



Status of the
**Unreinforced
Masonry
Building Law**



2000

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



Seismic Safety Commission
SSC 2000-02

Year 2000 Report to the Legislature

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



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

SSC 00-02

Seismic Safety Commission

Daniel Shapiro
Commission Chairman
Structural Engineering

Elaine White Alquist
Alternate: William Gates
State Assembly

Donald O. Manning
Fire Protection

Andrew A. Adelman
Mechanical Engineer

Richard Alarcon
Alternate: Chris Modrzejewski
State Senate

Scott P. Haggerty
County Government

Patricia Snyder
Volunteer/Social Services

Douglas E. Mochizuki
Local Government

Jeffrey A. Johnson
Seismology

Jerry C. Chang
Soils Engineering

Ashok S. Patwardhan
Mechanical Engineer

Seismic Safety Commission Staff

Richard J. McCarthy
Executive Director

Karen Cogan

Kathy Goodell

Kyshia Davis
URM Report Preparer

Henry Reyes, SE

Fred Turner, SE
URM Report Manager

Judy Deng
URM Report Preparer

Carmen Marquez

Adopted April 13, 2000 by the
California Seismic Safety Commission
1755 Creekside Oaks Dr. Suite 100
Sacramento, CA 95833

© California Seismic Safety Commission
All Rights Reserved

Cover Photos Provided By Commissioner Patricia Snyder

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface.....	1
Introduction: URM Buildings	2
The URM Law	2
The Scope of the URM Law	2
Measures of Implementation.....	3
Types of Programs	3
Current Status of Implementing the URM Law.....	4
Loss Reduction Program Effectiveness	6
2000 Recommendations.....	8
Conclusions.....	8
Acknowledgments.....	8
References.....	9
Table A: Statewide Summary of the URM Law Implementation	10
Appendix A	A1
Appendix B	B1

STATUS OF CALIFORNIA'S UNREINFORCED MASONRY BUILDING LAW

PREFACE

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

On the surface, the level of compliance with this law has been quite high with about 96 percent of the 25,500 URM buildings now in loss reduction programs. But so far, only slightly more than half of the owners has reduced losses by retrofitting in accordance with a widely recognized building code or by other means. Significant progress has occurred, yet many URM programs are ineffective in reducing future earthquake losses.

What lessons can be drawn from California's experience with URM buildings and how can they be applied to future loss reduction efforts? This report summarizes the status of local government and building owner efforts to comply with this law. The Seismic Safety Commission adopted this biennial report to the State Legislature with its recommendations on improving this law in April 2000.

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

INTRODUCTION: URM BUILDINGS

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

The URM Law

California's main effort to reduce these earthquake losses is the URM Law. Passed in 1986, this state law requires 366 local governments in the highest Seismic Zone 4 (ICBO, 1985) to do three things:

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

In addition, the law recommends that local governments:

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

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

California's Seismic Safety Commission monitors local government efforts to comply with this law and reports biannually to the state's Legislature. This report updates the Commission's prior status report of late 1997 (SSC, 1997).

The Scope of the URM Law

Seismic Hazard Zone 4 is a region defined in the California Building Code nearest historically active faults. In 1986, it included the major metropolitan areas of Los Angeles and San Francisco, roughly 27 million people, or 75 percent of the state's population. When the law was passed, the city of San Diego was not considered to be in Zone 4 (ICBO, 1985). Since then, San Diego has been added to Zone 4 and has now voluntarily adopted a loss reduction program (ICBO, 1997).

Approximately 25,400 URM buildings with an average size of 10,000 square feet have been inventoried in Zone 4's 366 jurisdictions. This is a relatively small percentage of California's

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

In the 1980's, it was estimated that the URM Law would result in roughly \$4 billion in retrofit expenditures with activity well into the new century. This cost, although large, pales in comparison with several hundred billion dollars in anticipated damage from one major urban earthquake in California. Average expected losses from earthquakes in California are approximately \$3 billion per year. Future earthquake losses can be greatly reduced by carrying out effective URM programs.

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

MEASURES OF IMPLEMENTATION

Types of Programs

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

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

California now requires all jurisdictions to enforce the 1997 Uniform Code for Building Conservation, Appendix Chapter 1 as a model building code although local governments may adopt amendments under certain circumstances (ICBO, 1997). For historical buildings, the California Historical Building Code also refers to the UCBC (ICBO, 1998). The UCBC contains only technical standards and has no administrative triggers for retrofitting other than the issuance of permits. Each local government usually defines triggers for compliance. A fair amount of retrofitting has been performed in accordance with standards preceding the UCBC and may only partially comply with the latest UCBC.

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

Program Type	Summary
Mandatory Strengthening	These programs require owners to strengthen or otherwise reduce risks in their buildings within times prescribed by each local government. Time schedules vary and generally depend on the number of occupants. Programs are based upon the City of Los Angeles' Division 88 ordinance (LA, 1981) which is also the historic basis for the Uniform Code For Building Conservation Appendix Chapter 1 (ICBO, 1994) and the Seismic Safety Commission's Recommended Model Ordinance (CSSC, 1995). Triggers for the Model Ordinance were developed in 1991 in cooperation with the California Building Officials.
Voluntary Strengthening	These programs establish seismic retrofit standards and require owners to evaluate the seismic risks in their buildings. Owners then write publicly available letters indicating their strengthening plans and schedules (CSSC, 1990). This is a somewhat more effective type of program than notification only.
Notification Only	Local governments write letters to owners stating that their building type has been known to perform poorly in earthquakes. This is typically the least effective type of program. Most jurisdictions have adopted more comprehensive measures than this.
Other	Variations of the above with unique requirements and effectiveness. Some cities, for example, require owners to post placards on URM buildings that warn occupants and passersby of earthquake risks. In general, placarding has not proven to be an effective motivation for owners to retrofit. (CSSC, 1995)

Current Status of Implementing the URM Law

Every other year, the California Seismic Safety Commission contacts local governments affected by the URM Law and asks them to summarize their efforts to date. In the late fall of 1999 and

early 2000, the Commission contacted the 286 jurisdictions in Seismic Zone 4 with URM buildings.

Table 2. City and County Responses to the URM Law in 2000

Cities & Counties	Number	Percent	Population	Percent	URM's	Percent
• with inventories not complete	9	2%	155,565	<1%	80	<1%
• with inventories complete, but no URM programs	27	7%	565,340	2%	488	2%
• with no URM's	79	22%	2,386,724	11%	0	0
• with URM programs	250	68%	19,599,026	86%	24,785	98%
Totals	366	100%	22,725,505	100%	25,353	100%

The URM Law continues to gain effectiveness in 2000. There weren't dramatic changes from the 1997 data, but most of the changes still depict the continued efforts of local governments and owners to carry out the URM Law.

Among the noteworthy changes are the following:

- One more jurisdiction completed their inventory since 1997, leaving only nine that have not completed theirs.
- Cities and counties with inventories completed, but with loss reduction programs not established (as required by law) decreased from 35 to 27.
- The number of cities and counties with URM buildings in compliance with the law increased from 243 to 250.
- The number URM buildings that are in communities that don't have earthquake loss reduction programs decreased from 846 to 568. One of the goals of the URM Law is to have every URM building in the high-seismic region of California under some type of program, preferably mandatory strengthening. So even though the URM Law is expanding its progress, work still remains to be done.
- Unfortunately, three jurisdictions have repealed or relaxed their mandatory strengthening ordinances: Morro Bay and San Bernardino City have repealed theirs

and Eureka has lengthened timeframes for compliance. An unknown number of local governments do not appear to enforce their mandatory strengthening ordinances based on the absence of retrofit activity.

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

Table 3. Number and Scope of URM Loss Reduction Programs in California's Zone 4 as of early 2000.

Type of Loss Reduction Programs	Entities	Percent	Population	Percent	URM's	Percent
Mandatory	129	52%	13,729,046	70%	18,884	76%
Voluntary	39	16%	1,620,225	8%	1,374	6%
Notification	46	18%	2,305,725	12%	1,639	7%
Other	36	14%	1,944,030	10%	2,888	12%
TOTALS	250	100%	19,599,026	100%	24,785	100%

The most notable progress since 1997 is that the number of jurisdictions with voluntary strengthening programs went up by 4, from 35 to 39. But these types of programs only encompass 6 percent of the URM buildings. Over three fourths of the URM buildings are in communities that adopted more-effective, mandatory strengthening programs.

Loss Reduction Program Effectiveness

The Commission wanted to depict the relative effectiveness of different types of programs, so several simplifying assumptions were made. Table 4 below is predicated on the assumption that most loss reduction programs have had sufficient time to cause substantial retrofit activity. Typically many programs were initiated around 1990 and have had seven years of retrofits. There are major exceptions to this assumption. Some programs are still just getting started and others were completed years ago. So the data to support the Commission's inferences remain incomplete and may be subject to other interpretations, since some retrofits are still in progress or have yet to start. In many ways, each building owner's situation is unique as well as each local government's, and the Commission has generalized with simplistic interpretations of the data below. Average values are provided, but the variation in retrofit rates is significant and not shown.

Readers should note that many strengthening programs have unique time schedules for compliance and that local economies vary widely from those with high property and rental rates to others facing high vacancy rates, low rents and property values. These variations are not captured by the information below.

Nevertheless, one way to gauge the effectiveness of different types of programs is by comparing average rates of retrofit and demolition. The following are the percentages of buildings in substantial compliance of Appendix Chapter 1 of the UCBC or demolished since their original inventories. These figures were taken from only those jurisdictions responding:

Table 4. Average Rates of Retrofit in Substantial Compliance with the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1 and Average Rates of Demolition Based on Local Government Responses to the 2000 Survey.

Type of Program	Mandatory	Voluntary	Notification	Other
Retrofitted	42%	11%	6%	11%
Demolished	17%	5%	5%	6%
Total Percent	59%	16%	11%	17%
Total No. URM's	17,100	1,000	1,000	2,700
Entities Responding	96	30	26	28

Overall, the average retrofit rate in substantial compliance with the UCBC was 35 percent and the demolition rate was 15 percent. Mandatory strengthening programs typically have much higher retrofit rates than the other program types. However, the demolition rate in mandatory programs is also much higher than the other programs. Also, in the 1997 survey, voluntary programs didn't appear to be significantly more effective in reducing losses than notification programs. With the passage of two more years, we are beginning to see distinctly greater progress in voluntary programs compared to notification.

The presence of economic incentives coupled with URM programs seems to encourage owners in voluntary strengthening programs to retrofit. There is a 36% rate of UCBC retrofit for the three responding cities with economic incentives and about a 11% rate for those twelve cities without them. Although data is limited, it appears that economic incentives may have helped encourage voluntary retrofits by owners albeit at a somewhat slower pace than mandatory strengthening programs.

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

COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 2000

- The Legislature should hold a hearing to revisit the state's 1986 Unreinforced Masonry (URM) Law and consider appropriate actions to address the inequities and the public's continuing exposure to risk that have resulted from the failure of a significant number of local governments to comply with the intent of the law, so that approximately half of the state's URM buildings remain unstrengthened. Actions to be considered should include but not be limited to:
 - Adopting legislation to mandate the strengthening of all unreinforced masonry buildings including state-owned buildings statewide in accordance with the state's model building code, the Uniform Code for Building Conservation, Appendix Chapter 1.
 - Developing and adopting legislation to encourage local governments jurisdictions that have little or no retrofit progress to provide financial incentives such as low interest loans to encourage owners to retrofit.
 - Exploring other policy options that would establish statewide financial incentives such as low interest loans.

CONCLUSIONS

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

Voluntary strengthening has not been as effective because current economic incentives are typically not sufficient to create a market-driven willingness to retrofit. The Commission has proposed additional retrofit incentives in its *California Earthquake Loss Reduction Plan* (CSSC, 1997). This new plans recommends that state and local governments "encourage economic incentives, such as improved mortgage terms, reduced insurance rates, and positive tax benefits, for upgrading structural and non-structural elements in buildings."

A follow-up Commission report titled "Incentives to Improve California's Earthquake Safety: an 'Agenda in Waiting'" (SSC, 1999) and an EERI report titled "Incentives and Impediments to Improving the Seismic Safety Performance of Buildings" (EERI, 1998) shed more light on the merits and nuances of incentives.

Still much remains to be done with respect to the URM Law. For example, California has 36 remaining jurisdictions with 568 URM buildings that are not in compliance with the law.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Commission wishes to thank all of the local governments that responded to the 2000 URM Survey. Without their efforts, this report would not have been possible.

The Commission also wishes to acknowledge the efforts of Carmen Marquez, Judy Deng, and Kyshia Davis in compiling the data in this report.

REFERENCES

- California Legislature. "The URM Law," Section 8875 *et. seq.*, Government Code, California Statutes of 1986.
- California Seismic Safety Commission. "California Earthquake Loss Reduction Plan." SSC 97-02, May, 1997.
- California Seismic Safety Commission. "Status of the Unreinforced Masonry Building Law." SSC 97-03, 1997.
- California Seismic Safety Commission. "Status of the Unreinforced Masonry Building Law." SSC 95-05, 1995.
- California Seismic Safety Commission. "Earthquake Hazard Identification and Voluntary Mitigation: Palo Alto's City Ordinance," SSC 90-05, 1990.
- International Conference of Building Officials. "State Historical Building Code," 1998, California Building Standards Commission, Part 8, Title 24, California Code of Regulations.
- International Conference of Building Officials. "Uniform Building Code," 1985 Edition, Seismic Zone Map in effect at the time of the passage of the 1986 URM Law.
- International Conference of Building Officials. "Uniform Building Code," 1997 Edition, California Building Standards Commission, California Building Code, Part 2, Title 24, California Code of Regulations.
- International Conference of Building Officials. "Uniform Code for Building Conservation, Appendix Chapter 1," 1997 Edition, California Building Standards Commission, Part 10, Title 24, California Code of Regulations.
- Los Angeles, City of. "Division 88 - Earthquake Hazard Reduction in Existing Buildings," February 13, 1981.
- Seismic Safety Commission, "Incentives to Improve California's Earthquake Safety: An 'Agenda in Waiting'", SSC 99-02.
- Earthquake Engineering Research Institute, "Incentives and Impediments to Improving the Seismic Safety Performance of Buildings," EERI, 1998.

Table A
State Summary of the URM Law Implementation

	Jurisdictions	Percentages	Population	Percentages	URM's	Percentages
Cities without inventories started	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Cities with inventories not completed	7	2.0	126,065	<1.0	54	<1.0
Cities with inventory completed—No mitigation program started	25	7.0	509,390	2.0	475	2.0
Cities with no URM's	75	20.0	2,036,374	9.0	0	0.0
Cities with mitigation programs	230	63.0	15,569,726	69.0	23,690	93.0
Cities in Zone 4 affected by the URM Law	337	92.0%	18,121,805	80.0%	24,219	96.0%
Counties without inventories started	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Counties with inventories not completed	2	<1.0	29,500	<1.0	26	<1.0
Counties with inventory completed—No mitigation program started	2	<1.0	55,950	<1.0	13	<1.0
Counties with no URM's	5	1.0	488,950	2.0	0	0.0
Counties with mitigation programs	20	6.0	4,009,300	18.0	1095	4.0
Counties in Zone 4 affected by the URM Law	29	8.0%	4,603,700	21.0%	1134	4.0%
Cities and counties without inventories started	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Cities and counties with inventories not completed	9	2.0	155,565	<1.0	80	<1.0
Cities and counties with inventory completed—No mitigation program started	27	7.0	565,340	2.0	488	2.0
Cities and counties with no URM's	79	22.0	2,386,724	11.0	0	0.0
Cities and counties with mitigation programs	250	68.0	19,599,026	86.0	24,785	98.0
Total cities and counties in Zone 4	366	100.00%	22,725,505	100.00%	25,353	100.00%
Types of mitigation programs established						
Mandatory Strengthening Program	129	52.0%	13,729,046	70.0%	18,884	76.0%
Voluntary Strengthening Program	39	16.0	1,620,225	8.0	1,374	6.0
Notification Only	46	18.0	2,305,725	12.0	1,639	7.0
Other	26	14.0	1,944,030	10.0	2,888	12.0
Total cities and counties with mitigation programs	250	100.00%	21,479,785	100.00%	24,785	100.00%
Cities and Counties that replied to the 1997 URM Survey	202	55.0%	17,312,291	76.0%	22,389	88.0%

Appendix A- 2000 Survey of City and County Mitigation Efforts

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1999 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted /Plancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Adelanto															
Yes	0	12	No		1					1	10				
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Agoura Hills															
Yes	1	0	Yes			1									
Mitigation Program Type: City completed strengthening of the historic.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: State Historic Building Code															
Progress and Remarks:															
Alameda															
Yes	0	73	Yes	yes	2	22	19							30	73
Mitigation Program Type: Parapet, wall anchorage, and wall slenderness limits only.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1985 Seismic Safety Commission (SSC) Model Ordinance partially referenced.															
Progress and Remarks:															
Alameda County															
Yes	0	17	Yes	Yes	unkn own	n/a	unkn own	0	0	0	1	0	unkn own	17	17
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Albany															
Yes	0	37	No	yes			4	0	0	0	0				37
Mitigation Program Type: Draft presented to City Council 3/95															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1 adopted 1/95.															
Progress and Remarks: Mandatory strengthening program expected to be adopted 7/95. The 1997 survey said that there were no significant changes since 1995. 1999 survey reported change of staff. Unable to verify no. of URMs in compliance with UCBC. No mitigation code was adopted. No. of URM slated for demolition unknown. No. of URM with posted warnings unknown.															
Alhambra															
Yes	6	164	Yes		150	150	9		5		3			3	170
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1985 Edition of Chapter 96 of the Los Angeles County Code.															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URM)												
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URM	Number of Non-Historic URM	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1999 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified	
Anaheim																
Yes	0	16	Yes	yes		10	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	16	
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening																
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1987 Edition of the SSC Model Ordinance																
Progress and Remarks: In 1988, the city believed that they only had 1 URM which was demolished, subsequent inventories identified more buildings.																
Antioch																
Yes	0	25	No													
Mitigation Program Type:																
Technical Mitigation Standards:																
Progress and Remarks: Requested a copy of the model ordinance in 1995.																
Apple Valley																
Yes	0	14	Yes	yes												
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners, retrofits triggered upon alterations or additions.																
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1987 Edition of the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1																
Progress and Remarks:																
Arcadia																
Yes	0	22	Yes	yes	0	19					3			0	22	
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening																
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1987 Edition of the SSC Model Ordinance																
Progress and Remarks:																
Arcata																
Yes	0	2	No		2											
Mitigation Program Type:																
Technical Mitigation Standards:																
Progress and Remarks:																
Arroyo Grande																
Yes	0	25	Yes	yes	2	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0		
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening																
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1987 Edition of the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1																
Progress and Remarks: Reduced permit fees, extended time limits, and non-conforming building use permitted.																
Artesia																
Yes	0	4	Yes													
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening																
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1985 Edition of Chapter 96 of the Los Angeles County Code																
Progress and Remarks:																

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)												
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1999 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified	
Arvin																
Yes	0	16	yes	yes	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	1	0	12	19	
Mitigation Program Type:																
Technical Mitigation Standards: Uniform Code for Building Conservation																
Progress and Remarks: The building official will bring a draft mitigation program to the City Council for its consideration in October 1997.																
Atascadero																
Yes	0	28	Yes	yes	8			1						19	28	
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening																
Technical Mitigation Standards: SSC Model Ordinance																
Progress and Remarks:																
Atherton																
No	0	1	No													
Mitigation Program Type:																
Technical Mitigation Standards:																
Progress and Remarks:																
Avalon																
Yes	0	19	Yes			2		2	3					12		
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening																
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1985 Edition Chapter 96 of the Los Angeles County Code																
Progress and Remarks:																
Avenal																
No	0	8	No													
Mitigation Program Type:																
Technical Mitigation Standards:																
Progress and Remarks:																
Azusa																
Yes	1	27	Yes	yes		9	4	1	1		11	5		2	28	
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening																
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1982 Edition of Division 88 Los Angeles City Code																
Progress and Remarks:																
Bakersfield																
Yes	0	191	Yes	yes	6	68	48	0	21	6	20	0	0	35	191	
Mitigation Program Type: Partial Strengthening - Wall & Parpet Anchors only																
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1991 Edition of the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1																
Progress and Remarks:																

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1999 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

Baldwin Park

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

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening

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

Progress and Remarks: 1955 program of parapet bracing and wall anchors

Banning

Yes	0	49	Yes												
-----	---	----	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners

Technical Mitigation Standards: None

Progress and Remarks:

Barstow

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

Mitigation Program Type:

Technical Mitigation Standards:

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

Beaumont

Yes	0	37	Yes												
-----	---	----	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening

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

Progress and Remarks:

Bell

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

Mitigation Program Type:

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

Bell Gardens

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

Mitigation Program Type:

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

Bellflower

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

Mitigation Program Type: 1

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

Progress and Remarks:

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1999 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Belmont															
Yes	0	2	Yes	yes				1	1						2
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1987 Edition of the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1 as amended to reflect the 1990 SHBC Draft Model Ordinance															
Progress and Remarks:															
Belvedere															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Benicia															
Yes	18	21	Yes												
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners Historic building owners were not notified, notices to tenants, semiannual progress reports by building official															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks:															
Berkeley															
Yes	0	587	Yes												
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory, nonbearing walls and veneers.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: City provides prescriptive standards for tall veneers, parapets and simple one or two story buildings. SEAOC/CALBO recommended retrofit provisions with modifications for bearing wall URMs.															
Progress and Remarks: City established a one-time fee of \$22 on all business licenses to recover city's program startup costs. City directed its staff to develop a hazards evaluation ordinance to be followed by a mandatory strengthening ordinance pending the availability of state and federal financing. 587 Buildings, All Pre-1976 Assembly, Business, Educational, Hazardous, and Resident with 5 or more units.															
Beverly Hills															
Yes	0	95	Yes	yes	88	88			1		2	2		2	95
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Similar to the 1991 edition of the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1															
Progress and Remarks:															
Big Bear Lake															
No	0	24	No			6	0				9			34	
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks: 7 damaged commercial buildings and 2 damaged fire stations have been demolished after the 1992 quake, 33 are left and some of those are residential, 4 are commercial.															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)												
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1999 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified	
Bishop																
Yes	0	1	Yes	yes							1					
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory Strengthening																
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1988 UCBC State Historical Building Code																
Progress and Remarks:																
Blue Lake																
Yes	0	0	N/A													
Mitigation Program Type:																
Technical Mitigation Standards:																
Progress and Remarks:																
Bradbury																
Yes	0	0	N/A													
Mitigation Program Type:																
Technical Mitigation Standards:																
Progress and Remarks:																
Brawley																
Yes	0	66	Yes			16								50		
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners																
Technical Mitigation Standards: None																
Progress and Remarks:																
Brea																
Yes	2	1	Yes	yes		2					24	1			3	
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners																
Technical Mitigation Standards: None																
Progress and Remarks:																
Brentwood																
Yes	0	7	Yes	yes	3	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	5	4	7	
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening																
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1																
Progress and Remarks: City put together a funding program in 1992.																
Brisbane																
Yes	0	4	Yes	yes	0					2	1	1		0	4	
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening																
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1985 UBC and the City of Los Angeles Division 88; for tiltup concrete buildings Section 2314 of the 1973 UBC upon major alterations, additions, or changes of use.																
Progress and Remarks: Ordinance also covers tiltup buildings.																

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1999 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Buena Park															
Yes	0	0	N/A	yes											
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1988 Edition of the City of Los Angeles Division 88															
Progress and Remarks: The latest survey as of 11-17-99 indicates that none of the 5 buildings originally inventoried were URM.															
Burbank															
Yes	0	53	Yes	yes		29	1	1	0	0	22	0	0	0	53
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1982 Edition of Division 88 Los Angeles City Code															
Progress and Remarks:															
Burlingame															
Yes	0	63	Yes	yes	53		0		0		9			1	
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Similar to the February 1990 Edition of the SSC Model Ordinance															
Progress and Remarks: Applicants are given the choice to update to UCBC or SSC Model Ordinance—all chose UCBC. 2 URMs with no progress have expired plan checks and 2 are in probate. Overall progress has been outstanding. Final deadline for compliance (completion of retrofit) is July 1, 1996. Anticipate problems in getting 2 (of the original 54 properties) to comply by deadline.															
Calexico															
Yes	0	21	Yes	yes		21	7	2	1		0	1		10	21
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners, structural reports, wall anchors, and demolition.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: "LA Model Ordinance"															
Progress and Remarks:															
California City															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Calipatria															
Yes	0	6	Yes												
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1988 Edition of the County of Los Angeles Chapter 96															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URM's)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URM's	Number of Non-Historic URM's	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1999 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Calistoga															
Yes	17	20	Yes		2	2*	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	33	37
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards: The 37 URM's are potentially hazardous. *Denotes that the two buildings in Substantial Compliance are the same as in Chapter 1.															
Progress and Remarks:															
Camarillo															
Yes	0	37	Yes	yes		36			0					1	37
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: February 1990 SSC Model Ordinance															
Progress and Remarks:															
Campbell															
Yes	0	9	Yes		2									7	
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Complete 1985 Edition of the UCBC including the Appendices															
Progress and Remarks: An earlier 1989 program of mandatory strengthening was relaxed in 1993.															
Capitola															
Yes	0	1	Yes	yes							1				
Mitigation Program Type: Demolition															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Carlsbad															
Yes	0	9	Yes	yes	2	1	0	5	0					0	9
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1															
Progress and Remarks:															
Carmel-by-the-Sea															
Yes	1	25	Yes	yes	0	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	5	25
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary Strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1987 Edition of the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1 for URM Bldgs, 1973 Edition of the UCBC for Non-URM Buildings, 1985 UCBC															
Progress and Remarks: 20 Bldgs were removed from the inventory after seismic hazard evaluation reports were submitted to the City June 17, 1991. 26 Bldgs URM, Pre-1935 with 100+ Occupants Pre-1976 with 300+ Occupants. The historic building is in the Carmel Mission Basilica.															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1999 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Carpinteria															
Yes	0	0	Yes	yes	3						0			0	0
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None Reported															
Progress and Remarks:															
Carson															
Yes	0	32	Yes			32	10								
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory Strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1985 Edition Chapter 96 of the Los Angeles County Code															
Progress and Remarks:															
Cathedral City															
Yes	0	0	N/A								1	1			
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Cerritos															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Chino															
Yes	2	25	Yes	yes		12					13	0	12		24
Mitigation Program Type: Posting, however most buildings will be demolished due to downtown redevelopment.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1991 Edition of the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1															
Progress and Remarks:															
Claremont															
Yes	31	1	Yes	yes	4	21	0	0	1	0	2	5	0	0	
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Parapets and wall anchors only.															
Progress and Remarks: In volunteer strengthening phase until August 1992. (Applied for Hazard Mitigation Grant Program to strengthen City Hall service portion containing the Emergency Operations Center. City has FEMA approval with Construction to be from 12/97 to 12/98) All of the private sector is in full compliance with Seismic Program. City all full compliance seismic strengthening completed 12/98															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1999 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Clayton															
Yes	0	1	Yes	yes		1									1
Mitigation Program Type: Notification only															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks: A draft ordinance, which will include adoption of UCBC Appendix Chapter 1 with a three year period for compliance, is being proposed for adoption in 1995. Contra Costa County contracts for Clayton, Lafayette, Moraga and Orinda.															
Clearlake															
Yes	1	4	Yes	yes		4									4
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening, historic buildings are exempt.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1, modified, SHBC															
Progress and Remarks: Seismic evaluation reports, posting, bracing of parapets and veneer, full strengthening required at time of major remodel or repairs.															
Cloverdale															
Yes	0	23	No		2								23		23
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC															
Progress and Remarks: Ordinance being written in 1995.															
Coachella															
Yes	0	1	No			1					1				
Mitigation Program Type: None															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks: Originally inventoried 14 URMs but metal detectors found 13 reinforced. The remaining single URM was destroyed in a fire in 1994.															
Coalinga															
Yes	0	66	No	yes	2						64				
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Colma															
yes	0	0	N/A	yes		0									0
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners, seismic hazard evaluation reports required															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks: Reports indicate that none of the buildings have been determined to be hazardous. City is reviewing the engineering reports.															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URM's)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URM's	Number of Non-Historic URM's	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1999 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Colton															
Yes	0	20	Yes	yes	0	5	0	0	0	0		1	0	14	20
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks:															
Commerce															
Yes	0	9	Yes	yes		4			0		3			1	
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1985 Edition Chapter 96 of the Los Angeles County Code															
Progress and Remarks:															
Compton															
Yes	0	1	Yes	yes	4	4	1	2	0	0	6	1	0	0	
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Concord															
Yes	2	12	Yes												
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening within 5 years															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1															
Progress and Remarks:															
Contra Costa County															
Yes	0	48	Yes	Yes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Mitigation Program Type: Notification only															
Technical Mitigation Standards: none															
Progress and Remarks: A draft ordinance, which will include adoption of UCBC Appendix Chapter 1 with a three year period for compliance, is being proposed for adoption in 1995. Contra Costa County contracts for Clayton, Lafayette, Moraga and Orinda.															
Corona															
Yes	0	14	Yes			12	2			4	1		11		14
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1987 Edition of the SSC Model Ordinance															
Progress and Remarks:															
Corte Madera															
Yes	0	3	Yes												
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to Owners															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URM's)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URM's	Number of Non-Historic URM's	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1999 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

Costa Mesa

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

Mitigation Program Type:

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

Cotati

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

Mitigation Program Type:

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

Covina

Yes	0	75	Yes	yes	7	46	3					4		15	75
-----	---	----	-----	-----	---	----	---	--	--	--	--	---	--	----	----

Mitigation Program Type: Notices to Owners and Voluntary Strengthening Program

Technical Mitigation Standards: None

Progress and Remarks:

Cudahy

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

Mitigation Program Type:

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

Culver City

Yes	0	65	Yes	yes	0	65	0			0		0		0	65
-----	---	----	-----	-----	---	----	---	--	--	---	--	---	--	---	----

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening

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

Progress and Remarks:

Cupertino

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

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening

Technical Mitigation Standards: 1990 Edition SSC Model Ordinance

Progress and Remarks:

Cypress

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

Mitigation Program Type:

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1999 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Daly City															
Yes	0	3	Yes	yes	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1987 Edition of the SSC Model Ordinance															
Progress and Remarks: Technical mitigation standard updated to the current edition of the Uniform Code for Building Conservation, Appendix Chapter 1.															
Dana Point															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Danville															
Yes	4	1	Yes												5
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None reported															
Progress and Remarks: A mandatory strengthening program was considered for adoption in May 1991. 1 Non-historic 4 Historic URM, all retrofits are underway,															
Davis															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Del Rey Oaks															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Delano															
Yes	0	38	Yes		1		1							37	38
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1999 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Desert Hot Springs															
Yes	0	1	Yes								1				
Mitigation Program Type: Demolition															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks:															
Diamond Bar															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Dixon															
Yes	0	14	Yes	yes	1	1	1			1				11	14
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners, seismic retrofits are triggered upon sale or alterations.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1															
Progress and Remarks:															
Downey															
Yes	0	14	Yes	yes	0	12		0	0		2				
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1985 Edition UCBC Appendix Chapter 1, 20% gravity for walls, 15 lb. wind load, 50% gravity for parapets, diaphragms 1/2 of current code.															
Progress and Remarks: Inventory not complete. 14 Pre-1957 URM buildings except one and two family dwellings															
Duarte															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Dublin															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
East Palo Alto															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)												
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1999 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified	
El Centro																
Yes	0	55	Yes	yes	3	7	15	0	0	0	3	7	0	20	55	
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory parapet bracing, additional strengthening at the time of remodel.																
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1991 Edition of the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1																
Progress and Remarks: Progress is slow, difficult to obtain financing. Construction cost is more than the value of the structures. Estimated cost of compliance was approximately \$5,700,000 in 1993. 1989 Program: Owner notification. 1991 Program: Active/passive program based on occupancy.																
El Cerrito																
Yes	0	32	Yes	yes	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	29	32	
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening																
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1985 Edition of the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1																
Progress and Remarks: Owners in violation guilty of misdemeanor. No changes for 97 status.																
El Monte																
Yes	0	25	Yes	yes	24	24								1	25	
Mitigation Program Type: Analysis required under a facade improvement ordinance.																
Technical Mitigation Standards: None																
Progress and Remarks:																
El Segundo																
Yes	0	14	Yes													
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening																
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1987 Edition SSC Model Ordinance																
Progress and Remarks:																
Emeryville																
Yes	0	101	Yes	Yes	26	24	8	2	3	2	12	3		19	101	
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory Strengthening, Structural analysis and report and mitigation by 8/93.																
Technical Mitigation Standards: Ordinance																
Progress and Remarks: They noted no changes since the 1995 survey.																
Encinitas																
Yes	0	20	No											20	20	
Mitigation Program Type:																
Technical Mitigation Standards:																
Progress and Remarks:																

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1999 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Escondido															
Yes	50	7	Yes	yes	3		28							26	57
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Floor to wall & roof to wall ties, parapet bracing. Section 502, 1991 UBC is being utilized to require retrofits on changes of occupancy															
Progress and Remarks: Voluntary with sunset date of 2015, incentives such as Mills Act & Fee Waivers															
Eureka															
Yes	0	27	Yes	yes	8		1	1	10					7	27
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening, structural analysis, hardship time extensions															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1987 Edition of the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1 as modified															
Progress and Remarks: Buildings were removed from the inventory 12/20/90. Time extensions again increased in September 1999.															
Fairfax															
Yes	0	4	Yes	yes		4							1		4
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1															
Progress and Remarks: All four of the URM's have been seismically strengthened.															
Fairfield															
Yes	0	5	Yes	yes		4								1	5
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening, historical buildings are exempt.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None included in the ordinance, although Division 88 is referenced in the report to the Commission.															
Progress and Remarks: 5 URM, Pre-1935 with 100+ Occupants Pre-1976 with 300+ Occupants															
Ferndale															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks: All except one URM building demolished after the 1906 EQ damaged them beyond repair. Last URM demolished after the April 1992 earthquakes.															
Fillmore															
Yes	0	42	Yes	yes	13				1		17			11	
Mitigation Program Type: Partial: only URM buildings damaged in the 1/17/94 earthquake, some buildings remain vacant with future unknown															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC as applicable to damaged buildings only															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URM)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URM	Number of Non-Historic URM	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1999 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Fontana															
Yes	0	85	Yes	yes										85	85
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks: 45 Bearing Wall URM, 32 Nonbearing Wall URM															
Fort Bragg															
Yes	1	1	Yes	Yes	1	1	1						1		2
Mitigation Program Type: Notice to owners															
Technical Mitigation Standards: State Historical Building Code															
Progress and Remarks: Contracts with Mendocino County for code enforcement.															
Fortuna															
Yes	0	1	Yes	yes							1				
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening, structural analysis, hardship time extensions.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1987 Edition of the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1 as modified.															
Progress and Remarks: Building damaged in April 25, 1992, earthquake and subsequently demolished.															
Foster City															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Fountain Valley															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Fremont															
Yes	10	22	Yes	yes	7		9	10			2			4	32
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1991 UCBC Appendix Chapter 1 and subsequent additions.															
Progress and Remarks: 1990 program notified owners. Fremont adopted a voluntary retrofit ordinance #2363 for soft story apartments in November 1999. Fremont created a loan program to assist owners with retrofits.															
Fresno County															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URM)												
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URM	Number of Non-Historic URM	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1999 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified	
Fullerton																
Yes	43	82	Yes	yes		124	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	125 (all)	
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening																
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1987 Edition of the SSC Model Ordinance for URM buildings, Certain 1988 UCBC sections referenced for tiltup construction.																
Progress and Remarks: A separate ordinance requires retrofit of pre-1973 tiltup buildings. A grant and deferred loan program was created with redevelopment funds - up to \$100,000 loans due on sale with no interest. The 1997 survey says that they are 99 percent done and will be presenting to the City Council a pre '73 masonry building.82 Nonhistoric URM 43 historic URM 220 Tiltup Concrete																
Garden Grove																
Yes	0	12	Yes	yes										11	11	
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening																
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1, State Model Ordinance																
Progress and Remarks:																
Gardena																
Yes	0	19	Yes		8	8			1						10	
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening																
Technical Mitigation Standards: Latest UCBC and/or 1990 SSC model ordinance																
Progress and Remarks: 19 URM, 1 accessory garage to 2-resident units not under mandatory mitigation program, deleted from list.																
Gilroy																
Yes	5	27	Yes	yes	32	32	2								32	
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening																
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1985 Edition of the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1, flat base shear of 10% g, ABK Method.																
Progress and Remarks:																
Glendale																
Yes	1	702	Yes	yes	0	491	0	2	0	0	206	0	0	4	703	
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening																
Technical Mitigation Standards: 13.3% Base Shear																
Progress and Remarks:																
Glendora																
Yes	0	5	Yes	yes		3								2		
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening																
Technical Mitigation Standards: Similar to Division 88 City of Los Angeles code																
Progress and Remarks:																

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URM's)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URM's	Number of Non-Historic URM's	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1999 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Gonzales															
Yes	0	3	Yes	yes								3			3
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1988 (sic) Edition of the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1, 1985 UCBC															
Progress and Remarks:															
Grand Terrace															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Greenfield															
Yes	0	14	Yes	yes	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	14	14
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1988 (sic) Edition of the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1, 1985 UCBC															
Progress and Remarks:															
Grover Beach															
Yes	0	4	Yes	yes	0	0					0		1	3	4
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1991 Edition of the SSC Model Ordinance.															
Progress and Remarks: Building for building replacement allowed without having to meet parking standards.															
Guadalupe															
Yes	0	40	Yes		1	1	2		5			1		19	27
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1															
Progress and Remarks: An earlier 1989 program notified owners.															
Half Moon Bay															
Yes	0	2	Yes	yes	1	1									1
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1987 Edition of the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1, 1985 UCBC															
Progress and Remarks: Owners were notified by 6/90. All work complete November 1993.															
Hawaiian Gardens															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)												
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1999 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified	
Hawthorne																
Yes	0	4	Yes													
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners, seismic retrofits triggered only upon change of use or alterations.																
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1990 SSC Model Ordinance																
Progress and Remarks:																
Hayward																
Yes	0	42	Yes	yes	0	34	6	1	0	0	0	1	100%	0	42	
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening																
Technical Mitigation Standards: Similar to Division 88 City of Los Angeles Code, 1973 UBC for Tiltup Retrofits																
Progress and Remarks: 46 URM 130 Tiltup. Tiltups all retrofitted. 1 Board up- Vacant and not retrofitted, 6 mostly done and being actively retrofitted, 34 retrofitted, 1 tilt up building was on the inventoried in error = 42																
Healdsburg																
Yes	0	26	Yes		10		1			1			26		26	
Mitigation Program Type: City Ordinance #881: Advisory only with compliance voluntary until 1996.																
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC 1991 edition and subsequent editions																
Progress and Remarks: Mandatory measures will be enforced after 12:01 a.m. on 9/16/96																
Hemet																
Yes	3	9	Yes	yes	0	0	0	0	10	0	2	Unkn own	0	2	12	
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory- City paid for engineering and plan for 10 buildings.																
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appindex Chapter 1																
Progress and Remarks: Adoption of a Mandatory program considered 3/92.																
Hercules																
Yes	0	3	Yes	yes								2		1	3	
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners																
Technical Mitigation Standards: None																
Progress and Remarks: 2 bldgs are slated for demolition before the end of May 1995.																
Hermosa Beach																
Yes	0	66	Yes	yes	60	60	3		0	0	1			2	50	
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening																
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1																
Progress and Remarks: An earlier ordinance in 1989 notified owners.																

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1999 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Hesperia															
Yes	1	1	Yes	yes											2
Mitigation Program Type: Discussions with owners															
Technical Mitigation Standards: State Historical Building Code															
Progress and Remarks: City plans to develop a Historical Structure/Site Ordinance.															
Hidden Hills															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Highland															
Yes	0	12	Yes	yes		3	3	1	2			5			12
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1987 Edition of the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1 for URM Bldgs, 1973 Edition of the UCBC for Non-URM Buildings, 1985 UCBC															
Progress and Remarks: The original count of 35 units was lowered to 12 URMs all pre-1935 dwellings															
Hillsborough															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Hollister															
Yes	0	9	Yes	yes	2	2									7
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to Owners															
Technical Mitigation Standards: SSC Model Ordinance															
Progress and Remarks:															
Holtville															
Yes	0	4	No	yes	0	0	0	0	0		3	1	0	0	
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URM)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URM	Number of Non-Historic URM	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1999 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Humboldt County															
Yes	0	7	Yes											6	1
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks: Earthquake damaged URM buildings shall be repaired and retrofitted to comply with UCBC. Some progress on one URM.															
Huntington Beach															
Yes	0	50	Yes	yes		13	1		1		35	2		0	50
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1976 UCBC, with modified allowable stresses for existing materials															
Progress and Remarks: Majority of structures attained compliance through demolition.															
Huntington Park															
Yes	0	132	Yes	yes	130	130	0			2	0	2	0	2	132
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1985 Edition of Division 88 Los Angeles City Code, and the Los Angeles' Rules for General Application RGA #1-87.															
Progress and Remarks: As of March 1995, 5 URMs have not fully complied.															
Imperial															
Yes	0	2	No	yes											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Imperial County															
Yes	0	0	N/A											2	
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Indian Wells															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URM's)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URM's	Number of Non-Historic URM's	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1999 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Indio															
Yes	0	48	Yes												48
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks:															
Industry															
Yes	1	0	Yes	yes								1			1
Mitigation Program Type: Other															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks: Building stated for demolition is posted unsafe, unoccupied, and boarded up.															
Inglewood															
Yes	0	56	Yes	yes		50	2	0			4				
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Similar to Division 88 City of Los Angeles Code															
Progress and Remarks: City reimburses up to \$3000 of the cost of engineering studies, 100% of plan check fees, permits, and taxes, using redevelopment money. 80% compliance.															
Inyo County															
No	0	20	No		1	5 *									6 in 1990
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Uniform Building Code (Deep Springs College)															
Progress and Remarks: Furnace Creek and Ranch indicated that there was reinforcing of concrete masonry unit with adobe fill. Three owners in Big pine were not responsive and were multiunit residential. 5*=reinforced															
Irvine															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Irwindale															
Yes	0	2	Yes	yes	2	0			0						0
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1985 Edition Chapter 96 of the Los Angeles County Code															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1999 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

Kern County

Yes		143	Yes	yes	1	143*	0	0	0	4	17	9	0	129	143
-----	--	-----	-----	-----	---	------	---	---	---	---	----	---	---	-----	-----

Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners

Technical Mitigation Standards: None

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

King City

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

Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening

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

Progress and Remarks:

Kings County

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

Mitigation Program Type:

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

La Canada Flintridge

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

Mitigation Program Type:

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

La Habra

Yes	0	15	Yes	yes		4					8			3	
-----	---	----	-----	-----	--	---	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	---	--

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening

Technical Mitigation Standards: 1987 Edition SSC Model Ordinance

Progress and Remarks:

La Habra Heights

Yes	0	15	No			6					9				
-----	---	----	----	--	--	---	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--

Mitigation Program Type:

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

La Mirada

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

Mitigation Program Type: Adopted with Los Angeles County

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URM)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URM	Number of Non-Historic URM	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1999 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
La Palma															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks: Working with property owners on a voluntary compliance program for pre-1973 tiltup concrete buildings, but do not have any URM buildings.															
La Puente															
Yes	0	21	Yes												
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
La Quinta															
Yes	7	0	Yes	yes		5					1			1	7
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1987 Edition SSC Model Ordinance															
Progress and Remarks:															
La Verne															
Yes	11	0	Yes	yes	9	9					2			2	11
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening, Voluntary Posting															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1985 Edition Chapter 96 of the Los Angeles County Code															
Progress and Remarks: City budgeted \$100,000 to fund facade / URM program for seismic retrofit in fiscal year 92/93 with goal of completing 2 URM buildings this next fiscal year. One building was completed in 90/91 (funded 92/93=1, 93/94=1) with agency funding leaving 9 URM buildings remaining.															
Lafayette															
Yes	0	4	Yes	Yes											4
Mitigation Program Type: Notification only															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks: A draft ordinance, which will include adoption of UCBC Appendix Chapter 1 with a three year period for compliance, is being considered. Contra Costa County contracts for Clayton, Lafayette, Moraga and Orinda.															
Laguna Beach															
Yes	0	29	Yes	yes		29								6	
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Similar to Division 88 City of Los Angeles Code															
Progress and Remarks: All known URM in the city have been strengthened per the city's mandatory strengthening ordinance.															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1999 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Lake County															
Yes		11	Yes		9	10	1			1			1		2
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening, historic buildings are exempt.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1 as modified, latest edition of the Uniform Building Code, seismic evaluation reports, posting, bracing of parapets and veneer, full strengthening required at time of major remodel or repairs.															
Progress and Remarks: Of the eleven inventoried, 1 URM was exempted since it is historic. 6 URMs were found to be reinforced.															
Lake Elsinore															
Yes	33	54	Yes	yes		81					6				
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1 as modified															
Progress and Remarks:															
Lakeport															
Yes	0	33	Yes		1	27	2	1					33	2	33
Mitigation Program Type: Seismic evaluation reports, posting, bracing of parapets and veneer, full strengthening required at time of major remodel or repairs, historic buildings are exempt															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBBC Appendix Chapter 1 as modified, 1985 UBC															
Progress and Remarks:															
Lakewood															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Lancaster															
Yes	0	7	Yes	yes						7				0	7
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1985 Edition Chapter 96 of the Los Angeles County Code															
Progress and Remarks:															
Larkspur															
Yes	0	12	Yes		4										10
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1999 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Lawndale															
Yes	0	3	Yes	yes	3	3						1		1	4
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1985 Edition Chapter 96 of the Los Angeles County Code															
Progress and Remarks:															
Livermore															
Yes	0	58	Yes	yes	51	51	0	0	0	0	1	3		3	58
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Modified 1990 SSC Model Ordinance															
Progress and Remarks: 9 bldgs have completed an engineering analysis.															
Loma Linda															
Yes	0	0	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1987 Edition of the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1 for URM Bldgs, 1973 Edition of the UBC for Non-URM Buildings, 1985 UBC															
Progress and Remarks: All of these were residential : 8 Non-historic URM, 50 Historic URM. The 1997 Survey response said that there were no non-residential URM's in the City of Loma Linda.															
City of Lomita															
Yes	0	17	Yes	yes		13					1	3			
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1985 Edition Chapter 96 of the Los Angeles County Code															
Progress and Remarks:															
Lompoc															
Yes	0	21	Yes	yes	14	1			2		1	1		2	21
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatoty Strenghtening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC App. Ch. 1															
Progress and Remarks:															
Long Beach															
Yes	49	887	Yes	yes		555	7	0	2	0	369	3	0	0	936
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1970 Edition of the UBC, proposed ordinance changes are based on the latest proposed ICBO code change for URM bldgs, and a base shear not to exceed 13 percent but varies with period, building type and occupant load.															
Progress and Remarks: In 1959, the building official was given the authority to abate parapet and appendage falling hazards; in 1971 a mandatory strengthening ordinance was passed, which was amended in 1976 and updated again in 1990. City created a special assessment district to issue bonds for seismic retrofit financing based on the 1911 Bond Act.936 URM bearing and nonbearing wall bldgs all pre-1934															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1999 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Los Alamitos															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Los Altos															
Yes	0	0	N/A			0							0	0	0
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners, request for voluntary upgrades															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None.															
Progress and Remarks: Consideration is being given to a more restrictive mandatory strengthening program. After further study, review of plans, and inspections, we have found only one building that may be a URM. The others have provided adequate proof that they do not have a URM or their building is not a URM. The placard posted on one URM has disappeared. The 1997 survey said that the recent inspections have revealed no URM's in the city due to verified steel reinforcements in the walls. They had a mitigation code 3, a notification only, before the recent correction.															
Los Altos Hills															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Los Angeles															
Yes*	90	7987	Yes	Yes	6035	6035	60	5	16	0	1902	35	0	24	8077*
Yes**	165	966	Yes	Yes	30	30	4	2	4	0	0	0	0	1091	1131**
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory for bearing wall, voluntary for non-bearing wall															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Div. 88 and Div. 95															
Progress and Remarks: *8077 bearing wall buildings have been identified as subject to Div. 88 . **1131 buildings have been identified with URM Infill walls subject to Div. 95.															
Los Angeles County															
Yes	3	285	Yes	yes	0	257	0	0	0	0	16	0	0	15	288
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1992 Edition Chapter 96 of the Los Angeles County Code - similar to Division 88 of the Los Angeles City Code															
Progress and Remarks: 278 non-historic URM, 3 historic URM all bearing wall															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1999 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Los Gatos															
Yes	6	15	Yes	yes		13	4							4	
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1991 Edition of the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1, 75% of the 91 UBC for the repair of earthquake-damaged non-URM bldgs, Chapter 37 of the 91 UBC for chimney repair															
Progress and Remarks: Revocation of occupancy for buildings that do not comply with deadline. City allows replacement of damaged buildings without providing more parking.															
Lynwood															
No	0	15	No												
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Mammoth Lakes															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Manhattan Beach															
Yes	0	12	Yes	yes		12									
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Similar to Division 88 Los Angeles City Code															
Progress and Remarks: All mandatory strengthening was implemented and completed. 12 URM commercial one story buildings.															
Maricopa															
Yes		16	No											16	
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Marin County															
Yes	0	1	Yes	yes			1								
Mitigation Program Type: Notice to owner with an order to strengthen or demolish															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URM's)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URM's	Number of Non-Historic URM's	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1999 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Marina															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Martinez															
Yes	0	58	Yes		6	8	14							30	58
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Standards are planned to be adopted.															
Progress and Remarks:															
Maywood															
Yes	0	25	Yes	yes	15	15				1	10	1			25
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Similar to 1982 Edition of Division 88 of the Los Angeles City Code															
Progress and Remarks:															
McFarland															
Yes	0	16	Yes		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	Yes
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to Owners															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks: City contracts with Kern County for code enforcement. Kern County notified the owners and states it is available to provide guidance concerning measures to retrofit buildings.															
Mendocino County															
Yes	0	5	No												
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Menlo Park															
Yes	0	2	Yes	yes				0	0	0	1	0	1		1
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1985 UCBC Appendix Chapter 1, State Historical Building Code															
Progress and Remarks:															
Mill Valley															
Yes	0	18	Yes	yes	14	14	1							3	18
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1987 Edition SSC Model Ordinance															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1999 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Millbrae															
Yes	0	3	Yes	yes	3	3									3
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1985 Edition of Division 88 of the Los Angeles City Code as modified, 1985 UBC															
Progress and Remarks:															
Milpitas															
Yes	0	1	Yes								3				
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1987 Edition of the SSC Model Ordinance, 1988 Edition of the Uniform Code for the Abatement of Dangerous Buildings															
Progress and Remarks: Strengthening deadline is negotiable depending on owner's financial situation. Only 1 building classified as URM left. This building is city owned, a complete seismic retrofit has been recently completed.															
Mission Viejo															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Mono County															
Yes		8	No	yes											
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Monrovia															
Yes	0	75	Yes	yes		75									1
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Wall anchorage, parapet bracing and height to thickness requirements only.															
Progress and Remarks:															
Montclair															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1999 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Monte Sereno															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Montebello															
Yes	0	20	Yes												
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Similar to the 1985 Edition of Chapter 96 of the Los Angeles County Code															
Progress and Remarks:															
Monterey															
Yes	18	16	Yes	yes	14	9	6		1		1	1		2	34
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening, historical buildings are exempt.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Similar to the 1987 Edition of the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1, 1988 UBC for base shear.															
Progress and Remarks:															
Monterey County															
Yes	0	2	Yes						1		1		2		
Mitigation Program Type: Demolition/retrofit															
Technical Mitigation Standards: More															
Progress and Remarks: Demolished - Historic Spreckels Building															
Monterey Park															
Yes	0	26	Yes	yes	20	20		2		1	3			2	26
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Similar to 1987 Edition SSC Model Ordinance															
Progress and Remarks:															
Moorpark															
Yes	0	7	Yes	yes		5					2				
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory?															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1999 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Moraga															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks: A draft ordinance, which will include adoption of UCBC Appendix Chapter 1 with a three year period for compliance, is being proposed for adoption in 1995. Contra Costa County contracts for Clayton, Lafayette, Moraga and Orinda. A draft ordinance is being considered.															
Moreno Valley															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Morgan Hill															
Yes	2	6	Yes	yes		1					7				
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1982 Edition of the Los Angeles City Code															
Progress and Remarks: This emergency ordinance was passed to repair and retrofit earthquake damaged URM buildings.															
Morro Bay															
Yes	0	16	Yes		1	1		2	6			1			16
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening, being reconsidered (12/95), reportedly repealed 1999?															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1991 UCBC															
Progress and Remarks: 46 buildings were originally inventoried and 30 were found to be reinforced.															
Mountain View															
Yes	0	25	Yes	yes	25	25								0	25
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners, retrofits are triggered upon remodel or renovation.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1															
Progress and Remarks: 1992: Drafting an ordinance for late summer that will require mandatory evaluation and upgrade within defined time period to be approved by city council.															
Napa															
Yes	10	25	Yes	yes	11		2	1	3			1	4	24	35
Mitigation Program Type: Seismic Retrofit Reimbursement Program															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks: The City of Napa Community Redevelopment Agency offers a reimbursement incentive program for the preparation of seismic retrofit architectural and engineering plans. Since the initial inventory of 46 URM structures, 11 have completed seismic retrofit projects and have been removed from the city's URM inventory. Currently, five properties are in the process of seismic retrofit efforts. Preliminary discussions with several property owners are likely to result in other seismic projects being underway during 2000.															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1999 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

County of Napa (unicorporated area)

Yes	0	7	Yes	yes	2	0	1			1				3	7
-----	---	---	-----	-----	---	---	---	--	--	---	--	--	--	---	---

Mitigation Program Type: Other

Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Ch. 1 for occupancy changes and structural upgrades.

Progress and Remarks:

Newark

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

Mitigation Program Type:

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

Newport Beach

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

Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening

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

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

Norco

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

Mitigation Program Type:

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

Norwalk

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

Mitigation Program Type:

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

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

Novato

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

Mitigation Program Type:

Technical Mitigation Standards:

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

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1999 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Oakland															
Yes	275	1333	Yes	yes	211	1078	68	5	3		90	2		151	1608
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory exterior falling hazard mitigation program. Voluntary structural upgrade program.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Bearing wall buildings: Mandatory standard - bolts plus tie roof and floors to exterior walls, brace parapets, remove or fix other exterior falling hazards; Voluntary standard - UCBC Appendix Chapter 1; Note - buildings complying with the mandatory standards only will remain on the list of potentially hazardous URM buildings until they are upgraded to comply with the voluntary standard. Frame structures with URM infill walls: Mandatory standard - Parapet plus brace parapets and remove or fix other exterior falling hazards. An earlier program notified owners.															
Progress and Remarks: Included a list of updates on the deadlines for completing URM upgrade work. Priority B1 - 2/1/97; B2 - 2/1/97; B3 - 2/1/98; N1-2/1/99; N2 - 2/1/2000; N3 - 2/1/2001.....1182 bearing wall type and 435 frame structures with URM infill walls															
Oceanside															
Yes	3	68	Yes		9	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	69	71
Mitigation Program Type: Parapet bracing & wall anchorage; time limit 11 years from effective date of ordinance, or when remodeling occurs exceeding 50% of the value of the building.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1, February 1991 Edition, SSC Model Ordinance, State Historic Building Code															
Progress and Remarks: Services of order to be sent to all URMs per revised ordinance. Mitigation adoption: 5/24/91 mandatory strengthening; 8/12/92 revised timelines; 3/1/95 revised mandatory strengthening ordinance to require only parapet bracing & wall anchorage.															
Ojai															
Yes	0	29	Yes			16	2		3					8	
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Yes-type not reported															
Progress and Remarks: A 1990 program notified owners.															
Ontario															
Yes	42	13	No	yes										55	
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks: The inventory of building is being rechecked and staff is drafting a ord. for voluntary strengthening using the 1997 UCBC. The city building department is planning to propose a URM program to city council in the summer of 1995.															
Orange															
Yes	43	35	Yes		29	29		49						49	78
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners															
Technical Mitigation Standards: URM ordinance 7-92															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URM)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URM	Number of Non-Historic URM	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1999 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Orange County															
Yes	0	14	Yes	yes	3				2		1	1		7	
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Division 88 City of Lost Angeles code															
Progress and Remarks: 2 buildings to be sold, 2 buildings to be demolished, 3 buildings sold and no longer within Orange County jurisdiction.															
Orinda															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks: A draft ordinance, which will include adoption of UCBC Appendix Chapter 1 with a three year period for compliance, is being proposed for adoption in 1995. Contra Costa County contracts for Clayton, Lafayette, Moraga and Orinda. (4/97) The city is exploring a mandatory strengthening program or possibly a voluntary one.															
Oxnard															
Yes	6	47	Yes	yes	2		1F							53	Yes
Mitigation Program Type: Notification Only															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks: City is in the process of developing the URM ordinance and conducting public hearings. No enforcement at this time other than to notify owners.															
Pacific Grove															
Yes	8	3	Yes	yes	1	3						0		7	11
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening, including all pre-1976 occupancy buildings															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Division 88 City of Los Angeles Code															
Progress and Remarks:															
Pacifica															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Palm Desert															
Yes	0	3	Yes	yes	3										
Mitigation Program Type: Other, Unknown															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URM)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URM	Number of Non-Historic URM	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1999 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Palm Springs															
Yes	15	11	Yes	yes		22	0	1	0	1	2				26
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Modified 1987 Edition of the SSC Model Ordinance															
Progress and Remarks:															
Palmdale															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Palo Alto															
Yes	4	43	Yes		17	47		1	1		7			26	
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1 for URM buildings, 1973 UBC for non-URM buildings															
Progress and Remarks: Additions to strengthened buildings are allowed, parking requirements are waived. According to the 1997 Survey : -All buildings have a structural evaluation report on file which is required by ordinance, the “reduced occupancy” is vacated due to collapse potential, “and “warning placards” are not enforced by this department.....47 URM, 28 Pre-1935 bldgs with 100 or more occupants, 21 pre-76 bldgs with 300 or more occupants															
Palos Verdes Estates															
Yes	0	2	Yes	yes	2										2
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: SSC Model Ordinance															
Progress and Remarks:															
Paramount															
no	0	7	Yes												7
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Chapter 96 County of Los Angeles															
Progress and Remarks: An earlier 1990 program provided notices to owners. Inventory not officially completed.															
Pasadena															
Yes	131	628	Yes	yes	0	661	17	0	10	0	25	0	0	46	759
Mitigation Program Type: Other															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC 1994 Edition															
Progress and Remarks: 125 URM’s are possibly eligible for the “Historic” designation.															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)												
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1999 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified	
Paso Robles																
Yes	0	58	Yes	yes	4	12	0	0	30	0	0	0	0	10	58	
Mitigation Program Type:																
Technical Mitigation Standards:																
Progress and Remarks:																
Perris																
Yes	0	17	yes	yes	0	17	0	0	1	0	0	0		0		
Mitigation Program Type:																
Technical Mitigation Standards:																
Progress and Remarks: C.MC.#1069 Sec. 3																
Petaluma																
Yes	32	62	Yes	yes		35	9							50	98	
Mitigation Program Type: Partial strengthening—bolts only																
Technical Mitigation Standards: None																
Progress and Remarks: A 1989 program notified owners and tenants....62 Non-historic URM 32 Historic URM 5 pre-1934 concrete bldgs 12/11/89																
Pico Rivera																
Yes	0	7	Yes	yes	7	7									7	
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening																
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1, 1987 Edition																
Progress and Remarks:																
Piedmont																
Yes	0	0	N/A													
Mitigation Program Type:																
Technical Mitigation Standards:																
Progress and Remarks:																
Pinole																
Yes	0	6	No	yes	2					1	2			1	0	
Mitigation Program Type:																
Technical Mitigation Standards:																
Progress and Remarks: The City of Pinole is currently drafting a Seismic Ordinance for adoption by the city council. We will provide for mandatory strengthening program.																

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URM's)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URM's	Number of Non-Historic URM's	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1999 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Pismo Beach															
Yes	0	39	Yes		11	11			0		1			27	39
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1															
Progress and Remarks: Deadlines for strengthening extended to July 11, 1995. The mitigation program was amended in early 1996 from a Mandatory to a Notification only system.															
Pittsburg															
Yes	20	15	Yes								3				35
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Placentia															
Yes	0	16	Yes	yes	6	3		1						6	6
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening, owner notification not specified. Seismic retrofit is mandatory upon change in use, application for any building permit or use permit, or development plan.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks: City is requesting additional commercial rehabilitation loan funds .															
Pleasant Hill															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Pleasanton															
Yes	0	38	Yes	yes	34	(34)	2	0	0	0	2		(36)	0	38
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC, Appendix Chapter 1															
Progress and Remarks: (1999) Of the original 38 URM's, 34 have been retrofitted and completed. Two (2) buildings have been demolished. Two (2) buildings are under construction and one about 80% complete. When the two (2) partially completed buildings are completed all of the identified URM's will be complete.															
Point Arena															
No			No												
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks: Indicated inventory started but not completed in 1992 survey. No activity reported since.															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1999 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Pomona															
Yes	1	96	Yes	yes	8	8	4	0	0	0	0	0		86	96
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks: 1992 ordinance tied into a special assessment district or similar financing.															
Port Hueneme															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Portola Valley															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Poway															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Rancho Cucamonga															
Yes	18	4	Yes	yes		15	2	0			3	0		2	22
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1982 Edition of Division 88 Los Angeles City Code, State Historical Building Code as modified															
Progress and Remarks: A pamphlet was developed explaining various options and incentives, encourages Mills Act.															
Rancho Mirage															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Rancho Palos Verdes															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)												
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1999 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified	
Redlands																
Yes	11	75	Yes	yes	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	71		
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners																
Technical Mitigation Standards: None																
Progress and Remarks: Changed mitigation code from (3) to (2) or from Notification Only to a Voluntary Strengthening Program.																
Redondo Beach																
Yes	0	20	Yes	yes	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening																
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1987 SSC Model Ordinance																
Progress and Remarks:																
Redwood City																
Yes	4	24	Yes	yes		24	26			2	2			2	28	
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening																
Technical Mitigation Standards: Similar to UCBC Appendix Chapter 1																
Progress and Remarks: City encourages Mills Act agreements for historical buildings to preserve facades. City said that they were not responsible for enforcement on the “warning placards” but all owners have been notified.																
Rialto																
Yes	0	19	Yes							7			19		19	
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory																
Technical Mitigation Standards: None																
Progress and Remarks: Adoption of UCBC Appendix Chapter 1 considered in 1992.																
Richmond																
Yes	0	70	Yes		4	4	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0		
Mitigation Program Type:																
Technical Mitigation Standards:																
Progress and Remarks:																
Ridgecrest																
Yes	0	0	N/A													
Mitigation Program Type:																
Technical Mitigation Standards:																
Progress and Remarks:																
Rio Dell																
Yes	0	0	N/A													
Mitigation Program Type:																
Technical Mitigation Standards:																
Progress and Remarks: No URM buildings have been identified. All structures in the city are wood frame construction.																

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1999 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Rio Vista															
yes		10	No												
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Riverside															
Yes	92	143	Yes	yes	unkn own	unkn own	unkn own	unkn own	unkn own	unkn own	unkn own	unkn own	unkn own	unkn own	235
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Similar to 1991 UCBC															
Progress and Remarks: Building Official does not know the status of the URMs.															
Riverside County															
Yes	0	4	Yes	yes	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners. Retrofit plans required in 180 days.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks:															
Rohnert Park															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Rolling Hills															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Rolling Hills Estates															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Rosemead															
Yes	0	6	Yes	yes		3					1		3	1	5
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1985 Edition of Chapter 96 Los Angeles County															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1999 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Ross															
Yes	0	1	Yes	yes											
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1															
Progress and Remarks:															
Saint Helena															
Yes	29	1	Yes	Yes		6	7	0	4					13	all
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory seismic retrofit ordinance adopted June 1998															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1998 California Code for Building Conservation, Appendix Chapter 1 with local amendments.															
Progress and Remarks: St. Helena's ordinance requires mandatory seismic retrofitting within 10 years of ordinance adoption. An incentive program was incorporated to encourage commencement of structural upgrades within the first 3 years of the program. As of January 2000, we are 1-1/2 years into the program with half of our URM buildings are in some stage of retrofitting. Incentives include A&E rebates, building permit fee waivers, creation of a National Register Historic District that allows owners to take advantage of a 20% federal tax credit for certified work, adoption of the Mills Act, permit renewal extensions, and a streamlined design review process.															
Salinas															
Yes	0	54	Yes	yes		23	7	2	14		5	2		1	54
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 199 Edition of the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1															
Progress and Remarks: The City Council is considering options to relax their URM program particularly since it triggers compliance with federal American with Disabilities Act requirements.															
San Anselmo															
Yes	0	21	Yes			1	1		1					18	
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1, State Historical Building Code															
Progress and Remarks:															
San Benito County															
No	0	6	No	yes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1999 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
San Bernardino															
Yes	0	136	Yes	yes	11	unkn own	2	0	0	7	7	0	unkn own	109	136
Mitigation Program Type: Other															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1, 1991 edition.															
Progress and Remarks: 1990 ordinance required seismic hazard evaluations. The 1993 Retrofit Ordinance requires retrofits within 4 to 11 years starting on April 15, 1994. In September 1996, the City Council adopted an ordinance which provides a three year extension to prior deadlines for compliance. Notification by the City has not been effective. Compliance is very low due to the lack of an enforcement mechanism in Government Code 8875. The (11) means that the eleven buildings in substantial compliance with the UCBC Code are in compliance with the entity program, for they are the same. The ordinance requiring mandatory strengthening was repealed in August 1999. The current ordinance only requires voluntary posting of warning signs on each building.															
San Bernardino County															
Yes	0	21	Yes												
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks:															
San Bruno															
Yes	0	5	Yes	yes		4									1
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Similar to UCBC Appendix Chapter 1															
Progress and Remarks: Update of status in process. New building official (Thomas Leonard) will start 3-6-00.															
San Carlos															
Yes	0	12	Yes	yes	6		1		1	1	1	0		2	12
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Division 88 Los Angeles City Code 1985 Edition, UCBC Appendix Chapter 1 is also allowed on a case by case basis.															
Progress and Remarks:															
San Clemente															
Yes	0	2	No	yes								2			2
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)												
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1999 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified	
San Diego																
No			Yes													
Mitigation Program Type: Parapet strengthening																
Technical Mitigation Standards:																
Progress and Remarks: Indicated inventory started prior to 1992 survey with no reports since. San Diego was in Seismic Zone 3 at the time of the enactment of the URM Law and is not strictly bound to comply with the law. Since then, San Diego's Seismic Zone has been revised to 4. They estimate they have 731 URM buildings.																
San Diego County																
Yes	4	34	Yes	Yes	8	11	0	2	0	0	2	1	Unkn own	22	46	
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening																
Technical Mitigation Standards: February 1990 Edition SSC Model Ordinance																
Progress and Remarks: Now 4 URMs are incorporated in Solano Beach, which replied to 1995 survey.																
San Dimas																
Yes	5	4	No	yes	1					1	2			5	0	
Mitigation Program Type:																
Technical Mitigation Standards:																
Progress and Remarks:																
San Fernando																
Yes	0	12	Yes	yes		11		1							3	
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening																
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1985 Revised Edition of Division 88 City of Los Angeles Code with ABK Modifications																
Progress and Remarks: Wall anchors and parapet repairs were required after the 1971 Sylmar Earthquake.																
San Francisco																
Yes	516	1552	Yes	yes		863	308	58	107	0	55	0	unkn own	677	2068	
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory Strengthening for Bearing Wall Buildings per Earthquake Hazard Reduction Ordinance 225-92, which was incorporated as Chapters 14 and 15 of the 1992 San Francisco Building Code.																
Technical Mitigation Standards: The URM building ordinance is based on the 1991 UCBC Appendix chapter 1 with modifications. The most significant change is the allowance of a seismic upgrade to "Bolts Plus" level for certain types of buildings: 1) Bolts-Plus Level; 2) Special Procedure (UCBC Appendix Chapter 1; 3) General Procedure (UCBC Appendix Chapter 1); 4) Retrofit for Essential & Hazardous Facilities; 5) Retrofit for Qualified Historical Buildings; 6) URM Buildings requiring Sections 104(f) and 2303(h) upgrade of the 1992 San Francisco Building Code. The Bolts-plus procedure is essentially a Special Procedure upgrade without a demand capacity ratio diaphragm check and an in-plane/shear check of the wall. There are eight requirements specified in Section 1509(b) exception 1 that must be satisfied before a building may be retrofitted to a "Bolts-Plus" level of upgrade. Qualified Historical Buildings may be upgraded to provisions of the State Historical Building Code. Essential and Hazardous Buildings: For these buildings, a modified form of General Procedure is used (I=1.25; V=1.25 X 1991 UBC force level). URMs requiring Section 104(f) upgrade are equal to 75% of the 1991 UBC level of design force.																
Progress and Remarks: The URM retrofit program started on February 15, 1993. Buildings with risk level 1 are required to be retrofitted in 3 1/2 years from that date. Other buildings with risk levels 2, 3 and 4 respectively have 5, 11 and 13 years from February 15, 1993, to complete their hazard mitigation programs levels of upgrade. The Building Inspection Commission has allocated \$200,000 in next year's budget to conduct inventories of all buildings of frames with infill walls. A 1990 program notified owners of bearing wall buildings. ...1891 URM Bearing Wall, 176 URM nonbearing walls identified so far. General obligation bond program.																

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URM)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URM	Number of Non-Historic URM	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1999 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
San Gabriel															
Yes	0	63	Yes												
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1985 Edition of Division 88 Los Angeles City Code															
Progress and Remarks:															
San Jacinto															
Yes	0	17	Yes												
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
San Joaquin County															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
San Jose															
Yes	74	72	Yes	yes	102	38					6				146
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: The 1991 San Jose Ordinance has now been sunsetted. Future building retrofits will need to comply with 1997 UBC or newer standards.															
Progress and Remarks: 100% of the 146 identified buildings are in compliance with the 1991 San Jose URM Ordinance. Compliance options included: retrofit, vacating the building or demolition. Warehouses were exempt. Program details are as follows: 102 Buildings retrofitted, 6 buildings demolished, 36 buildings vacant pending retrofit, 2 building exempt as warehouse use. Financial assistance for retrofit continues to be available through the City's Redevelopment Agency.															
San Juan Bautista															
Yes	0	13	No												
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
San Juan Capistrano															
Yes	16	3	Yes	yes	19	19									19
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URM's)												
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URM's	Number of Non-Historic URM's	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1999 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified	
San Leandro																
Yes	1	39	Yes	yes	0	30	1	5	0	0	5	4	0	0	40	
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening																
Technical Mitigation Standards: Similar to UCBC Appendix; chapter 1																
Progress and Remarks: The 1997 Survey said that the City has formed an assessment district to fund a low interest loan program to assist building owners with retrofit costs.																
San Luis Obispo																
Yes	38	89	Yes	yes	11	120	10	1	0	5	1	0	?	1	127	
Mitigation Program Type: Other - Structural report required by 11/4/94. Strengthening required when alterations exceed 50% of building value or if change of occupancy classification.																
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1																
Progress and Remarks: Will consider changes to the URM mitigation program during 1995-96 fiscal period; may include mandatory strengthening in conjunction with financial incentives. 5 buildings in the city are subject to county program. All but one property owner has submitted structural analysis. New mitigation requires that all URM's be strengthened by 1/1/2017. Financial incentives offered to owners to strengthen as soon as possible.																
San Luis Obispo County																
Yes	0	65	Yes			2								63		
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory																
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC, Appendix Chapter 1																
Progress and Remarks:																
San Marcos																
Yes	0	0	N/A													
Mitigation Program Type:																
Technical Mitigation Standards:																
Progress and Remarks: An earlier survey tentatively identified 1 Concrete Masonry Unit building that was later found to be reinforced.																
San Marino																
Yes	0	13	Yes	yes	13											
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners, required engineering inspection, written report, City reserves right to impose standards.																
Technical Mitigation Standards: SSC 1987 Model Ordinance																
Progress and Remarks: Program consists of a resolution																
San Mateo																
Yes	7	14	Yes	yes	0	17	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	21	
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening																
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1987 Edition SSC Model Ordinance																
Progress and Remarks: Category II buildings are not yet required to submit. All category I buildings have achieved some level of compliance. Provides Grants and Loans.																

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)												
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1999 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified	
San Mateo County																
Yes	4	3	Yes	yes	3	3								1		
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening, engineer's structural report, notices to owners, change of use/occupancy, demolition																
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1985 Edition of Division 88, 1973 UBC for non bearing wall URM buildings, State Historical Building Code																
Progress and Remarks: Program does not include an ordinance, recommends strengthening within three years otherwise a mandatory strengthening ordinance will be considered.																
San Pablo																
No	0	6	No	yes												
Mitigation Program Type:																
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC																
Progress and Remarks: Mitigation program in progress of being established. Survey being updated.																
San Rafael																
Yes	0	44	Yes	yes		43	1								44	
Mitigation Program Type: Partial mandatory strengthening																
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1990 Edition of the SSC Model Ordinance, partial compliance with the UCBC																
Progress and Remarks: A 1990 ordinance was voluntary strengthening.																
San Ramon																
Yes	0	0	N/A													
Mitigation Program Type:																
Technical Mitigation Standards:																
Progress and Remarks:																
Sand City																
Yes	0	0	N/A													
Mitigation Program Type:																
Technical Mitigation Standards:																
Progress and Remarks:																
Santa Ana																
Yes	0	207	Yes	yes	139	139					54	14			207	
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening																
Technical Mitigation Standards: Similar to Division 88, 1982 Edition Los Angeles City Code																
Progress and Remarks: City used Marks Bond Act funds for historical buildings.																

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1999 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Santa Barbara															
Yes	80	183	Yes	yes	252	252	3	2	0		13				256
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening, implemented in a district by district manner.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1															
Progress and Remarks: Seminars for contractors and building inspectors.															
Santa Barbara County															
Yes	2	21	Yes	yes	20	20	1	0	0	1(part of 20)	1 (part of 20)	1	0	2	23
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners, mitigation required based on occupant load and time frame established in UCBC.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC															
Progress and Remarks: The county passed a mandatory strengthening ordinance based on the 1991 UCBC.															
Santa Clara															
Yes	0	24	Yes	yes	3	10	1	1	6		7			6	
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening - first of three phases.															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks: 3% interest loans to fund engineering analysis with a 5 year payback.															
Santa Clara County															
Yes	2	58	Yes	yes		56							4		60
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening, except for owners of more than two buildings who may set their own time frames for compliance.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1987 SSC Model Ordinance															
Progress and Remarks: Exception was made for Stanford University which can establish its own time frames for compliance. 7 retrofits are currently under design.															
Santa Clarita															
Yes	0	4	Yes	yes	0	4									4
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1985 Edition Chapter 96 Los Angeles County Code															
Progress and Remarks:															
Santa Cruz															
Yes	24	27	Yes												
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners of undamaged buildings, a second ordinance established standards for repair of damaged URM buildings.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1987 UCBC Appendix Chapter 1, 1970 UBC for non-URM buildings for the repair ordinance. These standards do not apply to undamaged URM buildings.															
Progress and Remarks: Loma Prieta Earthquake damage prompted passage of two ordinances, a 1987 hazard reduction ordinance failed to pass.....24 Historic URM, 22 Non-historic URM were demolished, 5 others were severely damaged in Loma Prieta Earthquake.															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1999 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Santa Cruz County															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Santa Fe Springs															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Santa Maria															
Yes	0	25	Yes	yes	7	5	1		4		1	1		6	25
Mitigation Program Type: Partial mandatory strengthening, originally only applicable to a certain district of the city, affecting 8 buildings, of those 6 were retrofitted.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1989 Ordinance is based on the 1987 Edition of the SSC Model Ordinance. Original ordinance specified 75% of Division 88 City of Los Angeles Code Design Forces															
Progress and Remarks:															
Santa Monica															
Yes	0	209	Yes		144	154	10	15		2	41	5	100	45	209
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory Strengthening for all URMs															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1 standards by ordinance 1992. Wall anchors required by 1981 ordinance per 1915/21 Santa Monica codes. Upgrades for termination of the 1978 city recorded potentially hazardous building notices per UCBC standards.															
Progress and Remarks: URM inventory was done in 1977 and notice of potentially hazardous buildings recorded all URMs in 1978. Wall anchor certification required by ordinance in 1981. Engineer's seismic evaluation report ordinance in 1989. As of 1/1/95 about 80% of Santa Monica's total 1978 URM inventory has been resolved per ordinances. The majority of the remaining URMs will be retrofitted by 1996/97. Currently 20+ are in the retrofit process. All owner/public opposition to this city URM upgrade program ended with the clear significant "lucky" effects of the Northridge EQ on the city's URMs. Mitigation program process: 1975-78, Inv and recorded "notice potentially hazardous building"; 1981, required anchors ordinance; 1989, required SE report ordinance; 1992, mandatory strengthening ordinance....256 total city URM's noticed - 6 voided as non URM buildings, 27 demolished for redevelopment, 14 demolished from 1/94 earthquake damage. 209 remaining city URMs (144 upgrade work done, 65 upgrade work not done). Note: Repair and upgrade work is in progress on 12 of the city's URM buildings. Over 60 had major damage from the 1/94 EQ and 5-7 are still pending demolition.															
Santa Paula															
Yes	2	109	Yes	yes		13								98	
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Owners may analyze URM buildings according to 1994 UCBC Appendix Chapter 1															
Progress and Remarks: City is seeking an EQ Hazard Mitigation Grant															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1999 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified

Santa Rosa

Yes	0	67	Yes	yes	46	46	1		1	1	10	2		19	67
-----	---	----	-----	-----	----	----	---	--	---	---	----	---	--	----	----

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

Technical Mitigation Standards: 1955 UBC

Progress and Remarks:

Saratoga

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

Mitigation Program Type:

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

Sausalito

Yes	7	2	No	yes	2	2				1		1		9	
-----	---	---	----	-----	---	---	--	--	--	---	--	---	--	---	--

Mitigation Program Type:

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

Scotts Valley

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

Mitigation Program Type:

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

Seal Beach

Yes	0	10	No		2	2									
-----	---	----	----	--	---	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Mitigation Program Type:

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks:

Seaside

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

Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening, Posting

Technical Mitigation Standards: Similar to the 1987 SSC Model Ordinance

Progress and Remarks:

Sebastopol

Yes	0	0	Yes	yes		24	0					1		3	
-----	---	---	-----	-----	--	----	---	--	--	--	--	---	--	---	--

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

Technical Mitigation Standards:

Progress and Remarks: The program is complete. All buildings required to be in compliance with policy 11-A have been retrofitted.

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1999 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Shafter															
Yes	0	27	Yes	yes		27					1	1	25		27
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners & posts signs															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks:															
Sierra Madre															
Yes	0	51	Yes			2	2	2	4		6			35	
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Division 88 1985 Edition															
Progress and Remarks:															
Signal Hill															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Simi Valley															
Yes	2	0	Yes	yes	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1987 SSC Model Ordinance															
Progress and Remarks:															
Solano County															
Yes	0	2	Yes	yes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	
Mitigation Program Type: Notification Only															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks:															
Soledad															
Yes	0	4	Yes							1			4	4	4
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1 1987 Edition															
Progress and Remarks:															
Solvang															
Yes	0	3	Yes				1							3	3
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)												
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1999 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified	
Sonoma																
Yes	28	28	Yes	yes	16	22	5	1	8	0	4	0	0	21	56	
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening																
Technical Mitigation Standards: Similar to the Santa Rosa Program or UCBC Appendix Chapter 1, or SHBL if applicable.																
Progress and Remarks: \$2 per square foot reimbursement to owner for cost of developing upgrading plans. Community redevelopment agency pays for cost of URM upgrading permits.																
Sonoma County																
Yes	14	300	Yes	yes	7	314	2	2	2	0	0	2	0	305	314	
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners																
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1																
Progress and Remarks: Draft ordinance being reviewed.																
South El Monte																
Yes	0	0	N/A													
Mitigation Program Type:																
Technical Mitigation Standards:																
Progress and Remarks:																
South Gate																
Yes	0	47	Yes	yes	42	42	0	0	0	0	6	2	3		47	
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening																
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1987 Edition of SSC Model Ordinance																
Progress and Remarks:																
South Pasadena																
Yes	3	38	Yes		32	32	2		3		1			3	32	
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening																
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1982 Edition of Division 88 City of Los Angeles Code																
Progress and Remarks:																
South San Francisco																
Yes	0	14	Yes	yes	9		0		0		1	0		4	14	
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory Strengthening, Complete retrofit within 7 years or at time of sale, whichever comes first.																
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1																
Progress and Remarks:																
Stanton																
Yes	0	0	N/A													
Mitigation Program Type:																
Technical Mitigation Standards:																
Progress and Remarks:																

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URM's)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URM's	Number of Non-Historic URM's	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1999 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Suisun City															
Yes	0	19	Yes												19
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Sunnyvale															
Yes	10	0	Yes	yes										10	10
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners, educational material, voluntary engineering reports, review by city after one year.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks: Staff proposed to present the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1 for adoption by the City Council in June 1992. An earlier survey listed 86 bldgs and 10 were found to be URM.															
Taft															
Yes	0	42	No	yes							2	2	40		
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Tehachapi															
Yes	0	9	No												
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Temple City															
Yes	0	6	Yes												
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Chapter 96 of the Los Angeles County Code 1985 Edition															
Progress and Remarks:															
Thousand Oaks															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Tiburon															
Yes	0	1	No	yes		1									
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)												
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1999 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified	
Torrance																
Yes	0	50	Yes	yes	0	43	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	50	
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening																
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1982 Edition of Division 88 Los Angeles City Code																
Progress and Remarks: City funded a subsidy to pay for the engineering analysis at \$0.50/Sq. Ft. Formed \$679,000 assessment district for owners who choose to join.																
Tulare																
No			No													
Mitigation Program Type:																
Technical Mitigation Standards:																
Progress and Remarks: Indicated inventory started but not completed prior to 1992 survey with no reports since.																
Tustin																
Yes	0	8	Yes	yes		8	0	0								
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening																
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1990 SSC Model Ordinance																
Progress and Remarks: Community Development Block Grants for up to \$2000 provided for engineering costs.																
Twentynine Palms																
Yes	0	27	Yes													
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening, engineer's structural report, letters of intent, demolition for unsatisfactory progress, historical buildings are exempt.																
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1985 Edition of Division 88 as modified for URM buildings, 1973 UBC for non-URM bearing wall buildings																
Progress and Remarks:																
Ukiah																
Yes	0	48	Yes	yes		48							40	48	48	
Mitigation Program Type: Engineer's structural report, posting, structural upgrade if voluntary structural work exceeds 50% of building value on any one permit.																
Technical Mitigation Standards: State Historical Building Code																
Progress and Remarks: Earlier loan program is no longer available.																
Union City																
Yes	0	7	Yes	yes		5	1				1				7	
Mitigation Program Type:																
Technical Mitigation Standards:																
Progress and Remarks:																

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URM)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URM	Number of Non-Historic URM	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1999 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Upland															
Yes	0	58	Yes		10	10	4	4	6					34	
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening requires engineering reports, and letters of intent.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Latest Edition of Division 88 of the Los Angeles City Code, the 1973 UBC for non-URM buildings, and City Ordinance #1470 January 1990.															
Progress and Remarks: \$2 million Commercial Rehabilitation Loan Program - loans at market rate, architectural engineering and loan packaging.....58 URM, Pre-1935 with 100 + Occupants Pre-1976 with 300 + Occupants															
Vacaville															
Yes	14	7	Yes	yes		21	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	21
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to Owners															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks: 3% redevelopment matching loan program over 25 years for retrofits. Offers facade loans.															
Vallejo															
Yes	8	56	Yes		16	16		9	25					20	
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Similar to the UCBC Appendix Chapter 1															
Progress and Remarks: \$40,000 per building maximum CDBG loan. 19 buildings removed from list.															
Ventura															
Yes	11	134	Yes	yes	3	130		18	4		4			3	145
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory parapet strengthening. Voluntary Strengthening to UCBC Seismic Zone 2B Compliance Recommended by City.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC															
Progress and Remarks: Environmental Impact Study done. 2 ordinances adopted and 1 policy resolution. NOtice of non-compliance noted on deed to property.															
Ventura County															
Yes	0	19	Yes	yes	8	8					1	7		3	19
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: February 1990 SSC Model Ordinance															
Progress and Remarks:															
Vernon															
Yes	0	105	Yes	yes	8		3	0	0	0	35	2	63	59	79
Mitigation Program Type: See attached Ordinance 1059															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Appendix chapter One of U.C.B.C.															
Progress and Remarks: The number of URM buildings that were originally reported in 1995 was incorrect. The actual number of URM buildings was 105. Since 1995 there have been 35 URM buildings demolished leaving a total of 70 remaining URM buildings.															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1999 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Victorville															
Yes	0	37	Yes	yes	6		0	2	6	2	1			10	40
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners, owners are requested to voluntarily upgrade their buildings upon changes of occupancy or no later than 2 years.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: UCBC Appendix Chapter 1															
Progress and Remarks: 14 buildings have been contracted out to architects/engineers for seismic retrofit design. Building reduction is a result of further investigation of the structural elements and as a result they are no longer classified as URM (15 total).															
Villa Park															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Vista															
Yes	0	2	Yes	yes	1	1								1	
Mitigation Program Type: Voluntary strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None reported															
Progress and Remarks:															
Walnut															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Walnut Creek															
Yes	0	17	Yes	yes	14	14	1		1			1			17
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory Strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Modified Version of the 1987 SSC Model Ordinance used for administrative requirements. UCBC Appendix Chapter 1, 1997 edition used for structural requirements.															
Progress and Remarks:															
Wasco															
Yes	0	26	Yes	yes	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	26	26
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URM's)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URM's	Number of Non-Historic URM's	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1999 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Stated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Watsonville															
Yes	0	60	Yes		16	0	2	0	1	0	4	0	0	27	
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Adopted a Voluntary and Notification Only System (2 and 3) according to the 1997 Survey response.															
Progress and Remarks: Inventory started, but not completed or reported to the Commission.															
West Covina															
Yes	0	1	Yes	yes	1										1
Mitigation Program Type: Notice to owner, engineer's report															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Not indicated															
Progress and Remarks: Plans were prepared in 1992 and were being reviewed. Costs were being looked at.															
West Hollywood															
Yes	20	81	Yes	yes											
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1988 Edition of Chapter 96 of the Los Angeles County Code as modified, also accepts the 1984 ABK Methodology Report															
Progress and Remarks: Amended the rent control program to allow rent increases, \$7100 per building Community Development Block Grant funds, housing rehabilitation program of \$10,000 per building, reduction or waiver of fees, zoning incentives.															
Westlake Village															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Westminster															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Westmorland															
Yes	0	2	Yes												
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening															
Technical Mitigation Standards: 1988 Edition of Chapter 96 of the Los Angeles County Code															
Progress and Remarks:															

Jurisdiction				Survey Results (numbers of URMs)											
Inventory Completed	Number of Historic URMs	Number of Non-Historic URMs	Mitigation Program Established	Replied to 1999 Survey	UCBC Compliance	Compliance with Jurisdiction Program	Partial Compliance/Under Construction	Retrofit Permit Issued	Plans Submitted/Pancheck Underway	Reduced Occupancy	Demolished	Slated for Demolition	Warning Placards Posted	No Mitigation Progress	Owners Notified
Whittier															
Yes	0	12	Yes	yes		9	1				2				12
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Draft Model Ordinance (Division 88)															
Progress and Remarks: Notices served 5/92.															
Willits															
Yes	2	7	Yes	yes	1							1		5	7
Mitigation Program Type: Engineer's report, notices to owners, posting of buildings.															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Woodside															
Yes	0	0	N/A												
Mitigation Program Type:															
Technical Mitigation Standards:															
Progress and Remarks:															
Yorba Linda															
Yes	0	2	Yes	yes	2										
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening analysis required by structural engineer.															
Technical Mitigation Standards: Similar to 1982 Edition of Division 88															
Progress and Remarks:															
Yountville															
Yes	5	5	Yes	Yes	2		3							5	10
Mitigation Program Type: Notices to owners															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks:															
Yucaipa															
Yes	0	45	Yes		17									28	28
Mitigation Program Type: Mandatory strengthening requiring evaluations by June 1994															
Technical Mitigation Standards: None															
Progress and Remarks: Draft ordinance proposes adoption of UCBC Appendix Chapter 1 and a voluntary strengthening plan. Ordinance adopted in 1992, requires mandatory strengthening. They are now considering revising it to a voluntary program.															

Appendix B-The URM Law (Full Text)

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

§ 8875. Definitions

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

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

§ 8875.1

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

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

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

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

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

Local building departments shall do all of the following:

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

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

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

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

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

§ 8875.3 Local jurisdictions; immunity from liability

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

§ 8875.4 Annual report

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

§ 8875.5 Coordination of responsibilities

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

chapter.

§ 8875.6

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

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

§ 8875.7

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

§ 8875.8

(a) Within three months of the effective date of the act amending this section, enacted at the 1991-92 Regular Session, any owner who has received actual or constructive notice that a building located in seismic zone 4 is constructed of unreinforced masonry shall post in a conspicuous place at the entrance of the building, on a sign not less than 5x7 the following statement, printed in not less than 30-point bold type:

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

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

§ 8875.9

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

§ 8875.95

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