements and which were permitted for construction in California in accordance with the 1988 or later version of the UBC may generally be deemed to meet the intent of the requirements of Section 4 of this Guidance, provided the following conditions are met and documented:

- a. The near field requirements of either ASCE/SEI 7-05, ASCE/SEI 7-10 or the 1997 UBC, either using the near field maps or a site-specific spectrum, are satisfied or the facility is not located in the near field zone (i.e., where per ASCE/SEI 7-05 S_S is not greater than 1.5 and S_1 is not greater than 0.6 or per the 1997 UBC the facility is not within 15 km of an active fault).
- b. The soft soil site conditions of ASCE/SEI 7-05 or the 1997 UBC were considered in the design of the facility or the facility is not located on a soft soil site.
- c. A walkdown in accordance with Section 3 reveals adequate lateral force resisting systems.

The recommended contents of the initial report are given in Section 9.1.

1.4.2 New Facilities Submitted for Permit After December 2013 That Are Subject to CalARP Program Requirements – Design and construction of new facilities containing RS must satisfy the seismic provisions of the 2007 California Building Code (ASCE/SEI 7-05). In general, such facilities are deemed to satisfy the analytical evaluation requirements of the guidance document. However, a walkdown should always be performed in accordance with Section 3 after construction has been completed. The recommended contents of the initial report are given in Section 9.1.

1.4.3 Facility Revalidation With a Previous CalARP Seismic Assessment – The CalARP program requires that facilities, which are subject to the CalARP requirements, have their process hazard analysis updated and revalidated at least every five years. The extent of a seismic assessment revalidation depends on many factors that need to be coordinated and agreed to by the AHJ. If deemed appropriate by the Responsible Engineer (see Section 1.5), any portion of the previous assessment may be used for the current assessment. However, any revalidation should include the performance of a walkdown in accordance with Section 3 of this document. As part of the revalidation process the equipment population being assessed should be discussed with the process engineer responsible for defining the scope of the assessment. It is possible that process conditions have changed since the initial screening of equipment having offsite consequences was first performed. The recommended contents of the revalidation report are given in Section 9.2.

1.4.4 Occurrence of Conditions That Would Trigger an Assessment Within the Revalidation Period – It is recommended that owners/operators assessing the validity of past evaluations consider conditions that may make a partial or entirely new assessment necessary. Examples of such conditions include: Major increases in the estimated ground motions (new significant active fault discovered near the facility)

- 1) Major increases in the estimated ground motions (e.g., new significant active fault discovered near the facility).
- 2) System modifications that would significantly affect the seismic behavior of the equipment or system, such as changing or addition of equipment or processes.

- 3) The occurrence of an earthquake that has caused significant damage in the local vicinity of the facility since the latest assessment.
- 4) The occurrence of other events (e.g., fire or explosion) that have caused structural damage.
- 5) Significant deterioration (e.g., corrosion) in equipment, piping, structural members, foundations or anchorages.

1.5 Responsible Engineer – The Responsible Engineer has responsibility for conducting and/or overseeing the evaluations and walkdowns required by this document for a given facility. All applicable engineering work associated with seismic evaluations should be performed or supervised by California Registered Professionals in accordance with the Business and Professions Code, Chapter 7, §§6700-6799 and CCR, Title 16, Division 5, §§400-476. It is strongly recommended that the Responsible Engineer be registered in California as a Civil, Structural or Mechanical Engineer with experience in seismic design and/or evaluations of facilities within the scope of this document.

2.0 DETERMINATION OF SEISMIC HAZARDS

When a seismic hazard assessment is performed, it should address and, where appropriate, quantify the following site-specific seismic hazards:

- 1) Ground shaking, including local site amplification effects
- 2) Fault rupture
- 3) Liquefaction and lateral spreading
- 4) Seismic settlement
- 5) Landslides
- 6) Tsunamis and seiches

Each of these site-specific seismic hazards is discussed in the following sections. Attachment A presents guidance for geotechnical reports that may be necessary to perform these evaluations.

2.1 Ground Shaking – It is the consensus of the Seismic Guidance Committee that the same ground motion hazard used in the design of new facilities be used as the basis for evaluating existing facilities. (i.e., the “Design Earthquake Response Spectrum” as per Section 11.4.5 of ASCE/SEI 7-10). The procedures of ASCE/SEI 7-10 should be used consistently for determination of these ground motions, including Chapter 21 of ASCE/SEI 7-10 for site-specific assessments. Values to be used in these evaluations may be obtained online from the United States Geological Survey (USGS) website at <http://earthquake.usgs.gov/haz/designmaps/>. Latitude and longitude of the facility should always be used, along with the appropriate soil classification.

2.2 Fault Rupture – Fault rupture zones which pass near or under the site should be identified. A fault is a fracture in the earth's crust along which the separated sections have moved or displaced in relation to each other. The displacement can be in either a horizontal or vertical direction. A ground rupture involving more than a few inches of movement can cause major damage to structures sited on the fault or pipelines that cross the fault. Fault displacements produce forces so great that the best method of limiting damage to structures is to avoid building in areas close to ground traces of active faults.

Under the Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zones Act of 1972, the State Geologist is required to delineate "Earthquake Fault Zones" along known active faults in California. Fault maps are described and can be found online at the California Geological Survey (CGS) website at <http://www.conserv.ca.gov/cgs/rghm/ap/index.htm> in Special Publication 42 and the associated fault maps.

2.3 Liquefaction and Lateral Spreading – Liquefaction is the transformation of soil from solid to a liquid state caused by an increase in pore water pressure and a reduction of effective stress within the soil mass. The potential for liquefaction is greatest when loose saturated cohesionless (sandy) soils or silty soils of low plasticity are subjected to a long duration of seismically induced strong ground shaking.

The assessment of hazards associated with potential liquefaction of soil deposits should consider two basic types of hazards:

- 1) One type of hazard associated with liquefaction is translational site instability more commonly referred to as lateral spreading. Lateral spreading occurs on gently sloping ground with free-face (stream banks, and shorelines), when seams of liquefiable material are continuous over large lateral areas and serve as significant planes of weakness for translational movements.
- 2) Localized liquefaction hazards may include large liquefaction-induced settlements/differential settlements and foundation bearing failures.

The 2013 CBC, 2012 IBC and ASCE/SEI 7-10 require the liquefaction hazards be evaluated for the Maximum Considered Earthquake (MCE) geo-mean earthquake ground motions. Previous editions of the IBC and ASCE/SEI 7 required the liquefaction hazards be evaluated for the Design Earthquake (DE) hazard level.

It should be noted that although the new codes have changed their requirements regarding the hazard level, those changes are also associated with different performance expectations for the design of new structures (i.e., non-collapse) in the MCE. It is the consensus of this committee that changing the hazard levels for CalARP assessments of existing facilities to be consistent with philosophical changes in new design codes would add a level of complexity that is not justified and inconsistent with the approach used throughout this document. As such, this document continues to use the DE ground shaking levels to evaluate liquefaction hazards for existing facilities

The CGS has established evaluation guidelines in Special Publication 117 (SP117) (Reference 5). Preliminary screening investigations for liquefaction hazards should include the following:

- 1) Check the site against the liquefaction potential zone identified on the CGS Seismic Hazard Zones Maps where available.
- 2) Check for susceptible soil types. Most susceptible soil types include sandy soils and silty soils of low plasticity. Also susceptible are cohesive soils with low clay content (less than 15% finer than 0.005mm), low liquid limit (less than 35%), and high moisture content (greater than 0.9 times the liquid limit). The latter may be designated as “quick” or “sensitive” clays.
- 3) Check for groundwater table. Liquefaction can only occur in susceptible soils below the groundwater table. Liquefaction hazards should be evaluated only if the highest possible groundwater table is shallower than 50 feet from the ground surface.
- 4) Check for in-situ soil densities to determine if they are sufficiently low to liquefy. Direct in-situ relative density measurements, such as the ASTM D 1586 (Standard Penetration Test) or ASTM D 3441 (Cone Penetration Test) or geophysical measurements of shear-wave velocities can provide useful information for screening evaluation. This information will usually need to be evaluated by a geotechnical engineer.

The issue of liquefaction may be discounted if the geotechnical report or responsible engineer, using one or more of the above screening approaches, concludes that the likelihood of liquefaction is low.

A site-specific investigation and liquefaction evaluation may be omitted if a screening investigation can clearly demonstrate the absence of liquefaction hazards at site. Where the screening investigation indicates a site may be susceptible to liquefaction hazard, a more extensive site-specific investigation and liquefaction evaluation should be performed by a geotechnical engineer

2.4 Seismic Settlement – In addition to the effects of liquefaction, foundation settlement may occur due to soil compaction in strong ground shaking. A geotechnical engineer can determine the potential for this settlement.

2.5 Landslides – Facilities that are in close proximity to natural hillside terrain or man-made slopes (cut or fill slopes) are potentially susceptible to earthquake-induced landslide hazards. SP117 (Reference 5) presents guidelines for evaluation and mitigation of earthquake-induced landslide hazards. Information can also typically be obtained from the Seismic Safety Element of the General Plan. Preliminary screening investigation for such hazards should include the following:

- 1) As part of the site reconnaissance, the engineer should observe whether there are any existing slopes (natural or man-made) in the immediate vicinity of the facility.
- 2) If there are no slopes of significant extent within a reasonably adequate distance from the facility, then the potential for landslide may be dismissed as a likely seismic hazard. Engineering judgment may be used to assess what constitutes an “adequate distance.” For example, generally level alluvial valleys can be reasonably excluded from the potential for seismically induced landslide.
- 3) If the facility is in close proximity to existing slopes which could pose a significant hazard, a certified engineering geologist or a registered geotechnical engineer should perform the following screening investigation steps.
 - a. Check the site against the Seismic Slope Stability Hazard maps where available prepared by the CGS. Also check other similar maps from the USGS, Dibblee Geological Foundation (DGF), and Seismic Safety Elements of local cities and counties.
 - b. Check the site against available published and unpublished geologic and landslide inventory maps.
 - c. Review stereoscopic pairs of aerial photographs for distinctive landforms associated with landslides (steep slopes, scarps, troughs, disrupted drainages, etc.).

2.6 Tsunamis and Seiches

2.6.1 Background - Tsunamis, or tidal waves, are generated by distant earthquakes and undersea fault movement. Traveling through the deep ocean, a tsunami is a broad and shallow, but fast moving, wave that poses little danger to most vessels. When it reaches the coastline however, the waveform pushes upward from the ocean bottom to make a swell of water that breaks and washes inland with great force.

A seiche occurs when resonant wave oscillations form in an enclosed or semi-enclosed body of water such as a lake or bay. Seiches may be triggered by moderate or larger local submarine earthquakes and sometimes by large distant earthquakes. A tsunami or seiche may result in flooding of low-lying coastal areas. The greatest hazard results from the inflow and outflow of water, where strong currents and forces can erode foundations and sweep away structures and equipment. The rupture of storage tanks from debris impact and foundation erosion can result in fires and explosions.

In California, the Seismic Safety Elements of General Plans typically provide an estimate of the potential for tsunami and seiche inundation. Estimates of maximum tsunami run-up can be made using historical information or theoretical modeling.

Current methodologies for tsunami design are in development and are planned to be incorporated in the next edition of ASCE/SEI 7. These procedures will include methods to determine local tsunami risk, appropriate site design parameters, and procedures for analysis for tsunami loads and effects. Another useful resource for evaluating structures for tsunami loads is FEMA P646 (Reference 20). Although specifically intended for design of tsunami evacuation structures, the document presents analysis procedures and methods for determining tsunami loads which may be applicable to the structural systems and components within the scope of CalARP seismic assessments

2.6.2 Administrative Mitigation Measures - Due in part to a lack of specific tsunami likelihood and/or probability of occurrence data, administrative mitigation measures are valuable. These include:

- 1) Early Warning System
- 2) Evacuation Planning
- 3) Hazardous Materials Area Plans and Regional Plans
- 4) Emergency Plant Shutdown Procedures
- 5) Coordination Emergency Drills

These measures would also be more achievable and timely than attempts to strengthen plant tankage and equipment from the effects of a large tsunami event

2.6.3 Ongoing Developments for Mitigating Tsunami Hazards in the United States - The National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) is currently in the process of developing an early tsunami warning system for distant tsunami sources for the west coast of the United States. When the system becomes available, facilities which are vulnerable to a tsunami should be tied into the system and they should develop emergency plans in the event there is a tsunami warning issued that would affect their area.

“Tsunami Risk Reduction for the United States: A Framework for Action” (Reference 23), the joint report by the sub-committee on Disaster Reduction and the US Group on Earth Observations, called for development of a standardized and coordinated tsunami hazard and risk assessment for all coastal regions of the United States and its territories. In response to this report, at the request of the National Tsunami Hazard Mitigation Program (NTHMP), NOAA’s National Geophysical Data Center (NGDC) and the United States Geological Survey (USGS) collaborated to conduct the first tsunami hazard assessment of the United States and its territories with the following conclusion: both the frequency and the amplitudes of tsunami run-ups support a qualitative “high” hazard assessment for Washington, Oregon, California, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. The “high” value for Oregon, Washington, and northern California reflects the low frequency but the potential for very high run-ups from magnitude 9 earthquakes on the Cascade subduction zone. Updates will be required as additional knowledge is obtained of possible tsunami sources in offshore southern California.

As the result of this review, the *National Tsunami Research Plan* (Reference 24) has been developed. The Plan has identified the following high priority research areas for improving the knowledge essential to tsunami risk reduction:

- 1) Enhance and sustain tsunami education
- 2) Improve tsunami warnings
- 3) Understand the impacts of tsunami at the coasts
- 4) Develop effective mitigation and recovery tools
- 5) Improve characterization of tsunami sources
- 6) Develop a tsunami data acquisition, archival, and retrieval system

3.0 WALKDOWN CONSIDERATIONS

A critical feature of the evaluation methodology is the onsite review of the existing facility by a qualified engineer under the direction of the Responsible Engineer. This is primarily a visual review that considers the actual condition of each installation in a systematic manner. It is generally referred to as a "walkdown" or "walkthrough" review because the engineers performing the review systematically walk down each equipment item, building, or system to look for potential seismic vulnerabilities. The basis for assessment may include observed failure modes from past earthquake experience, basic engineering principles, and engineering judgment. The walkdown review emphasizes the primary seismic load resisting elements and the potential areas of weakness due to design, construction, or modification practices, as well as deterioration or damage. A special emphasis is placed on details that may have been designed without consideration of seismic loads. Specific guidance for ground supported tanks is discussed in Section 6. Specific guidance for piping systems is discussed in Section 7.

In many cases, the walkdown review should be supplemented by a review of related drawings. This may be done, for example, to check adequacy of older reinforced concrete structures, to verify anchorage details, or to identify configurations that cannot be visually reviewed due to obstructions, fireproofing, insulation, etc. Note that drawings may not always be available, in which case the engineer should document assumptions made and the basis for those assumptions.

The walkdown review is also used to identify whether or not calculations are needed to complete the evaluation and for what items. The amount of calculations will depend on several factors including the experience of the reviewer, the size, age and condition of the facility, the type of construction, etc. The engineer may choose to evaluate several "bounding cases" or "questionable items" and use those as a basis for further assessments. The calculations should use the guidelines in Section 4 or other appropriate methods.

A detailed description of the walkdown process can be found in ASCE guidelines (Reference 6). Examples of walkdown evaluation sheets are provided in Figure 6.1 of Reference 6 for equipment and References 7 and 8 for piping (see Attachment B). Items of concern identified in the walkdown should be addressed in the seismic report.

4.0 EVALUATION OF GROUND SUPPORTED BUILDING AND NONBUILDING STRUCTURES

4.1 Ground Motion – Define ground motion and response spectra as outlined in Section 2.

4.2 Analysis Methodology and Acceptance Criteria – Acceptance for existing ground supported building and nonbuilding structures (including pressure vessels), and their foundations may be accomplished by one of the following methods. Analysis methods described below may also be used in Sections 5 through 7.

4.2.1 Linear Static and Linear Dynamic Analyses – Perform an appropriate linear dynamic analysis or equivalent static analysis.

The evaluation consists of demonstrating that capacity exceeds demand for identified systems. Acceptance is presumed if the following equation is satisfied:

$$\frac{D + L + \frac{E_e}{Q}}{\leq} \phi R_n$$

* using Load Factors of unity for all loads

Where,

D = Dead load

L = Live and/or operating load

E_e = Unreduced elastic earthquake load based upon ground motion determined in Section 2

Q = Ductility based reduction factor per Table 1

ϕ = Strength reduction factor (per ACI) or resistance factor (per AISC)

R_n = Nominal strength (per ACI) or nominal resistance (per AISC)

And subject to the following considerations:

- 1) For systems whose fundamental period (T) is less than the period at

which the peak spectral acceleration occurs (T_{peak}), one of the following approaches should be used to determine the appropriate level of seismic acceleration for the fundamental and higher modes. [Note: T_{peak} is the period at which the ground motion has the greatest spectral amplification. For spectra that have flattened peaks (e.g., ASCE/SEI 7-05 Figure 11.4-1), the smallest period of the flattened peak (T_0) should be used.]

- a. The peak spectral acceleration should be used for the fundamental mode of the structure. When considering higher modes, either the peak or actual spectral acceleration values may be used.
 - b. For a structure that has a fundamental period less than $0.67 \times T_{peak}$, the maximum spectral acceleration in the range of $0.5 \times T$ to $1.5 \times T$ may be used in lieu of the peak spectral acceleration. When considering higher modes, either the peak or actual spectral acceleration values may be used.
- 2) For redundant structural systems, (e.g., multiple frames or multiple bracing systems), in which seismic loads can be redistributed without failure, the demand (from the previous equation) on an individual frame or member may exceed its capacity by up to 50 percent, provided that the structure remains stable. In addition, the total seismic demand on the structure should not exceed the capacity of the overall structure.
- 3) Relative displacements should be considered and should include torsional and translational deformations. Structural displacements that are determined from an elastic analysis that was based on seismic loading reduced by Q , should be multiplied by the factor Q to determine displacements to be used in an evaluation.
- a. Generally, the drift (relative horizontal displacement) should be less than $0.02H$, where H is the height between levels of consideration. This drift limit may be exceeded if it can be demonstrated that greater drift can be tolerated by structural and nonstructural components or the equipment itself.
 - b. To obtain relative displacements between different support points, absolute summation of the individual displacements can conservatively be used. Alternatively, the Square Root of the Sum of Squares (SRSS) method for combining displacements may be used where appropriate.
- 4) The potential for overturning and sliding of the foundation should be evaluated. When evaluating overturning, a minimum of 10 percent reduction in dead load should be assumed to account for vertical acceleration effects. This reduction factor may be higher for facilities close to active faults that may be subject to higher vertical acceleration.

The factor of safety against overturning and sliding should be larger than or equal to 1.0, considering the appropriate Q-factor from Table 1.F.

- 5) The capacity of existing concrete anchorage may be evaluated in accordance with the strength design provisions of Section 1923 of the 1997 UBC with inspection load factors specified in Section 1923.3 taken as unity. Alternatively, the capacity of existing concrete anchorage may be evaluated in accordance with the strength provisions of ACI 318-11 Appendix D excluding the requirements of D.3.3.4.3.(a).3, D.3.3.4.3.(d) and D.3.3.5.3.(c).
- 6) The directional effects of an earthquake should be considered either using the Square Root of the Sum of the Square (SRSS) rule or the 100%-30%-30% rule.
- 7) Structures that do not pass these evaluation criteria can be reassessed using a more rigorous approach to determine if structural retrofit is actually required.
- 8) Note that the importance factor (I), as defined in the ASCE/SEI 7-10 (Reference 4) base shear equation for design of new facilities, should be set to unity (1.0) for evaluation of existing facilities, unless an importance factor greater than 1.0 is requested by the owner of the facility.
- 9) For soil bearing and piping and pressure vessel designs where working stress allowable design is standard practice, capacity may be taken as 1.6 times working stress allowable (without the 1/3 increase).

4.2.2 Nonlinear Static and Nonlinear Dynamic Analyses – Alternative procedures using rational analyses based on well established principles of mechanics may be used in lieu of those prescribed in these recommendations. Methods such as nonlinear time history and nonlinear static pushover analyses would be acceptable. The resulting inelastic deformations should be within appropriate levels to provide reasonable assurance of structural integrity. Acceptable methods include those provided in ASCE/SEI 7-10 (Reference 4) Section 16.2 or ASCE 41-13 (Reference 25). For significant structures, where these types of analyses are preferred, a peer review should be done.

4.2.3 Recommended Guidelines for Seismic Evaluation and Design of Petrochemical Facilities – ASCE (Reference 6), Section 4.0, including appendices, provides a summary of analytical approaches as well as detailed examples for the evaluation of structural period, base shear and other pertinent topics.

5.0 EVALUATION OF EQUIPMENT AND NONSTRUCTURAL COMPONENTS

Permanent equipment and nonstructural components supported within or by structures as indicated in Section 1.2 should be assessed together with the supporting structure. If the equipment or component is directly founded on soil or ground, it should be treated separately as a nonbuilding structure per Section 4.

The supported permanent equipment and nonstructural components should be considered subsystems if their total weight is less than 25% of the total weight of the supporting structure and subsystems. For these subsystems, the anchorage and attachments may be evaluated in accordance with the equivalent static force provisions of Chapter 13 of ASCE/SEI 7-10. The equipment or the nonstructural component itself should be checked for the acceleration levels based on the above referenced sections. Alternatively, a modal dynamic analysis using the evaluation basis spectra as defined in Section 2 of this document, may be performed in accordance with equation 13.3-4 of ASCE/SEI 7-10 if the equivalent static force provisions of Chapter 13 result in excessive demand. Also, nonlinear dynamic analysis is permitted of combined nonstructural systems in accordance with Section 4.2.2.

If the permanent equipment or nonstructural component weight is greater than 25% of the weight of the supporting structure, Section 4 with Q values equal to the smaller of the values for the equipment or the supporting structure from Table 1 can be used for the entire system. Alternatively, a dynamic analysis of the equipment coupled with the supporting structure may be performed to determine the elastic response of the equipment. The elastic responses should then be reduced by the smaller Q value to obtain the design values.

Where an approved national standard provides a basis for the earthquake-resistant design of a particular type of nonbuilding structure, such a standard may be used, provided the ground motion used for analysis is in conformance with the provisions of Section 2.

6.0 EVALUATION OF GROUND SUPPORTED STORAGE TANKS

6.1 Scope – Vertical liquid storage tanks (commonly called flat bottom storage tanks) with supported bottoms at ground level should be addressed using the approaches provided in this section when they meet one of the criteria in Section 1.2. These are tanks which either (a) contain an RS, (b) contain fluids (firewater being the most common example) which are required in an emergency, or (c) are located sufficiently close to a tank in one of the two previous categories so as to pose a threat to the covered process or its emergency shutdown. Horizontal vessels (bullets), vertical vessels and spherical tanks which are supported at ground level are addressed in Section 4.0. Elevated tanks and vessels are addressed in Section 5.0.

Section 7.0 of Reference 6 provides a thorough overview of tank failure modes during a seismic event, seismic vulnerabilities to look for during a seismic walkdown, and the detailed methodology for analytical evaluation as well as suggested modifications to mitigate seismic hazards. See Figure 7.7 of that document for valuable illustrations of some of the items of concern, which typically include over-constrained piping, stairway and walkway attachments to the tank.

6.2 Tank Damage in Past Earthquakes – Vertical liquid storage tanks with supported bottoms have often failed, sometimes with loss of contents during strong ground shaking. The response of such tanks, unanchored tanks in particular, is highly nonlinear and much more complex than that generally implied in available design standards. The effect of ground shaking is to generate an overturning force on the tank, which in turn causes a portion of the tank bottom plate to lift up from the foundation. While uplift, in and of itself, may not cause serious damage, it can be accompanied by large deformations and major changes in the tank shell stresses. It can also lead to damage and/or rupture of the tank shell at its connection with any attachments (e.g., piping, ladders, etc.) that are over-constrained and cannot accommodate the resulting uplift. Tanks have been observed to uplift by more than 12 inches in past earthquakes.

The following are typical of the failure (or damage) modes of tanks that have been observed during past earthquakes:

- 1) Buckling of the tank shell known as "elephant foot" buckling. This typically occurs near grade around the perimeter of unanchored tanks. Another less common (and less damaging) buckling mode of the tank shell, normally associated with taller tanks, is "diamond shape" buckling.
- 2) Weld failure between the bottom plate and the tank shell as a result of high-tension forces during uplift.
- 3) Fluid sloshing, thus potentially causing damage to the tank's roof and/or top shell course followed by spillage of fluid.
- 4) Buckling of support columns for fixed roof tanks.
- 5) Breakage of piping connected to the tank shell or bottom plate primarily due to lack of flexibility in the piping to accommodate the resulting uplift.

- 6) Tearing of tank shell or bottom plate due to over-constrained stairway, ladder, or piping anchored at a foundation and at the tank shell. Tearing of tank shell due to over-constrained walkways connecting two tanks experiencing differential movement.
- 7) Non-ductile anchorage connection details (anchored tanks) leading to tearing of the tank shell or failure of the anchorage.
- 8) Splitting and leakage of tank shells due to high tensile hoop stress in bolted or riveted tanks.

6.3 Recommended Steps for Tank Evaluation – When evaluating existing ground supported tanks for seismic vulnerabilities, the following steps should be followed:

- 1) Quantification of site-specific seismic hazard as outlined in Section 2.
- 2) Walkdown inspection to assess piping, staircase and walkway attachments, and other potential hazards.
- 3) Analytical assessment of tanks to evaluate the potential for overturning and shell buckling. Such analysis may usually be limited to tanks having a height-to-diameter ratio of greater than 0.33.

Engineering judgment of the evaluating engineer should be relied upon to determine the need for analytical evaluations. Considerations such as presence of ductile anchorage, plate thickness, favorable aspect ratio of the tank, operating height, ductile tank material, weld/bolting detail, etc. are important in determining whether an analytical assessment is required. Two evaluation methods are provided below in Sections 6.3.1 and 6.3.2.

6.3.1 Linear Static Analysis of Tanks - Linear static analysis procedures are provided in the following industry standards. These include:

- 1) API 650 Appendix E (Reference 9) - This method is a standard for the design of new tanks for the petrochemical industry. Its provisions are accepted by the CBC and ASCE/SEI 7-10 and it addresses both anchored and unanchored tanks.
- 2) AWWA D100 (Reference 10) - This method is very similar to the API 650 method and is used primarily for design of water storage tanks. It addresses both anchored and unanchored tanks.
- 3) Veletsos and Yang (Reference 11) - This method is primarily for anchored tanks.
- 4) Manos (Reference 12) - This method was primarily developed to evaluate the stability of unanchored tanks and is based on correlation between empirical design approach and observed performance of tanks during past earthquakes. It is generally less conservative than API 650.

- 5) Housner and Haroun (Reference 13) - This method is primarily for the analysis of anchored tanks, but is often used for both anchored and unanchored tanks.
- 6) ACI 350.3-01, (Reference 14) - Applies to Concrete Tanks (both round and rectangular)
- 7) API 620 Appendix L (Reference 26)
- 8) "Nuclear Reactors and Earthquakes". United States Atomic Energy Commission, TID-7024, August 1961 (Reference 27)

Alternatively, the Q factor given in Table 1 for tanks in conjunction with the demand equation in Section 4.2.1 may be used to determine the lateral seismic loads for tanks. As a guidance, the Q factor method may be used for non-metallic as well as smaller less significant tanks whereas the more traditional methods in the literature as listed above may be used for larger tanks (metallic and concrete). It should be noted that in References 9 and 10 listed above, Q factor reductions are inherently included in the determination of seismic forces. In References 11 to 14 listed above, the Q factors should only be applied to impulsive or structural modes (not sloshing modes).

6.3.2 Nonlinear Static Analysis of Tanks - Section 4.2.2 allows that nonlinear static analysis is an alternative procedure that can be used to evaluate existing structures. Although there are no published guidelines on how to apply this methodology to bottom-supported liquid storage tanks, the following is a suggested approach that can be deemed as acceptable if other methods do not result in demonstrating adequate seismic resistance.

A vertical liquid storage tank may be evaluated using a nonlinear static analysis procedure such as the following:

The loading should be composed of both static fluid pressures, which are constant, plus the effects of fluid inertia forces which are simulated by monotonically increasing two pressure profiles on the tank walls and bottom. The fluid inertia force profiles may be taken from Appendix F of TID 7024 (Reference 27), which contains the original derivation of seismic-induced fluid inertial forces as derived by Housner. The two pressure profiles are (a) those for the portion of the fluid which moves with the tank (termed the impulsive portion), and (b) those for the portion of the fluid which "sloshes" (termed the convective portion). Both portions contain horizontal pressure profiles on the sides of the tank and a vertical pressure profile on the tank bottom.

The pressure profiles are to be monotonically increased until a horizontal "target displacement" for the design earthquake is exceeded at the maximum fluid level. The target displacement may be calculated using Equation 3-14 of ASCE 41-13 (Reference 25). When using this empirical equation for the calculation of the target displacement, in lieu of specific data, the product of the three "C" coefficients need not exceed 1.5.

For thin walled tanks, diamond and elephant foot buckling are potential limit states which can be evaluated by using either recognized equations for storage tank wall

stress state at incipient buckling (Reference 29 and 30) or by detailed nonlinear finite element analysis. The analysis is typically a nonlinear pushover analysis where the fluid inertial loads are increased until a post peak in the load-displacement curve is observed.

The acceptance criteria for the seismic-resisting elements of the tank, including anchor bolts and foundation, should be as follows. For deformation-controlled elements (as defined in ASCE 41-13), the plastic deformation of these elements should not exceed deformations consistent with a “collapse prevention” level of performance. For force-controlled elements (again as defined in ASCE 41-13), the seismic force in the specific element at target displacement may be reduced by a “Q” factor as per Section 4.2.1 of this document. However, for such force-controlled elements (such as shell buckling and anchor bolts whose ultimate load is governed by concrete failure), the “Q” factor should not exceed 2.5.

6.4 Mitigation Measures for Tanks – If the walkdown and the evaluation of the tank identify potential seismic vulnerabilities, mitigation measures should be considered. These mitigations may include measures such as increasing the tank wall section (e.g., ribs), addition of flexibility to rigid attachments, reduction of safe operating height or, as a last resort, anchorage of the tank.

6.5 Sloshing Effects – The height of the convective (sloshing) wave (d_s) may be calculated by the following equation:

$$d_s = 0.42 D_i S_a$$

Where,

D_i = the diameter of a circular tank, or the longer plan dimension of a rectangular tank.

S_a = the spectral acceleration, as a fraction of g , at the convective (sloshing) period.

The period (T) of the convective (sloshing) mode in a circular tank may be calculated by the following formula:

$$T = 2\pi \sqrt{\frac{D_i}{3.68 \cdot g \cdot \tanh\left(\frac{3.68 \cdot H}{D_i}\right)}}$$

Where,

H = the height of the fluid,

g = the acceleration due to gravity in consistent units

The above equation for amplitude of a sloshing wave is appropriate for fixed roof tanks. However, in lieu of a detailed analysis, the above equation may be used for a floating roof tank if the weight of the floating roof is replaced by an equivalent height of fluid.

- 1) For fixed roof tanks, the effects of sloshing may be addressed by having sufficient freeboard to accommodate the wave slosh height. However, when this is not possible, then the following steps should be incorporated into the tank evaluation (or the design of mitigation measures): The geometry of the wave (both unconfined and confined by the roof) should be defined. The geometry of the unconfined wave may conveniently be taken as a trapezoid or a parabola.
- 2) The fluid head of the freeboard deficit (the unconfined wave height less the available freeboard) should be considered to act as an upward load on the roof. The roof live load should not be considered as assisting to resist this upward fluid pressure.
- 3) The mass of the fluid that is in the sloshing wave but within the portion confined by the roof should be considered to act laterally at the period of the structural (or impulsive) mode, rather than at the period of the sloshing mode.

For floating roof tanks, the key concern is that the slosh height will be sufficient to lift the bottom of the floating roof onto the top of the shell, potentially leading to a release of contents. Since most tank shells cannot sustain such a weight, this could also result in a major risk of buckling or other failure of the shell at the top of the shell.

It should be noted that the T_L value in the seismic hazard formulation defines the long period response that affects sloshing. The engineer should be aware that significant sloshing can occur even at low seismicity sites. There are numerous documented instances of sloshing related damage at sites over 100 miles from the epicenter that had negligible short period ground shaking.

7.0 EVALUATION OF PIPING SYSTEMS

7.1 Aboveground Piping Systems – Evaluation of piping systems should be primarily accomplished by field walkdowns. One reason this method is recommended is because some piping is field routed and, in some instances, piping and supports have been modified from that shown on design drawings.

The procedure for evaluating aboveground piping systems should be as follows:

- 1) Identify piping systems to be evaluated. The list should include piping systems that can directly, or indirectly, lead to a significant release of RS as discussed in Section 1.2. The list should also include piping downstream of relief valves and other safety systems used to remove RS to a safe location.
- 2) Perform a walkdown of the piping systems for seismic capability. Document the walkdown and identify areas for detailed evaluation, if any.
- 3) Complete the detailed evaluation of any identified areas and recommend remedial actions, if required.

Damage to or failure of pipe supports should not be construed as a piping failure unless it directly contributes to a pressure boundary failure. The intention here is to preserve the essential pressure containing integrity of the piping system but not necessarily leak tightness. Therefore, this procedure does not preclude the possibility of small leaks at bolted flange joints.

The guidance provided in Sections 7.1.1 through 7.1.6 is primarily intended for ductile steel pipe constructed to a national standard such as the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) B31.3 (Reference 15). Evaluation of other piping material is discussed in Section 7.1.7. The basis for certain provisions in this section and further discussion can be found in Reference 8.

7.1.1 Historical Piping Earthquake Performance – Ductile piping systems have, in general, performed adequately in past earthquakes. Where damage has occurred, it has been related to the following aspects of piping systems:

- 1) Excessive seismic anchor movement. Seismic anchor movements could be the result of relative displacements between points of support/attachment of the piping systems. Such movements include relative displacements between vessels, pipe supports, or main headers for branch lines.
- 2) Interaction with other elements. Interaction is defined as the seismically induced impact of piping systems with adjacent structures, systems, or components, including the effects of falling hazards.
- 3) Extensive corrosion effects. Corrosion could result in a weakened pipe cross section that could fail during an earthquake.
- 4) Non-ductile materials such as cast iron, fiberglass, glass, etc., combined with high stress or impact conditions.

7.1.2 Walkdown – The walkdown is the essential element for seismic evaluations of piping systems. Careful consideration needs to be given to how the piping system will behave during a seismic event, how nearby items will behave during a seismic event (if they can interact with the piping system) and how the seismic capacity will change over time. The walkdown should be performed in accordance with Section 3. Some guidance on how to perform a walkdown can be found in Reference 6.

Additional aspects of piping systems which should also be reviewed during the walkdown for seismic capability are:

- 1) Large unsupported segment of pipe (see ASME B31E (Reference 21) Table 2)
- 2) Brittle elements
- 3) Threaded connections, flange joints, and special fittings
- 4) Inadequate supports, where an entire system or portion of piping may lose its primary support

Special features or conditions to illustrate the above concerns include:

- 1) Inadequate anchorage of attached equipment
- 2) Short/rigid spans that cannot accommodate the relative displacement of the supports (e.g., piping spanning between two structural systems)
- 3) Damaged supports including corrosion
- 4) Long vertical runs subject to inter level drift
- 5) Large unsupported masses (e.g., valves) attached to the pipe
- 6) Flanged and threaded connections in high stress locations
- 7) Existing leakage locations (flanges, threads, valves, welds)
- 8) Significant external corrosion
- 9) Corrosion Under Insulation (CUI)
- 10) Inadequate vertical supports and/or insufficient lateral restraints
- 11) Welded attachments to thin wall pipe
- 12) Excessive seismic displacements of expansion joints
- 13) Brittle elements such as cast iron pipes
- 14) Sensitive equipment impact (e.g., control valves)
- 15) Potential for fatigue of short to medium length rod hangers that are restrained against rotation at the support end

7.1.3 Analysis Considerations – Detailed analysis of piping systems should not be the focus of this evaluation. Rather it should be on finding and strengthening weak elements. However, after the walkdown is performed and if an analysis is deemed necessary, the procedures in ASME B31E (Reference 21) and the following general rules should be followed.

- 1) Friction resistance should not be considered for seismic restraint, except for the following condition: for long straight piping runs with numerous supports, friction in the axial direction may be considered
- 2) Spring supports (constant or variable) should not be considered as seismic supports
- 3) Unbraced pipelines with short rod hangers can be considered as effective lateral supports if justified
- 4) Appropriate stress intensification factors ("i" factors) should be used
- 5) Allowable piping stresses should be reduced to account for fatigue effects due to significant cyclic operational loading conditions. In this case the allowables presented in Section 7.1.7 may need to be reduced.
- 6) Flange connections should be checked to ensure that high moments do not result in significant leakage

7.1.4 Seismic Anchor Movement – The recommended procedure for seismic anchor movement (SAM) evaluation of piping is discussed in Section 3.4 of ASME B31E (Reference 21) including allowable stress values. The relative seismic anchor displacements should be calculated following the methodology in Section 4.2.1.

7.1.5 Interaction Evaluation – The recommended procedures for interaction evaluation of piping are as follows:

- 1) RS piping should be visually inspected to identify potential interactions with adjacent structures, systems, or components. Those interactions which could cause unacceptable damage to piping, piping components (e.g., control valves), or adjacent critical items should be mitigated.

Note that restricting piping seismic movement to preclude interaction may lead to excessive restraint of thermal expansion or inhibit other necessary operational flexibility.

- 2) The walkdown should also identify the potential for interaction between adjacent structures, systems or components, and the RS piping being investigated. Those interactions that could cause unacceptable damage to RS piping should be mitigated. Note that falling hazards should be considered in this evaluation.
- 3) Displacements used when considering seismic interaction should be those calculated per Section 4.2.1 (3).

7.1.6 Inertia Evaluation – The recommended procedure for seismic inertia evaluation of piping is discussed in Section 3.4 of ASME B31E (Reference 21) including allowable stress values. Seismic loading should be determined following Section 13.3.1 of Reference 4. The value of R_p should be substituted with Q from Table 1 and the value of $I_p=1.0$.

7.1.7 Allowable Stress – Piping made from materials other than ductile steel

accepted by ASME B31 may be required to withstand seismic loading. The criteria outlined above for ductile steel piping should be followed for piping made from other materials with the following allowable stress values:

- 1) When ductile material piping is designed and constructed to a national standard with basic allowable stresses given, then those values should be used multiplied by the appropriate factor in Section 3.4 of B31E.
- 2) When piping materials meet a national standard with a minimum specified tensile strength, σ_t , then the basic allowable stress at operating temperature should be:
 - a. Ductile Materials: $S_h = \sigma_t / 3$ at temperature
 - b. Brittle Materials: $S_h = \sigma_t / 10$ at temperature
- 3) When piping materials cannot be identified with a national standard with a minimum specified tensile strength, then one should be estimated from published literature or a testing program. The basic allowable stress at temperature should be determined using the appropriate equation in (2) above, unless a higher allowable can be justified by seismic testing.

7.2 Underground Piping Systems – Piping that is underground should be identified as such on walkdown reports and other documentation prepared for this evaluation. The evaluator can use the technical guidance provided in the aboveground piping section or other technical guidance appropriate for underground piping seismic evaluations. Concerns unique to underground piping that should be considered by the engineer include:

- 1) Liquefaction and lateral spreading
- 2) Seismic settlement
- 3) Surface faulting

Additional evaluation guidance for underground piping systems can be found in Reference 28.

8.0 STRENGTHENING CRITERIA

A strengthening and/or management program should be developed to correct deficiencies. If strengthening is required, appropriate strengthening criteria should be developed to provide a confidence level that retrofitted items will perform adequately when subjected to strong earthquake ground motions.

An important point to consider when retrofitting is that over-strengthening areas of the structure that are currently deficient in strength can force the weak link(s) to occur in other elements that are perhaps more brittle. This can have a negative impact on overall structural performance during a major earthquake. In other words, a structure that is presently weak, but ductile, should not be strengthened to the point that its failure mode becomes brittle with a lower energy absorbing capacity.

Often, the largest category of structural/seismic deficiencies in an existing facility will involve equipment which is not anchored or braced and thus has no lateral restraint. This may include equipment or structures for which bracing has been omitted or removed, or it may include structural bolts or anchor bolts, including their nuts, which were never installed. Another deficiency might be structural elements that are severely corroded or damaged. For such items, the strengthening measures may be obvious, or at least straightforward.

For "building-like" nonbuilding structures (those with framing systems that are specifically listed in the building codes), the procedures and analysis methods outlined in documents such as ASCE 41-13 (Reference 25) may be useful in determining appropriate strengthening measures.

When seismic hazards such as liquefaction or seismically induced landslide can potentially affect a site, it is recommended that a geotechnical engineer be consulted. The basic reference for assessing these seismic hazards is SP117 (Reference 5). However, Section 12 of Reference 16, developed by the Los Angeles Section of ASCE, gives additional guidelines for mitigating landslide hazards. Section 8 of Reference 17, also developed by the Los Angeles Section of ASCE, gives additional guidelines for mitigating liquefaction hazards at a site.

When any retrofit construction work associated with the CalARP program is to be undertaken, a Building Permit is normally required; thus the local Building Department is involved automatically. It should always be kept in mind that the intent of retrofitting these structures, systems, or components is not "to bring them up to current code." In many instances, "to bring them up to current code" may not be practical. The retrofit design criteria should be consistent with this proposed guidance. However, it is always advisable to meet code requirements to the extent practical. If the retrofit construction does not meet the current Building Code, the detail drawings should clearly state that the retrofit is a voluntary seismic upgrade and may not meet current Building Code requirements for new construction.

The concept of "grandfathering" of existing structures is addressed specifically in Sections 3403 to 3405 of the 2013 CBC. Those sections of the code basically set out conditions whereby the entire structure need not be brought up to current code when additions, alterations or repairs are made. In addition to requiring that the newly designed portion itself meet the current code, the primary requirements for "grandfathering" the unaltered portion of the structure are that the change cannot increase the gravity load in existing elements by more than 5% without meeting new code requirements for the gravity loads, and that the seismic demand-capacity ratios (DCRs) in existing elements cannot increase by more than 10% without meeting new code requirements. Note that the basis of comparison is the structure with the alteration versus the structure with the alteration ignored. The original design code is not relevant. Additional conditions are provided in Section 3404 of the 2013 CBC and restrictions for "voluntary seismic improvements" are provided in Section 3404.5. The consensus of the Committee is that allowing this type of "grandfathering" of existing structures is appropriate.

If the intent of any retrofit construction associated with the CalARP programs is to do enough work to satisfy the CalARP Program requirements (to mitigate the perceived risk of an accidental release of the regulated substance), but not meet the current code requirements. It behooves the owner and/or the Responsible Engineer, as appropriate to discuss the proposed work with the local Building Code Official to ensure the Building Code Official is in agreement.

9.0 RECOMMENDED REPORT CONTENTS

The CalARP seismic assessment report should contain the items listed below as applicable. There are two types of reports which can be generated. The first type is the initial, or first time, report for a system which has no prior CalARP seismic evaluation. The second type is the revalidation report which is for a system that has one or more prior CalARP seismic evaluations.

9.1 Initial Report Contents – CalARP seismic reports should at least contain the following information:

- 1) Provide a statement that this is an initial CalARP seismic evaluation report.
- 2) Provide a description of the scope of the structural/seismic evaluation as determined in Section 1.2. This description may be in terms of the RS present at the facility and where in the facility those RS are located (area, building, floor, etc.). The scope description should include a listing or a tabulation of the items in the facility that was reviewed including structures, equipment and piping. Key items which were specifically excluded and therefore were not reviewed should also be noted.
- 3) Provide a characterization of the soil profile at the site, and the basis for that characterization. For example, reference to a geotechnical report (e.g., see Attachment A for recommended contents of a Geotechnical report), including its date of issue, if such report serves as the basis for the site soil profile characterization (as per the guidelines in Section 2). In addition, if the geotechnical report serves as the basis for assessing the potential for any of the seismic hazards in Section 2, this should be noted. Depending on the extent to which the geotechnical report is relied upon, it may be appropriate to append a copy of this geotechnical report, or at least key excerpts from it, to the CalARP seismic report.
- 4) Provide a discussion of the determination of each of the seismic hazards listed in Section 2, and the basis for the determination of each. In particular, where ground response spectra are used as the basis for the CalARP seismic assessment, they should be referenced along with the basis for determining the ground response spectra (See Section 2.1).
- 5) For each reviewed item, provide an assessment of its structural adequacy to resist the estimated seismic ground shaking for the site.
 - a. The assessment should include a noting of any deterioration in the physical condition of the reviewed item that was observed in the field walkdown, such as excessive corrosion, concrete spalling, etc.

- b. The assessment should indicate the basis used. This would include visual observations made during a walkdown and corroborating photographs. Depending on the circumstances, the assessment may also be based on drawing reviews and structural/seismic calculations.
- 6) Provide recommendations for conceptual measures that will alleviate seismic deficiencies. These recommendations may include:
 - a. Strengthening of structural elements
 - b. Addition of new structural elements
 - c. Reduction or redistribution of the seismic forces
 - d. Measures for reducing the effects of a seismic hazard as identified in Section 2, etc.
 - 7) Provide a recommendation for further study or detailed design for items that appear to be seismically deficient or for items which are clearly deficient but for which an adequate seismic risk-reduction measure is not obvious. Such further study may involve a structural issue or it may involve a study on how to address a seismic hazard in Section 2.
 - 8) The initial CalARP report should be signed and stamped by the Responsible Engineer (see Section 1.5).
 - 9) The CalARP report should discuss all deficiencies and recommendations identified during this evaluation. Provide a photograph showing the identified deficiency if possible.
 - 10) A list of the drawings that were reviewed should be included (including date and revision number) when drawing reviews form part of the basis for determining the seismic adequacy of structures or equipment.
 - 11) Supplementary documentation of the observations made and the assessments performed. These may include photographs (where permissible) and copies of walkdown sheets.

9.2 Revalidation Report Contents – CalARP seismic reports should at least contain the following information:

- 1) Provide a statement that this is a revalidation CalARP seismic report.
- 2) Provide a description of the scope of the structural/seismic evaluation as determined in Section 1.2. This description may be in terms of the RS present at

the facility and where in the facility those RS are located (area, building, floor, etc.). The scope description should include a listing or a tabulation of the items in the facility that is to be reviewed including structures, equipment and piping. Key items which were specifically excluded and therefore were not reviewed should also be noted.

- 3) If available, provide an updated characterization of the soil profile at the site, and the basis for that characterization. For example, reference to a geotechnical report (e.g., see Attachment A for recommended contents of a Geotechnical report), including its date of issue, if such report serves as the basis for the site soil profile characterization (as per the guidelines in Section 2). In addition, if the geotechnical report serves as the basis for assessing the potential for any of the seismic hazards in Section 2, this should be noted. Depending on the extent to which the geotechnical report is relied upon, it may be appropriate to append a copy of this geotechnical report, or at least key excerpts from it, to the CalARP seismic report.
- 4) Provide a discussion of the determination of each of the seismic hazards listed in Section 2, and the basis for the determination of each. In particular, where ground response spectra are used as the basis for the CalARP seismic assessment, they should be referenced along with the basis for determining the ground response spectra (See Section 2.1). Compare the current CalARP seismic loading to the prior evaluations seismic loading and comment.
- 5) Provide a discussion of items with a recommendation for remediation or additional evaluation from a prior evaluation and list the status of these prior recommendations. Prior recommendations should be categorized as having been sufficiently addressed, partially addressed with further action still required, or not addressed. Prior recommendations should always be completed unless the reviewer can demonstrate in writing that the prior recommendation is not needed anymore and the basis for this determination.
- 6) For each reviewed item, provide an assessment of its structural adequacy to resist the estimated seismic ground shaking for the site.
 - a. The assessment should include a noting of any deterioration in the physical condition of the reviewed item that was observed in the field walkdown, such as excessive corrosion, concrete spalling, etc.
 - b. The assessment should indicate the basis used. This would include visual observations made during a walkdown and corroborating photographs. Depending on the circumstances, the assessment may also be based on drawing reviews or structural/seismic calculations.
- 7) Provide recommendations for conceptual measures that will alleviate seismic deficiencies. These recommendations may include:
 - a. Strengthening of structural elements
 - b. Addition of new structural elements
 - c. Reduction or redistribution of the seismic forces

- d. Measures for reducing the effects of a seismic hazard as identified in Section 2, etc.
- 8) Provide a recommendation for further study or detailed design for items that appear to be seismically deficient or for items which are clearly deficient but for which an adequate seismic risk-reduction measure is not obvious. Such further study may involve a structural issue or it may involve a study on how to address a seismic hazard in Section 2. Include prior recommendations that were not addressed or which were not addressed adequately since the last evaluation.
 - 9) The revalidation CalARP report should be signed and stamped by the Responsible Engineer (see Section 1.5).
 - 10) The revalidation CalARP report should discuss all deficiencies and recommendations identified during this evaluation regardless of whether or not they were contained in previous evaluation findings. Provide a photograph showing the identified deficiency if possible.
 - 11) A list of the drawings that were reviewed should be included (including date and revision number) when drawing reviews form part of the basis for determining the seismic adequacy of structures or equipment.
 - 12) Supplementary documentation of the observations made and the assessments performed. These may include photographs (where permissible) and copies of walkdown sheets.

10.0 REFERENCES

References may be obtained from:

Engineering Societies Library (Linda Hall Library), a private library located on the campus of the University of Missouri
5109 Cherry Street
Kansas City, Missouri 64110-2498
1-800-662-1545

1. California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 19, Division 2 Chapter 4.5, *California Accidental Release Prevention (CalARP) Program Detailed Analysis*.
2. *Guidance for California Accidental Release Prevention (CalARP) Program Seismic Assessments*, Prepared for the Administering Agency (AA) Subcommittee Region I Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC), Prepared by the CalARP Program Seismic Guidance Committee, September 2010, Approved by Region I LEPC, 1/14/2010.
3. *Uniform Building Code*, 1997 Edition, International Conference of Building Officials, Whittier, California, 1997.
4. ASCE/SEI 7-10, *Minimum Design Loads for Buildings and Other Structures*, American Society of Civil Engineers, Reston, Virginia, 2010.
5. California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, *Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California*, Special Publication 117A, 2008.
6. *Guidelines for Seismic Evaluation and Design of Petrochemical Facilities*, Second Edition, Task Committee on Seismic Evaluation and Design of Petrochemical Facilities, American Society of Civil Engineers, Reston, Virginia, 2011.
7. Gurbuz, O., Lopez, A., Summers, P., April 1992, "Implementation of the Proposed RMPP Seismic Assessment Guidance to Perform a Structural Seismic Evaluation of Existing Facilities" in *Proceedings of HAZMACON '92*, Session on "New Developments in Earthquake Caused Hazardous Materials Releases," Long Beach, CA.
8. Saunders, K.L. and Hau, G., "Seismic Evaluation Acceptance Guideline for Existing Above Ground Piping Systems", ASME PVP Volume 256-1, 1993.
9. API Standard 650, *Welded Tanks for Oil Storage*, 12th Edition, American Petroleum Institute, Washington, D.C., 2013.

10. AWWA D100-11, *Welded Carbon Steel Tanks for Water Storage*, American Water Works Association, Denver, Colorado, 2011.
11. Veletsos, A.S., Contributor, "Guidelines for the Seismic Design of Oil and Gas Pipeline Systems", ASCE, Committee on Gas and Liquid Fuel Lifelines, NY, NY, 1984.
12. Manos, G.W., August 1986, "Earthquake Tank-Wall Stability of Unbraced Tanks," American Society of Civil Engineers, *Journal of Structural Engineering*, Vol. 112, No. 8, including Erratum in *Journal of Structural Engineering*, Vol. 113, No.3, March 1987.
13. Housner, G.W., and Haroun, M.A., 1980, "Seismic Design of Liquid Storage Tanks," ASCE Convention and Exposition, Portland, Oregon, April 14-18, 1980.
14. ACI 350.3-06, *Seismic Design of Liquid - Containing Concrete Structures and Commentary*, American Concrete Institute, Farmington Hills, Michigan, 2006.
15. ASME B31.3 - 2012, *Process Piping, ASME Code for Pressure Piping, B31*, American Society of Mechanical Engineers, New York, New York, 2013.
16. ASCE, Los Angeles Section Geotechnical Group, "Recommended Procedures for Implementation of Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 117, Guidelines for Analyzing and Mitigating Landslide Hazards in California", Published by Southern California Earthquake Center (SCEC), June 2002.
17. ASCE, Los Angeles Section Geotechnical Group, "Recommended Procedures for Implementation of Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 117, Guidelines for Analyzing and Mitigating Liquefaction in California", Published by Southern California Earthquake Center (SCEC), March 1999.
18. FEMA 350 *Recommended Seismic Design Criteria for New Steel Moment-Frame Buildings*, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Washington, D.C., June 2000.
19. 2012 *International Building Code*, International Code Council, Inc., Country Club Hills, Illinois, June 2011.
20. FEMA P646 *Guidelines for Design of Structures for Vertical Evacuation from Tsunamis*, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Washington, D.C., June 2008.
21. ASME B31Ea – 2010, *Addenda to ASME B31E – 2008 Standard for the Seismic Design and Retrofit of Above – Ground Piping Systems*, American Society of Mechanical Engineers, New York, New York, 2010.
22. 2013 *California Building Code Title 24, Part 2, Volumes 1 and 2*, California Building Standards Commission, Sacramento, California, 2013.
23. National Science and Technology Council, *Tsunami Risk Reduction for the United States: A Framework for Action*, December 2005.

24. Bernard B, Dengler L, and Yim S (editors), 2007, *National Tsunami Research Plan: Report of a Workshop Sponsored by NSF/NOAA*.
25. ASCE/SEI 41-13, *Seismic Rehabilitation of Existing Buildings*, American Society of Civil Engineers, Reston, Virginia, 2013.
26. API Standard 620, *Design and Construction of Large, Welded, Low-pressure Storage Tanks*, Eleventh Edition, American Petroleum Institute, Washington, D.C., 2008.
27. US Department of Energy, *Nuclear Reactors and Earthquakes*, Report No. TID-7024, January 1961.
28. *Guidelines for the Design of Buried Steel Pipe*, American Lifelines Alliance, July 2001.
29. Priestley, M.J.N (Editor & Chairman) et. al, "Seismic Design of Storage Tanks," Recommendations of a Study Group of the New Zealand National Society for Earthquake Engineering, December 1986.
30. Eurocode 8, (1998), "Design provisions for earthquake resistance of structures, Part 1- General rules and Part 4 - Silos, tanks and pipelines," European committee for Standardization, Brussels.
31. *CSU Seismic Requirements*, The California State University, Office of the Chancellor, December 21, 2011.

TABLE 1

**DUCTILITY-BASED REDUCTION FACTORS (Q)
FOR EXISTING STRUCTURES AND SYSTEMS**

<p>A. STRUCTURES SUPPORTING EQUIPMENT</p> <p>This covers structures whose primary purpose is to support equipment, such as air coolers, spheres, horizontal vessels, exchangers, heaters, vertical vessels and reactors, etc.</p>	<p>Q</p>
<p>1. Steel structures</p> <p>Ductile moment frame (see Note 8) Use Q=6 if there is a significant departure from the intent of the 1988 (or later) UBC for special moment-resisting frames.</p> <p>Ordinary moment frame (see Note 8) The following structural characteristics are usually indicative of a Q=2 value (also see Note 7):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. There is a significant strength discontinuity in any of the vertical lateral force resisting elements, i.e., a weak story. b. There are partial penetration welded splices in the columns of the moment resisting frames. c. The structure exhibits "strong girder-weak column" behavior, i.e., under combined lateral and vertical loading, hinges occur in a significant number of columns before occurring in the beams. <p>The following structural characteristics are usually indicative of a Q=4 value (also see Note 7):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> d. Any of the moment frame elements is not compact. e. Any of the beam-column connections in the lateral force resisting moment frames does not have both: (1) full penetration flange welds; and (2) a bolted or welded web connection. f. There are bolted splices in the columns of the moment resisting frames that do not connect both flanges and the web. <p>Braced frame The following structural characteristics are usually indicative of a Q=2 value (also see Note 7):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. There is a significant strength discontinuity in any of the vertical lateral force resisting elements, i.e., a weak story (see ASCE7-10 Table 12.3-2). b. The bracing system includes "K" braced bays. Note: "K" bracing is permitted for frames of two stories or less by using Q=2. For frames of more than two stories, "K" bracing must be justified on a case-by-case basis. c. Brace connections are not able to develop the capacity of the diagonals. d. Column splice details cannot develop the column capacity. <p>The following structural characteristics are usually indicative of a Q=4 value (also see Note 7):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> e. Diagonal elements designed to carry compression have (kl/r) greater than 120. f. The bracing system includes chevron ("V" or inverted "V") bracing that was designed to carry gravity load and/or beams not designed to resist unbalanced load effects due to compression buckling and brace yielding. g. Tension rod bracing with connections which develop rod strength. <p>Cantilever column The following structural characteristics are usually indicative of a Q=2.0 value (also see Note 7):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Column splice details cannot develop the column capacity. b. Axial load demand represents more than 20% of the axial load capacity. 	<p>6 or 8</p> <p>2, 4 or 5</p> <p>2, 4 or 5</p> <p>2 or 3.5</p>

TABLE 1
(Continued)

A. STRUCTURES SUPPORTING EQUIPMENT (Continued)	Q
<p>2. Concrete structures</p> <p>Ductile moment frame Use Q=6 if there is a significant departure from the intent of the 1988 (or later) UBC for special moment-resisting frames. If shear failure occurs before flexural failure in either beam or column, the frame should be considered an ordinary moment frame.</p> <p>Intermediate moment frame</p> <p>Ordinary moment frame The following structural characteristics are usually indicative of a Q=1.5 value (also see Note 7):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. There is a significant strength discontinuity in any of the vertical lateral force resisting elements, i.e., a weak story. b. The structure exhibits "strong girder - weak column" behavior, i.e., under combined lateral and vertical loading, hinges occur in a significant number of columns before occurring in the beams. c. There is visible deterioration of concrete or reinforcing steel in any of the frame elements, and this damage may lead to a brittle failure mode. d. Shear failure occurs before flexural failure in a significant number of the columns. <p>The following structural characteristics are usually indicative of a Q=2.5 value (also see Note 7):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> e. The lateral resisting frames include prestressed (pretensioned or post-tensioned elements). f. The beam stirrups and column ties are not anchored into the member cores with hooks of 135° or more. g. Columns have ties spaced at greater than d/4 throughout their length. Beam stirrups are spaced at greater than d/2. h. Any column bar lap splice is less than 35d_b long. Any column bar lap splice is not enclosed by ties spaced 8d_b or less. i. Development length for longitudinal bars is less than 24d_b. j. Shear failure occurs before flexural failure in a significant number of the beams. <p>Shear wall The following structural characteristics are usually indicative of a Q=1.5 value (also see Note 7):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. There is visible deterioration of concrete or reinforcing steel in any of the frame elements, and this damage may lead to a brittle failure mode. b. There is a significant strength discontinuity in any of the vertical lateral force resisting elements, i.e., a weak story. c. Any wall is not continuous to the foundation. <p>The following structural characteristics are usually indicative of a Q=3 value (also see Note 7):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> d. The reinforcing steel for concrete walls is not greater than 0.0025 times the gross area of the wall along both the longitudinal and transverse axes. The spacing of reinforcing steel along either axis exceeds 18 inches. e. For shear walls with H/D greater than 2.0, the boundary elements are not confined with either: (1) spirals; or (2) ties at spacing of less than 8d_b. f. For coupled shear wall buildings, stirrups in any coupling beam are spaced at greater than 8d_b or are not anchored into the core with hooks of 135° or more. <p>Cantilever pier/column The following structural characteristics are usually indicative of a Q=1.5 value (also see Note 7):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. There is visible deterioration of concrete or reinforcing steel in any of the elements, and this damage may lead to a brittle failure mode. b. Axial load demand represents more than 20% of the axial load capacity. <p>The following structural characteristics are usually indicative of a Q=2.5 value (also see Note 7):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> c. The ties are not anchored into the member cores with hooks of 135° or more. d. Columns have ties spaced at greater than d/4 throughout their length. Piers have ties spaced at greater than d/2 throughout their length. e. Any pier/column bar lap splice is less than 35d_b long. Any pier/column bar lap splice is not enclosed by ties spaced 8d_b or less. f. Development length for longitudinal bars is less than 24d_b. 	<p align="center">6 or 8</p> <p align="center">4 1.5, 2.5 or 3.5</p> <p align="center">1.5, 3 or 5</p> <p align="center">1.5, 2.5 or 3.5</p>

TABLE 1
(Continued)

B. EQUIPMENT BEHAVING AS STRUCTURES WITH INTEGRAL SUPPORTS	Q
<p>1. Vertical vessels/heaters or spheres supported by:</p> <p>Steel skirts The following structural characteristics are usually indicative of a Q=2 value (also see Note 7):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The diameter (D) divided by the thickness (t) of the skirt is greater than $0.441 \cdot E/F_y$, where E and F_y are the Young's modulus and yield stress of the skirt, respectively. <p>Steel braced legs without top girder or stiffener ring The following structural characteristics are usually indicative of a Q=1.5 value (also see Note 7):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The bracing system includes "K" braced bays. b. Brace connections are not able to develop the capacity of the diagonals. c. Column splice details cannot develop the column capacity. <p>The following structural characteristics are usually indicative of a Q=3 value (also see Note 7):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> d. Diagonal elements designed to carry compression have (kl/r) greater than 120. e. The bracing system includes chevron ("V" or inverted "V") bracing that was designed to carry gravity load and/or beams not designed to resist unbalanced load effects due to compression buckling and brace yielding. f. Tension rod bracing with connections which develop rod strength. <p>Steel unbraced legs without top girder or stiffener ring The following structural characteristics are usually indicative of a Q=1.5 value (also see Note 7):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Column splice details cannot develop the column capacity. b. Axial load demand represents more than 20% of the axial load capacity. <p>2. Chimneys or stacks</p> <p>Steel guyed</p> <p>Steel cantilever</p> <p>Concrete</p>	<p align="center">2 or 4</p> <p align="center">1.5, 3 or 4</p> <p align="center">1.5 or 2.5</p> <p align="center">4</p> <p align="center">4</p> <p align="center">4</p>

TABLE 1
(Continued)

C. PIPEWAYS	Q
<p>Notes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) This includes pipeways supporting equipment that does not weigh more than 25% of the other dead loads. For pipeways supporting equipment that weighs more than 25% of the other dead loads, see Section A, STRUCTURES SUPPORTING EQUIPMENT. 2) In order to use the full Q-values below, the caveats mentioned earlier in Section A of this table for steel and concrete structures must not be present. If they are, the Q-values in Section A should be used. <p>1. Steel</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Ductile moment frame (see Note 8)</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Ordinary moment frame (see Note 8)</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Braced frame</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Cantilever column</p> <p>2. Concrete</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Ductile moment frame</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Ordinary moment frame</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Cantilever column</p>	<p></p> <p align="center">8</p> <p align="center">6</p> <p align="center">6</p> <p align="center">4</p> <p></p> <p align="center">8</p> <p align="center">5</p> <p align="center">3.5</p>

TABLE 1
(Continued)

D. GROUND SUPPORTED TANKS (see Notes 4 and 9)	Q
1. Anchored	4
2. Unanchored	3
E. FOUNDATIONS (See Note 5)	Q
1. Piled	6
2. Spread footings	6
F. ANCHORAGE TO CONCRETE (see Note 6 and 9)	Q
1. Anchorage in tension and/or shear when there is a ductile force transfer mechanism between structure and foundation.	As for structure
2. Anchorage in tension and/or shear when there is a non-ductile force transfer mechanism between structure and foundation.	1.5
G. PIPING	Q
1. Piping in accordance with ASME B31, including in-line components with joints made by welding or brazing.	4.5
2. Piping in accordance with ASME B31, including in-line components, constructed of high- or limited-deformability materials, with joints made by threading, bonding, compression couplings, grooved couplings or flanges.	4
3. Piping and tubing not in accordance with ASME B31, including in-line components, constructed of high-deformability materials, with joints made by welding or brazing.	4
4. Piping and tubing not in accordance with ASME B31, including in-line components, constructed of high- or limited-deformability materials, with joints made by threading, bonding, compression couplings, grooved couplings or flanges.	3.5
5. Piping and tubing constructed of low-deformability materials, such as cast iron, glass, and nonductile plastics.	3

TABLE 1
(Continued)

NOTES:

1. The use of the highest Q-factors in each category requires that the elements of the primary load path of the lateral force resisting system have been proportioned to assure ductile rather than brittle system behavior. This can be demonstrated by showing that each connection in the primary load path has an ultimate strength of at least equal to 150% of the load capacity (governed by either yielding or stability) of the element to which the load is transferred. Alternatively, Q-factors should be reduced consistent with the limited ductility of the governing connection and/or the governing connection should be modified as required.
2. A Q-factor different from the tabulated values (higher or lower) may be justified on a case-by-case basis.
3. If more than one of the conditions specified in the table applies, the lowest Q-factor associated with those conditions should be used.
4. Other approved national standards for the seismic assessment of tanks may be used in lieu of these guidelines.
5. These values of Q apply to overturning checks, soil bearing, and pile capacities. For the remaining items including connection between piles and pile caps, use the Q factor for the supported structure.
6. For anchorage in tension or shear a ductile force transfer mechanism can be defined as when the concrete-governed strength is greater than 1.2 times the anchorage steel strength or when there are properly detailed concrete reinforcing bars being provided that prevent a concrete failure. When this is the case, then the Q-factor to be used for the evaluation of the anchorage, and the rest of the structural system corresponds to that for the structural system itself. For the evaluation and design of concrete reinforcing bars, a ductility factor of $0.75Q$ of the structure or $Q=1.5$, whichever is greater, shall be used. Additionally, for vessels, stacks and tanks the use of properly proportioned anchor bolt chairs must also be provided to ensure a ductile force transfer.

For anchorage in tension or shear a non-ductile force transfer mechanism can be defined as when a concrete-governed strength controls the evaluation of anchorage (as opposed to anchorage steel and in situations where inadequate reinforcing is provided) or when there is some other non-ductile force transfer mechanism between the structure and foundation. When this is the case, then a Q-factor of 1.5 should be used for the evaluation of the anchorage.

Combined tension and shear interaction shall also be checked for both the steel anchorage itself and the concrete embedment. If either tension or shear reinforcing is provided to prevent concrete failure then no interaction effects need to be considered for the concrete strength evaluation

Additionally for skirt supported vessels, flat bottom tanks or other structural systems where the anchorage is the primary source for ductility, the Q-factor determined for the anchorage shall also be used for the evaluation of vessel or tank itself or structural system. Also see Note 7.

Where anchorage corrosion is found then the effective area of the anchorage shall be reduced accordingly and taken into account in determining the anchorage strength. If the anchorage corrosion is severe enough to prevent adequate ductile yielding of the anchorage then a Q-factor of 1.5 shall be used for the anchorage evaluation.

7. Alternatively, for structures that may contain localized/single features with limited ductility, such as limiting connections or splices, non-compact steel members, high (Kl/r) members and non-ductile anchor bolts, that do not occur at a significant number of locations, the load

TABLE 1
(Continued)

capacity of the specific limiting feature(s) may be evaluated and/or improved in lieu of using system-wide lower Q-factors that tend to generically penalize all elements of the structural system. The evaluation for these localized features may be performed using a Q-factor equal to 0.4 times the Q-factor normally recommended (i.e., unreduced) for the system. The evaluation for the remainder of the system may then be performed using the Q-factor normally recommended without consideration of the localized feature with limited ductility

8. Figure 1 below shows a common connection detail which has been used in the building industry. In the aftermath of the January, 1994 Northridge, California earthquake, over 100 buildings were found, where cracks occurred in connections based on this detail. This Committee suggests that for determining the connection forces using a Q-value equal to one half (1/2) of Q for the structure system, but not less than 2, where this type of connection is present, unless justified otherwise.




Figure 1: Former Standard Ductile Moment Connection Detail. (As a result of the Northridge Earthquake, this connection was shown to have major problems.)

9. For tanks made of fiberglass or similar materials, non-ductile anchorage and its attachments should be evaluated for a Q equal to 1.5.

ATTACHMENT A

RECOMMENDED GEOTECHNICAL REPORT CONTENTS

A proper assessment of the above earthquake hazard effects will generally require, as a prerequisite, knowledge of the underlying soil profile at the facility. Therefore, a geotechnical report for the facility should be made available to the engineer performing the CalARP seismic review.

If the soil profile is known to be uniform over the entire area, a geotechnical report developed for an adjacent facility may be adequate. It is preferable if the adjacent site having a geotechnical report is within 300 feet of the facility in question. Consultation with the AA and with the local Building Official may also provide some information in this regard.

If the owner cannot provide an adequate geotechnical report, then the options are as follows:

- 1) The owner may contract with a licensed geotechnical engineer to provide a report that will be adequate for the CalARP seismic review.
- 2) The engineer may engage a licensed geotechnical engineer as a sub-consultant to provide a geotechnical report.
- 3) The engineer may make a series of conservative (essentially “worst case”) assumptions in determining the effects of the underlying soil profile on the various seismic hazards. Such assumptions may be based on the soil characteristics known for the general area. Alternatively, the site class may be assumed which gives the largest evaluation forces. Depending on the situation, this option may or may not be the most cost-effective approach for the owner (e.g., for a single small item, it is generally not cost effective to have a geotech report performed).

A standard geotechnical investigation report should include the information in the following list. The listed items are divided into two “tiers” or types of information. The first tier lists the basic minimum contents of a geotechnical (soils) report. The second tier lists information which the engineer performing the CalARP seismic review will eventually require, and it will be convenient and beneficial if the geotechnical report provides a professional presentation of this information.

Tier 1 -- Minimum Contents of Geotechnical Report for CalARP Review

- 1) Plot Plans drawn to scale depicting the locations of exploratory borings.
- 2) Boring logs (to depth of at least 50 feet) indicating ground surface elevation, blow counts (penetration), graphic log of material encountered, depth to groundwater (if encountered), soil classification and description (per ASTM standards), moisture content and dry density.

ATTACHMENT A

(Continued)

- 3) Geologic setting, subsurface soil conditions soil types, and regional groundwater information.
- 4) Recommendations for appropriate foundation schemes and design parameters including soil bearing capacity, estimated total/differential settlements, and lateral resistance.
- 5) Recommendations for the design of retaining walls including active and passive earth pressures.

Tier 2 -- Desirable Additional Contents of Geotechnical Report

- 1) Recommendations pertaining to seismic design parameters based on ASCE/SEI 7-05 or the latest California Building Code adopted by the local jurisdiction. Parameters such as Site Class; Site MCE Ground Motion Parameters S_S and S_1 , Site Coefficients F_a and F_v and site DE parameters S_{DS} , S_{D1} and T_L .
- 2) Results of geologic and seismic hazard analysis (based on guidelines in SP117) including poor soil conditions, locations of active and potentially active faults, fault rupture potential, liquefaction, seismically-induced settlement/differential settlements, and seismically-induced flooding.

ATTACHMENT B

(Continued)

Seismic Evaluation CalARP Walkdown Review Sheet Piping

Line Number:		Date:	
Drawing Number:		By:	

Evaluation Summary (Circle one)

Adequate

Not Adequate

Further Evaluation Required

<u>Inspection Attributes</u>				
	Yes	No	Inac	Comments
Piping				
Damaged				
Corrosion				
Flanged/Threaded Joints				
Buried Run				
Adequate Branch Flexibility				
Rigidly Spans Components				
Supports				
Piping Spans OK				
Missing Hardware				
Corrosion				
Hardware Damaged/Loose				
Seismic Interaction				
Adequate Clearance				
Adjacent Comps. Secure				
Clearance at AOVs/MOVs				

ATTACHMENT B
(Continued)

Line Number:		Date:	
--------------	--	-------	--

Notes and Sketches