Washington State School Seismic Safety Assessments Project

SEISMIC UPGRADES CONCEPT DESIGN REPORT

Dayton High School – Gym

Dayton School District 2

June 2019

PREPARED FOR

PREPARED BY

DYKEMAN · rolluda architects architecture planning interiordesign · PRODIMS · BergerABAM · DCI ENGINEERS · wrk engineers STRUCTURAL & EARTHQUAKE ENGINEERING · ReidMiddleton

This page intentionally left blank.

WASHINGTON STATE SCHOOL SEISMIC SAFETY ASSESSMENTS PROJECT

SEISMIC UPGRADES CONCEPT DESIGN REPORT

Dayton High School – Gym

Dayton School District 2

June 2019

Prepared for:

State of Washington
Department of Natural Resources and Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction

6/6/2019



6/5/2019

Prepared by:

DCI ENGINEERS
707 W 2nd Ave
Spokane, WA 99201
509-455-4448
File No. 262018.063
info@dci-engineers.com

Reid Middleton
728 134th Street SW, Suite 200
Everett, WA 98204
425-741-3800
File No. 262018.063
www.reidmiddleton.com

Copyright© 2019 by Reid Middleton, Inc. All rights reserved.

This page intentionally left blank.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report documents the findings of a preliminary seismic evaluation of the Dayton High School Gymnasium building in Dayton, Washington. The gymnasium, located southeast of Dayton High School, is a 21,000-square-foot, single-story building with an additional 5,000-square-foot mezzanine and a 1,300-square-foot basement. The building houses a basketball court, locker rooms, a large lobby area, and several miscellaneous offices and support rooms. The building was completed in 1966 and has a metal building frame structure with rod bracing between the frames in the longitudinal direction. The roof diaphragm is metal deck spanning between open-web steel joists. The mezzanine is a monolithic, cast-in-place reinforced concrete deck and beam system. The lower infill walls are reinforced clay masonry units, with metal wall panels starting above the masonry. The gym floor is over a crawl space; the floor is supported by solid-sawn wood joists spanning between bundled solid-sawn wood girders. The foundation system is composed of shallow continuous footings under the stem and basement walls and shallow spread footings with piers below the steel frame-columns and floor girders.

DCI Engineers performed a Tier 1 screening in accordance with the ASCE 41-17 standard *Seismic Evaluation and Retrofit of Existing Buildings*. The evaluation included field observations and review of record drawings to verify the existing construction. The structural seismic evaluation indicated that the building has seismic deficiencies, including noncompliant moment-resisting connections and overstressed brace members. Other deficient items include canopies that are insufficiently anchored to the structure and staircases that are not detailed to allow for drift.

Conceptual seismic upgrade recommendations for structural and nonstructural systems are provided to improve the performance of the building to meet the designated performance criteria of ASCE 41-17. Sketches for the concept-level seismic upgrades are provided in Appendix B. The structural upgrades include installing supplemental rod bracing and strengthening moment-resisting connections. The nonstructural upgrades include modifying the base connection of the mezzanine stairs.

This page intentionally left blank.

Table of Contents

Page No.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.0 INTRODUCTION.....1

1.1 BACKGROUND.....1
1.2 SCOPE OF SERVICES.....1

2.0 SEISMIC EVALUATION PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA.....5

2.1 ASCE 41 SEISMIC EVALUATION AND RETROFIT OVERVIEW.....5
2.2 SEISMIC EVALUATION AND RETROFIT CRITERIA.....6
2.3 REPORT LIMITATIONS.....8

3.0 BUILDING DESCRIPTION & SEISMIC EVALUATION FINDINGS.....9

3.1 BUILDING OVERVIEW.....9
3.2 SEISMIC EVALUATION FINDINGS.....10

4.0 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....13

4.1 SEISMIC-STRUCTURAL UPGRADE RECOMMENDATIONS.....13
4.2 NONSTRUCTURAL UPGRADE RECOMMENDATIONS.....13
4.3 OPINION OF CONCEPTUAL CONSTRUCTION COSTS.....15

Appendix List

APPENDIX A: FIELD INVESTIGATION REPORT AND TIER 1 CHECKLISTS
APPENDIX B: CONCEPT-LEVEL SEISMIC UPGRADE FIGURES
APPENDIX C: OPINION OF PROBABLE CONSTRUCTION COSTS
APPENDIX D: EARTHQUAKE PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT TOOL (EPAT) WORKSHEET
APPENDIX E: DAYTON HIGH SCHOOL RECORD DRAWINGS
APPENDIX F: FEMA E-74 NONSTRUCTURAL SEISMIC BRACING EXCERPTS

Figure List

FIGURE 2-1. FLOW CHART AND DESCRIPTION OF ASCE 41 SEISMIC EVALUATION PROCEDURE. 5

Table List

TABLE 2.2.1-1. SPECTRAL ACCELERATION PARAMETERS (NOT SITE-MODIFIED).....7
TABLE 3.1.3-1. STRUCTURAL SYSTEM DESCRIPTIONS. 10
TABLE 3.1.4-1. STRUCTURAL SYSTEM CONDITION DESCRIPTIONS. 10
TABLE 3.2.1-1. IDENTIFIED STRUCTURAL SEISMIC DEFICIENCIES BASED ON TIER 1 CHECKLISTS. 11
TABLE 3.2.2-1. IDENTIFIED STRUCTURAL CHECKLIST ITEMS MARKED AS UNKNOWN. 11
TABLE 3.2.3-1. IDENTIFIED NONSTRUCTURAL SEISMIC DEFICIENCIES BASED ON TIER 1 CHECKLISTS. 12
TABLE 3.2.4-1. IDENTIFIED NONSTRUCTURAL SEISMIC DEFICIENCIES BASED ON TIER 1 CHECKLISTS. 12
TABLE 4.3.1. SEISMIC UPGRADES OPINION OF PROBABLE CONSTRUCTION COSTS.....17

Acronyms

ADA	Americans with Disabilities Act
ASCE	American Society of Civil Engineers
BPOE	Basic Performance Objective for Existing Buildings
BSE	Basic Safety Earthquake
BU	Built-Up
CMU	Concrete Masonry Unit
CP	Collapse Prevention
DNR	Department of Natural Resources
DCR	Demand-to-Capacity Ratio
EERI	Earthquake Engineering Research Institute
EPAT	EERI Earthquake Performance Assessment Tool
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
IBC	International Building Code
ICOS	Information and Condition of Schools
IEBC	International Existing Building Code
IO	Immediate Occupancy
LS	Life Safety
MCE	Maximum Considered Earthquake
MEP	Mechanical/Electrical/Plumbing
NFPA	National Fire Protection Association
OSHA	Occupational Safety and Health Administration
OSPI	Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction
PBEE	Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering
PR	Position Retention
ROM	Rough Order-of-Magnitude
SSSSC	School Seismic Safety Steering Committee
UBC	Uniform Building Code
USGS	United States Geological Survey
WF	Wide Flange
WGS	Washington Geological Survey

Reference List

Codes and References

2015 IBC, *2015 International Building Code,* prepared by the International Code Council, Washington, D.C.

ASCE 7-10, 2010, *Minimum Design Loads for Buildings and Other Structures*, prepared by the Structural Engineering Institute of the American Society of Civil Engineers, Reston, Virginia.

ASCE 31-03, 2003, *Seismic Evaluation of Existing Buildings*, prepared by the Structural Engineering Institute of the American Society of Civil Engineers, Reston, Virginia.

ASCE 41-06, 2007, *Seismic Rehabilitation of Existing Buildings*, prepared by the Structural Engineering Institute of the American Society of Civil Engineers, Reston, Virginia.

ASCE 41-13, 2014, *Seismic Evaluation and Retrofit of Existing Buildings*, prepared by the Structural Engineering Institute of the American Society of Civil Engineers, Reston, Virginia.

ASCE 41-17, 2018, *Seismic Evaluation and Retrofit of Existing Buildings*, prepared by the Structural Engineering Institute of the American Society of Civil Engineers, Reston, Virginia.

ATC-14, *Evaluating the Seismic Resistance of Existing Buildings,* prepared for Applied Technology Council by H.J. Degenkolb Associates, San Francisco, California.

FEMA E-74, 1994, *Reducing the Risks of Nonstructural Earthquake Damage: A Practical Guide*, prepared by Wiss, Janney, Elstner Associates, Inc., under contract from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), Washington, D.C.

FEMA E-74-FM, 2005, *Earthquake Hazard Mitigation for Nonstructural Elements, Field Manual*, prepared by Wiss, Janney, Elstner Associates, Inc., under contract with URS Corporation for the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), Washington, D.C.

FEMA 310, 1998, *Handbook for Seismic Evaluations of Buildings – A Prestandard*, prepared by America Society of Civil Engineers, Reston, Virginia.

FEMA 547, 2006, *Techniques for the Seismic Rehabilitation of Existing Buildings*, prepared by Rutherford & Chekene Consulting Engineers under contract with the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), funded by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).

NFPA 13, 2019, *Standard for the Installation of Sprinkler Systems*, prepared by National Fire Protection Association.

FEMA P-1000, *Safer, Stronger, Smarter: A Guide to Improving School Natural Hazard Safety*. Prepared by www.fema.gov/media-library/assets/documents/132592

Case Studies of Successful U.S. School Seismic Screening Programs. Prepared by EERI Staff, Members and Volunteers. https://www.eeri.org/wp-content/uploads/SESI_Screening_BestPractices_Version1_Dec2016.pdf

Incremental Seismic Rehabilitation of School Buildings (K-12): Providing Protection to People and Buildings (2003). Prepared by https://www.fema.gov/media-library/assets/documents/5154

FEMA E-74, *Reducing the Risks of Nonstructural Earthquake Damage.* Prepared by https://www.fema.gov/fema-e-74-reducing-risks-nonstructural-earthquake-damage

FEMA Earthquake School Hazard Hunt Game and Poster. Prepared by https://www.fema.gov/media-library/assets/documents/90409

Promoting Seismic Safety: Guidance for Advocates. Prepared by https://www.fema.gov/media-library/assets/documents/3229

Drawings

H. Brandt Gessel A.I.A. Dayton High School, S1 – S6

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Background

The Washington Geological Survey (WGS), a division of the Department of Natural Resources (DNR), is conducting a seismic assessment of 222 school buildings and 5 fire stations across Washington State to better understand the current level of seismic risk of Washington State's public-school buildings. The two main components of this project are: (1) geologic site characterization, and (2) the seismic assessment of buildings. As a part of the seismic assessments, Tier 1 screening of structural systems and nonstructural assessments were performed in accordance with the American Society of Civil Engineers' (ASCE) Standard 41-17 *Seismic Evaluation and Retrofit of Existing Buildings*. Concept-level seismic upgrades were developed to address the identified deficiencies of a select number of school buildings to evaluate seismic upgrade strategies, feasibilities, and implementation costs.

Fifteen school buildings were selected in consultation with WGS and the School Seismic Safety Steering Committee (SSSSC) to receive concept-level seismic upgrade designs utilizing the ASCE 41 Tier 1 evaluation results. This report documents the concept-level seismic upgrade design for one of those school buildings. The concept-level seismic upgrades will include structural and nonstructural seismic upgrade recommendations, with concept-level sketches and rough order-of-magnitude (ROM) construction costs determined for each building. The fifteen school buildings were selected from the list of schools with the intent of representing a variety of regions, building uses, construction eras, and construction materials.

The overall goal of the project is to provide a better understanding of the current seismic risk of our state's K-12 school buildings and what needs to be done to improve the buildings in accordance with ASCE 41 to meet seismic performance objectives.

The seismic evaluation consists of a Tier 1 screening for the structural systems performed in accordance with ASCE 41-17.

1.2 Scope of Services

The project is being performed in several distinct and overlapping phases of work. The scope of this report is as listed in the following sections.

1.2.1 Information Review

1. Project Research: Reid Middleton and their project team researched available school building records, such as relevant site data and record drawings, in advance of the field investigations. This research included searching school building records and contacting the districts and/or the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) to obtain building plans, seismic reports, condition reports, property records, or related construction information useful for the project.

2. Site Geologic Data: Site geological data provided by the WGS, including site shear wave velocities, was utilized to determine the project Site Class in accordance with ASCE 41, which is included in the Tier 1 checklists and concept-level seismic upgrades design work.

1.2.2 Field Investigations

1. Field Investigations: Each of the identified buildings was visited to observe the building's age, condition, configuration, and structural systems for the purposes of the ASCE 41 Tier 1 seismic evaluations. This task included confirmation of general information in building records or layout drawings and visual observation of the structural condition of the facilities. Engineer field reports, notes, photographs, and videos of the facilities were prepared and utilized to record and document information gathered in the field investigation work.

2. Limitations Due to Access and Worker Safety: Field observations at each site were typically performed by an individual engineer. Observation efforts were limited to areas and building elements that were readily observable and safely accessible. Observations requiring access to confined spaces, potential hazardous material exposure, access by unsecured ladder, work around energized equipment or mechanical hazards, access to areas requiring Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) fall-protection, steep or unstable slopes, deteriorated structural assemblies, or other conditions deemed potentially unsafe by the engineer were not performed. Removal of finishes (e.g., gypsum board, lathe and plaster, brick veneer, roofing materials) for access to concealed conditions or to expose elements that could not otherwise be visually observed and assessed was not performed. Material testing or sampling was not performed. The ASCE checklist items that were not documented due to access limitations are noted.

1.2.3 Seismic Evaluations

1. Preliminary Seismic Evaluations: Preliminary seismic assessments of the structural and nonstructural systems of the school buildings were performed in accordance with ASCE 41-17 Tier 1 Evaluation Procedures.

2. Concept-Level Designs: Further seismic evaluation work was performed to provide concept-level seismic retrofits and/or upgrade designs for the selected school buildings based on the results of the Tier 1 seismic evaluations. The concept-level seismic upgrades design work included narrative descriptions of proposed seismic retrofits and/or upgrade schemes and concept sketches depicting the extent and type of recommended structural upgrades.

3. Cost Estimating: Through the concept-level seismic upgrades design process, ProDims provided opinions of probable construction costs for the concept-level seismic upgrade designs for the selected school buildings. These concept-level seismic upgrade designs and the associated opinions of probable construction costs are intended to be

representative samples that can be extrapolated to estimate the overall capital needs of seismically upgrading Washington State schools.

1.2.4 Reporting and Documentation

1. Project Reports: A preliminary seismic evaluation report on the overall Tier 1 seismic assessment of the schools will be provided to DNR/WGS and OSPI. The Tier 1 seismic evaluation of each building was documented by a standard report format that provides a summary of the structural systems of the building, Tier 1 checklist, building sketches/plans (if available), and site photographs. The reports will summarize the seismic evaluation, with concept-level seismic upgrade sketches and opinions of probable construction costs for seismic upgrades for each school building.

2. Building Photography: Photos and videos were taken of each building during on-site walkthroughs to document the existing building configurations, conditions, and structural systems.

3. Record Drawings: Record drawings and other information that was collected during the evaluation process are available for DNR/WGS, OSPI, and the school districts.

This page intentionally left blank.

2.0 Seismic Evaluation Procedures and Criteria

2.1 ASCE 41 Seismic Evaluation and Retrofit Overview

The current standard for seismic evaluation and retrofit (upgrades) of existing buildings is ASCE 41-17. ASCE 41 provides screening and evaluation procedures used to identify potential seismic deficiencies that may require further investigation or hazard mitigation. It presents a three-tiered review process, implemented by first following a series of predefined checklists and "quick check" structural calculations. Each successive tier is designed to perform an increasingly refined evaluation procedure for seismic deficiencies identified in previous tiers in the process. The flow chart in Figure 2.1 illustrates the evaluation process.

TIER 1 – Screening Phase

- Checklists of evaluation statements to quickly identify potential deficiencies
- Requires field investigation and/or review of record drawings
- Analysis limited to "Quick Checks" of global elements
- May proceed to Tier 2, Tier 3, or rehabilitation design if deficiencies are identified

TIER 2 – Evaluation Phase

- "Full Building" or "Deficiency Only" evaluation
- Address all Tier 1 seismic deficiencies
- Analysis more refined than Tier 1, but limited to simplified linear procedures
- Identify buildings not requiring rehabilitation

TIER 3 – Detailed Evaluation Phase

- Component-based evaluation of entire building using reduced ASCE 41 forces
- Advanced analytical procedures available if Tier 1 and/or Tier 2 evaluations are judged to be overly conservative
- Complex analysis procedures may result in construction savings equal to many times their cost



Figure 2-1. Flow Chart and Description of ASCE 41 Seismic Evaluation Procedure.

The Tier 1 checklists in ASCE 41 are specific to each common building type and contain seismic evaluation statements based on observed structural damage in past earthquakes. These checklists screen for potential seismic deficiencies by examining the lateral-force-resisting systems and details of construction that have historically caused poor seismic performance in similar buildings. Tier 1 screenings include basic "Quick Check" analyses for primary components of the lateral system: in this building's case, the metal building frames and braces. Tier 1

screenings also include prescriptive checks for proper seismic detailing of connections, diaphragm spans and continuity, and overall system configuration.

Tier 2 evaluations then follow with more-detailed structural and seismic calculations and assessments to either confirm the potential deficiencies identified in the Tier 1 review or demonstrate their adequacy. A Tier 3 evaluation involves an even more detailed analysis and advanced structural and seismic computations to review each structural component's seismic demand and capacity. A Tier 3 evaluation is similar in scope and complexity to the types of analyses often required to design a new building in accordance with the International Building Code (IBC), with a comprehensive analysis aimed at evaluating each component's seismic performance. Generally, Tier 3 evaluations are not practical for typical and regular-type buildings due to the rigorous and complicated calculations and procedures. As indicated in the Scope of Services, this evaluation included a Tier 1 screening of the structural systems.

2.2 Seismic Evaluation and Retrofit Criteria

Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering (PBEE) can be defined as the engineering of a structure to resist different levels of earthquake demand in order to meet the needs and performance objectives of building owners and other stakeholders. ASCE 41 employs a PBEE design methodology that allows building owners, design professionals, and the local building code authorities to establish seismic hazard levels and performance goals for individual buildings.

2.2.1 Dayton High School Seismicity

Seismic hazards for the United States have been quantified by the United States Geological Survey (USGS). The information has been used to create seismic hazard maps, which are currently used in building codes to determine the design-level earthquake magnitudes for building design.

The Level of Seismicity is categorized as Very Low, Low, Moderate, or High based on the probabilistic ground accelerations. Ground accelerations and mass generate inertial (seismic) forces within a building (Force = mass x acceleration). Ground acceleration therefore is the parameter that classifies the level of seismicity. From geographic region to region, as the ground accelerations increase, so does the level of seismicity (from low to high). Where this building is located, the design short-period spectral acceleration, S_{DS}, is 0.229 g, and the design 1-second period spectral acceleration, S_{D1} is 0.082 g. Based on ASCE 41 Table 2-4, the Level of Seismicity for this building is classified as **Low**.

The ASCE 41 Basic Performance Objective for Existing Buildings (BPOE) makes use of the Basic Safety Earthquake – 1E (BSE-1E) seismic hazard level and the Basic Safety Earthquake – 2E (BSE-2E). The BSE-1E earthquake is defined by ASCE 41 as the probabilistic ground motion with a 20 percent probability of exceedance in 50 years, or otherwise characterized as a ground motion acceleration with a probabilistic 225-year return period. The BSE-2E earthquake is defined by ASCE 41 as the probabilistic ground motion with a 5 percent probability of exceedance in 50 years, or otherwise characterized as a ground motion acceleration with a

probabilistic 975-year return period. The BSE-2N seismic hazard level is the Maximum Considered Earthquake (MCE) ground motion used in current codes for the design of new buildings and is also used in ASCE 41 to classify the Level of Seismicity for a building. The BSE-2N has a statistical ground motion acceleration with 2 percent probability of exceedance in 50 years, or otherwise characterized as a ground motion acceleration with a probabilistic 2,475-year return period.

Table 2.2.1-1 provides the spectral accelerations for the 225-year, 975-year, and 2,475-year return interval events specific to Dayton High School that are considered in this study.

Table 2.2.1-1. Spectral Acceleration Parameters (Not Site-Modified).

BSE-1E 20%/50 (225-year) Event		BSE-1N 2/3 of 2,475-year Event		BSE-2E 5%/50 (975-year) Event		BSE-2N 2%/50 (2,475-year) Event	
0.2 Seconds	0.094 g	0.2 Seconds	0.229 g	0.2 Seconds	0.229 g	0.2 Seconds	0.343 g
1.0 Seconds	0.037 g	1.0 Seconds	0.081 g	1.0 Seconds	0.086 g	1.0 Seconds	0.122 g

2.2.2 Dayton High School Structural Performance Objective

The school building is an Educational Group E Occupancy (Risk Category III) structure and has not been identified as a critical structure requiring immediate use following an earthquake. However, Risk Category III buildings are structures that represent a substantial hazard to human life in the event of failure. According to ASCE 41, the BPOE for Risk Category III structures is the Damage Control structural performance level at the BSE-1E seismic hazard level and the Limited Safety structural performance level at the BSE-2E seismic hazard level. The ASCE 41 Tier 1 evaluations were conducted in accordance with ASCE 41 requirements and ASCE 41 seismic performance levels. Concept-level upgrades were developed for the **Immediate Occupancy** structural performance level at the **BSE-2E** seismic hazard level in accordance with DNR direction, the project scope of work, and the project legislative language.

At the Immediate Occupancy performance level, the structure remains safe to occupy and essentially retains its pre-earthquake strength and stiffness. Nonstructural components might be damaged to the extent that they cannot immediately function but are secured in place so that damage caused by falling, toppling, or breaking of utility connections is avoided. Life safety systems, including doors, stairways, emergency lighting, and fire alarms, generally remain available and operable, provided that power and utility services are available.

Knowledge Factor

A knowledge factor, *k*, is an ASCE 41 prescribed factor that is used to account for uncertainty in the as-built data considering the selected Performance Objective and data collection processes (availability of existing drawings, visual observation, and level of materials testing). No in-situ testing of building materials was performed, however, some material properties and existing construction information were provided in the existing record drawings. If the concept design is

developed further, additional materials tests and site investigations will be required to substantiate assumptions about the existing framing systems.

ASCE 41 Classified Building Type

Use of ASCE 41 for seismic evaluations requires buildings to be classified from a group of common building types historically defined in previous seismic evaluation standards (ATC-14, FEMA 310, and ASCE 31-03). The gymnasium is classified in ASCE 41 Table 3-1 as a Metal Building Frame, S3. Metal Building Frame (S3) buildings are those with transverse steel moment frames. They are one-story high, with roof and walls of lightweight metal, fiberglass, or cementitious panels.

2.3 Report Limitations

The professional services described in this report were performed based on available record drawing information and limited visual observation of the structure. No other warranty is made as to the professional advice included in this report. This report provides an overview of the seismic evaluation results and does not address programming and planning issues. This report has been prepared for the exclusive use of DNR/WGS and is not intended for use by other parties, as it may not contain sufficient information for purposes of other parties or their uses.

3.0 Building Description & Seismic Evaluation Findings

3.1 Building Overview

3.1.1 Building Description

Original Year Built: 1965
Building Code: Unknown

Number of Stories: 1
Attic Below Roof: Partial
Floor Area: 27,152 SF

FEMA Building Type: S3
ASCE 41 Level of Seismicity: Low
Site Class: B

The building is a single-story gymnasium, with a partial mezzanine, a small mechanical basement, and a triangular mechanical attic below the roof, running longitudinally down either side of the structure. The structure houses a basketball court, locker rooms, a large lobby, and several offices and support rooms.

The structural system consists of a metal building frame with transverse moment frames and rod bracing in the longitudinal direction. The mezzanine is a monolithic, cast-in-place reinforced concrete deck and beam system. The exterior walls are reinforced clay masonry units, positively tied to the lateral-load-resisting system, that transition to metal panel above 11 feet. The roof diaphragm is 18-gage, 3-inch "N" deck over LH-series open-web steel joists at 13 feet on center.

The foundation system for the building is composed of shallow continuous footings under the stem-and-basement walls and shallow spread footings with piers below the steel frame columns and floor girders.

3.1.2 Building Use

The building serves as the gymnasium for sporting events for the Dayton High School sports teams. It also has a partial mezzanine that serves as the weightlifting area for the school.

3.1.3 Structural System

Table 3.1.3-1. Structural System Descriptions.

Structural System	Description
Structural Roof	The roof structure consists of transverse steel frames with open-web steel joists framing between the frames. The joists are topped with metal deck sheathing.
Structural Floor(s)	The floor is wood-framed over a crawl space. The mezzanine is a monolithic cast-in-place deck and beam system.
Foundations	Conventional and shallow footings.
Gravity System	The gravity system consists of steel frames on concrete foundations with roof framing as described above.
Lateral System	The lateral system consists of transverse steel moment frames with braced frames providing stability in the longitudinal direction.

3.1.4 Structural System Visual Condition

Table 3.1.4-1. Structural System Condition Descriptions.

Structural System	Description
Structural Roof	Good. No visible signs of corrosion, damage, or deterioration.
Structural Floor(s)	Good. No visible signs of corrosion, damage, or deterioration.
Foundation	Good. No visible signs of corrosion, damage, or deterioration.
Gravity System	Good. No visible signs of corrosion, damage, or deterioration.
Lateral System	Good. No visible signs of corrosion, damage, or deterioration.

3.2 Seismic Evaluation Findings

3.2.1 Structural Seismic Deficiencies

The structural seismic deficiencies identified during the Tier 1 evaluation are summarized below. Commentary for each deficiency is provided based on this evaluation.

Table 3.2.1-1. Identified Structural Seismic Deficiencies Based on Tier 1 Checklists.

Deficiency	Description
Brace Axial Stress Check	The axial stress using the Quick Check procedure is greater than 0.50 Fy.
Moment-Resisting System	Per commentary Section A3.1.3.4, it is assumed that full penetration welded connections without added flange cover plates or removal of beam flange are noncompliant. The existing drawings show a fully welded connection with no additional ductility measures detailed.

3.2.2 Structural Checklist Items Marked as "U"nknown

Where building structural component seismic adequacy was unknown due to lack of available information or limited observation, the structural checklist items were marked as "unknown". These items require further investigation if definitive determination of compliance or noncompliance is desired. The unknown structural checklist items identified during the Tier 1 evaluation are summarized below. Commentary for each unknown item is provided based on the evaluation.

Table 3.2.2-1. Identified Structural Checklist Items Marked as Unknown.

Deficiency	Description
Liquefaction	The liquefaction potential of site soils is unknown at this time given available information. Moderate to high liquefaction potential is identified per ICOS based on state geologic mapping. Requires further investigation by a licensed geotechnical engineer to determine liquefaction potential.
Slope Failure	Requires further investigation by a licensed geotechnical engineer to determine susceptibility to slope failure. The structure appears to be located on a relatively flat site.
Surface Fault Rupture	Requires further investigation by a licensed geotechnical engineer to determine whether site is near locations of expected surface fault ruptures.

3.2.3 Nonstructural Seismic Deficiencies

The nonstructural seismic deficiencies identified during the Tier 1 evaluation are summarized below. Commentary for each deficiency is provided based on this evaluation. Some nonstructural deficiencies may be able to be mitigated by school district staff. Other nonstructural components that require substantial mitigation may be more appropriately included in a long-term mitigation strategy. Some typical conceptual details for the seismic upgrade of nonstructural components can be found in the FEMA E-74 Excerpts appendix.

Table 3.2.3-1. Identified Nonstructural Seismic Deficiencies based on Tier 1 Checklists.

Deficiency	Description
PCOA-2 Canopies	Spacing of girders attached to building is greater than 6'-0" on center.
S-2 Stair Details	Stairs are cast-in-place stairs that do not specifically allow any drift.

3.2.4 Nonstructural Checklist Items Marked as "U"nknown

Where building nonstructural component seismic adequacy was unknown due to lack of available information or limited observation, the nonstructural checklist items were marked as "unknown". These items require further investigation if definitive determination of compliance or noncompliance is desired. The unknown nonstructural checklist items identified during the Tier 1 evaluation are summarized below. Commentary for each unknown item is provided based on the evaluation.

Some nonstructural deficiencies may be able to be mitigated by school district staff. Other nonstructural components that require substantial mitigation may be more appropriately included in a long-term mitigation strategy. Some typical conceptual details for the seismic upgrade of nonstructural components can be found in the FEMA E-74 Excerpts appendix.

Table 3.2.4-1. Identified Nonstructural Seismic Deficiencies based on Tier 1 Checklists.

Deficiency	Description
C-1 Suspended Lath & Plaster	None observed, but access within the building was limited.
C-2 Suspended Gypsum Board	None observed, but access within the building was limited.
CG-8 Overhead Glazing	Entrance had overhead storefront but there was no access to verify the type of glass.
ME-1 Fall-Prone Equipment	None observed, but the mechanical equipment was inaccessible.
ME-2 In-Line Equipment	None observed, but the mechanical equipment was inaccessible.
ME-3 Tall Narrow Equipment	None observed, but the mechanical equipment was inaccessible.

4.0 Conclusion and Recommendations

4.1 Seismic-Structural Upgrade Recommendations

Concept-level seismic upgrade recommendations to improve the lateral-force-resisting system were developed. The sketches in Appendix B depict the concept-level structural upgrade recommendations outlined in this section. The following concept recommendations are intended to address the structural deficiencies noted in Table 3.2.1-1. This concept-level seismic upgrade design represents just one of several alternative seismic upgrade design solutions and is based on preliminary seismic evaluation and analysis results. Final analysis and design for seismic upgrades must include a more detailed seismic evaluation of the building in its present or future configuration. Proposed seismic upgrades include the following.

4.1.1 Additional Rod Bracing

The building has rod bracing in the longitudinal direction between frames as well as in the transverse exterior walls. It is recommended that additional rod bracing be added to the bays in which rod bracing is currently located. The additional rod bracing should be sized such that the gross area of the existing rod and the new rod have adequate capacity to transfer lateral loads.

4.1.2 Moment-Resisting Connection Cover Plates

The moment-resisting connections are full-penetration welds that are considered nonductile and noncompliant. Cover plates should be welded to the existing members to strengthen the existing connections. The new cover plates should be designed so that the connection is not the weak point in the moment frame structure.

4.2 Nonstructural Upgrade Recommendations

Table 3.2.3-1 identifies several nonstructural deficiencies that do not meet the performance objective selected for Dayton High School. It is recommended that these deficiencies be addressed to provide nonstructural performance consistent with the performance of the upgraded structural lateral-force-resisting system. As-built information for the existing nonstructural systems, such as fire sprinklers, mechanical ductworks, and piping, was not available for review. Only limited visual observation of the systems was performed during field investigation due to limited access or visibility to observe existing conditions. The conceptual mitigation strategies provided in this study are preliminary. The final analysis and design for seismic rehabilitation should include a detailed field investigation.

4.2.1 Architectural Considerations

This section addresses existing construction that, while not posing specific hazards during a seismic event, would be affected by the seismic improvements proposed.

For existing building remodel projects, the International Existing Building Code IEBC) is applicable. The intent of the IEBC is to provide flexibility to permit the use of alternative approaches to achieve compliance with minimum requirements to safeguard the public health, safety, and welfare insofar as they are affected by the work being done. Elements of the exterior building envelope being affected by the seismic work would also be required to be brought up to the current Washington State Energy Code per Chapter 5, where applicable.

It should also be noted that as a part of any upgrade to existing buildings, the IEBC will require that any altered primary function spaces (classrooms, gyms, entrances, offices) and routes to these spaces, be made accessible to current accessibility standards per the American with Disabilities Act (ADA), unless technically infeasible. This would include, but is not limited to: accessible restrooms, paths of travel, entrances and exits, parking, signage, fire alarm system, etc. Under no circumstances should the facility be made less accessible. The IEBC does however have exceptions for areas that do not contain a primary function (storage room, utility rooms) and states that costs of providing the accessible route are not required to exceed 20 percent of the costs of the alterations affecting the area of Primary Function. As with any major renovation and modernization, an ADA study would be recommended to determine the extent to which an existing facility needs to be improved to be in compliance with the ADA.

Additional Rod Bracing

The building has rod bracing in the longitudinal direction between frames as well as the transverse exterior walls. It is recommended that additional rod bracing be added to the bays in which rod bracing is currently located.

The addition of rod bracing between frames in the wall and roof will impact interior finishes and ongoing Gymnasium activities.

Moment-Resisting Connection Cover Plates

The addition of connection cover plates at joints in the wall-roof metal frames will impact interior finishes and may impact ongoing Gymnasium activities, depending on scheduling.

Canopies

The exterior canopy at the southwest end of the building is noncompliant based on the anchorage to the building spacing. The tube steel canopy beam is anchored to the building pilasters with a 1/4-inch fillet weld all around; the connections are spaced at 12'-8". Based on this connection and the configuration of the canopy, no additional connections are recommended.

Ceilings

Removal of the existing plaster and acoustic ceiling tiles above the lobby may be required to gain access to the underside of the roof deck for installation of bracing. Repair plaster to match existing finishes and fire rating. Replace damaged ceiling tiles, to match existing. Another option: replace the plaster and acoustic tiles with Tectum acoustic panels suspended from the roof structure.

Existing suspended T-bar ceilings would need to be removed and reinstalled with new seismically braced T-bar in order to gain access to the underside of the roof diaphragms for brace installation.

The existing ceiling-mounted light fixtures in the gym and elsewhere appear to be substandard and could become dangerous in an earthquake. Lighting should be updated to current lightweight LED fixtures with seismic bracing.

Overhead Glazing

Existing glass walls at the entry will need to be replaced with laminated safety glass. This work will impact interior finishes and ongoing Gymnasium activities.

Stairs

The steel mezzanine stairs base connection is to be replaced with a slotted connection. This may impact surrounding floor finishes. Work might impact ongoing Gymnasium activities.

4.2.2 Mechanical/Electrical/Plumbing (MEP) Systems

The main seismic concerns for mechanical equipment, ducting, and piping are sliding, swinging, and overturning. Inadequate lateral restraint or anchorage can shift equipment off its supports or topple equipment to the ground or onto other equipment. Inadequate bracing of piping and ducting, or the inability for piping to tolerate differential movement from the equipment it is attached to, can damage or dislodge connections. Such damage in fluid piping can potentially lead to major leaks or loss and disruption by damaging contents. Recommended seismic mitigation for MEP systems is as follows:

- Provide seismic bracing for equipment that weighs more than 20 pounds, has a center of mass more than 4 feet above the adjacent floor level, and is not in-line equipment.

4.3 Opinion of Conceptual Construction Costs

A preliminary opinion of probable construction costs to perform the concept-level seismic upgrade recommendations provided in this report is included in Appendix C. The input for these preliminary probable costs are the Tier 1 checklists and the preliminary concept-level seismic upgrades design recommendations and sketches. These preliminary concept-level design sketches depict a design concept that could be implemented to improve the seismic safety of the building structure. It is important to note that this preliminary seismic upgrades design concept is based on the results of the Tier 1 seismic screening checklists and engineering design judgement and has not been substantiated by detailed structural analyses and calculations. Consequently, the costs presented in this concept-level design report are very preliminary in nature and are only intended to be utilized in their aggregate form with the entire statewide school seismic safety assessments study.

For this preliminary opinion of probable construction costs, an estimate of the current year (2019) construction costs of the probable scope of work was developed. These costs were developed based on the Tier 1 checklist, concept-level seismic upgrade design sketches, and project narratives. Then a -20 percent (low) to +50 percent (high) range variance was used to develop the construction cost estimate range for the concept-level scope of work. The -20 percent to +50 percent range variance guidance is from Table 1 of the AACE International Recommended Practice 56R-08, *Cost Estimate Classification System for Class 5 Estimates*. The variable cost range of a Class 5 estimate is due to the limited design completeness and is defined as 0 percent to 2 percent Project Definition Deliverables.

The estimated structural and nonstructural construction cost to mitigate the deficiencies identified in the Tier 1 checklists of the Dayton High School Gymnasium ranges between approximately $50,000 and $95,000 (-20 percent/+50 percent). The estimated construction cost to seismically upgrade this building is approximately $63,000. On a per-square-foot basis, the seismic upgrade construction cost is estimated to be approximately $3 per square foot in 2019 dollars, with a variance range between $2 per square foot and $5 per square foot.

This preliminary opinion of construction cost includes labor, materials, equipment, and general contractor general conditions (mobilization), overhead, and profit. This is based on a public sector design-bid-build project delivery method. Project delivery methods such as negotiated, State of Washington GC/CM, and design-build are not the basis of the construction costs. Owner's project costs not included in the construction cost estimate are building permits, design fees, change order contingencies, escalation at a recommended 4.1 percent* per year to the midpoint of construction (currently unknown), materials testing/inspection, project planning and design schedule delay contingencies, and owner's overall project contingency. Additional owner's project costs would likely include owner's general overhead costs, including project management, financing/bond costs, administration/contract/accounting costs, review of plans, value engineering studies, equipment, fixtures, furnishings and technology, and relocation of the school staff and students during construction. These additional costs are not included in this preliminary concept-level design construction cost estimate.

Costs of all types excluded from the construction costs are site work, construction of replacement facilities, and mitigation of seismic risks for existing facilities and building code changes that occur over time after this report. <u>Future planning budgets should not be set on the basis of the preliminary construction costs estimate based on the concept-level design ideas presented in this report</u>. For budget planning purposes, it is highly recommended that a seismic upgrade budget be determined after the owner defines the scope of work and obtains the services of an A/E design team to study the proposed seismic mitigation strategies and to refine the concept-level seismic upgrades design approach contained in this report.

*-4.1%/year escalation rate for planning purposes should be compounded annually to the midpoint of construction and is sourced from *Engineering News Record (ENR),* November, 2017, the most recent rate representative of the escalation of construction costs throughout the state of Washington.

Table 4.3.1. Seismic Upgrades Opinion of Probable Construction Costs.

Building	FEMA Bldg Type	ASCE 41 Level of Seismicity / Site Class	Structural Performance Objective	Bldg Gross Area	Estimated Seismic Upgrade Cost Range $/SF (Total)	Estimated Seismic Upgrade Cost/SF (Total)
Dayton High School, Gymnasium	S3	Low / B	**Structural**			
			Immediate Occupancy	27,152 SF	$2 ($50K) - $3.50 ($95K)	$2.50 ($67K)
			Nonstructural			
			Life Safety	27,152 SF	$0.60 ($15K) - $1 ($27K)	$0.70 ($19K)
			Total			
				27,152 SF	$2.60 ($65K) - $4.50 ($122K)	$3.25 ($86K)

·W: Wood-Framed; URM: Unreinforced Masonry; RM: Reinforced Masonry; C: Reinforced Concrete; PC: Precast concrete; S: Steel-framed

This page intentionally left blank.

Appendix A: Field Investigation Report and Tier 1 Checklists

This page intentionally left blank.

1. Dayton, Dayton High School, Gymnasium

1.1 Building Description

Building Name:	Gymnasium
Facility Name:	Dayton High School
District Name:	Dayton
ICOS Latitude:	46.316
ICOS Longitude:	-117.973
ICOS County/District ID:	7002
ICOS Building ID:	21434
ASCE 41 Bldg Type:	S3
Enrollment:	139
Gross Sq. Ft. :	27,152
Year Built:	1966
Number of Stories:	1
$S_{XS\ BSE\text{-}2E}$:	0.229
$S_{X1\ BSE\text{-}2E}$:	0.086
ASCE 41 Level of Seismicity:	Low
Site Class:	B
V_{S30}(m/s):	1013
Liquefaction Potential:	moderate to high
Tsunami Risk:	None
Structural Drawings Available:	Yes
Evaluating Firm:	DCI Engineers - Spokane



The Dayton Gymnasium, constructed in the late 1960's, is a metal moment frame building with rod braced frames in the longitudinal direction. It is located southeast of the Dayton High School Building in Dayton, Washington. It is rectangular in shape measuring approximately 200-feet in length and 100-feet in width. It has a low roof lobby space at the northeast end of the building. The building has CMU infill walls at ground level; the walls are assumed to be a durable surface and not part of the lateral system.

1.1.1 Building Use

The building serves as the gymnasium for sporting events for the Dayton High School sport teams. It also has a partial mezzanine that serves as the weight lifting area for the school.

1.1.2 Structural System

Table 1.1-1. Structural System Description of Dayton High School

Structural System	Description
Structural Roof	The roof structure consists of transverse steel frames with open webbed steel joists framing between the frames. The joists are topped with metal deck sheathing.
Structural Floor(s)	The floor is wood framed over a crawl space. The mezzanine is a monolithic cast-in-place deck/beam system.
Foundations	Conventional/Shallow footings.
Gravity System	The gravity system consists of steel frames on concrete foundations with roof framing as described above.
Lateral System	The lateral system consists of transverse steel moment frames with braced frames providing stability in the longitudinal direction.

1.1.3 Structural System Visual Condition

Table 1.1-2. Structural System Condition Description of Dayton High School

Structural System	Description
Structural Roof	Good. No visible signs of corrosion, damage or deterioration
Structural Floor(s)	Good. No visible signs of corrosion, damage or deterioration
Foundations	Good. No visible signs of corrosion, damage or deterioration
Gravity System	Good. No visible signs of corrosion, damage or deterioration
Lateral System	Good. No visible signs of corrosion, damage or deterioration

1.2 Seismic Evaluation Findings

1.2.1 Structural Seismic Deficiencies

The structural seismic deficiencies identified during the Tier 1 evaluation are summarized below. Commentary for each deficiency is also provided based on this evaluation.

Table 1-3. Identified Structural Seismic Deficiencies for Dayton Dayton High School Gymnasium

Deficiency	Description
Brace Axial Stress Check	The axial stress using the Quick Check procedure is greater than 0.50Fy.

1.3.1 Nonstructural Seismic Deficiencies

The nonstructural seismic deficiencies identified during the Tier 1 evaluation are summarized below. Commentary for each deficiency is also provided based on this evaluation. Some nonstructural deficiencies may be able to be mitigated by school district staff. Other nonstructural components that require more substantial mitigation may be more appropriately included in a long-term mitigation strategy. Some typical conceptual details for the seismic upgrade of nonstructural components can be found in the FEMA E-74 Excerpts appendix.

Table 1-5. Identified Nonstructural Seismic Deficiencies for Dayton Dayton High School Gymnasium

Deficiency	Description
PCOA-2 Canopies. HR-not required; LS-LMH; PR-LMH.	Spacing of girders attached to building is greater than 6'-0\ o.c.
S-2 Stair Details. HR-not required; LS-LMH; PR-LMH.	Stairs are cast-in-place stairs that do not specifically allow any drift

1.3.2 Nonstructural Checklist Items Marked as 'U'nknown

Where building nonstructural component seismic adequacy was unknown due to lack of available information or limited observation, the nonstructural checklist items were marked as “unknown”. These items require further investigation if definitive determination of compliance or noncompliance is desired. The unknown nonstructural checklist items identified during the Tier 1 evaluation are summarized below. Commentary for each unknown item is also provided based on the evaluation.

Some nonstructural deficiencies may be able to be mitigated by school district staff. Other nonstructural components that require more substantial mitigation may be more appropriately included in a long-term mitigation strategy. Some typical conceptual details for the seismic upgrade of nonstructural components can be found in the FEMA E-74 Excerpts appendix.

Table 1-6. Identified Nonstructural Checklist Items Marked as Unknown for Dayton Dayton High School Gymnasium

Unknown Item	Description
C-1 Suspended Lath and Plaster. HR-H; LS-MH; PR-LMH.	None observed, but access within the building was limited
C-2 Suspended Gypsum Board. HR-not required; LS-MH; PR-LMH.	None observed, but access within the building was limited
CG-8 Overhead Glazing. HR-not required; LS-MH; PR-MH.	Entrance had overhead storefront but there was no access to verify the type of glass
ME-1 Fall-Prone Equipment. HR-not required; LS-H; PR-H.	None observed but the mechanical equipment was inaccessible
ME-2 In-Line Equipment. HR-not required; LS-H; PR-H.	None observed but the mechanical equipment was inaccessible
ME-3 Tall Narrow Equipment. HR-not required; LS-H; PR-MH.	None observed but the mechanical equipment was inaccessible

Photos:



Figure 1-1. Gymnasium, looking east at one of two moment frames.

Figure 1-2. Gymnasium, looking northeast at one of two moment frames.



Figure 1-3. Gymnasium, looking northeast.

Figure 1-4. Moment frame panel point close-up.

Figure 1-5. Moment frame panel point with rod bracing connection visible.

Figure 1-6. Gap between infill wall and intermediate column.

Figure 1-7. Northeast gym wall.

Figure 1-8. Front lobby ceiling.

Figure 1-9. View of horizontal reinforcement.



Figure 1-10. Plaque denoting the building completion date.

Dayton, Dayton High School, Gymnasium

17-2 Collapse Prevention Basic Configuration Checklist

Building record drawings have been reviewed, when available, and a non-destructive field investigation has been performed for the subject building. Each of the required checklist items are marked Compliant (C), Noncompliant (NC), Not Applicable (N/A), or Unknown (U). Items marked Compliant indicate conditions that satisfy the performance objective, whereas items marked Noncompliant or Unknown indicate conditions that do not. Certain statements might not apply to the building being evaluated.

Low Seismicity

Building System - General

EVALUATION ITEM	EVALUATION STATEMENT	C	NC	N/A	U	COMMENT
Load Path	The structure contains a complete, well-defined load path, including structural elements and connections, that serves to transfer the inertial forces associated with the mass of all elements of the building to the foundation. (Tier 2: Sec. 5.4.1.1; Commentary: Sec. A.2.1.10)	X				
Adjacent Buildings	The clear distance between the building being evaluated and any adjacent building is greater than 0.25% of the height of the shorter building in low seismicity, 0.5% in moderate seismicity, and 1.5% in high seismicity. (Tier 2: Sec. 5.4.1.2; Commentary: Sec. A.2.1.2)	X				
Mezzanines	Interior mezzanine levels are braced independently from the main structure or are anchored to the seismic-force-resisting elements of the main structure. (Tier 2: Sec. 5.4.1.3; Commentary: Sec. A.2.1.3)	X				

Building System - Building Configuration

EVALUATION ITEM	EVALUATION STATEMENT	C	NC	N/A	U	COMMENT
Weak Story	The sum of the shear strengths of the seismic-force-resisting system in any story in each direction is not less than 80% of the strength in the adjacent story above. (Tier 2: Sec. 5.4.2.1; Commentary: Sec. A.2.2.2)			X		Single-story plus mezzanine.
Soft Story	The stiffness of the seismic-force-resisting system in any story is not less than 70% of the seismic-force-resisting system stiffness in an adjacent story above or less than 80% of the average seismic-force-resisting system stiffness of the three stories above. (Tier 2: Sec. 5.4.2.2; Commentary: Sec. A.2.2.3)			X		
Vertical Irregularities	All vertical elements in the seismic-force-resisting system are continuous to the foundation. (Tier 2: Sec. 5.4.2.3; Commentary: Sec. A.2.2.4)	X				

Geometry	There are no changes in the net horizontal dimension of the seismic-force-resisting system of more than 30% in a story relative to adjacent stories, excluding one-story penthouses and mezzanines. (Tier 2: Sec. 5.4.2.4; Commentary: Sec. A.2.2.5)			X		
Mass	There is no change in effective mass of more than 50% from one story to the next. Light roofs, penthouses, and mezzanines need not be considered. (Tier 2: Sec. 5.4.2.5; Commentary: Sec. A.2.2.6)			X		Single-story plus mezzanine.
Torsion	The estimated distance between the story center of mass and the story center of rigidity is less than 20% of the building width in either plan dimension. (Tier 2: Sec. 5.4.2.6; Commentary: Sec. A.2.2.7)	X				

Moderate Seismicity **(Complete the Following Items in Addition to the Items for Low Seismicity)**

Geologic Site Hazards

EVALUATION ITEM	EVALUATION STATEMENT	C	NC	N/A	U	COMMENT
Liquefaction	Liquefaction-susceptible, saturated, loose granular soils that could jeopardize the building's seismic performance do not exist in the foundation soils at depths within 50 ft (15.2 m) under the building. (Tier 2: Sec. 5.4.3.1; Commentary: Sec. A.6.1.1)			X		Not applicable due to Low seismicity. The liquefaction potential of site soils is unknown at this time given available information. Moderate to high liquefaction potential is identified per ICOS based on state geologic mapping. Requires further investigation by a licensed geotechnical engineer to determine liquefaction potential.
Slope Failure	The building site is located away from potential earthquake-induced slope failures or rockfalls so that it is unaffected by such failures or is capable of accommodating any predicted movements without failure. (Tier 2: Sec. 5.4.3.1; Commentary: Sec. A.6.1.2)			X		Not applicable due to Low seismicity. If it were to evaluated in the future it would require further investigation by a licensed geotechnical engineer to determine susceptibility to slope failure. The structure appears to be located on a relatively flat site.

Surface Fault Rupture	Surface fault rupture and surface displacement at the building site are not anticipated. (Tier 2: Sec. 5.4.3.1; Commentary: Sec. A.6.1.3)			X		Not applicable due to Low seismicity. If it were to be evaulated in the future it would requires further investigation by a licensed geotechnical engineer to determine whether site is near locations of expected surface fault ruptures.

High Seismicity (Complete the Following Items in Addition to the Items for Low and Moderate Seismicity)

Foundation Configuration

EVALUATION ITEM	EVALUATION STATEMENT	C	NC	N/A	U	COMMENT
Overturning	The ratio of the least horizontal dimension of the seismic-force-resisting system at the foundation level to the building height (base/height) is greater than 0.6Sa. (Tier 2: Sec. 5.4.3.3; Commentary: Sec. A.6.2.1)			X		Not applicable due to Low seismicity.
Ties Between Foundation Elements	The foundation has ties adequate to resist seismic forces where footings, piles, and piers are not restrained by beams, slabs, or soils classified as Site Class A, B, or C. (Tier 2: Sec. 5.4.3.4; Commentary: Sec. A.6.2.2)			X		Not applicable due to Low seismicity. However, details show ties between frame columns.

17-12 Collapse Prevention Structural Checklist for Building Type S3

Building record drawings have been reviewed, when available, and a non-destructive field investigation has been performed for the subject building. Each of the required checklist items are marked Compliant (C), Noncompliant (NC), Not Applicable (N/A), or Unknown (U). Items marked Compliant indicate conditions that satisfy the performance objective, whereas items marked Noncompliant or Unknown indicate conditions that do not. Certain statements might not apply to the building being evaluated.

Low and Moderate Seismicity

Seismic-Force-Resisting System

EVALUATION ITEM	EVALUATION STATEMENT	C	NC	N/A	U	COMMENT
Brace Axial Stress Check	The axial stress in the diagonals, calculated using the Quick Check procedure of Section 4.4.3.4, is less than 0.50Fy. (Tier 2: Sec. 5.5.4.1; Commentary: Sec. A.3.3.1.2)		X			The axial stress using the Quick Check procedure is greater than 0.50Fy.

Connections

EVALUATION ITEM	EVALUATION STATEMENT	C	NC	N/A	U	COMMENT
Tansfer to Steel Frames	Diaphragms are connected for transfer of seismic forces to the steel moment frames. (Tier 2: Sec. 5.7.2; Commentary: Sec. A.5.2.2)	X				
Steel Columns	The columns in seismic-force-resisting frames are anchored to the building foundation. (Tier 2: Sec. 5.7.3.1; Commentary: Sec. A.5.3.1)	X				

High Seismicity **(Complete the Following Items in Addition to the Items for Low and Moderate Seismicity)**

Seismic-Force-Resisting System

EVALUATION ITEM	EVALUATION STATEMENT	C	NC	N/A	U	COMMENT
Moment-Resisting Connections	All moment connections are able to develop the elastic moment (FyS) of the adjoining members. (Tier 2: Sec. 5.5.2.2.1; Commentary: Sec. A.3.1.3.4)			X		Not applicable due to Low seismicity. If the seismicity were to be revised in the future, the following would likely be the evaluation result: Per commentary section A3.1.3.4, it is assumed full penetration welded connections without added flange cover plates or removal of beam flange, are noncompliant. The existing drawings show a fully welded connection with no additional ductility measures detailed.
Compact Members	All frame elements meet compact section requirements in accordance with AISC 360, Table B4.1. (Tier 2: Sec. 5.5.2.2.4; Commentary: Sec. A.3.1.3.8)			X		Not applicable due to Low seismicity.

Diaphragms

EVALUATION ITEM	EVALUATION STATEMENT	C	NC	N/A	U	COMMENT
Other Diaphragms	Diaphragms do not consist of a system other than wood, metal deck, concrete, or horizontal bracing. (Tier 2: Sec. 5.6.5; Commentary: Sec. A.4.7.1)			X		Not applicable due to Low seismicity.

Connections

EVALUATION ITEM	EVALUATION STATEMENT	C	NC	N/A	U	COMMENT
Roof Panels	Where considered as diaphragm elements for lateral resistance, metal, plastic, or cementitious roof panels are positively attached to the roof framing to resist seismic forces. (Tier 2: Sec. 5.7.5; Commentary: Sec. A.5.5.1)			X		Not applicable due to Low seismicity.
Wall Panels	Where considered as shear elements for lateral resistance, metal, fiberglass, or cementitious wall panels are positively attached to the framing and foundation to resist seismic forces. (Tier 2: Sec. 5.7.5; Commentary: Sec. A.5.5.2)			X		Not applicable due to Low seismicity. However, attachments are shown in the existing drawings and appear to be compliant.

Dayton, Dayton High School, Gymnasium

17-38 Nonstructural Checklist

Notes:
C = Compliant, NC = Noncompliant, N/A = Not Applicable, and U = Unknown.
Performance Level: HR = Hazards Reduced, LS = Life Safety, and PR = Position Retention.
Level of Seismicity: L = Low, M = Moderate, and H = High

Life Safety Systems

EVALUATION ITEM	EVALUATION STATEMENT	C	NC	N/A	U	COMMENT
LSS-1 Fire Suppression Piping. HR-not required; LS-LMH; PR-LMH.	Fire suppression piping is anchored and braced in accordance with NFPA-13. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.7.4; Commentary: Sec. A.7.13.1)			X		No sprinklers observed
LSS-2 Flexible Couplings. HR-not required; LS-LMH; PR-LMH.	Fire suppression piping has flexible couplings in accordance with NFPA-13. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.7.4; Commentary: Sec. A.7.13.2)			X		
LSS-3 Emergency Power. HR-not required; LS-LMH; PR-LMH.	Equipment used to power or control Life Safety systems is anchored or braced. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.7.7; Commentary: Sec. A.7.12.1)			X		No backup power present
LSS-4 Stair and Smoke Ducts. HR-not required; LS-LMH; PR-LMH.	Stair pressurization and smoke control ducts are braced and have flexible connections at seismic joints. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.7.6; Commentary: Sec. A.7.14.1)			X		Single-story building
LSS-5 Sprinkler Ceiling Clearance. HR-not required; LS-MH; PR-MH.	Penetrations through panelized ceilings for fire suppression devices provide clearances in accordance with NFPA-13. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.7.4; Commentary: Sec. A.7.13.3)			X		
LSS-6 Emergency Lighting. HR-not required; LS-not required; PR-LMH	Emergency and egress lighting equipment is anchored or braced. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.7.9; Commentary: Sec. A.7.3.1)			X		

Hazardous Materials

EVALUATION ITEM	EVALUATION STATEMENT	C	NC	N/A	U	COMMENT
HM-1 Hazardous Material Equipment. HR-LMH; LS-LMH; PR-LMH.	Equipment mounted on vibration isolators and containing hazardous material is equipped with restraints or snubbers. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.7.1; Commentary: Sec. A.7.12.2)			X		No hazardous material present
HM-2 Hazardous Material Storage. HR-LMH; LS-LMH; PR-LMH.	Breakable containers that hold hazardous material, including gas cylinders, are restrained by latched doors, shelf lips, wires, or other methods. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.8.3; Commentary: Sec. A.7.15.1)			X		
HM-3 Hazardous Material Distribution. HR-MH; LS-MH; PR-MH.	Piping or ductwork conveying hazardous materials is braced or otherwise protected from damage that would allow hazardous material release. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.7.3, 13.7.5; Commentary: Sec. A.7.13.4)			X		

HM-4 Shutoff Valves. HR-MH; LS-MH; PR-MH.	Piping containing hazardous material, including natural gas, has shutoff valves or other devices to limit spills or leaks. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.7.3, 13.7.5; Commentary: Sec. A.7.13.3)			X		
HM-5 Flexible Couplings. HR-LMH; LS-LMH; PR-LMH.	Hazardous material ductwork and piping, including natural gas piping, have flexible couplings. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.7.3, 13.7.5; Commentary: Sec. A.7.15.4)			X		
HM-6 Piping or Ducts Crossing Seismic Joints. HR-MH; LS-MH; PR-MH.	Piping or ductwork carrying hazardous material that either crosses seismic joints or isolation planes or is connected to independent structures has couplings or other details to accommodate the relative seismic displacements. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.7.3, 13.7.5, 13.7.6; Commentary: Sec. A.7.13.6)			X		

Partitions

EVALUATION ITEM	EVALUATION STATEMENT	C	NC	N/A	U	COMMENT
P-1 Unreinforced Masonry. HR-LMH; LS-LMH; PR-LMH.	Unreinforced masonry or hollow-clay tile partitions are braced at a spacing of at most 10 ft (3.0 m) in Low or Moderate Seismicity, or at most 6 ft (1.8 m) in High Seismicity. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.6.2; Commentary: Sec. A.7.1.1)			X		Partition walls are reinforced masonry
P-2 Heavy Partitions Supported by Ceilings. HR-LMH; LS-LMH; PR-LMH.	The tops of masonry or hollow-clay tile partitions are not laterally supported by an integrated ceiling system. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.6.2; Commentary: Sec. A.7.2.1)	X				
P-3 Drift. HR-not required; LS-MH; PR-MH.	Rigid cementitious partitions are detailed to accommodate the following drift ratios: in steel moment frame, concrete moment frame, and wood frame buildings, 0.02; in other buildings, 0.005. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.6.2; Commentary: Sec. A.7.1.2)			X		
P-4 Light Partitions Supported by Ceilings. HR-not required; LS-not required; PR-MH.	The tops of gypsum board partitions are not laterally supported by an integrated ceiling system. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.6.2; Commentary: Sec. A.7.2.1)			X		
P-5 Structural Separations. HR-not required; LS-not required; PR-MH.	Partitions that cross structural separations have seismic or control joints. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.6.2; Commentary: Sec. A.7.1.3)			X		
P-6 Tops. HR-not required; LS-not required; PR-MH.	The tops of ceiling-high framed or panelized partitions have lateral bracing to the structure at a spacing equal to or less than 6 ft (1.8 m). (Tier 2: Sec. 13.6.2; Commentary: Sec. A.7.1.4)			X		

Ceilings

EVALUATION ITEM	EVALUATION STATEMENT	C	NC	N/A	U	COMMENT
C-1 Suspended Lath and Plaster. HR-H; LS-MH; PR-LMH.	Suspended lath and plaster ceilings have attachments that resist seismic forces for every 12 ft2 (1.1 m2) of area. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.6.4; Commentary: Sec. A.7.2.3)				X	None observed, but access within the building was limited
C-2 Suspended Gypsum Board. HR-not required; LS-MH; PR-LMH.	Suspended gypsum board ceilings have attachments that resist seismic forces for every 12 ft2 (1.1 m2) of area. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.6.4; Commentary: Sec. A.7.2.3)				X	None observed, but access within the building was limited
C-3 Integrated Ceilings. HR-not required; LS-not required; PR-MH.	Integrated suspended ceilings with continuous areas greater than 144 ft2 (13.4 m2) and ceilings of smaller areas that are not surrounded by restraining partitions are laterally restrained at a spacing no greater than 12 ft (3.6 m) with members attached to the structure above. Each restraint location has a minimum of four diagonal wires and compression struts, or diagonal members capable of resisting compression. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.6.4; Commentary: Sec. A.7.2.2)			X		
C-4 Edge Clearance. HR-not required; LS-not required; PR-MH.	The free edges of integrated suspended ceilings with continuous areas greater than 144 ft2 (13.4 m2) have clearances from the enclosing wall or partition of at least the following: in Moderate Seismicity, 1/2 in. (13 mm); in High Seismicity, 3/4 in. (19 mm). (Tier 2: Sec. 13.6.4; Commentary: Sec. A.7.2.4)			X		
C-5 Continuity Across Structure Joints. HR-not required; LS-not required; PR-MH.	The ceiling system does not cross any seismic joint and is not attached to multiple independent structures. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.6.4; Commentary: Sec. A.7.2.5)			X		
C-6 Edge Support. HR-not required; LS-not required; PR-H.	The free edges of integrated suspended ceilings with continuous areas greater than 144 ft2 (13.4 m2) are supported by closure angles or channels not less than 2 in. (51 mm) wide. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.6.4 ; Commentary: Sec. A.7.2.6)			X		
C-7 Seismic Joints. HR-not required; LS-not required; PR-H.	Acoustical tile or lay-in panel ceilings have seismic separation joints such that each continuous portion of the ceiling is no more than 2,500 ft2 (232.3 m2) and has a ratio of long-to-short dimension no more than 4-to-1. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.6.4; Commentary: Sec. A.7.2.7)			X		

Light Fixtures

EVALUATION ITEM	EVALUATION STATEMENT	C	NC	N/A	U	COMMENT
LF-1 Independent Support. HR-not required; LS-MH; PR-MH.	Light fixtures that weigh more per square foot than the ceiling they penetrate are supported independent of the grid ceiling suspension system by a minimum of two wires at diagonally opposite corners of each fixture. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.6.4, 13.7.9; Commentary: Sec. A.7.3.2)			X		None observed
LF-2 Pendant Supports. HR-not required; LS-not required; PR-H.	Light fixtures on pendant supports are attached at a spacing equal to or less than 6 ft. Unbraced suspended fixtures are free to allow a 360-degree range of motion at an angle not less than 45 degrees from horizontal without contacting adjacent components. Alternatively, if rigidly supported and/or braced, they are free to move with the structure to which they are attached without damaging adjoining components. Additionally, the connection to the structure is capable of accommodating the movement without failure. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.7.9; Commentary: Sec. A.7.3.3)			X		
LF-3 Lens Covers. HR-not required; LS-not required; PR-H.	Lens covers on light fixtures are attached with safety devices. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.7.9; Commentary: Sec. A.7.3.4)			X		

Cladding and Glazing

EVALUATION ITEM	EVALUATION STATEMENT	C	NC	N/A	U	COMMENT
CG-1 Cladding Anchors. HR-MH; LS-MH; PR-MH.	Cladding components weighing more than 10 lb/ft2 (0.48 kN/m2) are mechanically anchored to the structure at a spacing equal to or less than the following: for Life Safety in Moderate Seismicity, 6 ft (1.8 m); for Life Safety in High Seismicity and for Position Retention in any seismicity, 4 ft (1.2 m) (Tier 2: Sec. 13.6.1; Commentary: Sec. A.7.4.1)			X		No cladding present
CG-2 Cladding Isolation. HR-not required; LS-MH; PR-MH.	For steel or concrete moment-frame buildings, panel connections are detailed to accommodate a story drift ratio by the use of rods attached to framing with oversize holes or slotted holes of at least the following: for Life Safety in Moderate Seismicity, 0.01; for Life Safety in High Seismicity and for Position Retention in any seismicity, 0.02, and the rods have a length-to-diameter ratio of 4.0 or less. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.6.1; Commentary: Sec. A.7.4.3)			X		

CG-3 Multi-Story Panels. HR-MH; LS-MH; PR-MH.	For multi-story panels attached at more than one floor level, panel connections are detailed to accommodate a story drift ratio by the use of rods attached to framing with oversize holes or slotted holes of at least the following: for Life Safety in Moderate Seismicity, 0.01; for Life Safety in High Seismicity and for Position Retention in any seismicity, 0.02, and the rods have a length-to-diameter ratio of 4.0 or less. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.6.1; Commentary: Sec. A.7.4.4)			X		
CG-4 Threaded Rods. HR-not required; LS-MH; PR-MH.	Threaded rods for panel connections detailed to accommodate drift by bending of the rod have a length-to-diameter ratio greater than 0.06 times the story height in inches for Life Safety in Moderate Seismicity and 0.12 times the story height in inches for Life Safety in High Seismicity and Position Retention in any seismicity. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.6.1; Commentary: Sec. A.7.4.9)			X		
CG-5 Panel Connections. HR-MH; LS-MH; PR-MH.	Cladding panels are anchored out of plane with a minimum number of connections for each wall panel, as follows: for Life Safety in Moderate Seismicity, 2 connections; for Life Safety in High Seismicity and for Position Retention in any seismicity, 4 connections. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.6.1.4; Commentary: Sec. A.7.4.5)			X		
CG-6 Bearing Connections. HR-MH; LS-MH; PR-MH.	Where bearing connections are used, there is a minimum of two bearing connections for each cladding panel. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.6.1.4; Commentary: Sec. A.7.4.6)			X		
CG-7 Inserts. HR-MH; LS-MH; PR-MH.	Where concrete cladding components use inserts, the inserts have positive anchorage or are anchored to reinforcing steel. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.6.1.4; Commentary: Sec. A.7.4.7)			X		
CG-8 Overhead Glazing. HR-not required; LS-MH; PR-MH.	Glazing panes of any size in curtain walls and individual interior or exterior panes more than 16 ft2 (1.5 m2) in area are laminated annealed or laminated heat-strengthened glass and are detailed to remain in the frame when cracked. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.6.1.5; Commentary: Sec. A.7.4.8)				X	Entrance had overhead storefront but there was no access to verify the type of glass

Masonry Veneer

EVALUATION ITEM	EVALUATION STATEMENT	C	NC	N/A	U	COMMENT
M-1 Ties. HR-not required; LS-LMH; PR-LMH.	Masonry veneer is connected to the backup with corrosion-resistant ties. There is a minimum of one tie for every 2-2/3 ft2 (0.25 m2), and the ties have spacing no greater than the following: for Life Safety in Low or Moderate Seismicity, 36 in. (914 mm); for Life Safety in High Seismicity and for Position Retention in any seismicity, 24 in. (610 mm). (Tier 2: Sec. 13.6.1.2; Commentary: Sec. A.7.5.1)			X		No masonry veneer present
M-2 Shelf Angles. HR-not required; LS-LMH; PR-LMH.	Masonry veneer is supported by shelf angles or other elements at each floor above the ground floor. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.6.1.2; Commentary: Sec. A.7.5.2)			X		
M-3 Weakened Planes. HR-not required; LS-LMH; PR-LMH.	Masonry veneer is anchored to the backup adjacent to weakened planes, such as at the locations of flashing. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.6.1.2; Commentary: Sec. A.7.5.3)			X		
M-4 Unreinforced Masonry Backup. HR-LMH; LS-LMH; PR-LMH.	There is no unreinforced masonry backup. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.6.1.1, 13.6.1.2; Commentary: Sec. A.7.7.2)			X		
M-5 Stud Tracks. HR-not required; LS-MH; PR-MH.	For veneer with coldformed steel stud backup, stud tracks are fastened to the structure at a spacing equal to or less than 24 in. (610 mm) on center. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.6.1.1, 13.6.1.2; Commentary: Sec. A.7.6.)			X		
M-6 Anchorage. HR-not required; LS-MH; PR-MH.	For veneer with concrete block or masonry backup, the backup is positively anchored to the structure at a horizontal spacing equal to or less than 4 ft along the floors and roof. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.6.1.1, 13.6.1.2; Commentary: Sec. A.7.7.1)			X		
M-7 Weep Holes. HR-not required; LS-not required; PR-MH.	In veneer anchored to stud walls, the veneer has functioning weep holes and base flashing. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.6.1.2; Commentary: Sec. A.7.5.6)			X		
M-8 Openings. HR-not required; LS-not required; PR-MH.	For veneer with cold-formed-steel stud backup, steel studs frame window and door openings. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.6.1.1, 13.6.1.2; Commentary: Sec. A.7.6.2)			X		

Parapets, Cornices, Ornamentation, and Appendages

EVALUATION ITEM	EVALUATION STATEMENT	C	NC	N/A	U	COMMENT
PCOA-1 URM Parapets or Cornices. HR-LMH; LS-LMH; PR-LMH.	Laterally unsupported unreinforced masonry parapets or cornices have height-tothickness ratios no greater than the following: for Life Safety in Low or Moderate Seismicity, 2.5; for Life Safety in High Seismicity and for Position Retention in any seismicity, 1.5. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.6.5; Commentary: Sec. A.7.8.1)			X		No parapets present

PCOA-2 Canopies. HR-not required; LS-LMH; PR-LMH.	Canopies at building exits are anchored to the structure at a spacing no greater than the following: for Life Safety in Low or Moderate Seismicity, 10 ft (3.0 m); for Life Safety in High Seismicity and for Position Retention in any seismicity, 6 ft (1.8 m). (Tier 2: Sec. 13.6.6; Commentary: Sec. A.7.8.2)		X			Spacing of girders attached to building is greater than 6'-0" o.c.
PCOA-3 Concrete Parapets. HR-H; LS-MH; PR-LMH.	Concrete parapets with height-to-thickness ratios greater than 2.5 have vertical reinforcement. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.6.5; Commentary: Sec. A.7.8.3)			X		
PCOA-4 Appendages. HR-MH; LS-MH; PR-LMH.	Cornices, parapets, signs, and other ornamentation or appendages that extend above the highest point of anchorage to the structure or cantilever from components are reinforced and anchored to the structural system at a spacing equal to or less than 6 ft (1.8 m). This evaluation statement item does not apply to parapets or cornices covered by other evaluation statements. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.6.6; Commentary: Sec. A.7.8.4)			X		

Masonry Chimneys

EVALUATION ITEM	EVALUATION STATEMENT	C	NC	N/A	U	COMMENT
MC-1 URM Chimneys. HR-LMH; LS-LMH; PR-LMH.	Unreinforced masonry chimneys extend above the roof surface no more than the following: for Life Safety in Low or Moderate Seismicity, 3 times the least dimension of the chimney; for Life Safety in High Seismicity and for Position Retention in any seismicity, 2 times the least dimension of the chimney. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.6.7; Commentary: Sec. A.7.9.1)			X		
MC-2 Anchorage. HR-LMH; LS-LMH; PR-LMH.	Masonry chimneys are anchored at each floor level, at the topmost ceiling level, and at the roof. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.6.7; Commentary: Sec. A.7.9.2)			X		

Stairs

EVALUATION ITEM	EVALUATION STATEMENT	C	NC	N/A	U	COMMENT
S-1 Stair Enclosures. HR-not required; LS-LMH; PR-LMH.	Hollow-clay tile or unreinforced masonry walls around stair enclosures are restrained out of plane and have height-to-thickness ratios not greater than the following: for Life Safety in Low or Moderate Seismicity, 15-to-1; for Life Safety in High Seismicity and for Position Retention in any seismicity, 12-to-1. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.6.2, 13.6.8; Commentary: Sec. A.7.10.1)			X		Mezzanine stairs are reinforced masonry

S-2 Stair Details. HR-not required; LS-LMH; PR-LMH.	The connection between the stairs and the structure does not rely on post-installed anchors in concrete or masonry, and the stair details are capable of accommodating the drift calculated using the Quick Check procedure of Section 4.4.3.1 for moment-frame structures or 0.5 in. for all other structures without including any lateral stiffness contribution from the stairs. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.6.8; Commentary: Sec. A.7.10.2)		X			Stairs are cast-in-place stairs that do not specifically allow any drift

Contents and Furnishings

EVALUATION ITEM	EVALUATION STATEMENT	C	NC	N/A	U	COMMENT
CF-1 Industrial Storage Racks. HR-LMH; LS-MH; PR-MH.	Industrial storage racks or pallet racks more than 12 ft high meet the requirements of ANSI/RMI MH 16.1 as modified by ASCE 7, Chapter 15. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.8.1; Commentary: Sec. A.7.11.1)			X		
CF-2 Tall Narrow Contents. HR-not required; LS-H; PR-MH.	Contents more than 6 ft (1.8 m) high with a height-to-depth or height-to-width ratio greater than 3-to-1 are anchored to the structure or to each other. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.8.2; Commentary: Sec. A.7.11.2)			X		
CF-3 Fall-Prone Contents. HR-not required; LS-H; PR-H.	Equipment, stored items, or other contents weighing more than 20 lb (9.1 kg) whose center of mass is more than 4 ft (1.2 m) above the adjacent floor level are braced or otherwise restrained. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.8.2; Commentary: Sec. A.7.11.3)			X		
CF-4 Access Floors. HR-not required; LS-not required; PR-MH.	Access floors more than 9 in. (229 mm) high are braced. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.6.10; Commentary: Sec. A.7.11.4)			X		
CF-5 Equipment on Access Floors. HR-not required; LS-not required; PR-MH.	Equipment and other contents supported by access floor systems are anchored or braced to the structure independent of the access floor. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.7.7 13.6.10; Commentary: Sec. A.7.11.5)			X		
CF-6 Suspended Contents. HR-not required; LS-not required; PR-H.	Items suspended without lateral bracing are free to swing from or move with the structure from which they are suspended without damaging themselves or adjoining components. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.8.2; Commentary: Sec. A.7.11.6)			X		

Mechanical and Electrical Equipment

EVALUATION ITEM	EVALUATION STATEMENT	C	NC	N/A	U	COMMENT
ME-1 Fall-Prone Equipment. HR-not required; LS-H; PR-H.	Equipment weighing more than 20 lb (9.1 kg) whose center of mass is more than 4 ft (1.2 m) above the adjacent floor level, and which is not in-line equipment, is braced. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.7.1 13.7.7; Commentary: Sec. A.7.12.4)				X	None observed but the mechanical equipment was inaccessible

ME-2 In-Line Equipment. HR-not required; LS-H; PR-H.	Equipment installed in line with a duct or piping system, with an operating weight more than 75 lb (34.0 kg), is supported and laterally braced independent of the duct or piping system. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.7.1; Commentary: Sec. A.7.12.5)				X	None observed but the mechanical equipment was inaccessible
ME-3 Tall Narrow Equipment. HR-not required; LS-H; PR-MH.	Equipment more than 6 ft (1.8 m) high with a height-to-depth or height-to-width ratio greater than 3-to-1 is anchored to the floor slab or adjacent structural walls. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.7.1 13.7.7; Commentary: Sec. A.7.12.6)				X	None observed but the mechanical equipment was inaccessible
ME-4 Mechanical Doors. HR-not required; LS-not required; PR-MH.	Mechanically operated doors are detailed to operate at a story drift ratio of 0.01. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.6.9; Commentary: Sec. A.7.12.7)			X		
ME-5 Suspended Equipment. HR-not required; LS-not required; PR-H.	Equipment suspended without lateral bracing is free to swing from or move with the structure from which it is suspended without damaging itself or adjoining components. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.7.1, 13.7.7; Commentary: Sec. A.7.12.8)			X		
ME-6 Vibration Isolators. HR-not required; LS-not required; PR-H.	Equipment mounted on vibration isolators is equipped with horizontal restraints or snubbers and with vertical restraints to resist overturning. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.7.1; Commentary: Sec. A.7.12.9)			X		
ME-7 Heavy Equipment. HR-not required; LS-not required; PR-H.	Floor supported or platform-supported equipment weighing more than 400 lb (181.4 kg) is anchored to the structure. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.7.1, 13.7.7; Commentary: Sec. A.7.12.10)			X		
ME-8 Electrical Equipment. HR-not required; LS-not required; PR-H.	Electrical equipment is laterally braced to the structure. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.7.7; Commentary: Sec. A.7.12.11)			X		
ME-9 Conduit Couplings. HR-not required; LS-not required; PR-H.	Conduit greater than 2.5 in. (64 mm) trade size that is attached to panels, cabinets, or other equipment and is subject to relative seismic displacement has flexible couplings or connections. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.7.8; Commentary: Sec. A.7.12.12)			X		

Piping

EVALUATION ITEM	EVALUATION STATEMENT	C	NC	N/A	U	COMMENT
PP-1 Flexible Couplings. HR-not required; LS-not required; PR-H.	Fluid and gas piping has flexible couplings. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.7.3, 13.7.5; Commentary: Sec. A.7.13.2)			X		
PP-2 Fluid and Gas Piping. HR-not required; LS-not required; PR-H.	Fluid and gas piping is anchored and braced to the structure to limit spills or leaks. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.7.3, 13.7.5; Commentary: Sec. A.7.13.4)			X		

PP-3 C-Clamps. HR-not required; LS-not required; PR-H.	One-sided C-clamps that support piping larger than 2.5 in. (64 mm) in diameter are restrained. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.7.3, 13.7.5; Commentary: Sec. A.7.13.5)			X		
PP-4 Piping Crossing Seismic Joints. HR-not required; LS-not required; PR-H.	Piping that crosses seismic joints or isolation planes or is connected to independent structures has couplings or other details to accommodate the relative seismic displacements. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.7.3, 13.7.5; Commentary: Sec. A.7.13.6)			X		

Ducts

EVALUATION ITEM	EVALUATION STATEMENT	C	NC	N/A	U	COMMENT
D-1 Duct Bracing. HR-not required; LS-not required; PR-H.	Rectangular ductwork larger than 6 ft2 (0.56 m2) in cross-sectional area and round ducts larger than 28 in. (711 mm) in diameter are braced. The maximum spacing of transverse bracing does not exceed 30 ft (9.2 m). The maximum spacing of longitudinal bracing does not exceed 60 ft (18.3 m). (Tier 2: Sec. 13.7.6; Commentary: Sec. A.7.14.2)			X		
D-2 Duct Support. HR-not required; LS-not required; PR-H.	Ducts are not supported by piping or electrical conduit. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.7.6; Commentary: Sec. A.7.14.3)			X		
D-3 Ducts Crossing Seismic Joints. HR-not required; LS-not required; PR-H.	Ducts that cross seismic joints or isolation planes or are connected to independent structures have couplings or other details to accommodate the relative seismic displacements. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.7.6; Commentary: Sec. A.7.14.4)			X		

Elevators

EVALUATION ITEM	EVALUATION STATEMENT	C	NC	N/A	U	COMMENT
EL-1 Retainer Guards. HR-not required; LS-H; PR-H.	Sheaves and drums have cable retainer guards. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.7.11; Commentary: Sec. A.7.16.1)			X		No elevator present
EL-2 Retainer Plate. HR-not required; LS-H; PR-H.	A retainer plate is present at the top and bottom of both car and counterweight. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.7.11; Commentary: Sec. A.7.16.2)			X		
EL-3 Elevator Equipment. HR-not required; LS-not required; PR-H.	Equipment, piping, and other components that are part of the elevator system are anchored. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.7.11; Commentary: Sec. A.7.16.3)			X		
EL-4 Seismic Switch. HR-not required; LS-not required; PR-H.	Elevators capable of operating at speeds of 150 ft/min or faster are equipped with seismic switches that meet the requirements of ASME A17.1 or have trigger levels set to 20% of the acceleration of gravity at the base of the structure and 50% of the acceleration of gravity in other locations. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.7.11; Commentary: Sec. A.7.16.4)			X		

EL-5 Shaft Walls. HR-not required; LS-not required; PR-H.	Elevator shaft walls are anchored and reinforced to prevent toppling into the shaft during strong shaking. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.7.11; Commentary: Sec. A.7.16.5)			X		
EL-6 Counterweight Rails. HR-not required; LS-not required; PR-H.	All counterweight rails and divider beams are sized in accordance with ASME A17.1. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.7.11; Commentary: Sec. A.7.16.6)			X		
EL-7 Brackets. HR-not required; LS-not required; PR-H.	The brackets that tie the car rails and the counterweight rail to the structure are sized in accordance with ASME A17.1. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.7.11; Commentary: Sec. A.7.16.7)			X		
EL-8 Spreader Bracket. HR-not required; LS-not required; PR-H.	Spreader brackets are not used to resist seismic forces. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.7.11; Commentary: Sec. A.7.16.8)			X		
EL-9 Go-Slow Elevators. HR-not required; LS-not required; PR-H.	The building has a go-slow elevator system. (Tier 2: Sec. 13.7.11; Commentary: Sec. A.7.16.9)			X		

Appendix B: Concept-Level Seismic Upgrade Figures

This page intentionally left blank.



Dayton High School Seismic Upgrades – Gym Building

Washington State School Seismic Safety Assessments Project – Dayton School District 2 – June 2019

Figure 1 - Main Floor Strengthening Plan



Notes:

Connection Reinforcement Required At All Joints Of Frame, Typ (2) Frames

Figure 2 - Roof Strengthening Plan

Appendix C: Opinion of Probable Construction Costs

This page intentionally left blank.

520 Kirkland Way, Suite 301
Kirkland, WA 98033
tel: (425) 828-0500
fax: (425) 828-0700
www.prodims.com

Name:	**Wa State School Seismic Safety Assessment**
Second Name:	**Dayton High School Gym**
Location:	**State of Washington**
Design Phase:	**ROM Cost Estimates**
Date of Estimate:	**April 25, 2019**
Date of Revision:	
Month of Cost Basis:	**1Q, 2019**

Dayton High School Gym

Master Estimate Summary

Project Name		Total Estimated Construction Cost
Dayton High School Gym	**Structural Costs**	**$48,427**
Dayton High School Gym	**Non-Structural Costs**	**$14,528**
TOTAL ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION COST		**$62,956**

Estimate Assumptions:

The ROM Construction Cost estimates are based on the Concept Design Report for the Project.
Construction Escalation is not included. Costs are current as of month of Cost Basis noted Above

Estimate Qualifications:

The ROM estimates are not be relied on solely for proforma development and financial decisions.
Further design work is required to determine construction budgets.
All Buildings Estimated to the 5' foot line for Utilities, All Sitework is estimated to go with any combination of the buildings and alternatives.
The ROM estimates do not include any Hazardous Material Abatement/Disposal.
For Construction Cost Markups they are additive, not cumulative. Percentages are added to the previous subtotal rather than the direct cost subtotal.
Owner Soft Costs are not included in the estimates. Soft costs can include design fees, sales tax, permits, owner's contingency and FF+E.
Estimated labor is based on an 8 hour per day shift 5 days a week. Accelerated schedule work of overtime has not been included.
Estimated labor is based on working on unoccupied facility without phased construction.
Estimate is based on a competitive public bid with at least 3 bona fide submitted and unrescinded general contractor bids.
Estimate is based on a competitive public bid with a minimum 6 week bidding schedule and no significant addendums within 2 weeks of bid opening.
State of Washington General Contractor/ Construction Manager (GC/CM) contracts typically raises construction costs. It is Not Included in this estimate.
Estimated construction cost is for the entire project. This estimate is not intended to be used for other projects.
Please consult the cost estimator for any modifications to this estimate. Unilaterally adding and deleting markups, scope of work, schedule, specifications, plans and bid forms could incorrectly restate the project construction cost.
Construction reserve contingency for change orders is not included in the estimate.
Sole source supply of materials and/ or installers typically results in a 40% to 100% premium on costs over open specifications.

PRODIMS

520 Kirkland Way, Suite 301
Kirkland, WA 98033
Phone: 425-828-0500 Fax: 425-828-0700
www.prodims.com

Structural Costs

Name:	Wa State School Seismic Safety Assessment
Second Name:	Dayton High School Gym
Location:	Dayton, WA
Design Phase:	ROM Cost Estimates
Date of Estimate:	April 25, 2019
Date of Revision:	
Month of Cost Basis:	4Q, 2018, 1Q, 2019

Areas	sqft
1st Floor	21,000
Total Areas	21,000

Dayton High School Gym

Construction Cost Estimate

Subtotal Direct Cost From the Estimate Detail Below $ 36,968

	Percentage of Previous Subtotal	Amount	Running Subtotal
Scope Contingency	10.0%	$ 3,697	$ 40,664
General Conditions	10.0%	$ 3,697	$ 44,361
Home Office Overhead	5.0%	$ 1,848	$ 46,209
Profit	6.0%	$ 2,218	$ 48,427
Escalation Not Included-Costs in 1Q, 2019 Dollars	0.0%	$ -	$ 48,427
Washington State Sales Tax	0.0%	$ -	$ 48,427

Total Markups Applied to the Direct Cost 31.00%
Markups are multiplied from each subtotal- They are not multiplied from the direct cost

		$/sqft
TOTAL ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION COST--	**$ 48,427**	**$ 2.31**
-20% TOTAL ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION COST VARIANCE --	**$ 38,742**	**$ 1.84**
+50% TOTAL ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION COST VARIANCE --	**$ 72,641**	**$ 3.46**

Please see the Master Summary for Assumptions and Qualifications for ROM Cost Estimates

Direct Cost of Construction

WBS	Description	Quantity	U of M	Labor	Labor Total	Material	Material Total	Equipment	Equipment Total	Total $/U of M	Direct Cost
1 -	**Seismic Retrofit**										
Superstructure											
Roof Systems											
	Steel Rod Bracing System - Steel Rods, Turnbuckles, Nuts, Backing Plates, Cutting Holes in Existing Steel	2.25	tons	$ 8,510.00	$ 19,147.50	$ 2,990.00	$ 6,727.50	$ 690.00	$ 1,552.50	$ 12,190.00	$ 27,427.50
	Steel Plates/Coped WT Welded onto Steel Arch Frames	0.6	tons	$ 11,100.00	$ 6,660.00	$ 3,900.00	$ 2,340.00	$ 900.00	$ 540.00	$ 15,900.00	$ 9,540.00
Subtotal of the Direct Cost of Construction				**Dayton High School Gym**							**$ 36,968**

PRODIMS

520 Kirkland Way, Suite 301
Kirkland, WA 98033
Phone: 425-828-0500 Fax: 425-828-0700
www.prodims.com

Non-Structural Costs

			Areas	sqft
Name:	Wa State School Seismic Safety Assessment			
Second Name:	Dayton High School Gym		Building Area	21,000
Location:	Dayton, Wa			
Design Phase:	ROM Cost Estimates			
Date of Estimate:	April 25, 2019			
Date of Revision:				
Month of Cost Basis:	4Q, 2018, 1Q, 2019		Total Areas	21,000

Dayton High School Gym

Construction Cost Estimate

Subtotal Direct Cost From the Estimate Detail Below $ 11,090

	Percentage of Previous Subtotal	Amount	Running Subtotal
Scope Contingency	10.0%	$ 1,109	$ 12,199
General Conditions	10.0%	$ 1,109	$ 13,308
Home Office Overhead	5.0%	$ 555	$ 13,863
Profit	6.0%	$ 665	$ 14,528
Escalation Not Included-Costs in 1Q, 2019 Dollars	0.0%	$ -	$ 14,528
Washington State Sales Tax	0.0%	$ -	$ 14,528

Total Markups Applied to the Direct Cost 31.00%
Markups are multiplied from each subtotal- They are not multiplied from the direct cost

		$/sqft
TOTAL ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION COST--	**$ 14,528**	**$ 0.69**
-20% TOTAL ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION COST VARIANCE --	**$ 11,623**	**$ 0.55**
+50% TOTAL ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION COST VARIANCE --	**$ 21,792**	**$ 1.04**

Please see the Master Summary for Assumptions and Qualifications for ROM Cost Estimates

Direct Cost of Construction

WBS	Description	Quantity	U of M	Labor	Labor Total	Material	Material Total	Equipment	Equipment Total	Total $/U of M	Direct Cost
2- Non- Structural Demo/Restoration*											
Interiors and M/E/P/FP systems											
	Mechanical/Electrical/Fire Protection Systems	21,000	sqft	$ 0.27	$ 5,754.38	$ 0.22	$ 4,708.13	$ 0.03	$ 627.75	$ 0.53	$ 11,090.25

*Allows 30 percent of existing nonstructural systems M/E/P/FP require upgrades/replacement.

Subtotal of the Direct Cost of Construction				**Dayton High School Gym**							**$ 11,090**

This page intentionally left blank.

Appendix D: Earthquake Performance Assessment Tool (EPAT) Worksheet

This page intentionally left blank.

Washington Schools Earthquake Performance Assessment Tool (EPAT)
MAIN PAGE

Full District Name	Dayton		
Point of Contact	Paula Moisio		
Telephone	509-382-2543		
E-Mail	paulam@daytonsd.org		
File Name	Dayton, Dayton High School, Gymnasium EPAT	**File Date:**	7/5/2018

District	Dayton
Facility Name	Dayton High School
Building Part Name	Gymnasium

Earthquake Ground Motion (% g)		**Earthquake Hazards**	
20% in 50 year PGA	3.6%	**Site Class**	B
10% in 50 year PGA	6.1%	**Ground Shaking Hazard**	Low
2% in 50 year PGA	16.5%	**Liquefaction Potential**	Moderate to High
Percentile S_s *Among all WA Campuses*	22%	**Combined Earthquake Hazard Level**	Moderate

Total Building Part Area (Square Feet)	**Building Evaluated By**	**Input Data by Person(s)**
27,152	TDNR, Reid Middleton	Tim Green, Reid Middleton

The Earthquake Ground Motion and Earthquake Hazard Hazards data shown above are primarily for use and interpretation by engineers.

Refer to the EPAT User Guide for technical explanations of the Earthquake Ground Motion and the Earthquake Hazards information.

Washington Schools Earthquake Performance Assessment Tool (EPAT)
BUILDING DATA PAGE

Facility Name	Dayton High School
Building Name	Gymnasium
Building Use	Assembly

Data Entry Item	User Entered Values	Default Values	Used for BCA
Seismic Data			
Decimal Latitude	46.316073	46.316073	46.316073
Decimal Longitude	-117.972817	-117.972817	-117.972817
Site Class (Soil/Rock Type)	B	D-E	B
Liquefaction Potential	Moderate to High	Moderate to High	Moderate to High
Geographic Region for Seismic Zones	Eastern	Eastern	Eastern
Building Structural Data			
HAZUS Building Type***	S3	Steel Light Frame	S3
Number of Stories (Excluding Basement)***	1		1
Year Built***	1966		1966
Code for Building Design (if known)	UBC	**Use the Drop-Down menus to Select Data Entries for the Bright Green Shaded data cells.**	UBC
Design Code Year (if known)	<1973		<1973
Severe Vertical Irregularity***	No		No
Moderate Vertical Irregularity***	No		No
Plan (Horizontal) Irregularity***	No		No

***** Mandatory Data Entry**

Washington Schools Earthquake Performance Assessment Tool (EPAT)
RESULTS SUMMARY

District Name	Dayton	**Existing Building Life Safety Risk & Priority for Retrofit or Replacement**
School Name	Dayton High School	
Building Name	Gymnasium	Low-Moderate

Building Data

HAZUS Building Type	S3	Steel Light Frame
Year Built	1966	These parameters determine the capacity of the existing building to withstand earthquake forces.
Building Design Code	<1973 UBC	
Existing Building Code Level	Pre	
Geographic Area	Eastern	
Severe Vertical Irregularity	No	Buildings with irregularities have greater earthquake damage than otherwise similar buildings that are regular.
Moderate Vertical Irregularity	No	
Plan Irregularity	No	

Seismic Data

Earthquake Ground Shaking Hazard Level	Low	Frequency and severity of earthquakes at this site
Percentile S_s Among WA K-12 Campuses	22%	Earthquake ground shaking hazard is higher than 22% of WA campuses.
Site Class (Soil or Rock Type)	B	Rock
Liquefaction Potential	Moderate to High	Liquefaction increases the risk of major damage to a building
Combined Earthquake Hazard Level	Moderate	Earthquake ground shaking and liquefaction potential

Severe Earthquake Event (Design Basis Earthquake Ground Motion)[1]

Building State	Building Damage Estimate[2]	Probability Building is not Repairable[3]	Life Safety[4] Risk Level	Most Likely Post-Earthquake Tagging[5]
Existing Building	32%	28%	Low-Moderate	Red
Life Safety Retrofit Building	15%	11%	Very Low	Green/Yellow
Current Code Building	11%	7.1%	Very Low	Green/Yellow

1. 2/3rds of the 2% in 50 year ground motion
2. Percentage of building replacement value.
3. Probability building is in the Extensive or Complete damage states. For existing buildings, the probability that the building is not economically repairable may be higher: some buildings in the Moderate Damage state are also likely to be demolished.
4. Based on probability of Complete Damage State.
5. Most likely post-earthquake damage state per ATC-20.

Source for the Data Entered into the Tool

Building Evaluated By:	TDNR, Reid Middleton
Person(s) Who Entered Data in EPAT:	Tim Green, Reid Middleton
User Overrides of Default Parameters:	Building Design Code Year, Latitude, Longitude, Site Class, Liquefaction, Geographic Region

This page intentionally left blank.

Appendix E: Dayton High School Record Drawings

This page intentionally left blank.



HAHN AND CAMPBELL
STRUCTURAL ENGINEERS
736

Architect
H. BRANDT GESSEL A.I.A.
214 E. BIRCH PH. JA 9-1143 WALLA WALLA, WN.

DATE
JOB NO.
DRAWN BY RBH
CHECKED BY

NEW GYMNASIUM AND SHOP/ADMINISTRATION BUILDING FOR
DAYTON HIGH SCHOOL
SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 2
DAYTON, WASHINGTON

SHEET NO. S1 OF 6

REVISED 5/10/65



BALCONY FLOOR FRAMING PLAN
SCALE 1/8" = 1 FT.



FRONT ROOF FRAMING PLAN
SCALE 1/8" = 1 FT.

MASONRY WALLS
HOLLOW UNIT MASONRY:

STANDARD DUR-O-WALL, K-WEB OR EQUIVALENT LAID IN HORIZONTAL BED JOINTS, AT BOTTOM, AND AT 12" c/c IN ALL "STACK BOND" MASONRY, AT 24" c/c IN ASHLAR BOND. LAP AT SPLICES AND BEND AROUND CORNERS.

"REINFORCED" MASONRY ALL EXTERIOR WALLS AND WALL UNDER GYMNASIUM EDGE OF BALCONY: ADD 1 # 5 VERT. IN CONC. FILLED CELLS AT CORNERS, WALL ENDS, JAMBS OF OPENINGS, AND AT 4' c/c. SEE STEEL DET. 9/S4 FOR GROUTING HOLES IN CAP CHANNELS. # 5 × 3'-0" DOWEL IN FOUNDATION, STUBBED 18" INTO EACH FILLED CELL IN MASONRY.

LINTELS OVER ALL OPENINGS 1'-6" TO 3'-4": 6" & 4" WALLS: 1 # 3 BOT., 1 # 3 TOP. 8" WALLS: 2 # 3 B., 1 # 3 T.
OPENINGS OVER 3'-4": 6" & 4" WALLS: 1 # 4 BOT., 1 # 3 TOP. 8" WALLS: 2 # 4 B., 1 # 3 T.
IN CONCRETE FILLED 8" HIGH LINTEL BLOCKS TOP BAR IN BED JOINT 4" CONC. FILL ABOVE.

STEEL DECKING: SEE NOTES ON SHEET S3. 8" c/c ON 4½" DECK = 3 PER 24".

CONVERT TO ROOF PLAN

HAHN AND CAMPBELL
STRUCTURAL ENGINEERS
736
ROBERT B. HYSLOP
REGISTERED
STRUCTURAL ENGINEER

Architect
H. BRANDT GESSEL A.I.A.
214 E. BIRCH PH. JA 9-1143 WALLA WALLA, WN.

DATE:
JOB NO.:
DRAWN BY: RBH
CHECKED BY:

NEW GYMNASIUM AND SHOP/ADMINISTRATION BUILDING FOR
DAYTON HIGH SCHOOL
SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 2 DAYTON, WASHINGTON

SHEET NO. S2 OF 6

REVISED 5/10/65



MAIN ROOF FRAMING PLAN
SCALE 1/8" = 1 FT.

NOTE: FOR SHORTENING GYMNASIUM APPROXIMATELY 10'-0" USE FIGURES IN BOXES.

CONVERT TO ROOF PLAN

STEEL ROOF DECKING:
WELD TO ALL SUPPORTS, WITH WELD WASHERS, @ 8" c/c.
BUTTON PUNCH ALL SIDE SEAMS, @ 18" c/c.
RECESSED SUMP PANS AT DRAINS, WELDED TO DECKING.
RIDGE & VALLEY PLATES, 20 GA., WELDED TO DECKING @ 16" c/c.

NOTE: USE SIMILAR CONSTRUCTION FOR METAL CANOPIES - SEE DETAILS & ARCH PLANS.

STEEL JOIST PURLINS:
STEEL JOIST INSTITUTE, LH SERIES WELDED TO ALL SUPPORTS, 2" OF 1/4" FILLET EACH SIDE OF BEARING PLATE.
STEEL CROSS BRIDGING AS SHOWN, WELDED TO JOISTS AND AT CROSSING.
LOWER CHORDS EXTENDED AS HAUNCHES TO BOTTOM FLANGE OF STEEL ARCH, WELDED.

N

REVISED 5/10/65

HAHN AND CAMPBELL
STRUCTURAL ENGINEERS
736

Architect
H. BRANDT GESSEL A.I.A.
214 E. BIRCH PH. JA 9-1143 WALLA WALLA, WN.

DATE.
JOB NO.
DRAWN BY. RBH
CHECKED BY.

NEW GYMNASIUM AND SHOP/ADMINISTRATION BUILDING FOR
DAYTON HIGH SCHOOL
SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 2 DAYTON WASHINGTON

SHEET NO. S3



A/S4 HALF ELEVATION OF END WALL FRAME
WEST END WALL SHOWN.



B/S4 END WALL SECTION



DETAILS SCALE ¾" = 1 FT.



C/S4 PART ELEVATION OF SIDE WALL FRAME

SCALE ¼" = 1 FT.



VALLEY PURLIN SLOPE DIAGRAM
HORIZONTAL SCALE 1/16" = 1' VERTICAL SCALE ¼" = 1'.

D/S4 SIDE WALL & HALF ROOF FRAME SECTION

REVISED 5/10/68

HAHN AND CANNELL STRUCTURAL ENGINEERS
ROBERT H. HAHN, C.E. REGISTERED
7336

Architect
H. BRANDT GESSEL A.I.A.
214 E. BIRCH PH. JA 9-1143 WALLA WALLA, WN.

DATE:
JOB NO.
DRAWN BY: R.B.H.
CHECKED BY:

NEW GYMNASIUM AND SHOP ADMIN STRATION BUILDING FOR
DAYTON HIGH SCHOOL
DAYTON, WASHINGTON
SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 2

SHEET NO. S4 OF

3/5/68 7336



AHN AND CAMPBELL
STRUCTURAL ENGINEERS
ROBERT B. HYLCO
REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER
STATE OF WASHINGTON
STRUCTURAL

Architect
H. BRANDT GESSEL A.I.A.
214 E. BIRCH PH. JA 9-1143 WALLA WALLA, WN.

DATE -
JOB NO. -
DRAWN BY - R.B.H.
CHECKED BY -

NEW GYMNASIUM AND SHOP ADMINISTRATION BUILDING FOR
DAYTON HIGH SCHOOL
SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 2 DAYTON, WASHINGTON

SHEET NO. S5 OF

2/27/65 776 DAYTON S5



HAHN AND CAMPBELL STRUCTURAL ENGINEERS

Architect
H. BRANDT GESSEL A.I.A.
214 E. BIRCH PH. JA 9-1343 WALLA WALLA, WN.

DATE:
JOB NO.:
DRAWN BY: R.B.H.
CHECKED BY:

NEW GYMNASIUM AND SUPPORTING BUILDING FOR
DAYTON HIGH SCHOOL
SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 2
DAYTON, WASHINGTON

SHEET NO. S6 OF S6

Appendix F: FEMA E-74 Nonstructural Seismic Bracing Excerpts

This page intentionally left blank.



Note: for seismic design category D, E & F, the flexible sprinkler hose fitting must accommodate at least 1" of ceiling movement without use of an oversized opening. Alternatively, the sprinkler head must have a 2" oversize ring or adapter that allows 1" movement in all directions.

Figure G-1. Flexible Sprinkler Drop.

(FEMA E-74, 2012, Reducing the Risks of Nonstructural Earthquake Damage)



Figure G-2. End of Line Restraint.

(FEMA E-74, 2012, Reducing the Risks of Nonstructural Earthquake Damage)

Partitions



Figure G-3. Mitigation Schemes for Bracing the Tops of Metal Stud Partitions Walls.

(FEMA E-74, 2012, Reducing the Risks of Nonstructural Earthquake Damage)



Figure G-4. Mitigation Schemes for Bracing the Tops of Metal Stud Partitions Walls.

(FEMA E-74, 2012, Reducing the Risks of Nonstructural Earthquake Damage)



Notes: Glazed partition shown in full-height nonbearing stud wall. Nonstructural surround must be designed to provide in-plane and out-of-plane restraint for glazing assembly without delivering any loads to the glazing.

Glass-to-frame clearance requirements are dependent on anticipated structural drift. Where partition is isolated from structural drift, clearance requirements are reduced. Refer to building code for specific requirements.

Safety glass (laminated, tempered, etc.) will reduce the hazard in case of breakage during an earthquake. See Example 6.3.1.4 for related discussion.

Figure G-5. Full-height Glazed Partition.

(FEMA E-74, 2012, Reducing the Risks of Nonstructural Earthquake Damage)



Figure G-6. Full-height Heavy Partition.

(FEMA E-74, 2012, Reducing the Risks of Nonstructural Earthquake Damage)



Figure G-7. Typical Glass Block Panel Details.

(FEMA E-74, 2012, Reducing the Risks of Nonstructural Earthquake Damage)

Ceilings



Figure G-8. Suspension System for Acoustic Lay-in Panel Ceilings – Edge Conditions.

(FEMA E-74, 2012, Reducing the Risks of Nonstructural Earthquake Damage)



Note: Compression strut shall not replace hanger wire. Compression strut consists of a steel section attached to main runner with 2 - #12 sheet metal screws and to structure with 2 - #12 screws to wood or 1/4" min. expansion anchor to structure. Size of strut is dependent on distance between ceiling and structure ($l/r \leq 200$). A 1" diameter conduit can be used for up to 6', a 1-5/8" X 1-1/4" metal stud can be used for up to 10'

Per DSA IR 25-5, ceiling areas less than 144 sq. ft, or fire rated ceilings less than 96 sq. ft., surrounded by walls braced to the structure above do not require lateral bracing assemblies when they are attached to two adjacent walls. (ASTM E580 does not require lateral bracing assemblies for ceilings less than 1000 sq. ft.; see text.)

Figure G-9. Suspension System for Acoustic Lay-in Panel Ceilings – General Bracing Assembly.

(FEMA E-74, 2012, Reducing the Risks of Nonstructural Earthquake Damage)



Figure G-10. Suspension System for Acoustic Lay-in Panel Ceilings – General Bracing Layout.

(FEMA E-74, 2012, Reducing the Risks of Nonstructural Earthquake Damage)



Figure G-11. Suspension System for Acoustic Lay-in Panel Ceilings – Overhead Attachment Details.

(FEMA E-74, 2012, Reducing the Risks of Nonstructural Earthquake Damage)



a) Gypsum board attached directly to ceiling joists



b) Gypsum board attached directly to furring strips (hat channel or similar)

Note: Commonly used details shown; no special seismic details are required as long as furring and gypboard secured. Check for certified assemblies (UL listed, FM approved, etc.) if fire or sound rating required.

Figure G-12. Gypsum Board Ceiling Applied Directly to Structure.

(FEMA E-74, 2012, Reducing the Risks of Nonstructural Earthquake Damage)



Figure G-13. Retrofit Detail for Existing Lath and Plaster.

(FEMA E-74, 2012, Reducing the Risks of Nonstructural Earthquake Damage)



Figure G-14. Diagrammatic View of Suspended Heavy Ceiling Grid and Lateral Bracing.

(FEMA E-74, 2012, Reducing the Risks of Nonstructural Earthquake Damage)



Figure G-15. Perimeter Details for Suspended Gypsum Board Ceiling.

(FEMA E-74, 2012, Reducing the Risks of Nonstructural Earthquake Damage)



Note: Compression strut shall not replace hanger wire. Compresion strut consists of a steel section attached to main runner with 2 - #12 sheet metal screws and to structure with 2 - #12 screws to wood or 1/4" min. expansion anchor to concrete. Size of strut is dependent on distance between ceiling and structure (l/r ≤ 200). A 1" diameter conduit can be used for up to 6', a 1-5/8" X 1-1/4" metal stud can be used for up to 10'. See figure 6.3.4.1-6 for example of bracing assembly.

Figure G-16. Details for Lateral Bracing Assembly for Suspended Gypsum Board Ceiling.

(FEMA E-74, 2012, Reducing the Risks of Nonstructural Earthquake Damage)

Light Fixtures



Figure G-17. Recessed Light Fixture in suspended Ceiling (Fixture Weight < 10 pounds).

(FEMA E-74, 2012, Reducing the Risks of Nonstructural Earthquake Damage)



Figure G-18. Recessed Light Fixture in suspended Ceiling (Fixture Weight 10 to 56 pounds).

(FEMA E-74, 2012, Reducing the Risks of Nonstructural Earthquake Damage)



Figure G-19. Light Storage Racks.

(FEMA E-74, 2012, Reducing the Risks of Nonstructural Earthquake Damage)



Note: Purchase storage racks designed for seismic resistance. Storage racks may be classified as either nonstructural elements or nonbuilding structures depending upon their size and support conditions. Check the applicable code to see which provisions apply.

Figure G-20. Industrial Storage Racks.

(FEMA E-74, 2012, Reducing the Risks of Nonstructural Earthquake Damage)



Figure G-21. Wall-mounted File Cabinets.

(FEMA E-74, 2012, Reducing the Risks of Nonstructural Earthquake Damage)



Figure G-22. Base Anchored File Cabinets.

(FEMA E-74, 2012, Reducing the Risks of Nonstructural Earthquake Damage)



Figure G-23. Anchorage of Freestanding Book Cases Arranged Back to Back.

(FEMA E-74, 2012, Reducing the Risks of Nonstructural Earthquake Damage)



Figure G-24. Desktop Computers and Accessories.

(FEMA E-74, 2012, Reducing the Risks of Nonstructural Earthquake Damage)



Cantilevered Access Floor Pedestal



Braced Access Floor Pedestal
(use for tall floors or where pedestals are not strong enough to resist seismic forces)

Note: For new floors in areas of high seismicity, purchase and install systems that meet the applicable code provisions for "special access floors."

Figure G-25. Equipment Mounted on Access Floor.

(FEMA E-74, 2012, Reducing the Risks of Nonstructural Earthquake Damage)



Figure G-26. Equipment Mounted on Access Floor – Independent Base.

(FEMA E-74, 2012, Reducing the Risks of Nonstructural Earthquake Damage)



Figure G-27. Equipment Mounted on Access Floor – Cable Braced.

(FEMA E-74, 2012, Reducing the Risks of Nonstructural Earthquake Damage)



Figure G-28. Equipment Mounted on Access Floor – Tie-down Rods.

(FEMA E-74, 2012, Reducing the Risks of Nonstructural Earthquake Damage)

Mechanical and Electrical Equipment



Note: Rigidly mounted equipment shall have flexible connections for the fuel lines and piping.

Figure G-29. Rigidly Floor-mounted Equipment with Added Angles.

(FEMA E-74, 2012, Reducing the Risks of Nonstructural Earthquake Damage)



Figure G-30. HVAC Equipment with Vibration Isolation.

(FEMA E-74, 2012, Reducing the Risks of Nonstructural Earthquake Damage)



Figure G-31. Rooftop HVAC Equipment.

(FEMA E-74, 2012, Reducing the Risks of Nonstructural Earthquake Damage)



Figure G-32. Suspended Equipment.

(FEMA E-74, 2012, Reducing the Risks of Nonstructural Earthquake Damage)



Figure G-33. Water Heater Strapping to Backing Wall.

(FEMA E-74, 2012, Reducing the Risks of Nonstructural Earthquake Damage)



Figure G-34. Water Heater – Strapping at Corner Installation.

(FEMA E-74, 2012, Reducing the Risks of Nonstructural Earthquake Damage)



Figure G-35. Water Heater – Base Mounted.

(FEMA E-74, 2012, Reducing the Risks of Nonstructural Earthquake Damage)



Figure G-36. Rigid Bracing – Single Pipe Transverse.

(FEMA E-74, 2012, Reducing the Risks of Nonstructural Earthquake Damage)



Figure G-37. Cable Bracing – Single Pipe Transverse.

(FEMA E-74, 2012, Reducing the Risks of Nonstructural Earthquake Damage)

Electrical and Communications



Figure G-38. Electrical Control Panels, Motor Controls Centers, or Switchgear.

(FEMA E-74, 2012, Reducing the Risks of Nonstructural Earthquake Damage)



Figure G-39. Freestanding and Wall-mounted Electrical Control Panels, Motor Controls Centers, or Switchgear.
(FEMA E-74, 2012, Reducing the Risks of Nonstructural Earthquake Damage)



Figure G-40. Emergency Generator.
(FEMA E-74, 2012, Reducing the Risks of Nonstructural Earthquake Damage)

This page intentionally left blank.

ReidMiddleton

728 – 134th St SW
Suite 200
Everett, WA 98204

Tel 425-741-3800
Fax 425-741-3900

www.reidmiddleton.com
File No. 262018.063