



Michael O. Leavitt
Governor

T. Leslie Youd
Chairperson

State of Utah

UTAH SEISMIC SAFETY COMMISSION

Staff:
Utah Geological Survey
2363 South Foothill Drive
Salt Lake City, Utah 84109-1491
Phone (801) 467-7970
FAX Line: (801) 467-4070

Utah Division of Comprehensive Emergency Management
State Office Building, Room 1110
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114
Phone (801) 538-3400
FAX Line: (801) 538-3770

UTAH SEISMIC SAFETY COMMISSION

March 13, 1996

State Capitol Room 414

Minutes

Members Present:

Chair, Les Youd
Lee Allison
Walter Arabasz
James Bailey
Barry Smith

Professor, BYU Civil Engineering Department
Director, Utah Geological Survey
Director, University of Utah Seismograph Stations
Structural Engineers Association of Utah
Western Mountain Region American Institutes of Architects

Members Not Present:

D. Douglas Bodrero
Ken Bullock
Lorayne Frank
James Golden
William E. Juszczak
Rep. Peter Knudson
Sen. Craig Peterson
Randall G. Updike
Russ Wilder
Suzanne Winters

Commissioner, Department of Public Safety
Director, Utah League of Cities and Towns
Director, Division of Comprehensive Emergency Management
Assistant Chief Structural Engineer, Department of Transportation
Division of Facilities and Construction Management
Utah House of Representatives
Utah State Senate
U.S. Geological Survey (Ex-Officio)
Federal Emergency Management Agency (Ex-Officio)
Science Advisor, Governor's Office of Planning and Budget

CEM Staff Present:

Bob Carey
Brenda Edwards
John Rokich

EPICENTER Program Manager, Natural Hazards Section
Office Technician, Natural Hazards Section
Natural Hazards Section Chief

UGS Staff Present:

Gary Christenson
Janine Jarva

Applied Geology Manager, Utah Geological Survey
Senior Geological Technician, Utah Geological Survey

Others Present

Roger Anderson
Earle Eppich
Carl Eriksson
Pat Lewis

Assistant Director, Davis County Emergency Services
Structural Engineer, Structural Engineers Association of Utah
Structural Engineer and Building Official, Salt Lake County
Claims Superintendent, State Farm Insurance Company



Call to Order

Chairman Les Youd called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m.

Review of Minutes

The minutes were approved by the members present. A quorum was not present to formally approve the minutes. Corrections or comments are welcome.

Standing Committee Report

Les began by asking Pat Lewis, chair of the Emergency Management Standing Committee if he had a report. Pat reported that their first meeting would be held Friday March 15, 1996 and there would be a report at the next Commission meeting. Earle Eppich of the Engineering and Architecture Standing Committee made a report on their meeting held March 7, 1996. (See attached minutes from the Committee meeting.) He stated that their focus would be Objective 3.1 from the Strategic Plan. Earle commented on most points [and they are] as follows:

- Point
- 1) Make plan checks more uniform and make sure structural plan checks are made
 - 2) State adopt the tests for certification and make sure plans examiners are licensed
 - 5) Construction costs produce a code enforcement fee for local jurisdictions, more of that money needs to be kept in building departments for code enforcement
 - 6) School Districts are not set up for a jurisdictional review; in-house reviews are done by a person who may or may not be trained
 - 7) Improvement needed in quality control monitoring
 - 9) The coordination of special inspections needs to be in place

Carl Eriksson commented that the Insurance Service Organization (ISO) is formed by insurance companies across the United States to establish insurance rate standards. ISO currently evaluates fire departments across the U. S. to set insurance rates and is extending the evaluation to building departments. Utah will be evaluated in 1997. Carl made available a copy of the "Building Code Effectiveness Grading Schedule". A copy of the publication was presented to the Commission members. Pat commented that if building codes are enforced the insurance rates will not be as great. Lee asked if earthquakes are the most significant insurance factor in Utah. Pat responded in the affirmative. Discussion followed on the insurance aspect in Utah regarding earthquakes. Lee asked about insurance rate increases. Pat responded that increases occur only if there is a history of claims requiring an increase to cover the expenses. He further stated that the rates are increased by class and area.

Earle stated that the second page of the minutes contained possible changes to improve building code enforcement. Earle suggested the creation of an administrative agency to assist local building officials in training, enforcement and plan checks. Discussion followed regarding the type of agency and if there is a precedent set in another state that could be followed. Discussion also included the Uniform Building Code Commission and the suggestion to add personnel to support plan checks. Clarification on the role of the Uniform Building Code Commission brought out that

it is an advisory Commission as are most other commissions in the state. Creating a bureau in the Department of Occupational and Professional Licensing as support to the local jurisdictions was a possible solution also presented. Earle commented that the rural areas may not have the benefit of a structural engineer to inspect the buildings.

Barry suggested that DFCM would be a logical, less complex agency that has the expertise to meet the requirements. Lee suggested two possible options: 1) Implement the act through the Commission holding hearings and inviting professional licensing, DFCM, and other outside groups regarding the proposals presented, 2) request the legislature meet during interim study with the above mentioned groups, insurance industry, engineers, and architects and present them with an agenda on these issues. Lee commented that an interim study ensures legislation is drafted and sponsors and supporters are located before the legislative session begins. Les stated that an extra effort be made to have Sen. Peterson and Rep. Knudson in attendance at the next meeting.

Les encouraged the Committee to continue preparing and present these issues to the ACIR so that legislation may be drafted. Jim commented that a Senator or Representative be identified to draft and push through the legislation. Lee responded that the ACIR has legislators on the committee. He further commented that this forum may be the best way to put the issues in front of the Legislature. Walter suggested that if the legislature is approached that those who support and oppose be identified. Involvement of the local jurisdictions is necessary to secure their support. Les suggested that the Commission be placed on the ACIR agenda for a future meeting. Lee and Walter complimented the Committee for the speed and the quality of information that was presented.

Barry suggested that natural allies to seismic concerns be identified being that earthquakes are only a part of the issue. Discussion followed on identifying natural allies. Allies mentioned are: ICBO, Structural Engineers Association, and Home Builders Association. Pat suggested that rural areas do not see earthquakes as a problem like ice, snow, and wind damage. He also commented that the local jurisdictions may be reluctant to give up control if there is a threat of losing funding generated from the plan check fees. Discussion followed on the revenues generated from plan check fees and the benefits of keeping the funding for that purpose. Pat concurred with the need for increasing the building codes and strongly supports the issues discussed. Walter asked for clarification of the need for legislation being in place before the building review in 1997. Earle responded that in order to receive a better review, legislation does need to be in place.

Walter commented that the white paper, "Public Policy and Building Safety", sent to EERI members, is an excellent road map detailing the political process and how to proceed with legislation. The earthquake exercise is a good way to get support from knowledgeable professionals with broad support potential, in addition to geoscientists. He further commented that at the conclusion of the exercise, if it was successful, constituencies may be identified that might listen to other relevant issues.

John Rokich suggested that a private non-profit organization may be another possible group that would be the administrative agency to help local governments with these building code issues. Discussion followed as to the logical lead group to organize this agency. Discussion of the Uniform Building Code Commission being the lead turned to the option of the USSC taking the lead with the support of the Uniform Building Code Commission.

Member/Chair Term Expirations

Les asked the staff to review the bylaws of the Commission on the terms of membership. Gary reported: 1) Professional Organizations, (i.e. Les, Barry, Jim Bailey) - biennial, 2) Legislators - biennial, and 3) all other positions are assigned to the director or designee. The term limit for the chair is one year. Letters will be sent out by the staff to the professional organizations and the Legislature stating that their terms expire on June 30, 1996 and they need to either re-appointment or elect a new representative beginning July 1, 1996. Gary asked that included in the letters state if the Commission members are willing to continue in the position. Representatives need to be identified by the next meeting. Les stated at the next meeting a new chair of the Commission will be elected. Discussion ensued on the organizations not represented and that their interests were not expressed due to lack of participation.

Report on Presentations to Legislative Caucuses

Les asked that Jim report on his presentations. Jim indicated a positive response from his presentations. He was concerned that the strong motion initiative was the only item in the Governor's budget but was encouraged that the funding would remain by the comments from the Senators and the House Democrats. He expressed surprise that the funding was cut. Les reported that his presentation to the House Republicans was shortened due to the length of the prior presentation.

Review Lessons Learned from 1995-1996 Efforts with the Governor/Legislature

Les reviewed the presentation to the Governor and the budget director, Lynn Koga. Les commented that he was surprised that the strong motion initiative was the only initiative that remained in the budget. The support was not there in the Legislative committees as results show. Lee commented that Sen. Lyle Hilliard suggested that at the time we discovered the strong motion initiative was not in the Legislature's budget, a sponsor could have been sought out and the bill run separately. Support in the Energy and Natural Resources Appropriations Committee was not great because members lived in areas of long seismic risk. There was a lot of support in the committee due to calls and letters regarding the seismic issues, but support was lost in the Executive Appropriations Committee to other pressing issues. If it went as a separate bill it more likely would have been heard by the State and Local Affairs other or urban committees and then gone to the floor for full debate. If future requests are put through UGS, they will have the same challenges.

Plan 1996 - 1997 Activities; Prepare for 1997 Legislature

Les requested input for next year's activities and if the priorities need to be reviewed. Lee suggested that the priorities be reviewed and possibly new priorities may be identified and presented in the fall. Walter commented that important groups were identified through the process this year and expressed that success may not occur if these resources are not utilized. Les suggested that the proposal on plan checking and inspection be ready to go to the ACIR by the next meeting.

Status of Conference Planning

Lee reported that the Education and Awareness Committee was concerned that training is not broad based. The focus has been on organizations dealing with the same issues, and other interested organizations. (i.e. professional organizations, local government, and businesses) are not brought in. Lee asked Gary to brief the Commission on the EERI conference in California. Gary reported that the conference was focused on an earthquake scenario bringing in utilities, lifelines, transportation, and technical groups to give realistic numbers as to damage and down time, etc. Lee stated the Committee liked the idea and suggested that one day be focused on this type of scenario with another day or half day of breakout sessions. The second day could be a more technical audience with the first day directed to business, professional organizations, and local government.

The Committee also suggested a workshop for Utah media (reporters, newspapers, TV, and radio) to give them a basic understanding of earthquake terms and definitions. This would also open the door from the media to request technical information.

Lee stated that the idea of awards was suggested to acknowledge people, groups, or organizations that have made significant contributions to earthquake safety. A recommendation was made to contact John Huntsman and dedicate an award after David Horne.

Lee commented that other innovative ideas were mentioned that may draw support and sponsorship from the private sector, including 1) a video tape of the conference aired on state education network, or through the University of Utah Education Station and 2) possibly providing an interactive session during the conference for direct response from the conference participants to the school(s).

Walter asked if the title "Governor's Conference" could be used to solicit nominal support. He then commented that the conference described is more of an awareness raising event. He questioned if this is really going to direct the Commission in the line of making a difference. Lee responded that the Committee agreed that this is the target group that are the decision makers who have interest but have not been involved. Lee commented that at the end of the conference the question "where do we go from here?" would be asked in a final session discussing mitigation. The Committee felt that this group of participants could move the USSC agenda forward. Walter then returned to the title of the conference and expressed that third party advocacy is a stronger statement than the Commission asking for the endorsement.

USSC Minutes
March 13, 1996
Page 6 of 6

Other Business

Les reported that at the annual EERI meeting in Los Angeles, a company called Seisalert, from California, is contracting to set sensors in communities. After an earthquake the magnitude, location and an intensity map is printed for emergency response. A representative sent him an article from the newspaper and if it appears appropriate they will come and make a presentation to the Commission.

Next Meeting

The next meeting will be on June 6, 1996 at 9:00 a.m.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Brenda Edwards