

GENERAL INDEX

GENERAL INDEX.....	xi
LIST OF FIGURES.....	xv
LIST OF TABLES.....	xviii
LIST OF MAPS.....	xxi
LIST OF PICTURES.....	xxiii
1 Introduction.....	1
1.1 General Scope.....	1
1.2 Objectives.....	3
1.3 Contents of the dissertation.....	3
2 State of the Art.....	5
2.1 Introduction.....	5
2.2 Preliminaries.....	5
2.3 Plate Tectonics as Seismic Event Sources.....	8
2.4 Seismic Risk.....	10
2.4.1 Quantifying Seismic Risk.....	11
2.4.2 Seismic Hazard.....	12
2.4.2.1 Deterministic Seismic Hazard.....	12
2.4.2.2 Probabilistic Seismic Hazard.....	13
2.4.3 Seismic Vulnerability.....	21
2.4.3.1 Vulnerability Index Method.....	26
2.4.4 Seismic Risk and Seismic Risk Scenarios.....	27
2.5 Summary.....	30
3 Vulnerability assessment methods.....	31
3.1 Introduction.....	31
3.2 The (Italian) Vulnerability Index Assessment Method (IVIM).....	31
3.2.1 Second Level Assessment Form (Reinforced Concrete).....	32
3.2.2 Vulnerability Index Quantification.....	39
3.3 Building Typology Matrix based methods.....	41
3.3.1 Empirical and expert opinions relationships.....	42
3.3.2 Numerical models relationships.....	51
3.4 Comparative analysis of vulnerability assessment approaches.....	58
3.5 Summary.....	59
4 Mérida, the City.....	61
4.1 Introduction.....	61
4.2 Venezuela's Geographical environment.....	61
4.3 Population in Venezuela.....	63
4.4 Mérida State Geography.....	63
4.4.1 Contour:.....	63
4.4.2 Climate:.....	63
4.4.3 Hydrography.....	63
4.4.4 Political division:.....	63
4.4.5 Population:.....	64
4.5 Geographical Features in Mérida City.....	65
4.6 Contour characteristics in Mérida's Tableau.....	66
4.7 History and physical evolution.....	67
4.8 Present Situation.....	74
4.8.1 Population and housing.....	74
4.8.2 Infrastructure.....	79

4.8.3	Transportation facilities.....	82
4.8.4	Health Care Facilities	83
4.8.5	Other Facilities	85
4.9	Summary	86
5	Seismic Hazard in Mérida	89
5.1	Introduction	89
5.2	Tectonic Environment and Seismicity in Venezuela	89
5.3	Seismicity for Mérida City	94
5.3.1	Geotectonic setting and seismicity for Northwestern Venezuela.....	94
5.3.2	Previous seismicity analyses for Mérida.....	103
5.3.3	Seismic hazard analysis in Mérida	105
5.4	Microzonation studies in Mérida city.....	107
5.4.1	Previous Microzonation Studies and Results	108
5.4.2	Plateau of Mérida: Geology, Geomorphology and Geotechnics.....	108
5.4.3	Microzonation Analysis.	110
5.4.3.1	Site response analysis.....	110
5.4.3.2	Mapping and analyzing the seismic hazard scenarios.....	119
5.4.4	Earthquake Induced Effects	124
5.4.4.1	Liquefaction Susceptibility Assessment.....	126
5.4.4.2	Landslide Susceptibility Assessment	136
5.5	Summary	146
6	Seismic Vulnerability in Mérida	149
6.1	Introduction	149
6.2	Preliminary vulnerability and damage in Mérida.....	149
6.2.1	Building typology matrix	149
6.2.2	General Damage Forecast	162
6.3	A detailed study: Barrio “La Milagrosa”	167
6.3.1	Sectors in “La Milagrosa”	168
6.3.2	Public Services	169
6.3.3	Building Types, Number of levels, and Plan Configuration of buildings.....	170
6.3.3.1	Predominant typology	173
6.3.3.2	Representative prototype buildings.....	179
6.3.4	Gravity loads behavior	181
6.3.4.1	General considerations	181
6.3.4.2	Structural analysis of the frames	181
6.3.4.3	Strength verifications in the transversal frames	184
6.3.4.4	Cantilevers.....	187
6.3.4.5	Slabs	188
6.3.4.6	Summary	188
6.3.5	Seismic behavior	189
6.3.5.1	Failure modes	189
6.3.5.2	Shear failure of the walls.....	191
6.3.5.3	Diagonal compression failure of the coplanar walls	193
6.3.5.4	Shear failure of the columns.....	196
6.3.5.5	Bending failure of the columns or beams.....	198
6.3.5.6	Combined failure of walls and frame.....	200
6.3.5.7	Out of plane failure of the walls.....	201
6.3.5.8	Detachment of the roofs	201
6.3.5.9	Collapse of vertical propped elements	201
6.3.5.10	Required tests	201

6.3.6	Analysis by the Venezuelan code.....	202
6.3.6.1	Design spectrum.....	202
6.3.6.2	Fundamental periods	203
6.3.6.3	Base shear.....	204
6.3.6.4	Lateral forces.....	206
6.3.6.5	Vertical forces	207
6.3.7	Expected failure modes	207
6.3.7.1	Building B1	207
6.3.7.2	Building B2	208
6.3.7.3	Buildings B3.....	208
6.3.8	Observed damage in similar situations.....	209
6.3.8.1	The El Quindío (Colombia) Earthquake	210
6.3.8.2	The Izmit (Turkey) earthquake	213
6.3.9	Vulnerability Assessment.....	216
6.3.9.1	The Italian Vulnerability Index Method (IVIM).....	216
6.3.9.2	The LM1 Methodology	226
6.3.9.3	Expected damage in the La Milagrosa Barrio.....	228
6.4	Summary	232
7	Construction and Strengthening Recommendations	234
7.1	Draft Construction Recommendations	235
7.2	Draft Strengthening Recommendations	240
7.2.1	Suggested measures.....	240
7.2.2	Disregarded measures	243
7.2.3	Seismic resistance of the strengthened buildings.....	243
7.3	Economical Appraisal	246
7.3.1	Cost-Benefit analysis.....	246
7.3.2	Expected physical damage and losses.....	247
7.3.2.1	Present situation	247
7.3.2.2	Strengthened buildings.....	248
7.3.2.3	Expected savings	249
7.3.3	Cost of the strengthening measures.....	250
7.3.4	Cost-Benefit results	251
7.4	Dissemination strategy	252
8	Seismic Damage Scenarios	254
8.1	Introduction	254
8.2	Seismic Damage Evaluation.....	254
8.3	Damage Scenarios for Intensity $I = VI$	257
8.3.1	Undamaged buildings for $I = VI$	259
8.3.2	Damage Grade 1 (Fully Operational Performance Level) Distribution.....	260
8.3.3	Damage Grade 2 (Functional Performance Level) Distribution	261
8.3.4	Damage Grade 3 (Life Safety Performance Level).....	262
8.3.5	Damage Grade 4 (Near Collapse Performance Level).....	263
8.3.6	Damage Grades Distribution by Parishes for Intensity $I = VI$	263
8.4	Damage Scenarios for Intensity $I = VII$	267
8.4.1	Undamaged Buildings for $I = VII$	268
8.4.2	Damage Grade 1 (Fully Operational Performance Level) Distribution.....	269
8.4.3	Damage Grade 2 (Functional Performance Level) Distribution	270
8.4.4	Damage Grade 3 (Life Safety Performance Level) Distribution	271
8.4.5	Damage Grade 4 (Near Collapse Performance Level) Distribution	272
8.4.6	Damage Grades Distribution by Parishes for Intensity $I = VII$	273

8.5	Damage Scenarios for Intensity $I = VIII$	275
8.5.1	Undamaged buildings for $I = VIII$	276
8.5.2	Damage Grade 1 (Fully Operational Performance Level) Distribution	277
8.5.3	Damage Grade 2 (Functional Performance Level) Distribution	278
8.5.4	Damage Grade 3 (Life Safety Performance Level) Distribution	279
8.5.5	Damage Grade 4 (Near Collapse Performance Level) Distribution	280
8.5.6	Damage Grade 5 (Collapse) Distribution.....	281
8.5.7	Damage Grades Distribution by Parishes for Intensity $I = VIII$	281
8.6	Damage Scenarios for Intensity $I = IX$	283
8.6.1	Undamaged buildings for $I = IX$	285
8.6.2	Damage Grade 1 (Fully Operational Performance Level) Distribution.....	286
8.6.3	Damage Grade 2 (Functional Performance Level) Distribution	287
8.6.4	Damage Grade 3 (Life Safety Performance Level) Distribution	288
8.6.5	Damage Grade 4 (Near Collapse) Distribution	289
8.6.6	Damage Grade 5 (Total Collapse) Distribution	289
8.6.7	Damage Grades Distribution by Parishes for Intensity $I = IX$	290
8.7	Other observations for the Damage Scenarios	292
8.8	Human casualties for the earthquake scenarios.....	297
8.8.1	Casualties for scenario event $I = VIII$	301
8.8.1.1	Casualties by parishes for $I = VIII$	301
8.8.2	Casualties for scenario event $I = IX$	302
8.8.2.1	Casualties by parishes for $I = IX$	303
8.9	Summary	304
9	Summary, Conclusions and Further Research	308
9.1	Introduction	308
9.2	Summary	308
9.3	Conclusions	309
9.3.1	Conclusions about Mérida.....	310
9.3.2	Conclusions about “La Milagrosa”	310
9.4	Further research.....	310
	References	312
	ANNEX A	324
	ANNEX B	340
	ANNEX C	342

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1: Casualties map for the December 26 th 2004 earthquake [EERI, 2005].	2
Figure 2.1: Problems and factors involved in predicting the seismic response of a building. [Bertero, 1992].	8
Figure 2.2: World Seismicity Map 1998-2000 (Data downloaded from: http://spatialnews.geocomm.com/features/quakes2000)	10
Figure 2.3: Gumbel I, II and III distributions.	17
Figure 2.4: Observed vulnerability function for Spain at MSK Intensity $I = VII$ [Barbat, 1995].	26
Figure 3.1: Dimensions for the evaluation of Resisting System Type and Organization [Yépez, 1996].	33
Figure 3.2: Plan Configuration parameters [Yépez, 1996].	35
Figure 3.3: Vertical Configuration parameters [Yépez, 1996].	37
Figure 3.4: Evaluated factors for Connectivity between Elements parameter [Yépez, 1996].	37
Figure 3.5: Low ductility elements identification, after [Yépez, 1996].	38
Figure 3.6: Vulnerability Functions for RC Frame Buildings, after [Barbat, 1998].	41
Figure 3.7: Vulnerability Functions for RC Flat Slab Buildings, after [Barbat, 1998].	41
Figure 3.8: Definitions of quantity [EMS, 1998].	44
Figure 3.9: Membership functions for the quantities in EMS-98 [Multinovic and Trendafiloski, 2003].	46
Figure 3.10: Plausible and possible behavior for each vulnerability class [Multinovic and Trendafiloski, 2003].	47
Figure 3.11: Membership functions of the vulnerability index [Multinovic and Trendafiloski, 2003].	48
Figure 3.12: Building capacity model [Multinovic and Trendafiloski, 2003].	52
Figure 3.13: Building capacity model [Multinovic and Trendafiloski, 2003].	54
Figure 3.14: RC1HPC building typology capacity spectra [Multinovic and Trendafiloski, 2003].	56
Figure 3.15: Example of fragility model (RC1/CBA Medium Height) [Multinovic and Trendafiloski, 2003].	57
Figure 4.1: Percentage of Housing Types by parishes, after [INE, 2001].	77
Figure 4.2: Electricity Service in the parishes studied.	80
Figure 4.3: Domestic Sewage for the parishes studied.	81
Figure 4.4: Telephone Service in the parishes studied.	81
Figure 5.1: Historical Seismicity Map for Venezuela (after [Schubert, 1984]).	90
Figure 5.2: National Seismological Array for Venezuela (downloaded from: http://www.funvisis.org.ve/red_sismologica_nacional.html).	93
Figure 5.3: National Seismic Code comparison: a) Norma Covenin 1756-98, b) Norma Covenin-Mindur-Funvisis, 1756-82 (actual code).	93
Figure 5.4: Microseismicity ($m_b \geq 3$) in Northwestern Venezuela for period: 1983 – mid-1995 [Pérez et. al., 1997].	96
Figure 5.5: Vertical Section A – A' [Pérez et. al., 1997].	97
Figure 5.6: Scheme of the Southwestern Caribbean – Northwestern Venezuela tectonic framework [Pérez et. al., 1997].	97
Figure 5.7: Geomorphologic features in BFZ trace, after [Schubert, 1984].	101
Figure 5.8: Isoacceleration Map for Western Venezuela and Hazard Curves for Mérida City [Bendito, 2000].	104
Figure 5.9: Annual Exceedance Probabilities and Return Periods for Magnitudes.	106
Figure 5.10: Acceleration Spectra for different soils in Mérida's Tableau [MOP, 1976].	109

Figure 5.11: Geotechnical properties for materials used in analysis.....	110
Figure 5.12: Elastic Response Spectra for Mérida [MINDUR and FUNVISIS, 1998].	112
Figure 5.13: Acceleration Time Histories and Spectral Accelerations used in analysis.....	113
Figure 5.14: Site Response Analysis results for Northerly Albarregas River Soils.....	115
Figure 5.15: Site Response Analysis results for Southerly Albarregas River Soils.....	116
Figure 5.16: Northerly – Southerly Albarregas River Soils Surface Response Spectra.	117
Figure 5.17: Conditional Liquefaction Probability relationships for Liquefaction Susceptibility categories, after [Liao et. al, 1988].....	130
Figure 5.18: Liquefaction Probability for $M = 6.8$ and water table depth of 3.0 m.	131
Figure 5.19: Lateral Spreading Displacement Relationship after [Youd and Perkins, 1978].	133
Figure 5.20: Forces acting on a block resting on an inclined plane under dynamic conditions.	138
Figure 5.21: Critical Acceleration as Function of Geologic Group and Slope Angle [Wilson and Keefer, 1985].....	139
Figure 5.22: Relationship between Displacement Factor and Ratio of Critical Acceleration- Induced Acceleration [HAZUS-99-SR2, 2002].	142
Figure 6.1: EMS-98 Vulnerability Classes distribution.	156
Figure 6.2: LM1 Vulnerability Classes distribution.....	157
Figure 6.3: Mean semi-empirical vulnerability functions for the building typologies in survey.	162
Figure 6.4: Percentage of Damaged Buildings by Damage Grades for the scenario events..	165
Figure 6.5: Damage Grades Distribution by Vulnerability Classes.	166
Figure 6.6: Construction system characteristics.....	174
Figure 6.7: Frames steel reinforcement.....	179
Figure 6.8: Isometric drawings for buildings B1 and B2.....	180
Figure 6.9: Isometric drawings for buildings B3-b and B3-c.	180
Figure 6.10: Typical plans for building prototypes.....	181
Figure 6.11: Transversal frames of buildings B2 and B3.	182
Figure 6.12 Internal forces for the inner frames in building B2.	183
Figure 6.13 Internal forces for the inner frames in buildings B3.	184
Figure 6.14: Ultimate state of the bent section.....	185
Figure 6.15: Loaded cantilever beam.....	187
Figure 6.16: Global failure modes (after [Paulay and Priestley 1992]).	190
Figure 6.17: Building slab encased by the columns.....	191
Figure 6.18: First floor masonry front wall with openings.	192
Figure 6.19: Failure mechanism for cladding wall and left force.	194
Figure 6.20: Failure mechanism for cladding wall and right force.....	194
Figure 6.21: Failure mechanism for partitioning wall and left force.	195
Figure 6.22: Failure mechanism for partitioning wall and right force.	195
Figure 6.23: Moment-curvature law.....	199
Figure 6.24: Collapse mechanisms.....	200
Figure 6.25: Elastic Design Spectrum in the Venezuelan Seismic Code.....	203
Figure 6.26: Vulnerability Parameters distribution (by percentages) in the buildings assessed.	222
Figure 6.27: Vulnerability Index distribution	223
Figure 6.28: Vulnerability Index distribution by sectors (in buildings number).	223
Figure 6.29: New vulnerability index distribution considering the adjacency parameter.	226
Figure 6.30: Mean semi-empirical vulnerability functions for LM1 classification.	228
Figure 6.31: Damage distribution in the La Milagrosa Barrio.....	229
Figure 6.32: Damage distribution by vulnerability classes.....	230

Figure 6.33: Mean Semi-empirical vulnerability function for $V_I = 0.69$ (NENG-RC typology).	232
.....	
Figure 6.34: Fragility Curves for $V_I = 0.69$ (NENG-RC typology).	232
Figure 7.1: Stripe foundation and column reinforcement	238
Figure 7.2: Walls	238
Figure 7.3: Columns	238
Figure 7.4: Transversal wall jacketing	241
Figure 7.5: Longitudinal wall strengthening	242
Figure 7.6: Secondary steel beams strengthening	242
Figure 7.7: Shear failure mode for the jacketed wall [Rosenblueth 1980].	244
Figure 7.8: Damage grade distributions for $I = VIII$ and $I = IX$	246
Figure 8.1: Damage grades distribution percentages by vulnerability classes for Intensity $I = VI$.	257
Figure 8.2: Typologies distribution in the parishes, with respect to all the buildings in the survey.	265
Figure 8.3: Typologies distribution within the parishes.	266
Figure 8.4: Damage Grades distribution by Parishes for Intensity $I = VI$.	266
Figure 8.5: Damage grades distribution by vulnerability classes for Intensity $I = VII$.	267
Figure 8.6: Damage Grades distribution by Parishes for Intensity $I = VII$.	274
Figure 8.7: Damage grades distribution by vulnerability classes for Intensity $I = VIII$.	275
Figure 8.8: Damage Grades distribution by parishes for Intensity $I = VIII$.	283
Figure 8.9: Damage grades distribution by vulnerability classes for Intensity $I = IX$.	284
Figure 8.10: Damage Grades distribution by parishes for Intensity $I = IX$.	292
Figure 8.11: Damage distribution by number of buildings in the parishes, for $I = IX$.	296
Figure 8.12: Factor M2, Occupancy at time of earthquake, after [Coburn and Spence, 2002].	299
.....	
Figure 8.13: Distribution of the casualties for scenario event $I = VIII$.	301
Figure 8.14: Distribution of the casualties in the parishes, for scenario event $I = VIII$.	302
Figure 8.15: Distribution of the casualties for scenario event $I = IX$.	303
Figure 8.16: Distribution of the casualties in the parishes, for scenario event $I = IX$.	304
Figure 8.17: Mean semi-empirical vulnerability functions.	306

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1: Distribution of earthquakes and mortality from year 1999 to year 2005, after [USGS, 2005].	2
Table 2.1: Damage Chart for European Macroseismic Scale [EMS, 1998].	22
Table 2.2: Parameters for Masonry and Reinforced Concrete Building Types [GNDT, 2002].	28
Table 3.1: Values for parameters defining the spectral ordinate by soil [Yépez, 1996].	34
Table 3.2: Parameter qualification values for Reinforced Concrete Buildings, [Yépez, 1996].	40
Table 3.3: Classifications used in the European Macroseismic Scale [EMS, 1998].	43
Table 3.4: Damage probability matrix for vulnerability class A buildings, after [Pujades, 2004].	44
Table 3.5: Damage quantity matrix for Vulnerability Class A.	45
Table 3.6: Vulnerability Index values for the vulnerability classes, after [Multinovic and Trendafiloski, 2003].	48
Table 3.7: Attribution of vulnerability classes and Vulnerability Index values for different building typologies, after [Giovinazzi and Lagomarsino, 2004].	49
Table 3.8: Scores for the vulnerability factors for Masonry Buildings [Giovinazzi and Lagomarsino, 2004].	50
Table 3.9: Scores for the vulnerability factors for RC Buildings [Giovinazzi and Lagomarsino, 2004].	50
Table 3.10: Fundamental periods of typical RC systems, after [Multinovic and Trendafiloski, 2003].	55
Table 3.11: Building Drift Ratios at the Threshold of Damage States, after [Multinovic and Trendafiloski, 2003].	57
Table 3.12: Approaches for seismic vulnerability assessment of buildings, after [Lang, 2002].	60
Table 4.1: Population in Mérida State Municipalities, after [INE, 2001].	65
Table 4.2: Percentages over total population in Venezuela for Andean and Center- North regions [Caminos, 1967].	70
Table 4.3: Population data from 19 th century to mid-20 th century [Pineda, 1992].	73
Table 4.4: Population, Density and Growth from 1961 to 2001, after [INE, 2001].	74
Table 4.5: Population for Municipalities in Mérida's Metropolitan Area, after [INE, 2001].	75
Table 4.6: Distribution of housing units by housing types for the parishes in Mérida's tableau, after [INE, 2001].	78
Table 4.7: Classification for Health facilities in Venezuela, after [Cedres de Bello, 1994].	83
Table 4.8: Levels of attention in health facilities for Venezuela [Cedres de Bello, 1994].	84
Table 4.9: Health Care Facility Types by parishes, after [venezuelasaludable, 2003].	85
Table 5.1: Relevant destructive earthquakes in Venezuela, from 1530 to 1997.	92
Table 5.2: Seismic Zones in Northwestern Venezuela (MOP, 1976).	95
Table 5.3: Seismogenic Sources for Mérida City (100-km radius) [Laffaille, 1996].	95
Table 5.4: Right-Lateral Strike-Slip movements in BFZ measured in geologic and geomorphologic features [Schubert, 1984].	102
Table 5.5: Return Periods for Mérida City [MOP, 1976].	103
Table 5.6: Return Periods for Mérida [Rengifo, 1982].	104
Table 5.7: Attenuation laws for Venezuela [Malaver, 2000].	107
Table 5.8: Scenario Earthquakes for risk analysis.	107
Table 5.9: Geotechnical Soil Columns used in Analysis [MOP, 1976].	111
Table 5.10: Geotechnical Soil Columns used in Analysis [MOP, 1976].	112

Table 5.11: Liquefaction Susceptibility for Sedimentary Deposits [Youd and Perkins, 1978].	127
Table 5.12: Proportion of Map Unit Susceptible to liquefaction, [HAZUS-99-SR2, 2002].	130
Table 5.13: Threshold Ground Acceleration ($PGA(t)$) corresponding to zero Probability of Liquefaction.	133
Table 5.14: Ground Settlement Amplitudes for Liquefaction Susceptibility Categories [HAZUS-99-SR2, 2002].	135
Table 5.15: Summary results for Potential Liquefaction Hazards ($I = IX$ scenario event)...	135
Table 5.16: Types and Characteristics of Earthquake-Induced Landslides, after [Kramer, 1996].	137
Table 5.17: Relative Abundance of Earthquake-Induced Landslides from study of 40 Historical Earthquakes ranging from $M_s = 5.2$ to $M_w = 9.5$ [Kramer, 1996].	138
Table 5.18: Landslide Susceptibility for Geologic Groups [HAZUS-99-SR2, 2002].	139
Table 5.19: Critical Acceleration for Susceptibility Categories [HAZUS-99-SR2, 2002].	139
Table 5.20: Percentage of Map Area having a Landslide-Susceptible deposit [Wieczorec et al., 1985].	140
Table 5.21: Ratio between Critical Acceleration and Induced Peak Ground Acceleration for each Landslide Susceptibility Category.	143
Table 5.22: Permanent Ground Displacements (cm) for scenario events considered.	144
Table 6.1: Guidelines for Seismic Vulnerability of Construction Types [EERI/IAEE, 2001].	152
Table 6.2: Proposed equivalence for Laffaille (1996) and EMS-98 building Types Classification.	153
Table 6.3: Vulnerability Indices for BTM buildings [Multinovic and Trendafiloski, 2003].	154
Table 6.4: Equivalence between EMS-98 and LM1 BTM.	156
Table 6.5: Damage Probability Matrices for the Building typologies in the survey.	164
Table 6.6: Percentage of Buildings by Damage Grades and Total Damage for Intensities.	165
Table 6.7: Description of sectors in “La Milagrosa” Barrio.	168
Table 6.8: Distribution of building types in “La Milagrosa” Barrio.	171
Table 6.9: Horizontal wall strength. Shear failure mode (kN/m).	193
Table 6.10: Horizontal wall strength. Diagonal compression mode (kN/m).	196
Table 6.11: Axial forces in one column.	198
Table 6.12: Shear strength in one column.	198
Table 6.13: Horizontal base shear strength per column (kN). Bending failure.	200
Table 6.14: Fundamental periods T (s) according to the Venezuelan code.	203
Table 6.15: Total Weight of the prototype buildings (kN).	205
Table 6.16: Base shear for the prototypes studied.	205
Table 6.17: Vertical distribution of base shear for prototype buildings.	206
Table 6.18: Lateral seismic forces.	207
Table 6.19: Seismic behavior of building B1.	208
Table 6.20: Seismic behavior of building B2.	208
Table 6.21: Seismic behavior of building B3.	209
Table 6.22: Ground motion parameters describing earthquakes.	209
Table 6.23: Effects of the earthquake in Armenia and Pereira, after [Yoshimura et al, 1999].	210
Table 6.24: Shear strength-demand ratio.	218
Table 6.25: Vulnerability Indices distribution in survey.	222
Table 6.26: IVIM parameters with the proposed 12 th parameter (adjacency).	225
Table 6.27: Lower and Upper values of LM1 vulnerability index, in the La Milagrosa survey.	227

Table 6.28: Values for the LM1 vulnerability index, in the La Milagrosa survey.....	228
Table 6.29: Damage Probability Matrix for $V_I = 0.69$ (NENG-RC).....	231
Table 7.1: Jacket strength for walls.....	244
Table 7.2: Seismic resistance of strengthened building B1	245
Table 7.3: Seismic resistance of strengthened building B2	245
Table 7.4: Seismic resistance of strengthened building B3	245
Table 7.5: Estimated cost of physical losses. Present situation	247
Table 7.6: Estimated casualties for damage grade 5	248
Table 7.7: Estimated casualties for damage grade 4	248
Table 7.8: Estimated cost of physical losses. Strengthened buildings	249
Table 7.9: Estimated casualties. Strengthened buildings	249
Table 7.10: Estimated savings of cost of physical losses.....	250
Table 7.11: Estimated savings of casualties.....	250
Table 7.12: Retrofit cost of building B1 (US\$).....	250
Table 7.13: Retrofit cost of building B2 (US\$).....	251
Table 7.14: Retrofit cost of building B3 (US\$).....	251
Table 7.15: Expected economical losses after strengthening.....	252
Table 7.16: Saved lives and injuries.....	252
Table 8.1: Damage Probability Matrix for $I = VI$, for the seven typologies considered in the survey.	255
Table 8.2: Vision 2000 [SEAO, 1995] “Standard Performance Levels” and European Macroseismic Scale damage grades [EMS, 1998].	258
Table 8.3: Damage grades distribution by typologies for $I = VI$	259
Table 8.4: Damage grades distribution by typologies for $I = VII$	268
Table 8.5: Damage grades distribution by vulnerability classes for $I = VIII$	276
Table 8.6: Damage grades distribution by vulnerability classes for $I = IX$	284
Table 8.7: Equivalence for damage descriptions in Vision 2000 and EMS-98 (N/A: Not Available).	293
Table 8.8: Breakdown of typical injury ratios for severity levels, after [Vacareanu et. al., 2004].	298
Table 8.9: Factor M3, Average percentage of occupants trapped by collapse, after [Coburn and Spence, 2002].	299
Table 8.10: Factor M4, Estimated injury distribution at collapses, in percentage of occupants trapped by collapse, after [Coburn and Spence, 2002].	300
Table 8.11: Factor M5, Percentage of trapped survivors in collapsed buildings that subsequently die, after [Coburn and Spence, 2002].	300
Table 8.12: Building typologies distribution by parishes.	305
Table 8.13: Scenario $I = VI$ damage distribution in parishes.....	306
Table 8.14: Scenario $I = VII$ damage distribution in parishes.	306
Table 8.15: Scenario $I = VIII$ damage distribution in parishes.	307
Table 8.16: Scenario $I = IX$ damage distribution in parishes.....	307

LIST OF MAPS

Map 2.1: Effective Peak Ground Acceleration in rock (return period of 475 years) for Colombia [AIS, Ingeominas and Uniandes, 1996].	19
Map 2.2: Estimated Intensity map for the 1989 Loma Prieta Earthquake [USGS, 2002].	19
Map 2.3: 2%/50 year seismic hazard for 5% damped PSA 0.2 seconds, on firm ground, for Canada [Adams et. al., 2000].	20
Map 2.4: Peak Acceleration (%g) with 10% Probability of exceedance in 50 Years [Frankel et al., 2002].	20
Map 4.1: Natural Regions in Venezuela	61
Map 4.2: Municipalities in Mérida State and their capitals, after [INE, 2001].	64
Map 4.3: Elevation Range in Mérida's Tableau.	66
Map 4.4: Slope classification for Mérida's Tableau.	67
Map 4.5: Growth of Mérida from 16 th to 18 th Century.	68
Map 4.6: Growth of Mérida in 19 th Century.	69
Map 4.7: Growth of Mérida city in the first half of 20 th Century.	71
Map 4.8: Metropolitan Area for Mérida [DCN, 1977].	75
Map 4.9: Parishes in the political division for Mérida City.	76
Map 4.10: Population density inside the tableau, after [MINDUR, 1992]	79
Map 4.11: Transportation facilities in Mérida.	82
Map 4.12: University of The Andes facilities location in Mérida City.	86
Map 5.1: Fault Zones and Fault Traces in Northwestern Venezuela (after [Bendito, 2000]). ..	98
Map 5.2: Historical Events for Northwestern Venezuela.	100
Map 5.3: First Layer Depth Data Available and Ambient Vibration Stations in [Montilla, 1998] and [Hernandez and De Barcia, 1998].	118
Map 5.4: First Layer thickness for soils in Mérida data from [MOP, 1976].	119
Map 5.5: Amplification Factors for Scenario Event $I = VI$	120
Map 5.6: Amplification Factors for Scenario Event $I = IX$	121
Map 5.7: Periods of Maximum Amplification for Intensity $I = VI$ Event.	121
Map 5.8: Increments of intensity degree for the soils in the tableau.	123
Map 5.9: Normalized Periods of Maximum Amplification for Intensity $I = IX$ event.	124
Map 5.10: Geologic Age of Deposits for Mérida's Tableau [Ministerio de Minas e Hidrocarburos, 1974].	128
Map 5.11: Geomorphology of Deposits in Mérida [Ministerio de Minas e Hidrocarburos, 1974].	128
Map 5.12: Liquefaction Susceptibility for Soil Deposits in Mérida's Tableau.	129
Map 5.13: Liquefaction Probability for $I = IX$ Scenario Event.	132
Map 5.14: Lateral Spread Permanent Ground Displacements, for $I = IX$ Scenario Event. ...	134
Map 5.15: Slope Classification for analysis.	141
Map 5.16: Landslide Susceptibility Map for Mérida's tableau.	141
Map 5.17: Critical Acceleration/Induced Acceleration Ratio for Scenario Event $I = IX$	143
Map 5.18: Landslide Permanent Ground Displacements for $I = IX$ scenario event.	144
Map 5.19: Landslide Permanent Ground Displacements (cm) for $I = VIII$ scenario event. ...	145
Map 5.20: Landslide Permanent Ground Displacements (cm) for $I = VII$ scenario event. ...	145
Map 5.21: Landslide Permanent Ground Displacements (cm) for $I = VI$ scenario event.	146
Map 6.1: Percentage of Rancho building typology in sub-sectors for Mérida.	158
Map 6.2: Percentage of M2 typology in sub-sectors for Mérida.	158
Map 6.3: Percentage of NENG-RC typology in sub-sectors for Mérida.	159
Map 6.4: Percentage of RC3.2 typology in sub-sectors for Mérida.	160
Map 6.5: Percentage of RC3.1 typology in sub-sectors for Mérida.	160

Map 6.6: Percentage of RC5 typology in sub-sectors for Mérida.....	161
Map 6.7: Percentage of S1 typology in sub-sectors for Mérida.....	161
Map 6.8: “La Milagrosa” Barrio in Mérida.....	167
Map 6.9: Sectors in Barrio “La Milagrosa”.	169
Map 6.10: Building types in Barrio “La Milagrosa”.....	171
Map 6.11: Number of Levels in the buildings, Barrio “La Milagrosa”.	172
Map 6.12: Plan Configuration for buildings in “La Milagrosa”.	173
Map 6.13: Vulnerability Index distribution in La Milagrosa Barrio (N/S: Not studied).	224
Map 6.14: New vulnerability index distribution in La Milagrosa Barrio, considering the adjacency parameter (N/S: Not studied).	226
Map 8.1: Sub-sectors in the survey with middle upper values of intensity for the scenarios.	256
Map 8.2: Undamaged buildings in the survey for Intensity $I = VI$	259
Map 8.3: Damage Grade 1 distribution scenario (Fully Operational) for Intensity $I = VI$	260
Map 8.4: Damage Grade 2 distribution scenario (Functional) for Intensity $I = VI$	261
Map 8.5: Damage Grade 3 distribution scenario (Life Safety) for Intensity $I = VI$	262
Map 8.6: Damage Grade 4 distribution scenario (Near Collapse) for Intensity $I = VI$	263
Map 8.7: Surveyed Sub-sectors and Parishes in Mérida.	264
Map 8.8: Undamaged buildings in the survey for $I = VII$	268
Map 8.9: Damage Grade 1 (Fully Operational Performance Level) for Intensity $I = VII$	269
Map 8.10: Damage Grade 2 distribution scenario (Functional) for Intensity $I = VII$	270
Map 8.11: Damage Grade 3 distribution scenario (Life Safety) for Intensity $I = VII$	271
Map 8.12: Damage Grade 4 distribution scenario (Near Collapse) for Intensity $I = VII$	272
Map 8.13: Undamaged buildings for Intensity $I = VIII$	276
Map 8.14: Damage Grade 1 distribution scenario (Fully Operational) for Intensity $I = VIII$	277
Map 8.15: Damage Grade 2 distribution scenario (Functional) for Intensity $I = VIII$	278
Map 8.16: Damage Grade 3 distribution scenario (Life Safety) for Intensity $I = VIII$	279
Map 8.17: Damage Grade 4 distribution scenario (Near Collapse) for Intensity $I = VIII$	280
Map 8.18: Damage Grade 5 distribution (Total Collapse) for Intensity $I = VIII$	281
Map 8.19: Undamaged buildings for Intensity $I = IX$	285
Map 8.20: Damage Grade 1 distribution scenario (Fully Operational) for Intensity $I = IX$. .	286
Map 8.21: Damage Grade 2 distribution scenario (Functional) for Intensity $I = IX$	287
Map 8.22: Damage Grade 3 distribution scenario (Life Safety) for Intensity $I = IX$	288
Map 8.23: Damage Grade 4 distribution scenario (Near Collapse) for Intensity $I = IX$	289
Map 8.24: Damage Grade 5 distribution scenario (Collapse) for Intensity $I = IX$	290
Map 8.25: Damage percentage distribution by parishes, in Mérida.....	295
Map 8.26: Critical scenario for $I = IX$	297

LIST OF PICTURES

Picture 1: Electricity and water supply in La Milagrosa Barrio.....	170
Picture 2: Buildings in flat and sloped sites.	175
Picture 3: Detail of a slab (balcony in a sloped site building).....	176
Picture 4: Stair in the front of a building.....	176
Picture 5: Metallic sheathing roofing. Poor bonding to frame and walls.....	177
Picture 6: Damage in masonry wall (3 rd floor), building in Pereira, Colombia [Pujol et. al, 1999].....	211
Picture 7: Damage to a RC a column, building in Armenia, Colombia [Yoshimura et. al, 1999].....	212
Picture 8: Damage in columns. Left: buckling of longitudinal reinforcement due to the lack of adequate transverse reinforcement. Right: Short-column effect. Both buildings in Armenia, Colombia. After [Pujol et. al, 1999].....	212
Picture 9: Damage in building due to steeped soft soil. Building in Armenia, Colombia. [Yoshimura et. al, 1999].....	213
Picture 10: Beam damage, longitudinal reinforcement slippage. Building in Adapazari, Turkey [PEER, 2000].....	214
Picture 11: Damage in columns. Left: Shear an axial failure due to excessive stirrup spacing. Right: shear failure in captive column. Building in Adapazari, Turkey [PEER, 2000].	215
Picture 12: Damage to beam-column joint, large rotations at the end of the columns. Building in Adapazari, Turkey [PEER, 2000].	215
Picture 13: Resisting system quality details. a) Lap splicing in column base is observed, and the excessive spacing of stirrups. b) Structure for the first phase of growth, showing identical dimensions for columns and beams, also the excessive stirrup spacing is noticed and an insufficient concrete covering of the reinforcing steel (this structure is in an abandoned state due to its construction in forbidden lands and a consequent restriction to occupation).	217
Picture 14: Alley in the Cristo Rey Sector showing four houses, the low quality of workmanship and materials in the walls and the absence of collar beams is observed.	218
Picture 15: Typical slabs in the building type assessed. a) Inside a two level building, the “I” shaped steel girders slide into the hollow clay tiles. b) Detail of the slab in a balcony perimeter.....	220
Picture 16: Roof Types in Barrios. a) Slab roof in one or more levels, and metal sheeting roof in two levels. b) Tile roofing supported over wooden deck and “I” shaped steel beams.	220
Picture 17: High-slope site for housing unit, structural members are observed in different lengths, with low-ductility elements in the middle structural axis, see columns over the foundations.	221
Picture 18: Building under construction.....	236